

## RPM Support - Issue #1926

### package without epoch in the erratum pkglist is not handled correctly during publish

05/18/2016 05:35 PM - ttereshc

<b>Status:</b>	CLOSED - CURRENTRELEASE	<b>Start date:</b>	
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>	ttereshc	<b>Estimated time:</b>	0:00 hour
<b>Category:</b>			
<b>Sprint/Milestone:</b>			
<b>Severity:</b>	2. Medium	<b>Groomed:</b>	Yes
<b>Version:</b>	2.8.3	<b>Sprint Candidate:</b>	No
<b>Platform Release:</b>	2.9.3	<b>Tags:</b>	Pulp 2
<b>OS:</b>		<b>Sprint:</b>	Sprint 7
<b>Triaged:</b>	Yes	<b>Quarter:</b>	
<b>Description</b>			
Create repo with feed <a href="https://repos.fedorapeople.org/pulp/pulp/fixtures/rpm/">https://repos.fedorapeople.org/pulp/pulp/fixtures/rpm/</a> and sync/publish it. Since our demo repo does not contain `epoch` for packages in updateinfo.xml, there will be a `null` value for epoch in the erratum pkglist in the database. This will cause a DB query which checks the presence of the particular rpm in the repo to be wrong and thus you will observe no packages in the updateinfo.xml after publish.			
<b>Related issues:</b>			
Related to RPM Support - Issue #833: older errata units may have 'null' in da...		<b>CLOSED - CURRENTRELEASE</b>	
Has duplicate RPM Support - Issue #2217: updateinfo.xml is not generated with...		<b>CLOSED - DUPLICATE</b>	

#### Associated revisions

##### Revision 250c100e - 08/29/2016 07:09 PM - ttereshc

Fix package filtering for errata when no epoch is specified

closes #1926 <https://pulp.plan.io/issues/1926>

#### History

##### #1 - 05/18/2016 05:46 PM - ttereshc

Should the epoch attribute be always present in the erratum pkglist for each package? If so, it is a problem of demo repo and not a bug in Pulp. Or should we handle this case during sync/upload? or during publish?

##### #2 - 05/20/2016 06:03 PM - mhrivnak

- Groomed changed from No to Yes

I was not able to find any old repos where the epoch is an empty string.

##### #3 - 05/25/2016 04:53 PM - dkliban@redhat.com

- Subject changed from package without epoch in the erratum pkglist is not handled correctly during publish to fixtures repo is missing 'epoch' in the erratum pkglist

- Triaged changed from No to Yes

We should fix the fixtures repository as part of this issue

##### #4 - 08/29/2016 05:48 PM - jsherril@redhat.com

This can happen in the wild: <https://pulp.plan.io/issues/833>

##### #5 - 08/29/2016 07:24 PM - ttereshc

- Subject changed from fixtures repo is missing 'epoch' in the erratum pkglist to package without epoch in the erratum pkglist is not handled correctly during publish

- Status changed from NEW to POST

- Assignee set to ttereshc

[https://github.com/pulp/pulp\\_rpm/pull/971](https://github.com/pulp/pulp_rpm/pull/971)

**#6 - 08/29/2016 07:25 PM - ttereshc**

- Has duplicate Issue #2217: updateinfo.xml is not generated with any packages added

**#7 - 08/29/2016 07:27 PM - ttereshc**

- Related to Issue #833: older errata units may have 'null' in database for pkglist package epoch added

**#8 - 08/29/2016 11:20 PM - ttereshc**

- Status changed from POST to MODIFIED

- % Done changed from 0 to 100

Applied in changeset [250c100ef1341c8c739fd42d7868d2928eda42ca](https://github.com/pulp/pulp_rpm/pull/971).

**#9 - 08/29/2016 11:26 PM - ttereshc**

- Platform Release set to 2.9.3

**#10 - 08/29/2016 11:35 PM - ttereshc**

- Sprint/Milestone set to 25

**#11 - 08/30/2016 08:47 PM - semyers**

- Status changed from MODIFIED to 5

**#12 - 09/19/2016 08:58 PM - pthomas@redhat.com**

- Status changed from 5 to 6

verified

1. synced and published repo with <https://repos.fedorapeople.org/pulp/pulp/fixtures/rpm/>
2. Checked the updateinfo.xml to make sure that the packages are present

**#13 - 09/19/2016 11:03 PM - semyers**

- Status changed from 6 to CLOSED - CURRENTRELEASE

**#15 - 03/08/2018 08:08 PM - bmbouter**

- Sprint set to Sprint 7

**#16 - 03/08/2018 08:08 PM - bmbouter**

- Sprint/Milestone deleted (25)

**#17 - 04/15/2019 10:30 PM - bmbouter**

- Tags Pulp 2 added