Refine and Document the Issue Tracking Process

07/02/2011 05:33 PM - lazaridis.com (Lazaridis Ilias)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target version</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

=end

Based on the experiences with some issues, especially #4893, I would like to suggest the following:

- The issue-tracking process should be refined and documented. The goal is to avoid misunderstandings and to make involved parties (developers, contributors, users, ...) feel better during interaction.

A few thoughts to consider (can be used as a foundation for a document draft):

- An issue remains "Open", until it is resolved.
- Rejecting an issue means "closing" it.
- An issue of type "bug" cannot be closed, until the bug is fixed.
  - The status "Rejected" for a bug report means essentially "the bug does not exist" (= workforme)
- If an issue contains [PATCH] in the title, and the patch cannot be applied, then ask the author first for a revision, prior to "rejecting".
- Prefer to place feature requests on future releases, instead of rejecting them.

- An issue (even a defect/bug) can be postponed (e.g. to version 1.9.x or 2.0)

- Some issues need several steps until they are solved in production quality and the author may use the issue-tracker to collect feedback and test results. A patch should not be "rejected" with the status, as this would close the issue.

Some issues about the Issue-Tracker:

- Introduce Tracker "Limitation", thus issues which are not exactly bugs but limitations (e.g. #4893, known limitation of current implementation) can be tracked.
- Introduce Status "Retracted", thus the issue author/reporter can say "I retract the issue", e.g. after understanding that he made a mistake. This would be much friendlier against the author/reporter.
- Find a replacement for the term "Rejected" (it just sounds a little bit "harsh").
- Possibly rename "bug" to "defect".

=end

History

#1 - 07/02/2011 07:28 PM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

Lazaridis Ilias wrote:

- An issue remains "Open", until it is resolved.

There is "Assigned" and "Feedback".

- Rejecting an issue means "closing" it.

Yes, if the author of the ticket doesn't think the ticket can be closed, they can reopen it.

- An issue of type "bug" cannot be closed, until the bug is fixed.
  - The status "Rejected" for a bug report means essentially "the bug does not exist" (= workforme)

What is the difference between bugs and features is difficult problem.
Spec level issue like #4893 can't be say simply a bug.
If an issue contains [PATCH] in the title, and the patch cannot be applied, then ask the author first for a revision, prior to "rejecting".

Yeah, it should be "Feedback" before "Reject", but if there is a bug or a reasonable feature the ticket's life won't depend on the patch.

On ruby, the spec is prior to a patch; even if the patch is valid, the patch will be rejected if the behavior it introduces is wrong.

- Prefer to place feature requests on future releases, instead of rejecting them.
- An issue (even a defect/bug) can be postponed (e.g. to version 1.9.x or 2.0)

Agree.

- Some issues need several steps until they are solved in production quality and the author may use the issue-tracker to collect feedback and test results. A patch should not be "rejected" with the status, as this would close the issue.

The issue tracker is not one's work space or a studying room, it should handle issues.

If you want to concrete a feature request which is half baked, it should be discussed on ruby-talk or ruby-core.

Some issues about the Issue-Tracker:

- Introduce Tracker "Limitation", thus issues which are not exactly bugs but limitations (e.g. #4893, known limitation of current implementation) can be tracked.

It should be "Feature"; difference between limitation and feature is difficult. I don't think it should be separate. "Bug" and "Feature" are different because "Bug" should be fixed as soon as possible. (so we don't want to increase low priority bugs)

- Introduce Status "Retracted", thus the issue author/reporter can say "I retract the issue", e.g. after understanding that he made a mistake. This would be much friendlier against the author/reporter.
- Find a replacement for the term "Rejected" (it just sounds a little bit "harsh").

Adding more status makes tracking difficult.

I think changing "Reject" to some friendly name is better.

- Possibly rename "bug" to "defect".

I can't comment this.

#2 - 07/02/2011 10:22 PM - lazaridis.com (Lazaridis Ilias)

Yui NARUSE wrote:

[-]

What is the difference between bugs and features is difficult problem.

Spec level issue like #4893 can't be say simply a bug.

[-]

- Introduce Tracker "Limitation", thus issues which are not exactly bugs but limitations (e.g. #4893, known limitation of current implementation) can be tracked.

It should be "Feature"; difference between limitation and feature is difficult. I don't think it should be separate.

[-] "Bug" and "Feature" are different because "Bug" should be fixed as soon as possible.

(s0 we don't want to increase low priority bugs)

(just a few notes to "specifications")

The issues relate usually all to "specifications":

defect : issue subjecting a violation of the specifications
feature : issue subjecting an extension of the specifications
limitation: issue subjecting the limitation of an implementation (to comply to the specifications)
rubyspecs : issue subjecting the specification itself (e.g. missing spec, defect spec, ...)

#3 - 07/03/2011 10:53 PM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)

Hi,
At Sat, 2 Jul 2011 17:33:26 +0900, Lazaridis Ilias wrote in [ruby-core:37732):

- Possibly rename "bug" to "defect".

I prefer to keep it than the less familiar word.

--
Nobu Nakada

#4 - 07/12/2011 06:04 AM - lazaridis.com (Lazaridis Ilias)
Yui NARUSE wrote:

Lazaridis Ilias wrote:

[...]

- Introduce Status "Retracted", thus the issue author/reporter can say "I retract the issue", e.g. after understanding that he made a mistake. This would be much friendlier against the author/reporter.
- Find a replacement for the term "Rejected" (it just sounds a little bit "harsh").

Adding more status makes tracking difficult.

You're possibly right here.

Status: Open, Assigned, Accepted, Closed, Rejected

I think changing "Reject" to some friendlier name is better.

Possibly "Negated" is the friendlier word.

#5 - 07/18/2011 01:21 AM - lazaridis.com (Lazaridis Ilias)

=begin
See #5034 as a negative example: rejecting issue in the middle of a conversation.
=end

#6 - 07/18/2011 02:11 AM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

We want a documentation which prevents people who don't read previous discussion even if we show a reference to the discussion.

#7 - 07/21/2011 03:25 PM - lazaridis.com (Lazaridis Ilias)
Yui NARUSE wrote:

We want a documentation which prevents people who don't read previous discussion even if we show a reference to the discussion.

Mr. Naruse, I'm sorry, I could not understand this comment.

#8 - 07/21/2011 03:26 PM - lazaridis.com (Lazaridis Ilias)

An issue type "Task" would be helpful (sometimes its simply a task which is filed).

#9 - 03/25/2012 04:37 PM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)
- Target version set to 3.0

#10 - 12/08/2017 01:36 PM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)
- Status changed from Open to Closed

I'm closing this ticket since it is not about ruby's feature. I think it should be discussed at ruby-core mailing list.