



Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>

Re: [sagemath/sage] Revert PR with disputed dependencies (PR #37796)

39 messages

roed314 <notifications@github.com>

Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 11:54 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBKUJM5PYOY3R4UN2TGEEYGSPEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Comment <comment@noreply.github.com>

Perhaps the people who were against [#36676](#) and [#36951](#) would disagree; I'd like to hear from them. I'm creating this in support of the process we have in place for resolving disputed PRs, which got mangled this time (we're still working out how it needs to coordinate with dependencies).

I'm open to other suggestions for how to proceed, from the people who were objecting to the code in [#36676](#) and [#36951](#) that got accidentally merged in [#36964](#). In the meantime, I'm going to sleep.

Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you commented.

Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 12:10 AM

To: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Another damaging action by David Roe at my expense, with the same highly problematic timing.
By the way, I will find it hard to believe that this was cleared with the committee.

Matthias

[Quoted text hidden]

Dr. Matthias Köppe <http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~mkoeppe>
Professor of Mathematics

Julian R  th <notifications@github.com>

Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 2:08 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBMD4RZXFRA57UKUV6EEYWJTEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias K  ppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Comment <comment@noreply.github.com>

This PR should not be merged because it is obviously not an improvement.

I don't think this PR is about the question of improvement or not. It's entirely a procedural question. When people voted on [#36964](#), they did not vote on the dependencies of it. After all, the missing dependencies did not have the sufficient majorities to be set to positive review yet. Also, the diff could not even be viewed on GitHub, so I am sure most people voted on the description and discussion of the PR, not on the actual change set ("The diff you're trying to view is too large. We only load the first 3000 changed files.")

There was absolutely nothing inappropriate in Volker merging the PR that he merged. He's the release manager.

I don't think it was ever claimed that [@vbraun](#) did anything wrong here. It was just a procedural misunderstanding. He simply missed the message about not merging this yet (and nobody is blaming him for that.) The (disputed) PR mechanism needs a bit of fine-tuning to take dependencies into account. But that should probably be discussed on sage-devel.

Easy suggestion: How about doing nothing rather than creating additional damage?

I believe that not merging this is harmful for the community because it ignores the votes on those dependencies. I volunteer to create PRs to restore the state of the disputed dependencies and [#36964](#) itself.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you commented.

github-actions[bot] <notifications@github.com>

Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 3:36 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBKOSD6G4EUHWLUIZSGEEZAUJEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Comment <comment@noreply.github.com>

[Documentation preview for this PR](#) (built with commit [f16eb4b](#); [changes](#)) is ready! 🍷

This preview will update shortly after each push to this PR.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you commented.

Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>

Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 4:40 AM

To: Matthias Koepppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Dear Matthias,

Thank you for your message. I had a look at the comment and could not come to the conclusion that a breach (if any) of the Code of Conduct is sufficiently clear that I must take immediate action here. I will make sure to bring this up with the rest of the committee in one of our regular meetings.

julian

* Matthias Koepppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> [2024-04-13 00:10:56 -0700]:

> Another damaging action by David Roe at my expense, with the same highly
> problematic timing.

> By the way, I will find it hard to believe that this was cleared with the
> committee.

>

> Matthias

>

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> From: roed314 <notifications@github.com>

> Date: Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 11:54 PM

> Subject: Re: [sagemath/sage] Revert PR with disputed dependencies (PR
> #37796)

> To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

> Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Comment <
> comment@noreply.github.com>

>

>

> Perhaps the people who were against #36676

> <<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36676>> and #36951

> <<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36951>> would disagree; I'd like to

> hear from them. I'm creating this in support of the process we have in

> place for resolving disputed PRs, which got mangled this time (we're still

> working out how it needs to coordinate with dependencies).

>

> I'm open to other suggestions for how to proceed, from the people who were

> objecting to the code in #36676
> <<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36676>> and #36951
> <<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36951>> that got accidentally merged
> in #36964 <<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36964>>. In the meantime,
> I'm going to sleep.
>
> —
> Reply to this email directly, view it on GitHub
> <<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37796#issuecomment-2053543216>>, or
> unsubscribe
> <<https://github.com/notifications/unsubscribe-auth/AB7VNBWLWQUPRYHVG5G6AKQ3Y5DJCPA>
> VCNFSM6AAAAABGFHGG6SVHI2DSMVQWIX3LMV43OSLTON2WKQ3PNVWWWK3TUHMZDANJTGU2DGMRRGY>
> .
> You are receiving this because you commented.Message ID:
[Quoted text hidden]
> --
> You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sage-conduct" group.
> To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sage-conduct+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
> To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sage-conduct/CAJ_wo5jY0H3881F7xtcWa5CZ5PmTbZZHugq%2Bu7YNnY2AXopKtA%40mail.gmail.com.
> For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

Gonzalo Tornaría <notifications@github.com> Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 7:47 AM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBWL6ZO3RKFM4OQ5W2WEEZ56VEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Comment <comment@noreply.github.com>

I verified this PR by running `git revert -m 1 6ecb1d8532bc9b59ec03a1c7f3b1ce86c6b43cdb` on a clean checkout of 10.4.beta3 and comparing the tree with the one in this PR.

—
Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you commented.

roed314 <notifications@github.com> Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 8:21 AM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNB77UUOW4LU6YWQKUGEE2B6VEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

I'm setting this back to positive review based on

- In favor: [@roed314](#) [@tornaria](#)
- Against: [@mkoeppe](#)

—
Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 8:30 AM
To: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

I am calling for David Roe to step down from the committee immediately.
His actions are clearly adversarial.

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **roed314** <notifications@github.com>
Date: Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 8:21 AM

Subject: Re: [sagemath/sage] Revert PR with disputed dependencies (PR #37796)
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

John H. Palmieri <notifications@github.com>

Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 8:40 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBMAX4O24NQXDNANAF0EE2EGLEVBNNHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

@mkoeppe you made no objection to Julian's comment "@vbraun please do not merge this one yet. It depends on two disputed PRs that have not received positive review yet." #36964 should have not been given a positive review because of its dependencies. This corrects that problem.

Reply to this email directly, view it on GitHub, or unsubscribe.

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

John H. Palmieri <notifications@github.com>

Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 8:43 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBO7OBYVQER5GQSZCLWEE2ERREVBNNHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

+1 from me.

Reply to this email directly, view it on GitHub, or unsubscribe.

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

roed314 <notifications@github.com>

Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 8:54 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBIG6QQNTY34MIR4GKWEE2F5FEVBNNHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

@tornaria checked that it did a very simple task: revert another PR that was accidentally merged. That's a review. This is just reverting state back to what develop was yesterday.

Reply to this email directly, view it on GitHub, or unsubscribe.

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 9:33 AM

To: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Necessary reminder to the committee that the "disputed" PRs, in particular the dependency <https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36676>, here is only called "disputed" as part of a strategy of appeasement by the previous committee. What happened on this PR is that there were severe violations, reported multiple times, of our code of review etc. by Tobias Diez. The failure to take appropriate action and instead make my PR subject to a 5-month holding pattern has been bad enough.

It's unacceptable that now rules of review are being invented with great haste and urgency to revert the merged changes.

Once again I have to point out the problematic contrast that is visible as a clear pattern:

- On the one hand, equivocation and both-siding and months of delay.
- On the other hand, unequivocal statements ("#36964 was inappropriately merged") and actions within minutes.

This needs to be addressed.

Matthias

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **roed314** <notifications@github.com>

Date: Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 8:55AM

Subject: Re: [sagemath/sage] Revert PR with disputed dependencies (PR #37796)

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

@tornaria checked that it did a very simple task: revert another PR that was accidentally merged. That's a review. This is just reverting state back to what develop was yesterday.

—
Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

[Quoted text hidden]

JP Labbe <notifications@github.com>

Sat, Apr 13, 2024 at 10:03 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBKPK5YBZRIA5NSEN7OEE2N5ZEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

Hello,

So, let me see if I can summarize the situation correctly:

- It seems to me that [#36964](#) had the required votes to be set as positive review
- [#36964](#) got merged.
- [#36964](#) depends on two disputed PRs
- This PR reverts [#36964](#)
- The Release Manager suggested to create such a PR to revert the changes of [#36964](#)

Before any further discussion occurs, I believe it would be a good thing that the points above shall be double-checked. Then the following things shall be clarified (my question might sound naive, but I would like clear answers):

- Can or can't a PR be set as positive review although it has disputed PRs as dependencies (I want a clarification on this [comment](#))
- Where can I find the two dependencies that are disputed? In the PR description of [#36964](#), I see three dependencies and they are all merged.

Before that, I do not see how a clear decision can be taken of the present PR.

—
Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

JP Labbe <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 1:21 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBW7STJ6WMXQEE2E76EFFWVXEVBNNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

- The Release Manager suggested to create such a PR to revert the changes

@jplab He did not "suggest" it. He explained what the process is to revert them if they need to be reverted.

Right.

May I ask what is your opinion about the two other points for which I am looking for clarification?

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Marc Culler <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 2:15 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBPOFF7UM2O6I5ENHCWEFF45VEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

I am in favor of both [#36676](#) and [#36951](#) and I am opposed to this proposal to revert them along with [#36964](#).

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Gonzalo Tornaría <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 3:07 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNB0OFLX3545N6BTTWJOEFGDBFEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

I am in favor of both [#36676](#) and [#36951](#) and I am opposed to this proposal to revert them along with [#36964](#).

Note that [#36964](#) broke the sagemath-standard sdist (see [#37286 \(comment\)](#) and [#37804](#)), and we don't even know the cause, because [#36964](#) includes too many merges of too large and delicate PRs, and reviewing is not only about whether we like the general approach and idea or not, but also about making sure the PR doesn't break stuff. If we rush because we are busy gaming our disputes, we risk sub-par review and breakage.

I also want to mention that I wanted to give "needs work" on [#36964](#) because of all the merges, as I believe a huge PR like that should be offered standalone, without any merges.

But I censored myself; that might have been a mistake, but surely caused by the intent to avoid more damage among ourselves. Instead, I reached other developers less involved on the disputes, and I was assured that a PR with non-approved dependencies cannot be merged (maybe that's another mistake, I don't know), and a note was made in the PR.

In summary, merging [#36964](#) was a mistake, and it has to be reverted to avoid permanent damage to the credibility of the sagemath project and its processes.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

kcrisman <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 3:32 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBBDHCSM5T2KGXCYHSGEFGGBTEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

I'm open to other suggestions for how to proceed, from the people who were objecting to the code in [#36676](#) and [#36951](#) that got accidentally merged in [#36964](#). In the meantime, I'm going to sleep.

My proposal is to go back to consensus-only merging, while we (hopefully) figure out a compromise.

Yeah, I'm not sure I see another way forward. Not because of this particular PR, which doubtless will have its own vote ... Rather, because not only is this type of voting often (highly) non-transitive, but it seems to now depends an awful lot on how often people are checking their email, who is requested to review, have motivation to comment on a particular arcane proposal, etc. @roed314 did the right thing (going to bed, I mean), but the fact that even time zones could theoretically come into play means even this process is broken.

I don't think it was ever claimed that @vbraun did anything wrong here. It was just a procedural misunderstanding. He simply missed the message about not merging this yet (and nobody is blaming him for that.)

Let's have an amen for that, and for @vbraun 's patience in continuing to do the release manager work.

If we rush because we are busy gaming our disputes, we risk sub-par review and breakage.

Thanks to @kiwifb for tracking something down with this breakage.

Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Michael Orlitzky <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 3:34 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBIOXRPGPRY7NDOHPY6EFGGHXEVBNNHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

As I said on sage-devel 7 days ago:

I don't think we should be voting on PRs with disputed dependencies. It's not clear what you're voting for (which commits exactly), and what happens if one of the dependencies is voted down? If it was really a dependency, that should materially affect the thing we're supposed to be voting on. At best, we'll wind up starting over... but now on a ticket with a bunch of 1 votes that have to be /very/ carefully counted because they reset in the middle.

You should be in favor of reverting this no matter which side you're on. Sloppy rules for merging disputed tickets are bad for everyone.

Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Gonzalo Tornaría <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 3:53 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBIP2KJE7HUYC3GEUOEFGINPEVBNNHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

I don't think it was ever claimed that @vbraun did anything wrong here. It was just a procedural misunderstanding. He simply missed the message about not merging this yet (and nobody is blaming him for that.)

Let's have an amen for that, and for @vbraun 's patience in continuing to do the release manager work.

Seconded. We have to try to put ourselves in @vbraun shoes. He merges a bunch of PRs and gives a thorough testing to the result, which takes time. Us playing the flip-flop with the "positive review" surely makes this harder.

Couldn't we just try to slow down a little bit and have a good technical discussion before we keep rushing all of this? Whatever we decide to do, we need everybody on board. "Winning" this game by pushing everybody else away becomes losing. [The only winning move is not to play.](#)

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Julian R  th <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 4:15 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBIR64B3TB6SVNBPXIOEFGLEBFEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias K  ppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

+1 from me for this PR.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Gonzalo Tornar  a <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 4:23 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBPUAJHMQABMBD7YN2WEFG55VEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias K  ppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

That's also why I'm removing "blocker".

I hope we don't have to write complicated rules for each and every label.

Merging [#36964](#) was a mistake, and it has to be reverted **ASAP** to avoid permanent damage to the credibility of the sagemath project and its processes.

That makes it a blocker.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Kwankyu Lee <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 6:56 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBPUAJHMQABMBD7YN2WEFG55VEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias K  ppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

-1 from me.

It is also a rule that the release manager has the right to merge, and as I understand it, this rule is above the other rules on disputed PRs. None can say that he broke a rule.

The present PR was prepared by one who wants to revert the "mistake" of the release manager. I regard this as any other PR, as a pull request of his contribution, in this case, "reverting the mistake".

I have reviewed positively for [#36964](#) and for [#36676](#). They are some corner stones of the modularization project. I am still puzzled why some people are against them. Having the PRs merged is more important to me than "reverting the mistake". Hence my vote -1.

Of course, the release manager may want to "fix his mistake" by merging this PR regardless of our votes here. This is up to him again.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Marc Culler <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 8:20 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBMB6M7ZO7BEVPMHMT6EFHHYREVBNNHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

I agree that if Volker feels that reverting the "accidental" merge is the best way to proceed then he should, by all means, revert it.

Of course I want to avoid a broken release or even a temporarily broken HEAD. But when I followed the link above to the comment about how sdist is broken I learned that there is already a PR with a fix to make sdist work again. So I think the claims of extreme urgency may be a bit exaggerated.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Kwankyu Lee <notifications@github.com> Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 9:32 PM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBNN3ZTCNTPMSJ3Z2H6EFHQEJEVBNNHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

[@mkoppe](#) is already abusing rules by blocking users on GitHub and thus denying them the right to vote ...

Blocking users on github PRs should be banned. Matthias might have needed that for self-defense before, but now that COCC is in operation, no one should be allowed using the blocking functionality. (btw, I am curious where the button is...)

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

John H. Palmieri <notifications@github.com> Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 9:41 PM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBIV6ZEGIWVWS3WQNOEFHRJDEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

[@mkoppe](#) is already abusing rules by blocking users on GitHub

There is no abuse of rules here. There are valid reasons to block users on GitHub, and this has been discussed a number of times, including the reasons why he has blocked you.

and thus denying them the right to vote - as such voters are not automatically informed that they might have something to vote on. So his constant referrals to "rules" are ironic, at best.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

John H. Palmieri <notifications@github.com> Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 9:43 PM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBILZDHREUPLM5EDWNOEFHRQVEVBNNHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

[@mkoppe](#) is already abusing rules by blocking users on GitHub and thus denying them the right to vote ...

Blocking users on github PRs should be banned.

No: consider for example an extreme case where one user is sexually harassing another on GitHub PRs. The target of the harassment must be allowed to block the harasser.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

John H. Palmieri <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 9:44 PM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBOVLBF2SCUASRD46A6EFHRUBEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

However, this discussion of blocking does not belong on this PR. Let's not discuss it further here.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

John H. Palmieri <notifications@github.com>

Tue, Apr 16, 2024 at 8:52 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBP7MEZPVLJ4ACWNX7OEFJ75DEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

[@mkoppe](#) is already abusing rules by blocking users on GitHub
and thus denying them the right to vote ...

Blocking users on github PRs should be banned.

No: consider for example an extreme case where one user is sexually harassing another on
GitHub PRs. The target of the harassment must be allowed to block the harasser.

Certainly bans have their place. In such an extreme case CoCC ought to permanently ban the harasser
from the project, sagemath org-wide.

But in my case it is merely a political ban, to make it harder for me to express my opinion on technical
matters.

This is false, as has been explained multiple times. Please stop repeating this.

PS. I stop here, I felt I needed to clarify.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Julian R  th <notifications@github.com>

Tue, Apr 16, 2024 at 9:55 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBjjKBIRVHG2QDQGBOGFEKHHNEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias K  ppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

(I believe the request for review was removed by mistake so I restored it.)

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

roed314 <notifications@github.com>

Thu, Apr 18, 2024 at 10:48 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNB044YFPDM6723AJMXWEFU67DEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

See my response on the thread.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

roed314 <notifications@github.com> Tue, Apr 23, 2024 at 7:10 AM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBPREXKA2NASE3KBVWEGORGREVBNNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

For the record, [the vote](#) on sage-devel was 8-4 in favor of this PR. I'm setting this back to positive review.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Volker Braun <notifications@github.com> Sat, Apr 27, 2024 at 8:59 AM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNB4LWXGM7IQHYJENOEHEA65EVBNNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

Merged [#37796](#) into develop.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Gonzalo Tornaría <notifications@github.com> Sat, Apr 27, 2024 at 2:04 PM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNB4LWXGM7IQHYJENOEHEA65EVBNNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

Merging this has also backed out [#36951](#), which has the necessary votes as pointed out in [#37796](#) ([comment](#)) Who's going to fix it?

In [#36951](#) ([comment](#)) you did not count my -1.

Please see: [#36951](#) ([comment](#))

In any case, if you can rebase that on current develop, we can have a look. I agree on moving to `pyproject.toml` features, but let's do it right. I'm sure we can figure out a way to respect the meaning of build-system requires (should be only `setuptools`) and have a static `pyproject.toml`, while getting the build-wheel requirements right.

[Reply to this email directly](#), [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Gonzalo Tornaría <notifications@github.com> Sat, Apr 27, 2024 at 2:31 PM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNB4LWXGM7IQHYJENOEHEA65EVBNNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

Here's the supported and recommended way to customize the build dependencies:
https://setuptools.pypa.io/en/latest/build_meta.html#dynamic-build-dependencies-and-other-build-meta-tweaks

Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Gonzalo Tornaría <notifications@github.com> Sat, Apr 27, 2024 at 2:57 PM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBOMTXNKBUIH5BZ7BEGEHFK3DEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

Of course, by declaring and implementing one's own build backend instead of `setuptools.build_meta`, anything can be implemented.

It's just writing a function that returns a list of dependencies. This is not implementing a build backend, and the code is all spelled out in the link above (except for the `[...]` part where we would place the build requirements).

But moreover, since this would be a python function, it would also allow us to create the build requirements dynamically, which seems like a big advantage.

Currently the build requirements are determined when one runs the `./bootstrap` shell script which does the following afaict:

1. use the shell script `sage-get-system-packages` to get the install requirements of packages from `build/pkgs/$PKG_BASE/*requirements.txt`.
2. write this information into `m4/sage_spkg_versions.m4` and `m4/sage_spkg_versions_toml.m4`.
3. run `m4` to substitute this information in `pyproject.toml.m4` producing `pyproject.toml`.

But in fact, step 1 could also be done in python in `get_requires_for_build_wheel()`, as long as the information on `sagemath-standard` dependencies can be included in the `sdist` (this doesn't mean the information has to be duplicated in all modularized distributions: it can be a single file that gets included in every `sdist`, similar to how `VERSION.txt` is included in every `sdist`).

Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Gonzalo Tornaría <notifications@github.com> Sat, Apr 27, 2024 at 3:11 PM
Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNBII4Y2NVPCAR46QWJTOEHFMPVEVBNHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>
To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>
Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

it would also allow us to create the build requirements dynamically, which seems like a big advantage.

Also an obvious big disadvantage, namely that the dependency is no longer visible in the metadata file. It's running counter to the trend to move this kind of stuff from `setup.py` (= available at runtime of the build) to a static file.

That's a good point, since we would want the code to be written only once (in `sage-setup`) but each package have its own set of dependencies. Maybe this information can be stored in `pyproject.toml` (in a `[sage-setup]` section or something) and write `get_requires_for_build_wheel()` in the shim-backend code so that it gets the metadata from the file. What do you think?

Reply to this email directly, [view it on GitHub](#), or [unsubscribe](#).
You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Julian Rüth <notifications@github.com>

Sun, Apr 28, 2024 at 8:48 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNB LNVWZMQNYHJFAZY6EHJIL3EVB NHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

Merging this has also backed out #36951, which has the necessary votes as pointed out in #37796 (comment) Who's going to fix it?

There are branches 36951, 36964, 36676 on my fork that cherry-pick the changes from the original PRs. I am happy to create PRs with these changes if you want me to but since the original PRs were yours, it's maybe easier if you create the PRs starting from these branches.

Reply to this email directly, view it on GitHub, or unsubscribe.

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Julian Rüth <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 29, 2024 at 4:59 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNB MWUOSSGKUJDIDOTFOEHNWLXEVB NHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

@mkoeppe I created #37900 to reproduce #36676. #36676 is still open though I think it was in essence merged and reverted. Probably #36676 should be closed now but I leave that to you.

Reply to this email directly, view it on GitHub, or unsubscribe.

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.

Julian Rüth <notifications@github.com>

Mon, Apr 29, 2024 at 5:10 AM

Reply-To: sagemath/sage <reply+AB7VNB KTLR3ZJAJ5FEJRDX6EHNXUBEVB NHHILGFSII@reply.github.com>

To: sagemath/sage <sage@noreply.github.com>

Cc: Matthias Köppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>, Mention <mention@noreply.github.com>

There are now #37900, #37901, #37902 which revert this revert.

Reply to this email directly, view it on GitHub, or unsubscribe.

You are receiving this because you were mentioned.