

# Table of Contents

Distributing into Microservices (15 pages).....	1
Continuing our design journey.....	1
Decomposing our monolith.....	2
Changes for frontend interactions.....	2
Changes for event interactions.....	8
Changes for database interactions.....	16
Summary.....	18

## Distributing into Microservices (15 pages)

A distributed system is one in which the failure of a computer you didn't even know existed can render your own computer unusable.

— Leslie Lamport

Thus far, we have a working application for LC application processing, which is bundled along with other components as a single package. Although, we have discussed the idea of subdomains and bounded contexts, the separation between these components is logical, rather than physical. Furthermore, we have focused primarily on the *LC Application Processing* aspect of the overall solution. In this chapter, we will look at extracting the LC Application Processing bounded context into components that are physically disparate, and hence enable us to deploy them independently of the rest of the solution. We will discuss various options available to us, the rationale for choosing a given option, along with the implications that we will need to be cognizant of.

### Continuing our design journey

From a logical perspective, our realization of the Letter of Credit application looks like the visual depicted here:




Figure 1. Current view of the LC application monolith

Although the *LC Application Processing* component is loosely coupled from the rest of the application, we are still required to coordinate with several other teams to realize business value. This may inhibit our ability to innovate at a pace faster than the slowest contributor in the ecosystem. This is because all teams need to be production ready before a deployment can happen. This can be further exacerbated by the fact that individual teams may be at different levels of engineering maturity. Let's look at some options on how we can achieve a level of independence from the rest of the ecosystem by physically decomposing our components into distinctly deployable artifacts.

## Decomposing our monolith

First and foremost, the *LC Application Processing* component exposes only in-process APIs when other components interact with it. This includes interactions with:

1. Frontend
2. Published/consumed events
3. Database

To extract *LC application processing* functionality out into its own independently deployable component, remotely invocable interfaces will have to be supported instead of the in-process ones we have currently. Let's examine remote API options for each:

### Changes for frontend interactions

Currently, the JavaFX frontend interacts with the rest of the application by making request-

response style in-process method calls (**CommandGateway** for commands and **QueryGateway** for queries) as shown here:

```
@Service
public class BackendService {

    private final QueryGateway queryGateway;
    private final CommandGateway commandGateway;

    public BackendService(QueryGateway queryGateway,
                          CommandGateway gateway) {
        this.queryGateway = queryGateway;
        this.commandGateway = gateway;
    }

    public LCAplicationId startNewLC(ApplicantId applicantId, String clientReference)
    {
        return commandGateway.sendAndWait(
            startApplication(applicantId, clientReference));
    }

    public List<LCView> findMyDraftLCs(ApplicantId applicantId) {
        return queryGateway.query(
            new MyDraftLCsQuery(applicantId),
            ResponseTypes.multipleInstancesOf(LCView.class))
            .join();
    }
}
```

One very simple way to replace these in-process calls will be to introduce some form of remote procedure call (RPC). Now our application looks like this:




Figure 2. Remote interaction with the frontend introduced

When working with in-process interactions, we are simply invoking methods on objects within the confines of the same process. However, when we switch to using out-of-process calls, we have quite a few considerations. These days when working with remote APIs, we have several popular choices in the form of JSON-based web services, GraphQL, gRPC, etc. While it is possible to make use of a completely custom format to facilitate the communication, DDD advocates the use of the [open host service](#) pattern using a published language that we covered in chapter 9. Even with the open host service style of communication, there are a few considerations, some of which we discuss here:

## Protocol options

There are several options available to us when exposing remote APIs. These days using a JSON-based API (often labeled as REST) seems to be quite popular. However, this isn't the only option available to us. In a resource-based approach, the first step is to identify a resource (noun) and then map the interactions (verbs) associated with the resource as a next step. In an action-based approach, the focus is on the actions to be performed. Arguably, REST takes a resource-based approach, whereas GraphQL, gRPC, SOAP, etc. seem to be action-based. Let's take an example of an API where we want to submit an LC. In a RESTful world, this may look something like below:

```
# Start a new LC application
curl POST /lc-applications/start \
  -d '{"applicant-id": "8ed2d2fe", "clientReference": "Test LC"}' \
  -H 'content-type:application/vnd.lc-application.v2+json'
```

whereas with a GraphQL implementation, this may look like:

```
mutation StartLCApplication {
  startLCApplication(applicantId: "8ed2d2fe",
                    clientReference: "Test LC") {
    lcApplicationId
  }
}
```

In our experience, designing APIs using REST does result in some form of dilution when attempting to mirror the language of the domain — because the focus is first and foremost on resources. Purists will be quick to point out that the example above is not RESTful because there is no resource named **start**. Our approach is to place more importance to remaining true to the ubiquitous language as opposed to being dogmatic about adherence to technical purity.

### Transport format

Here we have two broad choices: text-based (for example, JSON or XML) versus binary (for example, protocol buffers or avro). If non-functional requirements (like performance) are met, our preference is to use text-based protocols as a starting point, because it can afford the flexibility of not needing any additional tools to visually interpret the data (when debugging).

When designing a remote API, we have the option of choosing a format that enforces a schema (for example, protocol buffers or avro) or something less formal like plain JSON. In such cases, in order to stay true to the ubiquitous language, the process may have to include additional governance in the form of more formal design and code reviews, documentation, etc.

### Compatibility and versioning

As requirements evolve, there will be a need to enhance the interfaces to reflect these changes. This will mean that our ubiquitous language will also change over time, rendering old concepts to become obsolete. The general principle is to maintain backwards compatibility with consumers for as long as possible. But this does come with a cost of having to maintain old and new concepts together — leading to a situation where it can become hard to tell what is relevant versus what is not. Using an explicit versioning strategy can help in managing this complexity to an extent — where newer versions may be able to break backwards compatibility with older ones. But it is also not feasible to continue supporting a large number of incompatible versions indefinitely. Hence, it is important to make sure that the versioning strategy makes deprecation and retirement agreements explicit.

### Error handling

#### REST APIs

We recognize that there are several options when exposing web-based APIs, claims of using a REST (Representation State Transfer) approach seem quite common these days. REST was coined by Roy Fielding as part of his doctoral dissertation. The idea of what constitutes REST has been a matter of debate and arguably remains ambiguous even today. Leonard Richardson introduced the notion of

a maturity model for HTTP-based REST APIs that somewhat helped provide some clarity. The model describes broad conformance to REST in three levels, with each level being more mature than the preceding one:

1. **Resources:** TODO
2. **HTTP Verbs:** TODO
3. **Hypermedia controls:** TODO

Most web service based solutions that claim to be RESTful seem to stop at level 2. Roy Fielding, the inventor of REST seems to claim that [REST APIs must be hypertext-driven](#)<sup>[1]</sup>. In our opinion, the use of hypertext controls in APIs allows them to become self-documenting and thereby promotes the use of the ubiquitous language more explicitly. More importantly, it also indicates what operations are applicable for a given resource at that time in its lifecycle. For example, let's look at a sample response where all pending LC applications are listed:

```

GET /lc-applications?status=pending HTTP/1.1
Content-Type: application/json

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Content-Type: application/prs.hal-forms+json
{
  "_embedded" : {
    "lc-applications" : [
      {
        "clientReference" : "Test LC",
        "_links" : {
          "self" : {
            "href" : "/lc-applications/582fe5f8"
          },
          "submit" : {
            "href" : "/lc-applications/582fe5f8/submit"
          }
        }
      },
      {
        "clientReference" : "Another LC",
        "_links" : {
          "self" : {
            "href" : "/lc-applications/7689da3e"
          },
          "approve" : {
            "href" : "/lc-applications/7689da3e/approve"
          },
          "reject" : {
            "href" : "/lc-applications/7689da3e/reject"
          }
        }
      }
    ]
  }
}

```

In the example above, the first LC application needs to be **submitted**, whereas the second application needs to either be **approved** or **rejected** (presumably because it has already been submitted). Notice how the response also does not need to include a **status** attribute so that they can use this to deduce which operations are relevant for LC application at that time. While this may be a subtle nuance, we felt that it is valuable to point out in the context of our DDD journey.

We have looked at a few considerations when moving from an in-process out-of-process API. There are quite a few other considerations, specifically pertaining to non-functional requirements (such as performance, resilience, error handling, etc.) We will look at these in more detail in Chapter 11.

Now that we have a handle on how we can work with APIs that interact with the front-end, let's look at how we can handle event publication and consumption **remotely**.



## Changes for event interactions

Currently, our application publishes and consumes domain events over an in-process bus that the Axon framework makes available.

We publish events when processing commands:

*Event publishing when processing a command*

```
class LCApplication {  
  
    // Boilerplate code omitted for brevity  
    @CommandHandler  
    public LCApplication(StartNewLCApplicationCommand command) {  
        //...  
        AggregateLifecycle.apply(new LCApplicationStartedEvent(command.getId(),  
            command.getApplicantId(), command.getClientReference(), LCState.DRAFT  
    ));  
    }  
}
```

and consume events to expose query APIs:

*Event consumption to populate the query store*

```
class LCApplicationSummaryEventHandler {  
  
    // Boilerplate code omitted for brevity  
  
    @EventHandler  
    public void on(LCApplicationStartedEvent event) {  
        //...  
    }  
}
```

In order to process events remotely, we need to introduce an explicit infrastructure component in the form of an event bus. Common options include message brokers like ActiveMQ, RabbitMQ or a distributed event streaming platform like Apache Kafka. Application components can continue to publish and consume events as before—only now they will happen using an out-of-process invocation style. Logically, this causes our application to now look something like this:






Figure 3. Out of process event bus introduced

When working with events within the confines of a single process, assuming synchronous processing (event publishing and consumption on the same thread), we do not encounter a majority of problems that only become apparent when the publisher and the consumer are distributed across multiple processes. Let's examine some of these in more detail next.

### Atomicity guarantees

Previously, when the publisher processed a command by publishing an event and the consumer(s) handled it, transaction processing occurred as a single atomic unit as shown here:




Figure 4. ACID transaction processing within the monolith

Notice how all the highlighted operations in the diagram above happen as part of a single database transaction. This allowed the system to be strongly consistent end-to-end. When the event bus is distributed to work within its own process, atomicity cannot be guaranteed like it was previously. Each of the above numbered operations work as independent transactions. This means that they can fail independently, which can lead to data inconsistencies.

To solve this problem, let's look at each step in the process in more detail, starting with command processing as shown here:




Figure 5. Command processing transaction semantics

Consider the situation where we save to the database, but fail to publish the event. Consumers will remain oblivious of the event occurring and become inconsistent. On the flip side, if we publish the event but fail to save in the database, the command processing side itself becomes inconsistent. Not to mention that the query side now thinks that a domain event occurred, when in fact it did not.

Again, this leads to inconsistency. This **dual-write** problem is fairly common in distributed event-driven applications. If command processing has to work in a foolproof manner, saving to the database and the publishing to the event bus have to happen atomically - both operations should succeed or fail in unison. Here are a few solutions that we have used to solve this issue (in increasing order of complexity):

1. **Do nothing:** It is arguable that this approach is not really a solution, however it may be the only placeholder until a more robust solution is in place. While it may be puzzling to see this being listed as an option, we have seen several occasions where this is indeed how event-driven systems have been implemented. We leave this here as a word of caution so that teams become cognizant of the pitfalls.
2. **Transaction synchronization:** In this approach, multiple resource managers are synchronized in a way that failure in any one system, triggers a cleanup in the others where the transaction has already been committed. It is pertinent to note that this may not be foolproof in that it may lead to cascading failures.



The spring framework provides support for this style of behavior through the `TransactionSynchronization` and the now deprecated `ChainedTransactionManager` interfaces. Please refer to the framework documentation for more details. Needless to say, this interface should not be used without careful consideration to business requirements.

3. **Distributed transactions:** Another approach is to make use of distributed transactions and [two-phase commit](#)<sup>[2]</sup>. Typically, this functionality is implemented using pessimistic locking on the underlying resource managers (databases) and may present scaling challenges in highly concurrent environments.
4. **Transactional outbox:** All the above methods are not completely foolproof in the sense that there still exists a window of opportunity where the database and the event bus can become inconsistent (this is true even with two-phase commits). One way to circumvent this problem is by completely eliminating the dual-write problem. In this solution, the command processor writes to its database and the intended event to an *outbox* table in a local transaction. A separate poller component polls the outbox table and writes to the event bus. Polling can be computationally intensive and may again lead back to the dual write problem because the poller has to keep track of the last written event. This may be avoided by making event processing idempotent on the consumer so that processing duplicate events do not cause issues. In extremely high Another way to mitigate this issue is to use a change data capture (CDC) tool (like [Debezium](#)<sup>[3]</sup>). Most modern databases ship with tools to make this easier and may be worth exploring. Here is one way to implement this using the *transactional outbox pattern* as shown here:




Figure 6. Transactional outbox

The transactional outbox is a robust approach to dealing with the dual write problem. But it also introduces a non-trivial amount of operational complexity. In one of our previous implementations, we made use of the transactional synchronization to ensure that we never missed writes to the database. We also ensured that the event bus was highly available through redundancy on both the compute and storage tiers, and most importantly by avoiding **any** business logic on the event bus.

## Delivery guarantees

Previously, because all of our components worked within a single process, delivery of events to the consumers was guaranteed at least as long as the process stayed alive. Even if event processing failed on the consumer side, it was fairly straightforward to detect the failure because exception handling was fairly straightforward. Furthermore, rollbacks were straightforward because the production and consumption of events happened as part of a single database transaction. With the LC processing application now becoming a remote component, event delivery becomes a lot more challenging. When it comes to message delivery semantics, there are three basic categories:

1. **At-most once** delivery means that each message may be delivered once or not at all. This style of delivery is arguably the easiest to implement because the producer creates messages in a fire and forget fashion. This may be okay in environments where loss of some messages may be tolerated. For example, data from click-stream analytics or logging might fall in this category.
2. **At-least once** delivery means that each message may be delivered more than once with no messages being lost. Undelivered messages are retried to be delivered — potentially infinitely. This style of delivery may be required when it is not feasible to lose messages, but where it may be tolerable to process the same message more than once. For example, analytical environments may tolerate duplicate message delivery or have duplicate detection logic to discard already processed messages.
3. **Exactly once** delivery means that each message is delivered exactly once without either being lost or duplicated. This style of message delivery is extremely hard to implement and a lot of solutions may approach exactly once semantics with some implementation help from the consumers where duplicate messages are detected and discarded with the producer sticking to at least once delivery semantics.

For the purposes of domain event processing, most teams will obviously prefer to have exactly once

processing semantics, given that they would not want to lose any of these events. However, given the practical difficulties guaranteeing *exactly once* semantics, it is not unusual to approach exactly once processing by having the consumers process events in an idempotent manner or designing events to make it easier to detect errors. For example, consider a `MonetaryAmountWithdrawn` event, which includes the `accountId` and the `withdrawalAmount`. This event may carry an additional `currentBalance` attribute so that the consumer may know if they are out of sync with the producer when processing the withdrawal. Another way to do this might be for the consumer to keep track of the last "n" events processed. When processing an event, the consumer can check if this event has already been processed. If so, they can detect it as a duplicate and simply discard it. All the above methods again add a level of complexity to the overall system. Despite all these safeguards, consumers may still find themselves out of sync with the system of record (the command side that produces the event). If so, as a last resort, it may be required to use a partial or full [event replays](#) which was discussed in Chapter 7.

## Ordering guarantees

In an event-driven system like the one we are building, it is desirable for consumers to receive events in a deterministic order. Not knowing the order or receiving it in the wrong order may result in inaccurate outcomes. Consider the example of an `LCApplicationAddressChangedEvent` occurring twice in *quick succession*. If these changes are processed in the wrong order, we may end up displaying the wrong address as their current one. This does not necessarily mean that events need to be ordered for all use cases. Consider another example where we receive an `LCApplicationSubmittedEvent` more than once erroneously when it is not possible to submit a given LC application more than once. All such notifications after the first may be ignored.

As a consumer it is important to know if events will be ordered or not, so that we can make design considerations for out-of-order events. One default might be to accommodate for out-of-order events as a default. In our experience, this does tend to make the resulting design more complicated, especially in cases where the order does matter. We discuss three event ordering strategies and their implications for both the producer and the consumer here:

Strategy	Producer	Event Bus	Consumer
<b>No ordering</b>	Arguably the easiest to implement because there is no expectation from the producer to support ordering.	Without additional metadata, the event bus may only be able to guarantee ordering in the sequence of receipt (FIFO order).	If the consumer depends on ordering, it may have to implement ordering through some form of special processing.
<b>Per aggregate ordering</b>	The producer needs to make sure that each event includes an identifier to enable grouping by aggregate.	The event bus needs to support the notion of grouping (in this case by the aggregate identifier). For events belonging to the same aggregate instance, messages are emitted in FIFO order.	To guarantee ordering, events originating from the same aggregate instance need to be processed by the same consumer instance.



Strategy	Producer	Event Bus	Consumer
<b>Global ordering</b>	The producer needs to make sure that each event includes a sequence number.	Either the event bus or the consumer need to implement ordering logic.	

## Durability and persistence guarantees

When an event is published to the event bus, the happy path scenario is that the intended consumer(s) are able to process it successfully. However, there are scenarios that may cause message processing to be impacted adversely. Let's examine each of these scenarios:

- **Slow consumer:** The consumer is unable to process events as fast as the producers are publishing them.
- **Offline consumer:** The consumer is unavailable (down) at the time of the events being published.
- **Failing consumer:** The consumer is experiencing errors when trying to process events.

In each of these cases, there can develop a backlog of unprocessed events. Because these are domain events, we need to prevent the loss of these events until the consumer has been able to process them successfully. There are two communication characteristics that need to be true for this to work successfully:




Figure 7. Persistence versus durability

1. **Persistence:** the communication style between the publisher and the event bus.
2. **Durability:** the communication style between the event bus and the consumer.

Firstly, messages need to be persistent (stored on disk) and secondly the message subscription (relationship between the consumer and the event bus) needs to be durable (persist across event bus restarts). It is important to note that events have to be made persistent by the producer for them to be consumed durably by the consumer.

## Processing guarantees

When an event is processed by the query side component as shown here, the following steps occur:




Figure 8. Event processing failure scenarios

1. The event is consumed (either through a push or a pull) from the event bus
2. Transformation logic is applied on the payload of the event
3. The transformed payload is saved in the query side store.

Each of these steps can encounter failures. Irrespective of the cause of failure, the event should be durable (as discussed above) so that it can be processed later when the issue is fixed. These errors can be broadly segregated into four categories:

Error Cause	Example	Remediation
<b>Transient</b>	Network blip resulting in temporary connectivity issues to either the event bus or the query store.	A finite number of retries potentially with a backoff strategy before giving up with either a fatal error.
<b>Configuration</b>	Event bus or database URL misconfiguration.	Manual intervention with updated configuration and/or restart.
<b>Code Logic</b>	Implementation bugs either in the transformation logic.	Manual intervention with updated logic and redeployment
<b>Data</b>	Unexpected or erroneous data in the event payload.	Manual intervention that requires segregating spurious data (for example, by automatically moving problematic events to a <i>dead letter queue</i> ) and/or fixing code logic.

We have now looked at the changes that we need to make because of the introduction of an out-of-process event bus. Having done this allows us to actually extract the LC application processing component into its own independently deployable unit, which will look something like this:






Figure 9. LC Application processing deployed independently

However, we are continuing to use a common datastore for the LC application processing component. Let's look at what is involved in segregating this into its own store.

## Changes for database interactions

While we have extracted our application component into its own unit, we continue to be coupled at the database tier. If we are to achieve true independence from the monolith, we need to break this database dependency. Let's look at the changes involved in making this happen.

### Data migration

As a first step to start using a database of our own, we will need to start migrating data from the command side event store and the query store(s) as shown here:




Figure 10. Data migration

In our case, we have the command side event store and the query store(s) that will need to be migrated out. To minimize effort at the outset, it might be prudent to do a simple homogenous migration by keeping the source and target database technologies identical. In advance of the cut-over, among other things, it will be essential to:

- **Profile** to make sure that latency numbers are within tolerable limits/
- **Test** to make sure that the data has migrated correctly.
- **Minimize downtime** by understanding and agreeing on **SLAs** such as RTO (Recovery Time Objective) and RPO (Recovery Point Objective).

## Cut-over

If we have made it thus far, we are now ready to complete the migration of the LC application processing from the rest of the monolith. The logical architecture of our solution now looks like the diagram shown here:




Figure 11. Independent data persistence

With this step, we have successfully completed the migration of our first component. There is still quite a lot of work to do. Arguably, our component was already well-structured and loosely coupled from the rest of the application. Despite that, moving from an in-process to an out-of-process model between bounded contexts is quite an involved process — as should be evident from the work we have done in this chapter.

## Summary

In this chapter, we learnt how we can extract a bounded context from an existing monolith, although one could argue that this was from a reasonably well-structured one. You should have an understanding of what it takes to go from in-process event-driven application to a distributed one.

In the next chapter, we will look at how to extract pieces out of a monolith that may not be as well-structured, possibly very close to the dreaded big ball of mud.

[1] <https://roy.gbiv.com/untangled/2008/rest-apis-must-be-hypertext-driven>

[2] <https://martinfowler.com/articles/patterns-of-distributed-systems/two-phase-commit.html>

[3] <https://debezium.io/>