

Workshop Experiencing Domain Driven Design

- Cursusgever: Mattias Verraes http://verraes.net/#talks
- "Workshop" van drie dagen.
- Programma dag 1: Intro / Systems thinking, Event storming..
- Programma dag 2 (n.a.v. voting): "Heuristics", Boeken, Context mapping.
- Programma dag 3: Event sourcing, CQRS, Event store, Model storming.

Domain Driven Design





Domain Driven Design Summary

• Summary "Domain Driven Design Quickly"

Domain-Driven Design Quickly

A Summary of Eric Evans' Domain-Driven Design



DDD

- Supple design
- Declarative design
- Refactoring
- Bounded contexts
- Distillation
- Large-scale structure
- Modelling whirlpool
- Model storming

Event storming

- Alberto Brandolini (link: here)
- Important events for the business.
- Events ==> Past tense and in the
 Ubiquitious language.
- No consensus first, better to have alternatives.









• Happened in the past (expressed in past form: A car was rented,

Customer has subscribed)

• Happened in the past (expressed in past form: A car was rented,

Customer has subscribed)

• Interest the business

• Happened in the past (expressed in past form: A car was rented,

Customer has subscribed)

- Interest the business
- Expressed in Ubiquitous language

• Happened in the past (expressed in past form: A car was rented,

Customer has subscribed)

- Interest the business
- Expressed in Ubiquitous language

<u>NO</u> technical events like Network is down, Transaction has failed...



2) Find Commands

• Expressed in imperative phrase (Rent a car, Subscribe..)

- Expressed in imperative phrase (Rent a car, Subscribe..)
- They express intent/cause for the business

- Expressed in imperative phrase (Rent a car, Subscribe..)
- They express intent/cause for the business
- They can fail

- Expressed in imperative phrase (Rent a car, Subscribe..)
- They express intent/cause for the business
- They can fail
- Multiple outcomes (including exceptions)

- Expressed in imperative phrase (Rent a car, Subscribe..)
- They express intent/cause for the business
- They can fail
- Multiple outcomes (including exceptions)
- Possible sources: human, time, process.





3) Discover Bounded Contexts

• Explicit boundary between domain models.



3) Discover Bounded Contexts

- Explicit boundary between domain models.
- Each context has it's unique ubiquitious language

3) Discover Bounded Contexts

- Explicit boundary between domain models.
- Each context has it's unique ubiquitious language
- Example: Fleet Management, Scheduling, ..





4) Find Business rules / decisions

• Put them on the map to make the different scenarios explicit

4) Find Business rules / decisions

- Put them on the map to make the different scenarios explicit
- Example: An already cancelled reservation cannot be cancelled anymore



5) Group events that influence decision

 Aggregate is a group of objects that work together and are treated as a unit.

- Aggregate is a group of objects that work together and are treated as a unit.
- Provide a specific functionality.

- Aggregate is a group of objects that work together and are treated as a unit.
- Provide a specific functionality.
- *Transactional*

- Aggregate is a group of objects that work together and are treated as a unit.
- Provide a specific functionality.
- *Transactional*
- *Cohesive*



Heuristics

Heuristics are different approaches we want to confront with while building our models so that we can push our mind to influence our design in different directions.

Heuristics

Heuristics are different approaches we want to confront with while building our models so that we can push our mind to influence our design in different directions. All those heuristics lead us to try different models and throw them away at each time until we are happy with our model.

Heuristics 1/5

• Stable (static data) vs Volatile (changing data);

Heuristics 1/5

- Stable (static data) vs Volatile (changing data);
- Type (hierarchy of objects) vs Properties (of an object);

Heuristics 1/5

- Stable (static data) vs Volatile (changing data);
- Type (hierarchy of objects) vs Properties (of an object);
- Actor vs Roles;

Heuristics 1/5

- Stable (static data) vs Volatile (changing data);
- Type (hierarchy of objects) vs Properties (of an object);
- Actor vs Roles;
- Change together vs change separately;
- Stable (static data) vs Volatile (changing data);
- Type (hierarchy of objects) vs Properties (of an object);
- Actor vs Roles;
- Change together vs change separately;
- Different lifecycle dependencies;

- Stable (static data) vs Volatile (changing data);
- Type (hierarchy of objects) vs Properties (of an object);
- Actor vs Roles;
- Change together vs change separately;
- Different lifecycle dependencies;
- Immutable vs Mutable;

- Stable (static data) vs Volatile (changing data);
- Type (hierarchy of objects) vs Properties (of an object);
- Actor vs Roles;
- Change together vs change separately;
- Different lifecycle dependencies;
- Immutable vs Mutable;
- Immutability within a context only;

- Stable (static data) vs Volatile (changing data);
- Type (hierarchy of objects) vs Properties (of an object);
- Actor vs Roles;
- Change together vs change separately;
- Different lifecycle dependencies;
- Immutable vs Mutable;
- Immutability within a context only;
- Retroactive Business rules;



Heuristics 2/5

• Cohesive vs Decoupled;

- Cohesive vs Decoupled;
- Afferent coupling (things that are coupled to me) vs Efferent coupling (things that I couple to); Noun < Sentences < Phrases;

- Cohesive vs Decoupled;
- Afferent coupling (things that are coupled to me) vs Efferent coupling (things that I couple to); Noun < Sentences < Phrases;
- Follow the money;

- Cohesive vs Decoupled;
- Afferent coupling (things that are coupled to me) vs Efferent coupling (things that I couple to); Noun < Sentences < Phrases;
- Follow the money;
- Use personas;



Heuristics 3/5

3 archetypes we find in almost every software :

Heuristics 3/5

3 archetypes we find in almost every software :

• Collaborative construction;

Heuristics 3/5

3 archetypes we find in almost every software :

- Collaborative construction;
- Execution;

Heuristics 3/5

3 archetypes we find in almost every software :

- Collaborative construction;
- Execution;
- Business intelligence *tracking* monitoring;



Heuristics 4/5

• Consistency

- Consistency
- Same rules but different semantics;

- Consistency
- Same rules but different semantics;
- Warnings vs errors;

Heuristics 4/5

- Consistency
- Same rules but different semantics;
- Warnings vs errors;
- Synchronous (ordered) vs Asynchronous (unordered) [on a business point

of view, not a technical one]; Happy path vs divergent path;

Heuristics 4/5

- Consistency
- Same rules but different semantics;
- Warnings vs errors;
- Synchronous (ordered) vs Asynchronous (unordered) [on a business point

of view, not a technical one]; Happy path vs divergent path;

• Responsibility Layers (see Evans);

Heuristics 4/5

- Consistency
- Same rules but different semantics;
- Warnings vs errors;
- Synchronous (ordered) vs Asynchronous (unordered) [on a business point

of view, not a technical one]; Happy path vs divergent path;

- Responsibility Layers (see Evans);
- Atomicity / Transactionality;

Heuristics 4/5

- Consistency
- Same rules but different semantics;
- Warnings vs errors;
- Synchronous (ordered) vs Asynchronous (unordered) [on a business point

of view, not a technical one]; Happy path vs divergent path;

- Responsibility Layers (see Evans);
- Atomicity / Transactionality;
- Risks;



Heuristics 5/5

 Strictness (do we restrict user) vs Allow the user to abuse the system and monitor the abuse;



- Strictness (do we restrict user) vs Allow the user to abuse the system and monitor the abuse;
- Start from the end;

- Strictness (do we restrict user) vs Allow the user to abuse the system and monitor the abuse;
- Start from the end;
- Let the human do it;

Brownfield DDD

Start by drawing the Current Model and the Desired Model. Make a small step toward the Desired Model. Throw away both drawing models regularly while in the process of leading the current model to the desired model, so that desired model also evolved with the maturity of our understanding.

Brownfield DDD

Have a wall were people write identified Technical Debt. Each time someone stumble upon the same debt, put a dot in front of it. This helps us identify the most critical debt.



How do our different contexts communicate?

Context Mapping

How do our different contexts communicate?

Relationships fall into repeatable patterns..



• Shared kernel

- Shared kernel
- Customer / supplier

- Shared kernel
- Customer / supplier
- Published language ("language from a long running domain")

- Shared kernel
- Customer / supplier
- Published language ("language from a long running domain")
- Partnership

- Shared kernel
- Customer / supplier
- Published language ("language from a long running domain")
- Partnership
- Separate ways (rebuild the stuff you need)

• Anticorruption layer (translate from upstream to downstream model)

- Anticorruption layer (translate from upstream to downstream model)
- Conformist (mimic upstream model)

- Anticorruption layer (translate from upstream to downstream model)
- Conformist (mimic upstream model)
- Open Host Service (public 3rd party api we cannot influence (google maps)).

- Anticorruption layer (translate from upstream to downstream model)
- Conformist (mimic upstream model)
- Open Host Service (public 3rd party api we cannot influence (google maps)).
- Big Ball of Mud

- Anticorruption layer (translate from upstream to downstream model)
- Conformist (mimic upstream model)
- Open Host Service (public 3rd party api we cannot influence (google maps)).
- Big Ball of Mud
- Put yourself on the map
CQRS

CQRS challenge the assumption that reading and writing are supposed to share the same abstractions & models & databases & applications.

CQRS

CQRS challenge the assumption that reading and writing are supposed to share the same abstractions & models & databases & applications. So in short : "Split Write Model and Read Models"

75

CQRS

CQRS challenge the assumption that reading and writing are supposed to share the same abstractions & models & databases & applications. So in short : "Split Write Model and Read Models" The presentation : https://speakerdeck.com/mathiasverraes/fighting-

bottlenecks-with-cqrs



Using object's *history* to reconstitute its *state*. The history is expressed as a series of Domain events.

Using object's *history* to reconstitute its *state*. The history is expressed as a series of Domain events.

The aggregate records events and protect invariant but does not expose the state. Aggregate is the write model. State is exposed by projector (one of the read models).

Using object's *history* to reconstitute its *state*. The history is expressed as a series of Domain events.

The aggregate records events and protect invariant but does not expose the state. Aggregate is the write model. State is exposed by projector

(one of the read models).

The presentation and some code at

https://speakerdeck.com/mathiasverraes/practical-event-sourcing

Do not put invariant in the apply method because you couldn't restore the aggregate anymore if invariant change. It is then possible to have aggregate that do not comply with new invariants and it is a business decision to know what to do with these.



Projectors should be easy to write. Don't use an ORM here since they will slow the process down.

81

Testing the write model is like:

- Given { previous events }
- When { command }
- Then { expected new events or expected exception }

Testing projector / read model is like:

- Given { previous events }
- Then { expected states }



