

# KIP-603: Change `ConfigEntry` value to use optional fields

- [Status](#)
- [Motivation](#)
  - [follower.replication.throttled.replicas](#)
  - [leader.replication.throttled.replicas](#)
  - [client.id](#)
- [Public Interfaces](#)
- [Proposed Changes](#)
- [Compatibility, Deprecation, and Migration Plan](#)
- [Rejected Alternatives](#)

## Status

**Current state:** Draft

**Discussion thread:** [here](#) [Change the link from the KIP proposal email archive to your own email thread]

**JIRA:** [here](#) [Change the link from KAFKA-1 to your own ticket]

Please keep the discussion on the mailing list rather than commenting on the wiki (wiki discussions get unwieldy fast).

## Motivation

In the `ConfigEntry` class, the `value` field can be `null`. However, the users can assume it can't be and encounter `NullPointerException` since the type is not explicit. Thus we want to change its type to `Optional<String>` to make it explicit that it might not be set.

Furthermore, in our implementation [here](#) the `AlterConfigsRequest.ConfigEntry` value is required not to be null, however there is nothing preventing `configEntry.value()` to not return null. Similar cases can also be found in [here](#).

Considering the following configurations:

1. [follower.replication.throttled.replicas](#)
2. [leader.replication.throttled.replicas](#)
3. [client.id](#)

All of the above contain default empty string values and there is nothing preventing them to be set to null. Having read the documentation the caller might easily think that the value of the above configuration can't be null given its initial value is empty string. Consequently, they forget the null check and hit `NullPointerException` when these configurations are indeed `null`. The users can write code like `leaderConfig.value().length() == 0` which throws a `NullPointerException` in execution.

## Public Interfaces

We plan to add a new method `valueOptional()` and mark the `value()` method as deprecated.

```
public Optional<String> valueOptional() {  
    return value;  
}
```

## Proposed Changes

We plan to change the type of the value field to be an `Optional<String>` which requires us to also change the getter, `equals` and `hashCode` methods.

```

private final String value; => private final Optional<String> value;

@Override
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (this == o)
        return true;
    if (o == null || getClass() != o.getClass())
        return false;

    ConfigEntry that = (ConfigEntry) o;

    return this.name.equals(that.name) &&
           this.value.equals(that.value) && // CHANGED
           this.isSensitive == that.isSensitive &&
           this.isReadOnly == that.isReadOnly &&
           this.source == that.source &&
           Objects.equals(this.synonyms, that.synonyms);
}

@Override
public int hashCode() {
    final int prime = 31;
    int result = 1;
    result = prime * result + name.hashCode();
    result = prime * result + value.hashCode(); // CHANGED
    result = prime * result + (isSensitive ? 1 : 0);
    result = prime * result + (isReadOnly ? 1 : 0);
    result = prime * result + source.hashCode();
    result = prime * result + synonyms.hashCode();
    return result;
}

```

## Compatibility, Deprecation, and Migration Plan

Various callers that uses the constructor and getter will need to be changed to account for the change in type.

## Rejected Alternatives

We have also consider using a default sentinel value to represent value not set, e.g. `""`. However semantically, null and empty string is not always equivalent. For example we can have a configuration of [bootstrap.servers](#) which has the default value of `""` and also with another configuration [ssl.Key.Password](#) with a default value of null.