
Subject: Bug fix in PndEmcMakeBump.cxx
Posted by [Bertram Kopf](#) on Thu, 29 Jan 2009 16:34:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi,

by running some emc macros with the latest trunk revision I observed that no PndEmcBumps have not been stored in the root files anymore. This was caused by the following two commented lines in PndEmcMakeBump.cxx:

```
...  
    for (unsigned int i = 0; i < theBumps.size(); i++){  
//      Int_t size_ba = fBumpArray->GetEntriesFast();  
//      PndEmcBump* theNextBump = new((*fBumpArray)[size_ba])  
PndEmcBump(*(theBumps[i]));  
  
        if ((fVerbose>=1)&&(theBumps.size())>1){  
...  

```

I uncommented these two lines and it seems to me that it works fine again. The changes have been done in revision 4441. Please check whether everything is o.k. now.

Cheers,
Bertram.

Subject: Re: Bug fix in PndEmcMakeBump.cxx
Posted by [Stefano Spataro](#) on Thu, 29 Jan 2009 21:37:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks for the fix.

I am wondering why these lines were commented out in revision 4389, on 20th January.

I would like to ask to comment in the forum all the changes that are applied in the code, so that we know what is going on.

From my side, I have seen from svn that many emc classes were changed in the last days without any notice, in a substantial way. At least a summary on what was done is mandatory, to clarify even the possible sources of errors. And in each case a check of the full_emc.C output can prevent these errors before committing the code.

Subject: Re: Bug fix in PndEmcMakeBump.cxx
Posted by [Florian Uhlig](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2009 06:57:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Stefano

Maybe a small comment in the forum is usefull, but the main documentation of the changes should go to the SVN comments. I don't want to connect to the forum to find out about

changes. I want to have this inf together with the code.

The problem is that most developers don't use the SVN comments.

Ciao

Florian

Subject: Re: Bug fix in PndEmcMakeBump.cxx
Posted by [Bertram Kopf](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2009 09:04:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Florian and Stefano,

you are completely right that one should to use svn comments. And in addition it would be also very helpful to announce "all" changes in the forum with a brief description what has been changed. Therefore my question: Does it make sense to provide a new thread in the forum which is only dedicated to such announcements?

Cheers,
Bertram.

Subject: Re: Bug fix in PndEmcMakeBump.cxx
Posted by [Stefano Spataro](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2009 09:25:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Bertram and Florian,
the svn comments are fine, but the normal developer/user does not read svn usually, only when he finds some troubles.
The "rule" -> 'announcement of code changes' was stated I think two years ago, but it is not always followed.
The EMC thread is done for this for the emc detector, considering that all the emc developers are sitting in different institutes, as well the tracking thread and so on.

In general even this thread "Bugs, Fixes, Releases" can be used for this purpose, one should just use it.

Even if for small and decorative changes the message can be skipped, when the code is mid-heavily changed these are mandatory, in particular for developers which are using the trunk and uploading the code almost day by day, and even for people working on the same code that find something that can change their results.

Regards

Subject: Re: Bug fix in PndEmcMakeBump.cxx
Posted by [Bertram Kopf](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2009 13:25:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Stefano,

the idea behind a new thread for the announcements of code changes is that it is (in my opinion) better arranged. Isn't it? Then you can directly see what has been changed without going through all detector / system specific threads.

As you probably know there was an evo meeting before christmas which was focused on the release management. The slides can be found here:

<http://panda-wiki.gsi.de/pub/Computing/Minutes25Nov2008/SoftAdmReleases.pdf>

A more comfortable solution would be to provide a web page for these things. An example for this is shown on pages 6-10. It is for sure not the most urgent task to be done right now, but one should -at least- keep in mind that such web interfaces could be very helpful in the future.

Ciao,
Bertram.

Subject: Changelog bookkeeping
Posted by [Ralf Kliemt](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2009 13:33:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello,

Bertram Kopf said:A more comfortable solution would be to provide a web page for these things.

I'd suggest the wiki page. There is already a detector status site where we can add our changelogs and links to the trac browser.

Kind greetings from Dresden,
Ralf.

Subject: Re: Changelog bookkeeping
Posted by [Florian Uhlig](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2009 14:28:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi

Please wait some time. In principle all you ask for is available within trac. We wait for the update here at GSI.

Now some comments to the previous posts.

Quote:

the svn comments are fine, but the normal developer/user does not read svn usually, only when he finds some troubles.

Maybe then the normal developer should not use the trunk version but the stable version. The trunk version is not thought to be stable all the time. If one uses the trunk version one has to

take care at least a little bit.

Quote:you are completely right that one should to use svn comments. And in addition it would be also very helpful to announce "all" changes in the forum with a brief description what has been changed

Here i disagree. First of all you're flooded with thousands of meaningless topics which say "Changed variable B from int to double" if you really require this. I agree that a major change of the code should be made public somewhere that the people are aware of, but definitely not all changes. The other point i want to make is that if people don't write meaningful svn comments they will not write a topic for the forum. It would help much more if you would have a good comment.

If you want to see all the last changes go to

<https://subversion.gsi.de/trac/fairroot/browser/pandaroot/trunk>

and click on Revision log in the upper right corner. Here you see all revisions with the svn log.

Ciao

Florian

Subject: Re: Changelog bookkeeping

Posted by [Johan Messchendorp](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2009 12:19:20 GMT

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

Dear all,

I would support the line of thoughts of Florian, e.g.

1) try to provide as accurate comments while committing your changes. I know this is not easy and asks for some discipline (...and, ouch!, I am certainly not the best example of this!). And with "trac", one even gets an effective overview as far as I understand.....

2) The forum can also be used to inform about changes. Here, I would not submit all the changes, but primarily inform about really major changes or additions to the code, e.g. to tell that new features are added, etc.

3) Concerning the branches: Indeed, for the trunk it is not required to follow QA, but to be able to compile and link. If you require more, please use the "stable" branch, which - at the moment - is not really used and outdated.

4) The package manager should know about what is going on in the part of the code which he/she is managing... (Stefano's comment!)

Greetings,

Johan.

Subject: Re: Changelog bookkeeping
Posted by [Stefano Spataro](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2009 12:26:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just one important(?) observation:
at least the package manager should know which are the activities ongoing on his package,
considering that he should be the responsible.
Isn't it?

Subject: Re: Changelog bookkeeping
Posted by [Johan Messchendorp](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2009 12:32:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi,

yes, you are absolutely right about this.
Maybe we have become too relaxed about this, and we shouldn't.

Johan.

Subject: Re: Changelog bookkeeping
Posted by [Jens Sören Lange](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2009 15:00:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi all,

I also think that Stefano and Johan are right. However, maybe the confusion also arises from the fact, that in the structure before Sep08 the package manager was also (sort of) the (sub)coordinator. As an example, in case of emc, Stefano did all the emc code restructuring, merging of all the different calorimeters, all the phone calls, tested all the macros etc. etc. At least 50% of this work is emc (sub)coordinator work, which we now have in addition. So now we have two persons who are being responsible if the code doesn't work and/or there is not sufficient documentation. So maybe we just have to clearly define, who is taking care of what. The developers and package coordinators know the code and maybe write more svn comments, but maybe the (sub)coordinators should test the macros and maybe write more the Wiki (e.g. as it was in my case, and that is sort of an implicit filter so that not all the comments reach the Wiki). What would you think?

cheers, Soeren

Subject: Re: Bug fix in PndEmcMakeBump.cxx
Posted by [Mohammad Al-Turany](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2009 16:29:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi every body,

More comments in the SVN would surely help, this is the easiest way to follow the changes, and keep in mind that the trunk is assumed to compile, and the more tested code should be moved to the stable! that what we discussed few months ago, also I remember we had some discussion about responsables! speaking about coordinators and sub-coordinator is simply confusing for me, because of the many ways how the people define the responsibilities of a coordinator!!

one can call them coordinators or sub-coordinators or what ever he likes, I have a list in the svn authority file of the people who can decide if a package goes from stable to release, these people for me are the responsables (They all agreed at that time to take care of the the packages they work with!):

abiegun, acecchi, asanchez, awronska, johan, kgoetzen, pablo, ralfk, sneubert, soeren, spataro, tstockm

So I would suggest that these people may write something in the wiki when they move something to release! and every developer should try to write more comments in trunk and stable.

cheers, Mohammad
