# Project Structure Idioms and suggestions from the Go community

Colton J. McCurdy

**McCurdyColton** 

**Detroit Go Meetup** 

November 19th, 2019

## Credit Due

- https://changelog.com/gotime/102
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oL6JBUk6tj0

- Building a mental model / Readability
- Standardization
  - Reduce project on-boarding costs
  - $\cdot$  Logging, monitoring and alerting
- Reduce code duplication where appropriate
- Help manage dependencies
  - Specific and non-specific to Go
  - ullet In Go, this is a compilation error
  - This was actually the motivation for creating Go

- · Building a mental model / Readability
- Standardization
  - Reduce project on-boarding costs
  - Logging, monitoring and alerting
- Reduce code duplication where appropriate
- Help manage dependencies
  - Specific and non-specific to Go
  - In Go, this is a compilation error
  - This was actually the motivation for creating Go

- Building a mental model / Readability
- Standardization
  - Reduce project on-boarding costs
  - Logging, monitoring and alerting
- Reduce code duplication where appropriate
- Help manage dependencies
  - Specific and non-specific to Go
  - · In Go, this is a compilation error
  - This was actually the motivation for creating Go

- Building a mental model / Readability
- Standardization
  - Reduce project on-boarding costs
  - Logging, monitoring and alerting
- Reduce code duplication where appropriate
- Help manage dependencies
  - Specific and non-specific to Go
  - In Go, this is a compilation error
  - This was actually the motivation for creating Go

- Building a mental model / Readability
- Standardization
  - Reduce project on-boarding costs
  - Logging, monitoring and alerting
- Reduce code duplication where appropriate
- Help manage dependencies
  - Specific and non-specific to Go
  - In Go, this is a compilation error
  - · This was actually the motivation for creating Go

Ultimately, speed

Now and in the future

Ultimately, speed

Now and in the future

Before spending months on design, consider:

Context

- What problem(s) are you trying to solve?
- Will the project grow? How will it grow?
- Lifetime?
  - Of the problem and the project
  - Product-market fit?
- Who are your users?
  - Open-source library?
  - Public API for your company?
  - Internal tool or API at your company?
- How many users?
  - Library for Kubernetes?

- What problem(s) are you trying to solve?
- · Will the project grow? How will it grow?
- Lifetime:
  - Of the problem and the project
  - Product-market fit?
- Who are your users?
  - Open-source library?
  - Public API for your company?
  - Internal tool or API at your company?
- How many users?
  - Library for Kubernetes?

- What problem(s) are you trying to solve?
- · Will the project grow? How will it grow?
- · Lifetime?
  - Of the problem and the project
  - Product-market fit?
- Who are your users?
  - Open-source library?
  - Public API for your company:
  - Internal tool or API at your company?
- How many users?
  - Library for Kubernetes?

- What problem(s) are you trying to solve?
- · Will the project grow? How will it grow?
- · Lifetime?
  - Of the problem and the project
  - Product-market fit?
- Who are your users?
  - Open-source library?
  - Public API for your company?
  - Internal tool or API at your company?
- How many users?
  - Library for Kubernetes?

- What problem(s) are you trying to solve?
- · Will the project grow? How will it grow?
- · Lifetime?
  - Of the problem and the project
  - Product-market fit?
- Who are your users?
  - Open-source library?
  - Public API for your company?
  - Internal tool or API at your company?
- How many users?
  - Library for Kubernetes?

Before spending months on design, consider:

Design importance **fluctuates** based on the context.

- Structure / abstractions will emerge
- Rewrites are fine and often necessary
- Organizations and technologies will change
  - This will render your abstraction as useless
  - Or will make updating technologies difficult
  - Conway's Law
    - Organizations design systems that mirror their own communication structure

- Structure / abstractions will emerge
- · Rewrites are fine and often necessary
- Organizations and technologies will change
  - This will render your abstraction as useless
  - Or will make updating technologies difficult
  - Conway's Law
    - Organizations design systems that mirror their own communication structure

- Structure / abstractions will emerge
- Rewrites are fine and often necessary
- Organizations and technologies will change
  - This will render your abstraction as useless
  - · Or will make updating technologies difficult
  - Conway's Law
    - Organizations design systems that mirror their own communication structure

- Structure / abstractions will emerge
- Rewrites are fine and often necessary
- Organizations and technologies will change
  - This will render your abstraction as useless
  - Or will make updating technologies difficult
  - Conway's Law
    - Organizations design systems that mirror their own communication structure

# Go Background

```
pkg/
    a/
      a.go # package a
    b/
      b.go # package b
$ cat pkg/a/a.go
package a
import "b"
$ cat pkg/b/b.go
package b
import "a"
```

# Go Background

```
pkg/
    a/
      a.go # package a
    b/
      b.go # package b
$ cat pkg/a/a.go
package a
import "b"
$ cat pkg/b/b.go
package b
import "a" <---- "import cycle not allowed"</pre>
```

## Go Background

- Appreciate the "import cycle not allowed" error
- If you're fighting this error, consider a redesign or refactor
- Dependency management packages are dependencies — is important

Rob Pike comparing compilation times from C++ to Go

"...turns minutes into seconds, coffee breaks into interactive builds" - Rob Pike at SPLASH 2012

- No wrong "solution", just possibly better "solutions"
- "Bad" abstractions are worse than no abstractions
- It's important to understand the flow of requests
- Part of learning is discovering what doesn't work

- · No wrong "solution", just possibly better "solutions"
- · "Bad" abstractions are worse than no abstractions
- It's important to understand the flow of requests
- Part of learning is discovering what doesn't work

- No wrong "solution", just possibly better "solutions"
- · "Bad" abstractions are worse than no abstractions
- It's important to understand the flow of requests
- $\cdot$  Part of learning is discovering what doesn't work

- No wrong "solution", just possibly better "solutions"
- · "Bad" abstractions are worse than no abstractions
- It's important to understand the flow of requests
- Part of learning is discovering what doesn't work

## **Abstractions**

What are we trying to solve with abstractions?

- Efficient mental model building
- Readability
- Reduce code duplication
- · Ultimately, speed

#### Where do I put ...

- Tests
  - No tests/
  - name\_test.go files remain in the package with the related name.go file
- cmd/
  - Multiple binaries / "entrypoints"
- internal/ VS pkg/
  - internal/ "ensures that changes to the API of internal packages will never break an external application"
- · Where do I put everything else?
  - Dockerfile, README.md, dotfiles, etc.

- No package abstractions
- Everything is in package main
  - No "import cycle" errors
- ullet This is a great starting place

- · No package abstractions
- Everything is in package main
  - · No "import cycle" errors
- $\cdot$  This is a great starting place

- No package abstractions
- Everything is in package main
  - No "import cycle" errors
- This is a great starting place

```
main.go
server.go
database.go
thing1.go # model, view and controller code
thing1_test.go
thing2.go # model, view and controller code
thing2_test.go
```

1. Flat Structure (i.e., "abstractionless")

#### A few open-source examples

- github.com/Jguer/yay
- github.com/gorilla/mux
- github.com/sirupsen/logrus

1. Flat Structure (i.e., "abstractionless")

#### **Challenges:**

- Mental model construction is difficult from project structure alone
  - Ineffective display of "grouping", layering and request flow
- Readability

These become more true as the project grows in size.

1. Flat Structure (i.e., "abstractionless")

#### **Challenges:**

- Mental model construction is difficult from project structure alone
  - Ineffective display of "grouping", layering and request flow
- Readability

These become more true as the project grows in size.

1. Flat Structure (i.e., "abstractionless")

#### **Challenges:**

- Mental model construction is difficult from project structure alone
  - Ineffective display of "grouping", layering and request flow
- Readability

These become more true as the project grows in size.

1. Flat Structure (i.e., "abstractionless")

#### **Challenges:**

- Mental model construction is difficult from project structure alone
  - Ineffective display of "grouping", layering and request flow
- Readability

These become more true as the **project grows in size**.

1. Flat Structure (i.e., "abstractionless")

- Immediately tackling the problem(s) at hand
- Gives abstractions time to emerge, if they exist
- Easy to build abstractions from this point

1. Flat Structure (i.e., "abstractionless")

- Immediately tackling the problem(s) at hand
- Gives abstractions time to emerge, if they exist
- Easy to build abstractions from this point

1. Flat Structure (i.e., "abstractionless")

- Immediately tackling the problem(s) at hand
- · Gives abstractions time to emerge, if they exist
- Easy to build abstractions from this point

1. Flat Structure (i.e., "abstractionless")

- Immediately tackling the problem(s) at hand
- · Gives abstractions time to emerge, if they exist
- · Easy to build abstractions from this point

#### 2. Model-View-Controller (MVC)

```
main.go
pkg/
  handlers/ # package handlers
    thing1.go
    thing2.go
  database/ # package database
    database.go
  models/ # package models
    thing1.go
    thing2.go
  responses/ # package responses
    thing1.go
    thing2.go
```

2. Model-View-Controller (MVC)

#### **Challenges:**

- Code duplication to avoid circular dependencies
  - You will most likely have a model and response for the same type that are tightly-coupled
  - · Controller calls models and builds a view
- Related "things" are "far"

2. Model-View-Controller (MVC)

#### **Challenges:**

- Code duplication to avoid circular dependencies
  - You will most likely have a model and response for the same type that are tightly-coupled
  - · Controller calls models and builds a view
- Related "things" are "far"

2. Model-View-Controller (MVC)

#### **Challenges:**

- Code duplication to avoid circular dependencies
  - You will most likely have a model and response for the same type that are tightly-coupled
  - · Controller calls models and builds a view
- Related "things" are "far"

2. Model-View-Controller (MVC)

- Centralized logic for interacting with a data store
  - Easier to swap technologies (e.g., PostgreSQL to MySQL), if you have abstracted the technology away from the model
- Standard outside of Go
- Related "things" are "close"

2. Model-View-Controller (MVC)

- Centralized logic for interacting with a data store
  - Easier to swap technologies (e.g., PostgreSQL to MySQL), if you have abstracted the technology away from the model
- Standard outside of Go
- Related "things" are "close"

2. Model-View-Controller (MVC)

- Centralized logic for interacting with a data store
  - Easier to swap technologies (e.g., PostgreSQL to MySQL), if you have abstracted the technology away from the model
- Standard outside of Go
- Related "things" are "close"

2. Model-View-Controller (MVC)

- Centralized logic for interacting with a data store
  - Easier to swap technologies (e.g., PostgreSQL to MySQL), if you have abstracted the technology away from the model
- Standard outside of Go
- Related "things" are "close"

#### **Addition Patterns**

- Domain-driven design (DDD)
  - Similar goals to micro-services
  - Separating parts of the business
  - Domain-specific logic (i.e., for this service, let's do retries)
- Hexagonal architecture

#### **Addition Patterns**

- Domain-driven design (DDD)
  - Similar goals to micro-services
  - Separating parts of the business
  - Domain-specific logic (i.e., for this service, let's do retries)
- Hexagonal architecture

# My Framework

How I learned (and continue to learn)

- Go Package-focused design
- Ben Johnson's blog posts
  - Standard Package Layout
  - Structuring Applications in Go
- github.com/golang-standards/project-layout

I failed (and still fail), a lot

# My Framework

How I learned (and continue to learn)

- Go Package-focused design
- Ben Johnson's blog posts
  - Standard Package Layout
  - Structuring Applications in Go
- github.com/golang-standards/project-layout

I failed (and still fail), a lot

# My Framework

How I approach new projects

- Find an open-source example and refer (don't copy) its design
  - Kubernetes, Docker, Yay, FZF, HashiCorp/\*, etc.
  - github.com/trending/go?since=weekly
  - Go's stdlib github.com/golang/go

Standardize or should leave experimentation up to teams?

- Context
  - How many teams?
  - How many repositories?
    - single-digits? tens? thousands?
- · For adoption, having a standard in place is necessary
  - · Define the "paved path"
- Can't deviate from the standard creates barriers
  - Very few people making improvements

Standardize or should leave experimentation up to teams?

- Context
  - How many teams?
  - · How many repositories?
    - single-digits? tens? thousands?
- · For adoption, having a standard in place is necessary
  - Define the "paved path"
- Can't deviate from the standard creates barriers
  - Very few people making improvements

Standardize or should leave experimentation up to teams?

- Context
  - How many teams?
  - · How many repositories?
    - single-digits? tens? thousands?
- · For adoption, having a standard in place is necessary
  - · Define the "paved path"
- Can't deviate from the standard creates barriers
  - Very few people making improvements

Standardize or should leave experimentation up to teams?

- Context
  - How many teams?
  - · How many repositories?
    - single-digits? tens? thousands?
- · For adoption, having a standard in place is necessary
  - · Define the "paved path"
- · Can't deviate from the standard creates barriers
  - Very few people making improvements

Standardize or should leave experimentation up to teams?

- Context
  - How many teams?
  - · How many repositories?
    - single-digits? tens? thousands?
- · For adoption, having a standard in place is necessary
  - · Define the "paved path"
- Can't deviate from the standard creates barriers
  - Very few people making improvements

# Conclusion

There is no one "correct" design