

Date: Sat, 08 Oct 2005 05:47:31 -0400 (EDT)
From: Charles Severance <csev@umich.edu>
Subject: Fwd: Bringing the branches together 2.1
To: sakai <sakai@ctools.umich.edu>

FYI - Discussion about 2.1 - good stuff.

/Chuck

Begin forwarded message:

> From: Charles Severance <csev@umich.edu>
> Date: October 8, 2005 5:41:42 AM EDT
> To: sakai-dev <sakai-dev@collab.sakaiproject.org>
> Cc: Kirk Alexander <kdalex@ucdavis.edu>
> Subject: Bringing the branches together 2.1
>
>
> Kirk,
>
> Excellent question (changed the subject line for thread junkies...)
>
> Short Answer: 2.1 brings everything back together again - this was
> always the plan (see long answer).
>
> Long Answer:
>
> The IU branch was never a "separation" or "fork" - the IU branch
> was created when the HEAD of SVN started to get significant new
> code aimed at the 2.1 release which was not ready for production yet.
>
> Sakai 2.0 was released June 15, 2005 at 7PM Eastern time. From
> that day through early September, the head of SVN only had bug
> fixes for 2.0 and some very stable and upwards compatible 2.1
> modifications done by IU and UM over the summer as both
> institutions prepared for production. IU built some 2.1 features
> over the summer in head and UM did performance testing and bug
> fixing over the summer Stanford did bug fixing on Samigo. So by
> the end of summer the head of SVN was in really good shape with
> lots of bug fixes and a few new features.
>
> So Indiana was simply used the head (2.1-pre-alpha-but-very-stable)
> for production starting in September. UM was running 2.0.1 plus
> performance fixes and bug fixes from head because UM was not
> running Samigo. (Because all of the branches are very close, the
> performance fixes work nicely in all current versions including
> 2.0, 2.0.1, indiana, and even current head).
>
> In mid September, as the production issues started to iron out,
> more 2.1 code started to pour into head - from all of the sites.
> IU did not want to have to QA all that new code in head for each of
> their production upgrades - so they made the indiana branch to
> allow the head to move towards 2.1. In effect they wanted to
> switch from a situation where they took "everything" to a situation
> where they are "picking and choosing" from head.
>
> There was a debate in September as to whether IU should "claim

> head" as their own and effectively become the release manager for
> head and force the 2.1 work into a branch. While that debate may
> have sounded like there was some disagreement - the only issue was
> how to define head and what to name the branch. I decided to keep
> the head aimed at 2.1 and had IU make the indiana branch. There
> was never any disagreement about *what* we would do for the 2.1
> release - only *where* those mods should be initially checked into
> SVN by bug fixing and 2.1 developers.
>
> All bug fixes and 2.1 modifications continued to be checked into
> head across the entire Sakai team.
>
> IU now simply looks through the fixes checked into head and
> selectively moves them to the IU branch - making the IU branch a
> subset of head. No unique work is done in the IU branch. You
> could *almost* call the IU branch the 2.0.2-iu-maintenance-branch -
> but it had IU developed 2.1 functionality from head that looks
> slightly different from 2.0 - OSP-related functionality IU
> specifically wanted for their Fall production.
>
> Our Sakai project rules for maintenance releases (2.0.z) do not
> allow new functionality or change in look and feel. So our own
> rules prohibited calling the IU branch 2.0.2 - so to call it
> something, we called it "indiana" - clever huh? (I still like the
> rules and want to keep them - even though in this case they felt a
> little restrictive - I like a clear "contract" for maintenance"
> releases).
>
> Some sites who are willing to tolerate small GUI changes can run
> the whole indiana branch, and other sites who are running Samigo
> may just want to take Samigo from the indiana branch. If you run
> the whole indiana branch - it is a 2.1 preview in some (but not
> all) respects. But you should really talk to Lance for any
> precise recommendations. That is why we called it the "indiana"
> branch :)
>
> Speaking specifically of Samigo - there was never a "fork" - many
> bugs have been fixed all along, and the IU branch pretty much
> mirrors head after a bit of IU QA on the Samigo modifications on Head.
>
> I like to think of the "indiana" branch as those elements of 2.1
> head that get the "Lance Speelman production ready" stamp of approval.
>
> ----
>
> The 2.1 release is based on head and brings everything back
> together. The 2.1 release is based on the head of SVN including
> all of the bug fixes, maintenance fixes, and the new 2.1
> functionality being built now - this includes all modifications.
>
> I don't see this type of short-term divergence of what people are
> running in production as a problem as long as there is still one
> "head" - effectively IU accelerated its use of 2.1 features and we
> all have benefitted from the fact that they are effectively QAing a
> large part of the 2.1 modification in their production with 2000
> users *every single day*.
>

> I also see this type of divergence as "less necessary" in the
> future. IU jumped ahead because they *really badly* wanted some
> OSP related features that were in 2.1 but not in 2.0. We had to
> make a hard cut off date for 2.0 or we would have released it in
> September :(- the choice was to release in June with the
> functionality we had. In the 2.1 release, we do not have the three
> months between June and September to "evolve the head" tempting
> institutions to run from the next release head rather than the
> maintenance release as happened this Fall.
>
> I am expecting that sites running 2.1 production will hold together
> better, and perhaps we will be able to get several 2.1.z releases
> out before we get too distracted with development for the next
> release after 2.1. My 2.1 plan encourages more investment in the
> maintenance release and encourage lead sites to view their
> production "through the maintenance release" instead of having each
> site separately go to head to find bug fixes. My recommended
> approach for 2.1 is a blend of the IU and UM approaches for 2.0.
>
> This will make the maintenance branch far more useful and make it
> move faster to the point where we can get bug fixes out in QA'd
> maintenance releases rather than piecemeal using head and E-Mail.
>
> Hope this helps.
>
> /Chuck
>
> On Oct 7, 2005, at 11:27 PM, Kirk Alexander wrote:
>
>
>> Thanks to Chuck for an update on the strategy for the 2.1 release and
>> the "Criteria for Provisional Status" draft. The former in
>> particular
>> begins to allay a fear we were feeling after reading Lance Speelman's
>> post of Sept. 27th in which he indicated that IU is/was maintaining
>> their own production branch that includes Samigo and that they were
>> encouraging anyone running Samigo in production to upgrade to
>> their version.
>> If this were to happen with various different components of Sakai we
>> would soon find ourselves with exactly the kind of fractured
>> development
>> structure Sakai was supposed to avoid so that we don't have different
>> institutions running different versions of Sakai.
>> I hope I am right in reading the announcement about the 2.1 release
>> as an indication that the board and the developers have committed to
>> getting the Michigan and IU developments headed back towards a
>> single, QA's release. I also hope that it means that Samigo and
>> all--an extremely important component for many of us--will be again
>> folded into the major release along with all its bug fixes and not
>> tracking on its own.
>> While Samigo is a specific example it is important that the
>> Sakai community maintains a clean and efficient Sakai repository
>> management. In addition, as we go forward the Sakai Foundation
>> needs to closely
>> coordinate the process of source code management with all Sakai
>> tools,
>> services, and kernel maintainers to guarantee we have one complete

>>
>>
>
> -----
> This automatic notification message was sent by Sakai (<http://collab.sakaiproject.org>) from the Sakai Development site.
> You can modify how you receive notifications at MyWorkspace > Preferences.
>
>
>
>

[see attachment: "message0.html", size: 25329 bytes]

Attachments:

message0.html
<https://ctools.umich.edu/access/content/attachment/7290b672-24bc-4f7d-80e6-d2995bc6b2d9/message0.html>

This automatic notification message was sent by CTools (<https://ctools.umich.edu>) from the Mellon Sakai site.
You can modify how you receive notifications at My Workspace > Preferences.

X-Account-Key: account2
X-UIDL: 27919-1116672769
X-Mozilla-Status: 0001
X-Mozilla-Status2: 00000000
Received: from kungpao.ds.itd.umich.edu ([141.211.253.137])
by vms053.mailsvcs.net
(Sun Java System Messaging Server 6.2-2.05 (built Apr 28 2005))
with ESMTMP id <OI0100I47CJ7XVM0@vms053.mailsvcs.net> for jxf@immagic.com;
Sat, 08 Oct 2005 04:47:31 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from kungpao.ds.itd.umich.edu (kungpao.ds.itd.umich.edu [127.0.0.1])
by kungpao.ds.itd.umich.edu (Postfix) with ESMTMP id 0B510D71A for
<jxf@immagic.com>; Sat, 08 Oct 2005 05:47:31 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from kungpao.ds.itd.umich.edu ([127.0.0.1])
by kungpao.ds.itd.umich.edu (JAMES SMTP Server 2.1.3)
with SMTP ID 696 for <sakai@ctools.umich.edu>; Sat,
08 Oct 2005 05:47:17 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from snowcake.mr.itd.umich.edu
(ns-map.ds.itd.umich.edu [141.211.253.192]) by kungpao.ds.itd.umich.edu
(Postfix) with ESMTMP id EBC1ED6EC for <sakai@ctools.umich.edu>; Sat,
08 Oct 2005 05:47:17 -0400 (EDT)
Received: FROM pushingtin.mr.itd.umich.edu
(pushingtin.mr.itd.umich.edu [141.211.14.78]) BY snowcake.mr.itd.umich.edu ID
434795A5.7057D.24464 ; Sat, 08 Oct 2005 05:47:17 -0400
Received: from [192.168.123.103]
(c-67-167-181-172.hsd1.mi.comcast.net [67.167.181.172])
by pushingtin.mr.itd.umich.edu (smtp) with ESMTMP id j9891FPG025566 for

<sakai@ctools.umich.edu>; Sat, 08 Oct 2005 05:47:16 -0400

Message-id: <8470765.1128764851043.JavaMail.tomcat5@kungpao.ds.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Apple Mail (2.734)

Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; delsp=yes; format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

X-Content-Type-Outer-Envelope: multipart/alternative;

boundary=Apple-Mail-2-133773259

X-Content-Type-Message-Body: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; delsp=yes;

format=flowed

References: <13792973.1128764502244.JavaMail.tomcat5@sharkfin.ds.itd.umich.edu>