Subject: Welcome and lets finish that 2007.1
Posted by mirek on Mon, 12 Mar 2007 11:04:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ok, this forum is to coordinate release efforts, which seem to lag a little lately.

Our current goal - 2007.1. We are at rc3, which is seems to be fairly good, but not perfect.

First of all, there are only mingw and src version. Where is rest?

src is missing fixed Makefile.

I guess we have bad metology for major releases.

I think the *major* release should start with Bas releasing src version (+ linux packages), because Bas can fix the Makefile. Daniel then should download this "src" and prepare Win32 releases based on it to keep consistency.

Other maintainers could add theirs versions later.

In the same time, I do not think it is necessary to do this for "dev" releases - there using different slightly different version of sources is OK with me. In fact, I think all that is needed for dev release is mingw / src produced by Daniel + possible ports to Linux and others only for testing purposes.

Comments?

Mirek

Subject: Re: Welcome and lets finish that 2007.1
Posted by ebojd on Mon, 12 Mar 2007 14:12:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'll volunteer to coordinate with Bas to test and update the Linux Makefile updates. I'll also make a point of cleaning up the Gentoo portage ebuild to be released at the same time.

EBo --

Subject: Re: Welcome and lets finish that 2007.1
Posted by unodgs on Mon, 12 Mar 2007 14:19:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:
I guess we have bad metology for major releases.

I think the *major* release should start with Bas releasing src version (+ linux packages), because Bas can fix the Makefile. Daniel then should download this "src" and prepare Win32 releases based on it to keep consistency.
Other maintainers could add theirs versions later.

Well, win32 release is our MAIN release. That's why I'm preparing src file for Bas. Consistency is kept - but in opposite way. We could change it but 1) I don't see a good reason now (what that would change?) 2) Bas and I have our own tools to make packages optimized for proper input - uvs in my tool and zip file in Bas. Changing this would require time and tests.

In my opinion all maintainters should get sources directly from uvs. "Final" release should be tagged and all mainainers should sync those tagged sources. I only don't know if that is possible in current uvs. If not adding it is worth considering.

Subject: Re: Welcome and lets finish that 2007.1
Posted by mirek on Mon, 12 Mar 2007 14:19:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ebojd wrote on Mon, 12 March 2007 10:12I'll volunteer to coordinate with Bas to test and update the Linux Makefile updates. I'll also make a point of cleaning up the Gentoo portage ebuild to be released at the same time.

EBo --

Welcome!

However, I think for 2007.1, all we have to resolve now is organization of release. Bas AFAIK has Makefile running. I do not want to do any further improvements now, just make it released. I am afraid we are far from "perfect" state anyway, all we need now is to make each major release better than previous and not to make stupid bugs...

I really want to do some development again

Anyway, past 2007.1 release, I hope you and other people will take that release and contribute (and upload) all platform specific improvements to sf.net download page.

Mirek

Subject: Re: Welcome and lets finish that 2007.1
Posted by mirek on Tue, 13 Mar 2007 14:00:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

unodgs wrote on Mon, 12 March 2007 10:19
Well, win32 release is our MAIN release. That's why I'm preparing src file for Bas. Consistency is kept - but in opposite way. We could change it but 1) I don't see a good reason now (what that would change?)

Let see what happened to all of our rc-s - win32 release was always fine, but there was a problem in Linux. That is why I think releasing Linux version first is such a good idea.

Quote:
"Final" release should be tagged and all mainainers should sync those tagged sources.

Yes, but rc is that final release. Actually, I agree with you, the simple way is to get sources from uvs. There are no tags, but I think there is not that much uploaders to avoid problems.

OTOH, it sort of reminds me another issue - after finaly releasing, we might need to maintain 2007.1 for a while, fixing critical bugs...

Mirek

Subject: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by ebojd on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 13:08:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

How long till we expect to see the official 2007.1 release?

Is there someone I should coordinate with to vet the Linux Makefile(s), and make sure that everything is safe and sane?

EBo --

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by mirek on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 13:44:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ebojd wrote on Tue, 20 March 2007 09:08How long till we expect to see the official 2007.1 release?

Is there someone I should coordinate with to vet the Linux Makefile(s), and make sure that everything is safe and sane?

EBo --

The key person is Bas. The key problem is Linux release.

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by guido on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 14:44:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Tue, 20 March 2007 14:44
The key person is Bas. The key problem is Linux release.

So, what are the remaining issues exactly?

Guido

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by mirek on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 19:31:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

guido wrote on Tue, 20 March 2007 10:44luzr wrote on Tue, 20 March 2007 14:44
The key person is Bas. The key problem is Linux release.

So, what are the remaining issues exactly?

Guido

Stupid details... (lower/upper case issues in filenames, the correct selection of uppsrc packages etc...).

But it is coming (finally).

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by guido on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 23:54:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Wed, 21 March 2007 20:31guido wrote on Tue, 20 March 2007 10:44luzr wrote on

Tue, 20 March 2007 14:44
The key person is Bas. The key problem is Linux release.

So, what are the remaining issues exactly?

Guido

Stupid details... (lower/upper case issues in filenames, the correct selection of uppsrc packages etc...).

But it is coming (finally).

Mirek

I just discovered an X11 RichEdit paste bug.
In UWord I can't paste in the RichEdit ctrl within a UWord instance, be it within a document or to another document. But to another UWord instance it works. Only RichEdit to RichEdit exhibits this behaviour, EditString and LineEdit are OK, also RichEdit to EditString etc.
Topic++ has this problem in the exact same way, so there really is a bug in RichEdit clipboard management.

Guido

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by fallingdutch on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 08:34:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi all,

i am very sorry for the long absence but i had to do some stuff i get money for

I am happy to have - finally - time for upp again.

the current state of the linux release is:
- the case issues are fixed
- theide is build before creating the package
- every reference/example/tutorial is build with the new "theide" before creating the packages
- the uppsrc includes should be correct now.

At the moment i just built the current theide and a check of the examples/referenec/tutorials is running. The next step will be creation of the packages.

Bas
In the future i would love to generate Makefile.am's with upp so the source package is more portable.

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by Novo on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 11:29:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

fallingdutch wrote on Thu, 22 March 2007 04:34
In the future i would love to generate Makefile.am's with upp so the source package is more portable.

I can help with that
I already have everything set up. Just need to run a script ...
I'm generating project files for Visual Studio the same way.

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by ebojd on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 13:12:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Novo,

Can you post your scripts? I would like to take a look at them.

EBo --

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by fallingdutch on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 14:02:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ebojd wrote on Thu, 22 March 2007 14:12Novo,

Can you post your scripts? I would like to take a look at them.

EBo --

Me, too

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by Novo on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 22:20:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

fallingdutch wrote on Thu, 22 March 2007 10:02ebojd wrote on Thu, 22 March 2007 14:12Novo,

Can you post your scripts? I would like to take a look at them.

EBo --

Me, too

I'm using "The Makefile, Project, and Workspace Creator (MPC)" from http://www.ociweb.com/products/mpc.

I've prepared a bunch of project files for MPC. If you want to learn another technology I can post these mpc files.

Actually, they are quite similar to upp files

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by Novo on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 22:48:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Here they are ...

A command line I'm using to generate vc71 project files:

perl D:\bin\MPC\3.4.90\mwc.pl -nocomments -type vc71 -name_modifier *_vc71 -include mpc/config -relative UPP_ROOT=2007.1rc3 2007.1rc3/upp_ws.mwc

The icpp-problem is still not solved.

File Attachments
1) upp_mpc_all.tar.gz, downloaded 659 times

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by mirek on Fri, 23 Mar 2007 10:33:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

guido wrote on Wed, 21 March 2007 19:54luzr wrote on Wed, 21 March 2007 20:31guido wrote on Tue, 20 March 2007 10:44luzr wrote on Tue, 20 March 2007 14:44
The key person is Bas. The key problem is Linux release.

So, what are the remaining issues exactly?

Guido

Stupid details... (lower/upper case issues in filenames, the correct selection of uppsrc packages etc...).

But it is coming (finally).

Mirek

I just discovered an X11 RichEdit paste bug.
In UWord I can't paste in the RichEdit ctrl within a UWord instance, be it within a document or to another document. But to another UWord instance it works. Only RichEdit to RichEdit exhibits this behaviour, EditString and LineEdit are OK, also RichEdit to EditString etc.
Topic++ has this problem in the exact same way, so there really is a bug in RichEdit clipboard management.

Guido

Fixed.

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by ebojd on Fri, 23 Mar 2007 15:41:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I took a quick look last night at MPC. My concern with taking adopting this tools is that it looks like there could be license compatibility problems. It does look like a nice exterior package solution though...

If we were going to adopt the use of another tool for this purpose I would recommend also looking at Jam (a cross-platform make replacement) which has an attribute alike as-is license IIRC.

see:
  http://www.boost.org/tools/build/jam_src/index.html
  http://www.perforce.com/jam/jam.html

Just a thought...

So, is this seriously open for discussion, or just exploring? The likely easiest solution is to add scripting to the package organizer, and then it is just replacing the X11, etc., library directives with pkg-config...

  EBo --

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by Novo on Fri, 23 Mar 2007 23:44:27 GMT

ebojd wrote on Fri, 23 March 2007 11:41I took a quick look last night at MPC. My concern with taking adopting this tools is that it looks like there could be license compatibility problems. It does look like a nice exterior package solution though...

From the MPC's License:

"Since MPC is open source and free of licensing fees, you are free to use, modify, and distribute the source code, as long as you include this copyright statement.

In particular, you can use MPC to build proprietary software and are under no obligation to redistribute any of your source code that is built using MPC."

So, no visible restrictions except of a copyright. And you are free to distribute generated files ...

Quote:
If we were going to adopt the use of another tool for this purpose I would recommend also looking at Jam (a cross-platform make replacement) which has an attribute alike as-is license IIRC.

see:
  http://www.boost.org/tools/build/jam_src/index.html
  http://www.perforce.com/jam/jam.html

Just a thought...

There is a big difference between MPC and jam/bjam. jam is a build system like make. It doesn't generate project files of any kind. It builds everything itself. In opposite, MPC doesn't build anything itself. It generates make/project files. Basically, it is a template engine. Main advantage of MPC over other template engines is that it has quite simple and efficient language to describe everything related to organizing of software packages. I wouldn't say MPC is perfect, but it is usable. And it saves a lot of time.

Quote:
So, is this seriously open for discussion, or just exploring? The likely easiest solution is to add scripting to the package organizer, and then it is just replacing the X11, etc., library directives with pkg-config...

  EBo --

I've been asked to post a script.

I needed project files for Visual Studio because of a debugger. So, I've made them and shared with others.

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by mirek on Sat, 24 Mar 2007 16:05:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, sum of issues unresolved at the moment for the release:

* "Glossy theme bug in Ubuntu", Daniel, do you experience it after recompiling? (I do not

* "Popup problem in Gentoo/KDE", ebojd, what is the status?

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by unodgs on Sat, 24 Mar 2007 17:48:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Sat, 24 March 2007 12:05
* "Glossy theme bug in Ubuntu", Daniel, do you experience it after recompiling? (I do not

You were right about the old version of ide. I will check the new one ASAP.

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by ebojd on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 01:32:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mirek,

Sorry for the delay. Something sent me out like a light for the weelend, and I slept most of it away...

At the moment I simply reset the mouse to "focus under mouse" instead of "focus strictly under mouse". That solved the problem for the moment. I'll have to look into it in detail to see if the changes are actually in place (and to make sure that the gentoo build scripts are actually pulling down the proper source). Here are a couple of quick details:

The source is downloaded from:
http://downloads.sourceforge.net/upp/upp-2007.1_rc3/upp-src- 2007.1rc3.zip

I do not load any other source patches, just the Makefile and GCC.bm

EBo --

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by mirek on Wed, 28 Mar 2007 12:48:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

unodgs wrote on Sat, 24 March 2007 13:48luzr wrote on Sat, 24 March 2007 12:05
* "Glossy theme bug in Ubuntu", Daniel, do you experience it after recompiling? (I do not

You were right about the old version of ide. I will check the new one ASAP.

Well, I hopefully fixed focus problem, maybe it is now time for "ASAP"

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by ebojd on Wed, 28 Mar 2007 19:10:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

unodgs,

remember to replace the user copy of uppsrc with the system level sources which will be updated. I wasted a bunch of time with that one when I updated the system source, but never thought about what source tree my apps were being compiled off of...

Hope that helps and is correct,

EBo --

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by mirek on Wed, 28 Mar 2007 20:48:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ebojd wrote on Wed, 28 March 2007 15:10unodgs,

remember to replace the user copy of uppsrc with the system level sources which will be updated. I wasted a bunch of time with that one when I updated the system source, but never thought about what source tree my apps were being compiled off of...

Hope that helps and is correct,

EBo --

Well, I guess, after syncing uvs and releasing U++ (albeit Win32 version) for more than year, Daniel knows how to compile TheIDE

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by unodgs on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 06:41:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for the warning. Fortunately I use makeinstall which always copy the newest uvs sources before compiling.

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by ebojd on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 12:31:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ummm... well...

just trying to be helpful. Hope I did not offend or insult. *that* was not my intent.

BTW, do you keep a single copy of the source in /usr/share/upp (or similar), or do you also have a copy of the source in ~/upp/uppsrc, ~/upp/Common, etc.? It was the latter which cam back to byte me.

EBo --

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by mirek on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 12:51:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ebojd wrote on Thu, 29 March 2007 08:31
ummm... well...

just trying to be helpful. Hope I did not offend or insult. *that* was not my intent.

BTW, do you keep a single copy of the source in /usr/share/upp (or similar), or do you also have a copy of the source in ~/upp/uppsrc, ~/upp/Common, etc.? It was the latter which cam back to byte me.

EBo --

Well, I have sources on FAT32 partition, so that I can use the same files for both Win32 and Linux. On Linux, it is something like /media/sda5/uppsrc...

I almost always use "actual" version of U++ for everything, including my commercial apps.

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by ebojd on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 14:01:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Thu, 29 March 2007 07:51
Well, I have sources on FAT32 partition, so that I can use the same files for both Win32 and Linux. On Linux, it is something like /media/sda5/uppsrc...

I almost always use "actual" version of U++ for everything, including my commercial apps.

Mirek

Thank makes sense, and I'll have to meditate on that one a bit.

How do you deal with user side applications which require specific versions of u++ source?

EBo --

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by mirek on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 15:38:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ebojd wrote on Thu, 29 March 2007 10:01
How do you deal with user side applications which require specific versions of u++ source?

Special version of U++? Why?

Well, one thing is perhaps relevant - U++ development was for quite a long time "bussines app driven" - U++ was simply extended to satisfy demands of our customers.

Also, sometimes we refactor interface. Usually, this means fixing all applications, and yes, it is a bit annoying, but that is the price of perfection (and hopefuly, this will not happen too much in future).

BTW, "uppsrc" has more packages than you see in normal release. Many of them are "backward compatibility", some of them experimental or supporting some specific application (or simply not stable and refined enough).

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux Makefile(s)
Posted by ebojd on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 15:53:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Thu, 29 March 2007 10:38
Special version of U++? Why?

Well, one thing is perhaps relevant - U++ development was for quite a long time "bussines app driven" - U++ was simply extended to satisfy demands of our customers.

Also, sometimes we refactor interface. Usually, this means fixing all applications, and yes, it is a bit annoying, but that is the price of perfection (and hopefuly, this will not happen too much in future).

BTW, "uppsrc" has more packages than you see in normal release. Many of them are "backward compatibility", some of them experimental or supporting some specific application (or simply not stable and refined enough).

Mirek

When I ran into the problem of my code compiling libraries from ~/upp/uppsrc/* instead of the new ones in /usr/share/upp/uppsrc/* I got to thinking about why having a seperate copy would be necessary or useful. The most obvious would be for long term application maintenance, by bundling the library code. I had not realized (when I first ran u++) what the implications of having a copy of uppsrc, etc., made to ~/upp/. After thinking about it a little while I realized that library versions could be managed similar to how portage deals with multiple versions of libraries using slots, and they can be compiled against specific revisions of the source...

Hmmm... I just realized that this discussion is in releasing u++ and not in the coffee corner where I intended to keep it. How does one move a discussion to a different forum?

Anyway, thanks for the great work, the discussion, and putting up with my ramblings whilst I learn the system.

EBo --