

---

Subject: Releases

Posted by [andrei\\_natanael](#) on Thu, 02 Apr 2009 12:04:35 GMT

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

---

U++ is using a rolling release system which means that the developers are working always on dev branch and if there is a bug it get always solved but not back ported to say 2008.1. Usually a new release come out after some major changes and it's out for people who are "scared" about using latest changes . I don't see why someone would stay with U++ 2008.1 or other release. Using U++ from development branch doesn't break your application(too often ) and make you keeping the step with the changes which are introduced daily. My advice is to don't be afraid of using latest U++ from svn. And yes, i think there should be a new release for 2009 year and i think Mirek is thinking at that too ( U++ PR, server infrastructure, etc.)

---

---

Subject: Re: Bug crashing application in Upp2008.1

Posted by [cbpporter](#) on Thu, 02 Apr 2009 12:21:23 GMT

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

---

andrei\_natanael wrote on Thu, 02 April 2009 15:04I don't see why someone would stay with U++ 2008.1 or other release.

Some people, especially management refuse to work with non stable version, and will refuse any bug fix until it not incorporated into next minor version at least.

On my old job there was an unhappy coincidence where the single time a rolling version was installed it failed to build (some silly bug in Mt) and that practically sealed the deal and set 2008.1 and TheIDE from it as the only acceptable version ).

---

---

Subject: Re: Bug crashing application in Upp2008.1

Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 06 Apr 2009 07:42:39 GMT

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

---

andrei\_natanael wrote on Thu, 02 April 2009 08:04U++ is using a rolling release system which means that the developers are working always on dev branch and if there is a bug it get always solved but not back ported to say 2008.1. Usually a new release come out after some major changes and it's out for people who are "scared" about using latest changes . I don't see why someone would stay with U++ 2008.1 or other release. Using U++ from development branch doesn't break your application(too often ) and make you keeping the step with the changes which are introduced daily. My advice is to don't be afraid of using latest U++ from svn. And yes, i think there should be a new release for 2009 year and i think Mirek is thinking at that too ( U++ PR, server infrastructure, etc.)

I guess this requires some more discussion....

Actually, I was rather thinking that I will abandon the idea of "major" "stable" releases.

The real reason is that it seems unlikely that we have enough manpower and will to backport any bug fixes. Therefore, 'head' release is almost always more stable than any previous release.

In fact, in the past 10 years, I was always using head. Of course, for me it is simple as there is for me no real distinction between U++ bug and final application bug...

It is also worth mentioning that most abrupt changes of the past are now, well, the past.

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Bug crashing application in Upp2008.1  
Posted by [tojocky](#) on Tue, 28 Jul 2009 12:07:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

luzr wrote on Mon, 06 April 2009 10:42andrei\_natanael wrote on Thu, 02 April 2009 08:04U++ is using a rolling release system which means that the developers are working always on dev branch and if there is a bug it get always solved but not back ported to say 2008.1. Usually a new release come out after some major changes and it's out for people who are "scared" about using latest changes . I don't see why someone would stay with U++ 2008.1 or other release. Using U++ from development branch doesn't break your application(too often ) and make you keeping the step with the changes which are introduced daily. My advice is to don't be afraid of using latest U++ from svn. And yes, i think there should be a new release for 2009 year and i think Mirek is thinking at that too ( U++ PR, server infrastructure, etc.)

I guess this requires some more discussion....

Actually, I was rather thinking that I will abandon the idea of "major" "stable" releases.

The real reason is that it seems unlikely that we have enough manpower and will to backport any bug fixes. Therefore, 'head' release is almost always more stable than any previous release.

In fact, in the past 10 years, I was always using head. Of course, for me it is simple as there is for me no real distinction between U++ bug and final application bug...

It is also worth mentioning that most abrupt changes of the past are now, well, the past.

Mirek

I propose to implement an bugzilla or issue (as in google), this implementation will be better to know bug detail.

---