

Redmine - Feature #2746

Send out issue priority in the email notification header

2009-02-13 19:10 - Brad Beattie

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Start date:</b>	
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>	Go MAEDA	<b>% Done:</b>	0%
<b>Category:</b>	Email notifications	<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	5.1.0		
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Description</b>			
The attached patch will send out an issue's priority with the notification email's headers. This is important for when you want to route urgent tickets differently.			
<b>Related issues:</b>			
Related to Redmine - Feature #19939: New X-Redmine-Issue-Priority header, and...			Closed
Related to Redmine - Feature #12864: If ticket was created with priority High...			Closed
Related to Redmine - Feature #31910: Add additional mail headers for issue tr...			Closed
Has duplicate Redmine - Feature #20443: Add Priority header to Email notifica...			Closed

Associated revisions

Revision 22244 - 2023-05-13 10:05 - Go MAEDA

Add X-Redmine-Issue-Priority headers to issue notification mails (#2746).

Patch by Holger Just.

History

#1 - 2009-02-14 19:22 - Jean-Philippe Lang

Why not use the more standard X-Priority header?

#2 - 2009-02-14 21:39 - Brad Beattie

- Assignee set to Jean-Philippe Lang

Jean-Philippe Lang wrote:

Why not use the more standard X-Priority header?

Hrm. The header [Priority](#) has values "normal", "urgent" and "non-urgent". I can't find any RFC that defines the values of "X-Priority", but most examples I see use the values 1 through 5. While this maps up to Redmine's default priority values, other systems might have limited or extended these enumerations (e.g. my company uses "Low, Normal and Emergency". How would these modified values be mapped to X-Priority? 1, 3, 5? It's kinda vague, yeah?

I guess that's why I thought just creating a Redmine-specific priority header would be a better choice. What're your thoughts on this?

#3 - 2009-02-14 23:46 - Jean-Philippe Lang

An other problem is that a X-Priority of 1 means urgent, whereas Redmine priorities are sorted in opposite order (1 = low). We need to map Redmine priorities (max => 1, min => 5). Just need to retrieve the total numbers of priorities defined in Redmine. So yes, if you have 3 priorities defined in Redmine, they would be mapped to X-Priority 1, 3 and 5.

#4 - 2009-02-15 12:20 - Thomas Pihl

Other solution might be an extra field when defining priorities where you can choose x-priority manually for each priority. This might include an option not to send email for some priorities.

/T

#5 - 2009-02-15 14:33 - Jean-Philippe Lang

I'd really prefer not to add an extra field just for this purpose. Is there any problem with the solution I propose?

## #6 - 2009-02-16 04:00 - Brad Beattie

Jean-Philippe Lang wrote:

I'd really prefer not to add an extra field just for this purpose.  
Is there any problem with the solution I propose?

Hrm. Yeah. Let's say we have two Redmine instances: one has priorities *deferrable* and *normal*, the other has priorities *normal* and *emergency*. How would you propose those two instances would be mapped? I don't see a way of automating this to ensure that any set of customized priorities get mapped properly to the X-Priority header. I guess that's why I suggested a Redmine-specific header.

## #7 - 2015-07-31 03:19 - Go MAEDA

- Has duplicate Feature #20443: Add Priority header to Email notifications added

## #8 - 2015-07-31 03:22 - Go MAEDA

- Related to Feature #19939: New X-Redmine-Issue-Priority header, and modification of X-Redmine-Issue-Assignee added

## #9 - 2017-09-10 13:32 - Peter Volkov

Guys what's left to do here? Can we have X-Redmine-Priority field at least and leave a question if we need standard Priority field and mapping for better times?

## #10 - 2018-09-15 10:01 - Go MAEDA

- Related to Feature #12864: If ticket was created with priority High/Urgent, send smtp-email with priority Urgent added

## #11 - 2019-08-16 04:30 - Go MAEDA

- Related to Feature #31910: Add additional mail headers for issue tracker added

## #12 - 2021-05-16 10:04 - Go MAEDA

- Assignee deleted (Jean-Philippe Lang)

The following patch adds a standard Priority field defined in [RFC 2156](#). The priority values are mapped to one of "normal", "urgent", or "non-urgent".

```
diff --git a/app/models/mailer.rb b/app/models/mailer.rb
index f58a1c88d..33b82a519 100644
--- a/app/models/mailer.rb
+++ b/app/models/mailer.rb
@@ -71,6 +71,7 @@ class Mailer < ActionMailer::Base

  # Builds a mail for notifying user about a new issue
  def issue_add(user, issue)
+   headers['Priority'] = priority_for_header(issue)
+   redmine_headers 'Project' => issue.project.identifier,
+                     'Issue-Tracker' => issue.tracker.name,
+                     'Issue-Id' => issue.id,
@@ -103,6 +104,7 @@ class Mailer < ActionMailer::Base
  # Builds a mail for notifying user about an issue update
  def issue_edit(user, journal)
    issue = journal.journalized
+   headers['Priority'] = priority_for_header(issue)
+   redmine_headers 'Project' => issue.project.identifier,
+                     'Issue-Tracker' => issue.tracker.name,
+                     'Issue-Id' => issue.id,
@@ -763,6 +765,17 @@ class Mailer < ActionMailer::Base
  h.each {|k, v| headers["X-Redmine-#{k}"] = v.to_s}
  end

+ def priority_for_header(issue)
+   position_name = issue.priority.position_name
+   if position_name.start_with?('high')
+     'urgent'
+   elsif position_name.start_with?('low')
+     'non-urgent'
+   else
+     'normal'
+   end
+ end
+ end
+
  # Singleton class method is public
```

```
class << self
  def token_for(object, user)
```

### #13 - 2021-05-16 14:20 - Go MAEDA

- File 2746.patch added
- Target version set to Candidate for next major release

Added test code to [#2746#note-12](#).

### #14 - 2021-05-17 03:57 - Go MAEDA

- Target version changed from Candidate for next major release to 5.0.0

Setting the target version to 5.0.0.

### #15 - 2021-05-19 08:30 - Go MAEDA

- Target version changed from 5.0.0 to Candidate for next major release

Go MAEDA wrote:

The following patch adds a standard Priority field defined in [RFC 2156](#). The priority values are mapped to one of "normal", "urgent", or "non-urgent".

I found that it is not appropriate to use the Priority header to express issue priorities because the header is related to QoS control of mail delivery. [RFC2076](#) says the header "can influence transmission speed and delivery".

Since issue priority has nothing to do with mail delivery priority, it is wrong to use the Priority header to express issue priority.

### #16 - 2023-05-04 16:21 - Holger Just

- File 0001-Add-X-Redmine-Issue-Priority-headers-to-issue-notifi.patch added

The discussion got a bit derailed from the original request here.

I think the consent now is to just send the configured priority name as an additional header. For that, I have attached an updated patch which was extracted from [Planio](#). To resolve this issue, we could just apply this patch which is a nice low-friction addition.

Further trying to map this to the value to the "standard" X-Priority / Priority fields in mails could then be an additional step. However, this is something that some people may not want and it is something which has wildly differing support in the MTAs and MUAs with various headers allowing different values and slightly differing semantics.

From my (limited) research, the most common headers are:

- Priority - Allows the values Non-Urgent, Normal, Urgent
- X-Priority - Allows the numeric values 1 - 5 with lower numbers indicating higher priorities. Outlook only emits 1, 3 and 5 respectively.
- Importance - This appears to be a "Microsoft standard". It allows the values Low, Normal, High

Microsoft / Outlook map their internal importance value to all of these header values.

If so desired, we could set one or all of these headers based on the result of IssuePriority#low? or IssuePriority#high?. However, I don't believe this is particularly useful, as it still just reflects the priority of the issue overall, not the priority of the respective notification. As such, I'd rather vote for just adding the name of the priority in the X-Redmine-Issue-Priority header as implemented by the attached patch and not attempt to deduct a mail priority / importance from that.

Related documentation:

- [https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/openspecs/exchange\\_server\\_protocols/ms-oxcmail/2bb19f1b-b35e-4966-b1cb-1afd044e83ab](https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/openspecs/exchange_server_protocols/ms-oxcmail/2bb19f1b-b35e-4966-b1cb-1afd044e83ab)
- <https://stackoverflow.com/a/64922489/421705>

### #17 - 2023-05-05 11:20 - Go MAEDA

- Target version changed from Candidate for next major release to 5.1.0

Setting the target version to 5.1.0.

### #18 - 2023-05-14 16:35 - Go MAEDA

- Status changed from New to Closed

- Assignee set to Go MAEDA

Committed the patch in [r22244](#). Thank you for your contribution.

Redmine 5.1.0 will have X-Redmine-Issue-Priority header field that indicates the issue priority.

**#19 - 2023-10-29 23:48 - Mischa The Evil**

- Start date deleted (2009-02-13)

**#20 - 2023-10-30 10:42 - Go MAEDA**

- Tracker changed from Patch to Feature

- Resolution set to Fixed

**Files**

priority.patch	938 Bytes	2009-02-13	Brad Beattie
2746.patch	2.82 KB	2021-05-16	Go MAEDA
0001-Add-X-Redmine-Issue-Priority-headers-to-issue-notifi.patch	1.17 KB	2023-05-04	Holger Just