Release Management Within Open Source Projects

Justin R. Erenkrantz Institute for Software Research University of California, Irvine

Importance

• Release management focuses on delivery • "Getting software to user" • Directly user-focused task • Lots of variations between projects • Need for a taxonomy • Process and tools are still evolving

Decentralization & Distribution

• Compensating for decentralization • Users may desire canonical releases • Creation of virtual organizations • Compensating for distribution • Global reach • Often no contact for assistance

Classification of Policies

Responsibility - who?
Acceptance - when?
Versioning - what?
Distribution - where?
Binaries - how?

Examination of Three Projects

- Linux Kernel
- Subversion
- Apache HTTP Server
- Chosen for variety
- Directly involved in two of these projects

Linux Kernel

Highly centralized process
Source tree separated into branches

Multiple active branches at one time

Dedicated release manager per branch

Complete authority

Linux Kernel

- Extensive use of release candidates
 Stable branches, unstable branches
 Releases mirrored on kernel.org via FTP
 - No official packaging contributions
 - Source only
 - Others provide binaries

Subversion

• Version control system • Principal funder is CollabNet • CollabNet employees did releases • Now have a volunteer release manager • Milestones still determined by CollabNet

Subversion

Must pass automated test suite
Not yet at 1.0 release
Centralized download location
Users may contribute binaries

Apache HTTP Server

- Decentralized authority shared
- Committers volunteer to conduct release
- Releases do not have a formal schedule
- Three committers must approve release

Apache HTTP Server

Automated test suite available
Stable and unstable versions
Distributed by mirrors

Custom download system

Only committers can contribute binaries

Conclusions

• Core organizational structure dominates • Room for improvements • Linux: Testing • Subversion: Scalability • Apache: Frequency