mr_ped wrote on Wed, 11 April 2007 13:51
Overall I think too many living versions are not a very good idea, it may be quite confusing in forums and support.

I agree. What I had in mind and I was brainstorming above is how to deal with supporting projects that in essence uses legacy code in the same IDE. If we set up a CVS/SVN/etc. tree with branch tags, we can use those as what I have been calling named slots. From there the package organizer would have to know what slot/branch tag is being compiled against (uploading if necessary). The same mechanism would allow the developers to set up special branch tags or aliases for LIVE, CURRENT-STABLE, CURRENT-DEVEL, as well as upp-605-stable.

Just some thoughts following on from which at this point has gotten WAY off Topic

luzr wrote on Thu, 12 April 2007 07:36
I agree.

In fact, in this respect, "development" proved to be a double-edged sword. It is excellent for having everything tested soon, but it got us lazy about releasing "majors".

How about starting a list of things that you or others want to see for the next revision/release? That way as we tick off the tasks we know when it is reasonable to call for a new release/revision. anything else that made it in is gravy, and if there has been WAY tom many minor changes but the revision issues are not resolved, then maybe it can be called a subrevision or the remaining issues can be put off to the next cycle

Just some thoughts...

  EBo --