

---

Subject: Releases....

Posted by [mirek](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 08:41:40 GMT

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

---

I am now thinking a lot about U++ future and that involves a release infrastructure.

I think it is about time to create a list of all possible "U++ outputs" and current maintainers.

- source release; should contain makefile, maintainer: AFAIK missing
- win32 (with and without mingw): unodgs, tojocky
- ubuntu64 - mdelfede
- ubuntu32 - bytefield
- freebsd - masu
- Visual C++ - novo

Now some more outputs that I think we should do:

- .rpm
- win64 (maybe)
- NTL (as separate library)
- U++ allocator (because it is now the best in the world)

Anything or anybody missing?

As for future infrastructure plans, I plan to deploy "U++ server" to automate the release process, most likely with Ubuntu64 as base system, with ssh access for all maintainers. It should do nightly builds, nightly unit testing and perhaps even nightly benchmarking.

I think we should be able to use wine to compile win32 outputs... Or alternatively, virtualization.

Mirek

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [masu](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 08:55:46 GMT

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

---

I can do the source release, if desired.

However, I have holidays beginning in week 25 lasting for 1 month, so a release date before would help .

Matthias

---

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [guido](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 18:23:14 GMT

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

---

I might do OpenSolaris.

But no promise and not before Q3.

Incidentally, any Mac development happening?

At least the X11.app port still functional?

Guido

---

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [mirek](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 18:28:39 GMT

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

---

guido wrote on Wed, 28 May 2008 14:23l might do OpenSolaris.

But no promise and not before Q3.

Incidentally, any Mac development happening?

At least the X11.app port still functional?

Guido

OK, so we should add

- OpenSolaris

- MacOS X11

Mac development and other feature enhancements are another topic....

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [cbpporter](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 18:31:48 GMT

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

---

I could do some rpms. I have some linuxes on a vbox, so starting it up and running a script to

generate the rpm wouldn't be any problem about 2 times a month.

The problem with rpms is that they are not very portable between distros, so we have to pick some popular distros like Suse and Fedora and stick with the last stable version.

---

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [mirek](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 18:41:58 GMT

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

---

cbpporter wrote on Wed, 28 May 2008 14:31 I could do some rpms. I have some linuxes on a vbox, so starting it up and running a script to generate the rpm wouldn't be any problem about 2 times a month.

Excellent, thanks.

Anyway, it turns out that we will have sort of "main" releases, done perhaps as automated nightly builds (and maintainer's job will be mostly to maintain release scripts), and "secondary" releases like MacOSX, FreeBSD, Solaris etc...

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [cbpporter](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 18:58:01 GMT

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

---

And I was thinking about a way to offer a portable way of installing and compiling U++ on unsupported distros. AFAIK, a binary (ELF) without any shared libs referenced can be run out of the box on most linux distros, and even on FreeBSD, through their binary parallelization system (I could be wrong about the BSD part, but I remember reading that it had some emulation mechanism for such tasks). If we could package a completely self-contained UMK version together with some autodetect mechanism for gcc and needed header files or libs, I think we could make the task of installing on a fresh distro which does not have a binary distribution a lot easier, especially for people who don't have Linux bash experience or just hate bash based make scripts and makefiles like I do . Installation package would be sources plus build tool.

---

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [mirek](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 20:55:22 GMT

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

---

[quote title=cbpporter wrote on Wed, 28 May 2008 14:58 AFAIK, a binary (ELF) without any shared libs referenced can be run out of the box on most linux distros, and even on FreeBSD, through their binary parallelization system (I could be wrong about the BSD part, but I remember reading that it had some emulation mechanism for such tasks). If we could package a completely

self-contained UMK version together with some autodetect mechanism for gcc and needed header files or libs, I think we could make the task of installing on a fresh distro which does not have a binary distribution a lot easier, especially for people who don't have Linux bash experience or just hate bash based make scripts and makefiles like I do . [/quote]

Well, that would require "separating" umk from GUI. OTOH, that is something I wanted to do anyway.

Strangely, it seems we have some overlapping jobs now Separating SlaveProcess from Web, Console from ide and umk from GUI

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [Novo](#) on Thu, 29 May 2008 02:18:50 GMT

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

---

luzr wrote on Wed, 28 May 2008 04:41

- Visual C++ - novo

OK. I just need an SVN revision number. I can also generate C++Builder project files. Nobody complained they aren't working.

---

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [masu](#) on Thu, 29 May 2008 10:39:11 GMT

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

---

cbpporter wrote on Wed, 28 May 2008 20:58And I was thinking about a way to offer a portable way of installing and compiling U++ on unsupported distros. AFAIK, a binary (ELF) without any shared libs referenced can be run out of the box on most linux distros, and even on FreeBSD, through their binary parallelization system (I could be wrong about the BSD part, but I remember reading that it had some emulation mechanism for such tasks). If we could package a completely self-contained UMK version together with some autodetect mechanism for gcc and needed header files or libs, I think we could make the task of installing on a fresh distro which does not have a binary distribution a lot easier, especially for people who don't have Linux bash experience or just hate bash based make scripts and makefiles like I do . Installation package would be sources plus build tool.

You will need a linux emulation layer on BSDs which is no problem since I think all of them include a port for that. But you have the additional dependency on that layer.

Matthias

---

---

Subject: Re: Releases....

Posted by [cbpporter](#) on Tue, 03 Jun 2008 19:04:41 GMT

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

---

edit: Posted in wrong forum

---