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on 10/22/01 10:51 AM, "Doug Cutting" <DCutting@grandcentral.com> wrote:

>> From: Jon Stevens [mailto:jon@latchkey.com]

>>

>>> -version=1.2-rc1

>>> +version=1.2-dev

>>

>> I don't think that you should go back a version. It can

>> confuse people. It should be 1.2.1-dev.

>

> I made this change when I realized that I could make releases by specifying

> -Dversion=xxx on the command line.

I wouldn't do that. The reason is that you want to be able to tag CVS with

the right version of Lucene each time you make a release.

> It's good to keep the version that folks

> build themselves different from an official release name.

Correct. In Apache land, we use -dev for that.

> And the build

> name should be beyond the current release. Whether 1.2-dev is earlier or

> later than 1.2-rc2 isn't clear: it could be (and is in fact) development for

> 1.2-final.

'rc' stands for release candidate. -dev stands for what is in CVS at the

moment. 'rc' is definitely after '-dev' because you have made a release

available from the site which is 'rc'.

When you go to a 'rc' status that means you are heading towards release.

> Making the default 1.2.1-dev would make it clearly beyond

> 1.2-rc2, but it would also imply that 1.2.1 is the next release, which I

> don't think is the case.

Then it should be 1.2-rc3-dev because you are working on rc3 at this point.

> My plan was to leave the default as 1.2-dev until

> 1.2 is final, then switch the default to 1.3-dev. No official release will

> ever be named '-dev' and so that suffix is not well ordered with respect to

> release suffixes. Is that reasonable, or too confusing? How do other

> projects do this?

I think what is in CVS should be 1.2-rc3-dev and the release should be

1.2-rc3 or 1.2-final depending on whether or not you feel that rc3 has fixed

all the issues in the previous releases and not added new problems.

-jon