

Table of Contents

Integrating with External Systems	1
Technical Requirements	1
Continuing our design journey	1
Bounded context relationships	2
Symmetric relationship patterns	3
Asymmetric relationship patterns	6
Implementation patterns	10
Data-based	11
Code-based	13
IPC-based	15
Summary	17
Questions	18
Further reading	18

Integrating with External Systems

Wholeness is not achieved by cutting off a portion of one's being, but by integration of the contraries.

— Carl Jung

Thus far, we have used DDD to implement a robust core for our application. However, most bounded contexts usually have both upstream and downstream dependencies which usually change at a pace which is different from these core components. To maintain both agility and reliability and enable loose coupling, it is important to create what DDD calls the anti-corruption layer in order to shield the core from everything that surrounds it. In this chapter, we will look at integrating with a legacy Inventory Management system. We will round off by looking at common patterns when integrating with legacy applications.

Technical Requirements

Continuing our design journey

From our domain analysis in the earlier chapters, we have arrived at four bounded contexts for our application as depicted here:



Figure 1. Context map for the LC solution

Thus far, our focus has been on the implementation of the internals of the **LC Application** bounded context. While the LC Application bounded context is independent of the other bounded contexts, it is not completely isolated from them. For example, when processing an LC application, we need to perform merchandise and applicant checks which require interactions with the **Compliance** and **Customer Onboarding** bounded contexts respectively. This means that these bounded contexts have a relationship with each other. These relationships are driven by the nature of collaboration between the teams working on the respective bounded contexts. Let's examine how these team dynamics influence integration mechanisms between bounded contexts in a way that continues to preserve their individual integrity.

Bounded context relationships

We need bounded contexts to as independent as possible. However, this does not mean that bounded contexts are completely isolated from each other. Bounded contexts need to collaborate with others to provide business value. Whenever there is collaboration required between two bounded contexts, the nature of their relationship is not only influenced by their individual goals and priorities, but also by the prevailing organizational realities. In a high performing environment, it is fairly common to have a single team assume ownership of a bounded context. The relationships between the teams owning these bounded contexts, play a significant role in influencing the integration patterns employed to arrive at a solution. At a high level, there are two

categories of relationships:

1. Symmetric
2. Asymmetric

Let's look at these relationship types in more detail.

Symmetric relationship patterns

Two teams can be said to have a symmetric relationship when they have an equal amount of influence in the decision-making process to arrive at a solution. Both teams are in a position to and indeed, do contribute more or less equally towards the outcome.



Figure 2. Both teams have an equal say in influencing the solution

There are three variations of symmetric relationships, each of which we outline in more detail here:

Partnership

In a partnership, both teams integrate in an adhoc manner. There are no fixed responsibilities assigned when needing complete integration work. Each team picks up work as and when needed without the need for any specific ceremony or fanfare. The nature of the integration is usually two-way with both teams exchanging solution artifacts as and when needed. Such relationships require extremely high degrees of collaboration and understanding of the work done by both teams.




Figure 3. There is an adhoc, mutual dependency between teams in a partnership relationship

Example

A web front-end team working in close collaboration with the APIs team building the BFFs for the front-end. The BFF team creates experience APIs meant to be used exclusively by the front-end. To fulfill any functionality, the front-end team requires capabilities to be exposed by the APIs team. On the other hand, the APIs team is dependent on the front-end team to provide advice on what capabilities to build and the order in which to build them. Both teams freely make use of each

other's domain models (for example, the same set of request and response objects that define the API) to implement functionality. Such reuse happens mostly arbitrarily and when API changes happen, the both teams coordinate changes to keep things working.

When to use

Partnership relationship between teams require high levels of collaboration, trust and understanding. Teams tend to use this when team boundaries are informal. It also helps if these teams are co-located and/or have a significant working time overlap.

Potential pitfalls

Partnership relationships between teams can lead to a situation where individual team responsibilities become very unclear leading the solution towards the dreaded *big ball of mud*.

Shared kernel

Unlike in a partnership, when using a shared kernel, teams have a clear understanding of the solution artifacts and models they choose to share between themselves. Both teams take equal responsibility in the upkeep of these shared artifacts.

Example

The *LC Application Processing* and *Customer Onboarding* teams in our LC application may choose to use a common model to represent the `CustomerCreditValidatedEvent`. Any enhancements or changes to the event schema can affect both teams. The responsibility to make any changes is owned by both teams. Intentionally, these teams do not share anything beyond this mutually agreed upon models and artifacts.




Figure 4. Teams have an explicit understanding of shared models

When to use

The shared kernel form of collaboration works well if shared artifacts are required to be consumed in an identical fashion in both contexts. Furthermore, it is attractive for multiple teams to coordinate and continue sharing, as opposed to duplicating identical models in both contexts.


Potential pitfalls

Changes made to the shared kernel affect both bounded contexts. This means that any change made

to the shared kernel needs to remain compatible for both teams. Needless to say, as the number of teams using the shared kernel increases, the cost of coordination goes up manifold.

Separate ways

When two teams choose to not share any artifacts or models between them, they go their own separate ways.



Example

The *LC Application Processing* and the *Customer Onboarding* teams may start with sharing the same build/deployment scripts for their services. Over a period of time, deployment requirements may diverge to a point where the shared cost of maintaining these scripts becomes prohibitively expensive, causing these teams to fork their deployments to regain independence from the other team.

When to use

In some cases, two teams may be unable to collaborate for a variety of reasons, ranging from a drift in individual team requirements to organizational politics. Whatever the case may be, these teams may decide that the cost of collaboration is too high, resulting in them going their own separate ways.

Potential pitfalls

Choosing to go separate ways may result in duplicate work across affected bounded contexts. When working in bounded contexts that map to the core sub-domains, this may prove counter-productive as it could lead to inconsistent behaviors unintentionally.

It is possible to transition from one relationship type to another over a period of time. In our experience, transitioning from any one of these relationships may not be straightforward. In cases where requirements are relatively clear at the outset, it may be easier to start with a *shared kernel*. On the contrary, if requirements are unclear, it may be prudent to start either with a loose *partnership* or go *separate ways* until requirements become clear. In any of these scenarios, it is important to keep evaluating the nature of the relationship and transition to a more appropriate type based on our enhanced understanding of the requirements and/or the relationship itself.

In each of the relationships characterized above, the teams involved have a more or less equal say in how the relationship evolved and the resulting outcomes. However, this may not always be the case. Let's look at examples of cases where one team may have a clear upper hand in terms of how the relationship evolves.

Asymmetric relationship patterns

Two teams can be said to have an asymmetric relationship when one of the teams has a stronger influence in the decision-making process to arrive at a solution. In other words, there is a clear customer-supplier (or upstream-downstream) relationship where either the customer or the supplier plays a dominant role that affects solution design approaches. It is also likely that the customer and the supplier do not share common goals.




Figure 5. One of the teams has a dominant say in influencing the solution

There are at least three solution patterns when teams are in an asymmetric relationship, each of which we outline in more detail here:

Conformist (CF)

It is not unusual for the side playing the supplier role to have a dominant say in how the relationship with one or more customers is implemented. Furthermore, the customer may simply choose to conform with the supplier-provided solution as is, making it an integral part of their own solution. In other words, the supplier provides a set of models and the customer uses those same models to build their solution. In this case, the customer is termed to be a *conformist*.




Figure 6. Customer accepts dependency on supplier model

Example

When building a solution to validate United States postal addresses of LC applicants, we chose to conform to the [USPS Web Tools](#) address validation API schema. Given that the business started with just US-based applicants, this made sense. This means that any references to the address model in our bounded contexts mimic the schema prescribed by the USPS. This further means that we will need to keep up with changes that occur in the USPS API as and when they occur (regardless of whether that change is needed for our own functionality).

When to use

Being a conformist is not necessarily a negative thing. The supplier's models may be a well accepted industry standard, or they may simply be good enough for our needs. It may also be that the team may not have the necessary skills, motivation or immediate needs to do something different from

what the supplier has provided. This approach also enables teams to make quick progress, leveraging work mostly done by other experts.

Potential pitfalls

An overuse of the conformist pattern may dilute the ubiquitous language of our own bounded contexts, resulting in a situation where there is no clear separation between the supplier and customer concepts. It may also be that concepts that are core to the supplier's context leaks into our own, despite those concepts carrying little to no meaning in our context. This may result in these bounded contexts being very tightly coupled with each other. And if a need arises to switch to another supplier or support multiple suppliers, the cost of change may be prohibitively expensive.

Anti-corruption layer (ACL)

There may be scenarios where a customer may need to collaborate with the supplier, but may want to shield itself from the supplier's ubiquitous language and models. In such cases, it may be prudent to redefine these conflicting models in the customer's own ubiquitous language using a translation layer at the time of integration, also known as an *anti-corruption layer* (ACL).




Figure 7. Customer wants to protect itself from supplier models

Example

In the address validation example referenced in the [Conformist](#) section, the *LC Application Processing* team may need to support Canadian applicants as well. In such a case, being a conformist to a system that supports only US addresses may prove restrictive and even confusing. For example, the US *state* is analogous to a *province* in Canada. Similarly, *zip code* in the US is referred to *postal code* in Canada. In addition, US zip codes are numeric whereas Canadian postal codes are alphanumeric. Most importantly, we currently do not have the notion of a *country code* in our address model, but now we will need to introduce this concept to differentiate addresses within the respective countries. Let's look at the address models from the respective countries here:



While we initially conformed to the USPS model, we have now evolved to support more countries. For example, *region* is used to represent the concept of *state/province*. Also, we have introduced the *country* value object, which was missing earlier.

When to use

Anti-corruption layers come in handy when the customer models are part of a core domain. The ACL shields the customer from changes in the supplier's models and can help produce more loosely coupled integrations. It may also be necessary when we are looking to integrate similar concepts from multiple suppliers.

Potential pitfalls

Using an anti-corruption layer may be tempting in a lot of cases. However, it is less beneficial when the concepts being integrated don't often change, or are defined by a well known authority. Using an ACL with a custom language may only cause more confusion. Creating an ACL usually requires additional translations and thereby may increase the overall complexity of the customer's bounded context and may be considered premature optimization.

Open host service (OHS)

Unlike the conformist and the anti-corruption layer, where customers do not have a formal means to interface with the supplier, with the open host service, the supplier defines a clear interface to interact with its customers. This interface may be made available in the form of a well-known published language (for example, a REST interface or a client SDK):




Figure 8. Open host service (OHS) using a published language (PL).

Example

The LC Application Processing bounded context can expose an HTTP interface for each of its commands as shown here:

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

# Change the amount on an existing application
curl POST /applications/ac130002/change-amount \
  -d '{"amount": 100, "currency": "USD"}' \
  -H 'content-type:application/vnd.lc-application.v2+json'

# Other commands omitted for brevity
```

As an augment to the HTTP interface shown here, we may even provide a client SDK in some of the more popular languages used by our customers. This helps hide more implementation details such as the MIME type and version from customers.

When to use

When the supplier wants to hide its internal models (ubiquitous language), making an open host service enables the supplier to evolve while providing a stable interface to its customers. In a sense, the open-host service pattern is a reversal of the anti-corruption layer pattern: instead of the customer, the supplier implements the translation of its internal model. Also, the supplier can consider providing an open host service when it is interested in providing a richer user experience for its customers.

Potential pitfalls

While suppliers may have good intentions by providing an open host service for its customers, it may result in increased implementation complexity (for example, there may be a need to support multiple versions of an API, or client SDKs in multiple languages). If the open host service does not take into account common usage patterns of its customers, it may result in a poor customer usability and also in degraded performance for the supplier.

It is important to note that the conformist and the anti-corruption layer are patterns that customers implement, whereas the open host service is a supplier-side pattern. For example, the following scenario with the supplier providing an *open host service* and one customer is a *conformist* while another has an *anti-corruption layer*, can be true as depicted here:



Figure 9. Asymmetric relationships with multiple customers.

Now that we have seen the various ways in which bounded contexts can integrate with each other, here is one possible implementation for our LC application depicted in the form of a context map:



Figure 10. Simplified context map for the LC application.

Thus far we have examined the various ways in which inter-team dynamics influence integration mechanisms. While having clarity at the conceptual level helps, let's see how these relationships manifest themselves at the implementation level.

Implementation patterns

We have looked integration between bounded contexts at a design level, but these concepts need to be translated into code. There are three broad categories that can be employed when integrating two bounded contexts:

1. Data-based
2. Code-based
3. API-based

Let's look at each method in more detail now.

Data-based

In this style of integration, the bounded contexts in question share data between each other. If the relationship is symmetric, the teams owning these bounded contexts may choose to share entire databases with free access to both read, write and change underlying structures. Whereas in an asymmetric relationship, the supplier may constrain the scope of access, based on the type of relationship.

Shared database

The simplest form of data integration is the use of a shared database. In this style of integration, all participating bounded contexts have unrestricted access to the schemas and the underlying data as shown here:




Figure 11. Integration using a shared database

When to use

The shared database presents a very low barrier to entry for teams looking to quickly enable new or enhance existing functionality by providing ready access to data for read and/or write use-cases. More importantly, it also allows the use of local database transactions, which usually provides strong consistency, lower complexity and better performance (especially when working with relational databases).

Potential pitfalls

However, this symmetric integration style where multiple teams have shared ownership is usually frowned upon because it often leads to a situation where there is no clear ownership. Furthermore, the shared databases can become a source of tight coupling, accelerating the path towards the dreaded *big ball of mud*. Additionally, users of the shared database can suffer from the *noisy neighbor* effect where one co-tenant monopolizing resources adversely affects all other tenants. For these reasons, teams will be well advised to choose this style of integration sparingly.

Replicated data

In the case of asymmetric relationships, suppliers may be unwilling to provide direct access to their data. However, they may choose to integrate with customers using a mechanism based on data sharing. An alternate form of integration is to provide a copy of the data required by consumers. There are many variations on how this can be implemented, we depict the more common ways here:



Figure 12. Integration using data replication.

- **Database views:** In this form, the consumer gets or is provided access to a subset of the data using query-based or materialized views. In either case, the customer usually has read-only access to the data and both supplier and customer continue to share the same physical resources (usually the DB engine).
- **Full read replica:** In this form, the customer gets access to a read replica of the supplier's entire database, usually on physically disparate infrastructure.
- **Partial read replica:** In this form, the customer gets access to a read replica of a subset of the supplier's database, again on physically disparate infrastructure.

When to use

This style of integration may be required when there is an asymmetric relationship between the supplier and the customer. Like the shared database, this integration style usually requires less upfront effort to integrate. This is also apt when suppliers intend to provide read-only access to a subset of their data. It may also suffice to use data replication when customers only require to read a subset of the supplier's data.

Potential pitfalls

If we choose to use database views, we may continue to suffer from the noisy neighbor effect. On the other hand, if we choose to create physically disparate replicas, we will need to incur the cost of additional operational complexity. More importantly, the consumers remain tightly coupled to the supplier's domain models and ubiquitous language.

Next, let's look at some ways to make the most of data-based integrations.

Increasing effectiveness

When sharing data, the schema (the structure of the database) acts as a means to enforce contracts, especially when using databases that require specifying a formal structure (for example, relational

databases). When multiple parties are involved, managing the schema can become a challenge.

To mitigate undesirable changes, teams sharing data may want to consider the use of a schema migration tool. Relational databases work well with tools like [liquibase^{\[1\]}](#) or [flyway^{\[2\]}](#). When working with databases that do not formally enforce a schema, it may be best to avoid employing this style of integration, especially when working in symmetric relationships where ownership is unclear.

In any case, if using one of the shared data styles of integration is unavoidable, teams may want to strongly consider employing one or more techniques mentioned in [refactoring databases](#) to make it more manageable.

Code-based

In this style of integration, teams coordinate by sharing code artifacts, either directly in the form of source code and/or binaries. At a high level, there are two forms:

1. Sharing source code
2. Sharing binaries

We describe each of these here:

Sharing source code

A fairly common practice within organizations is to share source code with the objective of promoting reuse and standardization. This may include utilities (like logging, authentication, etc.), build/deployment scripts, data transfer objects, etc. In other words, any piece of source code where the cost of duplication is seen to be higher than reuse.

When to use

Depending on the relationship type (symmetric/asymmetric), teams sharing code may have varied levels of influence in how the shared artifacts evolve. This works well in a symmetric relationship, both teams are empowered to make changes compatible with each other. Similarly, in an asymmetric relationship, the supplier may accept changes from customers, while retaining ownership and control of the shared artifacts. This also tends to work well in case of non-core, infrequently changing code artifacts. Sharing source code also enables higher levels of transparency and visibility into the internals of the shared artifacts (case in point - open source software).

Potential pitfalls

Sharing code artifacts means that individual teams take on responsibility to make sure that the process of converting source code into binary executables is uniform and compatible with requirements for all parties. This may include code conventions, static quality checks, tests (presence or lack thereof), compilation/build flags, versioning, etc. When a relatively large number of teams are involved, maintaining this form of compatibility may become burdensome.

Sharing binary artifacts

Another relatively common practice is to share artifacts at the binary level. In this scenario, the consumers may or may not have direct access to source code artifacts. Examples include third party libraries, client SDKs, API documentation, etc. This form of integration is fairly common when the relationship between the coordinating parties is asymmetric. The supplier of the library has a clear ownership of maintaining the lifecycle of the shared artifacts.

When to use

Sharing just binary artifacts may be necessary when the supplier is unable/unwilling to share source artifacts, possibly because they may be proprietary and/or part of the supplier's intellectual property. Because the supplier takes ownership of the *build* process, it behooves the supplier to produce artifacts that are compatible with most potential consumers. Hence, this works well when the supplier is willing to do that. On the other hand, it requires that the customer place high levels of [trust](#)^[3] in the supplier's [software supply chain](#)^[4] when producing these artifacts.

Potential pitfalls

Integration through the use of binary artifact sharing reduces the visibility into the build process of the shared artifacts for the consumers. If consumers rely on slow-moving suppliers, this can become untenable. For example, if a critical security bug is discovered in the shared binary, the consumer is solely reliant on the supplier to remediate. This can be a huge risk if such dependencies are in critical, business-differentiating aspects of the solution (especially in the core subdomain). This risk can be exacerbated without the use of appropriate [anti-corruption layers](#) (ACLs) and/or service level agreements (SLAs).

Increasing effectiveness

When sharing code artifacts, it becomes a lot more important to be explicit in how changes are made while continuing to maintain high levels of quality—especially when multiple teams are involved. Let's examine some of these techniques in more detail:

1. **Static analysis:** This can be as simple as adhering to a set of coding standards using a tool like [checkstyle](#). More importantly, these tools can be used to conform to a set of naming conventions to allow the firmer use of the ubiquitous language throughout the codebase. In addition, tools like [spotbugs](#), [PMD/CPD](#) can be used to statically analyze code for the presence of bugs and duplicate code.
2. **Code architecture tests:** While static inspection tools are effective at operating at the level of a single compilation unit, runtime inspection can take this one level further to identify package cycles, dependency checks, inheritance trees, etc. to apply lightweight architecture governance. The use of tools like [JDepend](#) and [ArchUnit](#) can help here.
3. **Unit tests:** When working with shared codebases, team members are looking to make changes in a safe and reliable manner. The presence of a comprehensive suite of fast-running unit tests can go a long way to wards increasing confidence. We strongly recommend employing test-driven design to further maximize creating a codebase that is well-designed and one that enables easier refactoring.
4. **Code reviews:** While automation can go a long way, augmenting the process where a human

reviews changes can be highly effective for multiple reasons. This can take the form of offline reviews (using pull requests) or active peer reviews (using paired programming). All of these techniques serve to enhance collective understanding, thereby reducing risk when changes are made.

5. **Documentation:** Needless to say, well-structured documentation can be invaluable when making contributions and also when consuming binary code artifacts. Teams will be well advised to proliferate the use of the ubiquitous language by striving to write self-documenting code all throughout to maximize benefits derived.
6. **Dependency management:** When sharing binary code artifacts, managing dependencies can become fairly complicated due to having too many dependencies, long dependency chains, conflicting/cyclic dependencies, etc. Teams should strive to reduce afferent (incoming) coupling as much as possible to mitigate the problems described above.
7. **Versioning:** In addition to minimizing the amount of afferent coupling, using an explicit versioning strategy can go a long way towards making dependency management easier. We strongly recommend considering the use of a technique like [semantic versioning](#) for shared code artifacts.

IPC-based

In this style of integration, the bounded contexts exchange messages using some form of inter-process communication (IPC) to interact with each other. This may take the form of synchronous or asynchronous communication.

Synchronous messaging

Synchronous messaging is a style of communication where the sender of the request waits for a response from the receiver, which implies that the sender and the receiver need to be active for this style to work. Usually, this form of communication is point-to-point. HTTP is one of the commonly used protocols for this style of communication.




Figure 13. Synchronous messaging



Please take a look at the HTTP APIs for the commands used during LC application processing included with the code examples for this chapter.

When to use

This form of integration is used when the customer is interested in the supplier's response to the request. The response is then used to determine whether the request was successful or not. Given that the customer needs to wait for the response, it is advisable to use this style of messaging for

low latency operations. This form of integration is popular when exposing public APIs over the internet (for example, [Github's REST API^{\[5\]}](#)).

Potential pitfalls

When using synchronous messaging, the customer's ability to scale is heavily dependent on the supplier to satisfy the customer's requirements. On the flip side, customers making requests at too high a rate may compromise the supplier's ability to serve customers in a predictable manner. If there is a chain of synchronous messaging, the probability of cascading failure becomes much higher.

Asynchronous messaging

Asynchronous messaging is a style of communication where the sender does not wait for an explicit response from the receiver.



We are using the terms sender and receiver, instead of customer and supplier because they both can play either role of sender or receiver.

This is typically achieved by introducing an intermediary in the form of a message channel. The presence of the intermediary enables both one-to-one and one-to-many modes of communication. Typically, the intermediary can take the form of a shared filesystem, database or a queueing system.




Figure 14. Asynchronous messaging



Please take a look at the event APIs for the commands used during LC application processing included with the code examples for this chapter.

When to use

This form of integration is used when the sender does not care about receiving an **immediate** response from the receiver(s), resulting in the respective systems becoming a lot more decoupled from each other. This further enables these systems to scale independently. This also makes it possible to have the same message to be processed by multiple receivers. For example, in our LC application processing system, the `LCApplicationSubmittedEvent` is received by both the *Compliance* and *Customer Onboarding* systems.

Potential pitfalls

The introduction of the intermediary component adds complexity to the overall solution. The [non-functional](#) characteristics of the intermediary can have a profound effect on the resilience characteristics of the system as a whole. It can also be tempting to add processing logic to the intermediary, thereby coupling the overall system very tightly to this component. To ensure reliable communication between the sender and the receiver, the intermediary may have to support a variety of enhanced capabilities (such as ordering, producer flow control, durability, transactions, etc.)

Increasing effectiveness

When implementing integration using some form of IPC, a lot of the techniques discussed in the [code-based implementation](#) patterns section continue to apply. As discussed earlier, API documentation plays a significant role in reducing friction for customers. In addition, here are a few more techniques that apply specifically when using IPC-based integration. We outline some of these techniques here:

1. **Typed protocols:** When working with this form of integration, it is important to minimize the amount of time taken to gather feedback on structural validations. This is especially important given that the supplier and the customer may be in a constant state of independent evolution. The use of typed protocols such as protocol buffers, Avro, Netflix's Falcor, GraphQL, etc. can make it easier for customers to interact with suppliers while maintaining a lightweight mechanism to validate correctness of requests.



The operative word here is **lightweight**. It is pertinent to note that we are not advising against the use of JSON-based HTTP APIs (typically advertised as being RESTful) which do not enforce the use of an explicit schema. Neither are we promoting the use of (arguably) legacy protocols like SOAP, WSDL, CORBA, etc. Each of these, while being well-meaning suffered from being fairly heavyweight.

2. **Self discovery:** As outlined above, when working with a IPC-based integration mechanism, we should look to reduce the barrier to entry. When working with RESTful APIs, the use of [HATEOAS](#)^[6], although difficult for suppliers to implement, can make it easier for customers to understand and consume APIs. In addition, making use of a service registry and/or a schema registry can further reduce consumption friction.
3. **Contract tests:** In the spirit of failing fast and shifting left, the practice of contract testing and [consumer-driven contracts](#) can further increase the quality and speed of integration. Tools such as [Pact](#)^[7] and [Spring Cloud Contract](#)^[8] make the adoption of these practices relatively simple.

Summary

In this chapter, we looked at the different types of bounded context relationships. We also examined common integration patterns that can be used when implementing these bounded context relationships.

You should have learnt when specific techniques can be used, potential pitfalls and ideas on how to increase effectiveness when employing these methods.

In the next chapter, we will explore means to distribute these bounded contexts into independently deployable components (in other words, employ a microservices-based architecture).

Questions

1. In your ecosystem, can you identify bounded context boundaries and the integration mechanism in use?
2. Will you be able to draw a context map for your system?
3. Will you recommend any changes to the existing styles of integration based on the learnings from this chapter?

Further reading

Title	Author	Location
Integration database	Martin Fowler	https://martinfowler.com/bliki/IntegrationDatabase.html
REST APIs must be hypertext-driven	Roy T. Fielding	https://roy.gbiv.com/untangled/2008/rest-apis-must-be-hypertext-driven

[1] <https://www.liquibase.org/>

[2] <https://flywaydb.org/>

[3] <https://www.thoughtworks.com/en-us/insights/podcasts/technology-podcasts/securing-software-supply-chain>

[4] <https://blog.sonatype.com/software-supply-chain-a-definition-and-introductory-guide>

[5] <https://docs.github.com/en/rest>

[6] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HATEOAS>

[7] <https://pact.io/>

[8] <https://spring.io/projects/spring-cloud-contract>