

openQA Project - action #111314

`_SECRET` variables are exposed in vars.json when the job is not completed.

2022-05-19 11:03 - jlausuch

Status:	Workable	Start date:	2022-05-19
Priority:	High	Due date:	
Assignee:		% Done:	0%
Category:	Feature requests	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	future		
Difficulty:			

Description

Some workers contain sensitive information using `_SECRET` variables. Those variables are hidden in the settings tab and in `vars.json`, as expected.

However, if you restart or clone a job and cancel it while it's running, those variables are exposed in `vars.json`

```
70     "TEST": " ";
71     "TEST_GIT_
72     "TEST_SUI:
73     "TEXTMODE'
74     "VERSION"
75     "VIRTIO_CO
76     "VNC": "99
77     "WALLPAPER
78     "WORKER_CI
79     "WORKER_HO
80     "WORKER_II
81     "WORKER_II
82     "_SECRET_"
83     "_SECRET_"
84 }
```

NOTE: I don't want to provide links as I might give too many hints for a public place.

Related issues:

Related to openQA Project - action #110518: Call `job_done_hooks` if requested ...

Resolved

2021-09-18

History

#1 - 2022-05-19 11:10 - cdywan

We may want to consider [#110518](#) here and have a hook that verifies that no passwords were stored in production with an according hook on all jobs.

#2 - 2022-05-19 11:10 - cdywan

- Related to action #110518: Call `job_done_hooks` if requested by test setting (not only openQA config as done so far) size:M added

#3 - 2022-05-19 11:29 - okurz

- Project changed from openQA Tests to openQA Project

- Category set to Feature requests

- Target version set to future

[jlausuch](#) this is not really a problem of tests but os-autoinst so this ticket is better suited in "openQA Project", moving. But, are your plans to look into this yourself? I am putting into "future" because I don't see the feature request currently on our backlog but for now I am keeping "High" prio which means that there must be action on the ticket within the next 30 days. If not likely I will lower prio until then.

#4 - 2022-05-19 13:58 - jlausuch

okurz wrote:

[jlausuch](#) this is not really a problem of tests but os-autoinst so this ticket is better suited in "openQA Project", moving. But, are your plans to look into this yourself? I am putting into "future" because I don't see the feature request currently on our backlog but for now I am keeping "High" prio which means that there must be action on the ticket within the next 30 days. If not likely I will lower prio until then.

No plans to work on this during the next days at least. I consider this as a bug, not as a new feature request.

#5 - 2022-05-19 14:09 - okurz

jlausuch wrote:

No plans to work on this during the next days at least. I consider this as a bug, not as a new feature request.

We don't want to argue what people see as "bug". We only distinguish between "regressions" and "feature requests". "regressions" means we should look into the git history where we broke something and learn how that could have happened. based on what mkittler stated I believe that we never had the wished behaviour in place, hence we see it as a "feature request".

#6 - 2022-05-19 14:25 - jlausuch

okurz wrote:

jlausuch wrote:

No plans to work on this during the next days at least. I consider this as a bug, not as a new feature request.

We don't want to argue what people see as "bug". We only distinguish between "regressions" and "feature requests". "regressions" means we should look into the git history where we broke something and learn how that could have happened. based on what mkittler stated I believe that we never had the wished behaviour in place, hence we see it as a "feature request".

You depict it as A or B, Black or White, but it's not that simple. This is not a regression because it has been probably always like this and I found it by chance. But this doesn't mean it's a feature either. Exposing a secret in the log is a serious product/tool bug, no matter if it's a regression or not.

#7 - 2022-05-19 15:05 - okurz

Jose, seriously, don't waste your effort. If we categorize something as feature request or concrete bug shouldn't really matter that much. If I would select "Concrete Bugs" now then this would just confuse members of the SUSE QE Tools team as they would look for the git commit that broke something which does not exist. And it already happened in the past that comments like these discussing how the ticket should be handled confused people or made them shy away from actually looking into just fixing the issue.

#8 - 2022-05-19 15:32 - cdywan

okurz wrote:

Jose, seriously, don't waste your effort. If we categorize something as feature request or concrete bug shouldn't really matter that much. If I would select "Concrete Bugs" now then this would just confuse members of the SUSE QE Tools team as they would look for the git commit that broke something which does not exist. And it already happened in the past that comments like these discussing how the ticket should be handled confused people or made them shy away from actually looking into just fixing the issue.

I didn't read José as asking about ticket categories. But this was a requirement from the original feature request. This is was always expected to work but never sufficiently tested.

And I agree with that point. It's not a new idea that we only thought of now.

Files

vars.png	12.3 KB	2022-05-19	jlausuch
----------	---------	------------	----------