Working Group Outbrief

Ground System Architectures Workshop



Session 11E

Architecture-Centric Evolution Working Group 2009

Maryann Hutchison, The Aerospace Corporation



Session Goals

- Topic
 - SOA (Service Oriented Architecture) based approaches for architecting satellite ground systems in a net-centric environment – Where we are today

• Presentations & panel discussion

 Focus on sharing experiences in determining when (and if) a SOAbased architecture applies and experiences and lessons learned in developing or prototyping a SOA-based architecture.

• Panel questions related to topic areas

- Software Architecture Considerations and Tradeoffs
- Successes, Challenges, and Lessons Learned in Applying SOA
- Implementation Considerations
- Systems Interoperability
- Standards and Core Services
- Future Predictions



Presenters/Panelists

- Acquisition and Oversight Perspective
 - Michael Kramer, Aerospace
 - Major Steve Paine, USAF
 - John Arcos, Eltefat Shokri, Aerospace
- Development Perspective
 - Magdi Carlton, NASA JPL
 - Morris Brill, Northrop Grumman
- Research Perspective
 - Scott Tilley, SEI/CMI
 - Richard Taylor (UCI), Nenad Medvidovic (USC), Eric Dashofy (Aerospace)



Key Points

Definition of Service-Oriented Architecture

- Terminology overload: SOA is all things or "Are we drinking Kool-Aid?"
 - SOA cannot be purchased
 - Requires change of culture/paradigm;

Misconceptions on SOAs

- Net-centric == SOA
- Legacy applications can be easily integrated into SOA
 - consider using SMaRT for legacy migration
- SOA is not a technology....it is a paradigm
 - How do you standardize a paradigm?



Key Points

- Experiences- Lessons Learned
 - Need to align business operations and goals 75% fail on 1^{st} try
 - Cost of aligning business logic with IT
 - Agility in SOA framework is more important than immediate ROI
 - Reuse drives the long-term business case
 - Industry ROI is typically not seen for the first 2-5 years
 - Start small, fail small, build when you succeed!!
 - Tension between architectural purity and user needs
 - Selection and development of services should be driven by user-centric scenarios
- Current Status and Appropriateness of Standards
 - Reference architecture helpful in capturing diverse SOA viewpoints
 - Reference model captures core concepts and relationships to understand essence of SOA
 - Evolving SOA standards
 - Proliferation of competing standards and standards groups



Key Points

Implementation Considerations – Development

- Applied to: mission control, data management, S/C analysis, environmental information systems
 - Successful applications were those best suited to a SOA approach
- Service ownership decentralization and independent evolution entail loss of control
 - Who pays?
 - Who's responsible?
 - New contract-business incentives evolving
- Don't forget
 - Security
 - Training
 - Licensing dependencies
- Legacy System challenges:
 - Architectural mismatches
 - Operational mismatches,
 - Tool availability
 - Separation of Concerns
- CMU-SEI SMaRT available to analyze viability of legacy component migration
- Service granularity



Key Points

• Where are we going – Research

- Consider WWW view
 - RESTful service architectural style vs SOAP-based Web services
 - exposing info via URLs vs methods
- Semantics of service definition is a challenge
 - How to model and describe services?
 - QoS contract guarantees
- Trends in SOA
 - Major Concerns:
 - From hiding Heterogeneity to Standards-based Interoperability to Integration
 - Performance
 - Like a local application to Some Real-Time to Predictable to Predictable +



Conclusions

- Despite existence of an industry standard reference model (OASIS) on SOA, there is significant disagreement on what SOA is
- Decentralization means loss of control
 - Trust is a requisite component
- Successful SOA projects in progress
 - User-centric view
 - Importance of training
 - Essential to understand and align business operations and goals for achievable expectations