openQA Tests - action #112415
[qa-tools] handle new openSUSE-Leap-Micro-5.2
2022-06-14 15:59 - msmeissn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignee:</td>
<td>jbaier_cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>New test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target version:</td>
<td>Ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date:</td>
<td>2022-06-14</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Description
We have just established a new product openSUSE-Leap-Micro-5.2
Please add this to your testplan generator.

Related issues:
Related to QA - coordination #110016: [epic][teregen] teregen (maintenance te... New 2021-01-14

History
#1 - 2022-06-14 16:05 - pluskalm
- Subject changed from handle new openSUSE-Leap-Micro-5.2 to [qa-tools] handle new openSUSE-Leap-Micro-5.2

#2 - 2022-06-14 16:19 - jlausuch
Do you mean 5.3?
Leap Micro 5.2 was enabled already in openqa.opensuse.org some time ago: [https://openqa.opensuse.org/group_overview/94](https://openqa.opensuse.org/group_overview/94)

#3 - 2022-06-14 16:32 - pluskalm
[https://gitlab.suse.de/qa-maintenance/metadata/-/merge_requests/642](https://gitlab.suse.de/qa-maintenance/metadata/-/merge_requests/642)

#4 - 2022-06-14 16:32 - pluskalm
jlausuch wrote:
Do you mean 5.3?
Leap Micro 5.2 was enabled already in openqa.opensuse.org some time ago: [https://openqa.opensuse.org/group_overview/94](https://openqa.opensuse.org/group_overview/94)

I would emphasise "testplan generator" part

#5 - 2022-06-14 16:42 - okurz
- Category set to New test
- Status changed from New to Feedback
- Assignee set to okurz
- Target version set to Ready

pluskalm what do you expect we need to do on top of the merge request?

#6 - 2022-06-14 16:53 - msmeissn
This is new, we now export the SLE Micro updates 5.2 for openSUSE Leap Micro 5.2 ... similar to the openSUSE SLE Leap exports.
(Up to now Leap Micro had no update channel, but their releaemgmt wanted it.)

#7 - 2022-06-14 17:19 - pluskalm
okurz wrote:

pluskalm what do you expect we need to do on top of the merge request?

Probably review of said merge request by Jan or Ondrej would be enough

2022-09-10
#8 - 2022-06-14 17:20 - pluskalm
There might be some discussion in future who is responsible for metadata for template generator as its somehow between update validation and tools squad, but it's usually such a small think that it might not be worth time spent discussing this :)

#9 - 2022-06-14 20:00 - okurz
pluskalm wrote:

There might be some discussion in future who is responsible for metadata for template generator as its somehow between update validation and tools squad, but it's usually such a small think that it might not be worth time spent discussing this :)

Well, that sounds good and feasible :) I think the best approach is if we can make tooling simple and accessible enough so that most of the work can be solved by the requesters directly. Like in this example: Updating the metadata repository should be easier than asking someone else to do it :)

#10 - 2022-06-17 15:54 - okurz
- Related to action #112268: [teregen] Integrate productdefs generator inside template generator added

#11 - 2022-06-17 15:55 - okurz
- Related to deleted (action #112268: [teregen] Integrate productdefs generator inside template generator)

#12 - 2022-06-17 15:55 - okurz
- Related to coordination #110016: [epic][teregen] teregen (maintenance test report template generator) improvements added

#13 - 2022-06-17 15:55 - okurz
- Status changed from Feedback to Resolved
- Assignee changed from okurz to jbaier_cz

https://gitlab.suse.de/qa-maintenance/metadata/-/merge_requests/642 was merged two days ago, nothing heard. I assume this is good so assigning to jbaier_cz who did that review and merge. So for the future it could always work like this that someone outside the tools team prepares the enablement with an optional review of changes.