

Center for Information Management Studies (CIMS) at Babson College  
**CIMS NEWSLETTER**

Summary of Workshop



October 2005

**Mark Your  
Calendars!**



**Tuesday, January 10, 2006**

**Joint Session with the  
Massachusetts Network  
Communications Council**

***VoIP: Update on Enterprise  
Adoption***

**8:15 AM to 11:15 AM  
Olin Hall, Babson College**

**Speakers:**

*Jan Dawson, Ovum  
Jim Barry, OneUnited Bank  
Leo Donnelly, Harvard University  
Paul Scheib, Children's Hospital  
Bill Rebello, Lifeline Systems Inc.*

**Wednesday, January 25, 2006**

***Business Innovation and  
the Role of IT***

**8:15 AM to 11:15 AM  
Olin Hall, Babson College**

**Speakers:**

*Frank Gens, International Data  
Corporation  
Thornton A. May, Futurist, Business  
Advisor, Author  
Steven R. Gordon, Babson College*

**A Technology Update Session  
*Service Oriented Architecture and Technologies*  
Tuesday, October 18, 2005**

***Gregg Bjork  
Weblayers Inc.***

**SOA Governance**

*Gregg Bjork*, Senior VP of Field Operations at WebLayers, Inc., addressed the challenges of Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) and how governance helps address those challenges. Bjork stated that there is a high level of general interest in SOA within the IT industry, as well as in government. He mentioned that the government was 18 months ahead of the IT industry in implementing SOA due to the 9/11 congressional mandate for all government agencies to share information.

**Implementation Challenges**

Bjork described common challenges of implementing SOA. The current state of many companies and government organizations is that business functionality is buried in legacy applications with proprietary interfaces that only service silos within the company or agency. The goal of SOA is to share this functionality throughout the organization. Interoperability and reusability of services are major concerns when implementing SOA.

**Governance is Key to SOA Success**

Bjork went on to mention that developers have different views and perspectives of services, messaging, and security. Developers and project teams tend to do whatever they want. Without standardized policies and enforcement, implementing SOA will only result in new silos of functionality. The keys to a successful deployment of SOA are

implanting policies, enforcing compliance, and verifying the results. According to Bjork, WebLayers' product, Weblayers Center, provides the SOA governance and conformance solution to achieve SOA.

**Maintaining Services: Resource Requirements after Rollout**

During the Q&A session, Bjork agreed that there were other key issues to the success of an SOA rollout. In general, IT departments are disincented to create services because if the service is successful and popular, it must be maintained, upgraded and supported. Most funding is project based, he continued, and funding ends when a project is completed. But with services in SOA, there is a need for funds and support after the integration. Bjork suggested that there needs to be a funding and organizational change in which a body of resources and people maintain services after they are integrated. He pointed out that services within SOA are ranked and rated based upon usages and are funded accordingly.

**Summary**

Bjork concluded with a discussion of the WebLayers-sponsored SOA Forum which is an exclusive, quarterly round-table of Fortune 500 and government agency IT executives: ([http://www.weblayers.com/soa\\_forum.htm](http://www.weblayers.com/soa_forum.htm)). Although the Forum is sponsored by WebLayers, Bjork commented that it is a neutral assembly focused on discussing current issues and finding best practices of SOA adoption.



**Benjamin Moreland**  
**James McGovern**  
**The Hartford**

*Benjamin Moreland*, Assistant Director of Property & Casualty SOA and *James McGovern*, Enterprise Architect from The Hartford discussed how they implemented Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) at The Hartford and what they learned from their experience.

**SOA Objectives: Business Agility and Efficiency**

At The Hartford, the decision to migrate to SOA was not taken lightly. Moreland and McGovern saw the benefits of SOA such as driving down IT maintenance costs and improving business agility. One reason for focusing on SOA was to increase the ease of doing business, more specifically, to provide quotes and insurance quicker. They believed that implementing SOA would reduce development and deployment of new services from years to months. But Moreland realized that the main benefit from SOA would be on the maintenance and upgrade side rather than development or deployment. The ability to pull out a service and upgrade it transparently would allow Hartford to improve a service faster. McGovern commented that the Hartford had a history of difficulty depreciating technology. He added that an additional benefit of SOA would be to provide a gradual method of “sunsetting” their current mainframe system.

**SOA Characteristics**

SOA has several characteristics that allow it to provide agility and efficiency. All the participants in SOA are peers. All the services are loosely coupled, interoperable, and can be invoked over a network. The network makes location of these peers and services irrelevant. The technology used for SOA is not as important as having a set standard to which all the peers and services adhere.

SOA requires registries or directories. Similar to how the Yellow Pages are service oriented and allow people to find the services they need, peers in SOA need a way to find the available services. And, as with all aspects of SOA, directories and registries need standardized addressing schemes and namespaces.

**Success Factors: Governance Model & Collaborating Architects**

At The Hartford, Moreland did not plan to use a “rip and replace” approach. The benefit of SOA is that it allowed The Hartford to migrate to SOA a little at a time once the SOA layers were in place. As Gregg Bjork suggested in the earlier discussion, The Hartford set up the foundation services first before attempting to start implementing SOA. These services included rationalization, charters, and structure. With rationalization, The Hartford propagated the reasons for implanting SOA throughout the organization. This ensured improved adoption and acceptance of SOA. The Hartford also created a new funding model with governance to control the architecture change. In addition, they set up a cross functional team in charge of maintaining services. Finally, The Hartford planned and developed the structure of the SOA deployment with input from system architects from all aspects of the company.

For The Hartford, continued McGovern, SOA was not about standards and technology but about getting the right people, more specifically system architects, to work and talk together. The focus on architecture and SOA became pervasive throughout the organization. Once their system architects from different departments started communicating, they were able to formalize standards and see redundancies. Since The Hartford started with a piecemeal methodology, they were able to build trust with early success stories. For example, instead of taking four weeks for integrating JAVA to .net, it took two hours. Moreland and McGovern emphasized that the key to success for SOA was to avoid “throwing

services over the firewall”, and to demand good relationships.

**SOA Maturity Model**

The Hartford’s perspective on SOA included four main considerations that affected the level of return on investment and reflected the SOA maturity within the organization:

1. adopting SOA standards
2. implementing technology
3. the size and type of organization supporting SOA
4. the processes involved with maintaining SOA

The higher the SOA level of maturity was within The Hartford, the greater was the expected return on investment.

The Hartford began their journey into SOA by following the simple object access protocol (SOAP) and XML standards and focusing on improving web services technology. The organization that supported and managed SOA implementation was the Architect’s Collective, a loose group of architects from all aspects of The Hartford. This organization focused The Hartford implementation process on following the Application Reference architecture developed by the collective.

Although they are not there yet, The Hartford’s ultimate goal for SOA is to have SOA follow Business Process modeling standards and to enable business process modeling tools under SOA. They hope to have an SOA organizational structure to develop and support SOA throughout the organization, and expect continuous improvement of SOA from this new structure.

**Case Study: SEMCI**

The Hartford used Single Entry Multiple Company Interface (SEMCI) as an ideal target for the benefits of SOA. To explain SEMCI, independent insurance agents require multiple interfaces to collect user data, gather quotes from insurance carriers, and select a policy for their client from an insurance carrier.



As mentioned earlier, The Hartford had to migrate from its siloed applications to SOA. Since SEMCI applications exchanged documents in Accord XML, the insurance industry standard, The Hartford had to accept Accord XML messages. Also, The Hartford had to comply with security, authentication, validation, routing and translation. Once the information was received and sent to the correct area, The Hartford then had to generate a quote and return that quote to the independent insurance agent.

For SEMCI, The Hartford used a Universal Description, Discovery and Integration (UDDI) registry. UDDI is a web services protocol that discovers and stores information about services available on the network. UDDI's lookup capabilities gathered information from messages, retrieved the necessary service, and dynamically called the service. This allowed great flexibility in replacing and modifying services transparently. Changing a service no longer affected everything in an application.

**Summary**

Overall, Moreland and McGovern's description of The Hartford's SOA implementation reflected a robust approach with firm objectives, collaboration, and effective governance models.



These proceedings were written by Babson College MBA candidate, Rob "Rojo" Rojanasathit. For more information about CIMS programs, please call the office at Babson College at (781)-239-4531, or e-mail inquiries to [stoff@babson.edu](mailto:stoff@babson.edu).

**Speaker Biographies**

**Gregg Bjork** is Senior VP, Field Operations, at WebLayers, Inc. He is responsible for all field personnel involved in the delivery of services and engineering to the company's customer base. He also manages a partner network that supports WebLayers' technology and business development initiatives. Formerly, Bjork held executive management positions at Systinet Corporation, Attunity, NetCentric, and Powersoft Corporation. In these roles, he was responsible for various aspects of customer service, engineering, and professional services groups.

**Benjamin Moreland** is an Assistant Director responsible for the realization of The Hartford's Property & Casualty Service Oriented Architecture (SOA). He has over 20 years of IT experience that includes management, research, presentations and development, with a strong background in artificial intelligence. In the last three years at The Hartford, his team has implemented over 80 services and helped set the SOA standards for The Hartford. Formerly, at United Technologies and The University of Connecticut, he led and participated in many research and development efforts. Moreland has a BA in mathematics and an MS in Computer Science & Engineering from The University of Connecticut.

**James McGovern** is an Enterprise Architect for The Hartford with eighteen years experience in IT. He has co-authored books on IT subjects including *A Practical Guide to Enterprise Architecture* and *Enterprise Service Oriented Architectures*. McGovern is a member of the Java Community Process, IEEE Computer Society, and the Worldwide Institute of Software Architects. As an industry thought 'blogger', he writes frequently on topics such as enterprise architecture, technology innovation, open source, SOA, and the human aspects of technology.

\* \* \* \*

**Wall Street Journal Ranks Babson's MBA #2**

The Wall Street Journal released its 2005 Business School rankings and for the third straight year Babson's MBA program was ranked #2 in entrepreneurship by corporate recruiters. Babson was ranked behind Stanford and ahead of Harvard, California, and MIT.

In addition, Babson received strong press that positioned our Fast Track MBA program as an example of a "new product offering" that not only addresses corporate recruiters desire to hire MBAs who have benefited from vigorous classroom discussions and team situations, but also addresses a large component of the marketplace for working professionals who desire an MBA without leaving their jobs.

\* \* \* \*