Subject: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 11:57:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

(UPDATE: THERE ARE BINARY AND SOURCE RPMS FOR FEDORA CORE 9, SUSE 11.0 AND MANDRIVA 2008.1 SPRING IN FOLLOWING POSTS)

Hi

I have done the test on Mandrivalinux 2008.1 x86_64 and i586.

Before release a complete rpm source package on sourceforge.net (not binary), I would like to know if you successfully compiled, installed Ultimate++ on your favourite rpm Linux distribution?

Here you can find instructions: http://www.ultimatepp.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=3722& amp; amp; amp;start=0&

But is faster to read on here

Many thanks

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on with distro?
Posted by cbpporter on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 12:14:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thank you for the effort invested in making a rpm. I proposed once to make a rpm package, but somehow people never got back to me regarding it, so I never got to it and I just install deb under rpm based distros.

But those instructions are far too complicated. Couldn't you upload somewhere a beta rpm so that people can test it without those manual steps? And would you be willing to create binary rpms also? Sorry to bother you with such silly requests .

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 12:38:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Some kind of script?

Problem: Mandriva use urpmi. Redhat use yum. Suse use something else I think. I haven't find a way to download files automatically from U++ forum.
Here are instructions without comments for advanced users (replace urpmi by yum, ...):

```
# su
# urpmi rpm-build freetype2-devel gtk2-devel pango-devel atk-devel cairo-devel X11-devel
xft2-devel expat-devel
# exit

# cat > ~/.rpmrc << EOF
buildarchtranslate: i386: i586
buildarchtranslate: i486: i586
buildarchtranslate: i586: i586
buildarchtranslate: i686: i586
EOF

# cat > ~/.rpmmacros << EOF
%_topdir $HOME/rpm
%_tmppath $HOME/rpm/tmp
%distribution Linux
%vendor Ultimate++ team
%packager YourName YourLastName <youremail@provider.loc>
EOF

# mkdir -p       ~/rpm/{BUILD,RPMS/{i586,x86_64,noarch},SOURCES,SRPMS,SPECS,t mp}

# cd ~/rpm/SOURCE/
# wget -N       http://dfn.dl.sourceforge.net/sourceforge/upp/upp-src-2008.1 .tar.gz
```

Download and save the tarball you will find at the end of this message. Then uncompress it with this command:

```
# tar zxvf rpmscript_and_fix.tar.gz -C ~/
```

That's all. To create the source and binary rpm packages:

```
# rpmbuild -ba ~/rpm/SPEC/upp.spec
```

Simple enough?

File Attachments

1) rpmscript_and_fix.tar.gz, downloaded 616 times

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 12:39:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ask for help if needed.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by bytefield on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 12:54:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's simple for all to have all files in one rpm package like we have on Debian and Ubuntu all files in deb packages.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 12:59:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Of course. But the rpm is too big and the forum won't load it.
I have no ftp server to upload on.
The contract is: "Please don't upload the src.rpm before someone tell you it works on other rpm based Linux distro"

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by mirek on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 13:35:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, I think if you do not have any FTP at hand (surprising , you can release it in "upp-development" on sf.net.

Mirek

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 13:53:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ok. Found one. Simpler.

Download upp-2008.1-1.src.rpm from here: http://dl.free.fr/jdy1GSwDF

Then create your rpmbuild environment:

```
# cat > ~/.rpmrc << EOF
buildarchtranslate: i386: i586
buildarchtranslate: i486: i586
```

buildarchtranslate: i586: i586
buildarchtranslate: i686: i586
EOF

cat > ~/.rpmmacros << EOF
%_topdir $HOME/rpm
%_tmppath $HOME/rpm/tmp
%distribution Linux
%vendor Ultimate++ team
%packager YourName YourLastName <youremail@provider.loc>
EOF

For next command, please, remove the space between for tmp (shouldn't be "t mp}" but when I "Apply message changes" the space is back again:

mkdir -p ~/rpm/{BUILD,RPMS/{i586,x86_64,noarch},SOURCES,SRPMS,SPECS,t mp}

Now, build the rpm source file:

rpmbuild --rebuild upp-2008.1-1.src.rpm

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by cbpporter on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 10:19:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I tried to install under openSuse 11 and I got:

warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root

Also:

X11-devel is needed by upp-2008.1-1.i586
xft2-devel is needed by upp-2008.1-1.i586
expat-devel is needed by upp-2008.1-1.i586

X11-devel is xorg-x11-devel and expat is libexpat-devel.

Unfortunately, the old problem with Linux (and rpm) not providing a stable and reliable environment for software distribution and detection shows it's ugly head.

I don't think that it is possible to create a cross distro rpm. Only if you strip out all dependencies. Or create a rpm for each distro, which would be an extremely tedious and may I day cruel task.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 17:06:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Wed, 20 August 2008 12:19I tried to install under openSuse 11 and I got:

warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root

Yes. When you install a src.rpm, rpm always show this. It's because cpio try to keep the login:group of the original packager.

Quote:
Also:

X11-devel is needed by upp-2008.1-1.i586
xft2-devel is needed by upp-2008.1-1.i586
expat-devel is needed by upp-2008.1-1.i586

X11-devel is xorg-x11-devel and expat is libexpat-devel.

Please, can you show me the output of this 2 commands:

rpm -q --provides xorg-x11-devel
rpm -q --provides libexpat-devel

If they give me what I want, your distro as mine will works out of the box with the src.rpm.

Quote:
Unfortunately, the old problem with Linux (and rpm) not providing a stable and reliable environment for software distribution and detection shows it's ugly head.

I don't think that it is possible to create a cross distro rpm. Only if you strip out all dependencies. Or create a rpm for each distro, which would be an extremely tedious and may I day cruel task.

Me too, I don't understand why they don't talk to each other to have an unique name for each "--provides".
At least, rpm show us the name to search for.

Next, the rpm build. Did it works out of the box?

(many thanks for your previous post)

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by cbpporter on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 19:33:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

rpm -q --provides xorg-x11-devel

xorg-x11-compat70-devel
xorg-x11-man
XFree86-devel
xorg-x11-devel = 7.3-64.1

rpm -q --provides libexpat-devel

libexpat-devel = 2.0.1-62.1

I actually did a new install on a clean system (no dev packages installed) and satisfied dependencies one by one to make sure that everything is ok. Those 3 libraries are the only ones which my distro does not provide under that name.

I tried using --nodeps to build the rpm, but I got:
Installing /home/raul/upp-2008.1-1.src.rpm
warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root
warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root
warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root
warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root
Executing(%prep): /bin/sh -e /root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.5889
+ umask 022
+ cd /root/rpm/BUILD
+ cd /root/rpm/BUILD
+ rm -rf upp-2008.1
+ /bin/mkdir -p upp-2008.1
+ cd upp-2008.1
+ /usr/bin/gzip -dc /root/rpm/SOURCES/upp-src-2008.1.tar.gz
+ tar -xf -
+ STATUS=0
+ '[' 0 -ne 0 ']'
++ /usr/bin/id -u
+ '[' 0 = 0 ']'
+ /bin/chown -Rhf root .
++ /usr/bin/id -u
+ '[' 0 = 0 ']'
+ /bin/chgrp -Rhf root .
+ /bin/chmod -Rf a+rX,u+w,g-w,o-w .
+ echo 'Patch #0 (upp-src-2008.1.fix_png_name_in_desktop_file):'
Patch #0 (upp-src-2008.1.fix_png_name_in_desktop_file):

+ patch -p0 -s
/root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.5889: line 35: patch: command not found
error: Bad exit status from /root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.5889 (%prep)

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 20:19:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Wed, 20 August 2008 21:33rpm -q --provides xorg-x11-devel

xorg-x11-compat70-devel
xorg-x11-man
XFree86-devel
xorg-x11-devel = 7.3-64.1

rpm -q --provides libexpat-devel

libexpat-devel = 2.0.1-62.1

Thanks. I can use XFree86-devel and libexpat-devel. Both are in Mandriva. Btw, it's a pity because this is no more XFree86 and libexpat-devel could be lib64expat-devel on 64 bit system.

Fortunately, Mandriva has added those provides in their rpm for fedora compatibility.

This could be considered as a bug. Your distro packager are not following the redhat rpm naming policy.

Quote:
I actually did a new install on a clean system (no dev packages installed) and satisfied dependencies one by one to make sure that everything is ok. Those 3 libraries are the only ones which my distro does not provide under that name.

I tried using --nodeps to build the rpm, but I got:
Installing /home/raul/upp-2008.1-1.src.rpm
warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root
...
+ echo 'Patch #0 (upp-src-2008.1.fix_png_name_in_desktop_file):'
Patch #0 (upp-src-2008.1.fix_png_name_in_desktop_file):
+ patch -p0 -s
/root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.5889: line 35: patch: command not found
error: Bad exit status from /root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.5889 (%prep)

Well. On your distro, when you install rpmbuild, they don't install patch. My goodness. The patch program applies diff files to originals. This is the well know standard tool from GNU. Most every src.rpm need it for rpm building. You should file a bug report. No doubt about it.

I guess you are using an unstable release.

yum install patch

Should be enough.

Note: if you type "rpm -i upp-src-2008.1.rpm", you will have ~/rpm/SPEC/upp.spec installed and source+patches in ~/rpm/SOURCE. You can edit upp.spec to see what's going on.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by cbpporter on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 05:59:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, I didn't install patch, or rpmbuild for that matter. If it is needed, I don't understand why it did not warn me before it started spitting out all those logs.

Now I get:

```
Installing /home/raul/upp-2008.1-1.src.rpm
warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root
warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root
warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root
warning: user camrein does not exist - using root
warning: group camrein does not exist - using root
Executing(%prep): /bin/sh -e /root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.4612
+ umask 022
+ cd /root/rpm/BUILD
+ cd /root/rpm/BUILD
+ rm -rf upp-2008.1
+ /bin/mkdir -p upp-2008.1
+ cd upp-2008.1
+ /usr/bin/gzip -dc /root/rpm/SOURCES/upp-src-2008.1.tar.gz
+ tar -xf -
+ STATUS=0
+ '[' 0 -ne 0 ']'
++ /usr/bin/id -u
+ '[' 0 = 0 ']'
+ /bin/chown -Rhf root .
++ /usr/bin/id -u
+ '[' 0 = 0 ']'
```

```
+ /bin/chgrp -Rhf root .
+ /bin/chmod -Rf a+rX,u+w,g-w,o-w .
+ echo 'Patch #0 (upp-src-2008.1.fix_png_name_in_desktop_file):'
Patch #0 (upp-src-2008.1.fix_png_name_in_desktop_file):
+ patch -p0 -s
+ exit 0
Executing(%build): /bin/sh -e /root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.55292
+ umask 022
+ cd /root/rpm/BUILD
+ cd upp-2008.1
++ pkg-config --libs-only-L x11 freetype2 gtk+-2.0 glib-2.0 cairo pango atk
++ pkg-config --cflags x11 freetype2 gtk+-2.0 glib-2.0 cairo pango atk
+ %make -e HOSTTYPE=LINUX -e LOCALBASE=/usr -e LIBPATH= -e 'CINC= -Iuppsrc
-I/usr/include/freetype2 -I/usr/include/gtk-2.0 -I/usr/lib/gtk-2.0/include -I/usr/include/atk-1.0
-I/usr/include/cairo -I/usr/include/pango-1.0 -I/usr/include/glib-2.0 -I/usr/lib/glib-2.0/include
-I/usr/include/libpng12  '
/root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.59065: line 24: fg: no job control
error: Bad exit status from /root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.59065 (%build)
```

And CINC:

```
CINC= -Iuppsrc -I/usr/include/freetype2 -I/usr/include/gtk-2.0 -I/usr/lib/gtk-2.0/include
-I/usr/include/atk-1.0 -I/usr/include/cairo -I/usr/include/pango-1.0 -I/usr/include/glib-2.0
-I/usr/lib/glib-2.0/include -I/usr/include/libpng12  :
 No such file or directory
```

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 09:07:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You are running rpmbuild as root. You shouldn't. Normal user is what is recommended.

Tell me which distro you are using. I will fix this directly in a virtual machine and see what kind of problem this distrib has with this package.

I would like also to see the rpm script: /root/rpm/tmp/rpm-tmp.59065. Can you upload it here? Lets fix it.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Fri, 22 Aug 2008 08:06:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm stupid. rpm doesn't find %make in your distro.
Please, edit ~/rpm/SPEC/upp.spec, change the dependencies you want and replace %make with

make then:

rpmbuild -bb ~/rpm/SPEC/upp.spec
(ndrl: command fixed, thank cbpporter)

If you have the same problem than with patch, then install make.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by cbpporter on Fri, 22 Aug 2008 13:05:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, I replaced %make with make (what does %make mean?), and he two dependencies, and deleted xft2-devel as a dependency (it seems my distro includes it in x11 devel package).

Build went pretty well, expect that it lasted an incredibly long time. I could have built about 10% of a kernel in that time .

There are still some small problems. Rpmbuild tries to copy files to %{buildroot}, but it actually takes it verbatim and files wind up in "~/rpm/BUILd/upp-2008.1/%{buildroot}". I believe that it should have replaced %{buildroot} with something. Must set it up somewhere.

I also got a:
Processing files: upp-2008.1-1
error: File not found: /usr/share/icons/hicolor/48x48/apps/theide.png

Shouldn't it be working with local build files instead of with my systems /usr content?

PS:
rpm -bb ~/rpm/SPEC/upp.spec
is actually
rpmbuild -bb ~/rpm/SPECS/upp.spec
for those who want to try the build process also.

PS2: What is wrong with the png? It shows up OK.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Fri, 22 Aug 2008 17:24:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I installed Fedora 9 and OpenSuse 11.0 for testing.

I already tested Fedora and Mandriva.

The problem with %{buildroot}: in Mandriva, they already set it for you and their developers removed its definition into their .spec files. On Fedora, you need to include it.

The problem with the png: the one from the U++ tarball is a bad png. Perhaps because of svn when it was imported (not in binary form). Their is a good theide.png in the src.rpm and the rpm script use it instead.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Fri, 22 Aug 2008 20:36:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

(UPDATED WITH LAST RPMS, THEY WORKS)

Ok, here are the rpms. They are also now on sourceforge.net too.

RPM binary Release to use (those rpms will be there for 30 days if no one download them):

Fedora 9 i386 rpm: http://dl.free.fr/p3MvNQeEE
(install with yum install --nogpgcheck upp-2008.1-1.fc9.i386.rpm)

Mandriva 2008.1 i586 rpm: http://dl.free.fr/qS3GEy9wv

OpenSuse 11.0 i586 rpm: http://dl.free.fr/qTueoO3N8

Mandriva + Fedora + OpenSuse source rpm: http://dl.free.fr/jdy1GSwDF

Build dependencies if you want to build the source rpm yourself:
(because you are running a Linux 64 bit distro or want to test...)

First, create the rpmbuild environment (see 8th post) then, before building the binary with "rpmbuild --rebuild upp-2008.1-1.src.rpm" with your user account you need to become root and type":

Mandriva 2008.1: # urpmi rpm-build gcc gcc-c++ gtk2-devel pango-devel atk-devel cairo-devel expat-devel X11-devel freetype2-devel

Fedora 9: # yum install rpm-build gcc gcc-c++ gtk2-devel pango-devel atk-devel cairo-devel expat-devel xorg-x11-server-devel freetype-devel

OpenSuse 11.0: # YaST -i patch make gcc gcc-c++ gtk2-devel pango-devel atk-devel cairo-devel libexpat-devel xorg-x11-devel freetype2-devel

---

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?

Posted by cbpporter on Mon, 25 Aug 2008 22:56:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I installed the opensuse rpm on two machines, one of them beeing "clean" and I worked. U++ also behaves correctly after install.

There are some issues though.
1. In YaST, the License field for the rpm states "BSD-like, GPL-2.1, LGPL". That's a little much, is it not?
2. Distribution is empty and Vendor is "Mandriva".
3. It does not display anything in the "Install (Available)" column.
4. Clicking on "File List" crashes the program.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Tue, 26 Aug 2008 16:29:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Tue, 26 August 2008 00:56
I installed the opensuse rpm on two machines, one of them beeing "clean" and It worked. U++ also behaves correctly after install.

There are some issues though.
1. In YaST, the License field for the rpm states "BSD-like, GPL-2.1, LGPL". That's a little much, is it not?

U++ include external components using those license. If I write BSD-like only, then people won't know about GPL and LGPL code inside.

Quote:
2. Distribution is empty and Vendor is "Mandriva".

Yes! Thank you.
Will fix it.

Not: "rpm -qi upp" show all information correctly. "rpm -ql upp" too.

I just need to remove Mandrivalinux.

Quote:
3. It does not display anything in the "Install (Available)" column.

Because upp is not part of the default OpenSuse repository (I mean, on their website). The install tool only show what is available in their repository.

With OpenSuse, the two way I found to install an external rpm are:

- with command line ("Yast -i" or "rpm -i").
- with YaST install/remove tool. But only if the rpm distributor have made a repository specially for OpenSuse. You then need to add first this repository.

There's also perhaps another way, because I saw a few page on the web with a special "click me" button for quick rpm installation. Something like " click me and I will install this package X from this website " but just for Suse distro.

Quote:
4. Clicking on "File List" crashes the program.

It works here without problem.
I think you should update your distro with last bug fix.
Options for update (like MS Win update) are in YaST. Mine was buggy even before I tried U++ then I've got the updates and no problem since.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by cbpporter on Tue, 26 Aug 2008 17:50:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

amrein wrote on Tue, 26 August 2008 19:29
Because upp is not part of the default OpenSuse repository (I mean, on their website). The install tool only show what is available in their repository.

Yes, you are right! It shows the online package version. If all goes well maybe we can include it there. openSuse has the Factory system, which allows users to upload packages. I guess having Suse and Mandriva online packages in third party repository could help a little in boosting U++ popularity. AFAIK, Ubuntu deb is not in any official repository.

Quote:
With OpenSuse, the two way I found to install an external rpm are:

- with command line ("Yast -i" or "rpm -i").
- with YaST install/remove tool. But only if the rpm distributor have made a repository specially for OpenSuse. You then need to add first this repository.

There is also "zypper install <package>", but as YaST interface, it only works for packages in online repository. It is similar to apt-get, yum and urpmi. I wish people would stop inventing their own package manager front-ends.

Quote:
There's also perhaps another way, because I saw a few page on the web with a special "click me" button for quick rpm installation. Something like " click me and I will install this package X from this

website " but just for Suse distro.

That's the "one click install". It automatically registers a repository, and downloads and installs a package together with it's dependencies. Very useful for KDE (getting the latest 4.x) and other huge packages.

Quote:
It works here without problem.
I think you should update your distro with last bug fix.
Options for update (like MS Win update) are in YaST. Mine was buggy even before I tried U++ then I've got the updates and no problem since.

I'm up to date and still get crash. I'll try to clean system and do a reinstall to see if the problem persists.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by mirek on Tue, 26 Aug 2008 19:31:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

amrein wrote on Tue, 26 August 2008 12:29cbpporter wrote on Tue, 26 August 2008 00:56
I installed the opensuse rpm on two machines, one of them beeing "clean" and It worked. U++ also behaves correctly after install.

There are some issues though.
1. In YaST, the License field for the rpm states "BSD-like, GPL-2.1, LGPL". That's a little much, is it not?

U++ include external components using those license. If I write BSD-like only, then people won't know about GPL and LGPL code inside.

Only mingw release contains GPLed code. Worst you get for linux releases is LGPL in ndisasm package (which, quite ironically, is only needed for native MSC debugger

Mirek

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Tue, 26 Aug 2008 23:41:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Packages updated (links in previous post have also been updated).

RPMS are now on Sourceforge too.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by mirek on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 09:58:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

EXCELLENT work, thanks a lot.

Might we open a discussion how to do this each night automatically?

IMO, we will need 4 chroot environments, correct?

I guess I should setup something like SFTP on "infra" server so that maintainers can establish (upload) chroot environments required for builds.

IMO, we perhaps need some unified scripting interface to make everything work too..

Mirek

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 13:08:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There's something wrong in building rpms each night: for me there is no interest for end user and it could be a very big waste of time.

There are 2 types of users:

1. Those who want to use and work with U++ and TheIDE
2. Those who want to contribute and work on U++ and TheIDE source code and send improvements/patches

The fist category wants stable release (deb, rpm). The second category wants access to the svn source code and wants to build Ultimate++ themselves. None of them need everyday rpm build.

Quote:
EXCELLENT work, thanks a lot.

Might we open a discussion how to do this each night automatically?

IMO, we will need 4 chroot environments, correct?

I guess I should setup something like SFTP on "infra" server so that maintainers can establish

(upload) chroot environments required for builds.

IMO, we perhaps need some unified scripting interface to make everything work too..

cbpporter talked about OpenSuse "having the Factory system", which allows users to upload packages and build them for many distro on OpenSuse website. Their factory source code is available online (must register to download it).

They don't use chroot but VMWare to simulate all those distro (virtual machines) and have automatic package build from them. We could use VirtualBox instead of VMWare (VMWare is faster and have more options but not so much).

The difference is not so big between virtual computers and real computers. With virtual machines, you can clone the virtual computers easily (on any new installed server). You can make snapshots with one click. You can ask the virtual machine to go back to a previous snapshot with one click to get back to a working and clean build environment. You don't have issue with dbus/sys/proc/hal/... You don't have to mess up with scripts not working because of "chroot ." in another distro root.

Really, I said that it was the easier solution. I didn't know about Novell factory. If people like Novel/OpenSuse use virtual machines, I think they know what they are doing.

Note: This build architecture will be needed for next Ultimate++ release. How many time before 2008.2?

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by cbpporter on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 13:48:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:There's something wrong in building rpms each night: for me there is no interest for end user and it could be a very big waste of time.

There are 2 types of users:

1. Those who want to use and work with U++ and TheIDE
2. Those who want to contribute and work on U++ and TheIDE source code and send improvements/patches

The fist category wants stable release (deb, rpm). The second category wants access to the svn source code and wants to build Ultimate++ themselves. None of them need everyday rpm build.
I have to agree. Normal users want stable releases. Even I use stable releases most of the time and for all official stuff, and maintain some patches until next dev if I need a fix. Of course, on my hacking machine where I experiment with stuff, I have all the source dirs linked to svn and remain always up to date, except when I'm doing some experimental patch.

But having a working make system that does all the building for all targeted distros is a must, and

if the machine is working there is no reason to not do nightly builds, even if most users will stick with stable packages.

What would be better than nightly builds would be to create some kind of Update packages once a small number of bugs have been fixed. These updates must not break anything. If a user downloads 2008.1, he/she will most likely stick with it. But if offered 2008.1 Update 1, which is identical to 2008.1, except for fixed bugs, there would be incentive to upgrade. This is similar to current systems with dev builds, but devs have free form content (like the new allocator that was introduced some while ago and needed some testing before it was proven stable) which offer few advantages for users who want stability. So basically I propose smaller and more frequent updates which are guaranteed not to break anything (except accident of course), and when new features or changes are included, some beta/rc packages followed shortly by by new release and removing dev releases.
Dev branches can be checked out from svn by all developers/testers.

Quote:
Note: This build architecture will be needed for next Ultimate++ release. How many time before 2008.2?

I don't know when Mirek wants it, but basically I think the sooner the better.

I don't think that with current release schedule we'll have a 2008.2 (but a 2009.1), but probably we'll get to 2008.dev-2 by winter.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by mirek on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 14:15:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I understand the point about this being a little bit waste of time.

However, my point about this is that releasing each night will keep release scripts in "good shape". Of course, there will not be thousands to test it, but even if single user tests specific .rpm from time to time, he can detect packaging bugs.

I am sort of speaking from experience (2008.1 release). It is always very tedious process to "refurbish" all release methodology after 6 months.

Besides, it is not our time that will be wasted. I do not care if server works hard for one or two hours when I sleep

Mirek

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by mirek on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 14:17:05 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Actually, I was suggesting that the ".1" is not really needed... because it is unlikely we will have another "major" release this year.

In fact, I would like to have next release sort of "ultimate", we remaining U++ issues possibly solved (see and extend "The plan...").

Mirek

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by mr_ped on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 14:18:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Building deb/rpm every night is good for testing the distribution/deployment mechanism, so in case it gets broken over time, it will be noticed ASAP.

But I agree there are no "end users" for nightly rpms/debs, except some occasional tests or in case you want to know if some bug will be fixed by next release. Still I think if we have enough CPU power to do nightly full packages builds, it's worth of doing them.
Also I think there should be enough CPU power to run automated tests, ideally "per commit", or at least continuously/daily in case the commits will be too frequent to build per commit.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by mr_ped on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 14:31:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Wed, 27 August 2008 16:17Actually, I was suggesting that the ".1" is not really needed... because it is unlikely we will have another "major" release this year.

In fact, I would like to have next release sort of "ultimate", we remaining U++ issues possibly solved (see and extend "The plan...").

Mirek

I would try (if possible and it makes sense) to change+finish 1 thing from "The plan" at a time and release after each one is done.
Waiting for "ultimate" version may easily go from something like 1 year to 5-10 years, and at that point everyone will be either using svn/dev's releases as stable, or still stick to 2008.1 (unlikely).
I mean, let's find the smallest possible set of new features, which makes sense to be implemented together, do them and release. (See also "SCRUM" for reference what I feel)
While I would love version with "all issues solved", I don't believe into such things anymore. There will be always some new issue.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 18:36:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I think I have finally understood why you are still asking for this. If fact, you want to be sure that all U++ svn commit won't break Linux compatibility. Am I wrong?

Ok, but as long as U++ can build on Ubuntu, big patches won't be needed for rpm based distro. Here is a proof, there is no fix for the source code in my src.rpm. Nothing. I just fought with the rpm external dependencies.

Why no break on other distro? Because they use package with the same major release: GTK+ 2.x.x, xorg-1.4.x.x, ...

So, in my opinion, the only think to do is to test if building the unstable release works in Ubuntu.

I will add this:

- A ".rpm" file is a compressed file (using cpio), a kind of tar.gz of the binary (I mean what you get with "make install") with a few extra information at the beginning of the cpio file for authors, licenses, ... That's all.

- A src.rpms is a compressed file too. It's the original source code tarball with a few extra information at the beginning + an automatic build script. That's all. It's like having the tarball + a build script (doing make, make install) + info about the needed dependencies.

If you don't trust me, just type in a console:

rpm2cpio upp-2008.1-1.src.rpm | cpio -mdiv
rpm2cpio upp-2008.1-1.fc9.i386.rpm | cpio -mdiv

Really, building a rpm each night is a waste of time. There is no need to test it on all distro each night, only on one distro like Ubuntu is enough. You could even build unstable U++ with TheIDE from the stable release.

Be that as it may, I understood that you would like to create this build factory right now. So, to create this build environment for final release, I think OpenSuse source code from their "Factory system" will speed this process a lot.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 18:42:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:
I mean, let's find the smallest possible set of new features, which makes sense to be implemented together, do them and release. (See also "SCRUM" for reference what I feel)
While I would love version with "all issues solved", I don't believe into such things anymore. There

will be always some new issue.

Me too, I would like to know the roadmap for future U++ release. I searched but haven't found discussion about U++ future in the forum.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by mr_ped on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 19:10:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

amrein wrote on Wed, 27 August 2008 20:42
Me too, I would like to know the roadmap for future U++ release. I searched but haven't found discussion about U++ future in the forum.

The latest forum thread talking about future after 2008.1 is here:
http://www.ultimatepp.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=3753& amp;start=0&

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by amrein on Wed, 27 Aug 2008 19:20:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Cool. Thank you!

And now, if someone tell how to see only new messages in the forum and not all messages not already read (because I don't read them all) I will be over the moon.

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by cbpporter on Mon, 01 Sep 2008 08:22:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, it seems that using Factory is not that easy. Another solution would be Packman, which is the "official" unofficial third party repository. Also it is AFAIK the only general package repository except the official ones. In suse 11, it even appears in the list of common Software Repositories, so you don't even have to manually enter the address to enable it.

Unfortunately, if you want to contribute a package you have to mail them. If you don't want to mess around with such a system, I could contact them and get login info for you.

Also, maybe someone can find out how to contribute to Ubuntu repository. I believe the one that could accept third party packages is called "Universe".

Subject: Re: Does the provided upp.spec works for you and on which distro?
Posted by mr_ped on Tue, 02 Sep 2008 12:07:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

EDIT: this was supposed to be reply to another post in I think different thread, but it somehow got lost/deleted/moved when I was posting this?

And you still didn't even hit the "contribute the code, get refused anyway" scenario.

Well, keep contributing with ideas, discussing them, and your target is to make Mirek believe those changes are good and important. (Or "Uno" is your second change to change something in official U++, the third member of core U++ team does not show up at forums AFAIK)
But don't expect anything happen very fast, if it does not directly suit their needs. Patience. (many of us are going trough this, with complete finished source package it is usually easier to get included into U++, and even that takes lot of time and labor, with major concept changes like your proposals the resistance will be even higher)

Also most of us do use U++ for real projects. Even if those projects are just for fun or their are commercial, but we have very specific needs, etc... most of the time we are just trying to "make it work, eventually fix it in universal way", not the opposite way.