

---

Subject: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux  
Posted by [fallingdutch](#) on Tue, 07 Nov 2006 11:57:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi what about changing the log-destination for linux from ~/.Appname-date.log to ~/.Appname/logs/date.log?

I hate all these logfiles in my ~ and would prefer them in a ~/.Appname/logs/ dir

Bas

---

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux  
Posted by [masu](#) on Tue, 07 Nov 2006 12:07:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Very good idea, for FreeBSD, too .

Matthias

---

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 19:30:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, I was thinking about something like that too, but is that "logs" sub-dir necessary?

I would simply use .AppName/\*.log

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux  
Posted by [fallingdutch](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 20:18:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

luzr wrote on Thu, 09 November 2006 20:30Well, I was thinking about something like that too, but is that "logs" sub-dir necessary?

No it is not necessary ... but i would like it

Bas

---

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux

Posted by [masu](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 20:39:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

luzr wrote on Thu, 09 November 2006 20:30 Well, I was thinking about something like that too, but is that "logs" sub-dir necessary?

Mirek

I think the sub-dir necessary when looking at the number of log files created, due to date in the name. Or you integrate the date of logs into single files for usrlog, buglog, etc.

Matthias

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 06:52:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Actually, unless you activate .buglog and .usrlog, there is just single log file...

Mirek

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux

Posted by [masu](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 09:50:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

luzr wrote on Fri, 10 November 2006 07:52 Actually, unless you activate .buglog and .usrlog, there is just single log file...

How can I deactivate it?

Matthias

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 09:58:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In should be inactive. However, TheIDE has it activated in the source.

I guess it needs a bit of explanation:

.buglog and .usrlog files as intended as "post-mortem" tool to maintain applications. On my "enterprise" apps, there is about 150 users running apps.

---

.usrlog is log that attempts to log all actions that user performed with app. It is normally deleted on application exit, but if application terminates abnormally, normal application exit is not performed and .usrlog stays (if it is possible, crash is also recorded as last entry in the .usrlog). All this is done with hope that list of user actions can lead me to reproduce the bug.

.buglog simply logs all problems - that e.g. includes even oracle queries that run for too long.

Now when application starts, it checks for any pending .usrlog and .buglog files (but that is application specific issue - in TheIDE there is no code like that). All of them are moved to some shared network directory (better alternative would be to email them to me). When I am on my maintenance session, I simply check the folder to have a glue what is wrong with system....

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux

Posted by [masu](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 10:07:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thanks for your explanation

Matthias

---

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux

Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 11 Nov 2006 11:49:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Done...

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux

Posted by [ebojd](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 17:38:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hmmm... Here are some thoughts.

Placing the files in ~/.App-name/... clutters up the home directory, and more importantly if you have multiple versions of the same app, it will overwrite the logs. Ex: I have an assemblage named LIDAR\_apps which contains supposedly working versions of the packages, and LIDAR\_exp for experimental versions of the same code. Later, as I release specific versions, I was planning on renaming the assemblages to something like LIDAR\_apps\_001, etc. I'm still trying to decide the best way to handle specific version support for U++ packages. What is the U++ convention for handling application versioning?

My \$0.02 would be to place the logs in a sub directory of the package itself, add a new build menu item "clean logs" below "clean package", and possibly add a couple of check boxes in debug for creating logs, etc... Like I said, just my \$0.02

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 22:04:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ebojd wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 12:38

My \$0.02 would be to place the logs in a sub directory of the package itself, add a new build menu item "clean logs" below "clean package", and possibly add a couple of check boxes in debug for creating logs, etc... Like I said, just my \$0.02

No, placing intermediate files to directory sources is something we are trying to avoid hard.

Anyway, perhaps now, when we have GetExeDirFile more or less working, we could simply place them in output directory (where binary resides), just like in Win32. It would not just work well for release version, but release versions do not make .logs anyway.

Alternative is to move them one level down, e.g. into ~/.upp.log directory.

And then maybe, it could be output directory for debug and ~/.upp.log for release.

(That said, I do not like so much .\* subdirs in my ~ too...

Mirek

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux  
Posted by [ebojd](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 22:23:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> No, placing intermediate files to directory sources is  
> something we are trying to avoid hard.

fair enough. After pointing this out I very much agree with you

the linux default is to make a copy of the sources and build in \$(USER)/upp. how about a directory named log which is a sibling of out directory (ie \$(USER)/upp/logs)? That way we do not have to make a separate directory in home or root.

BTW, I'm looking forward to the day I learn u++ enough that I can actually contribute instead of wasting your time.

---

---

Subject: Re: LOG files in ~/.App-name/logs/date.log in Linux

Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 22:30:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ebojd wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 17:23> No, placing intermediate files to directory sources is

> something we are trying to avoid hard.

fair enough. After pointing this out I very much agree with you

the linux default is to make a copy of the sources and build in \$(USER)/upp. how about a directory named log which is a sibling of out directory (ie \$(USER)/upp/logs)? That way we do not have to make a seperate directory in home or root.

Actually, I believe I suggest something similar for release version.

The advantage of putting debug into output directory is that there is nice well defined "Open output directory file" function in TheIDE.

BTW, placing in ~/upp/logs has slight disadvantage as that directory is not well defined during execution of binary, it is just compilation issue.

Quote:

BTW, I'm looking forward to the day I learn u++ enough that I can actually contribute instead of wasting your time.

That is OK, you are not wasting my time. Actually, this one problem is the kind that can be implemented in 2 minutes, but takes months to decide what is the correct behaviour.... Brainstorming is highly appreciated.

---