

SOA Governance Roundtable Discussion

June 27, 2007, Brussels, Belgium

Introduction

Slide #1

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: Welcome to the SOA Governance Roundtable from the SOA Consortium meeting live in Brussels, Belgium. Today, we have Fill Bowen from IBM, Ed Cobb from BEA, Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt from SAP AG, Clive Read from Cisco Systems. We have Brenda Michelson representing the SOA Consortium Community of Practice, and our SOA Consortium attendees, all participating in our roundtable.

Slide #2

We have four topics that we asked people to prepare for and speak to for six or seven minutes each. The first one is SOA Governance Program Capability – either describe the top three capabilities of an SOA Governance Program or three lesser known but important capabilities. Typically, the literature is full of things like repositories, but perhaps there are some other really important capabilities that we don't hear about as much.

Another aspect is human factors in SOA Governance. Certainly today, and yesterday during the Executive Summits, the human factor of SOA came up a lot. So, how does that impact on the governed and the governors?

The third topic, what are some best SOA governance practices from the field.

The fourth, how does SOA governance tie into IT and corporate governance? How it ties in, or perhaps how it does not.

Slide #3

How the roundtable will work is each -- each thought leader will have anywhere from five to seven minutes to share their insights. Everybody has supplied at least one slide. Some have supplied more. I will present the community of practice perspective. Then we'll have a discussion based on the thought leader insights and other questions that come up, either from myself or from the group. Feel free as well to answer some of the questions if you're part of the audience. So -- and again, we're being recorded. We're going to start with Fill.

Governance Thought Leader Insights

Slide #4

Fill Bowen, IBM: Okay. As I said this morning, I am -- in addition to being the SOA Consortium representative; I am the IBM SOA Governance Marketing Manager. I have

responsibility for trying to make sure that IBM has an overall corporate-wide SOA governance strategy.

Slide #5

The first chart is basically to answer Brenda's questions. So I thought I'd just take a first pass at each one on this chart. First, the governance program capabilities. Certainly, one of the key aspects that we have seen and everybody that we've talked to as far as SOA governance is concerned is establishing a SOA Center of Excellence. That seems to be a really key first requirement, is to establish a set of skilled and knowledgeable people who understand the value of SOA and how you're going to focus on it across the company.

Next, is to set up your SOA governance based on the level of SOA effort. So putting a Cadillac SOA governance system in place when your SOA effort is targeted at just trying to walk seems to be a little bit of overkill. One of the things we talk about regularly is, if you're just starting out with three or four or five services and maybe one application, you don't necessarily even need any tools. We've had customers that started out with a spreadsheet that kept track of their services. But, what they had was a SOA governance framework in place so that they could add over time. As the SOA effort increased, they could add more SOA governance capability and enforcement.

Focus on process before products, and we've talked about that a lot here today. It's really -- what is the overall process. In the case of SOA governance, there's really two processes involved. There's your overall SOA governance process of how you're going to govern your SOA, and then there's the actual SOA life cycle process, and how is that process being governed once it's in place. So you have to think about SOA governance from first establishing governance and then executing governance.

As far as human factors, C-Suite and business buy-in are going to be what you need for IT to be successful. IT trying to do it themselves is just not going to get the buy-in from the business and the C-Suite folks.

Conduct early and extensive education and publicity. What we've found is a lot of times people don't -- and I have this problem in IBM today. I'll go talk to people in IBM and say SOA and they'll say S-O what. So one of the big efforts you have any time you're trying a new -- as we've talked about -- a whole new technology and a whole new paradigm is making sure everybody's educated about it.

And then take advantage of enterprise architects. Enterprise architects can sometimes be the guys that everybody says; they're just overhead because they're not doing anything. They're just designing architectures, and we never really use any of those architectures. But, I think over time, and one of the things the SOA Consortium is focused on, is how to make the enterprise architects much more valuable, both for the business side as well as the IT side in trying to help this transition to SOA. So I highly recommend using your enterprise architects, both in the COE as well as in moving to SOA and helping you with the governance.

As far as best practices from the field, I've already talked about establishing the Center of Excellence. One of the other areas that we found, and again we've talked about, is the fact that there are probably in most companies a lot of services already floating around. Particularly if you're doing any kind of web services activities. That can be an area where you start using governance day one. Look at the current services environment. Look for opportunities to establish governance and learn what level of governance you need for the current services environment and for moving that environment to an SOA structure. So take advantage of an environment you may already have that's not governed by looking at current services, the development teams, and what other organizations are already doing.

Then, develop process ownership and funding models early. The first questions that everybody asks me when I come in and talk about SOA governance is, how do you establish ownership, and how do you establish service funding. The answer is there is no standard answer for either of those questions. It's going to depend on the company, but those are questions that the SOA governance work effort needs to establish. Is how you're going to handle service governance, service ownership and service funding.

As far as ties to IT and corporate governance, the major point there seems to be -- and where we've found companies focused on -- is that SOA governance really should be considered an extension of IT governance. We've found a lot of companies where SOA governance actually can improve their overall IT governance by really forcing them to look at their governance and forcing them to put some active governance in place versus this shelf ware that a lot of companies have. Those are the answers to the questions Brenda had.

Slide #9

The only other chart then I want to discuss is our lessons learned chart. This for the most part, reiterates the comments on the first one. But, what we've found as far as lessons learned is you really need the C-level support across the board. You need -- you need the CIO support, the CTO, COO, CEO; whatever level of C suite folks you have. That's where it comes from. It's going to have to come from the top down. The developers are not going to want to do SOA. It's too big a paradigm change for them.

Engage the business and drive business value. Find the pain points that the business has that you think SOA can address quickly and go after that and really sell the business on the value of SOA.

Establish your SOA funding model. As I said, ownership and funding are going to be the big question, whether it's going to cost you more or less by going to SOA. Deciding, how you're going to charge back. You may decide you want to charge back for services or you may just decide that the first guy that needs it, owns it, and has to fund it from then on. So whatever it is you decide.

Use your enterprise architecture and your enterprise architects to set up your SOA governance. They really understand where the governance challenges are within your organization.

Commit the level of roles, responsibilities and resources. That's the organizational change discussion. How is your organization going to look different with SOA? It may look any different from a hierarchical perspective, but it may have different responsibilities for folks like enterprise architects or your IT executives.

Get the message out. As I said, publicize this. A lot of concerns we've seen in development organizations and in IT shops is -- is their job going to go away when we move to SOA. So a lot of discussions early on when you're putting your governance in place to say, okay, your job is not going away. It may change, but it's not going to away. This is not an effort -- we've had some companies that said, you know, going to SOA is a way to downsize. That is not the intent of SOA. It's not intended to downsize your IT shops. It's intended to make your business more productive.

And be ready for SOA both organizationally and technically. So there's -- as we've talked about, governance can help you address both of those, both with your Center of Excellence from a technical perspective and with the organizational change aspects of SOA governance from a -- from an organizational perspective. So that's sort of what we've learned as far as doing SOA governance over the last year and a half or so. Thank you.

Slide #10

Ed Cobb, BEA Systems: Okay. Let me just make couple comments to start off before I show my chart. Let's go back to the basics of what we're trying to get out of governance in the first place and what kinds of issues you're trying to resolve. Then, I'll show you a chart from our professional services people that talks about the various aspects of governance because it's a very, very broad topic. It covers everything from artifacts and assets to people and processes and organizations and almost anything that you could talk about.

So if you think about it (governance) from the point of view, what are you trying to accomplish, what you really want to do is figure out a way to minimize the conflicts that you are going to run across in making decisions. Because you want to make decisions in a way that allows all the stakeholders involved to think the decisions are being made fairly.

You want to enable collaboration because this is (SOA) not something the IT department can do by itself. This is something that's going to require buy-in from all the stakeholders in the business. And, you want a structure that enables people to collaborate constructively. You need something that, if you will, is analogous to a stick. Because in the sense of trying to put an SOA process in place and adhere to it over time, means at some point in time somebody's going to have to make a decision that says, this is the way we're going to do it. You are going to make changes to encourage alignment to the goals and the roadmap that you've set, which is part of the governing structure as well.

And you want to be able to measure your progress on your roadmap in terms of what you're actually doing. What kind of services you're creating, what kind of re-use you're getting, what kind of best practices you're learning as you go through this.

Slide #11 center build

We look at governance in several different dimensions. There's the question of governing the stuff that you're actually creating as part of your SOA initiative. There are the policies and procedures that are associated with designing your SOA infrastructure. And there are the things that go along with the operational side of this thing, because this is a lifecycle kind of journey.

And, if the (slide) build is right -- you'll see what you have to start thinking about now is lifecycles of services. How you're going to create them. How you're going to manage them. How you're going to change them and go forward.

What you tend to think about in terms of application in an SOA world is it's really a collection of services that you put together to create an application. And one of the agility benefits that you get out of an SOA environment is that you can change the collection of services to make a new application, or you can change the way they're executed using a business process engine so you can execute them with different programmatic conditions.

This is what we refer to as managing your portfolio and this is where things like a repository of some form come in. With the repository, you know what you have and what it's capable of doing. You can measure, know what is available, know what you might have to build, and know how these things are being used.

From a portfolio point of view, you've got to be able to categorize things, you got to be able to identify them and figure out how you're going to build them, who owns them, and how you're going to have these things align to your roadmap and how they're going to be used by your organization. And this gets into some of the funding questions that Fill Bowen talked about before.

Slide #11 top build

The second aspect of this is what we call vitality. This is really all about people. Because one of the things you want to be able to transform as part of this initiative (SOA) is not only your machine processes, but you want the people in your organization to be capable of doing this, then repeating this process as you go forward.

What we've seen so far in the customers that BEA has worked with is that this is a long term journey. This is something that's going to take you several years, five plus years probably from the beginning to where you want to get to. Some people might like to have a consultant in there for 10 years doing this all for you, but I think from a business perspective, you want people in your organization that know how this is done, and how to do this in a way that benefits your business. I think this (business focus) is a big part of what SOA is about compared to some of the other technological paths of the past.

So vitality comes in terms of things like knowing what your actual strategy is, where is your end game. I think that was part of the discussion you were having before. You have to start slowly, but you have to know where you want to go, or you'll never know

when you get there. So you've got to have a roadmap and you've got to have a strategy as to how you're going to pull that off.

You've got to be able to capture these best practices and reference architectures as you develop them, and modify them moving through it. Business process models, all those metrics and score cards -- the whole question of how you keep the organization vital going forward in time.

Slide #11 bottom build

Of course, there's the people part, the organizational part in there, which is often one of the more difficult ones. This is a question of who is responsible for what, and what roles you actually need. What are the communication mechanisms? What collaborations? What tooling? How you're going to sell this throughout the organization? The funding model?

So what you're trying to achieve in all of this is that you really need active leadership and alignment, strategic planning. You want roles, policies and principles and lightweight processes and tools. I think that's sort of a good place to leave it and move on to the next one.

Slide #12

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: Okay, my name is Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt. I'm Solution Marketing Director at SAP. I'm like full in charge for SOA governance globally at SAP. Couple of thoughts and I try to -- to not duplicate what -- what my predecessors have said.

SOA governance and why this is such a hot topic, is because everybody looks at enterprise SOA or a SOA and its benefits. We all hear that there are projects with high benefits and that there are projects with high failures. And the question mark out there when I talk to customers is, how do I make sure that I'm not on the failure side. How do I make sure that I'm on the winner side? SOA governance gives you the tools or at least the mechanisms to get you more on the track on actually going for all the benefits on the winner side.

Slide #13

Why is that? SOA governance is the key piece that actually helps you to link the different pieces, like the business strategy linking with the IT strategy, and with your solution portfolio planning and operations. You need to have those linkages and understand the holistic piece and how they are cross linked in order to have these projects going well. Governance, with all the roles and responsibilities procedures helps to safeguard your projects while you're on the way. A key factor in showing how well you are doing on the IT side, is how (SOA) drives re-use in the enterprise. That's one of the key indicators, not the key benefit, but of the key indicators that SOA project is being done well, or not.

If you are doing your SOA projects well, you accelerate your learning curve internally. And there is a learning curve involved. We all are here (SOA Consortium meeting) because we understand there is a learning curve -- a lot of learning to do, and we are here to share learnings and experience -- to accelerate our learning curve as a community. And governance done in a holistic way also gives you the right tools, gives you the ability to actually accelerate the learning curve.

Slide #14

The second slide -- and I have two slides -- the second slide is key also in my point of view of -- personal point of view is you need to be holistic in this. Don't go too small in the way of how you look at it. It has to include all the pieces about managing governance pieces, how do I set up the organization, what is the skill set I need, what roles and responsibilities do I have, and one of the very -- as Fill said -- early questions, roles and responsibilities comes to funding, and as Ed stated that one.

But there are more roles and responsibilities around that one. How do I align with the business side? How do I develop my people to become an enterprise architect? How do I match the process ownership on the business side with my IT people? All these pieces have to be part of it.

Yet, also the next piece is very key also -- governance automation. The tools and the lifecycle set around that one where you start to automate your governance pieces. Many vendors here. Many pieces here. That's also part of the game as soon as you scale up your projects.

Having the management piece and the organizational piece in place, as well as the tool set, requires also going into design. The people that actually design services. It is also about design principles, what patterns do I use, what principles do I use, what classifications do I use, how do I make my alignment processes, how do I make my harmonization. So that is very key to actually drive reuse.

And the fourth piece we see is very important to tap into communities. If you set your governance well, don't limit it to your own organization. Look into the communities, tap into best practices, and accelerate your learning curve by doing it.

And if you think you have to do all these four pieces at once, no, not at all. I think some said already, start with the people side, think of which architect I can make an enterprise architect, who is senior enough there. Tap into this person because in the end he has to be in spreading the word and getting buy-in within the organization. That's a very key piece. Look at the skill sets that are out there.

The second piece also very key about that one. If you want to start well, look at the design principles, how do I design services, think about that. Take that time to really figure that out. That helps you from hitting the wall which happens if you have a wild west SOA. That really kills you after a certain amount of projects.

In the end, the more you mature, the more need for putting in the pieces for governance automation. The more you go along also comes pieces like the Governance Board.

But that also means you proactively need to transition your development plan. How do I start with this nucleo space approach around the architecture? What kind of people do I attach to him so I can actually spread across the organization and start developing the knowledge within and throughout the organization?

I found that is a very good approach. You have this nucleus based approach where you start with people that build their design principles, build their roles and responsibilities and the procedures in small centers and then proactively go into the projects and say okay, listen, we're going to help you. We're going to help you in your project (a) in coding untimed resources and (b) in the design principles and the know-how we have. This is the key piece, why people have so big role on that one.

In the end, there is some maturity path you have to do, and it's very key to build your maturity path and your development path as you do develop your own roadmap for SOA. Both, as Fill already said, has to be matched to go and be very successful. With that, I hand over.

Slide #15

Clive Read, Cisco: Okay. I'm Clive Read. I'm the European Director of Cisco's SONA program, and my background is enterprise architecture. So I'm going to speak a bit from that perspective.

Slide #16

On the principle of re-use, I think one of the prompts was about how does it relate to traditional IT governance. Well, I had to think about this. Well, actually if you look at all the principles of good IT governance, then there's no reason in a lot of cases to reinvent the past. Because if you look at it from a kind of start from the beginning view -- if you look at strategic governance, which are the things we've been talking about in terms of the alignment of both business and IS/IT architectures, priorities and roadmap being application portfolio building. All of that stuff is there, you know. It's in the literature. Some companies have been doing it well, some haven't. So, you know, there's nothing new under the sun. It is, as I'd say, been around the block a few times. The same with business case and funding.

I think one of the key issues for me; some of the things I've heard today, is definitely the end result is what matters. So it's the business in terms of business productivity, customer satisfaction. Real business results. Those are the things that matter. So you've got to have real business cases, and that ultimately is the thing that's going to get you buy-in and traction in the organization. So real results. So that's important. Get the results and make people aware of them.

Another easy throw away line, I guess, is repeatable execution on projects and program performance. I mean this is -- all of these things, I guess, relate back into maturity models. I guess one of the take-aways out of this -- to stop being glib for a moment -- is to think that, just because SOA has come along, that does not mean that suddenly you have to invent something brand new in terms of governance. The principles are there. It also means that you have to take account of your current organizational maturity.

The old rule was you don't leap leapfrog stages overnight. The same is going to be true in governance as it is for all those other disciplines. So, therefore, you have to take account of where you are and be realistic.

Also, you cannot put the whole weight in developing all of this stuff because it is -- a lot of it is about people, influencing, organization, operational change -- and put all of that onto the SOA Program. If the SOA Program is going to bear all of this, the SOA Program is going to break. So that isn't going to happen either. So absolutely you have to co-opt this broader set of things around organizational maturity and execution.

Last but not least, I've been involved at the tail end of IT programs where, guess what, the most important thing is operations because when all the development stuff has been done and cleared out of the way, operations is the thing that gets the attention at the top of the organization. Guess what, it's the call center meltdowns, the network falling out, it's all that kind of stuff, and that's what gets the CIO the sack. So they're kind of interested in that, and therefore, you do need these feedback mechanisms so you're absolutely tapped into operational performance. You're actually feeding that back into the lifecycle and take accounts of those things. In an ideal world, if you're doing that upfront already, but you sure as hell have to when it hits the fan. So that's where you've got to be.

So, as I say, the take-away from this is, there is nothing new under the sun. There will definitely be a role for my colleagues here in terms of professional services and tools and technology. But, remember, get -- get back to the basics, you know. There are some fundamental values here, and that's what you have to keep in mind. Thank you.

Slide #17

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: Thank you. Okay, I have some feedback to share from the SOA Consortium practitioner community when we were on a call last Thursday or perhaps last Tuesday. I asked them for some insights on SOA governance in respect to the four topics.

While the insights that were just shared were great, they were very broad and high level; truly about safe governance and making sure that big governance happens. The practitioner group got a little more focused. I want to share those comments and then we'll start with the roundtable.

Slide #18

One of the things that the group shared, often we talk about or hear about SOA governance and especially service type governance, and it really pertains to IT re-use, investment or technical interoperability. It gets very focused on the technical side. What they were discussing is that you can't forget the business side, right. You can't forget that you're also trying to govern accuracy, consistency, and business interoperability. Business interoperability is something we talked about a lot here today because, of the exchange of information, right, to make sure that your services can actually interact.

One of the things that [the practitioner community] talked about was that successful SOA execution requires education to your organization on working in a consumer provider model. So, this isn't something that in IT that we're necessarily used to, that your job now is to provide something (service) to somebody else. You need to set expectations. You need to advertise what it is you're doing. You need to make agreements with other people in your organization, IT or business. Perhaps you need to do some type of certification of your offering. And there needs to be more collaboration and trust. Then, the same thing on the consumer side is you have to trust you're going to get a service that's going to work. So what are your requirements for certification, what is that conversation?

They talked about -- and this actually came up in our last presentation -- that your SOA governance programs and processes must anticipate and plan for change. So, at the detail level, you can't assume that you're only going to have one active version of something in production, right. You need to be able to manage for that. You need to be able to set a number (of versions) that your organization can handle managing. Then you need to manage service lifecycles to that limit. So, for example, if you stated that you're only going to have three versions of a service in production, well before the fourth one comes in, you have to have processes and notifications for people using the very first version to allow them to ease the migration. And you need to have some kind of agreement or contracts in place that say when you can actually eliminate a version and when you would move forward.

As well, the governance programs and processes have to anticipate and plan for valid deviations from standards, right. It's always going to happen. It might be because of project timelines, quality service requirements, quality of protection requirements, and as we discussed earlier, it might be performance. So, you need to include in your governance program processes for variance and then processes for bringing whatever it is that varies back into the architecture. How are you going to do that? Especially with a timeline based variance. Perhaps you need to figure out at the time of the variance how to move forward. You agree to bring and the deliverable up to standards within the next three months, within the next release cycle.

And the last thing they shared, which I think everybody here talked about as well, is communication is critical. It's the biggest success factor in your governance, and it's within IT, as well as between IT and the business. And you need to communicate not with just the SOA governance but also with different governance bodies. So, if there are people working on data governance and that actually impacts what you can offer in a service, you need to understand that. The same with IT governance and investment, and broader business governance. So they were saying, it's communication, it's the big picture.

Roundtable Conversation

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: Switching to my other half, as facilitator of the roundtable, I've made a few notes while these gentlemen were talking, and I will ask them some questions. As well, I would encourage meeting attendees to participate.

Fill said something that I've actually heard a lot out and about in the industry which is, developers don't want to do SOA, right. And actually I was talking to a noted SI and blogger who said developers hate SOA, right, and the reason being, of course, just because it's extra work from a development point of view, because of the extra protocols. And, there's the not-invented here syndrome, right. You know, I can do anything better myself.

So my question is: How do you get the developers on board? How do you build the trust in the environment, to get people to -- to actually say that, "you know what, the service that Fill developed is great and I'm going to use it too, and then I'm going to actually deliver better to the business". So, any experience on building that trust?

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: One of the pieces we've seen and we asked the people -- a whole bunch of applications have been through the process of getting developers to adhere to the new process. So we have the pain and learning curve ourselves.

The key piece is actually to make this a special project, to get these guys -- give them the feeling that they're doing a good piece of a special and a very interesting project. This is how you come back to the human factor again. So, okay, it is important to be highly recognized inside the developer's community. Place that high recognition on what they're doing as part of the project. Place your evangelist, your advocate, on the project. Show them you're all part of the game and your allow developers to grow via the projects and from the advocate. That's what we felt is the most important piece.

And the other thing comes back to the processes and how we go about that one. We have been talking about aligning with the business very strong, because that was missing. Also, listen to the developers too, incorporate them and listen to them. They're creative, they're strong, they're brilliant people are out there. If you listen to them, take them seriously, you again have that [trust and buy-in]. So those are the two factors we've found that are very key.

Ed Cobb, BEA Systems: Okay. I'm just going to augment that just a bit. One of the most effective means we've seen -- and this I'm getting from my professional service folks -- is what they call the incentive model, the three Es -- encouragement, enticement and enforcement. So one of the ways that you get people to do things that are shared is you make it in their business interest to do that. We've found that a number of engagements that we've had, that's been a very successful way of encouraging. Once you get them sort of down that particular path, I think you could move on to some of the things that Christian was talking about as well.

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: John?

John Schmidt, Wells Fargo: I have two questions. The first one goes back to governance. Currently, we have two primary governance mechanisms. One is for investments of all the projects. The other is operations, which is accounting for the applications. So, I it has taken years, but the business folks understand projects in respect to governance. And they understand the concept of applications and all of the related IT processes. With SOA we have a new dimension, both on the investment side

– cross silo build and sharing -- and on the operations side. Would you suggest that we add a third governance mechanism or dismantle the other two or somehow change them?

Fill Bowen, IBM: Well, I'll take a crack at that first. What tends to work the best for most companies is basically what you have today. A project developing a service or developing a composite business application, which is a set of services, is still similar to a project. I have a business requirement, and that business requirement requires some level of either putting services together, or potentially developing new services. And, my funding model says I'm going to fund that composite business application and its services the same way I fund a project today.

John Schmidt, Wells Fargo: But today the money is divvied out to silos. If your project is developing a shared service, how do you get the business to share the money?

Fill Bowen, IBM: Well, that's the funding model discussion. What you can decide to do is, we're going to fund each composite business application as its own project, and then what you have is -- if I can use services from some other group, I'm going to do that, and that will cut my costs, but the decision is made. The first person to develop a service pays for it, and then later on if other people want to use that service, they get to just use it for free basically because it's already been paid for.

But then, what you want to do in your maintenance discussion -- you talked about how you do maintenance and funding for that. You could add a charge back capability that says, if this application is using this service from some other silo, part of the maintenance funding is I charge those guys some amount of money for using that service within their composite business application. So you could conceivably use the same two funding models you have today and just add the services concept to it.

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: Barbara?

Barbara Errickson, EDS: I want to add something to that. We've run into this very question at an enterprise client, where in the past the silos did own all the funding. You need to embrace the business case concept and identify the value of the project. That way, you bring to the table what you've done before, such as comparing five solutions.

For example, consider dealing with document management. Take the five solutions and price them up and show the total. Then, show them how if you share a corporate level document management approach, enterprise content management, it will cost less. Pool your money, do the project together and get an interoperable solution.

I believe that you have to have a funding mechanism at the enterprise level project versus the project level. It does require an organizational change to get the people with the money together, to agree on that different approach to the major project. At the corporate level, of course, you have to have your top level management agreement to enforce that back to the three Es (encouragement, enticement and enforcement) and, in fact, we have seen a change in direction. So, this client now agrees to corporate level solutions.

As far as maintenance level, to me, part of SOA governance is for each service level with a charge back, you have to designate the value of the function that occurs each time the service is invoked. The service level requirements may vary by the consumer. If you want platinum support rather than silver, than by golly, I'm charging you more. So if you want 99 percent uptime, you'd get charged two pennies every time you invoke this, and someone else pays one penny. So you can look those things up. You gather that information and you have a very clear process where you go about buying services. So there are ways to physically manage that.

Ed Cobb, BEA Systems: I'm just going to sort of second what you said. What we've found in our customer engagements is as they get further along maturity level and more SOA kinds of projects, we start talking about the N plus one project approach. This is where you have N projects going on and then you have one sort of centralized, shared project that basically moves the entire SOA along. There's lots of different ways of doing it, but the cost of the infrastructure to support all of them or the cost of a common service development factory that's centrally located or a SOA center of excellence, all those kinds of things. You don't have to do that immediately. Immediately you probably look for a small project and eat the cost of building the initial services inside the project, but as you get further along the journey, then that's probably the thing you want to do.

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: I think it changes also as you go along. You said, the more I go along the maturity, there's going to be changes in my models. In the very early beginning, it's more very set -- very project driven approach. This is fine because the overhead of establishing a new funding model doesn't make sense at all. Then when you are at the next level, what Barbara said is very valid. In the end, you see in very advanced customers, from the typical silo or fiefdom oriented approach, they have switched to a process ownership based approach across the silos. So that's again very valid to look into where I am and which stage of maturity.

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: Excellent. Thank you. I have another question. There was a lot of conversation about, the organizational change required, especially with SOA governance. I heard a lot a references to Center of Excellence and dependence on enterprise architects. Now, my question to you is, who helps the enterprise architect learn how to be this type of organizational change leader, because that's not necessarily part of their particular skill set, right. I mean, so who is their best helper? What's their best resource to do this work?

Fill Bowen, IBM: Well, I would say you bring in an expert from outside. Conceivably, you either could hire them from some other organization where they've already done it, or you could bring in a consulting group or firm to help them do that. Experience to date with most companies is, in any transition, and I think this has been true throughout history, is that any major transition requires some outside assistance of some sort because corporations tend to be on one track, and it's hard to get them off that track without bringing in some outside assistance.

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: Is that outside assistance an organizational change expert or an SOA governance or SOA type expert?

Fill Bowen, IBM: Yes.

[Laughter]

Clive Read, Cisco: Well, I think that's a fair question. So I think certainly one of the things that we may have glossed over in this conversation is that in the real world of organizations and IT, that they work with partners. So, they're not doing the whole thing in the back yard. They do have implementation partners, their development partners. So they're already in all of organizations, those channels there in terms of corporate learning cycles.

I think establishing the governance, I would say that's too -- my own opinion -- it is too big a burden to put the whole thing onto an individual. You have to build a team. You have to look for centers of expertise, absolutely, But, look at it in the different disciplines. So don't try and overload it and say one person, yeah, you have to be expert in the technologies, and you have to be an expert in business change, and you have to go in and sell it or pitch to the CEO. I mean, make it reasonable. Reasonable requires building a team. If looking at those specialisms and views in the industry complex that you've got. You may want to actually, okay, parachute someone in, but there are other ways of actually, diffusing that knowledge through the organization.

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: Which reminds me on the quote you had in the beginning where the -- I think the CIO said how his architect changed. I think that's a very good quote because it shows that the CIO himself had some real skill planning attached to his own tasks, to his day-to-day tasks. I think that's one of the key enablers, and if your CIO says, okay, I want to develop this person to become an enterprise architect, make his career plan. Plan to incorporate that individual more on the CIO project because that way, if you draw the scale of IT business knowledge and who talks that way, it draws them more to the business side as the CIO's naturally more on the business side. This is one of the key pieces any corporation can do themselves, while at the other side using what our vendors, and service providers do.

Barbara Errickson, EDS: I would add to the comment that, I think it was Fill that said this, to bring experts in. Because one of the challenges for enterprise architects is the multiplicity of architectural views that are required to make SOAs successful. Oftentimes, you'll find that very few people in the company actually have ever done that before. They don't know what they don't know, and they do need some guidance, and so bringing in an expert and working with them, I think that's almost a must do because this is not a thing for OJT on-the-job-training.

Nick Stavros, Spawar: I hear a lot about governance, there is a governance group at OMG. I could replace the word governance here with management. That's different than governance. Governance is a specific thing with regulation, execution and compliance. I need to do all three of those things. Everything you guys said would fit within that framework by regulation, how I'm going to get there, what am I going to do. A good case was you don't have a business strategy. You have to have an IT strategy. That's regulation that I need to enforce.

I have 160 programs. Do I have to go through each one and say, do you have an IT strategy to your business strategy. Or, do I have to step up my goal level and say I

have this regulation and I have to be able to measure it, and that's where compliance comes in. Figure out am I successful, or not successful. That's where execution comes in. A lot of people don't know what to do and that's where you bring in the experts and the regulations helps. The experts help form the regulation, and then the experts go back out to the field where it has to be executed to help make it so.

So I would encourage you all to participate in the governance group of OMG. And if we are talking about management, let's talk about management. If we are talking about governance, let's talk about governance. We are trying to build a formal model of what governance is and how to use it and how to measure it and how to determine if you are governing well.

You don't even know when your governing well, and I think that's what you guys all alluded to, was that quite often you'd have a failure because people don't know how to govern well. They're off managing but they're not governing and everything Fill said -- I mean I wrote out almost everything he said. Everything he said fits within the (governance) framework absolutely beautifully. But, it's about governance. It's these things and managing, and managing the governance.

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: I was just going to ask, in respect to what you were just commenting on; I had made a note earlier about measurement. So what are the things that we should be measuring in SOA governance?

Fill Bowen, IBM: To me, SOA governance is about putting in place initially your governance framework. One of the things you want to measure is how well your governance framework is doing. So when I think about it, the governance framework says at the end of deployment we have to have a checkpoint, and so one of the measurements for governance is, have we had that checkpoint? Has the decision maker that's supposed to approve that always approved it, have there been exceptions to that and if so why? So, that's measuring my governance.

The management to me is just the execution of my SOA environment and are the activities that are plugged in from a governance perspective being successfully executed. For example, take the development of a service. The development of a service has a set of activities with it. Maybe it's got a hundred activities for developing a service. Only four of those activities are governance related. So what I want to do is measure -- are those four activities within the hundred being executed successfully. And then, the SOA management may have other things that are associated with it. Have these other activities happened from an operational perspective? Did I back up my data every week? That is a part of my operations governance but may not be part of SOA governance.

Nick Stavros, Spawar: That's why, to me, I have to govern lots of things. One of the things I have to govern is SOA. Another thing I have to govern is the funding and there are all kinds of things I have to govern. That's why a common model on how to govern the plethora of things being governed is important. With a common model, I could tell you regulation for everything I need to govern. I could do a compliance check for everything I need to govern. I have to have execution. Otherwise there's no reason to

have governance. So it doesn't matter whether I'm talking about it SOA or net security or data. Whatever it is, I have to have a governance structure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE1: This is a good segue into what I wanted to touch upon. Some of the measurements you just spoke about, you are actually talking about Governance. Governance is about control. Governance in an SOA is managing our resources and portfolios for effective execution with our business purposes. This means everything we do must be focused around quantitative goals. One of the things we are very good at doing is making functional architectures. But the non-functional architectures and marrying those non-functional architectures with functional architectures is something we don't do well.

A simple example is counting the hits for a web page. It has nothing to do with the page, it is just a hit. Now, in terms of effective service to the customer and relating that to how the server works and bringing those metrics all the way up, I would think that a governance program would be designed around metrics that we're trying to govern rather than around organizational principles.

Fill Bowen, IBM: The answer is you have to have both because SOA governance is about decision making. I mean, at the end of the day, SOA governance is really who gets to make what decisions and what the impact of those decisions are.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE1: I don't get it. Based on what?

Ed Cobb, BEA Systems: Based on a combination of strategy, your roadmap, and your architecture.

Fill Bowen, IBM: Right. So it is certainly architecture, and functional requirements are certainly a very key part of that. But, it might be how much money have I got. ... I think the answer is, who gets to make the decisions and what are the criteria for those decisions. There may be functional and non functional aspects to that decision-making criteria. Like, do I have the staff to go do this? Do I have the funding? Is it part of the current architecture? Does it conform to my design requirements? Have I had a developer inspection? Is it in the critical path?

I think the decision-making criteria within SOA governance have both functional and nonfunctional aspects to it. It has to.

Barbara Errickson, EDS: Part of SOA governance is, as you do your projects, which business values are you achieving and do you have the metrics to determine if you are achieving the highest value in the right sequence.

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: That's a hierarchy of KPIs, hierarchy of metrics. You have to be sure and have the time to do.

Ed Cobb, BEA Systems: I think that's what we would see as the roadmap for enterprise things in that context.

Barbara Errickson, EDS: And that to me is why SOA governance is different than how we governed our technology in the past.

Fill Bowen, IBM: Well, you would -- I think as Clive was talking about, you would hope not. You would hope that your IT governance in the past has been focused on high value activities that IT needs to do. Now, your point is, that hasn't always been the case, and --

Barbara Errickson, EDS: -- And it has been the case intentionally maybe only silo by silo, and we're trying to change that.

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: And as SOA changes the game and scope of the IT piece, that is why it's so much emphasis in SOA governance and needs to be made aware in SOA governance, these change aspects.

Nick Stavros, Spawar: So back what I was saying, it's still not regulation. What's in the regulation has to be specific to SOA. It doesn't mean everything in IT.

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: As you rightly said, I take what I have. I look at it. How does it apply but also what we and I think everybody at the table tries to encourage people, trying to look beyond the scope. This is a change game. Barbara said it rightly. The change is that you have to measure also the business value. That should have been done before, but as SOA changes it has more effect. If it's strongly applied we have to incorporate that one.

Barbara Errickson, EDS: And so one of your other methods is that you get your business case planned out.

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: Yeah, the alignment with the business case.

John Schmidt, Wells Fargo: Right. Yeah, that's new Governance, a new regulation, and now I have to define what a business case is (regulation).

Barbara Errickson, EDS: You need a template for that.

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: But it's not just getting it signed off, right, but it's actually going back at the end and saying, did I actually achieve what my business case stated? I've seen that a lot in organizations where you make a great business case and you probably did achieve it, but you don't actually go back and do that final measurement.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE2: On the one hand we've got SOA governance. On the other hand we've got all the projects implementing or building services. Do you have any ideal on how they relate to each other in order of magnitude of manpower or total cost to the corporation?

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: I think there's no one rule you can say. I think we both said that if you look at maturity model in terms of general SOA projects, number of projects you have relates to your corporation size. The same applies to SOA governance. It doesn't make sense if you have a whole staff or a big staff of a hundred

people on SOA governance and you have only one or two projects and vice versa. It doesn't make sense if you have a hundred projects and have only one or two people that think about the governance things.

Fill Bowen, IBM: Now, in an ideal world, you only do SOA governance once, right? I mean, I'm going to put my SOA governance structure in place, and it is perfect. I've designed it. [Laughter.] So after that, there's nothing to be done. You just follow it.

Fill Bowen, IBM: Now, the question I've been asked related to that a number of times is how many people should we have in our COE? I mean, that's the standard question we get, and the answer is if you're a Fortune 50 company, it probably ought to be 20. If you're -- you know, if you're a Joe Blow garage, you know, it's probably one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE2: But it's always somehow related to the number of projects and services?

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: The size of the project ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE2: And the complexity of the services...

Christian Hastedt-Marchwardt, SAP: The knowledge you have in the corporation. If you are still upscaling, you should have a bit larger Center of Excellence because you need to add more resources from a learning curve perspective. All these pieces come into place.

Fill Bowen, IBM: Or you could hire an outside consultant to come in to do it for you [laughter], and then you don't need anybody.

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: The skills transfer happens where?

[Laughter.]

Brenda Michelson, SOA-C: Okay, and I think this officially ends the recorded part of the transcript. [Laughter.]

[Clapping.]

[END OF ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION]