API evolution without versioning

Brandon Byars Head of Technology <u>bbyars@thoughtworks.com</u> @BrandonByars

Booking a cruise



Booking a cruise



Booking a cruise



About me

Experiences

• Led multiple digital platform engagements with a focus on API strategy

Books

• Testing microservices with mountebank

Articles on martinfowler.com

- Enterprise integration using REST
- You can't buy integration
- API evolution without versioning



MOVE FAST AND BREAK THINGS*

* (THAT OTHER PEOPLE HAVE TO FIX)

Some people, when confronted with a problem, think "I know, I'll use versioning." Now they have 2.1.0 problems.

An adaptation of Jamie Zawinski's famous dig on regular expressions

Contract specifications as promises

ath	hs:		
/a	audio/volume:		
	put:		
	requestBody:		
	required: true		
	content:		
	application/json:		
	schema:		
	type: integer		
	minimum: 0		
	maximum: 11		
	description:		
	Current volume for all audio output.		
	0 means no audio output (mute). 10 is the maximum value. 11 enables		
	the overdrive system (danger!).		
	When set to 0 all other audio settings have no effect.		

So why the word promise?

The term does not have the arrogance or hubris of the more frequently used *guarantee*, and that is good.

- Mark Burgess

Following the evolution of a complex API



mountebank (<u>https://www.mbtest.org</u>) is a multi-protocol service virtualization tool controllable through a REST API



Evaluating options from a consumer's perspective

All strategies will be evaluating against the following criteria. There is one criteria missing, which is often the primary one used for decision making: *implementation complexity*.



Evolution patterns

Change by addition

Add latency to the response





Multi-typing

Allow the latency to be determined dynamically





Upcasting

Allow a pipeline of shell transformations instead of just one



Isn't that a breaking change?

Of course it is!

Versioning pushes the cost of the breaking change to the consumers.

Upcasting absorbs the cost of the breaking change in the producer.

compatibility.upcast(request);

```
function upcast (request) {
    upcastShellTransformToArray(request);
}
```

```
.
```

Nested upcasting

Allow a pipeline of shell transformations instead of just one



Implementing nested upcasts

The trick is to simply execute the upcasts in chronological order of change

compatibility.upcast(request);

}

function upcast (request) {
 upcastShellTransformToArray(request);
 upcastBehaviorsToArray(request);

Downcasting

Replace complicated function signature with a Parameter Object

```
{
    "inject": "function (request,
    deprecatedLocalState, logger, callback,
    imposterState) { ... }"
}
```



"inject": "function (config) { ... }"



Implementing downcasting

Downcasting can be considerably trickier to implement than upcasting, and has less applicability.

```
function inject (request, fn, logger, imposterState) {
    return new Promise((done, reject) => {
        // Leave parameters for older interface
        const injected = `(${fn})(config, injectState,
        logger, done, imposterState);`,
```

```
// ...
```

compatibility.downcastInjectionConfig(config);

```
// ...
});
```

```
function downcastInjectionConfig (config) {
    if (config.request.method || config.request.data) {
        Object.keys(config.request).forEach(key => {
            config[key] = config.request[key];
        });
    }
}
```

Hidden interfaces

"shellTransform": "node ./time.js"

"is": { ... }, " behaviors": [





Breaking hidden interfaces

In the worst case, hidden interfaces can break consumers using the published interface.

Without care, this will happen.

```
// Windows has a pretty low character limit to the command line. When we're in danger
// of the character limit, we'll remove the command line arguments under the assumption
// that backwards compatibility doesn't matter when it never would have worked to begin with
let fullCommand = `${command} ${quoteForShell(request)} ${quoteForShell(response)}`;
if (fullCommand.length >= maxShellCommandLength) {
  fullCommand = command;
}
```

How to think about API evolution

Hyrum's Law

With a sufficient number of users of an API, it does not matter what you promise in the contract: all observable behaviors of your system will be depended on by somebody.

www.hyrumslaw.com



API evolution is a product management concern



Product tradeoffs

Versioning is less an architectural solution than a product solution, and should be evaluated within a product framework.

Remember Hyrum's Law: your contract is a promise, not a guarantee!

Viability - are we solving	Usability - are we making	Feasibility - can we do
a problem our users	it easy to use our	this in an architecturally
have?	product?	sound way?
Reduction of cognitive load or underlying complexity	Obviousness Elegance Stability	Protecting downstream systems



Brandon Byars Head of Technology bbyars@thoughtworks.com