

## SOA Maturity Assessment Exercise

The Oracle Level 5 SOA Maturity Model is designed to help organizations realize the extent of their SOA capabilities, identify appropriate projects to undertake, and understand what benefits to expect. Incorporated into the model are multiple capability dimensions of SOA (e.g. governance, infrastructure, and organizations). Assessing the maturity of an organization requires evaluating its capabilities in each of these dimensions. Oracle provides a cheatsheet to help with this task that describes the attributes of each dimension at every level. To practice making SOA maturity assessments, Oracle also provides sample case studies such as this one.

This case study exercise describes a fictitious company in need of an SOA assessment. Read the case study, and using the Oracle Level 5 SOA Maturity Model cheatsheet assess the company's SOA capabilities. To find the Oracle Level 5 SOA Maturity Model cheatsheet, go to [www.oracle.com/soa](http://www.oracle.com/soa) and access the Oracle SOA Resource Center.

### Guidelines

1. Assess the SOA maturity level of the company described in this case study. You should refer to the Oracle Level 5 SOA Maturity Model cheatsheet to do this.
2. It's a good idea to start at Level 1 for each dimension, review the criteria at that level and work your way up.
3. Assign a level for each SOA capability dimension (Architecture, Infrastructure, Organization, etc.) found in the Oracle Level 5 SOA Maturity Model. You may assign a partial score (e.g. 2+) if you feel the company deserves partial credit for a particular level of capability, e.g. you could assign 1+ for Architecture if you feel that company has some, but not all the capabilities for Level 2 Architecture.
4. Note the minimum level of maturity you can assign for any capability dimension is 1.
5. The maturity level for each capability dimension is more important and relevant to the organization than the overall, aggregate maturity level across all dimensions. The former provides a more specific gap analysis of where an organization should focus to improve.
6. Note that similar to most organizations today, our case studies do not reflect companies at extremely high levels of SOA maturity.
7. Consider what you would do if you were an enterprise architect who is tasked with helping this particular company.

### ***Throw Money Away and Waste Time Mortgages (TMAM)***

TMAM is a diversified financial services firm that has grown largely through M&A. As a result of this strategy, their retail mortgage division, which operated across a number of countries in Europe, ended up with disparate systems. The Enterprise Architecture group, who had a close involvement with each of the countries' IT organizations advocated a plan to phase out their legacy systems over time – to reduce cost and improve business responsiveness. However, they didn't like a rip and replace approach and were looking for a phased approach in which they could leverage those existing investments in the short term, but gradually phase them out without disruption. The benefits of consolidating burning platforms were not lost on them! The EA group realized that SOA could form the basis for this and engaged with the business owners and IT groups to get everyone onto the same page.

The EA group started to paint out their SOA architecture, corporate standards and suggested development and deployment technologies. They chose a shortlist of SOA platforms and in conjunction with the IT groups and the governance committee made recommendations. One recommendation was to standardize on a SOA platform – this one included messaging, orchestration, and Web services management capabilities. They also published guidelines for building SOA applications that they disseminated to each of the country IT teams. In order to ensure success, one country was chosen by the governance committee, in close liaison with the EA group, for the SOA pilot.

Since the country IT team was not familiar with SOA, the local team decided to engage a consulting company to build an initial set of services that could then be leveraged by the in-house local IT team. The consulting company that was engaged spent a considerable amount of time service-enabling all the existing legacy interfaces. The country IT team made sure that the integrator used the messaging capabilities of the SOA platform on which corporate had standardized – they didn't see the need for the other pieces. Since the integrator was on a tight deadline, they didn't reach out to business people to see where the business was going and to ascertain usage scenarios – the assumption was that the existing interfaces would have all the required functionality. The consulting company documented the services that they built upon completion of the project and produced guidelines to help the local team with service identification, development and deployment issues. They even anticipated some of the implementation and operational issues that shared services entail and developed a customized SOA Methodology for TMAM as well as an operational model for services. Finally, they put together a training plan for local architects and developers.

Nine months later, the governance committee asked the local IT manager to present his team's experience with SOA. The local IT manager unfortunately didn't have much to talk about other than the large portfolio of services that she had inherited during the consulting project – she really had no way of telling whether any of the services had been used, let alone reused! After careful investigation, she reported that almost none of the services had been used in application development. She attributed this to the fact that it was too difficult to use these services in their long running projects.