

Reference Model for Service Oriented Architecture 1.0

Public Review Draft 2, 31 May 2006

Document identifier:

wd-soa-rm-pr2

Location:

http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc_home.php?wg_abbrev=soa-rm

Editors:

C. Matthew MacKenzie, Adobe Systems Incorporated, mattm@adobe.com
Ken Laskey, MITRE Corporation, klaskey@mitre.org
Francis McCabe, Fujitsu Limited, frank.mccabe@us.fujitsu.com
Peter F Brown, peter@justbrown.net
Rebekah Metz, Booz Allen Hamilton, metz_rebekah@bah.com

Abstract:

This Reference Model for Service Oriented Architecture is an abstract framework for understanding significant entities and relationships between them within a service-oriented environment, and for the development of consistent standards or specifications supporting that environment. It is based on unifying concepts of SOA and may be used by architects developing specific service oriented architectures or in training and explaining SOA.

A reference model is not directly tied to any standards, technologies or other concrete implementation details. It does seek to provide a common semantics that can be used unambiguously across and between different implementations. **The relationship between the Reference Model and particular architectures, technologies and other aspects of SOA is illustrated in Figure 1.**

While service-orientation may be a popular concept found in a broad variety of applications, this reference model focuses on the field of software architecture. The concepts and relationships described may apply to other "service" environments; however, this specification makes no attempt to completely account for use outside of the software domain.

Status:

This document is updated periodically on no particular schedule. Send comments to the editor(s).

Committee members should send comments on this specification to the soa-rm@lists.oasis-open.org list. Others should visit the SOA-RM TC home page at http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc_home.php?wg_abbrev=soa-rm, and record comments using the web form available there.

For information on whether any patents have been disclosed that may be essential to implementing this specification, and any offers of patent licensing terms, please refer to the Intellectual Property Rights section of the SOA-RM TC web page at:

http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc_home.php?wg_abbrev=soa-rm

The errata page for this specification is at:

http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc_home.php?wg_abbrev=soa-rm.

Notices

OASIS takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on OASIS's procedures with respect to rights in OASIS specifications can be found at the OASIS website. Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification, can be obtained from the OASIS Executive Director.

OASIS invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights, which may cover technology that may be required to implement this specification. Please address the information to the OASIS Executive Director.

Copyright © OASIS Open 2006. *All Rights Reserved.*

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works.

However, this document itself **should** not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to OASIS, except as needed for the purpose of developing OASIS specifications, in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the OASIS Intellectual Property Rights document must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by OASIS or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and OASIS DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
1.1	What is a reference model.....	4
1.2	A Reference Model for Service Oriented Architectures.....	4
1.3	Audience	5
1.4	Guide to using the reference model.....	6
1.5	Notational Conventions	6
1.5.1	How to interpret concept maps.....	6
1.6	Relationships to Other Standards	7
2	Service Oriented Architecture.....	8
2.1	What is Service Oriented Architecture?.....	8
2.1.1	A worked Service Oriented Architecture example.....	9
2.2	How is Service Oriented Architecture different?	10
2.3	The Benefits of Service Oriented Architecture	11
3	The Reference Model.....	12
3.1	Service.....	12
3.2	Dynamics of Services.....	13
3.2.1	Visibility.....	13
3.2.2	Interacting with services	15
3.2.3	Real World Effect.....	18
3.3	About services	19
3.3.1	Service description	20
3.3.2	Policies and Contracts.....	22
3.3.3	Execution context.....	24
4	Conformance Guidelines.....	26
5	References	27
5.1	Normative	27
5.2	Non-Normative.....	27
A.	Glossary	28
B.	Acknowledgments	31

1 Introduction

The notion of Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) has received significant attention within the software design and development community. The result of this attention is the proliferation of many conflicting definitions of SOA. Whereas SOA architectural patterns (or *reference architectures*) may be developed to explain and underpin a generic design template supporting a specific SOA, a **reference model** is intended to provide an even higher level of commonality, with definitions that should apply to *all* SOA.

1.1 What is a reference model

A reference model is an abstract **framework** for understanding significant relationships among the entities of some environment. It enables the development of specific **reference or concrete** architectures using consistent standards or specifications supporting that environment. A reference model consists of a minimal set of unifying concepts, axioms and relationships within a particular problem domain, and is independent of specific standards, technologies, implementations, or other concrete details.

As an illustration of the relationship between a reference model and the architectures that can derive from such a model, consider what might be involved in modeling what is important about residential housing. In the context of a reference model, we know that concepts such as eating areas, hygiene areas and sleeping areas are all important in understanding what goes into a house. There are relationships between these concepts, and constraints on how they are implemented. For example, there may be physical separation between eating areas and hygiene areas.

The role of a **reference architecture** for housing would be to identify abstract solutions to the problems of providing housing. A general pattern for housing, one that addresses the needs of its occupants in the sense of, say, noting that there are bedrooms, kitchens, hallways, and so on is a good basis for an abstract reference architecture. The concept of eating area is a reference model concept, a kitchen is a realization of eating area in the context of the reference architecture.

There may be more than one reference architecture that addresses how to design housing; for example, there may be a reference architecture to address the requirements for developing housing solutions in large apartment complexes, another to address suburban single family houses, and another for space stations. In the context of high density housing, there may not be a separate kitchen but rather a shared cooking space or even a communal kitchen used by many families.

An actual – or concrete – architecture would introduce additional elements. It would incorporate particular architectural styles, particular arrangements of windows, construction materials to be used and so on. A blueprint of a particular house represents **a specific** architecture as it applies to a proposed or actually constructed dwelling.

The reference model for housing is, therefore, at least three levels of abstraction away from a physical entity that can be lived in. The purpose of a reference model is to provide a common conceptual framework that can be used consistently across and between different implementations and is of particular use in modeling specific solutions.

1.2 A Reference Model for Service Oriented Architectures


The goal of this reference model is to define the essence of service oriented architecture, and emerge with a vocabulary and a common understanding of SOA. It provides a normative reference that remains relevant for SOA as an abstract and powerful model, irrespective of the various and inevitable technology evolutions that will influence SOA deployment.

47 Figure 1 shows how a reference model for SOA relates to other distributed systems architectural
 48 inputs. The concepts and relationships defined by the reference model are intended to be the
 49 basis for describing references architectures and patterns that will define more specific categories
 50 of SOA designs. Concrete architectures arise from a combination of reference architectures,
 51 architectural patterns and additional requirements, including those imposed by technology
 52 environments.

53 | Architecture must account for the goals, motivation, and requirements that define the actual
 54 problems being addressed. While reference architectures can form the basis of classes of
 55 solutions, concrete architectures will define specific solution approaches.

56 Architecture is often developed in the context of a pre-defined environment, such as the
 57 protocols, profiles, specifications, and standards that are pertinent.

58 SOA implementations combine all of these elements, from the more generic architectural
 59 principles and infrastructure to the specifics that define the current needs, and represent specific
 60 implementations that will be built and used in an operational environment.



61 Concrete
 62 Figure 1 How the Reference Model relates to other work

63 1.3 Audience

64 The intended audiences of this document include non-exhaustively:

- 65 • Architects and developers designing, identifying or developing a system based on the
- 66 service-oriented paradigm.
- 67 • Standards architects and analysts developing specifications that rely on service oriented
- 68 architecture concepts.
- 69 • Decision makers seeking a "consistent and common" understanding of service oriented
- 70 architectures.
- 71 • Users who need a better understanding of the concepts and benefits of service oriented
- 72 architecture.

73 1.4 Guide to using the reference model

74 New readers are encouraged to read this reference model in its entirety. Concepts are presented
75 in an order that the authors hope promote rapid understanding.

76 This section introduces the conventions, defines the audience and sets the stage for the rest of
77 the document. Non-technical readers are encouraged to read this information as it provides
78 background material necessary to understand the nature and usage of reference models.

79 Section 2 introduces the concept of SOA and identifies some of the ways that it differs from
80 previous paradigms for distributed systems. Section 2 offers guidance on the basic principles of
81 service oriented architecture. This can be used by non-technical readers to gain an explicit
82 understanding of the core principles of SOA and by architects as guidance for developing specific
83 service oriented architectures.

84 Section 3 introduces the Reference Model for SOA. In any framework as rich as SOA, it is difficult
85 to avoid a significant amount of cross referencing between concepts. This makes presentation of
86 the material subject to a certain amount of arbitrariness. We resolve this by introducing the
87 concept of service itself, then we introduce concepts that relate to the dynamic aspects of service
88 and finally we introduce those concepts that refer to the meta-level aspects of services such as
89 service description and policies as they apply to services.

90 Section 4 addresses compliance with this reference model.

91 The glossary provides definitions of terms that are relied upon within the reference model
92 specification but do not necessarily form part of the specification itself. Terms that are defined in
93 the glossary are marked in **bold** at their first occurrence in the document.

94 Note that while the concepts and relationships described in this reference model may apply to
95 other "service" environments, the definitions and descriptions contained herein focus on the field
96 of **software architecture** and make no attempt to completely account for use outside of the
97 software domain. Examples included in this document that are taken from other domains are
98 used strictly for illustrative purposes.

99 1.5 Notational Conventions

100 The key words MUST, MUST NOT, REQUIRED, SHALL, SHALL NOT, SHOULD, SHOULD NOT,
101 RECOMMENDED, MAY, and OPTIONAL in this document are to be interpreted as described in
102 [RFC2119].

103 References are surrounded with **[square brackets and are in bold text]**.

104 1.5.1 How to interpret concept maps.

105 Concepts maps are used within this document. There is no normative convention for interpreting
106 Concept maps and other than described herein, no detailed information can be derived from the
107 concept maps herein.

108
109



110
111

Figure 2 A basic concept map

112
113
114
115

As used in this document a line between two concepts represents a relationship, where the
relationship is not labeled but rather is described in the text immediately preceding or following
the figure. The arrow on a line indicates an asymmetrical relationship, where the concept to
which the arrow points (Concept 2 in Figure 2) can be interpreted as depending in some way on

116 | the concept from which the line originates (Concept 1). The text accompanying each graphic
117 | describes the nature of each relationship.

118 | **1.6 Relationships to Other Standards**

119 | Due to its nature, this reference model may have an implied relationship with any group that:

- 120 | • Considers its work "service oriented";
- 121 | • Makes (publicly) an adoption statement to use the Reference Model for SOA as a base or
122 | inspiration for their work; and
- 123 | • Standards or technologies that claim to be service oriented.

124 | The reference model does not endorse any particular service-oriented architecture, or attest to
125 | the validity of third party reference model conformance claims.

126 2 Service Oriented Architecture

127 2.1 What is Service Oriented Architecture?

128 **Service Oriented Architecture** (SOA) is a paradigm for organizing and utilizing distributed
129 **capabilities** that may be under the control of different ownership domains.

130 In general, entities (people and organizations) create capabilities to solve or support a solution for
131 the problems they face in the course of their business. It is natural to think of one person's needs
132 being met by capabilities offered by someone else; or, in the world of distributed computing, one
133 computer agent's requirements being met by a computer agent belonging to a different owner.

134 There is not necessarily a one-to-one correlation between needs and capabilities; the granularity
135 of needs and capabilities vary from fundamental to complex, and any given need may require the
136 combining of numerous capabilities while any single capability may address more than one need.
137 The perceived value of SOA is that it provides a powerful framework for matching needs and
138 capabilities and for combining capabilities to address those needs.

139 Visibility, interaction, and effect are key concepts for describing the SOA paradigm. **Visibility**
140 refers to the capacity for those with needs and those with capabilities to be able to see each
141 other. This is typically done by providing descriptions for such aspects as functions and technical
142 requirements, related constraints and policies, and mechanisms for access or response. The
143 descriptions need to be in a form (or can be transformed to a form) in which their syntax and
144 **semantics** are widely accessible and understandable.

145 Whereas visibility introduces the possibilities for matching needs to capabilities (and vice versa),
146 **interaction** is the activity of using a capability. Typically mediated by the exchange of messages,
147 an interaction proceeds through a series of information exchanges and invoked actions. There
148 are many facets of interaction; but they are all grounded in a particular **execution context** – the
149 set of technical and business elements that form a path between those with needs and those with
150 capabilities. This permits service providers and consumers to interact and provides a decision
151 point for any policies and contracts that may be in force.

152 The purpose of using a capability is to realize one or more **real world effects**. At its core, an
153 interaction is “an act” as opposed to “an object” and the result of an interaction is an effect (or a
154 set/series of effects). **This effect may be the return of information or the change in the state of**
155 **entities (known or unknown) that are involved in the interaction.**

156 We are careful to distinguish between *public* actions and *private* actions; private actions are
157 inherently unknowable by other parties. On the other hand, public actions result in changes to the
158 *state* that is shared **between** at least those involved in the current execution context and possibly
159 shared by others. Real world effects are, then, couched in terms of changes to this **shared state**.

160 The expected real world effects form an important part of the decision on whether a **particular**
161 capability matches similarly described needs. At the interaction stage, the description of real
162 world effects establishes the expectations of those using the capability. Note, it is not possible
163 to describe every effect from using a capability. **A cornerstone of SOA is that capabilities can be**
164 **used** without needing to know all the details.

165 **This** description of SOA has yet to mention what is usually considered the central concept: the
166 **service**. The noun “service” is defined in dictionaries as “The performance of work (a function) by
167 one for another.” However, service, as the term is generally understood, also combines the
168 following related ideas:

- 169 • The capability to perform work for another
- 170 • The specification of the work offered for another
- 171 • The offer to perform work for another

172 These concepts emphasize a distinction between a capability and the ability to bring that
173 capability to bear. While both needs and capabilities exist independently of SOA, **in SOA,**
174 **services are the mechanism by which needs and capabilities are brought together.**
175 SOA is a means of organizing solutions that promotes reuse, growth and interoperability. It is not
176 itself a solution to domain problems but rather an organizing and delivery paradigm that enables
177 one to get more value from use both of capabilities which are locally “owned” and those under the
178 control of others. It also enables one to express solutions in a way that makes it easier to modify
179 or evolve the identified solution or to try alternate solutions. SOA does not provide any domain
180 elements of a solution that do not exist without SOA.

181 **Note that while an SOA service brings together needs and capabilities, the provider of the**
182 **underlying capability may not be the same entity that eventually provides the service which**
183 **accesses that capability. In reality, the entity with the domain expertise to create, maintain, and**
184 **evolve a given capability may not have the expertise or the desire to create, maintain, and evolve**
185 **its service access.**

186 The concepts of visibility, interaction, and effect apply directly to services in the same manner as
187 these were described for the general SOA paradigm. Visibility is promoted through the **service**
188 **description** which contains the information necessary to interact with the service and describes
189 this in such terms as the service inputs, outputs, and associated semantics. The service
190 description also conveys what is accomplished when the service is invoked and the conditions for
191 using the service.

192 In general, entities (people and organizations) offer capabilities and act as **service providers**.
193 Those with needs who make use of services are referred to as **service consumers**. The service
194 description allows prospective consumers to decide if the service is suitable for their current
195 needs and establishes whether a consumer satisfies any requirements of the service provider.

196 (Note, service providers and service consumers are sometimes referred to jointly as **service**
197 **participants**.)

198 In most discussions of SOA, the terms “loose coupling” and “coarse-grained” are commonly
199 applied as SOA concepts, but these terms have intentionally not been used in the current
200 discussion because they are subjective trade-offs and without useful metrics. In terms of needs
201 and capabilities, granularity and coarseness are usually relative to detail for the level of the
202 problem being addressed, e.g. one that is more strategic vs. one down to the algorithm level, and
203 defining the optimum level is not amenable to counting the number of interfaces or the number or
204 types of information exchanges connected to an interface.

205 Note that although SOA is commonly implemented using Web services, services can be made
206 visible, support interaction, and generate effects through other implementation strategies. Web
207 service-based architectures and technologies are specific and concrete. While the concepts in the
208 Reference Model apply to such systems, Web **services** are too solution specific to be part of a
209 general reference model.

210 **2.1.1 A worked Service Oriented Architecture example**

211 An electric utility has the capacity to generate and distribute electricity (the
212 underlying capability). The wiring from the electric company’s distribution grid
213 (the service) provides the means to supply electricity to support typical usage for
214 a residential consumer’s house (service functionality), and a consumer accesses
215 electricity generated (the output of invoking the service) via a wall outlet (service
216 interface). In order to use the electricity, a consumer needs to understand what
217 type of plug to use, what is the voltage of the supply, and possible limits to the
218 load; the utility presumes that the customer will only connect devices that are
219 compatible with the voltage provided and load supported; and the consumer in
220 turn assumes that compatible consumer devices can be connected without
221 damage or harm (service technical assumptions).

222 A residential or business user will need to open an account with the utility in
223 order to use the supply (service constraint) and the utility will meter usage and
224 expects the consumer to pay for use at the rate prescribed (service policy).
225 When the consumer and utility agree on constraints and polices (service
226 contract), the consumer can receive electricity using the service as long as the
227 electricity distribution grid and house connection remain intact (e.g. a storm
228 knocking down power lines would disrupt distribution) and the consumer can
229 have payment sent (e.g. a check by mail or electronic funds transfer) to the utility
230 (reachability).

231 Another person (for example, a visitor to someone else's house) may use a
232 contracted supply without any relationship with the utility or any requirement to
233 also satisfy the initial service constraint (i.e. reachability only requires intact
234 electricity distribution) but would nonetheless be expected to be compatible with
235 the service interface.

236 In certain situations (for example, excessive demand), a utility may limit supply or
237 institute rolling blackouts (service policy). A consumer might lodge a formal
238 complaint if this occurred frequently (consumer's implied policy).

239 If the utility required every device to be hardwired to its equipment, the underlying
240 capability would still be there but this would be a very different service and have
241 a very different service interface.

242 2.2 How is Service Oriented Architecture different?

243 Unlike Object Oriented Programming paradigms, where the focus is on packaging data with
244 operations, the central focus of Service Oriented Architecture is the task or business function –
245 getting something done.

246 This distinction manifests itself in several ways:

- 247 • OO has intentional melding of methods to a given data object. The methods can be thought
248 of as a property of the object. For SOA, one can think of the services as being the access to
249 methods but the actual existence of methods and any connection to objects is incidental.
- 250 • To use an object, it must first be instantiated while one interacts with a service where it exists.
- 251 • An object exposes structure but there is no way to express semantics other than what can be
252 captured as comments in the class definition. SOA emphasizes the need for clear semantics.

253 Both OO and SOA are as much a way of thinking about representing things and actions in the
254 world as these are about the specifics of building a system. The important thing is understanding
255 and applying the paradigm. So the question is not “what is a service?” any more than it is “what
256 is an object?” Anything can be a service in the same way anything can be an object. The
257 challenge is to apply the paradigms to enhance clarity and get things done. SOA provides a
258 more viable basis for large scale systems because it is a better fit to the way human activity itself
259 is managed – by delegation.

260 How does this paradigm of SOA differ from other approaches to organizing and understanding
261 Information Technology assets? Essentially, there are two areas in which it differs both of which
262 shape the framework of concepts that underlie distributed systems.

263 First, SOA reflects the reality that ownership boundaries are a motivating consideration in the
264 architecture and design of systems. This recognition is evident in the core concepts of visibility,
265 interaction and effect.

266 However, SOA does not itself address all the concepts associated with ownership, ownership
267 domains and actions communicated between legal peers. To fully account for concepts such as
268 trust, business transactions, authority, delegation and so on – additional conceptual frameworks
269 and architectural elements are required. Within the context of SOA, these are likely to be
270 represented and referenced within **service descriptions** and **service interfaces**. The presence
271 of service descriptions and service interfaces provides a ready location for including such

272 | references and thus facilitates reuse of externally developed frameworks and interoperability
273 | among systems availing themselves of this reuse.

274 | Second, SOA applies the lessons learned from commerce to the organization of IT assets to
275 | facilitate the matching of capabilities and needs. That two or more entities come together within
276 | the context of a single interaction implies the exchange of some type of value. This is the same
277 | fundamental basis as trade itself, and suggests that as SOAs evolve away from interactions
278 | defined in a point-to-point manner to a marketplace of services; the technology and concepts can
279 | scale as successfully as the commercial marketplace.

280 | **2.3 The Benefits of Service Oriented Architecture**

281 | The main drivers for SOA-based architectures are to facilitate the manageable growth of large-
282 | scale enterprise systems, to facilitate Internet-scale provisioning and use of services and to
283 | reduce costs in organization to organization cooperation.

284 | The value of SOA is that it provides a simple scalable paradigm for organizing large networks of
285 | systems that require interoperability to realize the value inherent in the individual components.
286 | Indeed, SOA is scalable because it makes the fewest possible assumptions about the network
287 | and also minimizes any trust assumptions that are often implicitly made in smaller scale systems.

288 | An architect using SOA principles is better equipped, therefore, to develop systems that are
289 | scalable, evolvable and manageable. It should be easier to decide how to integrate functionality
290 | across ownership boundaries. For example, a large company that acquires a smaller company
291 | must determine how to integrate the acquired IT infrastructure into its overall IT portfolio.

292 | Through this inherent ability to scale and evolve, SOA enables an IT portfolio which is also
293 | adaptable to the varied needs of a specific problem domain or process architecture. The
294 | infrastructure SOA encourages is also more agile and responsive than one built on an
295 | exponential number of pair-wise interfaces. Therefore, SOA can also provide a solid foundation
296 | for business agility and adaptability.


297

3 The Reference Model

298

Figure 3 illustrates the principal concepts this reference model defines. The relationships between them are developed as each concept is defined in turn.

299



300

301 Figure 3 Principal concepts in the Reference Model

302

3.1 Service

303

A **service** is a mechanism to enable access to one or more capabilities, where the access is provided using a prescribed interface and is exercised consistent with constraints and policies as specified by the service description. A service is provided by an entity – the **service provider** – for use by others, but the eventual consumers of the service may not be known to the service provider and may demonstrate uses of the service beyond the scope originally conceived by the provider.

309

A service is accessed by means of a service interface (see Section 3.3.1.4), where the interface comprises the specifics of how to access the underlying capabilities. There are no constraints on what constitutes the underlying capability or how access is implemented by the service provider. Thus, the service could carry out its described functionality through one or more automated and/or manual processes that themselves could invoke other available services.

314

A service is opaque in that its implementation is typically hidden from the **service consumer** except for (1) the information and behavior models exposed through the service interface and (2) the information required by service consumers to determine whether a given service is appropriate for their needs.

318

The consequence of invoking a service is a realization of one or more real world effects (see Section 3.2.3). These effects may include:

320

321

1. information returned in response to a request for that information,

322

2. a change to the shared state of defined entities, or

323 3. some combination of (1) and (2).


324

325 Note, the service consumer in (1) does not typically know how the information is generated, e.g.
326 whether it is extracted from a database or generated dynamically; in (2), it does not typically know
327 how the state change is effected.

328 The service concept above emphasizes a distinction between a capability that represents some
329 functionality created to address a need and the point of access **where** that capability **is brought** to
330 bear in the context of SOA. It is assumed that capabilities exist outside of SOA. In actual use,
331 maintaining this distinction may not be critical (i.e. the service may be talked about in terms of
332 being the capability) but the separation is pertinent in terms of a clear expression of the nature of
333 SOA and the value it provides.

334 3.2 Dynamics of Services

335 From a dynamic perspective, there are three fundamental concepts that are important in
336 understanding what is involved in interacting with services: the visibility between service providers
337 and consumers, the interaction between them, and the real world effect of interacting with a
338 service.




339

340 Figure 4 Concepts around the dynamics of service

341 3.2.1 Visibility

342 For a service provider and consumer to interact with each other they have to be able to 'see' each
343 other. This is true for any consumer/provider relationship – including in an application program
344 where one program calls another: without the proper libraries being present the function call
345 cannot complete. In the case of SOA, visibility needs to be emphasized because it is not
346 necessarily obvious how service participants *can* see each other.



347

348 Figure 5 Concepts around Visibility

349 Visibility is the relationship between service consumers and providers that is satisfied when they
 350 are able to interact with each other. Preconditions to visibility are **awareness**, **willingness** and
 351 **reachability**. The initiator in a service interaction **MUST** be aware of the other parties, the
 352 participants **MUST** be predisposed to interaction, and the participants **MUST** be able to interact.

353 3.2.1.1 Awareness

354 Both the service provider and the service consumer **MUST** have information that would lead them
 355 to know of the other's existence. Technically, the prime requirement is that the *initiator* of a
 356 service interaction has knowledge of the responder. The fact of a successful initiation is often
 357 sufficient to inform the responder of the other's existence.

358 Awareness is a state whereby one party has knowledge of the existence of the other party.
 359 Awareness does not imply willingness or reachability. Awareness of service offerings is often
 360 effected by various *discovery* mechanisms. For a service consumer to discover a service, the
 361 service provider must be capable of making details of the service (notably service description and
 362 policies) available to potential consumers; and consumers must be capable of becoming aware of
 363 that information. Conversely, the service provider may want to discover likely consumers and
 364 would need to become aware of the consumer's description. In the following, we will discuss
 365 awareness in terms of service visibility but the concepts are equally valid for consumer visibility.

366 Service awareness requires that the **service description** and **policy** – or at least a suitable
 367 subset thereof – be available in such a manner and form that, directly or indirectly, a potential
 368 consumer is aware of the existence and capabilities of the service. The extent to which the
 369 description is “pushed” by the service provider, “pulled” by a potential consumer, subject to a
 370 probe or another method, will depend on many factors.

371 For example, a service provider may advertise and promote their service by either including it in a
 372 service directory or broadcasting it to all consumers; potential consumers may broadcast their
 373 particular service needs in the hope that a suitable service responds with a proposal or **offer**, or a
 374 service consumer might also probe an entire network to determine if suitable services exist.
 375 When the demand for a service is higher than the supply, then, by advertising their needs,

376 potential consumers are likely to be more effective than service providers advertising offered
377 services.

378 One way or another, the potential consumer must acquire sufficient descriptions to evaluate
379 whether a given service matches its needs and, if so, the method for the consumer to interact
380 with the service.

381 **3.2.1.2 Willingness**

382 Associated with all service interactions is intent – it is an intentional act to initiate and to
383 participate in a service interaction. For example, if a service consumer discovers a service via its
384 description in a registry, and the consumer initiates an interaction, if the service provider does not
385 cooperate then there can be no interaction. In some circumstances it is precisely the correct
386 behavior for a service to fail to respond – for example, it is the classic defense against certain
387 denial-of-service attacks.

388 The extent of a service participant's willingness to engage in service interactions may be the
389 subject of policies. Those policies may be documented in the service description.

390 | **Willingness** on the part of service providers and consumers to interact is not the same as a
391 willingness to perform requested actions. A service provider that rejects all attempts to cause it to
392 perform some action may still be fully willing and engaged in interacting with the consumer.


393 **3.2.1.3 Reachability**

394 Reachability is the relationship between service participants where they are able to interact;
395 possibly by exchanging information. Reachability is an essential pre-requisite for service
396 interaction – participants **MUST** be able to communicate with each other.

397 A service consumer may have the intention of interacting with a service, and may even have all
398 the information needed to communicate with it. However, if the service is not reachable, for
399 example if there is not a communication path between the consumer and provider, then,
400 effectively, the service is not visible to the consumer.

401 **3.2.2 Interacting with services**

402 Interacting with a service involves performing actions against the service. In many cases, this is
403 accomplished by sending and receiving messages, but there are other modes possible that do
404 not involve explicit message transmission. For example, a service interaction may be effected by
405 modifying the state of a shared resource. However, for simplicity, we often refer to message
406 exchange as the primary mode of interaction with a service.



407

408 Figure 6 Service Interaction concepts

409 Figure 6 illustrates the key concepts that are important in understanding what it is involved in
 410 interacting with services; these revolve around the service description – which references a
 411 **information model** and a **behavior model**.

412 3.2.2.1 Information model

413 The information model of a service is a characterization of the information that may be exchanged
 414 with the service. Only information and data that are potentially exchanged with a service are
 415 generally included within that service's information model.

416 The scope of the information model includes the format of information that is exchanged, the
 417 structural relationships within the exchanged information and also the definition of terms used.

418 Particularly for information that is exchanged across an ownership boundary, an important aspect
 419 of the service information model is the consistent interpretation of strings and other tokens in the
 420 information.

421 The extent to which one system can effectively interpret information from another system is
 422 governed by the **semantic engagement** of the various systems. The semantic engagement of a
 423 system is a relationship between the system and information it may encounter. This is highly
 424 variable and application dependent; for example an encryption service interprets all information
 425 as a stream of bytes for it to encrypt or decrypt, whereas a database service would attempt to
 426 interpret the same information stream in terms of requests to query and/or modify the database.

427 Loosely, one might partition the interpretation of an informational block into structure (syntax) and
 428 semantics (**meaning**); although both are part of the information model.

429 3.2.2.1.1 Structure

430 Knowing the representation, structure, and form of information required is a key initial step in
 431 ensuring effective interactions with a service. There are several levels of such structural
 432 information; including the encoding of character data, the format of the data and the structural
 433 data types associated with elements of the information.

434 A described information model typically has a great deal to say about the form of messages.
435 However, knowing the type of information is not sufficient to completely describe the appropriate
436 interpretation of data. For example, within a street address structure, the city name and the street
437 name are typically given the same data type – some variant of the string type. However, city
438 names and street names are not really the same type of thing at all. Distinguishing the correct
439 interpretation of a city name string and a street name string is not possible using type-based
440 techniques – it requires additional information that cannot be expressed purely in terms of the
441 structure of data.

442 **3.2.2.1.2 Semantics**

443 The primary task of any communication infrastructure is to facilitate the exchange of information
444 and the exchange of intent. For example, a purchase order combines two somewhat orthogonal
445 aspects: the description of the items being purchased and the fact that one party intends to
446 purchase those items from another party. Even for exchanges that do not cross any ownership
447 boundaries, exchanges with services have similar aspects.

448 Especially in the case where the exchanges are across ownership boundaries, a critical issue is
449 the interpretation of the data. This interpretation **MUST** be consistent between the participants in
450 the service interaction. Consistent interpretation is a stronger requirement than merely type (or
451 structural) consistency – the tokens in the data itself must also have a shared basis.

452 There is often a huge potential for variability in representing street addresses. For example, an
453 address in San Francisco, California may have variations in the way the city is represented: SF,
454 San Francisco, San Fran, the City by the Bay are all alternate denotations of the same city. For
455 successful exchange of address information, all the participants must have a consistent view of
456 the meaning of the address tokens if address information is to be reliably shared.

457 The formal descriptions of terms and the relationships between them (e.g., an ontology) provides
458 a firm basis for selecting correct interpretations for elements of information exchanged. For
459 example, an ontology can be used to capture the alternate ways of expressing the name of a city
460 as well as distinguishing a city name from a street name.

461 Note that, for the most part, it is not expected that service consumers and providers would
462 actually exchange descriptions of terms in their interaction but, rather, would reference existing
463 descriptions – the role of the semantics being a background one – and these references would be
464 included in the service descriptions.

465 Specific domain semantics are beyond the scope of this reference model; but there is a
466 requirement that the service interface enable providers and consumers to identify unambiguously
467 those definitions that are relevant to their respective domains.

468 **3.2.2.2 Behavior model**

469 The second key requirement for successful interactions with services is knowledge of the actions
470 invoked against the service and the process or temporal aspects of interacting with the service.
471 This is characterized as knowledge of the actions on, responses to, and temporal dependencies
472 between actions on the service.

473 For example, in a security-controlled access to a database, the actions available to a service
474 consumer include presenting credentials, requesting database updates and reading results of
475 queries. The security may be based on a challenge-response protocol. For example, the initiator
476 presents an initial token of identity, the responder presents a challenge and the initiator responds
477 to the challenge in a way that satisfies the database. Only after the user's credentials have been
478 verified will the actions that relate to database update and query be accepted.

479 The sequences of actions involved are a critical aspect of the knowledge required for successful
480 use of the secured database.

481 3.2.2.2.1 Action model

482 The **action model** of a service is the characterization of the actions that may be invoked against
483 the service. Of course, a great portion of the behavior resulting from an action may be private;
484 however, the expected public view of a service surely includes the implied effects of actions.

485 For example, in a service managing a bank account, it is not sufficient to know that you need to
486 exchange a given message (with appropriate authentication tokens), in order to use the service. It
487 is also necessary to understand that using the service may actually affect the state of the account
488 (for example, withdrawing cash); that dependencies are involved (for example, a withdrawal
489 request must be less than the account balance); or that the data changes made have different
490 value in different contexts (for example, changing the data in a bank statement is not the same as
491 changing the amount in the account).

492 3.2.2.2.2 Process Model

493 The **process model** characterizes the temporal relationships and temporal properties of actions
494 and events associated with interacting with the service.

495 Note that although the process model is an essential part of this Reference Model, its extent is
496 not completely defined. Some process models MAY include aspects that are not strictly part of
497 SOA – for example, in this Reference Model we do not address the orchestration of multiple
498 services, although orchestration and choreography may be part of the process model. At a
499 minimum, the process model MUST cover the interactions with the service itself.


500 The reason that orchestration (and choreography) are not part of the SOA RM is that the focus of
501 the RM is on modeling what service is and what key relationships are involved in modeling
502 service.

503 Beyond the straightforward mechanics of interacting with a service there are other, higher-order,
504 attributes of services' process models that are also often important. These can include whether
505 the service is **idempotent**, whether the service is **long-running** in nature and whether it is
506 important to account for any **transactional** aspects of the service.

507 3.2.3 Real World Effect

508 There is always a particular purpose associated with interacting with a service. Conversely, a
509 service provider (and consumer) often has a priori conditions that apply to its interactions. The
510 service consumer is trying to achieve some result by using the service, as is the service provider.
511 At first sight, such a goal can often be expressed as “trying to get the service to do something”.
512 This is sometimes known as the “real world effect” of using a service. For example, an airline
513 reservation service can be used to learn about available flights, seating and ultimately to book
514 travel – the desired real world effect being information and a seat on the right flight.

515 As was discussed in Section 3.1, a real world effect can be the response to a request for
516 information or the change in the state of some defined entities shared by the service participants.
517 In this context, the shared state does not necessarily refer to specific state variables being saved
518 in physical storage but rather represents shared information about the affected entities. So in the
519 example of the airline reservation, the shared state - that there is a seat reserved on a particular
520 flight - represents a common understanding between a future passenger and the airline. The
521 details of actual state changes – whether on the part of the passenger (e.g. fund balances
522 required to pay for the ticket) or of the airline (e.g. that a seat is sold for that flight) - are not
523 shared by the other.



524

525 **Figure 7 Real World Effect and shared state**

526 **In addition, the** internal actions that service providers and consumers perform as a result of
 527 participation in service interactions are, by definition, private and fundamentally unknowable. By
 528 unknowable we mean both that external parties cannot see others' private actions and,
 529 furthermore, **SHOULD NOT** have explicit knowledge of them. Instead we focus on the set of facts
 530 shared by the parties – the shared state. Actions by service providers and consumers lead to
 531 modifications of this shared state; and the real world effect of a service interaction is the
 532 accumulation of the changes in the shared state.

533 For example, when an airline has confirmed a seat for a passenger on a flight this represents a
 534 fact that both the airline and the passenger share – it is part of their shared state. Thus the real
 535 world effect of booking the flight is the modification of this shared state – the creation of the fact of
 536 the booking. Flowing from the shared facts, the passenger, the airline, and interested third
 537 parties may make inferences – for example, when the passenger arrives at the airport the airline
 538 confirms the booking and permits the passenger onto the airplane (subject of course to the
 539 passenger meeting the other requirements for traveling).

540 For the airline to know that the seat is confirmed it will likely require some private action to record
 541 the reservation. However, a passenger should not have to know the details of the airline internal
 542 procedures. **Likewise, the airline does not know if the reservation was made by the passenger or**
 543 **someone acting on the passenger's behalf. The passenger's and the airline's understanding of**
 544 **the reservation is independent of how the airline maintains its records or who initiated the action.**

545 **There is a strong relationship between the shared state and the interactions that lead up to that**
 546 **state. The elements of the shared state SHOULD be inferable from that prior interaction together**
 547 **with other context as necessary. In particular, it is not required that the state be recorded;**
 548 **although without such recording it may become difficult to audit the interaction at a subsequent**
 549 **time.**

550 **3.3 About services**

551 In support of the dynamics of interacting with services are a set of concepts that are about
 552 services themselves. These are the service description, the execution context of the service and
 553 the contracts and policies that relate to services and service participants.




554
555 Figure 8 About services

556 3.3.1 Service description

557 One of the hallmarks of a Service Oriented Architecture is the large amount of associated
558 documentation and description.

559 The service description represents the information needed in order to use a service. In most
560 cases, there is no one “right” description but rather the elements of description required depend
561 on the context and the needs of the parties using the associated entity. While there are certain
562 elements that are likely to be part of any service description, most notably the information model,
563 many elements such as function and policy may vary.



564
565 Figure 9 Service description

566 The purpose of description is to facilitate interaction and visibility, particularly when the
567 participants are in different ownership domains, between participants in service interactions. By
568 providing descriptions, it makes it possible for potential participants to construct systems that use
569 services and even offer compatible services.

570 For example, descriptions allow participants to discriminate amongst possible choices for service
571 interaction; such as whether the service provides required capabilities, how to access the service,
572 and negotiate over specific service functionality. In addition, descriptions can be used to support
573 the management of services, both from the service provider's perspective and the service
574 consumer's perspective.

575 Best practice suggests that the service description SHOULD be represented using a standard,
576 referenceable format. Such a format facilitates the use of common processing tools (such as
577 discovery engines) that can capitalize on the service description.

578 While the concept of a SOA supports use of a service without the service consumer needing to
579 know the details of the service implementation, the service description makes available critical
580 information that a consumer needs in order to decide whether or not to use a service. In
581 particular, a service consumer needs to possess the following items of information:

- 582 1. That the service exists and is **reachable**;
- 583 2. That the service performs a certain function or set of functions;
- 584 3. That the service operates under a specified set of constraints and policies;
- 585 4. That the service will (to some implicit or explicit extent) comply with policies as prescribed
586 by the service consumer;
- 587 5. How to interact with the service in order to achieve the required objectives, including the
588 format and content of information exchanged between the service and the consumer and
589 the sequences of information exchange that may be expected.

590 While each of these items SHOULD be represented in any service description, the details can be
591 included through references (links) to external sources and are NOT REQUIRED to be
592 incorporated explicitly. This enables reuse of standard definitions, such as for functionality or
593 policies.

594 Other sections of this document deal with these aspects of a service, but the following
595 subsections discuss important elements as these relate to the service description itself.

596 3.3.1.1 Service Reachability

597 Reachability is an inherently pairwise relationship between service providers and service
598 consumers. However, a service description SHOULD include sufficient data to enable a service
599 consumer and service provider to interact with each other. This MAY include metadata such as
600 the location of the service and what information protocols it supports and requires. It MAY also
601 include dynamic information about the service, such as whether it is currently available.

602 3.3.1.2 Service Functionality

603 A service description SHOULD unambiguously express the function(s) of the service and the real
604 world effects (see Section 3.2.3) that result from it being invoked. This portion of the description
605 SHOULD be expressed in a way that is generally understandable by service consumers but able
606 to accommodate a vocabulary that is sufficiently expressive for the domain for which the service
607 provides its functionality. The description of functionality may include, among other possibilities,
608 a textual description intended for human consumption or identifiers or keywords referenced to
609 specific machine-processable definitions. For a full description, it MAY indicate multiple
610 identifiers or keywords from a number of different collections of definitions.

611 Part of the description of functionality may include underlying technical assumptions that
612 determine the limits of functionality exposed by the service or of the underlying capability. For
613 example, the amounts dispensed by an automated teller machine (ATM) are consistent with the
614 assumption that the user is an individual rather than a business. To use the ATM, the user must
615 not only adhere to the policies and satisfy the constraints of the associated financial institution
616 (see Section 3.3.1.3 for how this relates to service description and Section 3.3.2 for a detailed
617 discussion) but the user is limited to withdrawing certain fixed amounts of cash and a certain
618 number of transactions in a specified period of time. The financial institution, as the underlying

619 capability, does not have these limits but the service interface as exposed to its customers does,
620 consistent with its assumption of the needs of the intended user. If the assumption is not valid,
621 the user may need to use another service to access the capability.

622 3.3.1.3 Policies Related to a Service

623 A service description MAY include support for associating policies with a service and providing
624 necessary information for prospective consumers to evaluate if a service will act in a manner
625 consistent with the consumer's constraints.

626 3.3.1.4 Service Interface

627 The service interface is the means for interacting with a service. It includes the specific protocols,
628 commands, and information exchange by which actions are initiated that result in the real world
629 effects as specified through the service functionality portion of the service description.

630 The specifics of the interface SHOULD be syntactically represented in a standard referenceable
631 format. These prescribe what information needs to be provided to the service in order to access
632 its capabilities and interpret responses. This is often referred to as the service's information
633 model, see Section 3.2.2.1. It should be noted that the particulars of the interface format are
634 beyond the scope of the reference model. However, the existence of interfaces and accessible
635 descriptions of those interfaces are fundamental to the SOA concept.

636 While this discussion refers to a standard referenceable syntax for service descriptions, it is not
637 specified how the consumer accesses the interface definition nor how the service itself is
638 accessed. However, it is assumed that for a service to be usable, its interface MUST be
639 represented in a format that allows interpretation of the interface information by its consumers.

640 3.3.1.5 The Limits of Description

641 There are well-known theoretic limits on the effectiveness of descriptions – it is simply not
642 possible to specify, completely and unambiguously, the precise semantics of and all related
643 information about a service.

644 There will always be unstated assumptions made by the describer of a service that must be
645 implicitly shared by readers of the description. This applies to machine processable descriptions
646 as well as to human readable descriptions.

647 Fortunately, complete precision is not necessary – what is required is sufficient scope and
648 precision to support intended use.

649 Another kind of limit of service descriptions is more straightforward: whenever a repository is
650 searched using any kind of query there is always the potential for *zero or more* responses – no
651 matter how complete the search queries or the available descriptions appear to be. This is
652 inherent in the principles involved in search.

653 In the case that there is more than one response, this set of responses has to be converted into a
654 single choice. This is a private choice that must be made by the consumer of the search
655 information.

656 3.3.2 Policies and Contracts

657 A **policy** represents some constraint or condition on the use, deployment or description of an
658 owned entity as defined by any participant. A **contract**, on the other hand, represents an
659 agreement by two or more parties. Like policies, agreements are also about the conditions of use
660 of a service; they may also constrain the expected real world effects of using a service. The
661 reference model is focused primarily on the concept of policies and contracts as they apply to
662 services. We are not concerned with the form or expressiveness of any language used to
663 express policies and contracts.




Figure 10 Policies and Contracts

3.3.2.1 Service Policy

Conceptually, there are three aspects of policies: the policy assertion, the policy owner (sometimes referred to as the policy subject) and policy enforcement.

For example, the assertion: “All messages are encrypted” is an assertion regarding the forms of messages. As an assertion, it is measurable: it may be true or false depending on whether the traffic is encrypted or not. Policy assertions are often about the way the service is realized; i.e., they are about the relationship between the service and its execution context, see 3.3.3.

A policy always represents a participant’s point of view. An assertion becomes the policy of a participant when they adopt the assertion as their policy. This linking is normally not part of the assertion itself. For example, if the service consumer declares that “All messages are encrypted”, then that reflects the policy of the service consumer. This policy is one that may be asserted by the service consumer independently of any agreement from the service provider.

Finally, a policy may be enforced. Techniques for the enforcement of policies depend on the nature of the policy. Conceptually, service policy enforcement amounts to ensuring that the policy assertion is consistent with the real world. This might mean preventing unauthorized actions to be performed or states to be entered into; it can also mean initiating compensatory actions when a policy violation has been detected. An unenforceable constraint is not a policy; it would be better described as a wish.

Policies potentially apply to many aspects of SOA: security, privacy, manageability, Quality of Service and so on. Beyond such infrastructure-oriented policies, participants MAY also express business-oriented policies – such as hours of business, return policies and so on.

Policy assertions SHOULD be written in a form that is understandable to, and processable by, the parties to whom the policy is directed. Policies MAY be automatically interpreted, depending on the purpose and applicability of the policy and how it might affect whether a particular service is used or not.

A natural point of contact between service participants and policies associated with the service is in the service description – see Section 3.3.1. It would be natural for the service description to contain references to the policies associated with the service.

695 **3.3.2.2 Service Contract**


696 Whereas a policy is associated with the point of view of individual participants, a contract
697 represents an agreement between two or more participants. Like policies, contracts can cover a
698 wide range of aspects of services: quality of service agreements, interface and choreography
699 agreements and commercial agreements. Note that we are not necessarily referring to legal
700 contracts here.

701 Thus, following the discussion above, a service contract is a measurable assertion that governs
702 the requirements and expectations of two or more parties. Unlike policy enforcement, which is
703 usually the responsibility of the policy owner, contract enforcement may involve resolving
704 disputes between the parties to the contract. The resolution of such disputes may involve appeals
705 to higher authorities.

706 Like policies, contracts may be expressed in a form that permits automated interpretation. Where
707 a contract is used to codify the results of a service interaction, it is good practice to represent it in
708 a machine processable form. Among other purposes, this facilitates automatic service
709 composition. Where a contract is used to describe over-arching agreements between service
710 providers and consumers, then the priority is likely to make such contracts readable by people.

711 Since a contract is inherently the result of agreement by the parties involved, there is a *process*
712 associated with the agreement action. Even in the case of an implicitly agreed upon contract,
713 there is logically an agreement action associated with the contract, even if there is no overt action
714 of agreement. A contract may be arrived at by a mechanism that is not directly part of an SOA –
715 an out of band process. Alternatively, a contract may be arrived at during the course of a service
716 interaction – an in-band process.

717 **3.3.3 Execution context**



718
719 **Figure 11 Execution Context**

720 The **execution context** of a service interaction is the set of infrastructure elements, process
721 entities, policy assertions and agreements that are identified as part of an instantiated service
722 interaction, and thus forms a path between those with needs and those with capabilities.

723 As discussed in previous sections of this document, the service description (and a corresponding
724 description associated with the service consumer and its needs) contains information that can
725 include preferred protocols, semantics, policies and other conditions and assumptions that

726 describe how a service can and may be used. The participants (providers, consumers, and any
727 third parties as noted below) must agree and acknowledge a consistent set of agreements in
728 order to have a successful service interaction, i.e. realizing the described real world effects. The
729 execution context is the collection of this consistent set of agreements.

730 The consumer and provider can be envisioned as separate places on a map and, for a service to
731 actually be invoked, a path must be established between those two places. This path is the
732 execution context. As with a path between places, it can be a temporary connection (e.g. a
733 tenuous footbridge of an ad hoc exchange) or a well-defined coordination (e.g. a super highway)
734 that can be easily reused in the future.

735 The execution context is not limited to one side of the interaction; rather it concerns the totality of
736 the interaction – including the service provider, the service consumer and the common
737 infrastructure needed to mediate the interaction. While there may be third parties, for example,
738 government regulators, who set some of the conditions for the execution context, this merely
739 increases the conditions and constraints needing to be coordinated and may require additional
740 information exchange to complete the execution context.

741 The execution context is central to many aspects of a service interaction. It defines, for example,
742 a decision point for policy enforcement relating to the service interaction. Note that a policy
743 decision point is not necessarily the same as an enforcement point: an execution context is not by
744 itself something that lends itself to enforcement. On the other hand, any enforcement mechanism
745 of a policy is likely to take into account the particulars of the actual execution context.

746 The execution context also allows us to distinguish services from one another. Different instances
747 of the same service – denoting interactions between a given service provider and different service
748 consumers for example – are distinguished by virtue of the fact that their execution contexts are
749 different.

750 Finally, the execution context is also the context in which the interpretation of data that is
751 exchanged takes place. A particular string has a particular meaning in a service interaction in a
752 particular context – the execution context.

753 An execution context often evolves during a service interaction. The set of infrastructure
754 elements, the policies and agreements that apply to the interaction, may well change during a
755 given service interaction. For example, at an initial point in an interaction, it may be decided by
756 the parties that future communication should be encrypted. As a result the execution context also
757 changes – to incorporate the necessary infrastructure to support the encryption and continue the
758 interaction.

759 4 Conformance Guidelines

760 | The authors of this reference model envision that architects may wish to declare their **work** is
761 conformant with this reference model. Conforming to a Reference Model is not generally an easily
762 automatable task – given that the Reference Model’s role is primarily to define concepts that are
763 important to SOA rather than to give guidelines for implementing systems.

764 However, we do expect that any given Service Oriented Architecture will reference the concepts
765 outlined in this specification. As such, we expect that any design for a system that adopts the
766 SOA approach will

- 767 • Have entities that can be identified as services as defined by this Reference Model;
- 768 • Be able to identify how visibility is established between service providers and consumers;
- 769 • Be able to identify how interaction is mediated;
- 770 • Be able to identify how the effect of using services is understood;
- 771 • Have descriptions associated with services;
- 772 • Be able to identify the execution context required to support interaction; and
- 773 • It will be possible to identify how policies are handled and how contracts may be modeled
774 and enforced.

775 It is not appropriate for this specification to identify *best practices* with respect to building SOA-
776 based systems. However, the ease with which the above elements can be identified within a
777 given SOA-based system could have significant impact on the scalability, maintainability and
778 ease of use of the system.

779 **5 References**

780 **5.1 Normative**

781 [RFC2119] S. Bradner, *Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels*,
782 <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2119.txt>, IETF RFC 2119, March 1997.
783

784 **5.2 Non-Normative**

785 [W3C WSA] W3C Working Group Note "Web Services Architecture",
786 <http://www.w3.org/TR/ws-arch/> , 11 February 2004

787 A. Glossary

788 The glossary contains a concise definition of terms used within this specification, but the full
789 description in the text is the normative description.

790

791 **Action Model**

792 The characterization of the permissible actions that may be invoked against a service.
793 See Section 3.2.2.2.1.

794 **Awareness**

795 A state whereby one party has knowledge of the existence of the other party. Awareness
796 does not imply willingness or reachability. See Section 3.2.1.1.

797 **Behavior Model**

798 The characterization of (and responses to, and temporal dependencies between) the
799 actions on a service. See Section 3.2.2.2.

800 **Capability**

801 A real-world effect that a service provider is able to provide to a service consumer. See
802 Section 2.1.

803 **Execution context**

804 The set of technical and business elements that form a path between those with needs
805 and those with capabilities and that permit service providers and consumers to interact.
806 See Section 3.3.3.

807 **Framework**

808 A set of assumptions, concepts, values, and practices that constitutes a way of viewing
809 the current environment.

810 **Idempotency/Idempotent**

811 A characteristic of a service whereby multiple attempts to change a state will always and
812 only generate a single change of state if the operation has already been successfully
813 completed once. See Section 3.2.2.2.2.

814 **Information model**

815 The characterization of the information that is associated with the use of a service. See
816 Section 3.2.2.1.

817 **Interaction**

818 The activity involved in making using of a capability offered, usually across an ownership
819 boundary, in order to achieve a particular desired real-world effect. See Section 3.2.3.

820 **Offer**

821 An invitation to use the capabilities made available by a service provider in accordance
822 with some set of policies.

823 **Policy**

824 A statement of obligations, constraints or other conditions of use of an owned entity as
825 defined by a participant. See Section 3.3.2.

826 **Process Model**

827 The characterization of the temporal relationships between and temporal properties of
828 actions and events associated with interacting with the service. See Section 3.2.2.2.2.

- 829 **Reachability**
- 830 The ability of a service consumer and service provider to interact. Reachability is an
831 aspect of visibility. See Section 3.2.1.3.
- 832 **Real world effect**
- 833 The actual result of using a service, rather than merely the capability offered by a service
834 provider. See Section 3.2.3.
- 835 **Reference Architecture**
- 836 A reference architecture is an architectural design pattern that indicates how an abstract
837 set of mechanisms and relationships realizes a predetermined set of requirements. See
838 Section 1.1.
- 839 **Reference Model**
- 840 A reference model is an abstract framework for understanding significant relationships
841 among the entities of some environment that enables the development of specific
842 architectures using consistent standards or specifications supporting that environment.
- 843 A reference model consists of a minimal set of unifying concepts, axioms and
844 relationships within a particular problem domain, and is independent of specific
845 standards, technologies, implementations, or other concrete details. See Section 1.1.
- 846 **Semantics**
- 847 A conceptualization of the implied meaning of information, that requires words and/or
848 symbols within a usage context. See Section 3.2.2.1.2.
- 849 **Semantic Engagement**
- 850 The relationship between an agent and a set of information that depends on a particular
851 interpretation of the information. See Section 3.2.2.1.
- 852 **Service**
- 853 The means by which the needs of a consumer are brought together with the capabilities
854 of a provider. See Section 3.1.
- 855 **Service Consumer**
- 856 An entity which seeks to satisfy a particular need through the use capabilities offered by
857 means of a service.
- 858 **Service description**
- 859 The information needed in order to use, or consider using, a service. See Section 3.3.1.
- 860 **Service Interface**
- 861 The means by which the underlying capabilities of a service are accessed. See Section
862 3.3.1.4.
- 863 **Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)**
- 864 Service Oriented Architecture is a paradigm for organizing and utilizing distributed
865 capabilities that may be under the control of different ownership domains. It provides a
866 uniform means to offer, discover, interact with and use capabilities to produce desired
867 effects consistent with measurable preconditions and expectations. See Section 2.1.
- 868 **Service Provider**
- 869 An entity (person or organization) that offers the use of capabilities by means of a
870 service.
- 871 **Shared state**
- 872 The set of facts and commitments that manifest themselves to service participants as a
873 result of interacting with a service.

874

875 **Software Architecture**

876 The structure or structures of an information system consisting of entities and their
877 externally visible properties, and the relationships among them.

878 **Visibility**

879 The capacity for those with needs and those with capabilities to be able to interact with
880 each other. See Section 3.2.1.

881 **Willingness**

882 A predisposition of service providers and consumers to interact. See Section 3.2.1.2.

883

B. Acknowledgments

884 The following individuals were members of the committee during the development of this
885 specification and are gratefully acknowledged:

886 **Participants:**

887 Christopher Bashioum, Mitre Corporation
888 Prasanta Behera, Individual Member
889 Kathryn Breininger, The Boeing Company
890 Rex Brooks, HumanMarkup.org, Inc.
891 Al Brown, FileNet Corporation
892 | Peter F Brown, Individual Member
893 | Joseph Chiusano, Booz Allen Hamilton
894 | David Ellis, Individual Member
895 | Robert Ellinger, Northrup
896 | Jeff Estefan, Jet Propulsion Laboratory
897 | Don Flinn, Individual Member
898 | Steve Jones, Caggemini
899 | Gregory Kohring, NEC Europe Ltd.
900 | Ken Laskey, Mitre Corporation
901 | C. Matthew MacKenzie (**secretary**), Adobe Systems
902 | Francis McCabe (**secretary**), Fujitsu Laboratories of America Ltd.
903 | Wesley McGregor, Treasury Board of Canada, Secretariat
904 | Tom Merkle, Lockheed Martin Information Technology
905 | Rebekah Metz, Booz Allen Hamilton
906 | Oleg Mikulinsky, WebLayers, Inc.
907 | Jyoti Namjoshi, Patni Computer Systems, Ltd.
908 | Duane Nickull (**chair**), Adobe Systems
909 | George Ntinolazos, Strata Software Ltd
910 | Joseph Pantella, Individual Member
911 | Ron Schuldt, Lockheed Martin
912 | Michael Stiefel, Reliable Software, Inc.
913 | Danny Thornton, Individual Member
914 | Michal Zaremba, Digital Enterprise Research Institute