

## Redmine - Feature #7319

### Repetitive tasks ?

2011-01-13 15:18 - Frank Helk

<b>Status:</b> New	<b>Start date:</b> 2011-01-13
<b>Priority:</b> Normal	<b>Due date:</b>
<b>Assignee:</b>	<b>% Done:</b> 0%
<b>Category:</b> Issues	<b>Estimated time:</b> 0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	
<b>Resolution:</b>	
<b>Description</b> The issue just came up to me, while I was doing some work that comes up every quarter. I have some tasks coming up endless cycling, i.e. the preparation of mothly/quarterly/yearly reports. I would appreciate <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a type of tracker that goes back to some "open" state (preferably "assigned") on predefined intervals, or</li><li>• some kind of facility that spawns a new ticket at those predefined intervals</li></ul> The definiton part could be an extension to the "new ticket" form, i.e. <pre>[ ] Resurrect ticket every [&lt;num&gt;] [days/weeks/months/years], beginning on [date], to status [...].</pre> or <pre>[ ] Repeat ticket creation every [&lt;num&gt;] [days/weeks/months/years], beginning on [date].</pre> There should be a special permission to make tickets repetitive, and management could be done on the standard ticket edit form.	
<b>Related issues:</b> Related to Redmine - Feature #1176: Recurring Tasks <span style="float: right;"><b>New</b>      <b>2008-05-05</b></span>	

### History

#### #1 - 2011-10-05 11:02 - Tomasz Sawicki

Same as [#1176](#)?

+1 by the way..

#### #2 - 2011-10-05 11:47 - Etienne Massip

Tomasz Sawicki wrote:

Same as [#1176](#)?

Not exactly, thanks for pointing out this relationship.

#### #3 - 2012-03-01 12:20 - Frank Helk

I've described a way to do both this and [#1176](#) in issue [#1176](#) ...

#### #4 - 2013-01-08 11:54 - Luc GIROUX

+1

#### #5 - 2013-01-16 20:33 - Adrian Rotaru

+10

#### #6 - 2013-01-29 08:38 - Martin G

+1

**#7 - 2013-05-11 16:17 - Leonardo Salgado**

+1

**#8 - 2013-08-11 11:31 - Dotan Cohen**

Please make clear how this issue differs from [#1176](#). Thanks.

**#9 - 2013-08-14 10:57 - Frank Helk**

OK - I've read again over this ticket and [#1176](#) along with the comments and contemplated over 'em.

The requested features look similar, and I admit that they basically propose the same thing. I presume that if the feature gets implemented in a way like I've outlined it detailed in [#1176#note-46](#), it will probably fit both requests good enough to satisfy both.

**#10 - 2015-11-26 14:30 - Frank Helk**

Any news on that ?

I'm still in need for that ...