



INFORMATION SERVICES BOARD

Scott Came
Department of Information Services

Laura Parma
Department of Information Services
Enterprise Architecture Committee Steward

Solution Integration Design Standards

ISB Standards

Version 5

November 9, 2006

Information Services Board
Enterprise Architecture Committee

Bill Kehoe, *Department of Licensing*
Co-chair

Cathy Munson, *Legislative Service Center*
Co-Chair

Department of Information Services
1110 Jefferson Street SE
P.O. Box 42445
Olympia, WA 98504-2445
Phone 360/902.3519
Fax 360/902.2982

Table of Contents

1. Document History	2
2. Document Context	3
3. Description and Purpose	4
3.1. Summary of Standards	4
4. Compliance Component Information	4
4.1. Basic Component Metadata	4
4.2. Statutory Authority	4
4.3. Scope	4
4.4. Relationship to Other Components, Policies, Standards, or Guidelines	5
5. Solution Integration Design Standards	5
5.1. Standards	5
5.1.1. Provider system functionality shall be accessible through separate software interfaces	5
5.1.2. Consumer systems shall be insulated from changes in provider systems' implementation	6
5.1.3. Software interfaces shall conform to open industry standards	6
5.2. Rationale	7
5.2.1. Alignment with Statewide Integration Architecture	7
5.2.2. Alignment with Over-Arching Enterprise Architecture Principles	7
6. References	9
Appendix A: Documenter Team	10
Appendix B: Review Log	11

1. Document History

Date	Version	Editor	Change
February 3, 2006	1.0	Scott Came	Initial draft
April 14, 2006	1.1	Scott Came	Change to standards
May 26, 2006	1.2	Scott Came	Plain talk / usability edits
June 9, 2006	1.3	Scott Came	Change to guidelines

Date	Version	Editor	Change
June 14, 2006	2.0	Scott Came	Endorsed by EAC
September 14, 2006	4.0	Scott Came	Adopted by ISB
October 25, 2006	4.1	Trina Regan	Change guidelines to standards Endorsed by EAC
November 9, 2006	5	Paul Douglas	Adopted by ISB as Standards

2. Document Context

This document currently has ISB Standards status. This status signifies that the document was adopted as standards by a vote of the Information Services Board. For more information about the ISB Enterprise Architecture Committee and its initiative, please visit the EA Committee website at: <http://isb.wa.gov/committees/enterprise/Default.aspx>.

3. Description and Purpose

System designers, implementers, and purchases must use the Solution Integration Design Standards in this document on the following decisions:

- When purchasing a solution, what design qualities would improve the ability to integrate the solution with existing and future systems?
- When designing and building a software system internally, how should implementation teams design the system to improve the ability to integrate it with existing and future systems?

3.1. Summary of Standards

These standards are for the design of information systems that have (or are likely to have) interfaces to other systems across the state enterprise:

- Systems that make functionality or information available to other systems shall do so through a software interface that is separate from the system's user interface.
- Systems that use functionality or information provided by other systems shall access that functionality or information in a way that minimizes dependencies on those other systems' implementation details.
- Integration interfaces between systems shall be based on open industry standards, though the implementations of the systems themselves need not be based on open industry standards (note specific definition of the term "open industry standards" in section 5.1.3).

4. Compliance Component Information

This section includes key information that is required for all compliance components in the architecture.

4.1. Basic Component Metadata

Component Identifier:	Not yet assigned
Adoption Date:	Not yet Determined
Effective Date:	Not yet Determined

4.2. Statutory Authority

The provisions of RCW 43.105.041 detail the powers and duties of the Information Services Board (ISB), including the authority to develop statewide or interagency information services and technical policies, standards, and procedures.

4.3. Scope

These standards apply to executive and judicial branch agencies and educational institutions. Academic and research applications at institutions of higher education are exempted.

In this document, the terms "state agency" and "agency" mean any agency or institution within the scope of the previous paragraph, and the term "state enterprise" means all agencies and institutions (collectively) within the scope of the previous paragraph.

38 Starting November 9, 2006, the Integration Architecture Standards will govern the planning and
39 construction of all applications that share data with other agencies.

40
41 Exemption requests must be submitted to DIS MOSTD and will be forwarded to the ISB for
42 decision. Applications existing or under construction as of November 9, 2006, are not required to
43 immediately comply, but will be required to comply when redesigned or replaced.

44 **4.4. Relationship to Other Components, Policies, Standards, or Guidelines**

45 None.

46 **5. Solution Integration Design Standards**

47 This section includes the Solution Design Standards and the rationale behind them.

48 **5.1. Standards**

49 A **STATEWIDE INTEGRATED SYSTEM** is any information system that agencies can use in one or more
50 of the following ways:

- 51 • To connect to, interface with, or use the functionality of one or more information
52 system(s) provided by agencies other than the agency in which it resides (such a system
53 is called a **CONSUMER SYSTEM**)
- 54 • To provide functionality to one or more information system(s) in agencies other than the
55 agency in which it resides (such a system is called a **PROVIDER SYSTEM**)

56 Information systems are statewide integrated systems if they do not currently have these
57 characteristics, but are likely to have these characteristics in the future. Designers and
58 purchasers of information systems should recognize that most systems eventually become
59 consumer systems or provider systems (or both), even if the initial set of system requirements do
60 not include integration requirements.

61 State agencies that are building and maintaining or purchasing (with or without modification)
62 statewide integrated systems shall incorporate the following design characteristics.

63 **5.1.1. Provider system functionality shall be accessible through separate software 64 interfaces**

65 Most software systems have a graphical user interface, consisting of screens, windows, forms,
66 and reports that provide human users with access to the system's functionality. The user
67 interface is the part of the system that users actually see, and with which they interact.

68 Designs for provider systems shall provide access to the system's functionality through one or
69 more software interfaces that are separate and distinct from the system's user interface. The
70 system designer or vendor shall provide thorough and complete documentation of all software
71 interfaces.

72 This standard does not require that every function of an information system be available through
73 a separate software interface. Only those functions that are used (or are likely to be used in the
74 future) by a consumer system must be available through an interface.

75 Many system designers and vendors label a system's set of software interfaces as an Application
76 Programming Interface (API). An API that represents a set of open software interfaces, as
77 defined in section 5.1.3 below, satisfies the terms of this standard.

78 Agencies that purchase a software system from a commercial vendor shall verify that the
79 purchase agreement includes clear terms and conditions governing the use of separate software

80 interfaces. System vendors shall be familiar with interface-based integration requirements and
81 shall have a licensing model to accommodate them.

82 System designers may provide software interfaces through the use of "adapters." An adapter is a
83 software component, supplied either by a system vendor or a third party, that translates a
84 system's native, closed, or vendor-proprietary interface into an open software interface (as
85 defined in section 5.1.3). An adapter-based design satisfies the terms of this standard. However,
86 the selection of an adapter component often depends on the enterprise integration infrastructure
87 (such as middleware) being used to integrate systems. Consequently, when selecting adapter
88 components, decision-makers shall consult integration infrastructure standards in the statewide
89 Enterprise Architecture to ensure that the components will fit within that infrastructure.

90 **5.1.2. Consumer systems shall be insulated from changes in provider systems'** 91 **implementation**

92 System designers shall design consumer systems in such a way as to minimize direct
93 dependency on the implementation details of provider systems. This allows the agency that
94 hosts a provider system to change its implementation at will, without requiring consumer system
95 owners to redesign or re-implement their systems.

96 If an agency makes its provider system functionality accessible through separate software
97 interfaces (as described in section 5.1.1), then consumer systems must access that provider
98 system functionality through those interfaces only.

99 If an agency's provider system does not offer a separate software interface, then designers of
100 consumer systems must include an internal interface (within the consumer system) through which
101 all consumer system interaction with the provider system takes place.

102 **5.1.3. Software interfaces shall conform to open industry standards**

103 Designers of software interfaces to provider system functionality shall ensure that those
104 interfaces conform to open industry standards.

105 An "open industry standard" is a standard that has been:

- 106 • Developed and adopted by a standards development organization, participation in which
107 is permitted for any organization (commercial or otherwise) that wishes to contribute
- 108 • Developed through a process that makes discussions, deliberations, and decisions about
109 the content of the standard available to the public
- 110 • Implemented by at least two separate commercial vendors, or implemented in a solution
111 that is available to the public under an open source license, or both (an "open source
112 license" is a license approved by the Open Source Initiative
113 (<http://www.opensource.org/licenses/>)).

114 Note that this standard applies only to interfaces, not system implementation techniques or
115 technologies. It is common for a system implementer or vendor to implement a system using
116 technologies that do not conform to open industry standards (as defined above), yet still offer
117 interfaces into the system that do conform to open industry standards. Such a system would
118 conform to this standard.

- 119 • Systems implemented by agencies on the Microsoft .NET and Java 2 platforms align with
120 this standard if the separate software interfaces conform to open industry standards, as
121 defined above.
- 122 • Packaged software solutions (such as Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solutions)
123 align with this standard if the separate software interfaces conform to open industry
124 standards, as defined above.

125 There is nothing inherent in these technologies or solutions that prevent systems that use them
126 from aligning with this standard.

127 Interfaces that do not satisfy these criteria shall still be considered conformant to open industry
128 standards if they are based on technical implementation techniques (such as programming
129 languages or platforms) commonly in use in state agencies.

130 **5.2. Rationale**

131 The rationale for these standards is that they improve alignment of information systems
132 investments with the emerging statewide integration architecture and with the over-arching
133 enterprise architecture principles adopted by the Information Services Board.

134 **5.2.1. Alignment with Statewide Integration Architecture**

135 The Integration Architecture Initiative of the Enterprise Architecture Committee (EAC) has
136 endorsed a statewide technical reference architecture for integration (see **[CITRA]**), which will be
137 presented to the Information Services Board (ISB) for consideration for adoption. The EAC
138 intends for this architecture to guide agencies' solution/system design and investment decisions
139 to minimize the cost and risk and maximize the effectiveness of systems integration.

140 The conceptual integration architecture calls for a “service-oriented” approach to systems
141 integration. This approach views provider systems as capabilities that agencies offer to their
142 partners' consumer systems through service interfaces. The extent to which statewide integrated
143 systems conform to the standards above will determine the degree to which those systems can
144 be used as services. The availability of a separate software interface to a provider system
145 demonstrates an intent on the part of the system designer to have the system participate in a
146 broader set of scenarios than those enabled by the system's user interface.

147 The conceptual integration architecture also identifies, as a service design principle, that service
148 implementations (in the form of statewide integrated systems) should minimize inter-system
149 dependencies, in order to maximize flexibility, agility, and responsiveness to business change.

150 The standards above align with this principle by calling for separate software interfaces to
151 provider system functionality, and by calling for consumer systems to access the functionality in
152 provider systems through such interfaces. The standards result in provider and consumer
153 systems being dependent on the interface, rather than directly on each other. By encouraging
154 separate software interfaces, the standards reduce the dependency of consumer systems on the
155 provider system's user interface design and implementation. This is important because provider
156 system user interfaces tend to change frequently, and often these changes are cosmetic in
157 nature; the standards seek to prevent cosmetic user interface changes from affecting consumer
158 system implementations.

159 **5.2.2. Alignment with Over-Arching Enterprise Architecture Principles**

160 The standards above will improve the alignment of statewide integrated systems with three of the
161 over-arching enterprise architecture principles adopted by the Information Services Board
162 (<http://isb.wa.gov/committees/enterprise/architecture/overarchingprinciples.doc>): Natural
163 Boundaries, External Linkages, and Interoperability.

164 *5.2.2.1. Alignment with the Natural Boundaries Principle*

165 The Natural Boundaries principle suggests that information systems should be designed around
166 natural boundaries. In its simplest form, this principle calls for identifying groups of system
167 functions that tend to exhibit “implementation covariance”. That is, the grouping of functions
168 within a natural boundary represents an expectation that the implementation of those functions

169 will happen within a single system (or closely-linked group of systems) and at a single point in
170 time.

171 Within a natural boundary, agencies can streamline business processes by creating tight
172 coupling (or linking) of functions. The standards above will align system implementations with this
173 principle by:

- 174 • representing natural boundaries as interfaces
- 175 • allowing provisioners of provider systems the freedom to change the implementation of
176 those systems as long as they continue to satisfy the requirements of the interface
- 177 • promoting the tight linking and streamlining of processes within systems, while promoting
178 agility and flexibility between systems.

179 *5.2.2.2. Alignment with the External Linkages Principle*

180 The External Linkages principle suggests that information system designs should facilitate
181 linkages with external partners. This principle relies on the definition of clearly defined interfaces
182 for systems that have external linkages. The principle also suggests a migration to open industry
183 standards (as defined above in section 5.1.3).

184 The standards above promote the definition of clear interfaces to system functionality. In fact,
185 they extend beyond the definition of interfaces by suggesting that, at integration points, provider
186 and consumer systems shall be dependent only on their shared interface, not on the
187 implementation details of each other.

188 In addition, the standards suggest a preference for interfaces based on open industry standards
189 (as defined above in section 5.1.3). Designing consumer and provider systems so that they are
190 dependent on open-standard interfaces positions the state enterprise to integrate in the future
191 with external partners who have chosen diverse service implementation paths.

192 *5.2.2.3. Alignment with the Interoperability Principle*

193 The Interoperability principle suggests that information system designs and implementations
194 should facilitate the sharing of information and functionality with other systems. Interoperability
195 generally means the definition of standards for inter-system interaction with which all participating
196 systems are expected to comply. The selection of a standards-compliant system will provide a
197 level of assurance that the system will “interoperate” with other compliant systems.

198 The standards above support this principle by encouraging integration across interfaces.
199 Interfaces establish a clear, standard way of accessing provider system functionality. Without a
200 focus on interfaces, integration architectures tend to promote several ways of accessing the same
201 functionality in the same provider system, rather than a standard way of doing so. Designing and
202 implementing a new consumer system typically involves the definition of a new integration point
203 between the consumer and provider. The standards suggest establishing a standard interface to
204 provider system functionality, and integration across this interface simply becomes a required
205 capability of each consumer.

206 By encouraging open industry standards-based interfaces, the standards further promote
207 interoperability by broadening the range of tools, programming languages, and
208 developers/integrators capable of supporting the interface
209
210

211

6. References

212

CITRA

213

214

215

Washington State Information Services Board,
Enterprise Architecture Committee (2006). *Conceptual
Integration Technical Reference Architecture*, Enterprise
Architecture Committee Document.

216

Appendix A: Documenter Team

217

This document was developed through the Integration Architecture enterprise architecture initiative, chartered December 14, 2005. The following individuals were members of the Documenter Team for this initiative, and participated in review of this document.

218

219

220

- Kent Andrus, Office of Financial Management

221

- Lori Bame, LEAP Committee

222

- Jerry Britcher, Department of Social and Health Services

223

- Scott Came, Department of Information Services

224

- Gary Dubuque, Department of Revenue

225

- Jim Eby, Department of Fish and Wildlife

226

- Brian Everson, Washington State Patrol

227

- Laura Graham, Legislative Service Center

228

- Robin Griggs, Department of Licensing

229

- John Hanson, Commission on Trade and Economic Development

230

- Tom Henderson, Department of Labor & Industries

231

- Paul Hubert, Department of Information Services

232

- Debbie Johnson, The Higher Education Coordinating Board

233

- Lorraine Louderback, Department of Corrections

234

- Dan Mercer, Department of Labor & Industries

235

- Miles Neale, Department of Ecology

236

- Bill Norris, Department of Health

237

- Laura Parma, Department of Information Services

238

- Mike Rohrbach, Administrative Office of the Courts

239

- Jeff Sharp, Office of the State Treasurer

240

- Matt Stevens, Department of Information Services

241

- Lyle Tillett, Department of Retirement Systems

242

Appendix B: Review Log

243

The following feedback on this document was received by the Enterprise Architecture Program;

244

the response to each contribution is noted below.

Review by whom and when	Contribution	Response
Documenter Team March 16, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change guidelines to standards	Incorporated into document
EA Committee May 31, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change standards to guidelines	Incorporated into document
ISB September 14, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adopted as Guidelines	Adopted and posted as Guidelines
EA Committee October 25, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Added Grandfather language to Scope section• Changed Guidelines to Standards	Endorsed as Standards

245