

openSUSE Leap 15.0 - action #35494

eliminate duplicate binaries

2018-04-25 08:53 - Inussel

Status:	Resolved	Start date:	2018-04-25
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	2018-04-30
Assignee:	jberry	% Done:	100%
Category:	Release Engineering	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	Bugfree		
Description			
packages with duplicate binaries need to be cleaned up as OBS has undefined behavior with those			
https://build.opensuse.org/package/view_file/openSUSE:Leap:15.0:Staging/dashboard/duplicate_binaries?expand=1			
Related issues:			
Copied to openSUSE Leap 15.1 - action #47825: eliminate duplicate binaries		Closed	2019-04-10 2019-04-15

History

#1 - 2018-04-25 08:53 - Inussel

- Description updated

#2 - 2018-04-25 09:04 - Inussel

llvm

https://bugzilla.opensuse.org/show_bug.cgi?id=1090853

#3 - 2018-04-25 16:28 - Inussel

- Assignee set to jberry

another one for you jimmy, I wonder if we could add that to repochecker to prevent duplicates right away

#4 - 2018-04-26 02:52 - jberry

Created an issue for include in repo-checker last year <https://github.com/openSUSE/openSUSE-release-tools/issues/1031>.

#5 - 2018-04-26 16:06 - jberry

The current tool ignores src and nosrc packages. Other tools ignore -debugsource and -debuginfo.

a) Presumably the same problem exists when src packages are published with same name so does this make sense to ignore? Understandably the src packages are less "important" since they are not used in other builds nor typically by end users, but the underlying problem exists.

b) Same note as other tools ignoring -debug* packages. Clearly this would be a problem when installing them, but perhaps only interested in one entry?

#6 - 2018-04-26 16:20 - jberry

AS for the special self.ignore_extra_archs, should all parch != arch be ignored? Why just those packages? Is the OBS behavior "define" in general for that rule and they should always be ignored?

#7 - 2018-04-26 16:26 - Inussel

parch != arch is the special for i686 IIRC, those packages end up in a different directory by means of export filter IIRC. OBS black magic

src packages are less important, yes. Because they are not used for building. In OBS it's especially nasty if the package used for building changes all the time. maybe there needs to be a separate warning category for those. same for debug packages. I would live with overlaps there for now but really need to fix the real binary packages.

#8 - 2018-04-26 19:06 - jberry

It appears the hd5-examples duplicates is another stale binary case:

<https://github.com/openSUSE/open-build-service/issues/4373#issuecomment-384756318>

#9 - 2018-04-26 19:38 - jberry

- Status changed from New to Feedback

- % Done changed from 0 to 100

Created two pull requests to improve duplicate checking tool:

- [osclib/check_duplicate_binaries: ignore s/glibc.i686/glibc.i686/](#)
- [osclib/check_duplicate_binaries: rewrite to use package_binary_list\(\)](#)

Updated output:

i586:

blacs-devel-headers:

- scalapack:gnu-openmpi-hpc
- scalapack:mvapich2
- scalapack:openmpi
- scalapack:gnu-mvapich2-hpc hdf5-examples:
- hdf5:serial
- hdf5:gnu-hpc luaposix-doc:
- lua-luaposix:lua51
- lua-luaposix:lua53 x86_64: blacs-devel-headers:
- scalapack:mvapich2
- scalapack:openmpi fonttools:
- python-FontTools
- fonttools luaposix-doc:
- lua-luaposix:lua51
- lua-luaposix:lua53 mpv-plugin-mpris:
- lua-lua-mpris:lua53
- lua-lua-mpris:lua51 soapysdr0.6-module-airspy:
- soapy-airspy
- soapy-osmo soapysdr0.6-module-bladerf:
- libxtrx
- soapy-bladerf soapysdr0.6-module-hackrf:
- soapy-hackrf
- soapy-osmo

Resolutions:

- [delete openSUSE:Leap:15.0/fonttools](#) in favor of python-FontTools
- [submit science/scalapack](#) to only build blacs-devel-headers during one flavor
- [submit devel:languages:lua/lua-luaposix](#) to only produce docs during one flavor
- [submit devel:languages:lua/lua-lua-mpris](#) to only produce mpv-plugin-mpris during one flavor
- [submit hardware:sdr/soapy-osmo](#) to append -osmo suffix to packages in conflict and add conflicts meta
- [submit hardware:sdr/libxtrx](#) to append -libxtrx suffix to packages in conflict and add conflicts meta

Presumably the update crawler will propagate these once they hit Factory.

#10 - 2018-04-27 13:13 - Inussel

- Status changed from Feedback to New

- % Done changed from 100 to 90

very nice, thanks! I'll keep it open to check again next week. maybe those submit requests need pushing

#11 - 2018-05-07 16:43 - Inussel

I can't get around doing that myself. Can you check again and just close when finished?

#12 - 2018-05-09 01:49 - jberry

- bumped sr#601660 (science/scalapack to only build blacs-devel-headers during one flavor) pending devel project acceptance.
- [submit openSUSE:Factory/lua-luaposix](#) to only produce docs during one flavor

All other issues are shown as resolved.

#13 - 2018-05-09 23:35 - jberry

- Status changed from New to Feedback

- [submit request 605959 for scalapack](#) with suggesting added to SLE-workarounds

#14 - 2018-05-15 21:25 - jberry

- *Status changed from Feedback to Resolved*

- *% Done changed from 90 to 100*

Tool reports no duplicates.

#15 - 2019-02-13 12:15 - Inussel

- *Copied to action #47825: eliminate duplicate binaries added*