

ECE 473/573
Cloud Computing and Cloud Native Systems
Lecture 18 Loose Coupling

Professor Jia Wang
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Illinois Institute of Technology

October 23, 2024

Tight Coupling

Communication Patterns

Reading Assignment

- ▶ This lecture: 8
- ▶ Next Lecture: Apache Kafka
<https://kafka.apache.org/documentation/#design>

Tight Coupling

Communication Patterns

Coupling

- ▶ Degree of direct knowledge between components.
 - ▶ E.g. a client that sends requests to a service.
 - ▶ Cannot be avoided for a system to function.
- ▶ Tightly coupled: a great deal of knowledge.
 - ▶ E.g. to require same version of shared library.
 - ▶ An easy choice for short-term.
 - ▶ Problematic for long-term evolutions – one must change all tightly coupled components at the same time.
- ▶ Loosely coupled: minimal direct knowledge.
 - ▶ Components are relatively independent, interacting through mechanisms that are stable and mature.
 - ▶ Require more up-front planning but easier to upgrade or even be rewritten, without affecting existing systems.

Forms of Tight Coupling

- ▶ Things that are wrongly assumed to not change.
 - ▶ Modern software engineering practices are based on the assumption that requirements will change frequently.
- ▶ Fragile exchange protocols
 - ▶ Clients and servers communicating via SOAP/XML messages rely on strict formats that cannot be updated independently.
 - ▶ REST messages have less coupling because both clients and servers may choose to ignore attributes they don't understand.
- ▶ Shared dependencies
 - ▶ Require to use specific libraries and even specific versions of libraries for communication, e.g. Java RMI.
- ▶ Shared point-in-time
 - ▶ A request-response messaging creates coupling in time as the service must be available at the time.
 - ▶ A bad choice if users are not waiting for immediate answers.
- ▶ Fixed addresses
 - ▶ Have you ever hardcoded a file path to read data from?
 - ▶ Network services may relocate, and having multiple of them helps to separate production, testing, and development.

Tight Coupling

Communication Patterns

Communications Between Services

- ▶ Via message passing
 - ▶ Shared memory communications are less popular nowadays among servers as they make communication implicit and thus prevent optimizations toward delays and failures.
- ▶ Make use of a contract.
 - ▶ Backward-compatible with existing components.
 - ▶ Forward-compatible with future components.
- ▶ Messaging patterns
 - ▶ Request-response (synchronous): requester (client) issues a request to a receiver (server) and waits for a response.
 - ▶ Publish-subscribe (asynchronous): publisher send a message to a middleware (event bus, message exchange, etc.) and subscribers pick it up later.
- ▶ We will focus on request-response for this lecture and leave publish-subscribe to the next.

Request-Response Messaging

- ▶ A layered approach where structures can be introduced
 - ▶ TCP/UDP: messages in bytes, need to handle message length for TCP, and ordering and retrying for UDP.
 - ▶ Remote procedure calls (RPC): use messages to provide illusions to call a function on another server by sending function name and parameters and receiving returned values.
 - ▶ HTTP: messages as text, e.g. HTML, XML, json.
 - ▶ REST: messages in json to represent complex data.
 - ▶ GraphQL: json as a query language.
- ▶ Synchronous communications like request-response are easy to reason and straightforward to implement.
 - ▶ Point-to-point
 - ▶ Responses are either available or not, indicating failures that can be handled further.
- ▶ Not ideal for one-to-many communications or when requester needs to wait for long time.

HTTP Requests in Go

```
// Get issues a GET to the specified URL
func Get(url string) (*http.Response, error)
// Post issues a POST to the specified URL
func Post(url, contentType string, body io.Reader) (*Response, error)
type Response struct {
    Status      string // e.g. "200 OK"
    StatusCode  int    // e.g. 200
    // Header maps header keys to values.
    Header      Header
    // Body represents the response body.
    Body        io.ReadCloser
    // ContentLength records the length of the associated content. The
    // value -1 indicates that the length is unknown.
    ContentLength int64
    // Request is the request that was sent to obtain this Response.
    Request      *Request
}
}
```

- ▶ From the [net/http](#) package.
- ▶ Provide convenience functions like [Get](#) and [Post](#).
 - ▶ That one can call directly without the need to create some objects for the request first.

HTTP GET Example

```
package main
import (
    "fmt"
    "io"
    "net/http"
)
func main() {
    resp, err := http.Get("http://example.com") // Send an HTTP GET
    if err != nil {
        panic(err)
    }
    defer resp.Body.Close() // Close your response!
    body, err := io.ReadAll(resp.Body) // Read body as []byte
    if err != nil {
        panic(err)
    }
    fmt.Println(string(body))
}
```

HTTP POST Example

```
package main
import (
    "fmt"
    "io"
    "net/http"
    "strings"
)
const json = `{ "name":"Matt", "age":44 }` // This is our JSON
func main() {
    in := strings.NewReader(json) // Wrap JSON with an io.Reader
    // Issue HTTP POST, declaring our content-type as "text/json"
    resp, err := http.Post("http://example.com/upload", "text/json", in)
    if err != nil {
        panic(err)
    }
    defer resp.Body.Close() // Close your response!
    message, err := io.ReadAll(resp.Body)
    if err != nil {
        panic(err)
    }
    fmt.Printf(string(message))
}
```

Remote Procedure Calls (RPC) with gRPC

- ▶ gRPC is a full-featured data exchange framework.
 - ▶ Open sourced in 2015 by Google, and with CNCF from 2017.
 - ▶ A modern RPC solution as an alternative to RESTful services.
- ▶ Advantages
 - ▶ Conciseness: more compact than json, less network I/O.
 - ▶ Speed: binary format is much faster to produce and consume.
 - ▶ Strong-typing: avoid conversions, easier for troubleshooting.
 - ▶ Feature-rich: e.g. authentication, encryption, timeout, and compression.
- ▶ Disadvantages
 - ▶ Contract-driven: more coupling, less suitable for external facing services.
 - ▶ Binary format: not human-readable, complicating troubleshooting.

gRPC Message Definition

```
syntax = "proto3";
option go_package = "github.com/cloud-native-go/ch08/keyvalue";
message GetRequest {
    string key = 1;
}
message GetResponse {
    string value = 1;
}
message PutRequest {
    string key = 1;
    string value = 2;
}
message PutResponse {}
message DeleteRequest {
    string key = 1;
}
message DeleteResponse {}
```

- ▶ Make use of protocol buffers, fairly straightforward to follow.
- ▶ The protocol compiler generates code for clients and servers.
 - ▶ Available for most programming languages.

gRPC Service Definition

```
service KeyValue {  
    rpc Get(GetRequest) returns (GetResponse);  
    rpc Put(PutRequest) returns (PutResponse);  
    rpc Delete(DeleteRequest) returns (DeleteResponse);  
}
```

- ▶ A service consists of a group of methods.
- ▶ Define an interface without providing implementations.
 - ▶ Methods are used in the client program with your choice of programming language.
 - ▶ Methods are implemented in the server program with your choice of programming language.
 - ▶ Clients and servers can use different programming languages.

Implementing gRPC Server

```
// generated server interface to be implemented
type KeyValueServer interface {
    Get(context.Context, *GetRequest) (*GetResponse, error)
    Put(context.Context, *PutRequest) (*PutResponse, error)
    Delete(context.Context, *DeleteRequest) (*PutResponse, error)
}

// server.go
... // package, import etc.
type server struct {
    pb.UnimplementedKeyValueServer // embed the generated struct
}
func (s *server) Get(ctx context.Context, r *pb.GetRequest) (*pb.GetResponse, error) {
    log.Printf("Received GET key=%v", r.Key)
    value, err := Get(r.Key)
    return &pb.GetResponse{Value: value}, err
}
... // Put, Delete, etc.
```


Implementing gRPC Server (cont.)

```
...
func main() {
    // Create a gRPC server and register our KeyValueServer with it
    s := grpc.NewServer()
    pb.RegisterKeyValueServer(s, &server{})
    // Open a listening port on 50051
    lis, err := net.Listen("tcp", ":50051")
    if err != nil {
        log.Fatalf("failed to listen: %v", err)
    }
    // Start accepting connections on the listening port
    if err := s.Serve(lis); err != nil {
        log.Fatalf("failed to serve: %v", err)
    }
}
```

Implementing gRPC Client

```
// generated client interface to be used
type KeyValueClient interface {
    Get(ctx context.Context, in *GetRequest, opts ...grpc.CallOption) (*GetResponse)
    Put(ctx context.Context, in *PutRequest, opts ...grpc.CallOption) (*PutResponse)
    Delete(ctx context.Context, in *DeleteRequest, opts ...grpc.CallOption) (*PutResponse)
}

// client.go
... // package, import etc.
func main() {
    // Set up a connection to the gRPC server
    conn, err := grpc.Dial("localhost:50051", grpc.WithInsecure(),
        grpc.WithBlock(), grpc.WithTimeout(time.Second))
    ... // error handling
    defer conn.Close()
    // Get a new instance of our client
    client := pb.NewKeyValueClient(conn)
    ...
}
```

Implementing gRPC Client (cont.)

```
...
var action, key, value string
if len(os.Args) > 2 {
    action, key = os.Args[1], os.Args[2]
    value = strings.Join(os.Args[3:], " ")
}
// Use context to establish a 1-second timeout.
ctx, cancel := context.WithTimeout(context.Background(), time.Second)
defer cancel()
switch action {
case "get":
    r, err := client.Get(ctx, &pb.GetRequest{Key: key})
    ... // error handling
    log.Printf("Get %s returns: %s", key, r.Value)
case "put":
    _, err := client.Put(ctx, &pb.PutRequest{Key: key, Value: value})
    ... // error handling
    log.Printf("Put %s", key)
default:
    log.Fatalf("Syntax: go run [get|put] KEY VALUE...")
}
}
```

Summary

- ▶ Coupling is unavoidable.
- ▶ But we can keep it minimal with a good choice of communication patterns.