Redmine - Defect #20456
3.1-stable/3.1.0: missing commits (omitted from being merged from trunk)
2015-08-01 10:10 - Mischa The Evil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignee:</td>
<td>Jean-Philippe Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target version:</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution:</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Done:</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated time:</td>
<td>0.00 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected version:</td>
<td>3.1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

This was reported initially by Ryosuke Hirai in #11253-38:

> It seems that issue_query.rb @ Revision 14406 was not applied to the source code of 3.1.0. I could not find this part after downloading.

After I read that I started another round of commit hunting. I have summed up the issues I found – and how I found them, using some ASCII-"art". See below.

I'll start with a to-do section which list the commits that needs to be merged in 3.1-stable, the commits that can/should be merged in 3.1-stable and the commits that shouldn't be merged into 3.1-stable since they are related to issues that are explicitly targeted to 3.2.0 at the time of writing this.

Then I start a section which compares the commits on trunk versus the commits (backports/merges) on 3.1-stable which in the end provides a list of commits applied on trunk but not on 3.1-stable, which I in turn used to specify which commits belong to what and what should be done them. That itself is what I used to fill in the to-do section.

Note that I also include a third 'legend' section to make sure that my "art" can be understood ;-)...

---

1. To do on 3.1-stable branch:

```
* To merge.........: r14405, r14406, r14407, r14408, r14409, r14410, r14454
* Merge-able........: r14390, r14391, r14411, r14412, r14413, r14414, r14415, r14416
* Shouldn't be merged: r14458, r14468, r14469, r14470, r14471
```

-------------------------------

2. Commits scheme & reasoning:

```
v -> TRUNK
    |
    |
O  -> r14378
    \|
    \|
v ----------- O  -> r14379, 3.1 STABLE BRANCH CREATION
v
    \----->v
    |
    |
8  -> X14380, X14381, X14388, X14389, r14390, r14391, X14392, X14394, X14396, r14405, r14406, r14407, r14408, r14409, r14410, r14411,
```
r14412, r14413, r14414, r14415, r14416, X14417, X14428, X14429,
<< X14430, X14437, X14440, X14443, X14446, X14448, X14450, X14451,
/ r14454, X14455, X14419, X14420, r14458, X14459, X14460, X14461,
/ r14468, r14469, r14470, r14471  
|   ^ -> ((r => X) == (MARKED AS CONFIRMED AS MERGED FROM TRUNK TO 3.1-STABLE))
|   |   |
| v v   ^ -> WRAPUP & CONCLUSION: COMMITS ON TRUNK AFTER 3.1-STABLE BRANCH CREATION, THAT ARE NOT MERGED INTO 3.1-STABLE
| v v
|   8 -> r14382, r14385, r14393, r14395, r14397, r14400, r14403,
|   | r14418, r14421, r14422, r14431, r14432, r14433, r14438,
|   | r14441, r14444, r14447, r14449, r14452, r14453, r14456,
|   | r14462, r14463, r14464, >>----
| v v

v -> NOT EXPLICIT 3.1.0, BUT IT WAS PROBABLY INTENDED FOR 3.1.X THOUGH

8 -> r14405, r14406, r14407, r14408, r14409, r14410, -->>> EXPLICIT 3.1.0, #11253 AND RELATED

8 -> r14411, r14412, r14413, r14414, -->>> UNKNOWN, CAN BE BACK-PORTED TO 3.1: "CODE (LAYOUT) CLEANUP & HTTP => HTTPS"

8 -> r14415, r14416, -->>> UNKNOWN, MIGHT BE BACK-PORTABLE TO 3.1: "TRAVIS CHANGES, #20251"

8 -> r14454, -->>> EXPLICIT 3.1.0, "BG LOCALE REORDER", #11253 AND RELATED

8 -> r14458, r14468, r14469, r14470, r14471 -->>> EXPLICIT 3.2.0

--------------------

3. Legend:

* ->: MULTIPLE COMMITS
* ->: MULTIPLE COMMITS SPECIFICATION
* ->: COMMENT
* =>: == REPLACED BY
I'll leave the scheduling decision (strict: 3.2.0, lenient: 3.1.1) to the committers.

Please note that this issue brings me to issue #18134 again, and in particular to the questions I raised in its note #18134-5 (before "The examples."). If SCM-provided merge tracking features are used and maintained correctly, issues like this one and previous #18174 could have been spotted right on with some higher certainty. Just my two cents...

Kind regards, Mischa.

Related issues:
Related to Redmine - Feature # 11253: Total time spent from subtasks on the i... Closed

Associated revisions
Revision 14533 - 2015-08-31 05:38 - Toshi MARUYAMA
Merged r14406 from trunk to 3.1-stable (#11253, #20456)
Add "Total spent hours" column available on the issue list.

Revision 14534 - 2015-08-31 05:38 - Toshi MARUYAMA
Merged r14407 from trunk to 3.1-stable (#11253, #20456)
Preload total spent time on the issue list with 1 query.

Revision 14535 - 2015-08-31 05:38 - Toshi MARUYAMA
Merged r14408 from trunk to 3.1-stable (#11253, #20456)
Limit queries to given issues only.

Revision 14536 - 2015-08-31 05:38 - Toshi MARUYAMA
Merged r14409 from trunk to 3.1-stable (#11253, #20456)
Fixes methods comments.

Revision 14537 - 2015-08-31 05:38 - Toshi MARUYAMA
Merged r14410 from trunk to 3.1-stable (#11253, #20456)
Asserts that spent time is preloaded.

Revision 14538 - 2015-08-31 07:22 - Toshi MARUYAMA
Merged r14413 from trunk to 3.1-stable (#20243, #20456)

Use https links instead of http links in ApplicationHelper#avatar_edit_link and Redmine::Info class methods.

Patch by Mischa The Evil.

Revision 14596 - 2015-09-16 05:52 - Toshi MARUYAMA

Merged r14405 from trunk to 3.1-stable (#11253, #20456)

Don't display estimated hours when nil and total is 0.

History

#1 - 2015-08-01 10:11 - Mischa The Evil
- Description updated

#2 - 2015-08-01 10:12 - Mischa The Evil
- Description updated

#3 - 2015-08-01 10:13 - Mischa The Evil
- Related to Feature #11253: Total time spent from subtasks on the issue list added

#4 - 2015-08-01 13:15 - Toshi MARUYAMA
- Description updated

#5 - 2015-08-01 13:44 - Toshi MARUYAMA

Thank you for investigation. I will answer my revisions later.

If SCM-provided merge tracking features are used and maintained correctly

I almost agree, but SCM is not completed solution.

Rails uses git.
https://github.com/rails/rails

But Rails uses "backport/cherry-pick" model.
https://github.com/rails/rails/pull/19689

1. Revision is committed in master branch.
   https://github.com/rails/rails/commit/7e504927090362d132d4e315c6f22915050fe5ba

2. This master revision is backported in 4.2-stable branch.
   https://github.com/rails/rails/commit/4df216cb12e35c09ae5ec271755e581d692d0326

If they use Git/Mercurial, they should use stable/devel merge strategy.
http://marutosi.bitbucket.org/RxTstudy-20130622/one-html/html/index.html#id252

#6 - 2015-08-31 05:42 - Toshi MARUYAMA

r14390, r14391,
I think this is refactoring and not for stable.

#7 - 2015-08-31 05:43 - Toshi MARUYAMA
- Target version set to 3.1.1

#8 - 2015-08-31 07:25 - Toshi MARUYAMA

r14411, r14412, r14413, r14414,

--->>> UNKNOWN, CAN BE BACK-PORTED TO 3.1: "CODE (LAYOUT) CLEANUP & HTTP => HTTPS"

I have merged r14413 from trunk to 3.1-stable.
I think r14411, r14412 and r14414 are refactoring and not for stable.

#9 - 2015-08-31 07:29 - Toshi MARUYAMA

r14415, r14416,

--->>> UNKNOWN, MIGHT BE BACK-PORTABLE TO 3.1: "TRAVIS CHANGES, #20251"

r14415 was merged as r14523.
r14416 was merged as r14531.

#10 - 2015-08-31 07:33 - Toshi MARUYAMA

--> r14454,

--->>> EXPLICIT 3.1.0, "BG LOCALE REORDER", #11253 AND RELATED

Bulgarian translation is well maintained.
#11253 translation is merged as r14533.

#11 - 2015-08-31 07:36 - Toshi MARUYAMA
- Status changed from New to Resolved

I have finished checking revisions in description.

#12 - 2015-09-02 03:20 - Ryosuke Hirai

Mischa and Toshi,
Thank you so much for your dedicated work on this issue!, especially Mischa’s deep investigation

#13 - 2015-09-13 16:29 - Jean-Philippe Lang
Mischa and Toshi, thanks for your respective work. Can we close this for 3.1.1?

**#14 - 2015-09-15 06:14 - Mischa The Evil**
- Status changed from Resolved to Needs feedback

Jean-Philippe Lang wrote:

> [...] Can we close this for 3.1.1?

Toshi MARUYAMA wrote:

> I have finished checking revisions in description.

Toshi, thanks for the review. I'm ok with your decisions and merges. One question though: did you skip r14405 for any particular reason? After decision/action is taken on r14405 this issue is completed and can be closed for 3.1.1 inclusion.

Note: please mention the inclusion of #11253 in 3.1.1 instead of 3.1.0 in the 3.1.1 release announcement and changelog entry, since it's now showing on the changelog as part of 3.1.0.

**#15 - 2015-09-16 06:24 - Toshi MARUYAMA**
- Status changed from Needs feedback to Resolved
- Assignee changed from Toshi MARUYAMA to Jean-Philippe Lang

Mischa The Evil wrote:

Jean-Philippe Lang wrote:

> [...] Can we close this for 3.1.1?

Toshi MARUYAMA wrote:

> I have finished checking revisions in description.

Toshi, thanks for the review. I'm ok with your decisions and merges. One question though: did you skip r14405 for any particular reason?

There is no reason. I forgot it.

Note: please mention the inclusion of #11253 in 3.1.1 instead of 3.1.0 in the 3.1.1 release announcement and changelog entry, since it's now showing on the changelog as part of 3.1.0.

I keep open for JPL reminder.
Toshi MARUYAMA wrote:

Mischa The Evil wrote:

Jean-Philippe Lang wrote:

[...] Can we close this for 3.1.1?

Toshi MARUYAMA wrote:

I have finished checking revisions in description.

Toshi, thanks for the review. I'm ok with your decisions and merges. One question though: did you skip r14405 for any particular reason?

There is no reason. I forgot it.

I have merged as r14596.

#17 - 2015-09-19 09:30 - Jean-Philippe Lang

- Status changed from Resolved to Closed
- Resolution set to Fixed

Thanks.