

Continuous Integration (CI) - Feature #21061

Update the build/add_module_version API

10/08/2018 05:33 PM - Vito Di Benedetto

Status:	Closed	Start date:	10/08/2018
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	Vladimir Podstavkov	% Done:	100%
Category:		Estimated time:	4.00 hours
Target version:	v1_8_0_RC	Spent time:	3.00 hours
Experiment:	-	Stakeholders:	
Description			
<p>The build/add_module_version API is used to provide a link to the user repository revision. This API uses the attributes: module repourl gitrevision gitdescription</p> <p>In the current implementation it looks like the link provided in the checkout dashboard is built from repourl by appending "?rev="</p> <p>This works well for redmine repositories, but not for other repositories like GitHub.</p> <p>In the API update I propose to use 'repourl' as it is, the CI scripts will take care to provide the complete URL.</p> <p>We can have this tested for GenieCI instance as they are using GitHub for their repositories.</p>			

History

#1 - 10/24/2018 11:35 AM - Vladimir Podstavkov

- Status changed from Assigned to Work in progress
- Estimated time set to 4.00 h

#2 - 12/27/2018 12:10 PM - Vito Di Benedetto

- Target version changed from v1_9_0_RC to v1_8_0_RC

#3 - 02/15/2019 05:39 PM - Vladimir Podstavkov

- Status changed from Work in progress to Under Discussion
- Tracker changed from Task to Feature
- Experiment - added

Hey Vito,

It is not quite clear how to adapt this proposed model. Before, the module registered with the name and the repo URL in one table and then the module version registered in another table referring to the first one. This actually happened in one call to 'add_module_version' function. The link for the concrete module version was generated using the module URL and the version number combining them with '...?rev=....' parameter. From your description it looks like we need to merge those two tables in one storing the whole URL for the module version every time you send it. Then we would use the full URL to generate the link to the repo no matter if this is Redmine or Github.

Does it sound right?

#4 - 02/15/2019 06:09 PM - Vito Di Benedetto

Hi Vladimir,
I missed some details in this ticket description.

I think we can keep using the two tables, one with the repo URL and the other one with the module version as it is now. I'll provide the repo URL and the module version as separate attributes as I'm doing now.

The difference will be that when the web app code combines those two information, it should not combine them using "?rev=". For redmine repositories the "?rev=" part will be provided as part of the repo URL.

Do you think this can work?

#5 - 02/18/2019 10:34 AM - Vladimir Podstavkov

Oh! I see... I didn't look at it from this perspective! Sure, this will work and it will require the minimal changes in the code. And how it will look like for GitHub? Should I just join two parts together to build the full URL for the version?

Thank you Vito!

#6 - 02/18/2019 11:56 AM - Vito Di Benedetto

Vladimir Podstavkov wrote:

Oh! I see... I didn't look at it from this perspective! Sure, this will work and it will require the minimal changes in the code. And how it will look like for GitHub? Should I just join two parts together to build the full URL for the version?

Vladimir, that's correct for GitHub.

#7 - 02/18/2019 02:08 PM - Vladimir Podstavkov

- % Done changed from 0 to 90

- Status changed from Under Discussion to Work in progress

#8 - 02/27/2019 02:18 PM - Vladimir Podstavkov

- % Done changed from 90 to 100

- Status changed from Work in progress to Resolved

#9 - 02/27/2019 03:57 PM - Vito Di Benedetto

- Status changed from Resolved to Closed