

git_comments:

1. **comment:** Remove from mappings so removeAndUpdateAddressMap processes and cleanup
label: code-design
2. * * ARTEMIS-1627 - Verify that a address can be removed when there are no direct * bindings on the address but does have bindings on a linked address * * @throws Exception
3. Make sure topic2 address can be removed and the bindings still exist for topic1
4. Re-create address by creating a consumer on the topic and make sure the wildcard and the direct consumer still receive the messages
5. Remove the address
6. should still have 1 address and binding

git_commits:

1. **summary:** This closes #1807
message: This closes #1807

github_issues:

github_issues_comments:

github_pulls:

1. **title:** ARTEMIS-1627 - Support removing addresses that do not have direct bindings
body: If there are no direct bindings on an address and only linked bindings then the address should be able to be removed from the broker

github_pulls_comments:

1. Updated the PR with a slight change
2. **body:** I added a couple more tests for the WildcardAddressManager to show that getDirectBindings() works with a different wildcard setting
label: test

github_pulls_reviews:

1. Looking at this, it seems this new DirectBindings method completely will ignore wildcard config. Im not so sure this is a good idea, as these should be taken into account. e.g. what happens if someone is using different wildcards? Also it be good to add test cases where alternative wildcards are used to make sure removeAddress still works.
2. The getDirectBindings() method just does an equals() call and compares address names to see if they match exactly (ie simple strings). It's not doing a match so there is no wild card involved.
3. **body:** But I can still add some tests for a different wildcard anyways.
label: test

jira_issues:

1. **summary:** Unable to remove address from broker when linked with a wildcard address
description: I was doing some testing with wildcard addresses and I noticed that the broker does not allow an address to be removed when linked with a binding for another address (such as with wildcard addresses). For example, if there are two addresses created called durable.# and durable.test and a durable subscription is created on durable.# then later on the durable.test address is unable to be removed even though there is no direct consumer on that address. It seems like this should be allowed and I'm not sure if this would be considered a bug or an improvement. I will attach a very simple unit test that demonstrates the issue I am having.

jira_issues_comments:

1. [~martyntaylor] or [~clebertsuconic], what do you guys think about this?

2. Perhaps we should be using the `getMatchingBindings()` method call instead of `getBindingsForAddress()` method call when checking for bindings here: <https://github.com/apache/activemq-artemis/blob/master/artemis-server/src/main/java/org/apache/activemq/artemis/core/postoffice/impl/PostOfficeImpl.java#L535>
3. I think I have a PR for this that I will submit in the morning for review to see if others agree with it.
4. GitHub user cshannon opened a pull request: <https://github.com/apache/activemq-artemis/pull/1807> ARTEMIS-1627 - Support removing addresses that do not have direct bindings If there are no direct bindings on an address and only linked bindings then the address should be able to be removed from the broker You can merge this pull request into a Git repository by running: `$ git pull https://github.com/cshannon/activemq-artemis ARTEMIS-1627` Alternatively you can review and apply these changes as the patch at: <https://github.com/apache/activemq-artemis/pull/1807.patch> To close this pull request, make a commit to your master/trunk branch with (at least) the following in the commit message: This closes #1807 ---- commit 95d1092ce448006dea5180aaf16b924ccca78aac Author: Christopher L. Shannon (cshannon) <christopher.l.shannon@...> Date: 2018-01-23T12:46:33Z ARTEMIS-1627 - Support removing addresses that do not have direct bindings If there are no direct bindings on an address and only linked bindings then the address should be able to be removed from the broker ----
5. Github user cshannon commented on the issue: <https://github.com/apache/activemq-artemis/pull/1807> Updated the PR with a slight change
6. Github user michaelandrepearce commented on a diff in the pull request: https://github.com/apache/activemq-artemis/pull/1807#discussion_r163301265 --- Diff: artemis-server/src/main/java/org/apache/activemq/artemis/core/postoffice/impl/PostOfficeImpl.java --- @@ -532,7 +532,7 @@ public AddressInfo updateAddressInfo(SimpleString addressName, public AddressInfo removeAddressInfo(SimpleString address) throws Exception { synchronized (addressLock) { server.callBrokerPlugins(server.hasBrokerPlugins() ? plugin -> plugin.beforeRemoveAddress(address) : null); - Bindings bindingsForAddress = getBindingsForAddress(address); + final Bindings bindingsForAddress = getDirectBindings(address); --- End diff -- Looking at this, it seems it completely will ignore wildcard config. Im not so sure this is a good idea, as it takes into account these. e.g. what happens if someone is using different wildcards? Also it be good to add test cases where alternative wildcards are used to make sure removeAddress still works.
7. Github user cshannon commented on a diff in the pull request: https://github.com/apache/activemq-artemis/pull/1807#discussion_r163305830 --- Diff: artemis-server/src/main/java/org/apache/activemq/artemis/core/postoffice/impl/PostOfficeImpl.java --- @@ -532,7 +532,7 @@ public AddressInfo updateAddressInfo(SimpleString addressName, public AddressInfo removeAddressInfo(SimpleString address) throws Exception { synchronized (addressLock) { server.callBrokerPlugins(server.hasBrokerPlugins() ? plugin -> plugin.beforeRemoveAddress(address) : null); - Bindings bindingsForAddress = getBindingsForAddress(address); + final Bindings bindingsForAddress = getDirectBindings(address); --- End diff -- The getDirectBindings() method just does an equals() call and compares address names to see if the match exactly (ie simple strings). It's not doing a match so there is no wild card involved.
8. Github user cshannon commented on a diff in the pull request: https://github.com/apache/activemq-artemis/pull/1807#discussion_r163306080 --- Diff: artemis-server/src/main/java/org/apache/activemq/artemis/core/postoffice/impl/PostOfficeImpl.java --- @@ -532,7 +532,7 @@ public AddressInfo updateAddressInfo(SimpleString addressName, public AddressInfo removeAddressInfo(SimpleString address) throws Exception { synchronized (addressLock) { server.callBrokerPlugins(server.hasBrokerPlugins() ? plugin -> plugin.beforeRemoveAddress(address) : null); - Bindings bindingsForAddress = getBindingsForAddress(address); + final Bindings bindingsForAddress = getDirectBindings(address); --- End diff -- But I can still add some tests for a different wildcard anyways.
9. Github user cshannon commented on the issue: <https://github.com/apache/activemq-artemis/pull/1807> I added a couple more tests for the WildcardAddressManager to show that getDirectBindings() works with a different wildcard setting
10. Commit 8b6df5b73a6e2a028033212bdf89c5f2512346b6 in activemq-artemis's branch refs/heads/master from [~cshannon] [<https://git-wip-us.apache.org/repos/asf?p=activemq-artemis.git;h=8b6df5b>] ARTEMIS-1627 - Support removing addresses that do not have direct bindings If there are no direct bindings on an address and only linked bindings then the address should be able to be removed from the broker
11. Github user asfgit closed the pull request at: <https://github.com/apache/activemq-artemis/pull/1807>