

## openQA Project - action #67576

### [spike:20h] github as authentication provider

2020-06-02 09:34 - okurz

<b>Status:</b>	Resolved	<b>Start date:</b>	2020-06-02
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>	cdywan	<b>% Done:</b>	0%
<b>Category:</b>	Feature requests	<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	Current Sprint		
<b>Difficulty:</b>			

**Description**

### Motivation

We only support "OpenID" and "Fake" authentication so far. In [#66703](#) we can see the problem with the high reliance on OpenID. In multiple places we are happy users of what github provides. We should research how feasible it is to support github as authentication provider, same as many other services do.

### History

#### #1 - 2020-06-02 10:39 - cdywan

- Status changed from Workable to In Progress
- Assignee set to cdywan
- Target version changed from Ready to Current Sprint

#### #2 - 2020-06-02 17:16 - cdywan

- [OAuth 2.0 which GitHub supports](#) is pretty straightforward. Request a token via GET, get a temporary code and turn that into an access token.
- An **application** has to be [registered](#). The domain has to match or the login will fail.
- Getting user details like nickname/fullname/email requires gitHub-specific API, although that's just one more GET.
- [Mojolicious::Plugin::OAuth2](#) looks to make OAuth 2.0 easy to implement. Bonus points for supporting various other services by design.
- We could get the ~~gravatar~~ avatar and use it - this would be a new feature.

My [proof of concept](#) actually turned into a working implementation pretty quickly.

On a side note, we could hypothetically use GitHub credentials for needle editing. Although I didn't explore this further.

#### #3 - 2020-06-03 06:34 - okurz

- We could get the gravatar and use it - this would be a new feature.

We already support gravatar. Isn't that only based on the email?

#### #4 - 2020-06-03 11:16 - cdywan

okurz wrote:

- We could get the gravatar and use it - this would be a new feature.

We already support gravatar. Isn't that only based on the email?

Sorry, I actually meant **avatar** there. The email is optional if the user chooses to hide it. So using the provided avatar would work better in that case.

#### #5 - 2020-06-05 14:49 - cdywan

Note: [tinita](#) was so kind to me help out by preparing a package for the OAuth 2.0 plugin: <https://build.opensuse.org/request/show/811723>

#### #6 - 2020-06-05 15:30 - tinita

The request for Factory is here: <https://build.opensuse.org/request/show/811785> (still in review)

**#7 - 2020-06-26 10:06 - okurz**

<https://build.opensuse.org/request/show/811785> is accepted. PR has at least still one open unresolved comment [https://github.com/os-autoinst/openQA/pull/3150#discussion\\_r439386640](https://github.com/os-autoinst/openQA/pull/3150#discussion_r439386640)

**#8 - 2020-07-06 15:46 - cdywan**

- *Status changed from In Progress to Feedback*

<https://github.com/os-autoinst/openQA/pull/3150>

The *Feedback* here is not going to be observed in production instances, as we don't plan to enable it for now. Although we might see some on other instances so I'll use the status like usual.

Btw docs are/will be here soon <http://open.qa/docs/#authentication>

**#9 - 2020-07-16 13:04 - okurz**

- *Status changed from Feedback to Resolved*

[cdywan](#) you provided a minor fix with <https://github.com/os-autoinst/openQA/pull/3258> which has been merged and is active. <http://open.qa/docs/#authentication> is updated and we do not need to verify this on our production instances so considered "Resolved"