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Abstract— Whereas the research in service-oriented architecture (SOA) in general is well-past the early phase, the research in the area of architectural or quality metrics for SOA is still in the early stages. A number of formal models for SOA have been proposed in the literature, and many metrics have been derived from them. This paper serves to project that such a recurrence of formal-model-proposals is not of such magnitude as to be characterized as multiplicity or excess, and that a certain degree of proliferation is a welcome sign, and will only aid an increased understanding of SOA, rather than impede the same in any way. To support this entire view, this paper discusses the important existing formal models, associated metrics, and demonstrates that these models themselves are a fertile ground to create newer metrics. Thereby, it presents many new metrics, and discusses future research possibilities.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Service-oriented architecture (SOA) is an architectural style where systems consist of service users and service providers [1]. A related term, service-oriented computing (SOC), means the computing paradigm that utilizes services as fundamental elements for developing applications [2]. As an analogy, SOC is to SOA, what OOP is to OOAD. SOA can be much better understood in terms of two basic concepts: layers and binding. Fig. 1 shows the SOA layers or the SOA stack [5, 6, 7]. In static binding (see Fig. 2) the service requesters are bound to provided services at design time, whereas in case of the dynamic, run-time scenario (see Fig. 3), service requesters dynamically discover, select the requisite services from a registry, and bind thereof to selected services.

Whereas the research in service-oriented architecture (SOA) in general is well-past the early phase, the research in the area of architectural or quality metrics for SOA is still in early stages. A number of formal models for SOA have been proposed in the literature, and many metrics have been derived from them. We feel that such a recurrence of formal-model-proposals is not of such magnitude as to be characterized as multiplicity or excess, and that a certain degree of proliferation is a welcome sign, and will only aid an increased understanding of SOA, rather than impede the same in any way. To support this entire view, this paper discusses the important existing formal models, associated metrics, and demonstrates that these models themselves are a fertile ground to create newer metrics. Thereby, it presents many new metrics, and discusses future research possibilities.

II. THE PEREPLETCHIKOV-RYAN-FRAMPTON-SCHMIDT MODEL [8, 19, 10]

In the general case, a service-oriented system SYS is formally defined as:

$$\text{SYS} = \langle \text{SI}, \text{BPS}, \text{C}, \text{I}, \text{P}, \text{H}, \text{R} \rangle,$$

where SI is a set of all service interfaces in the system; BPS is a set of all business process scripts; C is a set of all OO classes; I is a set of all OO interfaces; P is a set of all procedural packages; and H is a set of all package headers. Generically, the elements of these sets are called service implementation elements, e. Given a system, SYS, a service s can be defined as:

$$\text{s} = \langle \text{si}, \text{BPS}_{\text{s}}, \text{Cs}, \text{Is}, \text{Ps}, \text{H}, \text{R} \rangle$$

is a service of SYS if and only if:

$$\text{si} \in \text{SI} \land (\text{BPS}_{\text{s}} \subseteq \text{BPS}, \text{Cs} \subseteq \text{C}, \text{Is} \subseteq \text{I}, \text{Ps} \subseteq \text{P}, \text{H} \subseteq \text{H}) \land (\text{BPS}_{\text{s}}, \text{Cs}, \text{Is}, \text{Ps}, \text{H} \not\subseteq \text{s}).$$

Note that $\not\subseteq$ symbol represents service membership. A service boundary is logical rather than physical, thus we need to examine the possible call paths in response to invocations of service operations via the service interface in order to determine whether an element is a
member of a service. Also note that $s_i$ is a singleton set since a service $s$ will have just one service interface $s_i$. $R$ is the set of overall coupling relationships in a service-oriented design defined on $E \times E$, i.e., $R \subseteq E \times E$, where $E$ is the set of all service implementation element $e$, i.e. $E= SI \cup BPS \cup C \cup I \cup P \cup H$.

The relationships $R$ can be categorized as:

**Incoming relationships**, $IR(s) = \{(c_1, e_2): c_1 \in (BPS-BPSs \cup C-Cs \cup I-I \cup P-Ps \cup H-Hs) \land e_2 \in (BPSs \cup C \cup I \cup P \cup H)\}$

**Outgoing relationships**, $OR(s) = \{(e_1, e_2): e_1 \in (BPSs \cup C \cup I \cup P \cup H) \land e_2 \in (BPS-BPSs \cup C-Cs \cup I-I \cup P-Ps \cup H-Hs)\}$

**Service incoming relationships**, $SIR(s) = \{(c, s_i): c \in (BPSs \cup C \cup I \cup P \cup H) \land s_i = s_i\}$

**Service outgoing relationships**, $SOR(s) = \{(e, s_i): e \in (BPSs \cup C \cup I \cup P) \land s_i \neq s_i\}$

**Interface to implementation relationships**, $IIR(s) = \{(s_i, e): s_i = s_i \land e \in (BPSs \cup C \cup I \cup P)\}$

The papers [8, 9, 10] discuss this model and associated metrics in detail. Here we describe one metric from this suite, Weighted Extra-Service Incoming Coupling of Element (WESICE).

WESICE for a given service implementation element $e$ of a particular service $s$ is the weighted count of the number of system elements not belonging to the same service that couple to this element. Formally, WESICE $\epsilon = |\{e, e_i\}^{WightFactors: (e, e_i) \in IR(s)}|$. WeightFactor is a value assigned to different types of relationships based on their perceived influence on system coupling. For example, CP (OO Class → Procedural Package) type of relationship is weighted higher than IC (OO interface → OO Class) type since the coupling is expected to be ‘stronger’ in the former case.

### III. RUD-SCHMIETENDORF-DUMKE SUITE [11, 12]

A service-oriented system consists of a set of providers’ nodes. Each node is providing one or more non-mobile services, each service has one or more operations (business functions). Services can be either atomic or composite, i.e. represent structured collaborations of other services. A few fundamental metrics of the model are:

**$N$**, Set of service providers’ nodes;  

**$S[n]$**, Set of services provided by the node $n \in N$; and  

**$A$**, Set of tuples (relation) = \{<InvokerNode, Invoker, ServiceNode, Service, Operation>\}: The meaning of each tuple is “Software component (i.e. a service, a composition engine or an end-user GUI application) Invoker that is located on the node InvokerNode invokes the operation Operation of the service Service that is located on the node ServiceNode.”

The details of this model and associated metrics can be found in [11, 12]. We discuss three metrics from this suite.

**AIIS[s]**, Absolute Importance of the Service $s \in S[n]$, $n \in N$ is defined as count of clients which depend on $s$, i.e. which invoke its operations. Note that it does not count here clients that are located on the node $n$.

$$AIIS[s] = |\pi_{Invoker} (\pi_{InvokerNode \rightarrow Service = s} (A))|$$, $\pi$ is a standard relational-algebra operation, which means projection. $\sigma$ is another operation meaning selection.

**ADIS[s]**, Absolute Dependence of the Service $s \in S[n]$, $n \in N$
is defined as count of other services this service depends on:

\[ ADS[s] = \prod_{\text{invoker} = \text{ServiceNode}(A)} \text{Service}(ı) \]

\[ ACS[s] \], Absolute Criticality of the Service \( s \in S[n] \), \( n \in N \)

is the product of its absolute importance and absolute dependence:

\[ ACS[s] = AIS[s] \times ADS[s] \]

IV. LIU-TRAORE COMPLEXITY METRIC \(^{[14]}\)

This metric employs what is called User-system Interaction Elements (USIE) model. For example, a USIE composite service graph is a tree that captures the service hierarchy underlining a particular composite service. We discuss their metric, Average Service Depth (ASD)

Given a composite service \( c \), \( ASD (c) = \sum (\text{NumOfServiceDependency (n) / |N|}) \)

Fig. 2 Static binding

Fig. 3 Dynamic binding

Where \( n \) denotes an atomic service in \( c \); \( \sum \) runs over \( n \in N \); \( \text{NumOfServiceDependency (n)} = \) the number of direct or indirect dependencies of \( n \); \( N \) is total number of atomic-service nodes in \( c \).

The ASD metric actually computes the average number of dependency relationships per atomic service node; therefore, high ASD values indicate high degree of dependencies in the service. Liu and Traore demonstrate in \([14]\) through a case study the empirical relationship between software complexity and attackability, confirming to some extent the widely held belief that complexity has a negative impact on security.

V. OTHER MODELS AND METRICS

There are a fair number of other models, metrics and measurement work \([13-15, 17-22]\) which we do not treat here in any detail for reasons of space constraints. For example, in \([21]\) Korostelev et al. derive a fault model for error detection from the SOA, and introduce metrics to evaluate efficiency of this model.

VI. COHESION METRICS

All proposed metrics are marked PM (for proposed metric). Van der Hoek et al. \([23, 24]\) have proposed two metrics for PLA (product line architecture). PLA refers to generic architecture for an entire product family/line and it explicitly specifies all mandatory components, optional components and variant components (only one of these variant components can be included in a product instance of PLA, in other words, a member of product line/family). Every component in a product instance provides some services (in van-der-Hoek model public-access things like operations, methods, functions etc are called a service) and requires some service. So, given a product instance, they define two metrics, Provided Service Utilization (PSU) and Required Service Utilization (RSU) as follows:

\[ PSU (X) = \frac{\text{Actual number of provided services of component X utilized within the product instance, Pactual}}{(\text{total number of services provided by X, Ptotal})} \]

That is, some of the services provided by X may not be utilized in a product instance.

\[ RSU (X) = \frac{\text{Actual number of required services of X available within product instance, Ractual}}{(\text{total number of services required by X, Rtotal})} \]

The fact that all required services are not available for X in the product may sound counter-intuitive. But, this is acceptable in product line/family because some of the required services of a component of a product may not be critical to system working, and can be optionally supplied as add-on.

A PSU close to 0 suggests that there is lot of extra functionality in X that is not utilized within the product, i.e. it is “bloated”. A value of 1 signifies that it is well utilized. Similarly, RSU close to 0 means it may not function well in products. Further, they derive two metrics CPSU (P) and CRSU (P) for a given product instance.

\[ CPSU (P) = \frac{\sum P_{\text{actual}}}{\sum P_{\text{total}}} \quad \text{and CRSU (P)} = \frac{\sum R_{\text{actual}}}{\sum R_{\text{total}}} \]

C stands for compound and the summations run over all components X in the product instance.

We use the formal model of Perepletchikov et al. (see Section II). The metrics for SOA can be derived as follows. We consider an e of service of SOA to be an analogue of component of van der Hoek model and a...
service of SOA itself to be analogue of product instance/simply product of van der Hoek model. Also the provided operations of an e are analogous to provided services of a component and required operations of an e are analogous to required services of a component. In fact, this makes sense easily; because an SOA may be some sort of complex PLA wherein a service, whether implemented initially or composed of other services, is indeed a product. Accordingly and analogously, we may define,

**PM1:** POU (e) = (Actual number of provided operations of an e utilized within the service) / (total number of operations provided by the e).

**PM2:** ROU (e) = (actual number of required operations of e available within service) / total number of operations required by e. (S of van der Hoek model replaced with O)

Then, CPOU (PM 3) and CROU (PM4) will signify if an entire service is more self-contained/ cohesive/ autonomous. Values close to 1 for CPOU and CROU indicate highly autonomous services.

Such metrics may be useful in SOA because SOA is an evolutionary, integrating architecture, wherein disparate legacy components, and new components and external components (external to enterprise) when exposed as services come together, and so it may not be possible to design highly cohesive services from scratch, and it may not be even cost-effective to do so (for example, repeating same design highly cohesive services from scratch, and it may not evolve.

**PM3:** PM1 = IRE (s) / (number of service components in service module) / total number of operations provided by the e.

**PM4:** PM2 = IRE (s) / (total number of service components in service module) / total number of operations provided by the e.

Then, CPOU (PM 3) and CROU (PM4) will signify if an entire service is more self-contained/ cohesive/ autonomous. Values close to 1 for CPOU and CROU indicate highly autonomous services.

Similarly, we propose CPOU and CROU for composite services (PM 5 and PM 6), and in this case we will treat the constituent services as components providing and requiring operations, i.e. either being invoked as subsidiary services or invoking other services. This metric will be of more use when some external services (external to an enterprise) are being used to compose such composite services. Use of external services signifies less cohesive composite services.

### VII. COMPLEXITY METRICS

#### A. Fan-in and Fan-out Variants

Menkhaus and Andrich [21] have proposed a metric suite for embedded software systems. The basic model they use is a directed graph containing “blocks” at vertices, and edges as dependencies. We adapt one of their metrics IOB, instability of block. Blocks that are stable are both independent and highly responsible. Blocks are independent if they do not depend upon the results of the other blocks. Blocks are responsible, if changes of this block have a strong and wide-ranged impact upon other blocks. We have simply substituted e in place of block. A similar metric, but on an absolute scale has been suggested in [27]. In both [26] and [27], a higher value signifies “instable” or “most easily affected.” Actually, these are either variants or direct adaptation of the classic fan-out complexity metric. And all outgoing coupling metrics of Perepletchikov et al. [10] (also Section II) are also direct adaptation of fan-out. And so is the ADS of Rud et al. (Section III). The IOB differs in that it takes into account fan-in in the denominator. This is factored-in with |IR (e) +1| in the metric below.

The instability of element, IOE (e), is defined as

\[
\text{IOE} (e) = \frac{|\text{OR}(e) + |\text{SOR}(e)|}{|\text{IR} (e)| +1 + |\text{OR} (e)| + |\text{SOR}(e)|}
\]

\[ e \notin \text{si} \quad (PM 7) \]

Where OR(e) is a set formed by including the pairs in OR (s), which have occurrence of e; SOR(e) is a set formed by including the pairs in SOR (s), which have occurrence of e; and IR (e) is a set formed by including the pairs in IR (s), which have occurrence of e. The term 1 in Dr. accounts for incoming coupling, whether direct or indirect, from si of s to which it belongs. OR (s), SOR (s) and IR (s) are defined as in Perepletchikov formal model discussed in Section II. The scale is \([0, 1]\). 0 means very less instable, and hence stable, and 1 means highly instable. For the special case of the element si,

\[
\text{IOE} (si) = \frac{|\text{IR}(s)|}{|\text{IR}(s)| + |\text{SIR}(s)|} \quad e = si \quad (PM 8)
\]

IR(s) and SIR (s) are as defined in the Perepletchikov formal model of Section II.

Zhao et al. [17] have suggested a metric, change cost, for what they call service component as an element of service module. It is actually total number of direct and indirect dependencies upon a service component, normalized to total number of service components in service module. The authors suggest that the change metric can be calculated with respect to complete SOS. We adapt this later version, and in that sense, it is complement of the above metric, because it signifies the influence or the effect on the rest of the system, or in other words, the “stability” or “strength” it signifies. Actually, this is akin to fan-in or incoming coupling metrics [9]. It is also similar to AIS [Section III]. However, we include fan-out in Dr to factor-in the dependence. The change cost of element e

\[
\text{CC} (e) = \frac{|\text{IR}(e)| +1}{|\text{IR}(e)| +1 + |\text{OR}(e)| + |\text{SOR}(e)|}
\]

\[ e \notin \text{si} \quad (PM 9)\]

Clearly, IOE (e) + CC (e) = 1.

Similarly, for the special case of si

\[
\text{CC} (si) = \frac{|\text{SIR}(s)|}{|\text{IR}(s)| + |\text{SIR}(s)|}
\]

\[ e = si \quad (PM 10)\]

Again, IOE (si) + CC (si) = 1.

#### B. Extending McCabe’s Cyclomatic Complexity (MCC)

We consider applying McCabe’s cyclomatic complexity metric. Perepletchikov et al. [8-10] also caution in their work, and rightly so, that traditional procedural and OO metrics are not immediately applicable to SOS. However, for example, basing on CBO from CK-metrics-suite, and with some adjustments, they derive some metrics at level of e’s, which can be aggregated to higher level of service. However, we do not see any problem in adapting McCabe’s cyclomatic complexity (MCC) to SOA, and in fact, we take the cue from Vasconcelos et al. [18] who have adapted this to derive a complexity metric for what they call ISA (Information System Architecture). MCC has had wide applicapibility, having been applied to parallel program [25], concurrent network models [20] and embedded software [25].

**PM11** For each operation in a service, there is control flow graph (CFG) across some e’s in a service. This graph is, of course, cs1 U cs2 Ucs3 U… Ucsn, where cs’re s are l number of collaboration sequences in an operation, and U denotes graph union. cs is defined in the Perepletchikov model (Section II) as set of elements e that are invoked in response to specific inputs on an operation. From CFG of each operation, cyclomatic complexity is calculated as usual as (edges-nodes+2). Then, cyclomatic complexities are calculated for all operations in a service. All these values are added, giving cyclomatic complexity for that service.
C. Inter-connection Complexity

Maertz and Lindner [30] have proposed a complexity metric, what they call complexity of interconnection, for digital instrumentation and control software. However, it is based on generic graph. The metric is basically an average value reflecting the multiplicity of usage of the individual functional blocks for the computation of various output signals of a logic diagram of I&C software. We adapt it as follows. We juxtapose functional block with the service implementation elements (e), and output signal to an operation in a service; the entire service being juxtaposed to a logic diagram. Complexity of interconnection V(s), where s is a service,

\[ V(s) = \sum \frac{|\text{VE}(o_i)|}{|e|} \]

(\text{PM}12)

The summation is over all operations o_i. VE(o_i) denotes the set of e's implementing o_i. Obviously, each VE(o_i) may have some common elements with another VE(o_i). The metric V(s) actually gives an average of multiplicity of usage of every element for implementing each operation of the service.

The metric V(s) will have a limited range of values, which is in the interval between 1 and the number of operations of a service i.e. 1 \leq V(s) \leq number of operations of service. As such, V(s) can be normalized to the interval [0, 1] thus giving a relative metric for the complexity of interconnection.

VIII. MODIFIED RESPONSE FOR OPERATION

The paper [9] does provide a definition for a metric Response for Operation, RFO. RFO for a given operation o of a service interface s is the cardinality of the sets of implementation elements and other service interfaces that can be executed in response to invocations of o with all possible parameters. So, RFO = |CS(o)|, as defined in [10], where CS is set of collaboration sequences, cs, of operation o. The original CK-metrics-suite [29] definition is: The response set of a class is a set of methods that can potentially be executed in response to a message received by an object of that class. This definition has been strictly followed in its essence in [18] to derive a metric, Average Response for Service, ARFS, but for Information System Architecture (ISA). We also follow the CK-metrics-definition strictly in its full essence, and derive a metric, Modified Response for Operation, RFO")

(\text{PM} 13): Construct composite graph (which is in fact control flow graph, CFG, in this case) as: \text{cs}_1 \cup \text{cs}_2 \cup \ldots \cup \text{cs}_n (graph union over all elements of CS (o)). The cardinality of this graph set gives RFO_o (m for modified, to distinguish it from RFO as above).

IX. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We have demonstrated in this paper that the existing work on metrics in SOA and related domains of software engineering offer ample scope of expanding and deepening existing models. Thereby, we illustrate that multiple formal models of SOA will benefit the metrics work in SOA.

This paper is intended to be an initial warm-up to our future plan of conducting research along the following tentative plan. We have also proposed MCC for business process workflow, derived the Liu-Traore metric for atomic service, and derived a service granularity metric. We intend to expand our initial work. An important avenue is to investigate all modeling work done so far, especially those that have lead to formulation of important metrics, including both generic models like UML and specific ones, e.g. that of Perepletchikov et al. and conduct a comparison and critical analysis vis-à-vis commonly understood and implemented SOA concepts, and those of software architecture, and in light of current SOA practice. It is likely some consolidated work will reveal more insights and depths, and possibly development of some more quality metrics. Another interesting area could be to explore if and how various metrics are related to other metrics within a suite, and to metrics external to suite. Specifically, metrics from different suites but measuring the same attributes should not reflect any conflict whatsoever.

Recommend thresholds for various SOA metrics is very important from practical-implementation viewpoint. Thresholds \([33]\) are heuristic values used to set ranges of desirable and undesirable metric values for measured software. These thresholds are used to identify anomalies, which may or may not be an actual problem.

As has been pointed out earlier in this paper, the research in quality, metrics and evaluation for SOA is in early stages. Many of the metrics suites need empirical validation. A metric that is demonstrated to empirically co-relate with the attribute it is supposed to measure finds wide acceptability. This option offers ample avenues for future research.
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