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Issue merging
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Status: New
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Assignee:
Category: Issues
Target version:
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Start date: 2008-07-11
Due date:
% Done: 0%
Estimated time: 0.00 hour

Description

I know i could add links to related issues, but what i'd really like to see is the possibility to merge 2 or more tickets into one.

Related issues:
- Related to Redmine - Feature # 7997: Merge Issues
  Status: New
  Start date: 2011-03-25
- Related to Redmine - Feature # 3708: Merge duplicated issues
  Status: New
  Start date: 2009-08-03
- Duplicated by Redmine - Feature # 8900: merge of two or more ticket
  Status: Closed
  Start date: 2010-11-15

History

#1 - 2008-07-11 11:02 - Paul Rivier
That makes sens.
Let's say B gets merged into A. Accessing to B sould :
- lead to a 404 ?
- redirect transparently to A
- redirect verbosely to A

Issue discussions can be merged automatically on a timestamp basis, but what about description ? I think merging operation should prompt for the new description, including both parent descriptions surrounded by tags like conflict tags with subversion. The person doing the merge should do something about that before validating the merge operation.

WDYT ?

#2 - 2008-07-13 10:21 - Nikolai Bochev
I think trying to access the merged ticket should redirect with a notice.
As far as the description goes - i am using OTRS at work, and it merges tickets keeping the original description of the host ticket, and adds the guest ticket's description down along the topic one a timestamp basis. What you describe should work also ( manually merging both descriptions ). The whole point for me on merging is to be able to merge duplicate tickets, but when somehow the duplicate adds something new to the related issue. So having the guest ticket's description down below in the notes will work also, as if you follow the "conversation" it will be just like someone updated the original ticket with new info.

#3 - 2009-12-01 07:23 - Fredrik Liljegren
I guess you could be given the choice of automatic merging of #X into #Y, or manual merging. With automatic merging, something like what's stated above would work: Title and description of the issue merged into (#Y) is kept, while the title and description of #X is added as a comment as "Merged with issue #X: Title...".

Merging is always preferrable to deleting double issues; if nothing else, you get a new watcher (the author of issue #X) and everyone can see more people wants the same thing.

2020-05-29
Oh, I forgot to add: I also vote for a redirection woth a notice.

Kind of reviving a semi old issue here, but I don't see any newer comments/issue pertaining to issue merging. I really wish I knew more ruby, but my background lies with perl.
I use request tracker(RT) from bestpractical.com( http://bestpractical.com/rt) on a daily basis for work, but chose redmine for personal and all code management because of its integration with subversion.
So.. I thought a little insight into how another system does this may be helpful.
Anyhoo, RT accomplishes issue merging by using a database column EffectiveID, that, under normal circumstances, would be equal to the issue ID, but when merged, the EffectiveID is equal to the issue it was merged into. The routine(s) that load issues for view, etc load up issues by id, but "overlay" it with the effectiveID, thereby giving the look that it is a single issue..

Again, if I knew ruby(at all) I'd be happy to dive in and at least hack something up, but I'm at a loss.
Hopefully this is helpful

One more vote for manual merging :) 

Another vote!

Oh, dear. I thought merging tickets is already possible in Redmine, but only began searching for such a feature as I couldn't figure out how to do this.

I'm also fond of the idea that it's done like in OTRS, which I had let being installed at work for handling customer issues.
However, Redmine seemed much better suited for the task of bug/feature/issue resolving and thus will hopefully supercede our homegrown bug tracking system, chiefly because of its procedure management, overview & reporting facilities.

If merging tickets really still isn't possible right now, is there any suggested workaround I can follow?

TIA and regards, Sonny

I could also really use this. We have all emails coming from service@yomamma.com auto-creating issues in a redmine project called "unassigned".
From there we move the issues into their specific projects. When we receive multiple emails in a discussion for instance, that creates a whole bunch of new issues, which is pretty annoying to handle :) 

+1 for that feature.
#11 - 2011-03-31 12:19 - Roland Discein

+1

#12 - 2011-04-26 16:59 - Jason Butz

+1 for this feature

#13 - 2011-12-08 08:13 - Mats Andreassen

I was surprised to find out this was impossible in current. Consider this a +1.

#14 - 2011-12-09 22:33 - Brian Jacobi

+1 I'm surprised this still isn't implemented. Concept of locking or merging please :)

#15 - 2011-12-10 10:20 - Terence Mill

The you suing the email import the wrng way.
If an issue is created is gets an id which will be referenced in "topic" field for all mail notification are created for this mail. If any new mail includes the (not 100% sure) "[#issuenumber" string the mail will be added to existing issue as comment.

Walter Heck wrote:

> I could also really use this. We have all emails coming from service@yomamma.com auto-creating issues in a redmine project called "unassigned". From there we move the issues into their specific projects. When we receive multiple emails in a discussion for instance, that creates a whole bunch of new issues, which is pretty annoying to handle :) 

#16 - 2012-03-06 17:17 - Jason Butz

I'd like at add a +1 for this feature as well.

#17 - 2012-03-24 16:26 - Paolo Sechi

absolute a must. so +1

#18 - 2012-04-05 20:58 - Vlad Tyschuk

Also, +1 from me for this feature.

#19 - 2012-05-01 15:37 - Jarek Potiuk

And +1 from me.
An extremely useful feature. Surprised there hasn't been more discussion on this..

it is not going to happen - 4 yo by now

I still want to see this.
Now we have to move all files and transfer time spend, but we can not transfer comments right?
So we have to delete old issue...

Merge is needed. It's needed when workflow is changed.
Related is not the same.

Just hit a case where I really need this! I went to merge two issues and was surprised that it wasn't there. This is essential!

- Duplicated by Feature #6900: merge of two or more ticket added

An example case:

Someone sends in an email to a support address and CC their colleagues. Their colleagues all join in the "conversation" and continually Reply-All with the support address as a "participant". Redmine scrapes the emails and creates lots of duplicates.

For now we've been using the most recent email as the original and marking the others as duplicates of it, but having a merge option would be very useful.
Related to Feature #7997: Merge Issues added

#28 - 2013-07-10 20:56 - Jonathan Schneider

+1

A feature I really miss from Request Tracker.

#29 - 2013-08-03 07:44 - Tarun Kakkar

Hi team need your support to merge two tickets in Redmine. Is this available as a feature?

Prompt response on this matter will be highly appreciable

Nikolai Bochev wrote:

I know i could add links to related issues, but what i'd really like to see is the possibility to merge 2 or more tickets into one.

#30 - 2013-08-28 23:17 - Chris Fields

+1. I was very surprised this isn't already a feature. At the moment we are making them subtasks or 'Duplicated as' relations, but that's not really optimal.

#31 - 2013-11-18 09:18 - Leonid Titov

Definitely necessary feature. +1 vote for it.

#32 - 2015-03-18 08:12 - Joerg Boeselt

+1

#33 - 2015-04-10 08:19 - Leo Gaggl

Any ideas if this will make it onto the roadmap at some stage? This seems such a long-standing and obvious problem covered by most other comparable systems. It would be good to have some indications if this will be looked at.

#34 - 2015-04-10 09:01 - Christian Zagrodnick

A related question is: Could this be sponsored? And if, how much money do we need.

#35 - 2015-04-10 09:20 - Leo Gaggl

Christian Zagrodnick wrote:

A related question is: Could this be sponsored? And if, how much money do we need.
I concur. I am sure there would be plenty organisations that would need this. Has some kind of 'crowd-funding' been considered in the past?

#36 - 2015-04-11 06:47 - Go MAEDA

Christian Zagrodnick wrote:

A related question is: Could this be sponsored? And if, how much money do we need.

I think the most needed thing to implement the feature is a patch rather than money.

#37 - 2015-04-14 15:50 - Go MAEDA
- Related to Feature #3708: Merge duplicated issues added

#38 - 2015-06-22 03:48 - Jamie Carl
+1 Will we ever get this feature?

I'm getting users who report issues via email constantly creating duplicate issues by fwd'ing the email again with amendments, instead of replying to the (New) email they receive. Currently I am manually cutting and pasting the new email into the existing one then closing the new issue as a duplicate. It would be way better to actually merge this stuff.

#39 - 2015-07-06 18:15 - nano devel
+1 for this feature! Any comment from the developer?

#40 - 2016-03-17 23:43 - Michael Krupp

I am willing to implement this feature as a plugin, but I have a few questions first:

- Original issue time log entries
  - leave them as-is?
  - move the entries to the target issue?

- Original issue
  - leave it as-is?
  - delete it?
  - link it to the target issue?
  - close it?

- Original issue relations
  - leave them as-is?
  - copy them to the target issue?
  - move them to the target issue?

- Original issue description
  - copy it as new journal entry?
  - ignore it when merging?
- Original issue journal entries
  - leave them as-is?
  - copy them to the target issue?
  - move them to the target issue?

- Original issue commit references
  - leave them as-is?
  - copy them to the target issue?
  - move them to the target issue?
  (note: commit messages cannot be updated)

**#41 - 2016-03-31 19:15 - John Cary**

This is what we would like to see:
- Original issue time log entries
  - move the entries to the target issue
- Original issue
  - link it to the target issue
  - close it
- Original issue relations
  - copy them to the target issue
- Original issue description
  - copy it as new journal entry
- Original issue journal entries
  - copy them to the target issue
- Original issue commit references
  - copy them to the target issue

We will be putting something at [https://freedomsponsors.org/](https://freedomsponsors.org/)

**#42 - 2016-04-14 16:41 - John Cary**

Curious as to whether there are any more comments on this?

Is there a way to contact someone at this site privately?

**#43 - 2016-06-14 12:39 - Sönke Noack**

I'd agree with everything in #1624#note-41.

Concerning "Original issue", in addition to "link it to the target issue" and "close it", I would also suggest to set a status "merged" (which is of "closed" type, like "closed" and "closed unresolved").

**#44 - 2016-08-31 18:56 - Michael Krupp**

Sorry for the late response, but I got carried away with other work. One of my co-workers is working on this right now, and we should have a 0.1-release ready soon.
Hi. 8 years later and we still can't merge issues. Sadness. @micheal has your team completed work on the hopeful plugin?

As an administrative task, merging may just move the notes from original to target issue, and leave the original issue without notes. Notices about original issue status changes will be lost.

The administrator then will manually decide what to do with the original issue data, as edit target issue and/or delete original it and/or link and/or anything else.

There are so many use cases for a merge that it is safer do nothing automatically and let the user manually handle the aftermath. Again, this is an administrative task and it is better leave the user manually handle what to do with the original issue after all notes have been moved.

+1

For me it would be enough to just link notes to the same issue ...

I create issues from email throw REST API. I need merge two issues to see attachments in one place (Duplicate relation is not useful)

What is the general holdup for this? This is a critical missing feature!

+1 for this feature!

+1 - would be great to have!