
Subject: Linux release cookbook

Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 26 Jan 2008 07:17:13 GMT

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

Well, I will try to describe raw process of .deb creation here, I hope anybody interested will fill in the missing parts:

First, get actual sources. Here the path has two options - either download "src", unzip and get package. Anyway, in the future, "src" should have makefile included, so it will linux releaser responsibility. Therefore, install Win32 version and take sources from it (e.g. dual boot). (Note: getting sources this way instead of uvs2/svn is essential in order to have the same code for all releases).

Now get previous .deb file. Read this:

<http://www.linuxdevices.com/articles/AT8047723203.html>

then read "dpkg" to learn how to "unpack" existing .deb package. Unpack old .deb, so that you will get all files and directory structure as required.

Replace sources (delete whole folders, then place new versions), recompile theide in optimal mode (check the size of result, should not be too different from previous version), replace theide. Then use dpkg to create .deb. Try to install it.

Create src package with makefile is sort of similar - only instead of compiling theide you use theide "Export makefile".

Now, what about .rpm?

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook

Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Sat, 26 Jan 2008 12:57:55 GMT

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

I guess the difficult stuff is not to make .deb or .rpm packages, but to make them on every supported platform.

Usually .deb created for ubuntu gutsy can have problems on feisty and on other debians. The same happns for rpms.

If you want to be sure to have packages for all distros, you must build one on each of them.

For example, I could make a .deb for ubuntu gutsy, but I've no time to make (and test) packages for other linuxes

The best would be to have a mantainer for each linux distribution. That could be done without much effort.

Another good solution would be to release souce tarballs with config/makefile, that could go well

for all distros.

Ciao

Max

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook
Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 26 Jan 2008 13:18:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IMO, we cannot support any distro in existence. Let us support what most people use - and that is Ubuntu 7.10. The control file from recent release works for Ubuntu 6.10 - 7.10.

The rest of world can compile from sources. Sure, it would be nice to support RH & Novel too, but supporting current Ubuntu only is better than endless meditations about what cannot be done....

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook
Posted by [nixnixnix](#) on Sat, 26 Jan 2008 16:36:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree. As a user, I will be happy to install whichever version of Ubuntu I need in order to have a working UPP under linux. (I currently use ubuntu 7.04 and kubuntu hardy heron alpha2)

just my 2c

Nick

EDIT: wow the new beta is shiny! it builds much faster and it doesn't crash horribly on exit

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook
Posted by [sergeynikitin](#) on Sat, 26 Jan 2008 16:48:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Where can i read about rpm building?
I try to build rpm, but dependencies is not working.
After install rpm, I must install dev-packages.

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook

Posted by [nixnix](#) on Sat, 26 Jan 2008 17:11:03 GMT

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

I found this

<http://www.rpm.org/RPM-HOWTO/build.html>

I don't know if that helps

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook

Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 15:28:42 GMT

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

Well, looking for printer drivers howto I stumbled on this one :

<http://www.linux-foundation.org/en/LSB>

It looks quite interesting in order to deploy a single binary package that 'should' run on all major distros.

In synthesis, LSB describes a minimal software environment that all LSB compliant distros should have; apps should be compiled and DYNAMICALLY linked *only* with that environment; libs and stuffs that are outside should be statically linked.

In the OpenPrinting site stays a detailed explanation of how it works, aimed to provide an environment for universal printer drivers :

<http://www.linux-foundation.org/en/OpenPrinting/WritingAndPackagingPrinterDrivers>

I think it's worth to take a look at those !

Ciao

Max

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook

Posted by [mirek](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 16:30:30 GMT

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

mdelfede wrote on Wed, 30 January 2008 10:28: Well, looking for printer drivers howto I stumbled on this one :

<http://www.linux-foundation.org/en/LSB>

It looks quite interesting in order to deploy a single binary package that 'should' run on all major distros.

In synthesis, LSB describes a minimal software environment that all LSB compliant distros should

have; apps should be compiled and DINAMICALLI linked *only* with that environment; libs and stuffs that are outside should be statically linked.

In the OpenPrinting site stays a detailed explanation of how it works, aimed to provide an environment for universal printer drivers :

<http://www.linux-foundation.org/en/OpenPrinting/WritingAndPackagingPrinterDrivers>

I think it's worth to take a look at those !

Ciao

Max

Well, I had big hopes for LSB.... 4 years ago.

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook
Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 16:39:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

luzr wrote on Wed, 30 January 2008 17:30

Well, I had big hopes for LSB.... 4 years ago.

It doesn't work ? From the web it seems that most major linux distros are LSB compliant...

Max

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook
Posted by [guido](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 17:26:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mdelfede wrote on Wed, 30 January 2008 17:39luzr wrote on Wed, 30 January 2008 17:30

Well, I had big hopes for LSB.... 4 years ago.

It doesn't work ? From the web it seems that most major linux distros are LSB compliant...

Max

The LSB exists, theoretically it works, but nobody wants it.

The official distro independent binaries of Firefox, OpenOffice, Acrobat, Flash don't bother with it - nobody does!

Dealing with the LSB build environment is a royal PITA.

And if you build that way, it won't work on the hundreds of non-LSB distros. Why would you do that, when all that is really needed is linking against an old version of the libc, and then the binary will work for everybody.

The LSB is a link-level fork - stupid IMHO.

Guido

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook

Posted by [cbpporter](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 18:03:03 GMT

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

Quote:Well, I had big hopes for LSB.... 4 years ago.

Quote:The LSB exists, theoretically it works, but nobody wants it.

Me too! I was really fed up with a lot of binary incompatibility, endless recompiles from sources and back then I was quite the Linux enthusiast (I still like it today, and use it from time to time). The idea is good, the implementation is not that great and the adoption is horrible. Even if most of today's distros are LSB compliant, that only means that other LSB compliant software would find a working LSB runtime and would have no problem running. For a software to be LSB compliant, it must use the LSB core (which is very poorly placed in the filesystem IMO, reducing the flexibility of "system" paths) and all the libraries must either be LSB compliant or static linking must be used. The last time I checked, the number of LSB compliant applications and libraries was close to zero (I mean a relative closeness: with thousands of libraries if you have 20 done, you're close to zero), and static linking is practically impossible with any non trivial applications. Try static linking with dozens of libs and you'll get huge exe sizes and a great redundancy in the binary files.

But for U++, it would be easier to produce LSB compliant programs. Reliance on external libraries is very low (I believe only some optional gtk libs for skinning, which I don't really know if there are any LSB versions of) and the rest of system calls could be routed toward the LSB runtime by using their tools and some not to hard tweaking of the build process (please correct me if I'm wrong).

While this is possible, I think the question is: who cares? Most distros don't even have LSB selected by default on their general installation option.

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook

Posted by [mirek](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 18:41:05 GMT

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

Actually, considering LSB, I think there is a new standard for desktop linux nowadays... It is called Ubuntu.

Mirek

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook
Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 18:46:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cbpporter wrote on Wed, 30 January 2008 19:03

But for U++, it would be easier to produce LSB compliant programs. Reliance on external libraries is very low.....

That's what I was thinking too... Upp is library that is almost self-contained, so should impose fery few requirements on external libs

Quote:

.....

While this is possible, I think the question is: who cares? Most distros don't even have LSB selected by default on their general installation option.

Well, I think it wouldn't be bad to try it. If it works for 4-5 major distros, it's much better than nothing. LSB environment is maybe poor, but it can work for Upp... maybe.

Ciao

Max

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook
Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 19:02:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

luzr wrote on Wed, 30 January 2008 19:41Actually, considering LSB, I think there is a new standard for desktop linux nowadays... It is called Ubuntu.

Well, I agree that's the best distro available today, but you can't call it a standard. There are many RH and Novell users.

I don't know which part of all linux users has ubuntu... do you ?

Max

Subject: Re: Linux release cookbook
Posted by [mirek](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 21:40:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mdelfede wrote on Wed, 30 January 2008 14:02luzr wrote on Wed, 30 January 2008 19:41Actually, considering LSB, I think there is a new standard for desktop linux nowadays... It is called Ubuntu.

Well, I agree that's the best distro available today, but you can't call it a standard. There are many RH and Novell users.
I don't know which part of all linux users has ubuntu... do you ?

Max

That is not the end of story. There are many derivative distros of Ubuntu, with compatible .debs, reusing Ubuntu's repository.

Sure, same can be said for RH/Novell, but these are mostly server variant copies...

Mirek
