Subject: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by ebojd on Sat, 23 Aug 2008 00:48:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello luzr et. al,

After a long hiatus I am back to programming and wanted to sync U++ to the latest. I've cleaned up a new version of the experimental portage tree and was working on setting up a live ebuild (directly from the svn source tree). I have the following questions:

1) has there ever been developed a method for bootstrap generation of the Makefiles without a full blown version of U++ installed? I am having a real chicken and egg problem with getting the live ebuild working, and a clean solution to the problem could clean up all of the patches I am hacking over the Makefiles.

2) at one point we discussed the inclusion of a pkg-config interface to find the includes/libraries/flags. Has any work been done on this?

3) is there anyone would would like to test my new ebuilds before I put them up on the server?

Thanks and best regards,

  EBo --

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by vcunat on Sat, 23 Aug 2008 10:30:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

3) I would test the ebuild gladly. But with paludis only, I've stopped using portage... (it shouldn't matter for the ebuild)

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by ebojd on Sat, 23 Aug 2008 13:48:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for the reply vcunat,

I remember reading that portage was being replaced, but was far and away when the switch really started happening. I'll check into it and see about converting too. I'll put you an a list to for beta testing. Hmmm... before punching the send button I did a quick read on paludis. There are enough subtle changes that I think I will put off switching over until I have a little more time to deal with potential snafoo's (like how I deal with overlays, and it looks like one or two of my packages may be known to be broken). Anyway, I'll send you the tree for testing.

As a note, trying to figure out generating the Makefiles would hugely simplify the ebuilds; any suggestions on that front would be greatly appreciated.

  EBo --

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by mirek on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 13:49:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Have you tried recent "Export project.." function?

It is not perfect, but the new way how makefiles are generated is IMO long-term viable option.

I would like to hear comments about this and gradually improve it.

Mirek

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by ebojd on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 14:07:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mirek,

Sorry for dropping off the face of the earth so long...

A couple of questions/comments:

1) where is the source code for the "Export project.." function? I've been gone so long I have to get reoriented.

2) my desire is to be able to generate the Makefiles from the command line as part of a boot strapping process. So, it might already be done and I just not know about it.

Thanks,

  EBo --

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by mirek on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 14:38:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ebojd wrote on Sun, 24 August 2008 10:07Mirek,

Sorry for dropping off the face of the earth so long...

A couple of questions/comments:

1) where is the source code for the "Export project.." function? I've been gone so long I have to get reoriented.

2008.1 release

Quote:
2) my desire is to be able to generate the Makefiles from the command line as part of a boot strapping process. So, it might already be done and I just not know about it.

Right now it is possible to generate "old style" Makefile from the commandline.

New export will be possible soon.

Mirek

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by ebojd on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 15:31:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Doh... I think I found it -- line in uppsrc/ide/Export.cpp. Is that all of it?

First impressions is that it cannot be easily made into a non GUI standalone tool.

After trying to hack this for a boot strapping tool I see that it is going to take more time that I can break away for the next few weeks. I'll take another look then.

To facilitate collaboration if people are willing, what I would like to see/work-on is a bootstrapping program that generates the Makefile/project files. As a bootstrapping program is a minimal command line program which does not require any upper level Ide or GUI tools to configure or build. They typically have a series of very simple hand coded Makefile/project files for the different architectures supported. Once the bootstrapper is built, the head and ide Makefile/project files are generated and we can begin building the entire system from working Makefiles.

If this sounds good, I'm willing to help, but I will be limited in how much time I can dedicate to this project.

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by ebojd on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 15:39:18 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Sun, 24 August 2008 09:38
2008.1 release

Sorry for not being clear... I was asking what the file name of the source code was, but I think I found it...

luzr
Right now it is possible to generate "old style" Makefile from the commandline.

New export will be possible soon.

Ok... searching the forums I do not see any info or documentation on the command line Makefile generation tools. What I have found looking in the code is so dependent on Win* or GUI stuff that I cannot even begin to build it for bootstrapping.

Laters,

  EBo --

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by mirek on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 16:44:15 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ebojd wrote on Sun, 24 August 2008 11:31Doh... I think I found it -- line in uppsrc/ide/Export.cpp. Is that all of it?

First impressions is that it cannot be easily made into a non GUI standalone tool.

After trying to hack this for a boot strapping tool I see that it is going to take more time that I can break away for the next few weeks. I'll take another look then.

To facilitate collaboration if people are willing, what I would like to see/work-on is a bootstrapping program that generates the Makefile/project files. As a bootstrapping program is a minimal command line program which does not require any upper level Ide or GUI tools to configure or build. They typically have a series of very simple hand coded Makefile/project files for the different architectures supported. Once the bootstrapper is built, the head and ide Makefile/project files are generated and we can begin building the entire system from working Makefiles.

If this sounds good, I'm willing to help, but I will be limited in how much time I can dedicate to this project.

I see, minor misunderstanding. Different focus, I guess...

For now, what we are trying to achieve is command-line mode of theide. IMO, that almost OK for what you want to do, except the need of X11 libs being present on the system.

Longer term goal is to separate build facilities to completely non-GUI tool, "umk". But that will tak a little bit more time.

Another short term goal is to start automated nightly builds. Commandline theide is of course quite useful. We should start with ubuntu, win32 and then extent to other systems (using either chroot environment or virtualization). I guess portage can be part of it.

Mirek

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by ebojd on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 20:21:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Sun, 24 August 2008 11:44
I see, minor misunderstanding. Different focus, I guess...

For now, what we are trying to achieve is command-line mode of theide. IMO, that almost OK for what you want to do, except the need of X11 libs being present on the system.

Longer term goal is to separate build facilities to completely non-GUI tool, "umk". But that will tak a little bit more time.

Another short term goal is to start automated nightly builds. Commandline theide is of course quite useful. We should start with ubuntu, win32 and then extent to other systems (using either chroot environment or virtualization). I guess portage can be part of it.

Mirek

I do not think that it is that much different than what I was thinking. If the tool does not have any gui requirements then the question I was asking is how can we build *just that tool* the first time without an entire U++ system installed or someone else generating its Makefiles.

I'm curious though why you think the X11 libs must being present on the system when building umk? If it has no gui requirements then it should be able to be built independently. If you are saying that for umk to configure the Makefiles it has to know where the x11 libs are, then that is different, and I agree.

When do you think the beta version of umk will be available?

  EBo -

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by mirek on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 22:21:44 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ebojd wrote on Sun, 24 August 2008 16:21
I do not think that it is that much different than what I was thinking. If the tool does not have any gui requirements then the question I was asking is how can we build *just that tool* the first time without an entire U++ system installed or someone else generating its Makefiles.

I am afraid that someone else has to generate the Makefile in any case. OTOH, this process can easily be automated (in nightly build).

Quote:
I'm curious though why you think the X11 libs must being present on the system when building umk?

You got it wrong... With X11 we already have 'umk' (it is just called 'theide').

The real goal, with 'umk', is to get rid of X11.

Quote:
When do you think the beta version of umk will be available?

Realistically, OTOH, there is not that high pressure right now.
Most things can be achieved with current 'theide' as commandline tool.

Mirek

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by ebojd on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 22:33:34 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

 if the Makefiles were generated every night (or preferably as part of every commit), then me generating a live ebuild would be a snap.

I still think we are not communicating clearly on the X11/umk thing, but I think I see where you are going at this point. umk will lot be usable for boot strapping, and theIde has to already be up and running to process the makefiles.

One other thing... You do not have to worry about makeing u++ great because it already is. It's just making it *better*

Thanks,

EBo --

Subject: Re: updating portage tree, questions, etc.
Posted by ebojd on Sun, 24 Aug 2008 22:36:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

 vcunat was kind enough to test the new portage ebuilds which helped me clean up a thing or two...

I would love to have one or more people test them before committing them to the repository. Are there any more takers?

 EBo --