

# **JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3**

## **Web Service Transactions Programmers Guide**

JBXTS-PG-4/13/07





**1801 Varsity Drive  
Raleigh, NC 27606-2072  
USA  
Phone: +1 919 754 3700  
Phone: 888 733 4281  
Fax: +1 919 754 3701  
PO Box 13588  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709  
USA**

Documentation-Administration

Copyright © 2007 by Red Hat, Inc. This material may be distributed only subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Open Publication License, V1.0 or later (the latest version is presently available at <http://www.opencontent.org/openpub/>).

Distribution of substantively modified versions of this document is prohibited without the explicit permission of the copyright holder.

Distribution of the work or derivative of the work in any standard (paper) book form for commercial purposes is prohibited unless prior permission is obtained from the copyright holder.

Red Hat and the Red Hat "Shadow Man" logo are registered trademarks of Red Hat, Inc. in the United States and other countries.

All other trademarks referenced herein are the property of their respective owners.

The GPG fingerprint of the `security@redhat.com` key is:

CA 20 86 86 2B D6 9D FC 65 F6 EC C4 21 91 80 CD DB 42 A6 0E

# Contents

<b>About This Guide .....</b>	<b>5</b>	WS-Coordination .....	18
What This Guide Contains.....	5	Activation.....	20
Audience .....	5	Registration .....	21
Prerequisites.....	5	Completion.....	21
Organization .....	5	WS-Transaction .....	22
Documentation Conventions.....	6	WS-Coordination Foundations.....	22
Additional Documentation.....	7	WS-Transaction Architecture.....	22
Contacting Us .....	7	WS-Transaction Models .....	24
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>8</b>	Application Messages .....	30
JBossTS Web Services transactions		WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-	
overview.....	8	Business Activity Messages .....	31
Managing Service-Based Processes.....	9	Summary .....	31
Servlets .....	10	<b>Getting started .....</b>	<b>32</b>
SOAP .....	10	Creating and deploying participants.....	32
Web Services Description Language		Creating Client Applications.....	32
(WSDL).....	10	Hints and tips .....	33
<b>Transactions overview .....</b>	<b>11</b>	Summary .....	33
The Coordinator.....	12	<b>Transactional Web services .....</b>	<b>34</b>
The Transaction Context.....	13	Introduction.....	34
ACID Transactions .....	13	A Transactional Web Service.....	34
Two-Phase Commit .....	14	<b>Participants .....</b>	<b>37</b>
The synchronization protocol .....	14	The Participant: an Overview.....	37
Optimizations to the protocol .....	15	Atomic Transaction.....	37
Non-atomic transactions and heuristic		Business Activity .....	39
outcomes .....	16	Participant Creation and Deployment .....	41
A New Transaction Protocol.....	16	Implementing Participants .....	41
<b>WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-</b>		Deploying Participants .....	41
<b>    Business Activity overview .....</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>Stand-alone coordinator.....</b>	<b>42</b>
Introduction.....	18		

Introduction.....	42
<b>The XTS API.....</b>	<b>43</b>
Introduction.....	43
API for the Atomic Transaction protocol .....	43
Vote.....	43
The transaction context.....	44
UserTransaction.....	44
UserTransactionFactory.....	45

TransactionManager.....	45
TransactionFactory.....	46
API for the Business Activity protocol .....	46
UserBusinessActivity.....	46
UserBusinessActivityFactory.....	46
BusinessActivityManager .....	46
BusinessActivityManagerFactory .....	47
<b>Index .....</b>	<b>49</b>

# About This Guide

## What This Guide Contains

---

The Web Service Transactions Programmers Guide contains information on how to use JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3. This guide provides information on how to develop service-based applications that use transaction technology to manage business processes. JBossTS provides a means of interacting with Web services within transactions, and constructing transaction-aware Web services, according to the WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity specifications, using common Web services platforms. While this guide discusses many of Web services standards like SOAP, WSDL and UDDI, it does not attempt to address all of their fundamental constructs. However, basic concepts are provided where necessary.

## Audience

---

This guide is most relevant for application developers and Web service developers who are interested in building applications and Web services that are transaction-aware. This guide is also useful for system analysts and project managers that are unfamiliar with transactions as they pertain to Web services.

## Prerequisites

---

JBossTS uses the Java programming language and this manual assumes that you are familiar with programming in Java. In addition, a fundamental level of understanding in the following areas will also be useful:

- A Working knowledge of Web services, including XML, SOAP, WSDL, and UDDI;
- A general understanding of transactions;
- A general understanding of WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity;

**Note:** This guide presents overview information for all of the above. However, to aid in understanding the Web Services component of JBossTS, the WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity specifications are discussed in great detail.

## Organization

---

This guide contains the following chapters:

1. **Chapter 1, Introduction:** an overview of what the Web Service component of JBossTS provides.
2. **Chapter 2, Transactions overview:** a brief description of some basic transaction concepts and techniques relevant to understanding JBossTS.
3. **Chapter 3, WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity overview:** an overview of the Web services protocols that JBossTS supports.
4. **Chapter 4, Getting started:** how to get going with JBossTS and Web Services.
5. **Chapter 5, Transactional web services:** a description of what a transactional Web service comprises.
6. **Chapter 6, Participants:** a description of what a transactional participant is and how to write one.
7. **Chapter 7, The XTS API:** a detailed description of the API provided by JBossTS for use when building applications which use Web Services transactions. This supplements the accompanying javadocs.

---

## Documentation Conventions

---

The following conventions are used in this guide:

Convention	Description
<i>Italic</i>	In paragraph text, italic identifies the titles of documents that are being referenced. When used in conjunction with the Code text described below, italics identify a variable that should be replaced by the user with an actual value.
<b>Bold</b>	Emphasizes items of particular importance.
Code	Text that represents programming code.
<b>Function   Function</b>	A path to a function or dialog box within an interface. For example, “ <b>Select File   Open.</b> ” indicates that you should select the Open function from the File menu.
( ) and	Parentheses enclose optional items in command syntax. The vertical bar separates syntax items in a list of choices. For example, any of the following three items can be entered in this syntax:  <code>persistPolicy (Never   OnTimer   OnUpdate   NoMoreOftenThan)</code>
<b>Note:</b> and	A note highlights important supplemental information.
<b>Caution:</b>	A caution highlights procedures or information that is necessary to avoid damage to equipment, damage to software, loss of data, or invalid test results.

**Table 1**      **Formatting Conventions**

## Additional Documentation

---

In addition to this guide, the following guides are available in the JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3 documentation set:

- JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3 *Release Notes*: Provides late-breaking information about JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3.
- JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3 *Installation Guide*: This guide provides instructions for installing JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3.
- JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3 *Failure Recovery Guide*: Provides guidance for administering the system.
- JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3 *Transactions API Guide*: Provides guidance for administering the system.
- JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3 *Transaction Core Programmers Guide*: Provides guidance for administering the system.
- JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3 *JTS Programmers Guide*: Provides guidance for administering the system.
- JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3 *Administration Guide*: Provides guidance for administering the system.

## Contacting Us

---

Questions or comments about JBoss Transaction Service 4.2.3 should be directed to our support team.

# Introduction

## **JBossTS Web Services transactions overview**

---

The XML transaction service component of JBossTS (shorthand referred to as XTS) supports the coordination of private and public Web services in a business transaction. Therefore, to understand XTS, you must be familiar with Web services, and also understand a little about transactions. This chapter introduces XTS and provides a brief overview of the technologies that form the Web services standard. Additionally, this chapter explores some of the fundamentals of transacting technology and how it can be applied to Web services. Much of the content presented in this chapter is detailed throughout this guide; however, only overview information about Web services is provided. If you are new to creating Web services, please see consult your Web services platform documentation.

JBossTS provides as the XTS component a transaction solution for Web services. Using XTS, business partners can coordinate complex business transactions in a controlled and reliable manner. The JBossTS Web Services API supports a transactional coordination model based on the WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity specifications. WS-C is a generic coordination framework developed by IBM, Microsoft and BEA, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity are transaction protocols that utilize this framework. Both specifications are available from <http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/library/>.

Web services are modular, reusable software components that are created by exposing business functionality through a Web service interface. Web services communicate directly with other Web services using standards-based technologies such as SOAP and HTTP. These standards-based communication technologies allow Web services to be accessed by customers, suppliers, and trading partners, independent of hardware operation system or programming environment. The result is a vastly improved collaboration environment as compared to today's EDI and business-to-business (B2B) solutions—an environment where businesses can expose their current and future business applications as Web services that can be easily discovered and accessed by external partners.

Web services, by themselves, are not fault tolerant. In fact, some of the reasons that make it an attractive development solution are also the same reasons that service-based applications may have drawbacks:

- Application components that are exposed as Web services may be owned by third parties, which provides benefits in terms of cost of maintenance, but drawbacks in terms of having exclusive control over their behavior;
- Web services are usually remotely located which increases risk of failure due to increased



network travel for invocations.

Applications that have high dependability requirements, must find a method of minimizing the effects of errors that may occur when an application consumes Web services. One method of safeguarding against such failures is to interact with an application's Web services within the context of a transaction. A transaction is simply a unit of work which is completed entirely, or in the case of failures is reversed to some agreed consistent state – normally to appear as if the work had never occurred in the first place. With XTS, transactions can span multiple Web services which mean that work performed across multiple enterprises can be managed with transactional support.

### Managing Service-Based Processes

XTS allows you to create transactions that drive complex business processes spanning multiple Web services. Current Web services standards do not address the requirements for a high-level coordination of services since in today's Web services applications, which use single request/receive interactions, coordination is typically not a problem. However, for applications that engage multiple services among multiple business partners, coordinating and controlling the resulting interactions is essential. This becomes even more apparent when you realize that you generally have little in the way of formal guarantees when interacting with third-party Web services.

XTS provides the infrastructure for coordinating services during a business process. By organizing processes as transactions, business partners can collaborate on complex business interactions in a reliable manner, insuring the integrity of their data - usually represented by multiple changes to a database – but without the usual overheads and drawbacks of directly exposing traditional transaction-processing engines directly onto the web. The following example demonstrates how an application may manage service-based processes as transactions:

The application in question allows a user to plan a social evening. This application is responsible for reserving a table at a restaurant, and reserving tickets to a show. Both activities are paid for using a credit card. In this example, each service represents exposed Web services provided by different service providers. XTS is used to envelop the interactions between the theater and restaurant services into a single (potentially) long-running business transaction. The business transaction must insure that seats are reserved both at the restaurant and the theater. If one event fails the user has the ability to decline both events, thus returning both services back to their original state. If both events are successful, the user's credit card is charged and both seats are booked. As you may expect, the interaction between the services must be controlled in a reliable manner over a period of time. In addition, management must span several third-party services that are remotely deployed.

**Caution: Without the backing of a transaction, an undesirable outcome may occur. For example, the user credit card may be charged, even though one or both of the bookings may have failed.**

This simple example describes the situations where XTS excels at supporting business processes across multiple enterprises. This example is further refined throughout this guide, and appears as a standard demonstrator (including source code) with the XTS distribution.

## Servlets

The WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity protocols are based on one-way interactions of entities rather than traditional synchronous request/response RPC style interactions. Entities (e.g., transaction participants) invoke operations on other entities (e.g., the transaction coordinator) in order to return responses to requests. What this means is that the programming model is based on peer-to-peer relationships, with the result that all services, whether they are participants, coordinators or clients, must have an active component that allows them to receive unsolicited messages.

In the current implementation of XTS, the active component is achieved through the use of Java servlet technology. Each endpoint that can be communicated with via SOAP/XML is represented as a servlet (and published within JNDI). Fortunately for the developer, this use of servlets occurs transparently. The only drawback is that (currently) clients must reside within a domain capable of hosting servlets, i.e., an application server. It is our intention that future versions of XTS will provide configurable deployment options, allowing servlets where required, but not mandating them.

## SOAP

SOAP has emerged as the de-facto message format for XML-based communication in the Web services arena. It is a lightweight protocol that allows the user to define the content of a message and to provide hints as to how recipients should process that message.

SOAP messages can be divided into two main categories: Remote Procedure Call (RPC) and Document Exchange (DE). The primary difference between the two categories is that the SOAP specification defines encoding rules and conventions for RPC. The document exchange model allows the exchange of arbitrary XML documents - a key ingredient of B2B document exchange. XTS is based on the loosely coupled document-exchange style, yet it can support transactions spanning Web service that use either document-exchange or RPC.

## Web Services Description Language (WSDL)

WSDL is an XML-based language used to define Web service interfaces. An application that consumes a Web service parses the service's WSDL document to discover the location of the service, the operations that the service supports, the protocol bindings the service supports (SOAP, HTTP, etc), and how to access them (for each operation, WSDL describes the format that the client must follow).

# Transactions overview

Transactions have emerged as the dominant paradigm for coordinating interactions between parties in a distributed system, and in particular to manage applications that require concurrent access to shared data. Much of the JBossTS Web Service API is based on contemporary transaction APIs whose familiarity will enhance developer productivity and lessen the learning curve. While the following section provides the essential information that you should know before starting to use XTS for building transactional Web Services, it should not be treated as a definitive reference to all transactional technology.

A classic transaction is a unit of work that either completely succeeds, or fails with all partially completed work being undone. When a transaction is committed, all changes made by the associated requests are made durable, normally by committing the results of the work to a database. If a transaction should fail and is rolled back, all changes made by the associated work are undone. Transactions in distributed systems typically require the use of a transaction manager that is responsible for coordinating all of the participants that are part of the transaction.

The main components involved in using and defining transactional Web Services using XTS are illustrated in Figure 1.

- A Transaction Service: The Transaction Service captures the model of the underlying transaction protocol and coordinates parties affiliated with the transaction according to that model.
- A Transaction API: Provides an interface for transaction demarcation and the registration of participants.
- A Participant: The entity that cooperates with the transaction service on behalf of its associated business logic.
- The Context: Captures the necessary details of the transaction such that participants can enlist within its scope.




Figure 1 Web Services and XTS

## The Coordinator

Associated with every transaction is a coordinator, which is responsible for governing the outcome of the transaction. The coordinator may be implemented as a separate service or may be co-located with the user for improved performance. Each coordinator is created by the transaction manager service, which is in effect a factory for those coordinators.


A coordinator communicates with enrolled participants to inform them of the desired termination requirements, i.e., whether they should accept (e.g., confirm) or reject (e.g., cancel) the work done within the scope of the given transaction. For example, whether to purchase the (provisionally reserved) flight tickets for the user or to release them. An application/client may wish to terminate a transaction in a number of different ways (e.g., confirm or cancel). However, although the coordinator will attempt to terminate in a manner consistent with that desired by the client, it is ultimately the interactions between the coordinator and the participants that will determine the actual final outcome.

A transaction manager is typically responsible for managing coordinators for many transactions. The initiator of the transaction (e.g., the client) communicates with a transaction manager and asks it to start a new transaction and associate a coordinator with the transaction. Once created, the context can be propagated to Web services in order for them to associate their work with the transaction.

## The Transaction Context

In order for a transaction to span a number of services, certain information has to be shared between those services in order to propagate information about the transaction. This information is known as the Context. Using XTS, the context is automatically propagated and processed by transaction-aware components of an application. Though XTS removes most of the work associated with propagating contexts, it is still instructive to understand what information is captured in a context:

- A transaction identifier which guarantees global uniqueness for an individual transaction;
- The transaction coordinator location or endpoint address so participants can be enrolled.



**Figure 2 Web Services and Context Flow**

As shown in Figure 2, whenever an application message is sent, the XTS Client API automatically creates a context and embeds it into the message. Similarly, any transaction-aware services are able to extract that context using the XTS service-side infrastructure and use it to perform work within the context of a particular transaction – even though that transaction was initiated elsewhere on the Web! The value of this approach is that the business logic contained within the client application and services are not peppered with transaction-processing code.

## ACID Transactions


Traditionally, transaction processing systems support ACID properties. ACID is an acronym for Atomic, Consistent, Isolated, and Durable. A unit of work has traditionally been considered transactional only if the ACID properties are maintained:

- Atomicity: The transaction executes completely or not at all.
- Consistency: The effects of the transaction preserve the internal consistency of an underlying data structure.
- Isolated: The transaction runs as if it were running alone with no other transactions running and is not visible to other transactions.
- Durable: the transaction's results will not be lost in the event of a failure.

## Two-Phase Commit

The classical two-phase commit approach is the bedrock of JBossTS (and more generally of Web Services transactions). Two-phase commit provides coordination of parties that are involved in a transaction. In general, the flow of a two-phase commit transaction is as follows:

- A transaction is started, and some work is performed.
- Once the work is finished, the two-phase commit begins.
- The coordinator (transaction manager) of the transaction asks each resource taking part in the transaction whether it is prepared to commit.
- If all resources respond positively, the coordinator instructs all work performed to be made durable (usually committed to a database).
- If not, all work performed is rolled back (undone) such that the underlying data structures are in their original states.



**Figure 3 The Two-Phase Commit Protocol**

**Note:** During two-phase commit transactions, coordinators and resources keep track of activity in non-volatile data stores so that they can recover in the case of a failure.

## The synchronization protocol

As well as the two-phase commit protocol, traditional transaction processing systems employ an additional protocol, often referred to as the synchronization protocol. If you recall the original ACID properties, then you'll remember that Durability is important in the case where state changes have to be available despite failures. What this means is that applications interact with a persistence store of some kind (e.g., a database) and this can impose a significant overhead – disk access is orders of magnitude slower than access to main computer memory.

One apparently obvious solution to this problem would be to cache the state in main memory and only operate on that for the duration of a transaction. Unfortunately you'd then need some

way of being able to flush the state back to the persistent store before the transaction terminates, or risk losing the full ACID properties. This is what the synchronization protocol does, with Synchronization participants.

Synchronizations are informed that a transaction is about to commit, so they can, for example, flush cached state, which may be being used to improve performance of an application, to a durable representation prior to the transaction committing. They are then informed when the transaction has completed and in what state it completed.

- Synchronizations essentially turn the two-phase commit protocol into a four-phase protocol:
- Before the transaction starts the two-phase commit, all registered Synchronizations are informed. Any failure at this point will cause the transaction to roll back.
- The coordinator then conducts the normal two-phase commit protocol.
- Once the transaction has terminated, all registered Synchronizations are informed. However, this is a courtesy invocation because any failures at this stage are ignored: the transaction has terminated so there's nothing to affect.

Unlike the two-phase commit protocol, the synchronization protocol does not have the same failure requirements. For example, Synchronization participants don't need to make sure they can recover in the event of failures; this is because any failure before the two-phase commit protocol completes means the transaction will roll back, and failures after it has completed can't affect the data the Synchronization participants were managing.

## Optimizations to the protocol

There are several variants to the standard two-phase commit protocol that are worth knowing about because they can have an impact on performance and failure recovery. We shall briefly describe those that are the most common variants on the protocol:

- Presumed abort: if a transaction is going to roll back then it may simply record this information locally and tell all enlisted participants. Failure to contact a participant has no affect on the transaction outcome; the transaction is effectively informing participants as a courtesy. Once all participants have been contacted the information about the transaction can be removed. If a subsequent request for the status of the transaction occurs there will be no information available and the requestor can assume that the transaction has aborted (rolled back). This optimization has the benefit that no information about participants need be made persistent until the transaction has decided to commit (i.e., progressed to the end of the prepare phase), since any failure prior to this point will be assumed to be an abort of the transaction.
- One-phase: if there is only a single participant involved in the transaction, the coordinator need not drive it through the prepare phase. Thus, the participant will simply be told to commit and the coordinator need not record information about the decision since the outcome of the transaction is solely down to the participant.
- Read-only: when a participant is asked to prepare, it can indicate to the coordinator that no information or data that it controls has been modified during the transaction. Such a participant does not need to be informed about the outcome of the transaction since the fate of the participant has no affect on the transaction. As such, a read-only participant can be omitted from the second phase of the commit protocol.

## Non-atomic transactions and heuristic outcomes

In order to guarantee atomicity, the two-phase commit protocol is necessarily blocking. What this means is that as a result of failures, participants may remain blocked for an indefinite period of time even if failure recovery mechanisms exist. Some applications and participants simply cannot tolerate this blocking.

To break this blocking nature, participants that have got past the prepare phase are allowed to make autonomous decisions as to whether they commit or rollback: such a participant must record this decision in case it is eventually contacted to complete the original transaction. If the coordinator eventually informs the participant of the transaction outcome and it is the same as the choice the participant made, then there's no problem. However, if it is contrary, then a non-atomic outcome has obviously happened: a heuristic outcome.

How this heuristic outcome is reported to the application and resolved is usually the domain of complex, manually driven system administration tools, since in order to attempt an automatic resolution requires semantic information about the nature of participants involved in the transactions.

Precisely when a participant makes a heuristic decision is obviously implementation dependant. Likewise, the choice the participant makes (to commit or to roll back) will depend upon the implementation and possibly the application/environment in which it finds itself. The possible heuristic outcomes are:

- Heuristic rollback: the commit operation failed because some or all of the participants unilaterally rolled back the transaction.
- Heuristic commit: an attempted rollback operation failed because all of the participants unilaterally committed. This may happen if, for example, the coordinator was able to successfully prepare the transaction but then decided to roll it back (e.g., it could not update its log) but in the meanwhile the participants decided to commit.
- Heuristic mixed: some updates (participants) were committed while others were rolled back.
- Heuristic hazard: the disposition of some of the updates is unknown. For those which are known, they have either all been committed or all rolled back.

Heuristic decisions should be used with care and only in exceptional circumstances since there is the possibility that the decision will differ from that determined by the transaction service and will thus lead to a loss of integrity in the system. Having to perform resolution of heuristics is something you should try to avoid, either by working with services/participants that don't cause heuristics, or by using a transaction service that provides assistance in the resolution process.

## A New Transaction Protocol

Many component technologies offer mechanisms for coordinating ACID transactions based on two-phase commit semantics (i.e., CORBA/OTS, JTS/JTA, MTS/MSDTC). ACID transactions are not suitable for all Web services transactions since:

- Classic ACID transactions are predicated on the idea that an organization that develops



and deploys applications does so using their own infrastructure, typically an Intranet. Ownership meant transactions operated in a trusted and predictable manner. To assure ACIDity, potentially long-lived locks could be kept on underlying data structures during two-phase commit. Resources could be used for any period of time and released when the transaction was complete. In the Web services arena, these assumptions are no longer valid. One obvious reason is that the owners of data exposed through a Web service will refuse to allow their data to be locked for extended periods since to allow such locks invites denial-of-service.

- All application infrastructures are generally owned by a single party, systems using classical ACID transactions normally assume that participants in a transaction will obey the will of the transaction manager and only infrequently decide to make unilateral decisions which will hamper other participants in a transaction. On the contrary, Web services participating in a transaction can effectively decide to resign from the transaction at any time, and the consumer of the service generally has little in the way of quality of service guarantees to prevent this.

### Addressing the Problems of Transactioning in Loosely Coupled Systems

Though extended transaction models which relax the ACID properties have been proposed over the years, to implement these concepts for the Web services architecture WS-T provides a new transaction protocol. XTS is designed to accommodate four underlying requirements inherent in any loosely coupled architecture like Web services:

- Ability to handle multiple successful outcomes to a transaction, with the ability to involve operations whose effects may not be isolated or durable;
- Coordination of autonomous parties whose relationships are governed by contracts rather than the dictates of a central design authority;
- Discontinuous service, where parties are anticipated to suffer outages during their lifetime, and coordinated work must be able to survive such outages;
- Interoperation using XML over multiple communication protocols – XTS chooses to use SOAP encoding carried over HTTP for the first release and other SOAP-friendly transports for future releases.

## Chapter 3

# WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity overview

## Introduction

---

This section provides fundamental concepts associated with WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity. All of these concepts are defined in the WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity specifications. WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity principles are discussed throughout this guide.

**Note:** If you are well versed in the WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity specifications then you may want to just skim through this part of the manual.


## WS-Coordination

---

In general terms, coordination is the act of one entity (known as the *coordinator*) disseminating information to a number of *participants* for some domain-specific reason. This reason could be in order to reach consensus on a decision like in a distributed transaction protocol, or simply to guarantee that all participants obtain a specific message, as occurs in a reliable multicast environment. When parties are being coordinated, information known as the *coordination context* is propagated to tie together operations which are logically part of the same coordinated work or *activity*. This context information may flow with normal application messages, or may be an explicit part of a message exchange and is specific to the type of coordination being performed.

The fundamental idea underpinning WS-Coordination is that there is a generic need for a coordination infrastructure in a Web services environment. The WS-Coordination specification defines a framework that allows different coordination protocols to be plugged-in to coordinate work between clients, services and participants, as shown in Figure 4.

The WS-Coordination specification talks in terms of activities, which are distributed units of work, involving one or more parties (which may be services, components, or even objects). At this level, an activity is minimally specified and is simply *created*, made to *run*, and then *completed*.



**Figure 4 WS-C architecture.**

Whatever coordination protocol is used, and in whatever domain it is deployed, the same generic requirements are present:

- Instantiation (or activation) of a new coordinator for the specific coordination protocol, for a particular application instance;
- Registration of participants with the coordinator, such that they will receive that coordinator's protocol messages during (some part of) the application's lifetime;
- Propagation of contextual information between Web services that comprise the application;
- An entity to drive the coordination protocol through to completion.

The first three of these points are directly the concern of WS-Coordination while the fourth is the responsibility of a third-party entity, usually the client application that controls the application as a whole. These four WS-Coordination roles and their interrelationships are shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5 WS-C infrastructure

## Activation

The WS-Coordination framework exposes an *Activation Service* which supports the creation of coordinators for specific protocols and their associated contexts. The process of invoking an activation service is done asynchronously, and so the specification defines both the interface of the activation service itself, and that of the invoking service, so that the activation service can call back to deliver the results of the activation – namely a context that identifies the protocol type and coordinator location. These interfaces are presented in Figure 6, where the activation service has a one-way operation that expects to receive a `CreateCoordinationContext` message and correspondingly the service that sent the `CreateCoordinationContext` message expects to be called back with a `CreateCoordinationContextResponse` message, or informed of a problem via an `Error` message.

```
<!-- Activation Service portType Declaration -->
<wsdl:portType name="ActivationCoordinatorPortType">
  <wsdl:operation name="CreateCoordinationContext">
    <wsdl:input
      message="wscoor:CreateCoordinationContext"/>
    </wsdl:operation>
  </wsdl:portType>

<!-- Activation Requester portType Declaration -->
<wsdl:portType name="ActivationRequesterPortType">
```

```
<wsdl:operation
  name="CreateCoordinationContextResponse">
  <wsdl:input
    message="wscoor:CreateCoordinationContextResponse"/>
</wsdl:operation>
<wsdl:operation name="Error">
  <wsdl:input message="wscoor:Error"/>
</wsdl:operation>
</wsdl:portType>
```

**Figure 6 Activation Service WSDL Interfaces**

## Registration

Once a coordinator has been instantiated and a corresponding context created by the activation service, a *Registration Service* is created and exposed. This service allows participants to register to receive protocol messages associated with a particular coordinator. Like the activation service, the registration service assumes asynchronous communication and so specifies WSDL for both registration service and registration requester, as shown in Figure 7.

```
<!-- Registration Service portType Declaration -->
<wsdl:portType name="RegistrationCoordinatorPortType">
  <wsdl:operation name="Register">
    <wsdl:input message="wscoor:Register"/>
  </wsdl:operation>
</wsdl:portType>

<!-- Registration Requester portType Declaration -->
<wsdl:portType name="RegistrationRequesterPortType">
  <wsdl:operation name="RegisterResponse">
    <wsdl:input message="wscoor:RegisterResponse"/>
  </wsdl:operation>
  <wsdl:operation name="Error">
    <wsdl:input message="wscoor:Error"/>
  </wsdl:operation>
</wsdl:portType>
```

**Figure 7 Registration Service WSDL Interface**

When a participant is registered with a coordinator through the registration service, it receives messages that the coordinator sends (for example, “prepare to complete” and “complete” messages if a two-phase protocol is used); where the coordinator’s protocol supports it, participants can also send messages back to the coordinator.

## Completion


The role of terminator is generally played by the client application, which at an appropriate point will ask the coordinator to perform its particular coordination function with any registered participants – to drive the protocol through to its completion. On completion, the client application may be informed of an outcome for the activity which may vary from simple succeeded/failed notification through to complex structured data detailing the activity’s status.

## WS-Transaction

In the past, making traditional transaction systems talk to one another was a holy grail that was rarely achieved. With the advent of Web services, there is an opportunity to leverage an unparalleled interoperability technology to splice together existing transaction processing systems that already form the backbone of enterprise level applications.

### WS-Coordination Foundations

An important aspect of WS-Transaction that differentiates it from traditional transaction protocols is that a synchronous request/response model is not assumed. This model derives from the fact that WS-Transaction is, as shown in Figure 8, layered upon the WS-Coordination protocol whose own communication patterns are asynchronous by default.




**Figure 8 WS-Coordination WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity**

Web Services Coordination provides a generic framework for specific coordination protocols, like WS-Transaction, to be plugged in. Recall that WS-Coordination provides only context management – it allows contexts to be created and activities to be registered with those contexts. WS-Transaction leverages the context management framework provided by WS-Coordination in two ways. Firstly it extends the WS-Coordination context to create a transaction context. Secondly, it augments the activation and registration services with a number of additional services (Completion, CompletionWithAck, PhaseZero, 2PC, OutcomeNotification, BusinessAgreement, and BusinessAgreementWithComplete) and two protocol message sets (one for each of the transaction models supported in WS-Transaction) to build a fully-fledged transaction coordinator on top the WS-Coordination protocol infrastructure.

### WS-Transaction Architecture


WS-Transaction supports the notion of the service and participant as distinct roles, making the distinction between a transaction-aware service and the participants that act on behalf of the service during a transaction: transactional services deal with business-level protocols, while the participants handle the underlying WS-Transaction protocols, as shown in Figure 8.



**Figure 9 WS-Transaction Global View**

A transaction-aware service encapsulates the business logic or work that is required to be conducted within the scope of a transaction. This work cannot be confirmed by the application unless the transaction also commits and so control is ultimately removed from the application and placed into the transaction's domain.

The participant is the entity that, under the dictates of the transaction coordinator, controls the outcome of the work performed by the transaction-aware Web service. In Figure 9 each service is shown with one associated participant that manages the transaction protocol messages on behalf of its service, while in Figure 10, there is a close-up view of a single service, and a client application with their associated participants.



**Figure 10 Transactional Service and Participant**

The transaction-aware Web service and its participant both serve a shared transactional resource, and there is a control relationship between them through some API - which on the Java platform is JAXTX. In the example shown in Figure 10, it is assumed that the database is accessed through a transactional JDBC database driver, where SQL statements are sent to the database for processing via that driver, but where those statements will be tentative and only commit if the transaction does. In order to do this, the driver/database will associate a participant with the transaction which will inform the database of the transaction outcome. Since all transactional invocations on the Web service carry a transaction context, the participant working with the database is able to identify the work that the transactional service did within the scope of a specific transaction and either commit or rollback the work.

At the client end, things are less complex. Through its API, the client application registers a participant with the transaction through which it controls transaction termination.

## WS-Transaction Models

Given that traditional transaction models are not appropriate for Web services, the following question must be posed, “what type of model or protocol *is* appropriate?” The answer to that question is that that no one specific protocol is likely to be sufficient, given the wide range of situations that Web service transactions are likely to be deployed within. Hence the WS-Transaction specification proposes two distinct models, where each supports the semantics of a particular kind of B2B interaction. The following sections shall discuss these two WS-Transaction models.

**Note:** As with WS-Coordination, the two WS-Transaction models are extensible allowing implementations to tailor the protocols as they see fit (e.g., to suit their deployment environments).



## ***Atomic Transactions (AT)***

An atomic transaction or AT is similar to traditional ACID transactions and intended to support short-duration interactions where ACID semantics are appropriate. Within the scope of an AT, services typically enroll transaction-aware resources, such as databases and message queues, indirectly as participants under the control of the transaction. When the transaction terminates, the outcome decision of the AT is then propagated to each enlisted resource via the participant, and the appropriate commit or rollback actions are taken by each.

This protocol is very similar to those employed by traditional transaction systems that already form the backbone of an enterprise. It is assumed that all services (and associated participants) provide ACID semantics and that any use of atomic transactions occurs in environments and situations where this is appropriate: in a trusted domain, over short durations.

To begin an atomic transaction, the client application firstly locates a WS-Coordination coordinator Web service that supports WS-Transaction. Once located, the client sends a WS-Coordination `CreateCoordinationContext` message to the activation service specifying `http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/ws/2004/10/wsat` as its coordination type and will get back an appropriate WS-Transaction context from the activation service. The response to the `CreateCoordinationContext` message, the transaction context, has its `CoordinationType` element set to the WS-Atomic Transaction namespace, `http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/ws/2004/10/wsat`, and also contains a reference to the atomic transaction coordinator endpoint (the WS-Coordination registration service) where participants can be enlisted.

After obtaining a transaction context from the coordinator, the client application then proceeds to interact with Web services to accomplish its business-level work. With each invocation on a business Web service, the client inserts the transaction context into a SOAP header block, such that each invocation is implicitly scoped by the transaction – the toolkits that support WS-Atomic Transaction-aware Web services provide facilities to correlate contexts found in SOAP header blocks with back-end operations.

Once all the necessary application level work has been completed, the client can terminate the transaction, with the intent of making any changes to the service state permanent. To do this, the client application first registers its own participant for the `Completion` protocol. Once registered, the participant can instruct the coordinator either to try to commit or rollback the transaction. When the commit or rollback operation has completed, a status is returned to the participant to indicate the outcome of the transaction.

While the completion protocol is straightforward, they hide the fact that in order to resolve to an outcome that several other protocols need to be executed.

The first of these protocols is the optional `Volatile2PC`. The `Volatile2PC` protocol is the WS-Atomic Transaction equivalent of the synchronization protocol we discussed earlier. It is typically executed where a Web service needs to flush volatile (cached) state, which may be being used to improve performance of an application, to a database prior to the transaction committing. Once flushed, the data will then be controlled by a two-phase aware participant.

All `Volatile2PC` participants are told that the transaction is about to complete (via the `prepare` message) and they can respond with either the `prepared`, `aborted` or `readonly` message; any failures at this stage will cause the transaction to rollback.

After `Volatile2PC` `prepare`, the next protocol to execute in WS-Atomic Transaction is `Durable2PC`. The `Durable2PC` (an abbreviation of the term two-phase commit) protocol is at the very heart of WS-Atomic Transaction and is used to bring about the necessary consensus between participants in a transaction such that the transaction can safely be terminated.

The two-phase commit protocol is used to ensure atomicity between participants, and is based on the classic two-phase commit with presumed abort technique. During the first phase, when the coordinator sends the `prepare` message, a participant must make durable any state changes that occurred during the scope of the transaction, such that these changes can either be rolled back or committed later. That is, any original state must not be lost at this point as the atomic transaction could still roll back. If the participant cannot prepare then it must inform the coordinator (via the `aborted` message) and the transaction will ultimately roll back. If the participant is responsible for a service that did not do any work during the course of the transaction, or at least did not do any work that modified any state, it can return the `readonly` message and it will be omitted from the second phase of the commit protocol. Otherwise, the `prepared` message is sent by the participant.


Assuming no failures occurred during the first phase, in the second phase the coordinator sends the `commit` message to participants, who will make permanent the tentative work done by their associated services.

If a transaction involves only a single participant, WS-Atomic Transaction supports a one-phase commit optimization. Since there is only one participant, its decisions implicitly reach consensus, and so the coordinator need not drive the transaction through both phases. In the optimized case, the participant will simply be told to commit and the transaction coordinator need not record information about the decision since the outcome of the transaction is solely down to that single participant.

Figure 11<sup>1</sup> shows the state transitions of a WS-Atomic Transaction and the message exchanges between coordinator and participant; the coordinator generated messages are shown in the solid line, whereas the participant messages are shown by dashed lines.

---

<sup>1</sup> Redrawn from the WS-Atomic Transaction specification.



**Figure 11 Two-Phase Commit State Transitions**

Once the 2PC protocol has finished, the Completion protocol that originally began the termination of the transaction can complete, and inform the client application whether the transaction was committed or rolled back. Additionally, the `Volatile2PC` protocol may complete.

Like the `prepare` phase of `Volatile2PC`, the final phase is optional and can be used to inform participants when the transaction has completed, typically so that they can release resources (e.g., put a database connection back into the pool of connections).

Any registered `Volatile2PC` participants are invoked after the transaction has terminated and are told the state in which the transaction completed (the coordinator sends either the `Committed` or `Aborted` message). Since the transaction has terminated, any failures of participants at this stage are ignored –it is essentially a courtesy, and has no bearing on the outcome of the transaction.

Finally, after having gone through each of the stages in an AT, it is possible to see the intricate interweaving of individual protocols that goes to make up the AT as a whole in Figure 12.




Figure 12 The AT Model

## Business Activities (BA)

Most business-to-business applications require transactional support in order to guarantee consistent outcome and correct execution. These applications often involve long running computations, loosely coupled systems and components that do not share data, location, or administration and it is difficult to incorporate atomic transactions within such architectures. For example, an online bookshop may reserve books for an individual for a specific period of time, but if the individual does not purchase the books within that period they will be “put back onto the shelf” for others to buy. Furthermore, because it is not possible for anyone to have an infinite supply of stock, some online shops may appear to users to reserve items for them, but in fact may allow others to pre-empt that reservation (i.e., the same book may be “reserved” for multiple users concurrently); a user may subsequently find that the item is no longer available, or may have to be reordered specially for them.

A business activity or BA is designed specifically for these kinds of long-duration interactions, where exclusively locking resources is impossible or impractical. In this model services are requested to do work, and where those services have the ability to undo any work, they inform the BA such that if the BA later decides to cancel the work (i.e. if the business activity suffers a failure), it can instruct the service to execute its undo behavior. The key point for Business Activities is that how services do their work and provide compensation mechanisms is not the domain of the WS-Business Activity specification, but an implementation decision for the service provider.

The WS- Business Activity simply defines a protocol for Web services-based applications to enable existing business processing and workflow systems to wrap their proprietary mechanisms and interoperate across implementations and business boundaries.

A business activity may be partitioned into *scopes*, where a scope is a business task or unit of work using a collection of Web services. Such scopes can be nested to arbitrary degrees, forming parent and child relationships, where a parent scope has the ability to select which child tasks are to be included in the overall outcome protocol for a specific business activity, and so clearly non-atomic outcomes are possible. In a similar manner to traditional nested transactions, if a child task experiences an error, it can be caught by the parent who may be able to compensate and continue processing.

When a child task completes it can either leave the business activity or signal to the parent that the work it has done can be compensated later. In the latter case, the compensation task may be called by the parent should it ultimately need to undo the work performed by the child.

Unlike the WS-Atomic Transaction protocol model, where participants inform the coordinator of their state only when asked, a task within a business activity can specify its outcome to the parent directly without waiting for a request. This feature is useful when tasks fail such that the notification can be used by business activity exception handler to modify the goals and drive processing forward without having to meekly wait until the end of the transaction to admit to having failed – a well designed Business Activities should be proactive, if it is to perform well.

Underpinning all of this are three fundamental assumptions:

- All state transitions are reliably recorded, including application state and coordination metadata (the record of sent and received messages);
- All request messages are acknowledged, so that problems are detected as early as possible. This avoids executing unnecessary tasks and can also detect a problem earlier when rectifying it is simpler and less expensive;
- As with atomic transactions, a response is defined as a separate operation and not as the output of the request. Message input-output implementations will typically have timeouts that are too short for some business activity responses. If the response is not received after a timeout, it is resent. This is repeated until a response is received. The request receiver discards all but one identical request received.

As with atomic transactions, the business activity model has multiple protocols: `BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletion` and `BusinessAgreementWithCoordinatorCompletion`. However, unlike the AT protocol which is driven from the coordinator down to participants, this protocol is driven much more from the participants upwards.

Under the `BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletion` protocol, a child activity is initially created in the `Active` state; if it finishes the work it was created to do and no more participation is required within the scope of the BA (such as when the activity operates on immutable data), then the child can unilaterally send an `exited` message to the parent. However, if the child task finishes and wishes to continue in the BA then it must be able to compensate for the work it has performed. In this case it sends a `completed` message to the parent and waits to receive the final outcome of the BA from the parent. This outcome will either be a `close` message, meaning the BA has completed successfully or a

compensate message indicating that the parent activity requires that the child task reverse its work.

The `BusinessAgreementWithCoordinatorCompletion` protocol is identical to the `BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletion` protocol with the exception that the child cannot autonomously decide to end its participation in the business activity, even if it can be compensated. Rather the child task relies upon the parent to inform it when the child has received all requests for it to perform work which the parent does by sending the complete message to the child. The child then acts as it does in the `BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletion` protocol.

The crux of the BA model compared to the AT model is that it allows the participation of services that cannot or will not lock resources for extended periods.

While the full ACID semantics are not maintained by a BA, consistency can still be maintained through compensation, though the task of writing correct compensating actions (and thus overall system consistency) is delegated to the developers of the services under control of the BA. Such compensations may use backward error recovery, but will typically employ forward recovery.

## Application Messages

Application messages are the requests and responses that are sent between parties that constitute the work of a business process. Any such messages are considered opaque by XTS, and there is no mandatory message format, protocol binding, or encoding style so the developer is free to use any appropriate Web services protocol. In XTS, the transaction context is propagated within the headers of SOAP messages.

**Note:** XTS provides out-of-box support for service developers building WS-T-aware services on the JBoss, Weblogic and Glue platforms<sup>2</sup>. The provision of interceptors for automatic context handling at both client and service significantly simplifies the developer's workload, allowing the developer to concentrate on writing the business logic without having to worry about the transactional infrastructure getting in the way. The interceptors simply add and remove context elements to application messages without altering the semantics of those messages. Any service which understands what to do with a WS-C context can use it, services which do not understand the context (those services that are not WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity-aware) may ignore the context; the important point here is that XTS manages contexts without user intervention.

---

<sup>2</sup> Future versions of JBossTS will support other SOAP platforms.

## WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity Messages

Although the application or service developer rarely sees or is interested in the messages exchanged by the transactional infrastructure (the transaction manager and any participants), it is useful to understand what kinds of exchanges occur so that the underlying model can be fitted in to an overall architecture.

In XTS, WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity-specific messages are transported using SOAP messaging over HTTP. The types of messages that are propagated include instructions to perform standard transaction operations like begin, prepare.

**Note:** XTS messages do not interfere in any way, shape, or form, with the application messages, and nor is there any requirement for an application to use the same transport as the transaction-specific messages. For example, it is quite reasonable for a client application to deliver its application-specific messages using SOAP RPC over SMTP even though under the covers the XTS messages are delivered using a different mechanism.

## Summary

---

XTS provides a coordination infrastructure designed to allow transactions to run between enterprises across the Internet. That infrastructure is based on the WS-C, WS-Atomic Transaction and WS-Business Activity specifications. It supports two kinds of transactions: *atomic transactions* and *business activities*, which can be combined in arbitrary ways to map elegantly onto the transactional requirements of the underlying problem. The use of the whole infrastructure is simple due to the fact that its functionality is exposed through a simple transactioning API. Furthermore XTS provides all of the necessary plumbing to keep application and transactional aspects of an application separate, and to ensure that the transactionality of a system does not interfere with the functional aspects of the system itself.

## Chapter 4

# Getting started

## Creating and deploying participants

---

A participant is a software entity which is driven by the transaction manager on behalf of a Web service. The creation of participants is non-trivial since they ultimately reflect the state of a Web service's back-end processing facilities which is a function of an enterprise's own IT infrastructure. The most that can be said about the implementation of a participant without getting into detail about the back-end systems it represents, or the details of the underlying transaction protocol is that implementations must implement one of the following interfaces, depending upon the protocol it will participate within:

```
com.arjuna.wst.Durable2PCParticipant,
com.arjuna.wst.Volatile2PCParticipant,                                or,
com.arjuna.wst.BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletionParticipant,
com.arjuna.wst.BusinessAgreementWithCoordinatorCompletionParticipant.
```

A full description of XTS's participant features is provided in Chapter 6.

## Creating Client Applications

---

There are two aspects to a client application using XTS. The first is the transaction declaration aspects and the second is the business logic that the client application performs. The transaction declaration aspects are taken care of automatically with XTS's client API. This API provides simple transaction directives like begin, commit, and rollback which the client application can use to initialize, manage, and terminate transactions. Under the covers, this API invokes (via SOAP) operations on the transaction manager.

When the client application performs invocations on business logic Web services, then XTS does not dictate an API for that purpose. However, there is a requirement that whatever API is chosen, the XTS context be inserted onto outgoing messages, and extracted and associated with the current thread for incoming messages. To make the user's life easier, the XTS software comes complete with three sets of "filters" which can perform the task automatically. These filters are designed to work with JAX-RPC and webMethods client libraries.

**Note:** If the user chooses to use a different SOAP client infrastructure, then the onus to perform client-side header processing rests with them. XTS does not provide client-side infrastructure for anything other than JAX-RPC or webMethods for this release.



## JAX-RPC Context Handlers

In order to register the JAX-RPC server-side context handler with the deployed web services, a handler chain must be included in the web services deployment descriptor. Please refer to the demo application `jboss/webservices.xml` deployment descriptor for an example of how this can be achieved.

In order to register the JAX-RPC client-side context handler used by the client applications, a handler chain must be included in the definition of the service-ref in the client `web.xml` deployment descriptor. Please refer to the demo application `jboss/client-web-app.xml` for an example of how this can be achieved.

## webMethods Context Handlers

In order to register the webMethods server-side context handler with the deployed web services, the inbound and outbound interceptors must be configured in the web services deployment descriptor. An example of how this can be configured can be found in the demo application, e.g. the `RestaurantServiceAT.xml`.

In order to register the webMethods client-side context handler, the inbound and outbound interceptors must be configured in the `glue-config.xml` deployment descriptor. Please refer to the soap interceptor section of the demo application `glue-config.xml` for an example of how this can be achieved.

## Hints and tips

---

If you want to create multiple JBoss deploys on the same machine, then you may wish to look at <http://www.yorku.ca/dkha/jboss/docs/MultipleInstances.htm> for information on what is required.

## Summary

---

This chapter has provided a high-level overview of how to use each of the major software pieces of the Web Services transactions component of JBossTS. The Web Services transaction manager provided by JBossTS is the hub of the architecture and is the only piece of software that users' software does not bind to directly. XTS provides header processing infrastructure for dealing with Web Services transactions contexts for both users' client applications and Web services. For developing transaction participants, XTS provides a simple interface plus the necessary document handling code.

This chapter is meant as an overview only, and is unlikely to answer questions on more difficult and subtle aspects. For fuller explanations of the components, please refer to the appropriate chapter elsewhere in this document.

## Chapter 5

# Transactional Web services

## Introduction

---


This chapter describes how to provide transactional support for new and existing Web services using the service-side facilities of XTS. It shows how new services can be made transactional with no additional programming, and how existing services can be made WS-T transaction-aware in a non-invasive fashion.

## A Transactional Web Service

---


A Web service is a business-level entity. It encapsulates application logic needed to perform some domain-specific task, or is designed to delegate to a back-end system which executes that logic. Given it is part of application code, such non-functional requirements as transactionality should not impinge on its construction.

To support this notion, XTS provides a suite of components designed to work at the SOAP stack level, which deal with transactional matters on behalf of a Web service without requiring any changes to that service. In XTS two context handling components are registered with the SOAP server and deal with context management on behalf of the service without the service having to worry about context propagation issues itself. This is shown in Figure 13.



**Figure 13 Context Handlers Registered with the SOAP Server**

The detail of the context management that the context processor performs is unimportant to the Web service application logic, and is orthogonal to any work performed by any other protocol-specific context handlers too. However back-end systems which the Web service application logic uses (such as databases) are often interested in the front-end transaction context such that any operations invoked within its scope can be mapped onto a back-end transaction context. This is typically achieved at the back-end by wrapping a database driver in a veneer which implements both the interface of the original driver and hooks into the service-side API to access the transaction context details. The general architecture for this pattern is shown in Figure 14.




**Figure 14 General Pattern for Back-End Integration, Service Side**

The missing element from this is the commit protocol which finally allows back-end work to be made durable or not at the end of a transaction. This is covered in the participant chapter where the participant/back-end relation is explored further.

# Participants

## The Participant: an Overview

The participant is the entity that performs the work pertaining to transaction management on behalf of the business services involved in an application. The Web service (e.g., a theatre booking system) contains some business logic for reserving a seat, enquiring availability etc, but it will need to be supported by something that maintains information in a durable manner. Typically this will be a database, but it could be a file system, NVRAM, etc. Now, although the service may talk to the back-end database directly, it cannot commit or undo any changes it (the services) makes, since these are ultimately under the control of the transaction that scoped the work. In order for the transaction to be able to exercise this control, it must have some contact with the database. In XTS this is accomplished by the participant, and the role played by the participant between the transaction and back-end transaction processing infrastructure is shown in Figure 15.



**Figure 15 Transactions, Participants, and Back-End Transaction Control**

Each participant in XTS is related to either the Atomic Transaction or Business Activity protocols. In the following sections we'll consider both protocols and their respective participants.

### Atomic Transaction

All Atomic Transaction participants are instances of one of the following interfaces.

## Durable2PCParticipant

This participant supports the WS-Atomic Transaction Durable2PC protocol with the following signatures, as per the `com.arjuna.wst.Durable2Participant` interface:

- *prepare*: the participant should perform any work necessary to allow it to either commit or rollback the work performed by the Web service under the scope of the transaction. The implementation is free to do whatever it needs to in order to fulfill the implicit contract between it and the coordinator. The participant is expected to indicate whether it can prepare or not by returning an instance of the `com.arjuna.wst.Vote`. Values are: `ReadOnly`, indicating the participant does not need to be informed of the transaction outcome as no state updates were made; `Prepared`, indicating the participant is prepared to commit or rollback depending on the final transaction outcome, and it has made sufficient state updates persistent to accomplish this; and `Aborted`, indicating the participant has aborted and the transaction should also attempt to do so.
- *commit*: the participant should make permanent the work that it controls. What it does will depend upon its implementation, e.g., commit the reservation of the theatre ticket. The participant will then return an indication of whether or not it succeeded.
- *rollback*: the participant should undo the work that it controls. The participant will then return an indication of whether or not it succeeded.
- *commitOnePhase*: if there is only a single `TwoPCParticipant` registered with the transaction, then the coordinator can optimize the protocol and simply tell the participant to commit: there is no need for a preparatory phase since consensus is implicit.
- *unknown*: during recovery the participant can enquire as to the status of the transaction it was registered with. If that transaction is no longer available (has rolled back) then this operation will be invoked by the coordination service.
- *error*: during recovery the participant can enquire as to the status of the transaction it was registered with. If an error occurs (e.g., the transaction service is unavailable) then this operation will be invoked.

## Volatile2PCParticipant

This participant supports the WS-Atomic Transaction Volatile2PC protocol with the following signatures, as per the `com.arjuna.wst.Volatile2Participant` interface:

- *prepare*: the participant should perform any work necessary to allow it to either commit or rollback the work performed by the Web service under the scope of the transaction. The implementation is free to do whatever it needs to in order to fulfill the implicit contract between it and the coordinator. The participant is expected to indicate whether it can prepare or not by returning an instance of the `com.arjuna.wst.Vote`. Values are: `ReadOnly`, indicating the participant does not need to be informed of the transaction outcome as no state updates were made; `Prepared`, indicating the participant is prepared to commit or rollback depending on the final transaction outcome, and it has made sufficient state updates persistent to accomplish this; and `Aborted`, indicating the participant has aborted and the transaction should also attempt to do so.

- *commit*: the participant should make permanent the work that it controls. What it does will depend upon its implementation, e.g., commit the reservation of the theatre ticket. The participant will then return an indication of whether or not it succeeded.
- *rollback*: the participant should undo the work that it controls. The participant will then return an indication of whether or not it succeeded.
- *commitOnePhase*: if there is only a single TwoPCParticipant registered with the transaction, then the coordinator can optimize the protocol and simply tell the participant to commit: there is no need for a preparatory phase since consensus is implicit.
- *unknown*: during recovery the participant can enquire as to the status of the transaction it was registered with. If that transaction is no longer available (has rolled back) then this operation will be invoked by the coordination service.
- *error*: during recovery the participant can enquire as to the status of the transaction it was registered with. If an error occurs (e.g., the transaction service is unavailable) then this operation will be invoked.

## Business Activity

All Business Activity participants are instances of the following interfaces.

### BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletion

This participant supports the WS-T BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletion protocol with the following signatures, as per the `com.arjuna.wst.BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletionParticipant` interface:

- *close*: the transaction has completed successfully. The participant previously informed the coordinator that it was ready to complete.
- *cancel*: the transaction has cancelled, and the participant should undo any work. The participant cannot have informed the coordinator that it has completed.
- *compensate*: the transaction has cancelled. The participant previously informed the coordinator that it had finished work but could compensate later if required, so it is now requested to do so.
- *status*: return the status of the participant.
- *unknown*: if the participant enquires as to the status of the transaction it was registered with and that transaction is no longer available (has rolled back) then this operation will be invoked by the coordination service.
- *error*: if the participant enquired as to the status of the transaction it was registered with and an error occurs (e.g., the transaction service is unavailable) then this operation will be invoked.

## BusinessAgreementWithCoordinatorCompletion

This participant supports the WS-T BusinessAgreementWithCoordinatorCompletion protocol with the following signatures, as per the `com.arjuna.wst.BusinessAgreementWithCoordinatorCompletionParticipant` interface:

- *close*: the transaction has completed successfully. The participant previously informed the coordinator that it was ready to complete.
- *cancel*: the transaction has cancelled, and the participant should undo any work.
- *compensate*: the transaction has cancelled. The participant previously informed the coordinator that it had finished work but could compensate later if required, so it is now requested to do so.
- *complete*: the coordinator is informing the participant that all work it needs to do within the scope of this business activity has been received.
- *status*: return the status of the participant.
- *unknown*: if the participant enquires as to the status of the transaction it was registered with and that transaction is no longer available (has rolled back) then this operation will be invoked by the coordination service.
- *error*: if the participant enquired as to the status of the transaction it was registered with and an error occurs (e.g., the transaction service is unavailable) then this operation will be invoked.

## BAParticipantManager

In order for the Business Activity protocol to work correctly, the participants must be able to autonomously signal the coordinator that they have left the activity (exited) or are ready to complete and (if necessary) compensate (completed). Unlike the Atomic Transaction protocol, where all interactions between the coordinator and participants are instigated by the coordinator when the transaction terminates, this interaction pattern requires the participant to be able to talk to the coordinator at any time during the lifetime of the business activity.

As such, whenever a participant is registered with a business activity, it receives a handle on the coordinator. This handle is an instance of the `BAParticipantManager` interface, located in `com.arjuna.wst.BAParticipantManager`, with the following methods:

- *exit*: the participant has exited the business activity. The participant uses this to inform the coordinator that it has left the activity. It will not be informed when (and how) the business activity terminates.
- *completed*: the participant has completed it works, but wishes to continue in the business activity, so that it will eventually be told when (and how) the activity terminates. The participant may later be asked to compensate for the work it has done.
- *fault*: the participant encountered an error during normal activation and has compensated. This places the business activity into a mandatory cancel-only mode.



## Participant Creation and Deployment

---

As has been shown, the participant provides the plumbing that drives the transactional aspects of the service. This section discusses the specifics of Participant programming and usage.

### Implementing Participants

Implementing a participant is, in theory, a relatively straightforward task, though depending on the complexity of the transactional infrastructure that the participant is to manage, the actual size and complexity of a participant will vary. The participant interfaces can be found under `com.arjuna.wst`. Your implementation must implement one of these interfaces.

### Deploying Participants

In order to allow Participants to be located remote from the Transaction Manager, XTS includes transparent message routing functionality. The Participant classes are not exposed directly as web services, but rather registered with a web service which receives messages from the Transaction Manager and maps them to appropriate method invocations on the relevant Participant instance. Transactional web services will typically enroll a new Participant instance of the desired type for each new transaction. A unique identifier must be provided at enrolment time and will be used to map transaction protocol messages to the appropriate participant instance. Note that Participant method invocations do not occur in a specific transaction context. Therefore, if your Participant implementation requires knowledge of the transaction context (e.g. to look up state information in a persistent store) then you should provide this to the Participant instance, typically as an argument to the constructor function. Sample Participant implementations and usage can be found in the demonstration application included with XTS.

Any application code which creates and enrolls Participants must be deployed along with the parts of XTS necessary for receiving and processing incoming messages from the Transaction Manager. This typically means including the appropriate XTS .jar, .wsr and .war files in your application. If you are deploying your application only a server which does not already contain a Transaction Manager installation, you will also need to deploy the XTS configuration files.

**Note:** In early access releases of the XTS product, the Transaction Manager and participant management functions are not provided as separable components. Configuration and deployment of the participant infrastructure is therefore as in the Transaction Manager section above. More flexible deployment of the XTS components will be available in the final release.

# Stand-alone coordinator

## Introduction

---

For configuring a stand-alone Web Services transaction coordinator, see the relevant chapter in the System Administrator's Guide.

# The XTS API

## Introduction

---

This chapter shows how to use the XTS API. This is of use both at the client-side where applications consume transactional Web services, and at the service/participant side where transactions need to be coordinated with back-end systems.

## API for the Atomic Transaction protocol

---

The following classes and interfaces are located within the `com.arjuna.wst` or `com.arjuna.mw.wst` packages and sub-packages.

### Vote

During the two-phase commit protocol, a participant will be asked to vote on whether or not it can prepare to confirm the work that it controls. It must return one of the following subtypes of `com.arjuna.wst.Vote`:

- **Prepared**: the participant indicates that it can prepare if asked to by the coordinator. It will not have committed at this stage however, since it does not know what the final outcome will be.
- **Aborted**: the participant indicates that it cannot prepare and has in fact rolled back. The participant should not expect to get a second phase message.
- **ReadOnly**: the participant indicates that the work it controls has not made any changes to state that require it to be informed of the final outcome of the transaction. Essentially the participant is resigning from the transaction.

Thus a possible implementation of a 2PC participant's `prepare` method may resemble the following:

```
public Vote prepare () throws WrongStateException, SystemException
{
    // Some participant logic here

    if(/* some condition based on the outcome of the business logic */)
    {
        // Vote to confirm
        return new com.arjuna.wst.Prepared();
    }
    else if(/*some other condition based on the outcome of the business
logic*/)
    {
        // Resign
        return new com.arjuna.wst.ReadOnly();
    }
}
```

```

    }
    else
    {
        // Vote to cancel
        return new com.arjuna.wst.Aborted();
    }
}

```

**Figure 16 API Example Showing Participant Voting**

## The transaction context

A transaction is typically represented by some unique identifier and a reference to the coordinator which manages the transaction, e.g., a URL. XTS allows transactions to be nested such that a transaction hierarchy (tree) may be formed. Thus, a transaction context may be a set of transactions, with the top-most transaction the root parent (superior).

### TxContext

`com.arjuna.mw.wst.TxContext` is an opaque representation of a transaction context.

- `valid`: this indicates whether or not the contents are valid.
- `equals`: can be used to compare two instances.

### UserTransaction

The `com.arjuna.wst.UserTransaction` is the class that most users (e.g., clients and services) will see. This isolates them from the underlying protocol-specific aspects of the XTS implementation. Importantly, a `UserTransaction` does not represent a specific transaction, but rather is responsible for providing access to an implicit per-thread transaction context; it is similar to the `UserTransaction` in the JTA specification. Therefore, all of the `UserTransaction` methods implicitly act on the current thread of control.

A new transaction is begun and associated with the invoking thread by using the `begin` method. If there is already a transaction associated with the thread then the `WrongStateException` exception is thrown. Upon success, this operation associates the newly created transaction with the current thread.

The transaction is committed by the `commit` method. This will execute the Volatile2PC and Durable2PC protocols prior to returning. If there is no transaction associated with the invoking thread then `UnknownTransactionException` is thrown. If the transaction ultimately rolls back then the `TransactionRolledBackException` is thrown. When complete, this operation disassociates the transaction from the current thread such that it becomes associated with no transaction.

The `rollback` operation will terminate the transaction and return normally if it succeeded, while throwing an appropriate exception if it didn't. If there is no transaction associated with the invoking thread then `UnknownTransactionException` is thrown.

## UserTransactionFactory

UserTransactions are obtained from a `UserTransactionFactory`.

## TransactionManager

The `TransactionManager` interface represents the service/container/participant's (service-side users) typical way in which to interact with the underlying transaction service implementation. As with `UserTransaction` a `TransactionManager` does not represent a specific transaction, but rather is responsible for providing access to an implicit per-thread transaction context.

A thread of control may require periods of non-transactionality so that it may perform work that is not associated with a specific transaction. In order to do this it is necessary to disassociate the thread from any transactions. The `suspend` method accomplishes this, returning a `TxContext` instance, which is a handle on the transaction. The thread is then no longer associated with any transaction.

The `resume` method can be used to (re-)associate a thread with a transaction(s) via its `TxContext`. Prior to association, the thread is disassociated with any transaction(s) with which it may be currently associated. If the `TxContext` is null, then the thread is associated with no transaction. The `UnknownTransactionException` exception is thrown if the transaction that the `TxContext` refers to is invalid in the scope of the invoking thread.

The `currentTransaction` method returns the `TxContext` for the current transaction, or null if there is none. Unlike `suspend`, this method does not disassociate the current thread from the transaction(s). This can be used to enable multiple threads to execute within the scope of the same transaction.

In order to register and resign participants with a transaction, the container or participant must use:

- `enlistForVolatileTwoPhase`: enlist the specified participant with current transaction such that it will participate in the Volatile2PC protocol; a unique identifier for the participant is also required. If there is no transaction associated with the invoking thread then the `UnknownTransactionException` exception is thrown. If the coordinator already has a participant enrolled with the same identifier, then `AlreadyRegisteredException` will be thrown. If the transaction is not in a state where participants can be enrolled (e.g., it is terminating) then `WrongStateException` will be thrown.
- `enlistForDurableTwoPhase`: enlist the specified participant with current transaction such that it will participate in the 2PC protocol; a unique identifier for the participant is also required. If there is no transaction associated with the invoking thread then the `UnknownTransactionException` exception is thrown. If the coordinator already has a participant enrolled with the same identifier, then `AlreadyRegisteredException` will be thrown. If the transaction is not in a state where participants can be enrolled (e.g., it is terminating) then `WrongStateException` will be thrown.

## TransactionFactory

TransactionManagers are obtained from a `TransactionFactory`.

## API for the Business Activity protocol

---

### UserBusinessActivity

The `com.arjuna.wst.UserBusinessActivity` is the class that most users (e.g., clients and services) will see. This isolates them from the underlying protocol-specific aspects of the XTS implementation. Importantly, a `UserBusinessActivity` does not represent a specific business activity, but rather is responsible for providing access to an implicit per-thread activity. Therefore, all of the `UserBusinessActivity` methods implicitly act on the current thread of control.

A new business activity is begun and associated with the invoking thread by using the `begin` method. If there is already an activity associated with the thread then the `WrongStateException` exception is thrown. Upon success, this operation associates the newly created activity with the current thread.

The business activity is completed successfully by the `close` method. This will execute the `BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletion` protocol prior to returning. If there is no activity associated with the invoking thread then `UnknownTransactionException` is thrown. If the activity ultimately cancels then the `TransactionRolledBackException` is thrown. When complete, this operation disassociates the business activity from the current thread such that it becomes associated with no activity.

The `cancel` operation will terminate the business activity and return normally if it succeeded, while throwing an appropriate exception if it didn't. If there is no activity associated with the invoking thread then `UnknownTransactionException` is thrown. Any participants that had previously completed will be informed to compensate for their work.

Some participants may have registered for the `BusinessAgreementWithCoordinatorCompletion` protocol, which requires the coordinator or application to inform them when all work that they need to do within the scope of a business activity has been performed. The application should therefore use the `complete` method to inform these participants.

### UserBusinessActivityFactory

UserBusinessActivities are obtained from a `UserBusinessActivityFactory`.

### BusinessActivityManager

The `BusinessActivityManager` interface represents the service/container/participant's (service-side users) typical way in which to interact with the underlying business activity service implementation. As with `UserBusinessActivity` a `BusinessActivityManager` does

not represent a specific activity, but rather is responsible for providing access to an implicit per-thread activity.

A thread of control may require periods of non-transactionality so that it may perform work that is not associated with a specific activity. In order to do this it is necessary to disassociate the thread from any business activities. The `suspend` method accomplishes this, returning a `TxContext` instance, which is a handle on the activity. The thread is then no longer associated with any activity.

The `resume` method can be used to (re-)associate a thread with an activity (or activities) via its `TxContext`. Prior to association, the thread is disassociated with any activity with which it may be currently associated. If the `TxContext` is null, then the thread is associated with no activity. The `UnknownTransactionException` exception is thrown if the business activity that the `TxContext` refers to is invalid in the scope of the invoking thread.

The `currentTransaction` method returns the `TxContext` for the current business activity, or null if there is none. Unlike `suspend`, this method does not disassociate the current thread from the activity. This can be used to enable multiple threads to execute within the scope of the same business activity.

In order to register and resign participants with a business activity, the container or participant must use:

- `enlistForBusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletion`: enlist the specified participant with current business activity such that it will participate in the `BusinessAgreementWithParticipantCompletion` protocol; a unique identifier for the participant is also required. If there is no business activity associated with the invoking thread then the `UnknownTransactionException` exception is thrown. If the coordinator already has a participant enrolled with the same identifier, then `AlreadyRegisteredException` will be thrown. If the activity is not in a state where participants can be enrolled (e.g., it is terminating) then `WrongStateException` will be thrown.
- `enlistForBusinessAgreementWithCoordinatorCompletion`: enlist the specified participant with current activity such that it will participate in the `BusinessAgreementWithCoordinatorCompletion` protocol; a unique identifier for the participant is also required. If there is no business activity associated with the invoking thread then the `UnknownTransactionException` exception is thrown. If the coordinator already has a participant enrolled with the same identifier, then `AlreadyRegisteredException` will be thrown. If the activity is not in a state where participants can be enrolled (e.g., it is terminating) then `WrongStateException` will be thrown.

## BusinessActivityManagerFactory

`BusinessActivityManagers` are obtained from a `BusinessActivityManagerFactory`.





# Index

ACID transactions .....	13	Creating transactional services .....	35
Heuristic outcomes.....	16	Deploying participants .....	42
Optimizations.....	15	Getting started.....	32
Synchronizations.....	14	Prerequisites .....	5
Two-phase commit.....	14	SOAP .....	10
Additional documentation .....	7	WS-Coordination .....	18
API .....		Completion .....	21
Atomic Transaction.....	38	The Activation Service .....	20
Business Activity .....	40	The Registration Service .....	21
Details .....	44	WSDL .....	10
Architecture of ATS WS-T component ....	11	WS-Transaction .....	22
ACID transactions.....	13	Atomic Transaction protocol.....	25
Business Activities.....	16	Business Activity protocol.....	28
The context.....	13	Impact on application messages .....	30
Compliance points.....	8	Protocols .....	22
Creating transactional clients .....	32	Relationship to WS-Coordination .....	22
Creating transactional participants .....	38	XTS .....	8