## Redmine - Feature #7319

# Repetitive tasks?

2011-01-13 15:18 - Frank Helk

Status:	New	Start date:	2011-01-13	
Priority:	Normal	Due date:		
Assignee:		% Done:	0%	
Category:	Issues	Estimated time:	0.00 hour	
Target version:				
Resolution:				
Description				
The issue just came up to me, while I was doing some work that comes up every quarter.				
I have some tasks coming up endless cycling, i.e. the preparation of mothly/quartery/yearly reports.				
I would appreciate				
<ul> <li>a type of tracker that goes back to some "open" state (preferably "assigned") on predefined intervals, or</li> <li>some kind of facility that spawns a new ticket at those predefined intervals</li> </ul>				
The definiton part could be an extension to the "new ticket" form, i.e.				
[ ] Resurrect ticket every [ <num>] [days/weeks/months/years], beginning on [date], to status [].</num>				
or				
[ ] Repeat ticket creation every [ <num>] [days/weeks/months/years], beginning on [date].</num>				
There should be a special permission to make tickets repetitive, and management could be done on the standard ticket edit form.				
Related issues:				
Related to Redmine - Fea		New	2008-05-05	

## History

### #1 - 2011-10-05 11:02 - Tomasz Sawicki

Same as #1176?

+1 by the way..

## #2 - 2011-10-05 11:47 - Etienne Massip

Tomasz Sawicki wrote:

Same as #1176?

Not exactly, thanks for pointing out this relationship.

### #3 - 2012-03-01 12:20 - Frank Helk

I've described a way to do both this and  $\frac{#1176}{}$  in issue  $\frac{#1176}{}$  ...

#4 - 2013-01-08 11:54 - Luc GIROUX

+1

#5 - 2013-01-16 20:33 - Adrian Rotaru

+10

#6 - 2013-01-29 08:38 - Martin G

2025-05-17 1/2

## #7 - 2013-05-11 16:17 - Leonardo Salgado

+1

### #8 - 2013-08-11 11:31 - Dotan Cohen

Please make clear how this issue differs from #1176. Thanks.

### #9 - 2013-08-14 10:57 - Frank Helk

 $\mbox{OK}$  - I've read again over this ticket and  $\underline{\#1176}$  along with the comments and contemplated over 'em.

The requested features look similar, and I admit that they basically propose the same thing. I presume that if the feature gets implemented in a way like I've outlined it detailed in #1176#note-46, it will probably fit both requests good enough to satisfy both.

### #10 - 2015-11-26 14:30 - Frank Helk

Any news on that ?

I'm still in need for that ...

2025-05-17 2/2