

Pulp - Issue #1515

pulp comps.xml usage doesn't jibe with fedora policy

01/12/2016 07:56 PM - semyers

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Status: | CLOSED - WONTFIX | Start date: | |
| Priority: | Low | Due date: | |
| Assignee: | | Estimated time: | 0:00 hour |
| Category: | | | |
| Sprint/Milestone: | | | |
| Severity: | 1. Low | Groomed: | No |
| Version: | | Sprint Candidate: | No |
| Platform Release: | | Tags: | Pulp 2 |
| OS: | | Sprint: | |
| Triaged: | Yes | Quarter: | |
| Description | | | |
| <p>Our current comps.xml file[0] creates many package groups. In the strictest sense of a yum repository, our groups usage is probably just fine, but in the broader context of fedora, groups have a more specific meaning[1] that isn't really compatible with how we're currently using them. Specifically, package groups in fedora are distribution-wide, and visible in the fedora installer. Addition of groups to fedora is non-trivial, and requires buy-in from fedora developers. As a result, we should consider using alternatives to package groups so we can provide consistent install instructions across distributions while still respecting fedora conventions.</p> <p>Fedora has very recently[2] added support to rpms for weak dependencies, but at the moment dnf doesn't appear to support them. While these are a good option, ideally any solution to this would be well-supported across all distributions where pulp installations are supported. This probably means using metapackages (packages that only depend on other packages) instead of package groups, and then probably sparingly and only in ways that benefit the average user.</p> <p>tl;dr we probably shouldn't use groups so much</p> <p>[0]: https://github.com/pulp/pulp/blob/73f178121522563fd9e8809ea824be409825f13a/comps.xml [1]: https://fedoraproject.org/wiki/How_to_use_and_edit_comps.xml_for_package_groups [2]: https://lists.fedoraproject.org/pipermail/devel/2015-July/212181.html</p> | | | |

Associated revisions

Revision e00a852e - 08/02/2016 06:37 PM - semyers

docs mention the COPR projects, no more groupinstalls

groupinstall change: re #1515 <https://pulp.plan.io/issues/1515>

copr stuff: re #1993 <https://pulp.plan.io/issues/1993>

Revision e00a852e - 08/02/2016 06:37 PM - semyers

docs mention the COPR projects, no more groupinstalls

groupinstall change: re #1515 <https://pulp.plan.io/issues/1515>

copr stuff: re #1993 <https://pulp.plan.io/issues/1993>

History

#1 - 01/12/2016 08:50 PM - bmbouter

+1 to switching to meta packages for better integration for fedora. We picked comps.xml arbitrarily (I think) instead of using meta packages.

The use case that I believe is important is that once a user has decided to install pulp can install one thing and pulp gets installed.

#2 - 01/15/2016 05:04 PM - mhrivnak

- Triaged changed from No to Yes

#3 - 08/02/2016 09:18 PM - semyers

Our docs from 2.10 onward no longer reference the comps groups for installing pulp. comps.xml and anything referencing it or the package groups should be fixed to no longer do either of those things.

#4 - 04/12/2019 09:23 PM - bmbouter

- Status changed from NEW to CLOSED - WONTFIX

#5 - 04/12/2019 09:28 PM - bmbouter

Pulp 2 is approaching maintenance mode, and this Pulp 2 ticket is not being actively worked on. As such, it is being closed as WONTFIX. Pulp 2 is still accepting contributions though, so if you want to contribute a fix for this ticket, please reopen or comment on it. If you don't have permissions to reopen this ticket, or you want to discuss an issue, please reach out via the [developer mailing list](#).

#6 - 04/15/2019 10:38 PM - bmbouter

- Tags Pulp 2 added