

# Microservice Architecture & Domain Driven Design

Amro Kudssi, MSc

**AAAEA IL - President** 



### A service that provides a business or technical capability

- $\odot$  Weather forecasting service
- $\odot$  Shipment tracking service
- $\odot$  Address searching service
- $\odot$  Account Transfer service
- $\odot$  Wire service
- $\circ$  Send Email
- $\odot\,\text{Buy}\,\text{a stock}$
- $\odot$  Find a flight
- $\odot$  Reserve a flight
- 0...
- 0...



## An Application is a combination of software services

 $\circ$  Gmail

- View list of emails
- Read an email
- Send email
- Search email
- ...
- $\circ$  Weather.com
  - Get current temperature
  - Get a forecast by zip
  - ...

## A Monolith Application





## Quality attributes

- Complexity
- Changeability
- Deployability
- Scalability
- Reliability
- Testability
- ...



Source: www.crystalinks.com





A relatively small software component that does one thing and one thing only

 Simple to build.
 Simple to test.
 Simple to deploy.
 Simple to scale.



- Bunch of loosely coupled microservices that provide business capabilities
- The microservice architecture enables the continuous delivery/deployment of large, complex applications.
- It also enables an organization to evolve its technology stack.

## In Microservice Architecture



## Quality attributes

- Complexity
- Changeability
- Deployability
- Scalability
- Reliability
- Testability



## **Microservice Architecture**





## Monolith vs Microservices





Source: www.knoldus.com

## Monolith vs Microservices





Source: www.medium.com

## The Design Problem





![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Software development is considered a cost center rather than a profit center.
- Producing Designs adds significant time and effort, resulting in the delay of software deliverables.
- Overly generalizing solutions rather than addressing actual concrete business needs.

![](_page_13_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Developers are too concerned about technology.
- Developers attempt to address all current and imagined future needs
- No emphasis on naming objects and operations according to the business purpose that they fill
- The database is given too much priority. • Large, slow, and locking DB queries.

## **Traditional Design Approaches**

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_1.jpeg)

## DDD is about modeling a Ubiquitous Language in an explicitly Bounded Context.

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

The language that is used between team members (developers and Domain Experts) is called the Ubiquitous Language because it is both spoken among the team members and implemented in the software model.

It is necessary to be rigorous, strict, exact, and tight.

![](_page_18_Picture_1.jpeg)

## a Bounded Context is a semantic contextual boundary.

![](_page_18_Figure_3.jpeg)

## **Bounded Context**

![](_page_19_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

Source: Vernon, Vaughn. Domain-Driven Design Distilled

## **Bounded Context**

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

Source: Vernon, Vaughn. Domain-Driven Design Distilled

## **DDD Techniques**

## **Event Storming**

## Strategic Designs Techniques

- Bounded Context and Ubiquitous Language
- Domains and Subdomains
- Context Mapping

## **Tactical Designs Techniques**

- Aggregates
- Entities and Value Types
- Domain Events & Commands

## Relationship with our Agile Process

![](_page_21_Picture_12.jpeg)

## Package Shipping Business Domain

![](_page_22_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Enterprise Applications usually consists of multiple Domains
- The organization strategic initiative Bounded Context is called the *Core Domain*.
- Other surrounding domains are called *Sub-Domains*
- a Subdomain is a sub-part of the overall business domain.
- Subdomains can be used to logically break up the whole business domain to simplify problem space on a large, complex project.

## **Event Storming**

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Rapid design technique engages *Business* and *Tech* in rapid learning process to define business process(s)
- Using sticky notes & markers everyone focuses on creating Business Events. Wide wall or long role of paper
- Event Storming:
  - Storm out the following from left to right and in following order
    - 1. Business domain Events Past tense verb (Orange stickies)
    - 2. Before each event place Command that caused the event (Blue sticky)
    - 3. Any process that is caused by Event or a Command should be placed and connected with arrow (Lilac sticky)
    - 4. Identify any special roles needed to any command
    - 5. Start forming the Entities and Aggregates around your corresponding Commands (Yellow sticky)
    - 6. Draw boundaries around aggregates creating your core domain and other subdomains

## **Event Storming**

![](_page_25_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_3.jpeg)

## **Domains and Sub-domains**

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_1.jpeg)

**Core Domain**: Strategic Investment, Core business, Elite developers, Competitive edge.

**Supporting Subdomain**: Supports Core Domain. Custom development because an off-the-shelf solution doesn't exist. Not the same investment of the Core Domain.

**Generic Subdomain**: Could be available for purchase off the shelf but may also be outsourced or even developed in house by a team that doesn't have elite developers

![](_page_28_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_1.jpeg)

Entities vs Value objects

Aggregates

**Domain Models** 

**Domain Events** 

## **Entities and Value Objects**

![](_page_30_Picture_1.jpeg)

*Entity* is a unique individual thing in the domain that can be distinguished from other Entities that are of <u>Same</u> or <u>Different</u> types

Value Object is an immutable value that describes the Entity. It does not a thing and not unique

*References to Entities in* Other Aggregates

![](_page_30_Figure_5.jpeg)

Package Shipping Domain

#### **#ChicagoTechFest** Hear It. See It. Do It.

## Aggregates

- Aggregates are clusters of objects
- Each Aggregate has Root Entity that owns all elements
- Aggregates forms Transactional Consistency boundaries
- Aggregates update in single business transaction

![](_page_31_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_7.jpeg)

## Aggregate Rules

![](_page_32_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_2.jpeg)

**#ChicagoTechFest** Hear It. See It. Do It.

## Aggregate Design Rules -1

Design Small Aggregates

-More transaction Success -Single Responsibility Principle

![](_page_33_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_1.jpeg)

**Protect Business Invariants** ..... inside Aggregate Boundaries Package -Customer Specs Payment Address info Facility Location -. -. ID Root Entity Entity Value

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_2.jpeg)

Aggregate Rules -4

![](_page_36_Picture_1.jpeg)

Update other Aggregates using Eventual Consistency

![](_page_36_Figure_3.jpeg)

## **Domain Model**

![](_page_37_Picture_1.jpeg)

Package aggregate

![](_page_37_Figure_3.jpeg)

## **Domain Model**

![](_page_38_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### shipment aggregate

![](_page_38_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### **Bounded Context: Sales**

Customer: View Service Rates (in: Package, From Location, To Location out: Services) Customer: Buy Service (in: Customer, Package, From Location, To Location, Service out: Package Id) Customer: Report Missing Delivery (in: Package Id, out: Investigation Id)

#### **Bounded Context: Delivery Tracking**

Customer: Receive Delivery Status (in: Service Id out: trackable steps: List::Hop)

**Bounded Context: Shipping Context** 

System: Create Shipment (in: Package Id, Collection Location, Delivery Location, Hops {ordered set} out: Shipment Id)

System: Register Package (in: Shipment Id, Package Id out: Shipment Id) Courier: Deliver Package (in: Shipment Id, Package Id, Digital Signature)

#### **Bounded Context: Service Ref Data**

System Administrator: Maintain Hop Metadata (in: Location, Facilities out: Hop Id) System Administrator: Maintain Service Type (in: Type, Price out: Service Id)

## Define a State Machine for each Aggregate

![](_page_40_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_2.jpeg)

## Define a State Machine for each Aggregate

![](_page_41_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Figure_2.jpeg)

## **Customer Journey**

![](_page_42_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_1.jpeg)

### Anemic Domain Model

- Aggregates have technical rather than business focus
- Takes all the overhead of OOD/OOP without realizing the benefits

## Leaking Business Logic into the service layer

- $\circ~$  Services suffer from identity crisis
- Business Logic must be embedded inside its domain model
- $\circ~$  Bunch of public empty getters and setters

![](_page_44_Picture_1.jpeg)

- 1. Start with Event Storming Session
- 2. Create use case from business requirements
- 3. Choose your Core, Support, Generic business domains
- 4. Create your aggregates into their own Bounded Contexts using their ubiquitous language
- 5. Create the Domain models
- 6. The use cases become messages (operations) between aggregates
- 7. Create State Machine diagrams to represents various aggregate states
- 8. System documentation is actually your functional test using Behavioral Driven Design (BDD)

## TDD, BDD

![](_page_45_Picture_1.jpeg)

1.Identify business feature.

- 2.Identify scenarios under the selected feature.
- 3.Define **steps** for each scenario.
- 4.Run feature and fail.
- 5.Write code to make steps pass.
- 6.Refactor code, Create reusable automation library.
- 7.Run feature and **pass**.
- 8.Generate test reports.

![](_page_45_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_1.jpeg)

- SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat
- Timebox modeling
- Functional Tests and BDD/ATDD System specifications need to be documented as features and scenarios (Given/when/then)

![](_page_47_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_0.jpeg)

## THANK YOU!!!

![](_page_49_Picture_1.jpeg)

Full day workshop on DDD and Microservice Design Concepts is in all CCB TechHubs in October, November and December

![](_page_50_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Appendix

![](_page_51_Picture_1.jpeg)

## Represents the relation ship between the contexts. Both Team and Technology

![](_page_51_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Picture_1.jpeg)

Closely aligns two teams with dependent set of goals.

- Synchronized, Continuous Integration.
- Hard to keep for long time. Limits need to be set.

![](_page_52_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_1.jpeg)

Teams (two or more) share a small common model

- Possibly on team owns and maintain that shared kernel
- Open communication between the teams and **Constant** agreement

![](_page_53_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_1.jpeg)

Supplier (U) holds the sway and Determine what the Customer (D) will get and when.

- Supplier plans to meet some/all customer needs
- Customer plan with Supplier to meet various expectations

![](_page_54_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_1.jpeg)

Upstream team has no motivation to support specific needs for Downstream team

- Downstream team **Conforms** with Upstream specs
- Example Amazon.com and its sellers

![](_page_55_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Picture_1.jpeg)

## Downstream teams creates translation layer to isolate them from Upstream team changes

- Most Defensive relationship
- A common solution used to integrate with legacy systems

![](_page_56_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Picture_1.jpeg)

Upstream system defines a protocol/Interface to downstream access to their bounded context set of services

- Well documented API from Team 1
- No need for Anti corruption layer, Team 2 can be comfortably Conformist

![](_page_57_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_58_Picture_1.jpeg)

Upstream system Publishes communication language of some standard

- Examples XML or JSON Schema, RESTful API, Async Messaging
- Consumer can translate from and to the language easily

![](_page_58_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_59_Picture_1.jpeg)

The integration will provide No significant payoff

- No one ubiquitous language provides the needed functionality
- Consumer builds its own solution and forget about integration to the provider ubiquitous language

![](_page_59_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Picture_1.jpeg)

This should be avoided at all costs

- Overtime, more and more cross aggregate relationship will be created, making system maintenance harder costly
- System will completely collapse eventually

![](_page_60_Picture_5.jpeg)

Source: Vernon, Vaughn. Domain-Driven Design Distilled