

Future perspectives on the middleware release process

Francesco Giacomini
EGEE JRA1

EGEE'09, Barcelona, 23rd September 2009

- **Definition**

- the services/components implementation teams [...] responsible to deliver software releases and all associated material. They perform the required technical tasks from design to release through implementation, testing and certification [...]. A Product Team usually has a responsible person [...] to transform the project objectives into concrete software releases
 - Includes third-level support

- **Every PT is responsible to execute its own testing**
- **All testing is done publicly and transparently, the tests and the test results are stored in the [...] test repository (ETICS)**
- **PTs using another PT products have a fixed grace period to validate new release candidates before they are released**
- **If the agreed tests/criteria are not passed, the release is rejected (can happen at various stages)**

- **Major releases**
 - once or twice per year, may contain non-backward compatible changes
- **Minor releases**
 - a few times per year, fully backward compatible, may contain new functionality
- **Revisions**
 - every week or two weeks, only bug fixes
- **Emergency**
 - as needed, only specific bug fixes, use emergency release procedures

How to be ready for EMI?

- **Draft proposal available at <https://edms.cern.ch/document/1019948>**
- **Very similar to the EMI approach**
 - with some more details

- **major.minor.revision(-age)**
 - Major releases are periodic
- **Major: well identified set of supported platforms and components, internal and external, defining the interfaces**
 - All changes are strictly backwards compatible
- **Minor # increment: a new version of a component with an interface change**
- **Revision # increment: bug fix**
- **gLite ETICS project configurations are locked and versioned**

- **Configuration locked and built against a project config**
 - Either an old gLite major.minor with a “sufficient” interface...
 - ... or the latest, but using constrained dependencies
 - Probably the best option
- **Testing and certification is done by the responsible PT, based on that component testplan**
- **If certification is successful the product goes to production**
 - Almost: Release candidates, grace period, staged rollout, ...
 - In general no node-type certification, apart maybe for major releases

- **Discipline in release management**
 - Changes (when and where) are priority-driven
 - See proposal on “Problem management and change management in gLite”, <https://edms.cern.ch/document/1019911>
- **Effective testing**
 - Unit testing
 - System testing
 - Deployment testing
 - Integration testing
 - Interoperability testing
 - Scalability testing
 - ...
- **Re-allocation of resources**
 - Clusters-of-competence → Product Teams

- **The test plan for a product should be**
 - As complete as possible, to cover all the uses of that product
 - Public, to establish trust on that component and on that team
 - As automatic as possible
- **Test beds are critical**
 - ETICS testing
 - Reference testbed: a set of services maintained by PTs, with a production + RC installation
 - Mainly for functional testing
 - Experimental services
 - Alpha testing
 - Pilot services
 - Beta testing

- **How to re-build a bunch of affected RPMs as quickly as possible?**
 - The Release Manager should be able to do it alone
- 1. Identify the affected RPMs and the relevant configurations**
 - Should be possible with ETICS
- 2. Clone those configurations, increment the age, lock and build**
 - Lock against which project config?
 - Either the previously-locked-against project config is kept in a locked component config and that one is used...
 - ...or use constrained versions in dyn deps and lock against the latest project config
- **A script can do most (all) of this**

What about starting gLite 4?