JMS not in extenson list after divesting slave

Posted by phmc - 2015/01/12 15:59

Hi Edwin,

As you know, one of my project's requirements is to be able to divest a slave site from the Parent site. I've backed up the site via SSH with the tar command you listed on your backup instructions page which resolves the symbolic links and restores the core Joomla code in the backup file.

I also exported the slave site database — as you know they all have separate databases — and reconnected everything in the config file as needed. The site displays fine.

But I noticed that when I log into the admin area, I do not see JMS Multi Sites listed in the component pulldown menu.

When we chatted via Teamviewer, you said that I would have to uninstall JMS. Since it is not there, did I do something wrong? Please let me know.

The site appears to work fine, though I'm afraid there may be something I'm not aware of.

I haven't gotten to the part where I would move the images_specific files back into the core Joomla images directory and resolve the img and link paths in the database file, yet, but I'd think that is not related to the missing JMS component.

Should I have restored to the Parent database instead — though that doesn't make sense to me?

Thanks,
Bruce

==========

Re: JMS not in extenson list after divesting slave

Posted by edwin2win - 2015/01/15 18:02

When you perform the backup of a slave site with the "tar -czhf" to resolve the symbolic link, it might be normal that you don't see JMS in the slave site if it was not present and installed previously.

The list of extension that you can see in the back-end of Joomla is resulting from the #__extension table that might not have the JMS installed in the slave site.

If you want to "discover" it in the slave site that you have restored on a standalone environment, you can always do it with the Joomla / extension manager / discover menu

Concerning the restore of the DB, you only have to restore the parent (or other DB) when you are sharing content.
In this case, the sharing may create a link on the table of another DB and therefore should have to be restore as physical table instead of a link but I don't think this is your case.

==========