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Service-oriented computing is a key enabler for major trends such as cloud computing, Internet of things, and digital transformation. About a decade after the first wave of Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) patterns and platforms reached a plateau of maturity and market saturation, microservices are currently emerging as a state-of-the-art implementation approach to SOA that leverages recent advances in software engineering and agile practices such as domain-driven design, continuous delivery and deployment automation. Due to the invariant intricacies and fallacies pertaining to distributed systems, service interface design remains a wicked problem irrespective of currently trending service decomposition paradigms and other market dynamics. Hence, service designers and API managers seek design guidance and reusable architectural knowledge for this problem domain.

This presentation first recapitulates selected SOA principles and establishes seven corresponding microservices tenets. It then reports on the ongoing compilation of a service design pattern catalog that complements previous such approaches, and discusses related tool support. It concludes with a reflection on open research challenges and problems.
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Agenda

1. **Paradigms: Service-Oriented Computing (Re-)Visited**
   - Service-Oriented Architecture vs. Microservices Architecture (?)
   - Microservices tenets: agile approach to service realization

2. **Principles: From OOAD to SOAD and Agile Architecting**
   - IDEAL cloud application architectures, coupling criteria
   - Architectural Decision Capturing and Sharing (OLAF, AKMAD)

3. **Patterns: From Enterprise Application/Integration to Service Design and Conversations**
   - *Interface Representation Patterns (IRP)*:
     - Pagination, Service Granularity (Business/Technical), Quality of Service

4. **Open Source Tools for Service Design and Arch. Decision Making**
   - ADMentor, Service Cutter

5. **Conclusions and Outlook**
   - Research challenges, vision and roadmap
Microservices do not constitute a new style, but services are here to stay

- Microservices evolved as an implementation approach to SOA that leverages recent advances in agile practices, cloud computing and DevOps
- Microservices Architecture (MSA) constrains the SOA style to make services independently deployable and scalable (e.g., via decentralization)

Architectural principles and patterns characterize architectural styles

- e.g. loose coupling is a key SOA principle (multiple dimensions)

There is no single definite answer to the “what is the right granularity?” question, which has several context-specific dimensions and criteria

- Business granularity: semantic density (role in domain model and BPM)
- Technical granularity: syntactic weight and QoS entropy

Platform-independent service design can benefit from interface representation patterns such as Parameter Tree, Pagination, Wish List

Pattern-centric service design involves architectural decisions that recur
“We decided for the Model-View-Controller (MVC) pattern to control Web page flow because we gained positive experience with it on many similar projects.”

“We decided for the BPEL language as workflow technology because it is standardized and supported by tools.”

“We decided for Apache Axis as our Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) asset because it performs and scales well.”

No single definition – “SOA is different things to different people”

- A *set of services* that a business wants to expose to their customers and partners, or other portions of the organization.

- An architectural style which requires a *service provider*, a *service requestor* (consumer) and a *service contract* (a.k.a. client/server).

- A set of architectural patterns such as *enterprise service bus*, *service composition*, and *service registry*, promoting principles such as *modularity*, *layering*, and *loose coupling* to achieve design goals such as separation of concerns, reuse, and flexibility.

- A *programming and deployment model* realized by standards, tools and technologies such as Web services and Service Component Architecture (SCA).

Adapted from IBM SOA Solution Stack (S3) reference architecture and SOMA method, [https://www-01.ibm.com/software/solutions/soa/](https://www-01.ibm.com/software/solutions/soa/)
1. **Fine-grained interfaces** to single-responsibility units that encapsulate data and processing logic are exposed remotely to make them independently scalable, typically via RESTful HTTP resources or asynchronous message queues.

2. Business-driven development practices and pattern languages such as **Domain-Driven Design (DDD)** are employed to identify and conceptualize services.

3. Cloud-native application design principles are followed, e.g., as summarized in Isolated State, Distribution, Elasticity, Automated Management and Loose Coupling (**IDEAL**).

4. Multiple storage paradigms are leveraged (SQL and NoSQL) in a **polyglot persistence** strategy.

5. **Lightweight containers** are used to deploy services.

6. **Decentralized continuous delivery** is practiced during service development.

7. Lean, but holistic and largely automated approaches to configuration and fault management are employed (a.k.a. **DevOps**).

J. Lewis and M. Fowler (L/F): “[…] an approach to developing a single application as a suite of small services, each running in its own process and communicating with lightweight mechanisms, often an HTTP resource API. These services are built around business capabilities and independently deployable by fully automated deployment machinery. There is a bare minimum of centralized management of these services, which may be written in different programming languages and use different data storage technologies.”

IEEE Software Interview with J. Lewis, M. Amundsen, N. Josuttis:
### Microservices Definition: 4+1 Viewpoint Mapping (More: CSR&D Paper)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Component Property (Gartner/TMF)</th>
<th>Mapping to 4+1 Viewpoint Model (Kruchten 1995)</th>
<th>Mapping to ZIO Tenet</th>
<th>Novel or “Same Old Architecture”?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tightly scoped</td>
<td>Scenario/Use Case, Logical</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>SOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly encapsulated</td>
<td>Logical, Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loosely coupled</td>
<td>Development, Process (Integr.)</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>SOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independently deployable</td>
<td>Process, Physical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independently scalable</td>
<td>Process, Physical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>novel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Diagram:**
- **Logical VP (Functional)**
- **Development VP (Build Time Maintenance Qualities)**
- **Scenario/Use Case VP (Business, Test)**
- **Process VP (Runtime Qualities)**
- **Physical VP (Operational Qualities)**
From Tenets and Principles to Patterns and Decisions

- Business goals and design goals
- Paradigms (defined by tenets)
- Principles
- Patterns
- Decisions
- Methods and practices
**Isolated State:** most of the application is *stateless* with respect to:
- *Session State:* state of the communication with the application
- *Application State:* data handled by the application

**Distribution:** applications are decomposed to:
- ... use multiple cloud resources
- ... support the fact that clouds are large globally distributed systems

**Elasticity:** applications can be scaled out dynamically
- *Scale out:* performance increase through addition of resources
- *Scale up:* performance increase by increasing resource capabilities

**Automated Management:** runtime tasks have to be handled quickly
Example: exploitation of pay-per-use by changing resource numbers
Example: resiliency by reacting to resource failures

**Loose Coupling:** influence of application components is limited
Example: failures should not impact other components
Example: addition / removal of components is simplified
SOA Principle and IDEAL Application Property: Loose Coupling

- **Academic contributions (research results):**
  - General software engineering/architecture literature since 1960s/1970s
    - Starting from D. Parnas (modularization, high cohesion/low coupling)
  - **ESOCC 2016 keynote by F. Leymann** and PhD theses (e.g. C. Fehling):
    - Four types of *autonomy*: reference (i.e., location), platform, time, format
  - **WWW 2009 presentation** and paper by C. Pautasso and E. Wilde:
    - 12 facets used for a remoting technology comparison, e.g., discovery, state, granularity

- **Practitioner heuristics (a.k.a. coupling criteria) scattered in books, articles, blogs:**
  - **SOA in Practice** book by N. Josuttis, O’Reilly 2007
    - 11 types of (loose) coupling; emphasis on versioning and compatibility
  - **IBM Redbook SG24-6346-00** on SOA and ESB (M. Keen et al.), IBM 2004
    - Coupled vs. decoupled continuum: semantic interface, (business) data model, QoS (e.g. transactional context, reliability), security
  - **DZone**, IBM developerWorks articles, **InfoQ**, MSDN, …
Coupling Criteria (CC) in “Service Cutter” (ESOCC 2016 Paper)

- **Semantic Proximity** can be observed if:
  - Service candidates are accessed within same use case (read/write)
  - Service candidates are associated in OOAD domain model

- **Coupling impact** (note that coupling is a relation not a property):
  - Change management (e.g., interface contract, DDLs)
  - Creation and retirement of instances (service instance lifecycle)

From Tenets and Principles to Patterns and Decisions

- Business goals and design goals
- Paradigms (defined by tenets)
- Principles
- Patterns
- Decisions
- Methods and practices
Service Granularity Test (by Example)

- **Test**: Do the exemplary services qualify as microservices?
  - “small” (Lewis/Fowler) and “fine grained” (Netflix, ZIO)?
  - “having a single responsibility” (R. Martin)?
  - “being maintainable by a 2-pizza team” (J. Bezos)?
  - supporting IDEAL principles such as loose coupling (Fehling et al, ZIO)?

- **Example A**: *Exchange Rates* in YaaS/Hybris (SAP):
  - [https://devportal.yaas.io/services/exchangerates/latest/](https://devportal.yaas.io/services/exchangerates/latest/)

- **Example B**: *Create an Outbound Delivery with a Reference to a Sales Order* (in ESA/Hana via SAP Business Hub)
  - [https://api.sap.com/#/catalog/a7a325f837df42f8a5c1083890e28801/II_SHP_OUTBOUNDDELIVERYCWRRC/SOAP](https://api.sap.com/#/catalog/a7a325f837df42f8a5c1083890e28801/II_SHP_OUTBOUNDDELIVERYCWRRC/SOAP)
Business granularity (a.k.a. *semantic density*) has a major impact on agility and flexibility, as well as maintainability

- Position of service operation in Business Architecture, e.g., expressed in a **Component Business Model (CBM)** or enterprise architecture model
- Amount of business process functionality covered
  - Entire process? Subprocess? Activity?
- Number and type of analysis-level domain model entities touched

Technical granularity (a.k.a. *syntactic weight*) determines runtime characteristics such as performance and scalability, interoperability – but also maintainability and flexibility

- Number of operations in WSDL contract, number of REST resources
- Structure of payload data in request and response messages
- QoS *entropy* adds to the maintenance effort of the service component
  - Backend system interface dependencies and their properties (e.g. consistency)
  - Security, reliability, consistency requirements (coupling criteria)
Granularity Scores by Service Pattern and Granularity Type

Service Granularity Scores (Relative, 1 to 5 Scale)

- Business Transaction (Activity)
  - Semantic Density: 4
  - Syntactic Weight: 3
  - QoS Entropy: 4
- Entity Search
  - Semantic Density: 2
  - Syntactic Weight: 1
  - QoS Entropy: 5
- Status Check
  - Semantic Density: 1
  - Syntactic Weight: 1
  - QoS Entropy: 2
- Master Data CRUD
  - Semantic Density: 5
  - Syntactic Weight: 2
  - QoS Entropy: 5
- Periodic Report
  - Semantic Density: 3
  - Syntactic Weight: 4
  - QoS Entropy: 3

- Semantic Density
- Syntactic Weight
- QoS Entropy (Transactionality, Security, Reliability)
Granularity Types and Criteria – Findings

- **Granularity is property of service contract exposed by a service provider**
  - Not an exact measure/metric, but a heuristic/an indicator of modularity and cohesion (on different levels of abstraction)
  - Business granularity vs. technical granularity (syntax, QoS)

- **Can’t really tell the “right” size w/o use cases and (de)coupling criteria – “it depends”:**
  - Clients, contexts, concerns differ – for good reasons!
    - Service semantics, information need of consumer
    - Hidden complexity (backend, relations)

- **Conclusion: A continuum of service granularity patterns exists**
  - There is no such thing as a “right” service size for all systems and service ecosystems

- **Sometimes granularity is also seen as an architectural principle:**
Service Granularity Patterns: In/Out Message Structure

**Decision drivers:** Functional requirements (domain model), capabilities of BPEL, SOAP, WSDL, XML processors (verbosity), interoperability, network topology, number of deployment artifacts and generated code structure, strong vs. weak typing philosophy.

**Issue:** *In Message Granularity* (Conceptual/Technology Level)
How many message parts should be defined in the service contract?
How deeply should the part elements be structured?
The four alternatives have not been published as patterns yet.

- **Alternative 1:** Atomic Parameter Pattern
  - Single scalar (Dot)
  - Easy to process for SOAP/XML engines, much work for programmer

- **Alternative 2:** Parameter Tree Pattern
  - Single complex parameter (Bar)
  - Deep structure and exotic types can cause interoperability issues.

- **Alternative 3:** Atomic Parameter List Pattern
  - Multiple scalar parameters (Dotted Line)
  - Handled by all common engines, some programmer convenience.

- **Alternative 4:** Parameter Comb Pattern
  - Multiple complex parameters
  - Combination of options 2 and 3, biggest overhead for processing engines.

**Recommendation:** All alternatives have their place; alternatives 2 and 3 are often chosen. Base decision on layer and service type. Avoid overly deep nesting of data structures unless you want to stress test the XML processing. Minimize message verbosity.

Reference: Adapted from IBM, SATURN 2010
## Candidate Patterns in IRP (Work in Progress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Vertical Integration, Horizontal Integration</th>
<th>Public API</th>
<th>Community API</th>
<th>Solution-Internal API</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>Contract First</td>
<td>Static Discovery</td>
<td>Dynamic Discovery</td>
<td>Service Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation</strong></td>
<td>AtomicParameter (Single Scalar, Dot)</td>
<td>Parameter Tree (Single Complex)</td>
<td>Atomic Parameter List (Mult. Scalars, Dotted Line)</td>
<td>ParameterComb (Multiple Complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pagination, Page</td>
<td>Query Parameter</td>
<td>Cursor</td>
<td>Offset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wish List</td>
<td>Request Deck</td>
<td>Metadata Parameter</td>
<td>Annotated Parameter List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Semantics</strong></td>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Reporting Service</td>
<td>Status Check</td>
<td>Master Data Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QoS</strong></td>
<td>Service Contract, Context Object</td>
<td>SLA-SLO</td>
<td>API Key/Access Token</td>
<td>Rate Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evolution</strong></td>
<td>Semantic Versioning, Version Identifier</td>
<td>Two (Versions) in Production</td>
<td>Aggressive Deprecation</td>
<td>Liberal Receiver/ Conservative Sender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference:** O. Zimmermann et al., Interface Representation Patterns, submitted to *EuroPLOP 2017*
Example IRP: Pagination (1/2)

- **Context**
  - An API endpoint and its calls have been identified and specified.

- **Problem**
  - *How can a provider transmit large amounts of repetitive or inhomogeneous response data to a consumer that do not fit well in a single response message?*

- **Forces**
  - Data set size and data access profile (user needs), especially number of data records required to be available to a consumer
  - Variability of data (are all result elements identically structured? how often do data definitions change?)
  - Memory available for a request (both on provider and on consumer side)
  - Network capabilities (server topology, intermediaries)
  - Security and robustness/reliability concerns
Solution
- Divide large response data sets into manageable and easy-to-transmit chunks.
- *Send only partial results in the first response message and inform the consumer how additional results can be obtained/retrieved incrementally.*
- Process some or all partial responses on the consumer side iteratively as needed; agree on a request correlation and intermediate/partial results termination policy on consumer and provider side.

Variants
- Cursor-based vs. offset-based

Consequences
- E.g. state management required

Know Uses:
- Public APIs of social networks
From Tenets and Principles to Patterns and Decisions

- Business goals and design goals
- Paradigms (defined by tenets)
- Principles
- Patterns
- Decisions
- Methods and practices
AD Modeling with Reuse – Context and Motivation (by Example)

- AD capturing matters, e.g. ISO/IEC/IEEE 42010 has a rationale element
  - But it remains an unpopular documentation task – particularly, but not only in agile communities
  - Effort vs. gain (feeding the beast)?

- Example (from cloud application design): Session State Management
  - Shopping cart in online commerce SaaS (e.g., Amazon) has to be stored while user is logged in; three design options described in literature

"In the context of the Web shop service, facing the need to keep user session data consistent and current across shop instances, we decided for the Database Session State Pattern from the PoEAA book (and against Client Session State or Server Session State) to achieve ideal cloud properties such as elasticity, accepting that a session database needs to be designed, implemented, and replicated."

Approach: Refactor decision capturing templates into problem-option-driver fragments and change tone, to separate concerns and to ease reuse.

“In the context of the Web shop service, facing the need to keep user session data consistent and current across shop instances, we decided for the Database Session State Pattern from the PoEAA book (and against Client Session State or Server Session State) to achieve cloud elasticity, accepting that a session database needs to be designed, implemented, and replicated.”

Curate {decision need, solutions, qualities} for reuse – but not the actual decision outcomes.

“When designing a stateful user conversation (for instance, a shopping basket in a Web shop), you will have to decide whether and how session state is persisted and managed.” (question: is this a requirement or stakeholder concern?)

“Your conceptual design options will be these patterns: Client Session State, Server Session State, and Database Session State.” (question: are patterns the only types of options in AD making?)

“The decision criteria will include development effort and cloud affinity.” (question: what else influences the decision making?)
**IRP Selections (a.k.a. Service Design Space) in ADMentor**

- **Pattern selection and adoption qualifies as AD making**
  - Rationale to be captured: qualities, conformance with principles, etc.

- **Guidance through service design space via problem-option pair modeling**
  - In ADMentor
ADMentor Tool (AddIn to Sparx Enterprise Architect)

- ADMentor is openly available at https://github.com/IFS-HSR/ADMentor

Architectural Decision Guidance across Projects
Problem Space Modeling, Decision Backlog Management and Cloud Computing Knowledge

Olaf Zimmermann, Lukas Wegmann
Institute for Software
Hochschule für Technik (HSR FHO)
Rapperswil, Switzerland
{firstname.lastname}@hsr.ch

Heiko Koziolek, Thomas Goldschmidt
Research Area Software
ABB Corporate Research
Ladenburg, Germany
{firstname.lastname}@de.abb.com

- My version (the Y-approach):
  - In the context of <use case/user story u>, facing <concern c>, we decided for <option o> to achieve <quality q>
  - These Y-statements yield a bullet list of open/closed (design) issues (link to project management)
  - Can go to appendix of software architecture document, notes attached to UML model elements, spreadsheet, team space, or wiki

Project website http://www.ifs.hsr.ch/index.php?id=13201&L=4
Leveraging Reusable Architectural Decision Models as a Design Method for Service-Oriented Architecture Construction

ECOWS Keynote
Nov 28, 2007

Olaf Zimmermann
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The Need for Service Modeling and Engineering Research

- Focus @ ECOWS 2007 and other conferences:
  - Dynamic matchmaking, automated service composition, semantics notations
  - Only 2/24 ECOWS 2007 papers have a pure design time focus!

- Service modeling (SOAD) is where OOAD was in ~1995
  - Several methods emerging, none of them is complete (page count!)
  - Many overlapping techniques – no “silver bullet”, no consensus, not actionable
  - None of them addresses detailed design concerns based on quality attributes

- Who advances state of the art in…
  - … IDEs for programming without call stack: resolving architectural forces, refactoring to services, build time matchmaking?
  - … quality metrics for interface granularity and other design issues?
  - … resolving tensions between different forms of pre- and postconditions in contract design (human service designer vs. logic-based)?

⇒ Dagstuhl seminar proposed: “Software Service Engineering”
**My take on future trends in service-oriented computing/service design:**

- Overarching knowledge question: *How to adopt existing and new computer science research results for the context of agile Web/service engineering?*
- “Long live services – of various kinds and granularities” ([ZIO, 2016](#))
Thank you very much!

Feedback?
- Questions?
- Comments?
- Ideas?

Next Steps?
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Example:
An insurance company uses three SAP R/3, MS Visual Basic, and COBOL applications to manage customer information, check for fraud, and calculate payments. The user interfaces (UIs) are the only access points.

A multi-step, multi-user business process for claim handling, executing in IBM WebSphere, is supposed to reuse the functions in the existing applications. How to integrate the new business process with the three legacy applications in a flexible, secure, and reliable way?
Architectural Principles and Heuristics

- **Object-Oriented Analysis and Design (OOAD), Component-Based Software Engineering (CBSE)**
  - Single Responsibility Principle (SRP) by R. Martin (revisited by K. Henney)
  - Fowler’s First Law of Distributed Objects: Don’t distribute your objects
  - Cheesman/Daniels, Catalyst approach, Larman GRASP

- **SOAD vision (2004)**
  - EAM + BPM + OOAD
  - Coarse and fine grained granules
  - Several proposals from industry responded to call for methods (none of which seem to sustain)

- **Rules of Thumb (ZIO)**
  - POINT principles for API design
  - “If in doubt leave it out” (metamodeling, method engineering and adoption)
  - “Worst first” (architectural decision making)
### SOA Principles and Patterns vs. Microservices Tenets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect/Capability</th>
<th>SOA Principles and Patterns</th>
<th>Microservices Tenets and Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core metaphor</td>
<td>(Web) Service, Service Contract</td>
<td>Fine-grained interfaces, RESTful resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>OOAD/UP; SOMA and others</td>
<td>Domain-Driven Design, agile Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural principles</td>
<td>Layering, loose coupling, flow independence, modularity</td>
<td>IDEAL Cloud Architectural Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data storage</td>
<td>Information Services (RDB, File)</td>
<td>Polyglot Persistence (NoSQL, NewSQL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment and hosting</td>
<td>Virtual machines, JEE, SCA; Application Hosting/Outsourcing</td>
<td>Lightweight Containers (e.g., Docker, Dropwizard); Cloud Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build tool chain</td>
<td>n/a (proprietary vendor approaches, custom developed in-house assets, ITIL and other management frameworks)</td>
<td>Decentralized Continuous Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations (FCAPS)</td>
<td>n/a (proprietary vendor approaches, custom developed in-house assets, ITIL and other management frameworks)</td>
<td>Lean but Comprehensive System Management (a.k.a. DevOps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message routing,</td>
<td>Enterprise Service Bus (ESB)</td>
<td>API Gateway, lightweight messaging systems (e.g., RabbitMQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adaption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service composition</td>
<td>Service Composition DSLs, POPL</td>
<td>Plain Old Programming Language (POPL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookup</td>
<td>Service Registry</td>
<td>Service Discovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do I split my system into services?

Step 1: Analyze System
- Entity-relationship model
- Use cases
- System characterizations
- Aggregates (DDD)

Coupling information is extracted from these artifacts.

Step 2: Calculate Coupling
- Data fields, operations and artifacts are nodes.
- Edges are coupled data fields.
- Scoring system calculates edge weights.
- Two different graph clustering algorithms calculate candidate service cuts (=clusters).

Step 3: Visualize Service Cuts
- Priorities are used to reflect the context.
- Published Language (DDD) and use case responsibilities are shown.

Technologies:
Java, Maven, Spring (Core, Boot, Data, Security, MVC), Hibernate, Jersey, Jhipster, AngularJS, Bootstrap
https://github.com/ServiceCutter
Other Research Projects: Architectural Refactoring Content/Tool

- Pattern language for Web API Design and Evolution?
- Lean Decision Backlog?

(screen captions clickable)

Reviewed papers in journals and proceedings

- (49) O. Zimmermann, Microservices Tenets: Agile Approach to Service Development and Deployment, Overview and Vision Paper, Proc. of Symposium and Advanced School on Service-Oriented Computing (SummerSoC), 2016.
CURRENT ISSUE: THE ROLE OF THE SOFTWARE ARCHITECT

The Software Architect’s Role in the Digital Age

Graeme Richa, Allied HE
Speak Outspeak, Carnegie Mellon Software Engineering Institute
New Editor, University of Vienna
Olaf Zimmermann, University of Applied Sciences of Eastern Switzerland, Switzerland

Architectural Refactoring for the Cloud (ARC)
Cloud Knowledge Sources
Microservices Resources and Positions
Domain-Driven Design Overview and Links
DevOps Resources and Positions

Online Resources for Software Architects

The November/December 2016 Theme Issue of IEEE Software on the Role of the Software Architect in the Digital Age is a good starting point (Guest Editor’s Introduction to Theme Issue as PDF).

Websites by thought leaders that we frequently consult (among many others) are:
1. Martin Fowler’s [Blik](http://www.blik.com)
2. Gregor Hohpe’s [Ramblings](http://www.ggregorhohpe.com)
3. Philippe Kruchten’s [Weblog](http://www.philkruchten.com)
4. Eoin Wood’s website and blog at Artecheva
5. Michael Stal’s software architecture blog
6. The Software Architecture Handbook website by Grady Booch
7. Personal page of Gernot Oberhauser (mostly in German) - arc42, aim42, IT architect profession
8. Technical Reports and other publications in the Digital Library of the Software Engineering Institute (SEI)
9. The Open Group website - IT Architect Certification, TOGAF, ArchMate, XA
10. Object Management Group (OMG) - UML, SPEM, MDA, CORBA, ADM, KDM
11. IEEE Software, as well as SWEBOK and the very readable standard for architecture descriptions, ISO/IEC/IEEE 42010

The following conferences have a practitioner focus on all things software architecture are (most of the presentations are available online and can be accessed from the conference websites):
1. SEI SATURN, e.g. SATURN 2013
2. Industry Day at [CompArch/WICSA 2011](http://www.comparch.org/wicsa2011/)
3. BCSA 2014 also had an Industry Day
4. [OOP](https://oopsla.org) (most talks in German, presentations not available online by default)
5. SPLASH and [OOPSLA](https://oopsla.org) (e.g. practitioners reports program at OOPSLA 2008)

If you are new to the field, you can get started by reviewing the arc42 site (in German) or look for architectural guidance and practices in Oopslip. If you have a little more time to study, many excellent books on the topic are available to you, including (but of course not limited to):