

Git for Teams

A USER-CENTERED APPROACH TO CREATING EFFICIENT
WORKFLOWS IN GIT

Emma Jane Hogbin Westby

Git for Teams

You can do more with Git than just build software. This practical guide delivers a unique people-first approach to version control that also explains how using Git as a focal point can help your team work better together. You'll learn how to plan and pursue a Git workflow that not only ensures that you accomplish project goals, but also fits the immediate needs and future growth of your team.

The first part of the book on structuring workflow is useful for project managers, technical team leads, and CTOs. The second part provides hands-on exercises to help developers gain a better understanding of Git commands.

- Explore the dynamics of team building
- Walk through the process of creating and deploying software with Git
- Structure workflow to influence the way your team collaborates
- Learn a useful process for conducting code reviews
- Set up a shared repository and identify specific team members as contributors, consumers, or maintainers
- Know the *why* behind the Git commands your teammates use
- Use branching strategies to separate different approaches to your project
- Examine popular collaboration platforms: GitHub, Bitbucket, and GitLab

“By focusing on workflows and interactions between roles, *Git for Teams* guides you, the reader, to understand your exact needs within your particular projects. Equipped with this knowledge, you will then learn the fun part: how to use Git to best support your needs.”

—Dr. Johannes Schindelin
Git for Windows maintainer

Emma Jane Hogbin Westby has been developing websites since 1996, initially as a developer and later as a team leader. She's been teaching web-related technologies since 2002 and has delivered over 100 conference presentations, courses, and workshops around the world.

PROGRAMMING

US \$49.99

CAN \$57.99

ISBN: 978-1-491-91118-1



5 4 9 9 9
9 781491 911181



Twitter: @oreillymedia
facebook.com/oreilly

Git for Teams

Emma Jane Hogbin Westby

Beijing • Boston • Farnham • Sebastopol • Tokyo

O'REILLY®

Git for Teams

by Emma Jane Hogbin Westby

Copyright © 2015 Emma Jane Hogbin Westby. All rights reserved.

Foreword text by Mark Atwood, Copyright © 2015 Hewlett-Packard Company. All rights reserved.

Foreword text by Johannes Shindelin, Copyright © 2015 Johannes Shindelin. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

Published by O'Reilly Media, Inc., 1005 Gravenstein Highway North, Sebastopol, CA 95472.

O'Reilly books may be purchased for educational, business, or sales promotional use. Online editions are also available for most titles (<http://safaribooksonline.com>). For more information, contact our corporate/institutional sales department: 800-998-9938 or corporate@oreilly.com.

Editor: Rachel Roumeliotis

Indexer: WordCo Indexing Services

Production Editor: Colleen Lobner

Interior Designer: David Futato

Copyeditor: Kim Cofer

Cover Designer: Ellie Volckhausen

Proofreader: Jasmine Kwityn

Illustrator: Emma Jane Hogbin Westby

September 2015: First Edition

Revision History for the First Edition

2015-08-17: First Release

See <http://oreilly.com/catalog/errata.csp?isbn=9781491911181> for release details.

The O'Reilly logo is a registered trademark of O'Reilly Media, Inc. *Git for Teams*, the cover image of wag-tails, and related trade dress are trademarks of O'Reilly Media, Inc.

While the publisher and the author have used good faith efforts to ensure that the information and instructions contained in this work are accurate, the publisher and the author disclaim all responsibility for errors or omissions, including without limitation responsibility for damages resulting from the use of or reliance on this work. Use of the information and instructions contained in this work is at your own risk. If any code samples or other technology this work contains or describes is subject to open source licenses or the intellectual property rights of others, it is your responsibility to ensure that your use thereof complies with such licenses and/or rights.

978-1-491-91118-1

LSI

To Joe Shindelar. Thanks, eh?

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	xi
Foreword.....	xiii
Preface.....	xv
Introduction.....	xix
<hr/>	
Part I. Defining Your Workflow	
1. Working in Teams.....	1
The People on Your Team	2
Thinking Strategies	3
Meeting as a Team	7
Kickoff	8
Tracking Progress	8
Cultivating Empathy	10
Wrap-Up and Retrospectives	11
Teamwork in Terms of Git	12
Summary	13
2. Command and Control.....	15
Project Governance	16
Copyright and Contributor Agreements	16
Distribution Licenses	18
Leadership Models	19
Code of Conduct	19

Access Models	20
Dispersed Contributor Model	22
Collocated Contributor Repositories Model	25
Shared Maintenance Model	28
Custom Access Models	30
Summary	31
3. Branching Strategies.....	33
Understanding Branches	34
Choosing a Convention	35
Conventions	36
Mainline Branch Development	36
Branch-Per-Feature Deployment	39
State Branching	42
Scheduled Deployment	45
Updating Branches	51
Summary	55
4. Workflows That Work.....	57
Evolving Workflows	57
Documenting Your Process	58
Documenting Encoded Decisions	59
Ticket Progression	60
A Basic Workflow	62
Trusted Developers with Peer Review	64
Untrusted Developers with QA Gatekeepers	66
Releasing Software According to Schedule	67
Publishing a Stable Release	67
Ongoing Development	68
Post-Launch Hotfix	69
Collaborating on Nonsoftware Projects	69
Summary	71
<hr/>	
Part II. Applying the Commands to Your Workflow	
5. Teams of One.....	75
Issue-Based Version Control	76
Creating Local Repositories	78
Cloning an Existing Project	80
Converting an Existing Project to Git	81
Initializing an Empty Project	83

Reviewing History	84
Working with Branches	85
Listing Branches	86
Updating the List of Remote Branches	87
Using a Different Branch	87
Creating New Branches	88
Adding Changes to a Repository	90
Adding Partial File Changes to a Repository	93
Committing Partial Changes	94
Removing a File from the Stage	94
Writing Extended Commit Messages	95
Ignoring Files	96
Working with Tags	97
Connecting to Remote Repositories	99
Creating a New Project	100
Adding a Second Remote Connection	100
Pushing Your Changes	102
Branch Maintenance	103
Command Reference	103
Summary	105
6. Rollbacks, Reverts, Resets, and Rebasing.....	107
Best Practices	108
Describing Your Problem	108
Using Branches for Experimental Work	110
Rebasing Step by Step	113
Begin Rebasing	114
Mid-Rebase Conflict from a Deleted File	115
Mid-Rebase Conflict from a Single File Merge Conflict	118
An Overview of Locating Lost Work	120
Restoring Files	124
Working with Commits	126
Amending Commits	126
Combining Commits with Reset	127
Altering Commits with Interactive Rebasing	130
Unmerging a Branch	135
Undoing Shared History	137
Reverting a Previous Commit	137
Unmerging a Shared Branch	138
Really Removing History	144
Command Reference	146
Summary	148

7. Teams of More than One.....	149
Setting Up the Project	150
Creating a New Project	150
Establishing Permissions	151
Uploading the Project Repository	152
Document the Project in a README	156
Setting Up the Developers	157
Consumers	158
Contributors	160
Maintainers	161
Participating in Development	163
Constructing the Perfect Commit	163
Keeping Branches Up to Date	167
Reviewing Work	170
Merging Completed Work	173
Resolving Merge and Rebase Conflicts	174
Publishing Work	176
Sample Workflows	177
Sprint-Based Workflow	177
Trusted Developers with No Peer Review	181
Untrusted Developers with Independent Quality Assurance	183
Summary	183
8. Ready for Review.....	185
Types of Reviews	186
Types of Reviewers	186
Software for Code Reviews	187
Reviewing the Issue	188
Applying the Proposed Changes	189
Shared Repository Setup	189
Forked Repository Setup	190
Checking Out the Proposed Branch	191
Reviewing the Proposed Changes	192
Preparing Your Feedback	194
Submitting Your Evaluation	194
Completing the Review	195
Summary	196
9. Finding and Fixing Bugs.....	197
Using stash to Work on an Emergency Bug Fix	198
Comparative Studies of Historical Records	201
Investigating File Ancestry with blame	203

Historical Reenactment with bisect	206
Summary	208

Part III. Git Hosting

10. Open Source Projects on GitHub.....	211
Getting Started on GitHub	212
Creating an Account	212
Creating an Organization	215
Personal Repositories	216
Using Public Projects on GitHub	224
Downloading Repository Snapshots	225
Working Locally	226
Contributing to Projects	230
Tracking Changes with Issues	230
Forking a Project	230
Initiating a Pull Request	232
Running Your Own Project	234
Creating a Project Repository	234
Granting Co-Maintainership	235
Reviewing and Accepting Pull Requests	236
Pull Requests with Merge Conflicts	237
Summary	238
11. Private Team Work on Bitbucket.....	241
Project Governance for Nonpublic Projects	241
Getting Started	242
Creating an Account	242
Creating a Private Project from the Welcome Screen	245
Creating a Private Project from the Dashboard	246
Configuring Your New Repository	247
Exploring Your Project	249
Editing Files in Your Repository	251
Project Setup	254
Project Documentation in Wiki Pages	255
Tracking Your Changes with Issues	258
Access Control	262
Shared Access	263
Per-Developer Forks	264
Limiting Access with Protected Branches	264
Pull Requests	266

Submitting a Pull Request	266
Accepting a Pull Request	268
Extending Bitbucket with Atlassian Connect	268
Summary	269
12. Self-Hosted Collaboration with GitLab.....	271
Getting Started	271
Installing GitLab	272
Configuring the Administrative Account	274
Administrative Dashboard	275
Projects	279
Creating a Project	279
User Accounts	280
Creating User Accounts	281
Adding People to Projects	284
Groups	284
Adding People to Groups	286
Adding Projects to Groups	287
Access Control	289
Project Visibility	289
Limiting Activities with Project Roles	290
Limiting Access with Protected Branches	292
Milestones	293
Summary	295
A. Butter Tarts.....	297
B. Installing the Latest Version of Git.....	301
C. Configuring Git.....	307
D. SSH Keys.....	313
Index.....	317

Foreword

At the time of Git’s inception, the Linux kernel development had used the proprietary version control system BitKeeper for several years, with great success. But there was one problem: some Linux developers took exception with the proprietary nature of their version control system and what ensued was an epic flame war. Out of this conflict, the free BitKeeper license for Linux developers was revoked, and Git was born. Linus Torvalds himself took two weeks off from working on Linux, originally to search for a replacement for BitKeeper. Failing to find any that met his criteria, he instead wrote the first, very rudimentary version of what we now call Git: tiny programs cobbled together with shell scripts, Unix style. An ironic twist is that the distributed nature of Git was implemented using rsync, a tool which in turn had been developed by the very Linux developer who triggered the fallout with BitKeeper.

As to myself, I was fascinated by the simplicity of Git’s data structures and got drawn in early on, first by working on Git’s portability, then on more and more general improvements, including the invention of the “interactive rebase” (sorry for the name!), and ultimately maintaining the Windows port of Git. For the past 10 years, I used Git almost daily as a life science researcher, as part of different teams ranging from being the designated coder in interdisciplinary projects to leading highly distributed Open Source projects.

My first contact with Emma was at the Git Merge conference in Paris celebrating Git’s 10th birthday, where she gave a compelling talk titled “[Teaching People Git](#)”. This talk left quite the impression on me, reflecting Emma’s broad skill set and experience in teaching and project management.

Reading *Git for Teams*, I learned a lot from its unique perspective that emphasizes how Git can facilitate teamwork. It sounds so simple, but all those years, I had been focusing on technical details, and I had been teaching Git in what must be one of the most frustrating ways: from the ground up. By focusing on workflows and interactions between roles, *Git for Teams* guides you, the reader, to understand your exact

needs within your particular projects. Equipped with this knowledge, you will then learn the fun part: how to use Git to best support your needs.

Just like her talk, Emma's writing style is very enjoyable, making this book both educative and fun to read. It gave me valuable insights into my daily work. Whatever your role in *your* daily work, let this book be more than just a manual. Explore the different ways teams can work together, the ways a modern version control system can help moving projects forward, and let it inspire you to unleash the full power of Git to support you in what you want to do.

—Dr. Johannes Schindelin
Git for Windows maintainer
August 2015
Cologne, Germany

Foreword

It is difficult to overstate the importance of version control.

I believe that it is as important as the inventions of the chalkboard and of the book for multiplying the power of people to create together.

Over my career, I have watched the approach to version control systems in software development advance from resistance to ubiquity, and have watched the underlying technology make quantum jumps, each jump accelerating the value of the work we create together and the speed at which we create it. We are doing more, faster, with more people.

The latest jump, exemplified by Git, imposes almost no arbitrary constraints on a workflow. Thus, we have to discover and share the workflows that suit our people and our organizations, instead of living with past awkward workflows that suited our machines. Some of those workflows are explored in this book. I'm sure that more will be discovered in the future.

It is also difficult to overstate the importance and difficulty of education. Not merely memorizing facts or merely training tasks, but the deeper kind of education: how to think a certain way, to understand why to think that way, and how to share those thoughts with someone else.

Using a version control system properly is a way to think: to structure, remember, and share thoughts, at the level of depth and rigor demanded by the exhausting craft of writing software. Without that understanding, using Git will be, at best, "magical incantations", used by rote, and full of unknown dangers. With that understanding, Git can become almost invisible, leaving instead the patterns of working up the intricate spells of symbols that are the magic of software.

This book will help you to educate yourself, to gain that understanding, and to do that work.

—Mark Atwood
*Director of Open Source Engagement,
Hewlett-Packard Company*
August 2015
Seattle, WA

Preface

For nearly two decades, I've been working on teams of one or more in a distributed fashion. My first paid job as a web developer was in the mid-'90s. At the time, I maintained versions of my files by simply changing the names to denote a new version. My workspace was littered with files that had unusual extensions; *v4.old-er.bak* was an all too common sight. I wasn't able to easily track my work. On one project, which was a particularly challenging one for me, I resorted to the copyediting techniques I used for my essays: I'd print out the Perl scripts I was working on, and put the pages into a ring binder. I'd then mark up my scripts with different colors of pen and transcribe the changes back into my text editor. (I *wish* I had photos to share.) I tracked versions by flipping through the binder to find previous versions of the script. I had no idea how to set up an actual version control system (VCS), but I was obsessive about not losing good work if a refactoring failed.

When I started working with other developers, either for open source projects or client work, I was never the first developer on the scene and there was always some kind of version control in place by the time I got there—typically Concurrent Versions System (CVS). It wasn't the easiest thing to use, but compared to my ring binder of changes, it was definitely more scalable for the distributed teams that I worked with. Very quickly I came to value the commit messages, and the ease of being able to review the work others were doing. It motivated me to watch others commit their work to the repository. I didn't want others to think I was slacking off!

Meanwhile, I'd been teaching web development at a couple of different community colleges. In 2004, I had my first opportunity to teach version control in a year-long program designed by Bernie Monette, at Humber College. The class was split into several groups. In the first semester, the students sketched out a development plan for a website. In the second semester, the teams were mixed up, and the new teams were asked to build the site described by the previous team. In the third and final semester, the groups were shuffled again, and the final task was to do bug fixing and quality assurance on the built site. Each team was forced to use version control to track their work. The students, who had no prior programming experience, weren't thrilled with

having to use version control because they felt it got in the way of doing work. But it also made it easier because they never accidentally overwrote their classmates' work. It taught me a lot about how to motivate people to use a tool that didn't feel like it was core to the job at hand.

In the decade since that class, I've learned a lot about how to teach version control, and a lot about best practices in adult education. This book is the culmination of what I've learned about how to work efficiently with others when using version control. I encourage you throughout the book to do whatever is best for your team. There are no Git police who will show up at your door and tell you "you're doing it wrong." That said, wherever I can, I explain to you "the Git way" of doing things so that you have some guidance on where you might want to start with your team, or what you might want to grow into. Using "common" ways of working will help you onboard others who've previously used similar techniques.

This book won't be for everyone. This book is for people who love to plan a route, and then follow the clearly defined road ahead. My hope is that, if nothing else, this book helps to fill the gaps that have been missing in Git resources to date. It's not so much a manual for the software as a manual for how teams collaborate. If your team of one (or more) finds bits of this book confusing, I hope you'll let me know (emma@gitforteams.com); and if you find it useful, I hope you'll let the world know.

Acknowledgments

Several years ago, in a little bar off the side of a graveyard in Prague, Carl Wiedemann indulged my questions about Git. Thank you, Carl. Your enthusiasm motivated me to convert my frustration with Git into resources to help others avoid the painful process I'd experienced when learning Git.

I had the wonderful fortune to work with Joe Shindelar at my first job-job after a decade of self-employment. Joe, your passion for excellence has raised the bar for my own work. I am grateful for your patience and leadership. This book was born out of the conversations we had about leadership, team structures, and the Git documentation we created for the Drupalize.Me team. Thank you.

O'Reilly found the excellent Christophe Portneuve to serve as one of my tech reviewers. Christophe, thank you for your patience as I worked through the first few chapters. Your feedback was invaluable. I am grateful for the conversation we had at Git Merge, which helped me to clarify the concepts I use in this book—I had lofty goals of transforming the way people learn Git. I hope this book has become a resource you will be proud to have been a part of.

Bernie Monette, Martin Poole, Drew McLellan: you gave me a platform to refine my understanding of version control through your own projects.

Lorna Jane Mitchell, your cheerleading is tireless. Thank you for sharing your own work on Git. It has inspired me to raise the bar even higher.

Much of this book was fueled by 200 Degrees Coffee, a Nottingham-based roaster. My beverage of choice is a flat white served from 200 Degrees Café, or Divine Coffee at the Galleries of Justice. Thanks for providing an escape and letting me stay as long as I needed to.

To the O'Reilly family: you have been superb at handling all of my requests (and missed deadlines). Thank you Rachel, Heather, Robert, Colleen, Brian, Josh, Rebecca, Kim, and the countless others who worked behind the scenes to make this book happen.

To the core Git community: thank you for welcoming me with open arms at Git Merge in 2015. You embraced my rant from the stage about exploring new ways of teaching Git. You took my suggestions to heart, and made improvements to the Git experience. I am looking forward to participating more in the wonderful community you have been quietly nurturing.

Thank you also to my community of reviewers: Diane Tani, Novella Chiechi, Amy Brown, Blake Winton, Stuart Langridge, Stewart Russell, Dave Hammond, John Wynstra, Chris Tankersley, Mike Anello, Piotr Sipika, Nancy Deschenes, Robert Day, Dave Hammond, Sébastien Simard, Tobias Hiep, Nick Gard, Christopher Maneu, Johannes Schindelin, Edward Thomson, matt j. sorendon, Douwe Maan, Sytse Sijbrandij, Rob Allen, Steven Pears, Laura Lemay. Your feedback was invaluable.

To my partner, James Westby: thank you for patiently waiting as I finish *just one last thing*. This book would not exist without your support and encouragement.

Introduction

The book takes a people-first approach to version control. I don't start with a history of Git; instead, I begin with a 10,000-foot view of how teams can work together. Then we will circle our way into the commands, ensuring you always know the *why* behind the command you're about to type. Sometimes you can save your future self time (and confusion) by adopting specific routines or workflows. These explanations give you a holistic understanding of how your work today affects your work tomorrow—and hopefully make sense out of the near-religious insistence by some people on why they use Git the way they do.

Part I will be most useful to managers, technical team leads, chief technology officers, project managers, and technical project managers who need to outline a workflow for their team.

Good technology comes from great teams. In [Chapter 1](#), you will learn about the dynamics of creating a great team. By the end of this chapter, you will be able to identify roles within a team; plan highly effective meetings; recognize key phrases from people who are out of sync with what your team needs; and apply strategies that will help you to cultivate empathy and trust within your team.

Set the expectations early for the type of project you are running. In [Chapter 2](#), you will learn about different permissions strategies used to grant and deny access to a Git repository. Should team members be allowed to save their work to the repository without a review, or is it more of a trust and be trusted scenario? Both systems have their merits, and you'll learn about them in this chapter.

Make the intentions of your work clear. In Git, you will separate streams of work with branches. [Chapter 3](#) shows you how to separate each of the ideas your team is working on through the use of these branches. Of course, you will also need to know how to bring these disparate pieces of work into a unified piece of software. This chapter covers some of the more common branching strategies, including GitFlow.

Write the documentation today that will help you work more efficiently tomorrow. [Chapter 4](#) is the culmination of all the ideas in [Part I](#). You will learn how to create your own documentation and walk through the process of creating and deploying a simple software product.

Part II will be most useful for developers. This is where (finally!) you will get to learn how all those Git commands are actually supposed to work. If you're impatient and want to get your hands on code, you'll do well to skip ahead to [Part II](#) and then once you've completed it, go back and read [Part I](#).

Ground yourself in practical skills. [Chapter 5](#) covers the basics of distributed version control. In this chapter you will learn how to create repositories, and track your changes to files locally through commits, branches, and tags.

Learn to recover from your mistakes. [Chapter 6](#) allows you to explore history revisionism. This chapter covers how to amend commits, remove commits from your time line, and rebase your work.

Expand your team to be inclusive of others. Now that you're a master of history in your own repository, it's time to begin collaborating with others. [Chapter 7](#) will show you how to track remote changes, upload your code to a shared repository, and update your local repository with the updates from others.

Through peer review, share the glory and the responsibility of a job well done. In [Chapter 8](#), you will learn about the process for conducting code reviews with your team. We'll also cover the commands for a common reviewing methodology, along with suggestions on how to customize it for your team.

Investigate history; it holds the answer to the problem you're facing. In [Chapter 9](#), you will learn some advanced methods to track down bugs using Git. Don't be scared, though! The commands we'll be using are no more difficult than anything else you've done to date.

Finally, [Part III](#) gives the how-to for a few of the popular code hosting systems on the market today. It is aimed at both managers and developers.

Through open collaboration we grow our community. [Chapter 10](#) covers the mechanics of starting and maintaining an open source project on GitHub.

A team must have a repository of their own if they are to write good code. In [Chapter 11](#), you will learn how to collaborate on private repositories. This chapter will be especially useful for those who want to set up a private repository but have extremely limited funds to pay for private teams on GitHub.

Good fences sometimes do make better neighbors. In [Chapter 12](#), you will learn how to host your own instance of GitLab, and run projects through it. This is particularly useful for developers who are inside a firewall and cannot access public repositories on the Internet.

This book won't be for everyone. It will be especially frustrating for people who learn by poking at things and tinkering and exploring. This book, rather, is written for people who are a little afraid of things that go bump in the night.

Additional resources and larger versions of several of the flowcharts are available from [the book's companion site](#).

Conventions Used in This Book

The following typographical conventions are used in this book:

Italic

Indicates new terms, URLs, email addresses, filenames, and file extensions.

Constant width

Used for program listings, as well as within paragraphs to refer to program elements such as variable or function names, databases, data types, environment variables, statements, and keywords.

Constant width bold

Shows commands or other text that should be typed literally by the user.

Constant width italic

Shows text that should be replaced with user-supplied values or by values determined by context.



This element signifies a tip or suggestion.



This element signifies a general note.



This element indicates a warning or caution.

Using Code Examples

Supplemental material (code examples, exercises, etc.) is available for download at <http://gitforteams.com>.

This book is here to help you get your job done. In general, if example code is offered with this book, you may use it in your programs and documentation. You do not need to contact us for permission unless you're reproducing a significant portion of the code. For example, writing a program that uses several chunks of code from this book does not require permission. Selling or distributing a CD-ROM of examples from O'Reilly books does require permission. Answering a question by citing this book and quoting example code does not require permission. Incorporating a significant amount of example code from this book into your product's documentation does require permission.

We appreciate, but do not require, attribution. An attribution usually includes the title, author, publisher, and ISBN. For example: “*Git for Teams* by Emma Jane Hogbin Westby (O'Reilly). Copyright 2015 Emma Jane Hogbin Westby, 978-1-491-91118-1.”

If you feel your use of code examples falls outside fair use or the permission given above, feel free to contact us at permissions@oreilly.com.

Safari® Books Online



Safari Books Online is an on-demand digital library that delivers expert **content** in both book and video form from the world's leading authors in technology and business.

Technology professionals, software developers, web designers, and business and creative professionals use Safari Books Online as their primary resource for research, problem solving, learning, and certification training.

Safari Books Online offers a range of **plans and pricing** for **enterprise**, **government**, **education**, and individuals.

Members have access to thousands of books, training videos, and prepublication manuscripts in one fully searchable database from publishers like O'Reilly Media, Prentice Hall Professional, Addison-Wesley Professional, Microsoft Press, Sams, Que, Peachpit Press, Focal Press, Cisco Press, John Wiley & Sons, Syngress, Morgan Kaufmann, IBM Redbooks, Packt, Adobe Press, FT Press, Apress, Manning, New Riders, McGraw-Hill, Jones & Bartlett, Course Technology, and hundreds **more**. For more information about Safari Books Online, please visit us **online**.

How to Contact Us

Please address comments and questions concerning this book to the publisher:

O'Reilly Media, Inc.
1005 Gravenstein Highway North
Sebastopol, CA 95472
800-998-9938 (in the United States or Canada)
707-829-0515 (international or local)
707-829-0104 (fax)

We have a web page for this book, where we list errata, examples, and any additional information. You can access this page at <http://bit.ly/git-for-teams>.

To comment or ask technical questions about this book, send email to bookquestions@oreilly.com.

For more information about our books, courses, conferences, and news, see our website at <http://www.oreilly.com>.

Find us on Facebook: <http://facebook.com/oreilly>

Follow us on Twitter: <http://twitter.com/oreillymedia>

Watch us on YouTube: <http://www.youtube.com/oreillymedia>

PART I

Defining Your Workflow

It is common to start teaching programming by writing a trivial program that demonstrates the output of a specific set of commands. This can often leave adult learners thinking “so what?”, unsure of how to apply the commands to their particular scenario. This book begins with a 10,000-foot view of how structuring your workflow in specific ways will impact how your team collaborates. If you prefer to tinker with the commands, skip this part and start reading at [Part II](#). Then, as you begin to ask yourself “so what?”, return to the chapters in this part so that you can see how your day-to-day tasks with Git will affect future collaborations.

This part of the book will be of most use to those overseeing how work gets done. These folks are primarily in management roles and may include technical team leaders, CTOs, managers, project managers, and technical project managers.

CHAPTER 1

Working in Teams

I've been teaching version control for more than a decade. The largest percentage of the folks who attend my in-person workshops are dealing with political issues, not technical ones. The issues vary, of course. Perhaps they are struggling to get their coworkers to see the light on how important version control is; perhaps they want to force accountability; or perhaps they have been nominated by the team to go figure out how to make sense of the mess that's become the team's workflow. No matter what the issue, understanding and dealing with the underlying social problems *first* can make learning and using Git a lot easier.

By the end of this chapter, you will be able to:

- Identify roles within a complete team
- Structure meetings so they have useful outcomes
- Recognize key phrases from people who are working in an opposing state from what the team should be working on
- Apply strategies to cultivate empathy and trust within your team

You must begin by understanding your team and the requirements for your software. By beginning from a place of trust and compassion, you will almost always find it easier to map out the Git commands necessary to accomplish your goals. By working with a trusting team, you'll be able to help one another out when people get stuck with commands (and people will be more honest when they need help). And when people feel supported, and they understand the reasons *why* they need to use specific commands in Git, they will be that much more likely to make Git work for them, rather than simply committing a few commands to memory and hoping they're all right.

The People on Your Team

On small teams you may have one person who performs many roles. It's relatively easy to stay in touch with all of the daily activities of everyone on a small team. On large teams, however, you may have roles segregated into different departments. Those performing the user acceptance testing for your code base might never talk to the designers and developers who designed and built the product that's being tested. Both types of teams can have their own challenges: someone who's being asked to do too much without the right amount of context is definitely going to miss something, eventually. Having artificial barriers between teams will always increase tension between them. Fences do not make good neighbors in the development of code.

Have you heard the expression “begin with the end in mind”? When I build software, I am always building it for someone. Even if I think really hard, I can't think of a product I've built that was just me tinkering. I'm not a hacker by nature. I was drawn to software because of what it could do for others. Every time I sit down to work on a problem, I want to be making a better experience for the user. I want to avoid regressions, and I want to keep my users safe. I want them to feel clever, and not stupid. If there are clients between myself and the users, I sometimes need to help shape how they think about the problem in order to accomplish their business goals, while maintaining the integrity of the experience for the end user. Each time we sit down to work, we should be starting with a description of a problem we want to solve for a user—literally a *user story*.

Next, in test-driven development, you will write the acceptance test so that you have a definition of how you will know the problem has been solved. Depending on how these statements are written, they may be used by an automated testing suite, a quality assurance (QA) team, or a peer reviewer. Working with the testing team ahead of time to determine the acceptance test makes it much easier for developers to know what the outcome of their work should be. Usually the test should be descriptive of the problem to be solved, not prescriptive of the technology that should be used.

Part of your testing process should include a security review. Larger organizations are very lucky to have dedicated security specialists. Bring these experts on as early as you can in the process and get them to teach you how to write secure code. If you have segregated QA, security, and development teams, bringing the teams together at the beginning can make the testing process that much more fun as the developers strive to provide perfect code, and the testing teams strive to break it.

If you are not responsible for your deployments, bring the operations team on board as early as you can as well. Ensure your development environment is as close as it can be to the final production environment. Ideally, you will have build scripts that can be used to automatically duplicate as much as possible. You may even choose to work with [Docker](#) and/or [Vagrant](#) to create an exact replica of your environment. Work

with your operations team to create a configuration management infrastructure with something like [Chef](#), [Puppet](#), or [Ansible](#).

Moving along the development stack, if you are using open source software, get to know the community that built the products you will be working with. We rarely encounter new problems. Someone, somewhere, has probably seen what you're dealing with at this moment. Find mentors from within your code community, and offer to mentor others. Extending your team beyond the walls of your office building can make scary problems a lot less stressful.

Wherever you can increase collaboration between departments that have been isolated in larger corporations, you can reduce the time code spends sitting around doing nothing. Idle code costs you money in several ways: it may be preventing you from earning more money if it's a new feature, or it may be preventing you from not losing money if it's a bug fix. It's also getting stale. The longer code has to wait for a review, the more likely it has deviated from the main branch of work. To bring the work up to date so that it can be released is an increasingly difficult task the more it deviates.

Finally, we look inward to our own team. A technical architect will be responsible for planning how a solution will be implemented. The architecture decisions should be documented, and shared wherever possible. The architect may also be part of your coding team. The coding team may be comprised of frontend and backend developers, a designer, and a project manager. I've occasionally worked with business analysts as well. If you are working in an Agile environment, you may also have a ScrumMaster and a Product Owner.

I prefer working in an environment where everyone is willing to roll up their sleeves and pitch in where necessary. Self-managing teams are often filled with trust and respect for one another. It's a state that you need to build toward, though. Consensus-driven development works best for smaller, internal projects, but that doesn't mean you can't do your best to collaborate where possible. When I'm managing projects, I like for developers to choose the tickets they're going to work on. It increases the sense of autonomy, and lets the developers take a break from specific tasks if they need to. I've also found, however, that some people actually prefer to have their tickets picked for them.

There is no single right way to structure every team or manage every project. The trick to a motivated, cohesive team is to respect each of the individuals on the team and, where possible, to optimize the process to suit their preferences.

Thinking Strategies

Everyone on your team will have a preferred way to work. Different ways of working can be perfect for different situations. There's no right way to do things, and being

able to accommodate differences will actually make your team more robust, if you can share the strategies of what makes each person productive. I know I'm always looking for little ways to work in a more efficient manner, and I love to hear about what makes people able to really sink their teeth into a problem.

Several years ago, I was exposed to a leadership training program, **Lead and Succeed in 4 Dimensions**, by Bob Wiele, which described a series of thinking strategies. This program helped me to identify why I enjoyed some types of activities so much, while others left me drained. It also taught me a lot about how to structure meetings and interactions to get what I needed to proceed with my own work. The system works best if everyone on the team is aware of the language, but it's something you can take advantage of without having to convince others to participate. It breaks thinking into three dimensions: creative thinking, understanding thinking, and decision thinking. A fourth dimension, personal spirit, is used to indicate how likely a person is to engage—I think of it as a volume control, or modifier for those of you who are into role-playing games.

Individual preferences for different thinking strategies can derail teams quickly. If I'm trying to brainstorm how to solve a merge conflict in Git, and you tell me I shouldn't have used rebase, we're at odds in the conversation. I'm trying to use my "green" thinking to go through a problem, and you've just used your "red" thinking to stop the conversation. Being aware of these preferences can help us to have stronger collaboration while building new features, more productive code reviews, and overall, a healthier, happier team.

One of the easiest places to introduce the concept of playing into and setting aside preferences is in meetings that explicitly take advantage of these three dimensions. Focusing on the outcomes of the meeting can help identify to people which thinking strategies to employ during the meeting, which can then carry over into code reviews, and supporting teammates who have procedural questions about how to use Git, or more general implementation questions about the product you're working on together.

Let's review each of these thinking strategies in a little more detail.

A *creative thinker*'s greatest asset is the ability to find unpredictable solutions to problems. Left unchecked, a creative thinker can sometimes spend too much time thinking about different ways to do something, instead of just committing to one idea and getting the work done. Creative thinkers:

Envision

To see an alternative future (whether it's good or bad). This is useful for long-term strategy work.

Reframe

To pivot a little bit away from the current situation, or to see the current situation from a different perspective.

Brainstorm

This is useful for muscling through a problem. Brainstorming is almost the ability to doodle through a problem. It includes a constant action without self-censorship.

Employ flash of insight

Where brainstorming takes “muscle,” flash of insight thinking happens when you’re not thinking about the problem. It happens when you’re out for a walk, or in the shower.

Challenge

To question the status quo. The rebel; the child who points out that the king is not wearing clothes.

Flow

To ignore distractions and focus wholly on a given task. From this uninterrupted flow, you are able to get deeper into a problem and understand it more fully.

You can recognize creative thinkers from their key phrases:

- “Can we try ...”
- “I know we’re done, but what about ...?”
- “OMG! I just had this great idea ...”
- “Have you thought about doing it like this instead?”

By developing creative thinking on your team, you can generate entirely new ways of approaching problems, allowing you to improve your workflow and solve bigger problems.

The next type of thinking is *understanding thinking*. It can be broken into two sub-categories: understanding information (analytic), and understanding people (compassion). The analytic thinker’s greatest asset is the ability to see patterns and bring clarity to a situation. The tech industry tends to attract people who enjoy working with these thinking strategies. Analytic thinkers:

Scan the situation

Survey the environment to gather as much information as possible.

Clarify

Sharpen the understanding of a situation by gathering information and asking questions.

Structure

Organize data, people, resources, and processes in meaningful and systematic ways.

Tune-in

Sense and connect with the emotional dimensions in a situation.

*Empathize**

Show compassion for another's thoughts, emotions, and situations.

Express

Select the appropriate emotional and verbal language to get the true message across to the receiver.

You can recognize analytic thinkers from their key phrases:

- “So what you’re saying is ...?”
- “Just to clarify ...”
- “Can you tell me how ...?”
- “Is this related to ...?”
- “So I made this spreadsheet ...”
- “That must feel horrible!”

Finally, we have the “buck stops here” thinking strategy: *decision thinking*. Someone who favors “red” thinking hates talking around in circles forever. They want a quick decision so they can move on to the action! Decision-making skills help teams get to the real root of the problem, and then decide how to proceed. A decision thinker’s weakest point is lack of patience. They often want to jump ahead before the creative thinkers have had the necessary time to suggest the best possible solution, or before a careful analysis has been completed. Decision thinkers can often be misinterpreted as being negative. They aren’t. Using their ability to cut through the weeds to find the best solution is invaluable. Decision thinkers:

Get to the crux

Determine the essence, or most critical part, of a problem.

Conclude

Reach a logical decision, or resolution, about the best way to proceed.

Validate the conclusion

Pose questions to eliminate inferior options and poor quality information in order to critically assess and ensure the best decision.

Experience

Rely on experience to guide decision making and problem solving.

Values-drive

Rely on personal core beliefs about what is good or bad, right or wrong.

Gut instinct

Rely, not on information, but on a hunch and deep instincts as a guide.

You can recognize decision thinkers from their key phrases:

- “I’m ready to move on to ...”
- “No. We’ve already made a decision ...”
- “I don’t know why I think this, but ...”
- “Last time we tried this ...”
- “So I think the real problem is ...”
- “My gut tells me ...”

Meeting as a Team

Nearly my entire career has been spent working on a distributed team where my co-workers were not in the same office as me. It is a rare treat when people are at least in the same time zone as me. This has given me some excellent communication habits that I often take for granted. If you are already working with a prescribed methodology, you may have an established pattern of meetings that you use to move your project forward.

Your project, and each of the component parts within the project, should have an opening sequence, the bulk of the activity, and a wrap-up. This open-engage-close sequence is also described in great detail in the excellent book *Gamestorming* by Dave Gray, Sunni Brown, and James Macanufo (O'Reilly). It's also used by teachers in the classroom: a teacher will first tell you what you're going to learn, engage you in the learning, and then provide you with a summary of what you've learned.

All the way down to the planning of meetings, you should have this pattern in mind: start, engage, conclude. This becomes most apparent in meetings. Too often I see meetings with a general outline of topics, but not the intended outcome for the meeting. For example, if you are at the beginning of your project, the team might engage in *ideation* meetings, where your creative thinkers will be most engaged and productive:

Agenda: Ideation Total time: 45 minutes

- Identify the crux of the problem (10 minutes)
- Brainstorm solutions (25 minutes)

- Structure ideas (5 minutes)
- Identify top three ideas to test (5 minutes)

Identifying the outcome for a meeting ahead of time can be as simple as needing some free-flow time to discuss a problem.

Kickoff

The beginning of a project is a chaotic time, especially if you are bringing together a new group of people who wouldn't normally work together. If at all possible, have a collocated kickoff meeting with everyone present. This can be incredibly expensive from both a time and money perspective if you are a distributed team.



Face-to-Face is Best

Ideally a kickoff meeting is conducted face-to-face. If this is not possible, try to have people in as few places as possible, and connected through a video call.

By having everyone in the same place at the same time, you can take advantage of a shared experience. You can engage in kinetic (motion-based) processing of the information through whiteboards, flip charts, and sticky notes. There's something really gratifying about being able to see your collective decisions, which helps motivate the team into working on the project.

Tracking Progress

Once the project has begun, you will want to continue meeting with your team regularly. It is very easy to hide when you are working on a distributed team. Falling behind can be an embarrassing and often compounding problem. Over-communicating is a great habit to get into, but that doesn't mean wasting all of your time in meetings. A successful team will only meet to achieve very specific outcomes. I like working in very tiny increments of one-week sprints. It's very hard to hide problems with such a small unit of time. It's not about micromanaging, though. It's about trying to achieve a consistent velocity—or flow. Each of these meetings has a specific project-focused outcome:

Sprint planning

As a project manager, I've found there are two types of workers: those who are ready to jump in and take accountability for the work that is being done, and those who prefer to have work assigned to them. Those who prefer having work assigned to them are often looking for help in identifying which tasks they can succeed at, and which tasks have the highest business value to be completed in the context of the project as a whole. You may choose to do your sprint planning

as a group, or you may find that sprint planning is less time wasteful if it is done among a smaller group of client-facing team members and senior developers.

Commitment

These meetings should happen several times a week at the same time each day. The outcome of this meeting is a list of “promises” that team members are making regarding their work. People should not just answer “what are you working on today?” but “what are you expecting to hand in before the next time we meet?” This should be a “no shame; no blame” round robin with each person taking not longer than three minutes for their update. Larger, specific problems can be discussed in a follow-up meeting. In Scrum parlance, these commitment meetings are referred to as “stand-ups” and are conducted with the participants physically standing up. I find the term “stand up” doesn’t push enough accountability onto a team that isn’t trained in Scrum. Use whatever term works for your team, but make sure you are extracting valuable information from the meeting.

Project deep dives

Any problems that need further discussion than the commitment meeting will allow should have a follow-up deep dive. Ideally your team will use a calendaring system, such as [Google Calendar](#), where people who need help can review the schedules of their coworkers and simply book an available time to have a follow-up conversation. Generally I have blocked off one or two *deep dive* time slots of 45 minutes each week immediately following two of the 15 minute commitment meetings. Only the affected people need to attend to the deep dives, although everyone is welcome.

Sprint demos

Once a week, the team should get together to show off their work. During the demo, each person who completed work should list the ticket number he or she was working on, and show the outcome of that work. Having this demo once a week encourages an “always be finishing” culture, which breaks work into small, doable chunks. This meeting can also be a great opportunity to see the site with fresh ideas and identify bugs that might need to be documented for fixing later, as well as discuss any necessary refinements to the process for the upcoming work sprint. Depending on the cohesion of the team, and the level of communication throughout the week, you may find these meetings to be unnecessary. If, however, you are seeing an increase in incomplete features passing through code review, or you find great work going unrecognized, or you find your team isn’t reaching out for help often enough, it may be appropriate to introduce weekly demos to your team. [Google Hangouts](#) and [GoToMeeting](#) work well for this type of meeting.

Sprint retrospectives

At the end of each sprint, you should assemble with your team to discuss the process of working together. Identify things that are working well, and parts of the process that could be improved. One set of questions I have seen used effectively has each participant answer the following prompts about the project: I wish; I want; I wonder. This meeting should be restricted to the core team. Its length may vary, but plan to spend about an hour for a small team.

If you are a distributed team, you may also want to have a few scheduled social calls. **Lullabot**, a wholly distributed company of approximately 50 people, adds the following nonproject calls to its schedule. The aim of these additional meetings is to develop a greater empathy between staff members:

Company-wide stand-ups

A weekly one-hour call where a lottery of staff members are given up to two minutes each to talk about what's happening in their personal and work life. When the company was smaller, each person was asked to speak on this call. As the company grew in size, the lottery system was implemented and the one-on-one calls were added.

One-on-one

A lottery system where two to three company members are given the time to talk, in a facilitated space, about the life, the universe, and everything.

For the most part, these calls are conducted over a voice-only line, which also allows staff to use the call time to multitask (loading the dishwasher; or even time outdoors for those with good cell phone service).

Cultivating Empathy

When you are working in a distributed team, it becomes much easier to think of people on your code team as “resources” and not as human beings. It takes a very conscious effort to cultivate relationships and to develop trust among the team. A team that is able to trust one another, that is not fearful, is a team that will be able to play more with ideas, and will have greater capacity for finding appropriate and creative solutions to tough problems.

The first step to improving the empathy on your team is to care *just enough* about the people you work with. You don't need to become everyone's therapist, but taking the time to talk to people about nonwork things is a good investment of your time. If you are perceived as being a caring person, people will also like you more, which will improve the trust between you and the other person. As a technical project manager, I've often been asked to lend an ear to someone as they talk through a problem. My naive understanding of the problem as they bring me up to speed can force the focus back onto the basics, where the solution often lies. But those conversations are rare

with a new team—I must first earn the trust of the individuals on the team (that I won't judge if they don't know the answer; and that I can help to focus attention instead of just typing while they talk).

There are a few key tips to caring “just enough”:

Collect stories

Ask people questions about what's happening in their life; about interesting challenges they're working on; about what they're enjoying (or hating) about the project you're working on together. This isn't a gossip session! This is about connecting with the people you're speaking with about their lives.

Listen with intention

When you talk with people, listen wholly. Do not multitask. Listen to what the person is saying, and listen completely. Do not cut in, unless you are confused and need to clarify. Some people are natural storytellers and have the capacity to go on. And on. For these folks, you might want to schedule a time so that you have a predetermined finishing point.

Refer back

If someone tells you about their life, circle back with them to see how that story has progressed. Is their daughter still teething? How's that cold doing; feeling better today?

I like to think of this list as “**Empathy for Beginners**”. Everyone can, and should, manage this small amount of connection with the people they're working with.

Wrap-Up and Retrospectives

These meetings can be a prime time to talk about what worked, and what can be refined. They should also be used to clean up any templates that have been used during the project to make them reusable in future projects. The closing activity for a period of work should always be a no-shame, no-blame event where people are able to talk about things that didn't go well. Only very rarely do I regret my decisions as a project manager. I rely on my team to help me to make the best possible decision with the available information. So in retrospect, I find it quite easy to avoid the “shoulda coulda” temptation. What I do try to do, though, is to identify the patterns to watch out for in the future. In other words, to discover ways we could have altered what we asked in meetings to get a different set of information available to us (which might have caused us to make better decisions for that type of project in the future).

From a version control perspective, the end of the project is also a great opportunity to find your favorite tickets and document the characteristics of what made them excellent. Perhaps there was a new way of structuring the information that you'd like to be able to reuse. Take a peek in your Git repository as well, and look for especially

good commit messages that you can have as examples in your documentation for future projects.

Teamwork in Terms of Git

If you are absolutely brand new to distributed version control, there is a set of terms you will see throughout the rest of the book. These terms are easiest to understand in the context of a simple developer workflow.

Each developer has a local copy of a repository. This is, at its core, a standalone copy of the history of changes made in the project. In order to share changes, developers will typically publish a copy of the repository to a centralized code hosting system, such as GitHub. Although, as you will see later in this chapter, there are other ways to share code.

From the central copy of the repository, developers will create a copy of the repository that they can make changes to. In Git parlance, this process is referred to as *creating a clone*, although this process can also be referred to as *forking*.

When cloning a repository, software developers may choose to make their copy of the project private or public. A private repository makes a quiet decision to not encourage people to look directly at this copy of the repository, and instead only look to the main project for officially accepted changes. A public copy of a developer's repository, on the other hand, is available for individuals to contribute to directly. This is a more open approach to software development, but may cause confusion about which copy of a repository ought to be the starting point.

It's only through project governance that one repository for a project is decided to be the most important version. This is because every repository can accept changes, and share its changes with others. The relationships between projects are not fixed in stone. You can create a web of relationships between different copies of the repositories, or a more linear chain. Generally, though, the official version of a software product is referred to as being *upstream* of the current repository. For example, my blog is created with [Sculpin](#). I cloned the official release of the software and make changes directly to the repository to write blog posts. If I wanted to incorporate the latest changes to the software, I would be incorporating the *upstream* changes.



The Butter Tart Recipe was Forked

For long-time open source software developers, the term *fork* is loaded with the frustrations of a split community where a group of developers decided to “fork the project” and take it in a different direction. Forks are simply a divergence, like a path in the woods, or like my Great Granny Austin’s butter tart recipe. Each branch on a forked path leads in a different direction. Or, in the case of the butter tarts, the addition or omission of currants. You can read my family’s version of a forked recipe in [Appendix A](#).

Within a single repository, I can store different versions of the project. These in-repository changes are tracked via branches. To switch from my current branch to another one, I will *check out* the branch I want to switch to. (In my head I say, “This is really cool! Check! It! Out!”) Before switching, Git will force me to deal with the uncommitted changes by either committing them, stashing them, or discarding them. The *commit* process will permanently store my changes to the repository, whereas *stash* will temporarily shelve the changes, allowing me to pull them off the shelf and reapply them later.



A Crafter’s Stash

Knitters, quilters, and other fiber artists will often refer to having a *stash* of yarn or fabric. When starting a new project, we might “shop the stash” instead of going to the store. Those of us who have a lot of stashed supplies may talk about having “achieved SABLE” (Stash Amassed Beyond Life Expectancy). I think this analogy works well for Git’s stash, and just like in crafting, I recommend pruning the stash regularly to look for moth damage. If you are a knitter, you may enjoy [Git for Knitters](#).

The process of incorporating and publishing changes uses the following set of commands. I *pull* my changes from the remote repository to automatically incorporate them into the repository. This procedure *fetches* the new changes and then *merges* them into the *tracked* copy of the local *branch*. At any given time, I work on a local branch within my repository. If I want to share my changes with other developers, I *commit* my work to the repository, and then *push* my branch to the remote repository.

Summary

One of my favorite things to do is to work with a broken-down, burnt-out team, to help them find a new way of working together in a fun and creative way. It’s not

always easy, because broken teams always have at least some degree of mistrust. Sometimes there are tears. But the rewards are huge when it can come together:

- A trusting, empathetic team is more likely to help its coworkers with the specific Git commands necessary to get the job done.
- Preferences for different thinking strategies can derail progress. Ensuring the right strategies are being used at the right time can reduce friction, and make work faster and more fun.
- By having transparency around your work, and by including relevant stakeholders at key points, you may be able to gain faster deployments by reducing the time needed to test code, and by reducing the number of bugs found.

In the next chapter, you will begin to sketch out the governance for your project repositories.

CHAPTER 2

Command and Control

By its very definition, *distributed* version control eschews centralized control. There are no fixed rules built into Git that will help you to control access to your code—Git is, after all, just a simple content tracker. This can be a real turnoff for some people who are accustomed to version control systems that double as gatekeepers and access control managers. This lack of centralized access controls doesn't mean your project suddenly turns into anarchy.

In “[Project Governance](#)” on page 16, you will learn about:

- Authorship, copyright, and distribution licenses
- Leadership models, which can set the tone for how contributions are made to your project
- Codes of Conduct, which establish firm guidelines for expected and acceptable behavior of contributors

Then, in “[Access Models](#)” on page 20, you will learn how to structure access to your project. Three models are described:

- Dispersed contributors
- Collocated contributor repositories
- Shared maintenance

By the end of this chapter, you will be able to confidently establish an access model for your team that keeps contributors happy, and ensures you are still able to comply with any reporting requirements from regulatory bodies.

Project Governance

If I were the betting type, I'd wager you picked up this book with the intention of learning Git. This section talks about legal mumbo jumbo. If you are the impatient type, you may wonder exactly why I have wasted valuable time on this esoteric topic. Think of this information as a primer that outlines your rights as an author, and also your responsibilities as a steward of a project repository. The content outlined in this section will be slightly more relevant to public, open source projects. Increasingly, though, government and large enterprises are working with publicly available code, and choosing to make their own code open. (Even Microsoft has many open source libraries available today! Go, Microsoft!)



Producing Open Source Software

In this chapter I cover the *highlights* for running a project. Software developers and managers who are considering running their project as an open source project should also read Karl Fogel's [Producing Open Source Software](#). This free book covers everything from publicly handling growth to legal matters and political infrastructure.

In this section, you will learn about the assignment of authorship for a given piece of code. Later, when you are working with Git, you will see that Git allows you to track who injected each tiny piece of code into your repository. In addition to tracking authorship, you can even use Git to "sign off" on new code that is added to a repository.

Copyright and Contributor Agreements

Copyright is the exclusive, assignable, legal right to use and distribute a piece of work. Around the world, the details of copyright legislation vary; however, the general rule is that the person who created a work owns the right to copy and distribute the work. In open source software, the copyright holders agree to license their work to a wider community. Popular Free Libre Open Source Software (FLOSS) distribution licenses are covered in the next section.

If the author was compensated for his or her work product, the copyright will often be granted to the payer or patron. In the United States, this is referred to as a *work for hire* and is almost always the case in employer-employee relationships, and is typically the case for contract workers. If you're not sure if you own the copyright to your work, check your agreement; and if there isn't a clause, check your local jurisdiction to see if there is an established precedent. In the United States, contractors and freelancers don't fall under the [definition supplied by the Supreme Court](#), so it isn't work

for hire. The terms are broad, though. Ideally, update your contract so that it explicitly states who owns the copyright to your work.

Copyright only covers the specific implementation of a work. You cannot copyright an idea. You may have heard of *reverse engineering*, which is one way of getting around a specific author's moral claim to a piece of work. Some jurisdictions around the world also have a *restraint of trade* clause. This language prohibits an employee (or contractor) from engaging in similar work elsewhere for a period of time. Effectively, this clause prevents employees from starting at a new job and reverse engineering or creating an equivalent piece of work from the one they developed for their former employer. It must be deemed by the courts as a “reasonable” restraint—limited to an industry or specifics about the job; and cannot be so broadly interpreted that the worker is essentially prevented from working at any job.

Patents, in some jurisdictions, do cover the idea behind an invention. Software patents are extremely contentious because they are perceived in many cases to stifle innovation. Patents are never automatically granted and always involve an application within a specific jurisdiction.

If you are participating on an open source project on behalf of your employer, the assignment of copyright might be a bit more complicated. This is especially true if the project has a policy to only accept work from individuals, and your place of employment retains all copyright on the work you produce; it may also be true if your place of employment has rules about what you are allowed to work on in your free time. (I can name specific examples of both open source projects and companies with these restrictions.) I am not a lawyer and cannot give you legal advice. Only you can choose if you want to ask permission or beg forgiveness. I can, however, highlight the issue of copyright and encourage you to consider what is most appropriate for everyone in the long term. It would be a shame if your work had to be removed from an open source project for any reason. Radical transparency is risky, but I think it’s worth it in the end.

To increase their future powers, some corporations have opted to put a contributor agreement on their public projects. [Canonical](#), [Chef](#), [Puppet](#), [Google](#), and [.NET](#) all have a variation on a contributor license agreement. The agreement varies per company, but the gist of most of them is “if you choose to submit a contribution, you agree to reassign your copyright to the project.” Just as there is a Creative Commons license for content, there is now a [Harmony Agreements template for contribution agreements](#). The biggest rationale I’ve seen for a contributor agreement is that it allows the project to change the distribution license of a project without explicit consent from individual contributors. In open source software, these contributor agreements are often perceived as being against the spirit of open source. On the other hand, it can make it difficult for corporations to make legal decisions regarding that software in the future if they don’t own the copyright.

Distribution Licenses

Once you have determined copyright for your project, the next piece you need to establish is the distribution license. This will clarify how you want others to use, or not use, your project.

GitHub has put together an excellent primer for the more popular [open source licenses it recommends](#). The primer includes the following licenses:

- The [MIT License](#) allows people to do anything they want with your code as long as they provide attribution back to the original authors of the work, and do not hold you liable for the software. jQuery and Rails both use an MIT license.
- The [Apache License](#) is similar to the MIT License, but it also explicitly grants patent rights from contributing authors to users, and requires a change notice that describes how the derivative work changes from the previous version. Apache, Subversion, and NuGet use an Apache license.
- The GNU General Public License (GPL), [V2](#) or [V3](#), is a sharing-friendly copyleft license that requires anyone who distributes your code or a derivative work to make the source available under the same terms. V3 is similar to V2, but further restricts use in hardware that forbids software alterations. Linux, Git, and WordPress use this type of license.
- If your content isn't code, a [Creative Commons license](#) may be more appropriate for your work. This license allows you to grant redistribution rights, with or without modification, for commercial or noncommercial use.

You are also welcome to *not* choose a distribution license; however, this effectively signals to people that you are not interested in others using your work without seeking explicit permission.



When to Not Use a Distribution License

Using a distribution license on a public project is almost always a good idea. That said, I sometimes choose to omit a distribution license on my public repositories. Typically this happens if I think I may incorporate the work into a full-length book with a traditional publisher. Some publishers require you to reassign copyright to them and will protect the work on your behalf. (O'Reilly leaves all copyright with the original author.) If I have accepted contributions from others under an open license, it *may* impact my ability to reassign copyright later.

If you encounter a public project that does not have an explicit license, and you want to incorporate the work into your own, get in touch with the project maintainers first and ask them to add a license to their work.

Leadership Models

Open source software allows people to collaborate on building systems that are more powerful, more secure, more feature-rich, and more sustainable when the burden of maintenance is shared among many. If you are a project of one, it might not make sense to create a governance document, but if you are anticipating others contributing as well, you should consider outlining how you want the project to be run.

A few of the governance models I participated in include:

Benevolent Dictator for Life (BDFL)

In this model, the leader of the project has final say over every decision about every aspect of the code base. The BDFL may not actively participate in every code review, but ultimately retains the control to reject or reverse any decision made. The community exists at the whim of the dictator. Sounds horrible, right? Well, it can be if the dictator isn't *benevolent*. This model has been successfully used by the [Ubuntu project, and others](#).

Consensus-driven, leader-approved

The Drupal community works on a consensus model where the community most active on a given part of the system is encouraged to find solutions that are appropriate. When the community is happy with the solution, they mark an issue as *Reviewed and Tested by the Community* (RTBC, which is a backronym for *Ready to be Committed*). Drupal has [additional working groups for content, licensing, and security issues](#).

Technical review board or Project Management Committee

A fork of the Drupal project, Backdrop, distinguished itself early in the project by adopting [an explicit governance model](#), which is based on the Apache project [Project Management Committee \(PMC\) model](#).

If you would like more guidance on setting up a governance plan for your project, I recommend resources by Lisa Welchman, including her book [Managing Chaos](#) (Rosenthal Media).

Code of Conduct

Some communities have made the difficult decision to reject code from community members who refused to behave in a friendly manner toward others in the community. Other communities, however, are notorious for their unfriendly, intolerant behavior. You may be able to think of several communities you enjoy participating in, and want to emulate in your own project.

Community culture is the consistent reinforcement of behavioral standards. Although you may wish to simply cross your fingers and hope that people are excellent to each other, there may come a day when you wish you had a rule book you

could point to. A community code of conduct allows you to explicitly detail what is expected of those who participate in your project. There are several established codes of conduct that have been community vetted. You may wish to begin with one of these as your starting point.

Flickr is the first community code of conduct that I was aware of using, and which made a point to ensure its members knew there were guidelines in place. I'm sure it has changed since I first read the document; you can read the current version at [Flickr Community Guidelines](#).

The [Drupal Code of Conduct](#) is the one I'm most familiar with. It was derived from an early version of the [Ubuntu Code of Conduct](#) (a [newer version](#) is now available), and has even been used as inspiration for the [Humanitarian ID Code of Conduct](#), a project by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.

It is appropriate to add your Code of Conduct (CoC) document to the project's supporting website. If you do not have a separate website for your project, you could add your CoC as a wiki page within GitHub. Links to wiki pages are available in the right-hand sidebar from the home page for the project.

Access Models

If you have been using version control for a long time, you may remember systems like CVS or Subversion with a centralized repository. [Figure 2-1](#) demonstrates how changes were made in Subversion's centralized system. In this system, each time you wanted to save a snapshot of your work to the repository, you were potentially saving to the same place as someone else. Just when you thought you were ready to share your work, or request a code review, you would sometimes be prevented from doing so if someone else had recently updated the same branch with their own work.




Figure 2-1. Working with files in Subversion

Git, on the other hand, is a distributed version control system. This means instead of having one central place that everyone must use if they want to have their changes recorded, each person works independently from the centralized code hosting system, and is responsible for making commits to his or her local copy of the repository. This means changes from other developers are never forced into your work; instead, it is your decision of when to incorporate outside work, and when to share your own.



Establishing Connections to Others

Although people love to talk about coding from airplanes that don't have an Internet connection when working with Git, I think the real advantage is that you can do more of your thinking in private. You can make new branches, think about new ideas in code and—only when you're ready—establish a connection with others.

If you subscribe to [Myers-Briggs](#), Git might be INTP, and Subversion might perhaps be ESFJ.

Every time you sit down to work with Git, you are sort of working in a centralized fashion as far as your computer is concerned; your repository of changes is entirely self-contained on your local machine, as shown in [Figure 2-2](#). You do some work, and then save that work to your local repository. Then, when you're ready to share your work with others, you make a connection to a remote repository and push your copy of a specific branch to it.




Figure 2-2. Working with files in Git

Keeping your work entirely local would be very limiting! Instead, we make connections to other systems, and share our code through the remote repositories.

Git does not have the ability to control access—instead, it allows any developer full read/write access to the repository. At the most coarse level, you limit this control through login controls. I develop on my machine, to which you don't have access, and therefore you cannot change my repository. As soon as we put the repository in a shared location, such as a centralized code hosting server, we need to agree on how we will *govern* our access to the repository.

Some Git hosting systems, such as Bitbucket, allow fine-grained, per-branch access controls; however, most force you to limit control on a per-repository basis. In other words, you either are a committer for any branch on the repository, or you are limited to making your contributions through pull requests.

In this section, we cover the three most popular models:

- Single Repository; Shared Maintenance, wherein everyone on the team is considered a maintainer and is granted access to upload changes to the project repository.
- Collocated Contributor Repositories, wherein contributing developers create a remote copy of a project, and have their changes accepted by project maintainers.
- Dispersed Contributor Repositories, wherein code is shared via a text-based patch file.

At the end of the section, you will learn how to chain these methods together to create a custom access model that is perfect for your team.

Dispersed Contributor Model

When Git was originally conceived, conversations about changes to the code base of an open source software project commonly happened on public mailing lists, not on centralized web hubs. This model is still used today by the Git development team. It is almost certainly not appropriate for your team to use this model for its development; however, understanding the model has implications for some of the more advanced concepts required to use the commands `rebase` (Chapter 6) and `bisect` (Chapter 9).

To share their work with the community, developers would create a patch file using the program `diff`. They would then write an email to the discussion group, and attach their patch file as shown in Figure 2-3. To investigate the proposed changes, members of the mailing list would download the attached patch file, and apply it to their local code base, using their system's `patch` command.

By sharing the patch files via a mailing list, developers were able to encapsulate and share their work—while efficiently limiting what was shared to that patch file so that

the people evaluating the work could easily see what had changed between two specific points in time within a shared code base.



Form Follows Function

To make the process of working with emailed patch files easier, Git added the ability to deal with patches that were sent via a mailing list through the command `am`.

This model is still used by the Git project today—it is still using a mailing list to share patches, and have conversations about what features should be added to Git and what bugs should be removed.

Although the model might seem archaic, it does have some advantages:

- You don't need to use a specific version control system locally because the patch file doesn't require specific version control software to be installed locally.
- Developers can easily review the proposed changes from the comfort of their email application.
- This model encourages *whole idea* thinking. If you have to email a group of people each time you make a change, you are more likely to ensure everything is right so you can avoid the embarrassment of “just one more thing.”
- Uploading your proposed changes to a system that is *not* the code hosting system enforces a review procedure among the participants in the software project. In other words, as a developer, I can't just upload my changes to the main repository; I have to announce my completed work and wait for someone else to merge it in.




Figure 2-3. The community review process for patches

Having dispersed repositories isn't specific to projects that communicate via mailing lists. At the time of this writing, the Drupal project was using a variant of this model. Instead of using a mailing list to share patches, though, it was using a self-hosted, centralized code hosting and ticket issue system. [Figure 2-4](#) shows a screenshot of an issue with an attached patch file.

The screenshot shows a Drupal issue queue interface. At the top, a comment from user 'emmajane' is visible, dated 'commented 5 years ago'. Below the comment, there is a status bar with 'Status: Active' and a link to 'Needs review'. A table displays an attached patch file named 'removing-pleases.patch', which is 'new' and has a size of '4.37 KB'. The patch has passed 12875 tests, with 0 fails and 0 exceptions. Below the table, a note from the user states: 'Just looked at the welcome screen with fresh eyes on a new install. There were three "please"s. Patch attached to remove my Canadian-isms. :)'.

Figure 2-4. A Drupal issue queue with attached patch file

In this model, you can sign the individual commits before sharing them; however, this makes it more difficult to unpack the history of who made which changes if multiple people were involved. The team will need to, instead, adhere to a patch formatting policy (signed or not), and a commit message style. Drupal has **strict formatting guidelines for its commit messages** to ensure everyone receives credit for their work.

For most projects starting today, this model is not appropriate. It does, however, help to understand some of the more advanced commands, such as `bisect`, if you are able to think about commits as *whole ideas*. A more modern approach to this model is to use fork, or clone, repositories on a single code hosting system.

Collocated Contributor Repositories Model

These days, software developers are unlikely to trade patch files—instead, they are much more likely to use a central code hosting system that manages the patch process for them. Using a single code hosting system makes it easier to programmatically create and submit patches between repositories. The method for how these patches are managed is the secret sauce that makes up any code hosting system. The restrictions are presumably handled via Git's pre-commit hooks to ensure access control is respected.

On a collocated system, the “upstream” project retains complete control over who is allowed to write to the primary project repository. Individual contributors make a clone, or fork, of the project to their own repository on the code hosting system. The contributors make changes to the copy, and then submit their requested changes in the form of a *merge request* or *pull request*, as shown in [Figure 2-5](#). If you are working on an open source project with a lot of contributors, you are most likely using this model.




Figure 2-5. Creating a chain of cloned repositories

GitHub has popularized this model for development for contemporary open source projects. I've also seen this model used for internal projects with strict walls between departments. For example, if the quality assurance team is solely responsible for the final merging of code into the stable release branch, the team is likely using some variation on this model. Another reason for this separation would be if you were using extra contractors and you wanted to limit their ability to accidentally add something to the repository that hadn't first undergone a review of some kind.



Git Versus GitHub Terms

It can be difficult to know which terms to use because the GitHub terms, which have become commonplace, don't always match their corresponding Git commands. For example, the GitHub term *fork* uses the Git command `clone` to create a copy of a repository. Because the focus of this book is on the Git software, and not just the implementation on GitHub, the Git commands will be used. Occasionally both terms will be used because the GitHub terminology is sometimes more familiar than the individual commands.

When GitHub creates a *fork* of a repository, it is the same as using the Git command `clone` to make a copy of a repository. Once you have created a fork, you *can* use the GitHub web interface to make your changes directly to your repository, but this isn't great for more than a very minor typo fix. Instead, you will likely create a second clone of the repository—this time from the forked repository to your local workstation. This effectively creates a chain of clones from one copy to another. Keeping all of the repositories in sync takes a little bit of work; however, it's a lot fewer commands to memorize than working directly with patches. You win some, you lose some.

Working with repositories that share the same infrastructure should be easier than the dispersed repositories because it allows you to more easily use wrapper software. In addition to it being a little easier to keep the work updated, the wrapper software can also give you more control over who is able to commit work and receive credit for their work.

Typically, the first repository in the chain can only be altered by a handful of core committers who can add new commits to the repository, or merge branches. Most of the people working on the project will, instead, be working from a local clone of the repository. In this local, cloned repository, each person will have infinite control over what happens. They can add new branches, add new code, and share their proposed changes with others by pushing their work to their public clone of the main repository. Once the work has been pushed to the public clone, coders can solicit feedback on their work to date. Once the work has been fully reviewed and tested by the community, the coders can make a *merge request* or *pull request* from their public clone to the main repository.

If someone doesn't have the intention of contributing their work back to the main project, they can skip creating a public clone, and instead create a clone from the main project directly to their local environment. Things can get a little tangled if you realize you do have changes you want to submit back to the project, and you've also done your own work, which shouldn't be shared.

It isn't always easy to know that you're going to do something that might be useful to others, though. For example, I was working on my slide deck for OSCON with an

open source presentation framework, [reveal.js](#). Your equivalent example might be with a WordPress theme, or a frontend framework, or some other project that gives you a basic starter kit as part of the initial package.

Previously while working on my slides with reveal.js, I decided I probably wouldn't need to upgrade the reveal.js software I was running and stopped worrying about keeping a Git connection to the *upstream* project. I shuffled all of the folders around in my repository to make it work for what I was doing. A custom theme was created. Tweaks were made. It had truly become a forked project, disconnected from where it began. (Developers with even a little bit of open source experience will be groaning at this point because they're already jumping ahead to the inevitable realization that I'm about to reveal.) But as I started working on things, I realized I couldn't get the slides to format properly for the handout. I wanted my [speaker notes to appear alongside the slide](#), instead of having them tucked below it. I opened a bug report for the project on GitHub, and continued working. A few people gave me suggestions on how I might want to reformat things. Aha! I had some ideas on how to solve the problem. I considered my own issue closed, but there were others who were also interested in my solution. Now I was truly stuck. I had created my project without the intention of sharing my work.

If you are submitting a patch, you might have been able to cheat and share only snippet of your work, but when you are working with collocated contributors, you need a chain of repositories in place to be able to share your work back. My own project didn't have a branch for the upstream work because I never had the intention of sharing my work back to the presentation framework. So I started by creating a new chain of repositories. [Figure 2-6](#) shows the sequence of what I did next. On GitHub, I [created a fork of the main reveal.js project](#). Then I made a local clone of this forked repository. To my local clone I created a new branch for my changes. Then I copied the changes from my OSCON slide deck (there were only a few, so I didn't bother creating a patch, I just used my trusty copy-and-paste tools) into my cloned repository of the presentation framework. With the changes in place, I pushed my changes back to my remote repository on GitHub, and created a pull request to ask to have my changes incorporated back into the project.

The public clone of the reveal.js repository was required because I do not have write permission for the reveal.js repository. If I did have write access, I could have skipped making the public clone and just created a local clone.

Shared Maintenance Model

Finally, we have arrived at what is likely the most typical permission model for internal teams (and teams of one): shared maintenance. In this model, there is an inherent trust among team members. It is assumed that code will be checked and verified before it is committed to the main project branch, and that, generally, the developers

are trusted. In this model, work is done locally by all developers before it is pushed into the shared repository for the project. When working with an internal team, as shown in [Figure 2-7](#), this is often where we start: with a single shared repository that everyone has shared write access into.




Figure 2-6. Suggesting changes to a project from collocated repositories

Git does not accommodate permissions and instead relies on other systems to grant or deny write access to a repository. If you do need to prevent people from uploading their code to a shared repository, you need to use the host system's access control to do so. If you are not using a Git hosting platform, this access control might be controlled via SSH accounts.

In addition, Git further does not allow you to be locked out of only some branches, as you might find in Subversion. Without additional software in place, it is by convention that teams agree not to commit changes to specific branches without the prerequisite testing. Per-branch access restrictions are available through Bitbucket ([Chapter 11](#)) and GitLab ([Chapter 12](#)). If you prefer a more lightweight system, take a look at [Gitolite](#).




Figure 2-7. Everyone on the team has write access to the central repository from their local repository

Custom Access Models

In addition to these individual strategies, teams may also choose to use multiple access models for a given project. This would be particularly useful for projects with very strict regulations on who could commit code to the canonical repository. Indeed, most open source projects will have different levels of access for different contributors.

A common workflow is as follows:

- An official project repository, to which only a very few people are able to commit code. In an open source project, it would be the project maintainers; and in a closed source, or corporate, project, it could be the quality assurance team.
- A less restricted, internal copy of the repository, which is used for integration by each of the contributors and project teams. This repository might follow a shared maintenance model, where everyone is allowed to merge their branches into the repository as part of a code review process, or even on an ad hoc basis.

- Individually created personal repositories, locked to the individual contributors. These are typically hosted on the same code hosting system as the official repository, because most modern code hosting systems have easy-to-integrate functionality (usually called a “pull request” or “merge request”).

This split would commonly be seen in teams that employ junior developers, quality assurance teams, or perhaps external contractors.

[Chapter 4](#) covers common workflows in more depth.

Summary

In this chapter, you learned about different ways to grant and restrict access to your project repository:

- Clearly defining a project governance model will help ensure ownership is understood by all contributors.
- Copyright of code is typically assigned to the author, unless the right has been reassigned to another legal entity as a *work for hire* or through a *contributor agreement*.
- The rules restricting distribution, and derivative works of a code base are defined by its software license.
- Git is just a simple content tracker; it does not include access control mechanisms out of the box. Some code hosting systems have incorporated pre-commit hooks that can be used to limit access per-branch.
- Access can be limited or open for any given repository. Changes submitted to a repository are made via a patch. On code hosting systems, a programmed graphical interface is used to manage the patch submission process.

With your permission structure in place for your repository, we will next look at how you can divide your repository so that both work in progress and finished work can be shared among team members.

Branching Strategies

In version control, a branch is a way to separate parallel thinking about how a piece of code might evolve. A branch always begins from a specific point in the code base. In [Chapter 2](#) we talked about forking and cloning a repository. A branch is like an in-repository split where new work begins. A branch might be created with the intention of contributing work back, or it might be created with the intention of keeping work separate. Branches don't care what changes they're tracking! They just are.

The branching strategy that you use depends on your release management process. Branches allow you to change the files that are visible in the working directory for your project, and only one branch can be active at a time. Most branching strategies separate the work in your project by coarse ideas. An idea could be the version of your software—for example, version 1, version 2, version 3. And spawning from those software versions you might have ideas that are in progress. These ideas are generally separated into branches according to the name of the feature they represent. They might be a bug fix or a new feature, but they also represent whole ideas on a smaller scale.

This chapter outlines:

- How to choose a branching convention for your team
- Mainline development
- Branch-per-feature deployment
- State branching
- Scheduled deployment

There are no limits to the ways you can use branches. This can be a good thing and a bad thing. A few artificial constraints (*conventions*) will help you consider the possibilities for your team.

Understanding Branches

Without getting into the internals of how Git works, having a basic understanding of what a branch is will help you to choose and apply the strategies outlined in this chapter.

Each Git repository contains a pool of commits. These commits are linked to one-another through their metadata—each commit contains a reference to its parent. In the case of a merge commit, there may be more than one parent commit referenced. I like to think of a branch as a string of beads, with each commit represented as a bead on the string. The analogy isn't technically correct, but it works quite well as a mental model for our purposes. Branches in Git are actually a named pointer to a specific commit. (Give yourself a magic wand, and tap on a specific bead while saying a name. You have just created a named branch.) When you check out a branch you are copying the data stored in the commit object (identified by the pointer) to your working directory. Once the work has been copied into the working directory, you can make as many changes as you like (add, edit, delete files), and save the changes as a new commit object to your local repository. The named pointer will be automatically updated to point to the new commit object you have just created and your branch will be updated.

Any commit objects you create are local and exclusively yours until you choose to explicitly share them with a remote repository. This is radically different than the centralized model of version control where committing a change automatically uploads the work. For some foreshadowing of conflicts to come, just remember that each developer has a magic wand for his or her own repository.

To avoid conflict, developers have created conventions for the naming and use of branches. These conventions help developers to choose when to allow work to diverge (create new branch), and when to merge (combine commit objects from two or more branches). Generally there are two types of branches used in a convention: a long-running public branch; and a short-lived private branch. The function of a long-running branch is to act as a mediator for code which is contributed by lots of developers. The function of a short-lived branch is to sandbox the development of a new idea. These new ideas could be bug fixes, feature additions, or experimental refactoring. It's up to you!

When you share a branch with others, you may continue adding commit objects to your copy of the branch; however, now that the branch has been shared, someone else could also be adding commit objects to *their* copy of the branch. The next time you

try synchronize the two copies of the branch Git, as a simple content tracker, will defer to your expertise in combining the two sets of commit objects into a single shared history. This pause in the automated process is referred to as a *merge conflict* which sounds scary, I'll admit. Your job is to engage in *conflict resolution* and choose the best shared history for the work in question.

You will learn about strategies to keep your branches up to date in “[Updating Branches](#)” on page 51, and practical commands in [Chapter 7](#). Conflict resolution is also covered in [Chapter 7](#). First, though, let's take a look at some of the most common branch naming strategies developers use for maintaining their work in Git.

Choosing a Convention

A convention is an agreed-upon standard for how things are usually done. As developers, conventions allow us to quickly pick up the patterns of how a software project runs and integrate our work without disrupting the flow for others on the team. A documented convention makes onboarding easier for both the newcomer and others on the team who now need to take less time away from their work to help the new person.

Choosing an appropriate branching strategy for your team requires a conversation with your teammates about how you want to release your work. (From now on, I'll use “software” to mean your project, even though Git can be used for other things as well, such as writing books!) You might want to use a daily release schedule for a website, but a monthly, quarterly, or biannual release schedule for a downloadable software product. You may even have to comply with auditing or compliance regulations that have their own requirements. Once you know how you will release your software, and whether you have auditing or tracking requirements, you can choose the best branching strategy for your needs.

If you already know how you'll be working, take a few minutes to sketch out your requirements before diving into the details and choosing the branching strategy that best matches your needs. If you're not really sure what your system will look like, [Chapter 4](#) will give you ideas about how you might want to structure your team interactions.

As long as your team documents what they're doing, there are no hard rules. Indeed, if you look at the repositories for several open source projects, you'll see that there's no standard way of doing things. I recommend using the GitHub mirrors to easily compare the branching strategies used by [Drupal](#), [Git](#), and [Sass](#). These three very popular projects all use very different branching strategies.

There are no version control police who will show up at your door and tell you if you're doing things wrong, and you're almost guaranteed to find at least one other team who's making software in a similar fashion to you. But if you are new to work-

ing with version control, or your team has been struggling to figure out how to make things a little smoother, using one of the conventions described in this chapter might help.

Conventions

When working with software projects, there are generally two different approaches teams can take: they can either use an “always be integrating” approach, or they can collate the work that’s being done and release a collection of work all at once. In between these two opposites there are many different variations on how work can be done.

This section outlines several of the most common strategies used by development teams today. You may choose to adopt one of these strategies wholesale, or adapt it for your needs. No matter what you choose, remember to document your decisions.

Mainline Branch Development

The easiest branching strategy to understand is the mainline branch method. In this strategy, there are fewer branches to work with. The developers are constantly committing their work into a single, central branch—which is always in a deployment-ready state. In other words, the main branch for the project should only contain tested work, and should never be broken.

As a team of one, I often work on tiny side projects that only just barely warrant having version control, such as writing an article for a magazine. In these cases, I commit all of my work in the default branch (named *master* by Git) as is shown in [Figure 3-1](#). If I have two unrelated ideas that I am working on, I might be lazy and choose to commit everything, or I might `stash` some of the work to save it for later. For these simple projects, it doesn’t warrant separating thinking into different branches in order to work efficiently.



Reading Ball-and-Chain Diagrams

Each circle on the diagram represents a *commit* of work stored in the Git repository that can be reversed. The proper name for these “ball-and-chain” commit diagrams is a *directed acyclic graph (DAG)*. There’s no quiz where you need to remember this. Promise. But it is a useful term if you’re looking for keywords for future research.




Figure 3-1. Mainline branch development: storing all commits to a single branch

As the project matures, there will be more and more to think about, and it will get harder to keep track of ideas. I'll start adding new branches as I think about new directions I might want to take my project in, but that aren't as fully thought out as some of the other pieces I'm working on. Perhaps I'll even expand my team and have a reviewer or two with their own, independent branches, as shown in [Figure 3-2](#). As the project grows in complexity (and team members), so will the number of branches. But they won't all be active all the time. Like in the story of *Goldilocks and the Three Bears*, your team will likely settle on a number of branch types that feel "just right." Each unit of work (or *sprint*) may have an accordion effect on the number of branches. At first, the developers are all working on their own pieces, and the number of branches expands. Then, as each of the developers finishes his or her work and integrates it with the others', the accordion compresses back down again.

At scale, this approach of having a single working branch is used by teams working with automated build procedures.



Terms for Teams Who Are Always Deploying

Continuous integration is the practice of having all developers incorporate their work into the mainline of the project several times a day. Continuous delivery is the practice of automating the steps from a developer's local workstation up to the server (but not deploying through an automated process). And finally, continuous deployment is the most complete definition of automation, with all code passing through a series of test gates directly to the production server.




Figure 3-2. Mainline development with branching: branches separate the work being contributed by multiple people

Perhaps it makes sense for your team to integrate their work into a central branch regularly, but only deploy work occasionally. As soon as you start collecting your work, you need to make a distinction between what you have locally, and what is being used on your production server. If all code is ready for deployment, it shouldn't be too big of a deal to add a little fix and roll everything out. But what if you have changes committed in your repository that are only mostly finished? This is where we start to move away from a purely continuous deployment strategy, and toward multiple branches in a scheduled deployment strategy.

There are several advantages to using a branching strategy that encourages regular integration of your work:

- There aren't very many branches across the entire project. This results in less confusion about where a change disappeared into.

- Commits that are being made into the code base are relatively small. If there is a problem, it should be relatively quick to undo the mistake.
- There are fewer emergency fixes, because any code that is saved into the main branch is ready to be deployed. Deployments can often be stressful for developers as they hold their breath while code goes live in production and wait to hear back from the code's users. With tiny frequent updates, this procedure becomes practiced, and finally automated to the point where it should be almost invisible to the end user.

There are disadvantages to using this strategy as well:

- The assumption is that the main branch contains deployment-ready code. If your team doesn't have a testing infrastructure, it can be risky to assume that new code won't break anything, especially as the project becomes more complex over time.
- The notion of a *deployment* is more appropriate for code that is automatically loaded onto a user's device (for example, a website). It is less appropriate for software that must be downloaded and installed. While updates that fix problems are welcomed, even I would get annoyed if I had to download and reinstall an application on my phone on a daily basis.
- One of the ways developers can verify code on production is to hide the feature behind a flag or a flipper. Facebook, Flickr, and Etsy are all rumored to use this technique. The potential risk here is that code can be abandoned behind the flags, resulting in a large technical debt for code that isn't removed because it is hidden.

Unfortunately, it is out of the book's scope to describe how to set up the infrastructure for continuous deployment because it will be somewhat dependent on the language you are writing in (each language has its own testing libraries) and your deployment tools. If you would like to read more about the philosophy, the book *Continuous Delivery: Reliable Software Releases Through Build, Test, and Deployment Automation* by Jez Humble and David Farley (Addison-Wesley Professional) is a good starting place.

Branch-Per-Feature Deployment

To overcome some of the limitations of the single branch strategy just described, you can introduce two additional types of branches: feature branches and integration branches. Technically, they aren't different kinds of branches; it's just the convention of what type of work is committed to the branch that differs.

In the branch-per-feature deployment strategy, all new work is done in a feature branch, which is as small as it can be to contain a whole idea. These branches are kept up to date with the work being done by other developers via an integration branch. When it is time to release software, the build master can selectively choose which fea-

tures to include in the build and create a new integration branch for deployment. As Figure 3-3 shows, a build does not necessarily include all of the work completed since the last build.




Figure 3-3. Branch-per-feature: feature branches are kept up to date via an integration branch

By adding feature branches and an integration branch, you can continue to have deployment-ready code, but also a pause before deploying the code. The most popular description of this model is by [Adam Dymitruk](#). A slightly earlier description of this model was by Scott Chacon and is named the [GitHub Flow](#). With a [few minor updates](#), this process is still used by GitHub today.

In the GitHub Flow branching model, anything in the *master* branch is deployable. When working on new code, GitHub Flow has the developers create a descriptively named feature branch and commit their work regularly to this branch. This branch is kept up to date with *master* and is regularly pushed to a branch on the shared repository, allowing others to see which features are actively being worked on. When developers think their work is complete, or when they need help with their work, they will issue a pull request to the *master* branch. In the ticketing system, there will then be a conversation about the work that is being proposed.

Up to this point, the GitHub Flow is virtually the same as the Dymitruk model. Where they differ is in how the deployment happens. In the Dymitruk model, a build is made by selecting which features are ready to be incorporated. In the GitHub Flow

model, once a pull request is accepted, the work is immediately ready to be deployed from its feature branch. This makes the strategy closer to mainline development. Originally, GitHub merged its feature branches into the *master* branch and then deployed the *master* branch. Nowadays, the feature branch is deployed and if there are no errors, it is merged into *master* as shown in Figure 3-4. This means that if there are problems with a feature branch, *master* can immediately be redeployed because it is proven to be in a working state.




Figure 3-4. GitHub Flow: feature branches are deployed after a review and then merged into master

There are several advantages to using a branch-per-feature deployment strategy:

- Much like mainline development, the focus is on rapid deployment of code.
- Unlike the mainline development, there is an optional build step. When the build step is used, there is the option to select which features should be incorporated into the *master* branch for deployment.

There are disadvantages to using a branch-per-feature deployment branching strategy as well:

- If code is kept on a feature branch, but it is not immediately rolled into *master*, there is an extra maintenance requirement for developers who need to keep their features up to date while waiting to be rolled into the deployed branch.
- The semantic naming of the branches helps those who are familiar with the system, but it also represents an insider language that can make onboarding more difficult if there are a lot of open features.
- There is now a housekeeping requirement for developers to remove old branches as they are rolled into *master*. This isn't a large burden, but it is more than would be required from working out of a single *master* branch.

The branch-per-feature strategy offers a nice middle ground between mainline development and scheduled deployment. In some ways, scheduled deployment extends the branch-per-feature strategy, but with specific naming conventions.

State Branching

Unlike the strategies up to this point, state branching introduces the idea of a *location* or *snapshot* for some of the branches. Often our deployment diagrams are overly simplified and suggest that code moves between environments ([Figure 3-5](#)), but generally this isn't really how it happens. Instead, [Figure 3-6](#) shows the code is merged from one branch to another, and each of the branches is deployed to a specific environment. (Yes, we'll talk about tagged releases later. Patience, grasshopper.) As [Figure 3-6](#) shows, there's often a mismatch between the branch names that are used and the name of the environment we are deploying to. (What does *master* mean? Is it for production? For development? Are you sure?) This strategy was described as the [GitLab Flow](#) model.




Figure 3-5. Deployment lies: code doesn't really walk from the local server to the production server




Figure 3-6. The real deployment process uses a centralized code hosting system

Through branch naming conventions, GitLab Flow makes it clear what code is going to be used in what environment, and therefore what conditions might need to be met before merging in commits. For example, you would clearly not merge untested code into a branch named *production*. Alternatively, if you are shipping code to “the outside world,” GitLab Flow suggests having release branches. Ideally, these release branches should follow **semantic versioning** conventions, although GitLab Flow does not explicitly require it.



Know When to Increment with Semantic Versioning

In semantic versioning, a release should always be numbered as follows: MAJOR.MINOR.PATCH. The first number (MAJOR) should be incremented when you make API-level changes that are not backward compatible. The second number (MINOR) should be incremented when you add *new* functionality that does not break existing functionality (it is *backward compatible*). The third number (PATCH) should be incremented when you make backward-compatible bug fixes.

An interesting variation on the state branching strategy is the **branch naming convention** that the Git project uses. It has four named *integration* branches:

maint

This branch contains code from the most recent stable release of Git as well as additional commits for point releases (*maintenance*).

master

This branch contains the commits that should go into the next release.

next

This branch is intended to test topics that are being considered for stability in the *master* branch.

pu

The *proposed updates* branch contains commits that are not quite ready for inclusion.

The branches work much like a stacked pyramid. Each of the “lower” branches contain commits that are not present in the “higher” branches. As is shown in [Figure 3-7](#), *maint* has the fewest commits, and *pu* has the most commits. Once code has passed through the review process, it is incorporated into the next integration branch, getting closer to being incorporated into an official release.




Figure 3-7. Integration branches used by the Git project

There are several advantages to using a state branching strategy:

- Branch names are context specific and completely relevant to the work at hand.
- There is no guessing about the purpose of each branch, making it easier for people to select the right branch when merging their work.

There are also disadvantages to using a state branching strategy:

- It's not always obvious where to *start* a branch from without guidance.
- Because the branch names are extremely specific to the context of that team, it can be harder to get consistency across projects, making onboarding more difficult.

Left to my own devices, I typically end up with this style of branching for my own projects. I like using words that mean something *to me* instead of terms that meant something to someone else on some other team. Pedants, unite! Unless you prefer your own word. ;)

Scheduled Deployment

Scheduled deployment branching is the most appropriate strategy to use if you do not have a completely automated test suite, and in any situation where you must schedule a deployment. This may be because you have deployment windows (for example, never after 4PM, and never on a Friday); or an additional regulatory gate you need to pass through (for example, iOS applications being deployed to the App Store). As soon as you involve humans in a review process, or someone else's arbitrary constraints on your deployment process, there will inevitably be delays *somewhere*, and you will need a way to suspend your work while you wait for the humans.

Through the different types of branching strategies, we have been adding an increasing amount of complexity to the branching that takes place in a repository. We started with just one branch, and then we added features and an integration branch. In a scheduled deployment, we add to this again. However, scheduled deployments can get quite complex in their branching patterns. They should be built up over time, and only as the complexity is warranted.

In this section, I will walk you through the progression of how the GitFlow branching strategy can be implemented by a team. GitFlow, the most popular implementation of this strategy, was first described by [Vincent Driessen](#). It has been used by countless teams around the world to structure software projects. It can look very complex when it is presented in its final form. Fortunately, though, software projects build up to this point; they don't start out this way. If there are any parts of the GitFlow that which are not relevant for your team, you can omit them from your project.

Let's walk through the model together.

At first your software project has a single branch, `develop`. From this branch, your programmers create a diverging branch and add their features. [Figure 3-8](#) shows that at this point, the diagram of GitFlow looks very similar to the previous models described in this chapter. In this case I will use the term “features” very broadly. A feature could actually be a bug fix, a refactoring, or indeed a completely new feature. Ideally when you’re working with a team, a feature will be described in a ticket before you start your work, and the branch name will resemble the ticket name. For example, if you had a ticket “1234” that was a bug report to fix a broken link, and you were using the convention `[ticket_id]-[terse_title]`, your branch name would be `1234-fixing_links`.




Figure 3-8. Development and feature branches used in GitFlow

Your team works and works and works and then you get to a point where you say “No new features!” We’ll often refer to this as *feature freeze*. At this point, a new branch is created from the `development` branch, as shown in [Figure 3-9](#), and the only

things that can be committed to this branch are bug fixes. These bugs may include regressions in performance, security flaws, and other general bits and bobs that are now broken. In more traditional Waterfall team structures, this bug-fixing period would be led by a quality assurance team. In a more Agile team, a developer would follow the issues through the series of branches to deployment, and would even be responsible for testing the work of others. We'll talk more about the review process in [Chapter 8](#).




Figure 3-9. Feature freeze in GitFlow; only bug fixes are allowed

Perhaps not all features were completed when the feature freeze happened, so there is still work being committed to the `develop` branch. And if bugs are reported, these bugs need to be incorporated “backward” into the `develop` branch as well. [Figure 3-10](#) shows our first view of a branching diagram with code being merged in two different directions. The longer your quality assurance period, the more likely you are going to have work happening both on the `develop` branch and also on the release branch.




Figure 3-10. Development continues, but is not incorporated into the release branch

After an amount of time in testing, it will be declared that all bugs have been found, and what remains is ready to be deployed. Congratulations! At this point, all code that has passed quality assurance testing is committed to a new branch, *master*, which is then tagged (like a bookmark) with the version of the software at that point. The software is then deployed as shown in [Figure 3-11](#). Your project manager gives you a heart-shaped candy, or maybe an animated GIF, and you get the rest of the day off. Good job, team! (If your project manager is not doing this, kindly send them my way and I'll have a little chat with them on your behalf. We're all friends here, it's cool.)

Of course, reality dictates that sometimes bugs that need to be immediately fixed will sneak into the software. These *hotfixes* are so critical that a programmer should not go home for the evening before they are fixed. They are generally made by initiating a branch from the production branch, and when the hotfixes are released, they do not contain any additional work that has been happening since the last official release, as shown in [Figure 3-12](#).




Figure 3-11. Software is released by merging onto a new branch, master, with a tag



Define “Urgent” with Your Team

A developer I used to work with once told me that a bug could only be marked as a *hotfix* if he wasn’t allowed to go to the pub for a pint of beer before it was fixed. This radically changed my perception of what it meant for a problem to be marked as *urgent*. We recalibrated our definition of “urgent” and had fewer late nights as a result. In the same vein, I once worked with a client who was willing to mark tickets as “super very important, for later.” Have fun with your naming conventions where you can but make sure you document what they mean so you can avoid frustration of things not being completed in a timely manner.

We’ve slowly built up these branches as we needed different places for work to continue happening. You don’t need to create all of these branches to start. In fact, it’s better if you don’t, because it ends up being more code to maintain. Once you’ve got code in production, and code in development, you end up having a lot of wheels turning on your branching graph, as shown in [Figure 3-12](#). This can be overwhelming for a newcomer, but it will be a natural progression for any developer who has

worked on the project from the beginning. And if you choose to use this convention, it will also feel familiar to any new developer who has worked with this model previously.




Figure 3-12. A hotfix is made, rolled into master, and our release tag is now 1.0.1

There are several advantages to using a scheduled deployment strategy:

- Scheduled deployment does not require an extensive testing infrastructure to start using.
- The process of building software, with phases for development, quality assurance, and production, is very common. This means GitFlow conventions will feel very familiar to software developers once they understand the process of how and where their typical tasks happen in the branching convention.
- By adhering to conventions, developers should always be able to determine from which branch they should begin their work.
- This is also a good model for versioned software, such as a product that you'd download from an app store where it is not appropriate to be deploying a new version every few days.

There are disadvantages to using a scheduled deployment branching strategy as well:

- There is a lot of cognitive overhead for developers who are new to software deployment and haven't experienced the process of walking a product through each phase of development.
- If developers start their work from the wrong branch, it can be squirrelly to get everything back in sync.
- It's not as trendy as continuous deployment.

The scheduled deployment strategy offers the most rigid conventions about how code should be moved through the review gates. It is typically used when there is little to no automation for code review, and it is always present in some form for projects that are not using an automatic deployment scheme. Any time work is collated before being released, you will have at least some of the characteristics described in this section.

Updating Branches

This chapter has focused on common strategies used to isolate and merge streams of work. The strategies have focused on a single best-path scenario where branches of work are magically kept up to date with all relevant work happening elsewhere. In a distributed version control system the way you incorporate external work is independent of the branching strategy that you've chosen. When updating a branch, you can choose from one of two strategies: merging or rebasing. Before diving into the differences in these two strategies, let's take a quick look at how connections are maintained between multiple repositories.

Every Git repository is an autonomous record of changes. Connections can be made between repositories by establishing a remote reference. This reference allows a developer to copy a record of all commit objects made in the remote repository to his or her local repository. Remote connections are typically made to repositories with at least a partially shared history. For example, the initial download of a repository using the command `clone` would result in a duplicate copy of the remote repository and its commit objects.

Let's say, for example, you wanted to add your work to your coworker's branch. You make a connection to their remote repository, fetch their branch, and try to add your work. But you can't! If it were a local branch, you could add a few new commit objects to the tip of the branch. However, because it is a *remote* branch you want to update, you cannot assign a new commit object as the tip of the branch in your repository because this can only be done by the owner of the remote repository. Instead, you must first create a new tracking branch to store your changes.



Some Tracking Branches are Automatic

By default the command `clone` will create a tracking branch named `master` that is identical to the remote branch of the same name.

So now you have a local copy of a branch which you can add new commits to, a reference copy of the branch which you *cannot* add commits to, *and* the original branch still exists in the remote repository. Inevitably these branches will get out of sync as you and your coworker make changes to your respective repositories. Remember when you update your local repository you have two branches you need to update. On its own the command `fetch` will update the reference copy of the branch, downloading any new commits. Your mutable tracking copy of the branch, however, can be updated in more than one way. This is because you are now merging two branches into one, an action for which there are multiple strategies in Git. And where there is choice, there is potential for disagreement on which method should be used.

The process of updating your tracking branch from its remote reference will typically be achieved by using the command `pull`. However, `pull` is a combination of two discrete steps: `fetch` and `merge` *or* `fetch` and `rebase`. By default the command `pull` uses the `merge` strategy to update the local branch; however, by adding the parameter `--rebase`, a developer can opt to bring his or her local branch up to date using a `rebase` strategy instead.



All Your Rebase Are Belong to Us

Rebasing can be used to update a sequence of commits in one of two ways. First, as an alternate method to merging when incorporate new work from a related branch (*bringing a branch up to date*). Second, to alter history on the existing branch by adding, changing, or removing individual commits in the branch's history of commits to make it a more concise history. This section refers to the former use of the term.

Rebasing has earned its reputation for being complicated and frustrating. But from a graphing perspective, rebasing is actually the easiest strategy to read. [Figure 3-13](#) shows two branches before and after rebasing one branch onto another. Typically, we explain rebasing as replaying existing commits onto an existing time line. This analogy, although technically incorrect, works extremely well as a mental model for understanding the difference between `merge` and `rebase`.

While the command `rebase` is used to bring a branch up to date, the command `merge` is used to introduce completely new work. When the command `merge` is used with the *fast-forward* strategy the resulting graph is virtually identical to the output of a rebased branch. This fast-forward merging only works if the branch receiving the

merge contains only commits that are included in the incoming branch. As Figure 3-14 shows, the graph for a fast-forward merge is as clean as rebasing.




Figure 3-13. Rebasing two branches changes the history of one branch so that it appears as though the other branch was always in place

When there is new work on both branches, and you want to combine the work, you will need to store the combined work in a new commit. Several different merge strategies can be applied, and Git will choose the best one for your particular situation. If you're really curious about the different merge strategies, the Git help pages for merging can tell you how an octopus and a recursive merge are different. To read the documentation, run the command `git help merge`.



Need Help Choosing Between Merge and Rebase?

The graphed output is virtually identical for two branches which have been combined using either merge with fast forward or rebase. This can make it confusing to know which one should be used at what point. So confusing, in fact, that some teams choose to use the commands interchangeably! If you invest a little time in understanding when to use which strategy you will have agility in using different branching strategies for different projects you may work on. [Merge or Rebase?](#) includes a decision tree diagram to help you identify when you should be using each of the two strategies.




Figure 3-14. Merging two branches using the fast-forward strategy is as clean as rebasing

If you are merging to bring your work up to date, the graphed history can get quite difficult to read as the connections become bidirectional. In other words, history swerves between the two branches as the code is brought up to date and new features are published into the main branch. [Figure 3-15](#) shows how a merge keeps a historical record of where something came from. This is great if you’re incorporating a feature branch into the main development branch for your project, but it can be quite confusing if you’re trying to read the history of only the current features because the main development branch will now be spaghettiied into your history graph, with merged connections being drawn from both the feature branch and the integration branch.

As a result of this synchronization issue, developers using Git typically don’t work on the tracking branch when they are planning to submit their work back to a project. Instead, a developer will make a fourth copy of the branch (a copy of the tracking branch which is a copy of the reference branch which is a copy of the remote branch). Regardless of the branching strategy, a tracking branch generally maps onto any long-running branch (e.g., master, or a release branch), and the working branch is a feature, ticket, or hotfix branch.

Rebasing a branch to bring it up to date makes history easier to read by simplifying the graph. Rebasing does, however, come at a cost especially if your copy of the branch contains commit objects you have created. In order to rebase a branch that has its own unique commits, you must replay each of your commits onto the new branch tip—assigning each commit a completely new identifier in Git as it is assigned

a new parent. This can cause confusion if the commit that is assigned a new parent was one that had previously been shared in other remote repositories. In addition to the new identifiers, each time you replay a commit, there is a potential for a merge conflict, and conflicts are time consuming to deal with. It's a little like keeping timesheets: so long as you invest a little time each day to keep your timesheets up to date, they're no big deal. But if you're really bad at remembering to make entries on your timesheets each day, it can be time consuming to try and catch up. The reward for maintaining an up to date branch through a rebasing strategy is an easy-to-read branch history. But is it worth it? It can cost novice Git users a fair amount of confidence if they are not entirely comfortable resolving merge conflicts.

Your homework is to talk with your team about which is more important: ease of use (choose merging to bring branches up to date), or an easier-to-read historical graph (choose rebasing to bring branches up to date).




Figure 3-15. Merging two branches without the fast-forward strategy

Summary

If you are working with a Git hosting system, such as GitHub, Bitbucket, or GitLab, a branch might be used to separate the work being done for a particular bug or feature ticket. Depending on your branching strategy, your goal may be to keep the branches separate indefinitely, or you may want to merge the branches every so often to com-

bine the work that has been done separately into one deployable branch. Even though all of the information is stored in the repository, only one branch is ever visible at a time. The checked-out branch is visible in the working directory. So if you have two ideas that you've been working on and you want them both to be present on your server, you'll need to merge the two branches into a common branch so that they can both appear at once.

This chapter covered several branching strategies that you can use with Git, along with variations within these strategies that have been used by some teams:

- Mainline development
- Branch-per-feature deployment
- State branching
- Scheduled deployment

In addition to these strategies, you will also need to decide how your team will incorporate new work into shared branches; and keep branches up to date. For very novice teams, there is not always an obvious answer to how branches should be kept up to date. Two strategies were offered: rebasing or merging. A rebasing strategy can be more difficult especially if it is not performed regularly; however, it does give your history a cleaner graph that is easier to review. By using merges to keep your branch up to date, the history of your project will be more difficult to review. So if the origin of how your work came to be doesn't matter, you can choose either strategy, but if you will be reviewing the history often, rebasing will make future work easier (even though it can be more time consuming in the moment).

Workflows That Work

I love working with teams of people to hash out a plan of action—the more sticky notes and whiteboards the better. Throughout the process, there may be a bit of arguing, and some compromises made, but eventually you get to a point where people can agree on a basic process. Everyone gets back to their desks, clear about the direction they need to go in and suddenly, one by one, people start asking, “But how do I start?” The more cues you can give your team to get working, the more they can focus on the hard bits. Version control should *never* be the hard part.

By the end of this chapter, you will be able to create step-by-step documentation covering:

- Basic workflow
- Integration branches
- Release schedules
- Post-launch hotfixes

This chapter is essentially a set of abstracted case studies on how I have effectively used Git while working in teams. You will notice my strong preference for Agile methodologies, in particular Scrum, in this chapter. This process for collaboration works well with the popular workflow model, [GitFlow](#). If you are already very familiar with GitFlow, you should still read the first section in this chapter on establishing and documenting your team’s procedures.

Evolving Workflows

In [Chapter 2](#), you learned about governance models, and in [Chapter 3](#), you learned about branching strategies. The way we work together through Git can get quite com-

plicated very quickly, and the greater the complexity, the harder it is to remember how it all works. Establishing conventions with your team will help to maintain consistency, which will help you to quickly decipher the history of your code.

In this section you will discover:

- Basic tools to document your team's process
- Where documentation should be placed
- What types of things need to be documented
- Sample states for your ticketing system

It is never too late to talk to your team about how they want to work together, and it's never too late to improve on the processes you have in place. If you are using Agile methodologies, you may already have dedicated time for retrospective meetings, or Kaizens, to review your development process.

Documenting Your Process

Git, as an inanimate piece of software, doesn't actually care how you set things up. Rest easy, because Git won't suddenly reach out from your computer and wag its finger at you crossly if you use the wrong branch name or use merge when you should have rebased (although sometimes I think it would be nice if it did). It's up to you to decide how you want to use Git.

The easiest way to be consistent is to follow a set of rules, or a checklist. Each time you begin working on a new site you should document the workflow. By starting from a template ([Example 4-1](#)), you will ensure "obvious" details are still obvious when you onboard new people, or even better, in a moment of crisis.

Example 4-1. Template workflow

```
Product Manager: Name
Dev site: URL
Branch deployed on dev site: name of branch
Live site: URL
Branch deployed on live site: name of branch
When starting a dev ticket, branch from: name of branch
When starting a hotfix ticket, branch from: name of branch
When updating your work, use: git command
When merging your work post review, use: git command
```

The more details you include in your documentation, the more consistency you will have among your teammates, and the easier it will be to unpack the historical record of your repository.

If you are collocated, sit down and sketch out the diagram of where the permission divisions should be made in your code. If you're a distributed team, that doesn't mean you can't still sketch things out. And you don't need to be an illustrator. There are lots of decent diagram programs out there to help you sketch out your ideas. I'm a fan of [Balsamiq](#) for very basic diagrams. Others have also recommended [Pencil](#), [OmniGraffle](#), [Dia](#), and [Inkscape](#). The diagrams from [Chapter 2](#) will be a useful starting point for many teams. All of the diagrams from this book are also available as both SVG files and Balsamiq files. You can download them from the [Git for Teams Diagrams](#) repository.

Documenting Encoded Decisions

Throughout this book, I will talk about working on tickets, or issues. The rigor of open source software projects has enforced more than a few good work habits, one of which is the use of a bug tracker to capture all requirements. For open source projects, I've used product-specific trackers, such as the [Drupal Project module](#) (affectionately referred to as *The Issue Queue*); and generic solutions, such as [GitHub](#). For internal projects, I've also used [Pivotal Tracker](#), [JIRA](#), [Redmine](#), and [Unfuddle](#), among others.

Each of these systems has positive and negative aspects. I don't have any one favorite product. At their core, these systems allow you to document and track the discussion of the work to be done, the tasks that need to be completed, and a summary of any follow-up issues that may have been discovered during quality assurance testing. I cannot imagine working with a team where there wasn't a centralized ticket tracker capturing the information about the work being done.

Collocated teams may choose to use a whiteboard and sticky notes to show what is currently being worked on. Some teams also use very simple spreadsheets to track who is currently working on what task. Perhaps the conversations and related assets (e.g., diagrams, design assets, wireframes) are stored in a wiki so that whiteboards can be wiped down and used for the next conversation. No matter which system you use, I encourage you to track at least the *rationale* for the decisions that are made about *why* features are being built in an easy-to-read and searchable system. If you don't capture this information in writing somewhere, you may have to resort to guessing about why decisions were made in the past.

Using ticketing systems, however, can make teams dependent on sticking with that particular system if the decisions aren't also captured in the commit messages for each change to the repository. Your team may choose to think of the conversation as ephemeral, tracking conclusions in commit messages and allowing themselves to move on from the conversation itself.

It's a balance. The trick is to anticipate future conversations and ensure your tracking system has a way to easily answer questions. Perhaps you want to prevent a future

developer from forcing you to rehash a conversation after a decision is made. In this case, you'll want a ticketing system that shows the progression of arguments from both sides (as comments) as well as the final conclusion, and a link to the commit where the decision was solidified as code. Perhaps you are creating software that is subject to industry regulations and you are required to prove that software has been through a specific review process. In this case, it may be sufficient for your software repository to have signed commits from individual quality assurance testers.

I don't think there is any one system that is better at tracking software development. Many have strengths, and they all have their limitations. If you are using a specific process management philosophy that advocates a specific task workflow, you may find it easier to use software products that have been optimized for this process. For example, a Kanban board is a very specific way of dealing with tasks.

Most of the Git hosting platforms also have a basic ticket tracker to help you coordinate the development of your project. [Part III](#) covers three of these systems (Bitbucket, GitHub, and GitLab) in greater detail.

Ticket Progression

Even if you are working on an internal project without fixed deadlines, I recommend finding a small unit of time to iterate through. My personal preference is for one-week sprints. For internal projects, these sprints can act as arbitrary deadlines to keep the team motivated and moving forward. At the end of each sprint, I recommend hosting an internal demo so that the team can show off their work. This public display of work keeps developers accountable. If your team is distributed, you can host these demos over [Google Hangout](#), or [GoToMeeting](#) for larger teams.

Project methodologies that track the work of people will all have some variation of these basic ideas:

Not Now

In Scrum terms, this would be referred to as the *product backlog*. Essentially, though, it's anything that has not been deemed relevant for this work effort (or *sprint*). Developers should not pick from this list of tickets. The backlog should be prioritized to give hints to the team on what should be worked on in the next work sprint. Recently, a team that I worked with referred to this as the "super very important for later" pile.

Ready for Work

Prioritized tickets for this work iteration. These tickets might be blockers for tickets in the backlog, or simply be the next piece the team has chosen to work on. Your team may want to subdivide this stage into separate subcategories, such as: Ready for Development, Ready for Code Review, Ready for Testing, Ready for Client Approval, and Ready for Deployment.

In Progress

A developer is currently working on this ticket, or a quality assurance review is being done. With larger teams, you may want to break this category down further as well. For example: In Definition, In Development, and In Testing.

Completed

The work has been finished, or has been canceled. Perhaps there were follow-up tickets, but only very rarely should a ticket be reopened after it has passed a code review, quality assurance review, and a client review.



Do Not Allow Your Project Managers to Overcategorize!

Allow your team to grow into states as needed. I have worked on too many projects where a team of project managers had decided on a range of categories that described every possible state. The system was *always* cumbersome to use. (And I *am* a category loving manager!) The developers never liked trying to remember to micro-shift their tickets, and, more often than not, the tickets weren't in the right state unless a project manager was the one moving the tickets through the progression of states. Have compassion for developers who want to develop, not spend their day updating timesheets and micromanaging ticket updates. Start simple. Make as few categories as possible. As the *team of developers* asks for new states, add them.

As an example of a variation, the team I worked with in the fall of 2014 had nine people working in the ticket tracker on the tickets throughout the project (a relatively small project, but a typical team size for Agile projects). The ticket tracker had summary columns for the following statuses:

On Deck

This ticket is ready to be worked on, and should be completed during this week's work.

In Progress

This ticket is actively being worked on.

Pull Request

The code has been written, and is ready to be reviewed and merged into the main branch.

Needs Testing

The code has been reviewed, and rolled into the development branch. It is ready to be reviewed on the quality assurance server by a team member.

Done

The ticket is completed. This state is also used for tickets that are closed without being completed (duplicate task, feature no longer needed).

The backlog was simply a collection of tickets without a status assigned.

If a developer was ever blocked, he or she would reassign the ticket to the person most likely to “unstick” the issue. Getting into the habit of trading tickets to communicate with others is a cultural piece that won’t work for all teams—but it does seem to work well for distributed teams where you can’t just tap someone on the shoulder to get your questions answered.

I love a categorization system more than the average developer; however, adding complexity has consequences. Complexity increases the time it takes people to decide which variation their ticket currently belongs to (“is this *Needs Testing* or *Pull Request*?”). It also increases the number of times developers have to open the ticketing system, instead of their code editor. This has the potential of both improving communication with other developers *and* slowing down the actual doing of the work. You’ll need to monitor this closely to see where you can make refinements to improve your own process.



Pick Your Own Battles

Teams I’ve worked on have responded well to developers being able to self-assign at least a few of their own tickets. Sure, there may be some tickets that require the specialized knowledge of one person, but it’s amazing how much of a difference it can make when it’s that one person who identifies he or she needs to work on that ticket instead of being told what to do.

It is near impossible to over-communicate with your team members. I don’t mean filling your time with unstructured meetings; I mean truly communicating what you are working on, and what is preventing you from getting your tasks completed. The ticket status helps you to standardize the communication—so make it easy to keep up to date, and ensure everyone on the team gets into the habit of confirming their ticket status once a day.

A Basic Workflow

This basic workflow is appropriate for small teams of one or two trusted developers. As was mentioned in the introduction, it is a stripped down version of GitFlow; but without the extra levels of complexity, it also resembles a branch-per-feature workflow. As such, you may find it also works well for teams of developers with a testing infrastructure, who are aiming for rapid deployment of code.

Key characteristics include:

- Governance model: contributors with shared maintenance
- Integration merge: performed by original developer
- Integration branch: *develop*

My personal preference for this workflow is closer to a Kanban-style system, which allows tickets to flow through a work board; however, I find it much easier to communicate plans to outside stakeholders by using the Scrum approach to time-boxed sprints. In Scrum, a specific set of tickets is loaded into a sprint and the goal is to get the number of outstanding tickets down to zero by the deadline. For internal projects, Scrum-style sprinting can act as arbitrary deadlines to keep teams motivated and moving forward.

At the end of each sprint, I recommend hosting an internal demo so that the team can show off their work and ask for help from the wider group if they are stuck on a specific piece.

The workflow is as follows:

1. As you begin a ticket, update the status in the ticket tracker to say the ticket is In Progress. This will notify your team about what you are currently working on, and will give you the number for the branch you will create to work on your ticket.
2. From the branch *develop*, create a new branch whose name includes the ticket ID and a terse description of the work. If you are working on tickets that have subtasks, ensure the branch name uses the most relevant ticket number. For a bigger feature, this ticket might be referred to in your ticketing system as a Meta ticket or Epic ticket. If you are working on only part of the larger feature, you should use the smallest relevant ticket number. Your ticket system might refer to this as a user story, an issue, or bug ticket.
3. Work on your ticket, ensuring you keep the ticket branch up to date with any changes that might have been incorporated into the branch *master* since you started your work. Begin each commit message with the ticket number enclosed in square brackets: [#1234].
4. Run relevant tests for your code to ensure typos and basic errors are caught. This may include a spellcheck, and a language syntax check (*linting*). If you are working in a test driven environment you will definitely have additional tests to run.
5. When you have completed your work (or think you have!), make a final commit with the keyword “Resolves” and then the ticket number: Resolves #1234.

6. Optionally, push your ticket branch to the code hosting repository. With the keyword in place in your commit message, this will move your ticket tracker forward to the next step.
7. In your ticket tracker add a comment to the ticket to include a note about the rationale for the approach you took and some kind of proof that the work was been completed. For example, a screenshot of how the ticket changes the display on your local development environment. This acts as a sanity check later if, suddenly, things stop working.
8. Ensure the ticket branch is up-to-date and then merge your work in the branch develop, and, assuming there are no merge conflicts, push the updated branch to the central repository.
9. Assuming there were no new problems introduced by the new work (*regressions*), the ticket can be closed.
10. Finally, delete your local ticket branch and the remote copy of the ticket branch.



In some ticketing systems, adding a pound sign (#) will automatically link the commit message to the ticket number. Adding square brackets around the ticket number will ensure that commit messages aren't omitted if you choose to rebase your work because lines beginning with a # are ignored when commit messages are automatically composed for the new commit objects. In many systems, including the keyword "resolves" will automatically move a ticket from In Progress to the next state (for example, Needs Testing or Closed); this will vary depending on the ticketing system you're using. Check the documentation for whatever system you are using.

This pattern works extremely well for small teams with no peer review requirements. As your team starts to grow, or if you have a specific quality assurance process you need to undergo, you may find this pattern is not rigorous enough for your needs.

Trusted Developers with Peer Review

This expands the basic team workflow by adding a peer review process. Now, every ticket is reviewed by someone on the team from a code perspective. The rationale for peer review testing, and not just automated testing (or test-driven development), is covered in [Chapter 8](#).

Key characteristics include:

- Governance model: contributors with shared maintenance
- Integration merge: performed by the reviewer

- Integration branch: *develop*

The workflow is as follows:

1. As you begin a ticket, update the status in the ticket tracker to say the ticket is In Progress.
2. From your local copy of the branch *develop*, create a new branch.
3. Work on your ticket, ensuring your branch is kept up to date with rebasing. Begin each commit message with the ticket number enclosed in square brackets ([#1234]), or with the keyword “Resolves” and then the ticket number: Resolves #1234.
4. Run relevant tests for your code to ensure typos and basic errors are caught. This may include a spellcheck, and a language syntax check (*linting*). If you are working in a test driven environment you will definitely have additional tests to run.
5. Push your branch to the code hosting repository. This acts as your backup, so don’t skimp on this step!
6. When you’ve finished working on your ticket, ensure the branch is up to date with *develop*, and uploaded to the code hosting system. Mark your ticket as Needs Testing in the ticket tracker.

Assuming a manual review is necessary, and there isn’t a series of automated tests, the reviewer will finish off the remaining steps:

1. Perform a review of the work according to the original ticket description. It is the coder’s responsibility to ensure his or her work is clear, and that the steps to test the work are coherent. If necessary, send the ticket back to the developer with any necessary changes, or to bring the branch up to date if it has gotten out of sync with *develop*.
2. Merge the ticket branch into the branch *develop*, and, assuming there are no merge conflicts, push the updated branch to the central repository.
3. Assuming there were no regressions, the reviewer will now close the ticket and notify the developer that his or her work has been merged into the main branch. Both the developer and the reviewer can now delete their local copies of the ticket branch. Because they are currently in cleanup mode, the reviewer should delete the remote copy of the ticket branch; the developer might have to break focus in the current task to do the cleanup. Wherever possible, we should protect the focus, and flow, of our teammates.

Once your team is large enough to have a review process, it makes sense to also have a shared development server from which the team can conduct regular demos of their work. This development server can also double as a quality assurance machine

during the development process. To reduce the overhead for team members needing to check out the latest version of the *develop* branch and build the software, you may choose to set up a [Jenkins](#) instance to automate the process.

Untrusted Developers with QA Gatekeepers

This process is a minor variation on the previous section “[Trusted Developers with Peer Review](#)” on page 64. This time the process assumes an *untrusted* developer, who is not allowed to merge anyone’s work into the main branch. Instead, a trusted *quality assurance* (QA) team performs the final merge.

Key characteristics include:

- Governance model: contributors with collocated repositories
- Integration merge: performed by the reviewer
- Integration branch: *develop*

Developers begin by creating a fork of the project on the code hosting system, and then creating a local clone from this forked copy of the repository. This step is only performed once.

The workflow is as follows:

1. To begin a ticket, update the status in the ticket tracker to say the ticket is In Progress.
2. From your local copy of the branch *develop*, create a new branch.
3. Work on your ticket, ensuring your branch is kept up to date with rebasing. Push your ticket branch to your fork of the project as a backup of your work in progress.
4. Run relevant tests for your code to ensure typos and basic errors are caught. This may include a spellcheck, and a language syntax check (*linting*). If you are working in a test driven environment you will definitely have additional tests to run.
5. When you’ve finished working on your ticket, ensure the branch is up to date with *develop*, and push your work to your forked repository. Open a pull request (in some ticketing systems, this might be called a *merge request*) for your work.

The reviewer will finish off the remaining steps:

1. Perform a review of the work according to the original ticket description.
2. On the main copy of the repository, accept the pull request. Depending on the ticketing system, this might be done via a web UI, or in a local clone of the repository.

3. Assuming there were no regressions, close the ticket. Because the work was completed in a fork of the main project, there is no additional cleanup in the main repository.

This approach also works well if your team is mostly trusted developers, but you have a few contractors as well. You might want to have your contractors working in a fork of the repository, instead of giving them write access to the main project. For some types of software, this split might even be a requirement for your own staff. For example, if you were working on firmware for a medical device, you might have very strict government regulations you need to follow on who is allowed to check in work, and how that work must be reviewed before it is added to a repository.

Releasing Software According to Schedule

The vast majority of the projects I have worked on have used a release schedule to expose new versions of the software to its users. The process described in this section is based almost entirely on the very popular workflow, [GitFlow](#). If you are deploying continuously, and do not collate multiple tickets worth of work into a specific release, this section will not be relevant to you.

Publishing a Stable Release

Up to this point, all of the examples have been working from the branch, *develop*. Eventually, though, you'll want to release the product you've been working on. When you're ready to do this, you will need to split your repository into a public-facing *stable* version of the product, and a developer-facing "no guarantees" version of the product.

When the first version of your software is launched, a development manager will prepare the repository for a code release. Generally this work is done locally, and then pushed up to the main copy of the repository.

The workflow is as follows:

1. From an agreed-upon commit, create a new branch named *master*.
2. Tag the agreed-upon commit with a version number with an easy-to-remember naming convention. For example, v1.0.
3. Push the updated repository to the central code hosting system. If an automated build process is not being used, update the relevant servers with the new code.

Once the first release has been published, you will now split your work into stable, public-facing work and ongoing development.

Ongoing Development

Once an official release of a product has happened, your team will effectively be forced to think in two separate spaces at once: monitoring the health of the live code, and continuing the development process to add new features or improve those that already exist.

My preference, again, is for short work sprints. Developers are motivated to see their work in action. The longer the sprint, the longer people have to wait to see others engaging with their work.

The one-week release schedule I commonly use has the following routine. The days vary a little from team to team, but the generalized procedure is a good starting point for many teams.

Setup (Mondays):

- All work in the *develop* branch is merged into the testing branch, *qa*. Any work that isn't completed and peer reviewed by Monday simply remains in its ticket branches.
- The testing server is updated with the latest version of the *qa* branch.
- A QA checklist should be created for each of the user stories completed in the last week of work. A standardized ticket format will make this list easy to compile.

You may want to compile your QA checklist in a separate document, such as a Google Doc, or an internal wiki. I've also used saved queries in JIRA to look for tickets resolved in the last week, or which have been tagged for a specific release. This will depend entirely on how you choose to track progress in your ticketing system.

Testing (Mondays and Tuesdays):

- Automated tests are run to ensure no new business-critical interactions have suffered regressions (site visitors and members can still use all expected functionality).
- Team members responsible for testing complete the checklist and update the tickets according to a PASS or FAIL grade.
- Any bugs that are found have new tickets opened and are addressed before launch day by either a new fix, or by removing the relevant commits from the *qa* branch.

Launch Day (Wednesday):

- The *qa* branch is merged into the *master* branch and tagged with the release version.

- The live site is brought up to date by checking out the commit on the *master* branch, which has been designated as the newest release for the project. Using an explicit tag ensures you can easily roll back to a previous known state.

Announcements about the latest features and fixes are posted to the development blog. Many teams choose to wait a day or two after Launch Day before publishing the blog post. This allows the team to ensure the release is stable and does not need to be reversed.

Post-Launch Hotfix

Sometimes deployed code has mistakes in it. If a bug needs to be fixed quickly before the next batch of software is ready, an out-of-cycle fix might need to be made. These deployments are referred to as a *hotfix*.

In a hotfix, the work begins not from the *develop* branch, but from the *master* branch. This ensures the changes only introduce a fix that addresses the problem identified in the deployed code.

The workflow is as follows:

1. To create a hotfix branch, start by checking out the *master* branch, not the *develop* branch. This will ensure that no additional features accidentally sneak into the fix.
2. Generate a list of tag names, and locate the latest tagged release.
3. From the latest tagged release on the *master* branch, create a new branch, using the branch name `hotfix- <ticket_number>-<description>`. For example, `hotfix-1234-fixing_three_seat_issue`.
4. Complete the same review steps as you would for a development ticket.
5. Merge the tested hotfix branch into the *master* branch.
6. Tag the new commit on the *master* branch with the latest release version. For example, v1.0.1.
7. Merge the tested hotfix branch into the development branch so that the changes are not lost in the next official release of the software.

Collaborating on Nonsoftware Projects

Git isn't just for software developers! As a technical author, I've used Git a lot to track changes to files that weren't software—for example, configuration files, articles I'm writing, and even this book! Some people even use Git to maintain a personal journal.

To illustrate the importance of matching the Git commands to the team's process, let me explain how I structured the repository for this book.

While writing this book, I worked with the O'Reilly automated build tool, [Atlas](#). This system also has a web-based GUI, which allows editors to work on book files directly, and saved files are immediately committed to the *master* branch. Due to the GUI, there is no peer review process because anyone on my team is able to make edits directly to a file. My preference, however, is to work locally, and not through a web GUI. Initially, I had been keeping the branch overhead low locally and had just been working in *master* as well. It only took me one merge conflict to alter the way I was working locally.

When I wanted to update my work, I would use the command `fetch` to see if any changes had been made by my editors. With the `fetch` completed, I would compare my copy of the *master* branch with their copy of the *master* branch (`origin/master`). Assuming I agreed with all the editors' changes, I would merge in the editors' copy of the branch; if I disagreed, I would merge in their branch with the strategy `--strategy-option=ours`, effectively throwing out their changes but letting Git think that the two branches were merged.

This can be done on a per-commit basis, or if there is a merge conflict, it can be done on a very granular line-by-line basis with a merge tool. (It feels a bit passive-aggressive to be throwing stuff out, but really it's just the limitation of a single branch system where you don't have the ability to talk about the proposed changes in a separate branch.) Depending on the granularity of the commits, I might also choose to *cherry-pick* some commits (and keep them), but discard other commits.

Then I started getting reviews as marked-up PDFs and realized, once again, I had another way that I wanted to separate work. I wanted to be able to write a chapter and keep those commits nice and tidy, but sometimes I was mid-chapter when an edit came in that I wanted to address immediately. Instead of intermingling these commits, I set up the following structure for my branches: *master*, *drafts*, and one branch per chapter.

The branch *drafts* gave me a place to integrate all of the work that I'd been doing. It was kept up to date by merging in chapters as they were completed, or rebasing the *master* branch if changes had been made by one of my editors. When I was first writing chapters on my own, without others contributing, multiple branches would have been a lot of overhead to maintain, but as more contributors started offering different kinds of contributions, more granularity in branches allowed me to pick and choose how I wanted the manuscript to progress.

As you can see, my process differed wildly from the workflows used for software projects, but it's still Git that I'm working with! Your work may have its own idiosyncrasies that justify nonstandard branches. Don't be afraid to experiment, but when

you do, document your process well so that others can understand what is expected of them.

Summary

The workflows described in this chapter have been successfully implemented in teams I have worked with. Your own team might want to make adjustments, but starting from something will be a lot easier than starting from nothing.

- The workflow you use may change before and after the launch of your product.
- Before launch, you will likely have fewer integration branches, because the concept of a hotfix is unlikely to be an issue.
- By using your documentation to complete your work, you ensure your documentation is always up to date, which makes it faster to onboard others if you need help.

In [Part II](#), you will learn the commands necessary to implement the processes described in this part.

PART II

Applying the Commands to Your Workflow

This part of the book approaches the commands in Git from a very practical point of view. You will be presented with a scenario first, and then given the commands you would need to get yourself into (or out of) trouble.

Hands-on activities are sprinkled throughout the chapters. Where possible, you should do these activities because it will help you gain a greater understanding of the commands (and will make the messages feel more natural when working with your own software projects). Where there are diagrams provided, you should redraw them because every motion that you make when learning a new activity will help to develop the neural pathways needed to cement the information into your mind.

Before reading the chapters that follow, you should make sure you have the latest version of Git installed (see [Appendix B](#)) and that your system is correctly configured (see [Appendix C](#)).

CHAPTER 5

Teams of One

Although this book is aimed at teams of more than one, there are often times when we are working as a team of one—a solo developer. This might be a personal side project, or you might actually be the only developer on your team. Working solo with no team constraints can be intimidating because there's no one available to walk you through what you should do, or help you if you get stuck. In this chapter, I'll show you how I do my work when I'm working on my own projects. Of course there are places where I get tempted to cut corners as a solo developer (after all, no one is watching over my shoulder, so who would know if I took a little shortcut here or there?). Where I can, I will show you the implications of those shortcuts.

By the end of this chapter, you will be able to:

- Create a local copy of a remote repository
- Initialize version control for an existing set of files
- Create a new repository from an empty project directory
- Examine the history of a repository via its commit messages
- Work with branches to isolate different streams of work
- Make commits to a local repository
- Use tags to highlight individual commits
- Connect your project to a remote code hosting system

If you are a creator (as opposed to a reviewer or manager), the majority of your time will likely be spent using the commands outlined in this chapter. Being able to work effectively with all of the tools outlined here should be considered a prerequisite to the remaining chapters in this part.

Those who learn best by following along with video tutorials will benefit from [Collaborating with Git](#) (O'Reilly), the companion video series for this book.

Issue-Based Version Control

Someone once told me that the person who can best describe a problem is the most likely to solve it. In writing this book, I've found that to be entirely too true. When I write myself a TODO item that is vague, such as "finish chapter 4," I rarely feel motivated to work on the book. But when I write the task as "write-up sample workflow for small teams like Mai's," I become way more motivated to dive into the writing. This isn't unique to writing books, though. As a team of one, you might not feel entirely motivated to work on your code. If you're like me, though, if the work is re-framed as a way to help a person, you're more likely to get it done.



If you've never thought about what motivates you as a developer, you may enjoy Joe Shindelar's presentation "[A Developer's Primer to Managing Developers](#)".

You might be asking yourself, "what does this have to do with Git?" Each time you sit down to work on a project in source control, you should have an idea about what you're trying to do. It doesn't matter if you're developing a new feature, fixing a bug, refactoring old code, or just trying out a new idea; you should still have some kind of motivation for tinkering. There are a lot of different ways to write down what you want to work on, but the following works nicely and can be more rewarding than *just* working on tickets.

The ticket has three main parts:

Problem

A terse description of what you're trying to do

Rationale

The reason why you'd want to do this (who will it help if this problem is solved?)

Quality assurance test

How will I know that this problem has been solved?

This format is quite similar to another that I've seen used for Agile projects:

Card

A terse description of the problem, written from the perspective of the user

Conversation

Details about the problem you're trying to solve; where possible, it should avoid prescribing solutions

Confirmation

The steps a user (from the first part) will be able to take to verify the problem has been solved

In a team of one, you might feel that the overhead of a ticketing system is a bit much for you. Perhaps your paper notebook is sufficient. I often think this is true, but then as I get working on my project, I start to lose track of all the little ideas I had. Sometimes I start a new branch for each idea, but then end up getting buried under an avalanche of out-of-date branches. If this sounds like you, take a moment now to find the ticket tracking options in whatever code hosting system you use, and start to get into the habit of writing yourself love notes for what you plan to do with your software. At the very least, it will give you arbitrary numbers that you can use to create branches and help you keep track of your code.



If you don't have a code hosting system yet, I recommend GitLab, or its free online offering, GitLab.com. It will allow you to create private repositories with unlimited collaborators for free, and it can be installed on a local network if you are learning Git behind a firewall. The advantage of a private repository is that you can hide your work while you learn. If your work is hidden, you won't be able to take advantage of community support, but I understand if you're a bit shy right now. It happens to the best of us.

Once you have a way of tracking your ideas, the process for doing work should follow these steps:

1. Create a new ticket in your issue tracking system; note the number on the issue.
2. In your local repository, create a new branch using the format *issuenumber-description*.
3. Do the work described in the ticket (and only the work described in the ticket).
4. Test your work and make sure it is complete and correct. Ensure it passes your QA test from the ticket you wrote in the development environment.
5. You now have a “dirty” working directory that contains new and/or modified files. Add your changes to the staging area of your local repository.
6. Commit your staged changes to the repository.
7. Push your changes to a backup server. In many cases, this will also be where your tickets are being tracked, such as GitLab, Bitbucket, or GitHub. Depending on

your ticketing system, the ticket may now be marked as *resolved* but not necessarily *closed*.

8. When you are completely satisfied with your work, merge your ticket branch into your main branch (usually *master*) and push the revised branches to the code hosting system.
9. Test your work again to ensure there are no follow-up issues.
10. Update your ticket as appropriate to close it out.

Depending on the type of code you're writing, these steps may vary slightly. Rewrite this list, in full, and include any steps that are different for the way you work. For example, you may practice test-driven development, or have build scripts that you use to deploy your code. Commit to following your own process. If you're not really motivated by words, draw out your process instead ([Figure 5-1](#)).

However you choose to do it, make sure you capture your process. You may choose to tuck it into the repository as a *README* file, or print it out and paste it to your Kanban board. By practicing consistency now, it will become infinitely easier to work with your coworkers to establish a process that everyone can follow.

In the remainder of the chapter, you will learn the commands needed to use the process I described. We'll start by creating a new repository where you can store your work.

Creating Local Repositories

When you create a new repository in Git, you generally begin from one of three starting points:

- From a clone of an existing repository
- From an existing folder of untracked files
- From an empty directory

In this section, you will learn how to create a new repository using each of these three methods.

Begin by creating a folder that will store all of your sample repositories ([Example 5-1](#)). You may choose to put this folder on your desktop, or in your home directory, or somewhere else. Git won't care, so long as *you* remember where the folder is.




Figure 5-1. Sketch a diagram of your workflow

Example 5-1. Create a project directory in your home directory

```
$ mkdir learning-git-for-teams  
$ cd learning-git-for-teams
```

Unless otherwise stated, each of the exercises in this book will assume you have navigated to a sample repository within this folder. If it matters which repository you use, I will specify it in the instructions. Generally, however, it will not matter.

Cloning an Existing Project

On code hosting systems, such as GitLab or BitHub, when you navigate to a project page, you are typically given the option to download a *.zip* package of all the files or create a clone of the repository. Often these options are close together, but not always. **Figure 5-2** shows the location of the repository URL in GitLab.




Figure 5-2. Locating the URL to clone a repository



Practice What You Will Do Most Often

By starting with a repository, you will also have an easier time of learning the commands without having to invent problems to fix as you learn Git.

To download a copy of a project, you will use the command `clone`, as shown in **Example 5-2**. Unlike downloading a zipped set of files, creating a clone of a project

will download a copy of all the files in the repository—along with the commit history—and it will remember where you downloaded the code from by setting up the remote code hosting server as a tracked repository. Don’t worry, it doesn’t keep a persistent connection, but rather it bookmarks the location in case you want to check for updates and download them to your local repository at a later date.

You will only clone a project once. Once the project is downloaded, you will use a different set of commands to keep it up to date. In [Chapter 7](#), you will learn different ways to work with the command `clone`; in this chapter, we’re just going to use it to grab a snapshot of a project so that you have something to work with.

Example 5-2. Create a clone of the Git for Teams repository

```
$ git clone https://gitlab.com/gitforteams/gitforteams.git
```

The following should appear in the output of your terminal window:

```
Cloning into 'gitforteams'...
remote: Counting objects: 1040, done.
remote: Compressing objects: 100% (449/449), done.
remote: Total 1040 (delta 603), reused 915 (delta 538)
Receiving objects: 100% (1040/1040), 9.49 MiB | 1.68 MiB/s, done.
Resolving deltas: 100% (603/603), done.
Checking connectivity... done.
```

Congratulations! You have just cloned your first Git repository. You can muck about in this directory as much as you like. If you mess things up beyond recognition, delete the folder and run the `clone` command again.

Now that you have this directory, you also have all of the support material for this book. You can explore the supporting files, look for hidden Easter eggs, and generally have something to start with as you learn the more advanced commands without needing to worry about inventing weird scenarios, or destroying your own work.

Converting an Existing Project to Git

If I am working with software for the very first time, I tend to download a zipped package of files and begin versioning with an initial import of the software at that specific point. I’ll rip things out, move things around, and generally give myself a trial-by-fire introduction of how (and why) I might want to keep things exactly the way the original developers intended things to be.

In order to compare the effect of the commands you’re running, download a second instance of the *Git for Teams* repository, but this time grab a zipped package of the same repository you just cloned:

1. Navigate to <https://gitlab.com/gitforteams/gitforteams>.

2. Locate and download the zipped package for the project.
3. Unpack the project, and place it into your project directory for this book. Because there is already a cloned copy of the files in this directory, you should name this new folder `gitforteams.zip`.

You can start with any folder of files and create a Git repository from it using the initialization command, `init`, as shown in [Example 5-3](#). Git will be aware of all files in this directory, including subfolders, so make sure you run the command `init` from the root folder for your project.

Example 5-3. Initialize a directory for version control

```
$ git init
```

You will see a message similar to the following:

```
Initialized empty Git repository in /Users/emmajane/gitforteams/gitforteams.zip/.git/
```

Files are not immediately added to the repository. This is a feature because Git allows you to ignore files as well, and so it is waiting for you to tell it exactly which files you'd like to track. If there is a logical next step, Git will almost always have a useful suggestion in its status message. You should get into the habit of using the command `status` as frequently as you would use Save in a word processing program. This command does not save your work, but rather it lets you know what's happening at this moment in your repository—and knowing what's happening is key to understanding Git. Go ahead and check the status of your repository now ([Example 5-4](#)).

Example 5-4. Check the status of your repository

```
$ git status
```

Git lets you know the next step is to add the files you would like to track because you have just initialized the repository:

```
On branch master  
  
Initial commit  
  
Untracked files:  
(use "git add <file>..." to include in what will be committed)  
  
[ lots of files listed here ... ]  
  
nothing added to commit but untracked files present (use "git add" to track)
```

Getting your files into Git is a two-step process. Although it feels a little tedious when you're first getting started, this is a feature because it allows you to make multiple

unrelated changes at once in your working directory. Changes can be *staged* into groups of commits in the index—each group getting a different commit message. We want to add everything that is in our working directory because this is the initial import of files ([Example 5-5](#)).

Example 5-5. Add all files to the staging area of your repository

```
$ git add --all
```

Once again use the command `status` to check the status. The output will let you know the files have been staged and are ready to be committed:

```
On branch master  
  
Initial commit  
  
Changes to be committed:  
(use "git rm --cached <file>..." to unstage)  
  
    new file:   [ lots of files listed ... ]
```

Now that your files are added, you can save their current state into the repository with the command `commit` ([Example 5-6](#)).

Example 5-6. Commit all staged files to your repository

```
$ git commit -m "Initial import of all project files."
```

A lengthy commit confirmation message will be printed to the screen, notifying you that the files have been added to your repository. Your project files are now under version control.

Initializing an Empty Project

When we teach Git, it's generally easiest to start with a completely empty directory, void of any files. This is because it's easiest for the instructor and the student to begin from the same point. This exercise allows you to introduce yourself to Git without worry:

1. Create a new, empty folder:

```
$ mkdir empty-repository
```

2. Change into your new folder:

```
$ cd empty-repository
```

3. Run the Git initialization command:

```
$ git init
```

4. Verify the hidden repository folder was added:

```
$ ls -al
```

On Windows:

```
dir
```

If you see a new hidden folder, `.git`, your repository has been created. This folder will contain the record of all the changes to your repository. There's nothing scary contained in this folder, but if you remove it, your project will no longer be tracked. This means you will not be able to recover previous versions of any of the files in your repository, you will lose all commit messages for your repository, and whatever state the files are currently in will be immutable.

At this point, you can follow the additional steps from the previous section to add files ([Example 5-5](#)), and commit them to your repository ([Example 5-6](#)).

Reviewing History

Once you have made your first commit into a repository, you are ready to start reviewing history. Of course, the history of your project is a combination of the work you have done, as well as the work done by others you have collaborated with. It may not feel like collaboration if you've merely downloaded an open source project, but it is. Collaboration can be as simple as adding your changes to someone else's work.

To review the changes that have been made in a repository, use the command `log` ([Example 5-7](#)). By default, this command allows you to review the commit message and author information for every commit in the branch that is currently checked out of your local repository.

Example 5-7. Reviewing a repository's history with log

```
$ git log
```

The command `log` will output a full history of your repository's commit messages in reverse chronological order.



Ensure Your Details are Configured

If your name and email address aren't displayed, refer to [Appendix C](#) for tips on how to configure Git.

If you've only made one commit message, the initial import, there will only be one message displayed:

```
commit fa04c309e3bb8de33f77c54c1f6cc46dc520c2ca
Author: emmajane <emma@emmajane.net>
Date:   Sat Oct 25 12:44:39 2014 +0100
```

Initial import of all project files.

If, however, you are working with a more established code base, there will be a lot of messages. This can be quite overwhelming and difficult to scan. You can shorten the messages to just the first line of the message by adding the parameter `--oneline` as shown in [Example 5-8](#). To exit, press q.

Example 5-8. Viewing a condensed history of your project

```
$ git log --oneline
```

To get a sense of how the same files can have a different history, run the commands from Examples [5-7](#) and [5-8](#) from both the cloned repository and from the repository you created from a downloaded `.zip` package. Even though the files are identical, their history is different (this will come up again when we talk about rebasing in [Chapter 6](#)).



Other branches will have different commits, and different copies of the repository will have commits made by different developers. It's basically anarchy, but limited to each little repository. The conventions we establish as software teams are what bring order to the chaos and allow us to share our work in a sane manner. (Remember the branching strategies we learned in [Chapter 3](#)? They'll keep the work sorted into logical thought streams. Remember the permission strategies from [Chapter 2](#)? They'll keep people locked into the right place, and unable to make changes to the "blessed" repository without the community gatekeeper's consent.)

If you have completed all of the steps in this section, you will now have three separate repositories to work from for the remaining activities. For the section on branching, I recommend you work with the cloned repository because it has more to look at. For the other sections, you may choose any of the three.

Working with Branches

In version control, branches are a way of separating different ideas. They are used in a lot of different ways. You can use branches to denote different versions of software. You might use very short-term branches to work on a bug fix, or you might use a longer-term branch to test out a new idea.

Listing Branches

To get a list of all branches ([Example 5-9](#)), you can use either the `branch` command on its own, or add the parameter `--list`. At the beginning of this chapter, you cloned a repository; use that repository for this section because it already has branches for you to look at.

Example 5-9. Listing local branches

```
$ git branch --list
```

A list of the local branches will be printed:

```
master
```

By default, the `master` branch is copied into your local repository and you can begin working directly on it. In addition to this branch, you have also downloaded all other branches that were available in the remote repository. They are available for reference purposes, but they are not available to be worked on until you have set up a working copy of the remote branch. To list all branches in your repository, use the parameter `--all` ([Example 5-10](#)).

Example 5-10. List all branches

```
$ git branch --all
```

If you use this command in your local copy of the cloned repository, you should see both your local branches and a list of remote branches. The `*` denotes which branch you are currently viewing (or have “checked out”). The remainder of these lines all begin with `remotes/origin:` `remotes` just means “not here,” and `origin` is the default convention used for “my copy is cloned from here.” The final piece is the name of the branch (`master`, `sandbox`, and `video-lessons` are all branches):

```
* master
  remotes/origin/master
  remotes/origin/sandbox
  remotes/origin/video-lessons
```

The list can be a bit misleading, though. The remote branch names do not actually include the word `remotes`. This is just a piece of information about what type of branch it is. To get a usable list of the names of the remote branches, use the parameter `--remotes` (or `-r` for short) instead ([Example 5-11](#)).

Example 5-11. List remote branches

```
$ git branch --remotes
```

This will give a list of only the remote branches (using their real names):

```
origin/master  
origin/sandbox  
origin/video-lessons
```

These branches are all accessible to you, although you'll need to make your own copy before committing changes to them.

Updating the List of Remote Branches

The list of remote branches does not stay up to date automatically, so the list will become out of date over time. To update the list, use the command `fetch` ([Example 5-12](#)).

Example 5-12. Fetch a revised list and the contents of all remote branches

```
$ git fetch
```

You will learn more about working with remotes in [Chapter 7](#).

Using a Different Branch

When you check out a branch, you are updating the visible files on your system (the *working tree*) to match the version stored in the repository. This switch is completed with the command `checkout` ([Example 5-13](#)). The checkout process is a little different from a centralized version control system (VCS), such as Subversion. In a centralized VCS, you would need an Internet connection to use the `checkout` command because the branches are not stored locally, and must be downloaded in order to use.

Example 5-13. Switching branches with the command `checkout`

```
$ git checkout --track origin/video-lessons
```

```
Branch video-lessons set up to track remote branch video-lessons from origin.  
Switched to a new branch 'video-lessons'
```

This command works differently in older versions of Git. If the previous command gave you an error, you may choose to upgrade (see [Appendix B](#)), or run the following variant:

```
$ git checkout --track -b video-lessons origin/video-lessons
```

This command (`checkout -b`) creates a new branch named `video-lessons` with tracking enabled (`--track`) from the branch `video-lessons` stored on the remote repository, `origin`. The local copy of the remote branch is available at `origin/video-lessons`, and your copy of the branch is available at `video-lessons`.

You should now have a local copy of the remote branch `video-lessons` (Figure 5-3).




Figure 5-3. A local copy of a remote branch has been created

In your list of branches, it will look like the branch exists twice, except one includes the reference information for the remote repository:

```
$ git branch -a  
master  
* video-lessons  
remotes/origin/master  
remotes/origin/sandbox  
remotes/origin/video-lessons
```

From this new branch, you can review history using [Example 5-22](#) or [Example 5-23](#). Note the commit history is not the same between the two branches.

Creating New Branches

For very tiny projects, I happily putter along in the `master` branch with each commit acting as a resolution to a problem; however, the bigger the team gets, the more it will benefit from having some structure in how people collaborate on the work. [Chapter 3](#) covered the strategies you may want to adopt with your team for branching strategies. As a solo developer it can be more difficult to know if you should be working on a different branch. To help you decide, ask yourself a few questions:

- Is it possible I will want to completely abandon this idea if things don't work out?
- Am I creating something that is a significant deviation from the current published version of the software?
- Does my work need to undergo a review before it's published or accepted into the published version of the software?
- Is it possible I will need to switch tasks before I've completed this work?

If you answered “yes” to any of these questions, you should consider creating a new branch for your work. Teaching yourself good habits now is like buying insurance. You hope you never have to use it, but you buy it just in case.

The best way to decide what goes into a branch is to start with the issue tracker. By creating a written description of what you’re about to do, you will have a clear sense of when to start and finish with your branch. Yes, this will often feel like overhead, but it is a really good habit to get into, especially when you’re working in larger teams.

When you start a new branch, it will contain the identical history as the place you are branching from at the moment you create it ([Figure 5-4](#)). When you review the history of a new branch with the command log, it will also show the commits from its ancestor branch.




Figure 5-4. New branches contain the same commits as their ancestor

Seeing as you are working on issue-based version control, your branch name should reflect the ticket you are working on. For example, if the issue was “1: Add process notes to README,” then the branch would be named `1-process_notes`. The history for the new branch will include all of the commits up to the point of departure, so make sure you begin your new branch from the correct starting point. You can do this by either using the command `checkout` to situate yourself in the correct branch first ([Example 5-14](#)), or you can add the desired parent branch to your command ([Example 5-15](#)).

Example 5-14. Creating a new development branch

First checkout the branch you want to use as the starting point:

```
$ git checkout master
```

```
Switched to branch 'master'
```

Next, create a new branch:

```
$ git branch 1-process_notes  
[no message displayed]
```

Finally, check out the new branch:

```
$ git checkout 1-process_notes
```

```
Switched to branch '1-process_notes'
```

Although it's a little more to remember, [Example 5-15](#) does have the advantage of creating a branch explicitly from the right base branch, meaning you don't need to remember the extra checkout step from the previous instructions.

Example 5-15. Creating a new development branch from the master branch

```
$ git checkout -b 1-process_notes master
```

```
Switched to a new branch '1-process_notes'
```

Once you are in your new branch, you can go ahead and do your work. As an exercise, I encourage you to try adding your notes on how your process works to one of the three repositories you've created in this chapter. Once you've made all of your edits, it's time to commit the changes to your local repository.

Adding Changes to a Repository

Each time you make a change to your working directory, you will need to explicitly save the changes to your Git repository. This is a two-part process. [Figure 5-5](#) shows how changes must be explicitly staged in the index, and then saved to your repository.




Figure 5-5. Changes in Git must be staged, and then saved to the repository

When you previously created a new repository, you imported a series of files all at once ([Example 5-5](#)). You don't have to add all the files at once, though. This can be especially helpful if you have been working on unrelated edits that should be captured in separate commits. If you do want to separate the changes into multiple commits, you need to change the parameter `--all` that you used previously for the filename you want to stage ([Example 5-16](#)). You can add one or more filenames at a time; the filenames do not need to be the same type.

Example 5-16. Add selected changed files to your Git repository

```
$ git add README.md process-diagram.png  
$ git add branch-naming-rules.png
```

For the most part, I add files to the staging area one at a time. I find this prevents me from accidentally adding more than I meant to. At the command line, I can type the first few letters of the filename and then press the Tab key, and the remainder of the filename will be automatically typed out (this is known as *tab completion* and it's one of my favorite things to use). If, however, you have a lot of files you need to add, and they're all contained in the same directory, you may want to use a wildcard to match files with a subdirectory ([Example 5-17](#)), or that all have a similar name ([Example 5-18](#)).

Example 5-17. Add all files, recursively, from a given path

```
$ git add <directory_name>/*
```

Example 5-18. Add all files with the file extension .svg

```
$ git add *.svg
```

You can also completely omit the filenames, and instead stage files according to whether or not they are known to Git. By using the parameter `--update` you can stage all files that are known to Git, and that have been edited (or updated) since the last commit:

```
$ git add --update
```

If you want to be even more outrageous, you can stage all changed files in the working directory by adding the parameter `--all`. This will restage any files that have been modified since they were first staged (ensuring all new edits are captured in the commit); stage any files that are known to Git, but not already staged; and stage any files that are not currently being tracked by Git. It is a very greedy command! Before using it, you should check the list of files that will be added:

```
$ git status  
$ git add --all
```

Once a change has been added to the staging area, it must be committed. If you continue to work in any of the files you've added to the index, only the previously staged changes will be added when you next run the command `commit` ([Figure 5-6](#)). If you keep working on the file, and want to include these changes in your commit, you will need to repeat the previous command where you added your files to the staging area.




Figure 5-6. A commit will only save the work that has been added to the index

You can commit your staged changes to the repository by running `commit` ([Example 5-6](#)).

If this feels frustrating at first, you're not alone! It took me a while to get used to this behavior and I felt it was broken when it didn't automatically notice I'd changed the

file and stage the new changes. It wasn't until I started playing around with partial staging of files that I realized how powerful it was to *not* have my changes automatically staged.

Adding Partial File Changes to a Repository

If you want even more granularity over your commits, you can choose to add partial changes within a saved file by using the parameter `--patch`. One of my favorite reasons for committing files in this way is to record several unrelated edits into multiple smaller commits.

Adding files via the `--patch` process is a multistep approach ([Example 5-19](#)). You will first initialize the procedure, and then choose from a list of options on how you want to create your patches. You will be prompted to add the change to the staging area (y), or leave this hunk unchanged (n). Changed lines will begin either with a - (line removed) or a + (line added). If a line has been changed, it will display as both removed and added.

To separate the hunks into smaller units, you can use the option s to split the hunk. This will only work if there is at least one line of unchanged work between the two hunks. If you want to separate two adjacent lines for staging separately, you can edit (e) the hunk.

Example 5-19. Add selected changes to your Git repository interactively

```
$ git add --patch filename
```

By adding the optional filename, you will not need to cycle through each file. If you know exactly which file you need to split up, and you have a lot of files that need staging, it can save you time to work with specific files. After running the command, you will begin the process of walking through the files, looking for changes to stage:

```
diff --git a/ch05.asciidoc b/ch05.asciidoc
index 8f82732..e7be9ce 100644
--- a/ch05.asciidoc
+++ b/ch05.asciidoc
@@ -6,7 +6,6 @@ changed significantly in the last few years; however, a few of
the commands we'll easier to remember. Chances are very good that you have Git
installed if you are using Linux or OSX. If you are using Windows, however,
the changes are very good that Git is not installed unless you've explicitly
installed it already.

.. Open a terminal window.
. Enter the command: +git --version+

The version of Git you are running should be printed to the screen.

Stage this hunk [y,n,q,a,d,/ ,j,J,g,e,?]?
```

In the output displayed, we can see that Git is asking if we want to stage this one line change (. Open a terminal window), which is a proposed deletion as indicated by the -. Additional options for what to do with this hunk are available by pressing ?.

Committing Partial Changes

Assuming you've only added some changes from a given file to the staging area, when you check the status of your repository, you will see that a file is both ready to be committed, and has unstaged changes:

```
On branch master
Changes to be committed:
  (use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)

    modified:   ch05.asciidoc

Changes not staged for commit:
  (use "git add <file>..." to update what will be committed)
  (use "git checkout -- <file>..." to discard changes in working directory)

    modified:   ch05.asciidoc
```

This is the same message that is displayed if you add a file to the staging area and then continue to edit the file before committing it to the repository, or if you only choose to stage some hunks while adding files interactively to the index with the parameter patch.

Removing a File from the Stage

If you accidentally add too many files from the staging area, and want to break your changes into smaller commits, you can unstage your proposed changes ([Example 5-20](#)). Removing a file from the stage doesn't mean you'll be undoing the edits you've made; it notifies Git that you're not ready for these changes to be committed to the repository yet.

Example 5-20. Remove proposed file changes from the staging area

```
$ git status
On branch master
Changes to be committed:
  (use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)

    modified:   ch05.asciidoc

$ git reset HEAD ch05.asciidoc
Unstaged changes after reset:
M       ch05.asciidoc
```

Optionally, you can also use the `--patch` parameter with the command `reset` if you only want to unstage *some* of the changes you've made to a file.

Undoing your work will be covered in greater detail in [Chapter 6](#).

Writing Extended Commit Messages

Up to this point it's possible you have been writing terse, one-line commit messages. While this is fine if you're just practicing version control commands, it's not going to make your future self very happy if you need to figure out what the commit message "Oops. Trying again." means.

It took me quite a while to get out of the habit of thinking of Git as a place where I saved my work and instead as a place where I recorded my results. When I first started working with version control the commits I was making were granular to take advantage of the advanced tools available to me (you'll learn more about these in [Chapter 6](#)). This is because I was coming the mindset of saving work and undoing mistakes. When in the *save* mindset, I would think of clicking the save button, or using control-Z to undo the last few things I typed. When the commits are this small, the commit messages tend to be nearly useless ("stopped for lunch"; "tried something"; "didn't work"; "oops"; "testing"). If I wanted to roll back history, how the heck would I use those commit messages to find the spot where the code was working after something broke? It make take you a while to find your stride as well.

Your commit messages should always include the rationale for why you made a change, as well as a quick summary of the changes you made. In order to write a detailed commit message, you will need more than one line the one line short message style you have been using up to now. I typically write my commit messages with a two-step procedure ([Example 5-21](#)):

1. Use a terse, one-line message to commit the changes to the repository.
2. Amend the commit to include a full description of what I was thinking when I made the change.

Example 5-21. Writing a detailed commit message

```
$ git add --all  
$ git commit -m "CH05: Adding technical edits."  
$ git commit --amend
```

You don't need to do this two-step process; you can jump straight into the message editor by omitting the parameter `-m` when first making your commit:

```
$ git commit
```

Your default editor will open, and you will be prompted to add a new commit message. The first line of the message will be used for the `--oneline` display, and all lines beginning with `#` will be removed from the final message. Once you've crafted your commit message, you will need to save it and then quit the editor to complete the commit.

Working with the Default Editor, Vim

By default, the commit editor is Vim. This works for me because I like Vim, but if you don't, there's information on changing the editor in [Appendix C](#). You'll need a few key commands to navigate Vim:

- `i` takes you from visual mode to insert mode. You'll need to do this so that you can begin typing your commit message.
- `esc` returns you to visual mode. From here you can navigate using the arrow keys to a different line.
- `:w` saves the file by writing it to disk.
- `:q` quits the editor, returning you back to the command line.

You can also chain these commands together. For example, after writing your commit message, you can save and quit the editor with `esc :wq`.

In [Chapter 6](#) you will learn how to squash granular commits into whole ideas with interactive rebasing.

Ignoring Files

Eventually, you may run into a situation where Git keeps adding files to the repository that you actually never want to add. If you're on a Mac, this might include the pesky `.DS_Store` files. If you're on Linux, maybe it's your text editor's `.swp` files. If you're working on a web project, this may include the compiled CSS files created from Sass.

If you know that your favorite text editor, or IDE, creates temporary files, which are not project specific, you should create a *global* setting to ignore these files.

First, run the following command to let Git know which file you would like to store your list of "ignored" files in:

```
$ git config --global core.excludesfile ~/.gitignore
```

You can now update this file using one filename per line. You can use exact filenames, or wildcards (for example: `*.swp` will match any file ending in `.swp`). For a useful starting point of files to ignore, check out [gitignore.io](#).

Additionally, you may want specific repositories to ignore specific files or file extensions. In this case, your best option is to add an extra `.gitignore` file to the repository. This has the added benefit of ensuring your teammates don't accidentally sneak in their build files.

Complete the following steps to customize which files should be ignored for a specific repository:

1. Create a file in the root level of your project named `.gitignore`.
2. Using one filename per line, add all of the files you never want Git to add to the repository. You can use exact filenames, or wildcards (for example, `*.swp`).
3. Add the file `.gitignore` to your repository by using the commands `add` and `commit`.

Files with these extensions will no longer be added to your repository, even if you are using the parameter `--all`.

Working with Tags

Tags are used to pinpoint specific commits. You can think of them like a bookmark. I don't use tags nearly as much as I should. As a result, I rely on my commit messages to find specific points in the repository. You may find working with tags is a good habit to get into because they will allow you to easily reference points in your timeline.



Tags for Teams of More Than One

In this chapter, we are referring to private repositories with no branches that are shared with other teammates. When your branches aren't shared, there are no reasons to limit how and when you use tags. Use them as often as you'd like! The tags you use on shared branches, however, are typically used for deployment purposes and should follow a convention that is useful to the whole team.

Tags can only be added to specific commits. To know which commit you want to add your tag to, you'll probably want to use a combination of `log` and `show`. The command `log` will give you a list of all commits in your repository ([Example 5-22](#)), and the command `show` will display the detailed information for any single commit.

Example 5-22. Quick list of recent commits

```
$ git log --oneline  
fa04c30 Initial import
```

Once you think you have found a commit that you would like to investigate a little further, you can get the detailed commit message beginning at that commit by adding the commit ID ([Example 5-23](#)). To limit the output to only that commit, add the optional parameter `--max-depth=` along with the number of log entries you would like to show.

Example 5-23. Log details for a single commit

```
$ git log fa04c30 --max-depth=1

commit fa04c309e3bb8de33f77c54c1f6cc46dc520c2ca
Author: emmajane <emma@emmajane.net>
Date:   Sat Oct 25 12:44:39 2014 +0100

    Initial import
```

If you want even more details about the commit object, you can use the command `show` ([Example 5-24](#)) to list the changes that happened in that commit as text (of course, this will be less useful for binary files, such as images).

Example 5-24. Use show to display the log message and textual diff for a single commit

```
$ git show fa04c30

commit fa04c309e3bb8de33f77c54c1f6cc46dc520c2ca
Author: emmajane <emma@emmajane.net>
Date:   Sat Oct 25 12:44:39 2014 +0100

    Initial import

diff --git a/ch05.asciidoc b/ch05.asciidoc
new file mode 100644
index 0000000..8f82732
--- /dev/null
+++ b/ch05.asciidoc
@@ -0,0 +1,867 @@
+
+==== Verifying Git
+
+Before we dive into using Git, you'll want to check and see which version is
installed. For our purposes, Gi

[etc]
```

Once you have identified a commit that you want to bookmark, you can do so by using the command `tag`. In [Example 5-25](#), a new tag, `import`, is created for the commit hash `fa04c30`.

Example 5-25. Adding a new tag, import, to a commit object

```
$ git tag import fa04c30
```

You can now list the available tags by using the command `tag` without any parameters ([Example 5-26](#)).

Example 5-26. Listing all tags

```
$ git tag
```

A list of tags will be printed to the screen. At this point, only one tag has been added, so the list is very short:

```
import
```

Once a tag is made, you can investigate the commit where the tag was added ([Example 5-27](#)).

Example 5-27. Reviewing a tagged commit

```
$ git show import
```

As you have seen previously, the command `show` will display the log message and textual diff for that commit.

Connecting to Remote Repositories

In a centralized version control system, like Subversion, there is one master copy of the repository and all work is written into that copy. When you commit, the information is immediately uploaded to that central repository and available to others. In a decentralized version control system, like Git, there is no single repository that everyone works with. It is merely a convention that declares one copy of the repository to be privileged (and considered to be the official source for the code).

When you're a team of one, a remote repository is really more of a backup to your local repository because there won't be any changes happening on the remote unless you put them there. This remote repository can also be used to transfer code between your different local development environments. For example, you may use both a laptop and a desktop for your projects. The remote repository can be an effective way to bounce your work from one place to the next so that you can continue working even when switching machines.

If you've been following along in this chapter, you should now have three local repositories: one created from a clone of a repository on GitLab, one created from a downloaded `.zip` package, and a third repository created from an empty folder. They

are all local, however, and you don't have the option to share your work with others because they either don't have a remote associated with them (repository from the zipped package, and the repository that was initialized locally) or you don't have write access to the remote repository (repository that you cloned).

In order to upload your work, you will need to create a new project on GitLab and associate it with one of your existing repositories.

Creating a New Project

If you haven't already, you will need to create an account on [GitLab.com](#) (it's free) and sign into your account. You can also sign in via GitHub, Twitter, or Google. Although you can also complete these steps on another code hosting system, such as GitHub, GitLab is an open source product that you can host yourself for free if you need to practice source control from behind a firewall:

1. Log in to your GitLab account and navigate to your [dashboard](#).
2. From the project summary tab, click the button New project.
3. Enter a Project path, such as `gitforteams`. All remaining fields can be left as their defaults.
4. Click Create project. You will be redirected to the instruction page on how to upload your repository.

Adding a Second Remote Connection

GitLab gives you the copy/paste instructions you need to upload your repository to its platform; however, you don't necessarily want to complete all of the steps. From your new project page, take a look at the second section, Create a new repository ([Example 5-28](#)).

Example 5-28. Create a new repository on GitLab

```
mkdir my-git-for-teams
cd my-git-for-teams
git init
touch README.md
git add README.md
git commit -m "first commit"
git remote add origin git@gitlab.com:emmajane/my-git-for-teams.git
git push -u origin master
```

Can you see where your starting point would be if you had already created a repository locally? (Hint: compare it with the section labeled Push an existing Git repository.) You've already done all of the steps up to the line `git remote add origin`. If

you want to create a new repository from scratch, you would follow all of these instructions, but you already have three local repositories! So instead of creating a new one (again), you are going to add the remote connection so that you can upload one of the three repositories to this new project on GitLab. It doesn't matter which of the three you choose, but you can only choose one because each project presents a single repository.

When you add a remote to your repository, you must also assign it a nickname ([Example 5-29](#)). By default, the nickname is *origin*. You could name it anything you like, though—*pickles*, *peanutbutter*, *kittens*—Git wouldn't care. The advantage of using *origin* is that more tutorials online will be as easy as copy and paste; the disadvantage is that *origin* doesn't really explain very much, especially if your repository actually started locally. In addition to this, *origin* is already in use if you created your repository by cloning it from a remote repository. To connect the project you created to any of the three repositories you have locally, use the nickname *my_gitlab*.

Example 5-29. Adding a remote to a local repository with a custom name

```
$ git remote add my_gitlab git@gitlab.com:emmajane/my-git-for-teams.git
```

It wasn't until I finally started taking control over the names of things in Git that I really started to understand how all the pieces fit together. For example, I will often nickname my remote according to the name of the code hosting system. My local copy of the *Git for Teams* repository has the following remotes: *github*, *gitlab*, and *bitbucket* ([Example 5-30](#)).

Confirm the remote was correctly added with the command `remote`, as shown in [Example 5-30](#).

Example 5-30. List remote repositories connected to your current repository

```
$ git remote --verbose
```

If you have assigned the remote to the repository you cloned, you will see two pairs of remotes listed:

```
my_gitlab      git@gitlab.com:emmajane/my-git-for-teams.git (fetch)
my_gitlab      git@gitlab.com:emmajane/my-git-for-teams.git (push)
origin        git@gitlab.com:emmajane/gitforteams.git (fetch)
origin        git@gitlab.com:emmajane/gitforteams.git (push)
```

You are now ready to push your work from any branch to your remote repository.

Pushing Your Changes

To upload your changes, you need to have a connection to the remote repository, permission to publish to the repository, and the name of the branch to which you want to upload your changes. The first time you push your branch, you will need to explicitly tell Git where to put things. If you start by using the command `push`, it will tell you what to do next.



Avoid the Hassle of Typing Your Password

If you haven't added your SSH keys to the code hosting system (see [Appendix D](#)), you will need to enter your username and password each time you want to push your changes.

For example, if you're currently using the branch `1-process_notes`, and you try to push it to the remote repository ([Example 5-31](#)), you will get an error message ([Example 5-32](#)).

Example 5-31. Upload a branch using the command `push`

```
$ git push
```

Example 5-32. Without an upstream branch, you will get an error message

```
fatal: The current branch 1-process_notes has no upstream branch.  
To push the current branch and set the remote as upstream, use
```

```
git push --set-upstream origin 1-process_notes
```

This error message provides us with very useful information, but it's not *quite* right. Instead of uploading the branch to the remote `origin`, we actually want to use our new remote, `my_gitlab` ([Example 5-33](#)).

Example 5-33. Set the upstream branch while uploading your local branch

```
$ git push --set-upstream my_gitlab 1-process_notes
```

This will upload your branch and set it up for future use. Now whenever you are using this branch, you can issue the much shorter command `git push` to upload your work. By setting the upstream connection, you are building a relationship between your local copy of the branch and the remote repository. This has the same effect as when you used `--track` to check out a remote branch, except in that case you were starting with the remote copy and adding a tracked local copy.

Branch Maintenance

Once the code has been fully tested, you will want to merge the ticket branch into the *master* branch ([Example 5-34](#)), and delete the local ([Example 5-35](#)) and remote copies of the ticket branch ([Example 5-36](#)). As a team of one, it's unlikely you'll need to deal with merge conflicts. Merge conflicts will be covered in [Chapter 7](#).

Example 5-34. Merging a ticket branch into your main branch

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git merge 1-process_notes
```

If a *true merge* needs to be performed, as opposed to just a fast-forwarding of history, you may be presented with the editor for a commit message. Generally I leave the default message in place. Once the work has been merged into the *master* branch, you should push the *master* branch to the remote repository as well:

```
$ git push --set-upstream my_gitlab master
```

Now that the changes have been merged into the *master* branch, there's not a lot of reason to keep the ticket branch open. To keep your repository tidy, you can go ahead and delete the ticket branch now ([Example 5-35](#)).

Example 5-35. Delete your local copy of the branch

```
$ git branch --delete 1-process_notes
```

Git will complain wildly if there are changes that haven't been merged into another branch, so you don't need to worry (too much) about losing unsaved work.

Finally, you need to do a bit of housekeeping for the remote repository as well. You should also delete remote branches whose changes have been merged into *master* ([Example 5-36](#)).

Example 5-36. Delete remote branches that are no longer needed

```
$ git push --delete my_gitlab 1-process_notes
```

With your housekeeping finished, it's time to repeat this process for your next new idea.

Command Reference

[Table 5-1](#) lists the commands used in this chapter. These commands are shell commands and should be used as written.

Table 5-1. Basic shell commands

Command	Use
<code>cd ~</code>	Change to your home directory
<code>mkdir</code>	Make a new directory
<code>cd <i>directory_name</i></code>	Change to a specified directory
<code>ls -a</code>	List hidden files for OS X and Linux-based systems
<code>dir</code>	List files on Windows
<code>touch <i>file_name</i></code>	Create a new, empty file with the specified name

Table 5-2 lists the subcommands for the Git application. They will always be preceded by the command `git` when used at the command line.

Table 5-2. Basic Git commands

Command	Use
<code>git clone URL</code>	Download a copy of a remote repository
<code>git init</code>	Convert the current directory into a new Git repository
<code>git status</code>	Get a status report for your repository
<code>git add --all</code>	Add all changed and new files to the staging area of your repository
<code>git commit -m "<i>message</i>"</code>	Commit all staged files to your repository
<code>git log</code>	Review a repository's history
<code>git log --oneline</code>	View a condensed history of your project
<code>git branch --list</code>	List all local branches
<code>git branch --all</code>	List local and remote branches
<code>git branch --remotes</code>	List all remote branches
<code>git checkout --track <i>remote_name/branch</i></code>	Create a copy of a remote branch for local use
<code>git checkout <i>branch</i></code>	Switch to a different local branch

Command	Use
<code>git checkout -b <i>branch</i> <i>branch_parent</i></code>	Create a new branch from a specified branch
<code>git add <i>filename(s)</i></code>	Stage only the specified file so that it is ready to be committed
<code>git add --patch <i>filename</i></code>	Stage only portions of a file so that they are ready to be committed
<code>git reset HEAD <i>filename</i></code>	Remove proposed file changes from the staging area
<code>git commit --amend</code>	Update the previous commit with changes currently staged, and supply a new commit message
<code>git show <i>commit</i></code>	Log details for a single commit
<code>git tag <i>tag commit</i></code>	Add a tag to a commit object
<code>git tag</code>	List all tags
<code>git show <i>tag</i></code>	Log details for the commit where the tag was applied
<code>git remote add <i>remote_name</i> <i>URL</i></code>	Create a new reference to a new remote repository
<code>git push</code>	Upload changes for the current branch to a remote repository
<code>git remote --verbose</code>	List the fetch and push URLs for all available remotes
<code>git push --set-upstream <i>remote_name</i> <i>branch_local</i> <i>branch_remote</i></code>	Push a copy of your local branch to the remote server
<code>git merge <i>branch</i></code>	Incorporate the commits currently stored in another branch into the current one
<code>git push --delete <i>remote_name</i> <i>branch_remote</i></code>	Remove named branch from the remote server

Summary

Throughout this chapter you have learned how to work with Git as a team of one. The following is a guide to the best practices outlined in this chapter:

- Always begin your work by defining the problem you want to work on. This definition will help you determine the name of the branch, and which piece of work you want to branch away from to start your work.

- As you are making changes in your branch, you can choose to add some or all of the changes you've made through the staging area. This will help you to craft commits with related work.
- Regardless of whether you start your repository locally or via a clone, you can always start a new project on a code hosting system and upload your work by adding a new remote to your local repository.
- Housekeeping tasks should be performed as you wrap up each line of work. You can do this by merging your ticket branches into your main branch, and then deleting the local and remote copies of your branch.

In the next chapter, you will learn how to go back in time in the Git time machine to undo your work and change your commit history.

Rollbacks, Reverts, Resets, and Rebasing

This is otherwise known as the “Rrrrgh!” chapter. Bad things happen to good people. Fortunately, Git can help you undo some of those past mistakes by traveling back in time. There are several commands in Git that vary in their degree of severity—making minor adjustments of a commit message all the way through to obliterating history. Mistakes are typically committed and removed from a personal repository, but the way you deal with them can impact how others interact with the code base. Ensuring you are always dealing with problems in the most polite way possible will help your team work more efficiently.

By the end of this chapter, you will be able to:

- Amend a commit to add new work
- Restore a file to a previous state
- Restore your working directory to a previously committed state
- Revert previously made changes
- Reshape your commit history using rebase
- Remove a file from your repository
- Remove commits added to a branch from an incorrect merge

Throughout the chapter you will be learning techniques that feel invisible, but have huge implications. Take the time to slow down, and draw a diagram of how you want things to appear after you have run the sequence of commands. This will help you to select the right subcommand and the right parameters. It will also help you to recall information the next time you need to perform the same task again.

Those who learn best by following along with video tutorials will benefit from [Collaborating with Git](#) (O’Reilly), the companion video series for this book.

Best Practices

In this chapter you are going to be learning to manipulate the history of your repository. While the exercises in this book are easy to follow, there will come a time when you are a little under pressure and a little unpracticed and you will panic and think you've lost your work. Take a deep breath. It will be okay. If you've committed something into the repository, it will (almost) always be there if you are willing to do some digging. It's very difficult to *completely remove* work from a repository in Git; it is, however, relatively easy to *lose* work and not be able to find it again. So before you learn how to muck about with history, let's make sure you've got some good recovery tools to help you MacGyver your way out of difficult situations.

Describing Your Problem

There are a lot of ways to undo work in Git, and each method is exactly right some of the time. In order to choose the correct method, you need to know exactly what you want to change—and how it should be different after you are finished. When I was first learning version control, I would often draw a quick sketch of what I was trying to accomplish to ensure I was using the right command for the job. [Figure 6-1](#) shows the three concepts you need to be aware of: the working directory (the files currently visible on your filesystem); the staging area (the index of changes that will be written to the repository after the next `commit`); and the repository (which stores files and records the changes made to the files over time).




Figure 6-1. The working directory, staging area, and repository each contain different information about your files



The Staging Area is Not Automatically Updated

[Figure 6-1](#) is a bit of a lie, as you need to explicitly place things into the staging area using the command `add`, but it's a decent working model to start from.

Whenever you can separate your problem into the discrete places where Git is storing its information, you have a better chance of choosing the correct command sequence to return your work to the state you want it to be in. **Table 6-1** contains a series of scenarios might encounter while working with Git.

Table 6-1. Choosing the correct undo method

You want to...	Notes	Solution
Discard changes you've made to a file in your working directory	Changed file is not staged, or committed	<code>checkout -- filename</code>
Discard all unsaved changes in the working directory	File is staged, but not committed	<code>reset --hard</code>
Combine several commits up to, but not including, a specific commit		<code>reset commit</code>
Remove all unsaved changes, including untracked files	Changed files are not committed	<code>clean -fd</code>
Remove all staged changes and previously committed work up to a specific commit, but do not remove new files from the working directory		<code>reset --hard commit</code>
Remove previous work, but keep the commit history intact ("roll forward")	Branch has been published; working directory is clean	<code>revert commit</code>
Remove a single commit from a branch's history	Changed files are committed; working directory is clean; branch has not been published	<code>rebase --interactive commit</code>
Keep previous work, but combine it with another commit	Select the squash option	<code>rebase --interactive commit</code>

Figure 6-2 shows one diagram for the first scenario. Additional answers are available on the *Git for Teams* website.




Figure 6-2. You want to discard changes you've made to a file in your working directory; the incorrect copy of the file is not staged or committed

As you can see in the examples outlined in [Table 6-1](#), some commands have two different outcomes depending on the parameters used. [Figure 6-3](#) contains a flowchart of the scenarios you may find yourself in. Redraw this chart digitally, or on paper. The act of re-creating the chart will reinforce the options you will be forced to deal with in Git, and it will give you a personal reference point, which is often easier to remember than a page in a book.

You may have your own types of changes you need to recover from as well. Create a list of all the problem scenarios you may want to recover from. The better you are able to describe what's wrong, the more likely you are to find the correct solution. As you work through this chapter, you may choose to expand on the flowchart in [Figure 6-3](#) or create your own diagrams. Please share your work on Twitter by using [#gitforteams](#). I'd love to see what you come up with!

Using Branches for Experimental Work

On a tree, a branch is independent from its sibling branches. Although they may have a common ancestor, you can (typically) saw a branch off a tree without impacting the other branches. In Git, the commits you add to your repository are connected to one or more branches. If you check out a different branch and manipulate the commit objects in that new branch, they are assigned a new identifier, leaving the original commit objects tied to the original branch unchanged. This means it is always safer to do your work in a new private branch, and when you are happy with the results, merge your branch back into the main branch ([Figure 6-4](#)).




Figure 6-3. Create a flowchart to help you select the appropriate command




Figure 6-4. Working in a branch protects you from unintended changes; merge your work back into the main branch only when it is correct and complete

Previously we've created and deleted branches using the ticket as a starting point. But what if you were working on a ticket, and you weren't sure which of two approaches you should take? In this case you could create a branch off of your ticket branch, make your experimental changes ([Example 6-1](#)), and then merge your experimental branch into your ticket branch ([Example 6-2](#)) if you want to save the changes.

Example 6-1. Use an experimental branch to test changes

```
$ git checkout -b experimental_idea
  (do work)
$ git add --all
$ git commit
```

You may have one or more commits in your experimental branch. When you merge the two branches, you can optionally combine all of those commits into a single one at the time of the merge with the parameter `--squash`. If you use this parameter, you will still need to run the command `commit` separately to save the changes from the other branch. By merging the branch in this way, you will be unable to unmerge the branch later. As such, it's appropriate to use `--squash` only when merging branches you wish had never been separate to begin with.

Example 6-2. Merge your experimental branch back into the main branch

```
$ git checkout master
$ git merge experimental_idea --squash

Squash commit -- not updating HEAD
Automatic merge went well; stopped before committing as requested
```

```
$ git commit
```

After merging your experimental branch, you can delete it ([Example 6-3](#)).

Example 6-3. Delete your experimental branch

```
$ git branch --delete experimental_idea
```

If you want to discard your experimental ideas, complete the preceding steps, but omit the step where you merge your work into your main ticket branch. To delete an unmerged branch, you will need to use the parameter `-D` instead of `--delete`.

Subsequent sections of this chapter cover removing commits you made in a branch *before* you realized they were just experiments.

Rebasing Step by Step

Out of the three commands `rebase`, `reset`, and `revert`, `rebase` is the only command which is not exclusively focused on undoing work. Generally when we talk about rebasing, we are referring to the process of bringing a branch up to date with commits that have been made on its parent branch. This is typically a very straightforward process: from the branch you want to update, you run the command `rebase` along with the name of the parent branch. Git removes your commits from the child branch you have been working on, adds the new commits that were made on the parent branch to the tip of your branch, and then adds an updated *copy* of your commits to your branch. This makes it *seem* as though your commits were added *after* the new changes from the parent branch. It's the Git equivalent to whistling innocently and pretending nothing happened when *actually* it has snuck a vase with flowers onto the table while you weren't looking.

Although we often talk about rebasing as “replaying your history,” rebasing is perhaps more correctly defined as traveling back in time and then attempting to re-enact history. If you have seen *Back to the Future* (or a modern time travel equivalent) you know that history is never *quite* the same the second time around. This is the case with rebase as well. Although it appears as though the commits are simply dropped back onto a new branch tip, they are actually completely new commits with their own reference ID. As these new commits are applied to the time line, problems can arise if the new history conflicts with the work you are trying to apply. This will result in errors about being in a detached HEAD state. Mind blown? Here is another way to think of it: Git allows us to retell history, inserting new facts as it pleases us. It does not, however, *actually* allow us to change anything that has happened in the past. What's done is done all we can do is change the stories we tell about it.

Most of the time, when bringing a branch up-to-date with command `rebase`, it is virtually instant and happens automatically. If, however, during the rebasing process there are conflicting changes in the work you have done and the work that you are trying to sneak onto the parent branch, the process will stop and Git will ask you to resolve the conflicts by hand before it proceeds. This can be in-file changes, and deleted files (where one deletes a file that the other has edited). Git is, after all, just a simple content tracker. A mediated conflict resolution by you, the expert, always results in a better end product. Even if you would rather that Git just figured it out, it is good that it stops and asks for help. Think of it as a valuable life lesson: asking for help is okay.

The second cause of frustration is when `rebase` is used to force updates into a public branch. In this case a timeline will end up with the same code represented by two (or more) commit objects with distinct IDs. To help you choose whether you should be rebasing, or merging, please use the [rebase or merge decision tree](#).

The remainder of this section describes the process of dealing with mid-rebase conflicts when bringing a branch up-to-date. In our example, the parent (or source) branch is named `master` and the branch we are attempting to bring up-to-date (the child branch) is named `feature`.

Begin Rebasing

Ensure your local copy of the parent branch is up to date with the most recent commits available from the main project repository:

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git pull --rebase=preserve remote_nickname master
```



If It Helps, Be Explicit

When updating a local copy of a branch with the command `pull`, the parameters for the name of the remote, and name of the remote branch are typically optional. Occasionally, if I have more than one remote for a given repository, Git sometimes seems to miss if there are updates available. Adding the two additional parameters seems to help.

Change into the branch that is currently out of date from the main project, but which contains new work that hasn't been introduced yet:

```
$ git checkout feature
```

Begin the rebasing process:

```
$ git rebase master
```

If there are no conflicts, Git will skip merrily through the process and spit you out the other end with no additional action required from you. See? Rebasing is easy! You should try it! However, sometimes there are conflicts...

Mid-Rebase Conflict from a Deleted File

A conflict in the rebasing process occurs when the changes you have made occur on the same line as the changes which are stored in one of the new commits on the parent branch. As a simple content tracker, Git doesn't feel qualified to know whether *our* changes should be kept, or *theirs*. Instead of making guesses, Git stops and asks for your help. I think that's actually quite considerate that Git perceives me to be more of an expert on the content than it is! Unfortunately the process isn't called "asking you, the expert, for help"; it's called "resolving conflict while in a detached HEAD state." This is very scary language for process that is actually quite respectful.

To resolve a conflict you will need to put on your content expert hat, and help Git make some decisions about what to do next.

This section covers an example of a mid-rebase conflict. The file *ch10.asciidoc* has been deleted in the *source* branch, *master*, but I've been making updates to it in *feature*. This is a problem Git doesn't know how to resolve. Do I want to keep the file? Should it be deleted? Git has put me into a detached HEAD state so that I can explain to Git how I want to proceed:

```
First, rewinding head to replay your work on top of it...
Applying: CH10: Stub file added with notes copied from video recording lessons.
Using index info to reconstruct a base tree...
A       ch10.asciidoc
Falling back to patching base and 3-way merge...
CONFLICT (modify/delete): ch10.asciidoc deleted in HEAD and modified in CH10:
Stub file added with notes copied from video recording lessons.. Version CH10:
Stub file added with notes copied from video recording lessons. of ch10.asciidoc
left in tree.
Failed to merge in the changes.
Patch failed at 0001 CH10: Stub file added with notes copied from video
recording lessons.
The copy of the patch that failed is found in:
  /Users/emmajane/Git/1234000002182/.git/rebase-apply/patch

When you have resolved this problem, run "git rebase --continue".
If you prefer to skip this patch, run "git rebase --skip" instead.
To check out the original branch and stop rebasing, run "git rebase --abort".
```

The relevant piece of information from this output is:

```
When you have resolved this problem, run "git rebase --continue".
```

This tells me that I need to:

1. Resolve the merge conflict.
2. Once I think the merge conflict is resolved, run the command:

```
git rebase --continue
```

I accomplish step 1 by opening the file in question in my designated file comparison tool:

```
$ git mergetool ch10.asciidoc
```

There are no merge conflict markers displayed in the file, so I quit the merge tool and proceed to the next step Git had identified:

```
$ git rebase --continue
```

The following message is returned from Git:

```
ch10.asciidoc: needs merge  
You must edit all merge conflicts and then  
mark them as resolved using git add
```

That's not very helpful! I just looked at that file and there were no merge conflicts. I'll ask Git what the problem is using the command `status`:

```
$ git status
```

The output from Git is as follows:

```
rebase in progress; onto 6ef4edb  
You are currently rebasing branch 'ch10' on '6ef4edb'.  
(fix conflicts and then run "git rebase --continue")  
(use "git rebase --skip" to skip this patch)  
(use "git rebase --abort" to check out the original branch)

Unmerged paths:  
(use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)  
(use "git add/rm <file>..." as appropriate to mark resolution)

deleted by us: ch10.asciidoc

no changes added to commit (use "git add" and/or "git commit -a")
```

Aha! There are two clues here for me. The text: `Unmerged paths` and then a little later on the text: `deleted by us: ch10.asciidoc`. Well, I don't want the file to be deleted. This is useful because Git has told me `deleted by us` and I know I don't want to delete the file; therefore I need to `unstage` Git's change. Unstaging a change is effectively saying to Git, “That thing you were planning to do? Don't do it. In fact, forget you were even thinking about doing anything with that file. Reset your `HEAD`, Git.”

Git tells me how to prevent this change from happening with the following text:

```
(use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)
```

Using this message as a guide, I run the following command:

```
$ git reset HEAD ch10.asciidoc
```

Now, what this command is actually doing is clearing out the staging area, and moving the pointer back to the most recent known commit. Because I am knee-deep in a rebase, and in a detached HEAD state as opposed to in a branch, `reset` clears away the staging area and puts me in the most recent state from the rebasing process. In my case, this leaves me with the older version of the file, which is fine. As I proceed through the rebase, I will replace the contents of the file with the latest version from the branch *feature*. If I wanted to preserve their deletion of the file, I would skip this step and proceed with the instructions, adding the file to the staging area as described later.

With my chapter file replaced, let's see what clues Git is giving me on how I should proceed:

```
$ git status
```

The output from Git is as follows:

```
rebase in progress; onto 6ef4edb
You are currently rebasing branch 'ch10' on '6ef4edb'.
  (all conflicts fixed: run "git rebase --continue")

Untracked files:
  (use "git add <file>..." to include in what will be committed)

    ch10.asciidoc

nothing added to commit but untracked files present (use "git add" to track)
```

So I've still got the file (great!), but Git is still confused about what to do, because as far as it's concerned, that file should have been deleted. I need to explicitly add the file back into the repository, which Git tells me to do by giving me the message:

```
Untracked files: (use "git add <file>..." to include in what will be
committed) ch10.asciidoc
```

The formatting is awkward if there is only one affected file but in the case of a longer list of files, the formatting is lovely.

Per Git's request, I will now add the file *ch10.asciidoc* to the staging area:

```
$ git add ch10.asciidoc
```

Now at this point, I know that the command `add` is just the beginning of a process, and that I'm going to need to `commit` the file as well, but this is rebasing and the rules are different. I'm going to ask Git what to do next by checking the output of the command `status` again:

```
$ git status
```

The output from Git is as follows:

```
rebase in progress; onto 6ef4edb
You are currently rebasing branch 'ch10' on '6ef4edb'.
(all conflicts fixed: run "git rebase --continue")

Changes to be committed:
(use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)

    new file:   ch10.asciidoc
```

Okay, it's saying there are changes to be committed (yup, already knew that), *but* it doesn't tell me to commit them! Instead it tells me to continue with the rebasing with the message:

```
all conflicts fixed: run "git rebase --continue"
```

I proceed with this command even though `add` is normally paired with `commit` to save changes:

```
$ git rebase --continue
```

Mid-Rebase Conflict from a Single File Merge Conflict

After restarting the rebasing process, Git has run into another conflict as it replays the commits. The output is as follows:

```
Applying: CH10: Stub file added with notes copied from video recording lessons.
Applying: TOC: Adding Chapter 10 to the book build.
Using index info to reconstruct a base tree...
M     book.asciidoc
Falling back to patching base and 3-way merge...
Auto-merging book.asciidoc
CONFLICT (content): Merge conflict in book.asciidoc
Recorded preimage for 'book.asciidoc'
Failed to merge in the changes.
Patch failed at 0002 TOC: Adding Chapter 10 to the book build.
The copy of the patch that failed is found in:
  /Users/emmajane/Git/1234000002182/.git/rebase-apply/patch
```

When you have resolved this problem, run "git rebase --continue".

If you prefer to skip this patch, run "git rebase --skip" instead.

To check out the original branch and stop rebasing, run "git rebase --abort".

Another conflict. You're being high maintenance, Git! No wonder people complain about rebasing! Okay, okay, at least it's a different file this time (**CONFLICT (content): Merge conflict in book.asciidoc**). I take a closer look at the output of the command `status` again to see if Git gives me additional clues:

```
$ git status
```

The output from Git is as follows:

```
rebase in progress; onto 6ef4edb
You are currently rebasing branch 'ch10' on '6ef4edb'.
  (fix conflicts and then run "git rebase --continue")
  (use "git rebase --skip" to skip this patch)
  (use "git rebase --abort" to check out the original branch)

Unmerged paths:
  (use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)
  (use "git add <file>..." to mark resolution)

    both modified:  book.asciidoc

no changes added to commit (use "git add" and/or "git commit -a")
```

Long sigh. Alright, Git. Let's see what the conflict is in this file:

```
$ git mergetool book.asciidoc
```

Opening up the file in my favorite merge tool, I see there *is* indeed a merge conflict in this file. The merge conflict markers are displayed as three columns. One column for each of the two branches being merged, and one column displaying how the merge conflict should be resolved. I choose the hunk of text I want to keep, which resolves the conflict. I save the file, close the merge tool, and ask Git if it's happy by using the command `status`, again:

```
$ git status
```

The output from Git is as follows:

```
rebase in progress; onto 6ef4edb
You are currently rebasing branch 'ch10' on '6ef4edb'.
  (fix conflicts and then run "git rebase --continue")
  (use "git rebase --skip" to skip this patch)
  (use "git rebase --abort" to check out the original branch)

Unmerged paths:
  (use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)
  (use "git add <file>..." to mark resolution)

    both modified:  book.asciidoc

no changes added to commit (use "git add" and/or "git commit -a")
```

The message is a little misleading because I *have* fixed the conflicts. At this point, I open the file to double check. Nope, no conflicts there. So now I move on to the next group of instructions: unmerged paths: use "git add <file> ..." to mark resolution and then both modified: book.asciidoc:

```
$ git add book.asciidoc
```

And check the status again:

```
$ git status
```

The output from Git is as follows:

```
rebase in progress; onto 6ef4edb
You are currently rebasing branch 'ch10' on '6ef4edb'.
(all conflicts fixed: run "git rebase --continue")

Changes to be committed:
(use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)

modified:   book.asciidoc
```

As before, I don't pair the command `add` with the command `commit`. Instead, Git instructs me as follows: all conflicts fixed: run "`git rebase --continue`", so I proceed with the rebasing process:

```
$ git rebase --continue
```

The output from Git is as follows:

```
Applying: TOC: Adding Chapter 10 to the book build.
Recorded resolution for 'book.asciidoc'.
Applying: CH10: Outline of GitHub topics
```

The rebasing procedure has been completed. My copy of the branch *feature* is now up to date with all changes that had been previously committed to the branch *master*.

There are a few different ways that rebasing can kick up a conflict. Take your time, read the instructions carefully, and if you aren't getting useful information, try using the command `status` to see if there's something more helpful that Git can offer. If you are really in a panic about what's happening, you can always abort the process with the command `git rebase --abort`. This will return you the state your branch was in right before you started the rebase.

An Overview of Locating Lost Work

It is very difficult to completely remove committed work in Git. It is, however, pretty easy to misplace your work with the same frequency that I misplace my keys, my glasses, my wallet, and my family's patience. If you think you have lost some work, the first thing you will need to do is locate the commit where the work was stored. The

command `log` displays commits that have been made to a particular branch; the command `reflog` lists a history of everything that has happened in your local copy of the repository. This means that if you are working with a repository you cloned from a remote server, the reflog history will begin at the point where you cloned the repository to your local environment—whereas the `log` history will display all of the commit messages since the command `init` was used to create the repository.

If you haven't already, get a copy of the project repository for this book, and compare the output of the two commands `reflog` and `log` ([Example 6-4](#)).

Example 6-4. Compare the output of log and reflog

```
$ git clone https://gitlab.com/gitforteams/gitforteams.git

Cloning into 'gitforteams'...
remote: Counting objects: 1084, done.
remote: Total 1084 (delta 0), reused 0 (delta 0)
Receiving objects: 100% (1084/1084), 12.07 MiB | 813.00 KiB/s, done.
Resolving deltas: 100% (628/628), done.
Checking connectivity... done.

$ git log --oneline

e8d6aff Updating diagram: Adding commit ID reference to rebase.
ae56a1f Adding workflow diagram for: reset, revert, rebase, checkout.
2480520 Merge pull request #5 from xrmxrm/1-markdown_fixes
ee46470 Fix some markdown Issue #1

$ git reflog

2f17715 HEAD@{1}: clone: from https://gitlab.com/gitforteams/gitforteams.git
```

If the only thing you have done is clone the repository, you will only see one line of history in the reflog. As you do more things, the reflog will start to grow. Following is a sample of the output from this book's repository:

```
fdd19dc HEAD@{157}: merge drafts: Fast-forward
af9e2c8 HEAD@{158}: checkout: moving from drafts to master
fdd19dc HEAD@{159}: merge ch04: Merge made by the 'recursive' strategy.
af9e2c8 HEAD@{160}: checkout: moving from ch04 to drafts
e296faa HEAD@{161}: commit (amend): CH04: first draft complete
dd87941 HEAD@{162}: commit: CH04: first draft complete
```

This is a private history. Only you can see it, thank goodness! It will contain everything that you have done including things that have no impact on the code, such as checking out a branch.

Both of the commands `log` and `reflog` show you the commit ID for a particular state that is stored in the repository. So long as you can find this commit ID, you can check

it out ([Example 6-5](#)), temporarily restoring the state of the code base at that point in time.

Example 6-5. Check out a specific commit in your repository

```
$ git checkout commit
```

```
Checking out files: 100% (2979/2979), done.  
Note: checking out 'a94b4c4'.
```

You are in 'detached HEAD' state. You can look around, make experimental changes and commit them, and you can discard any commits you make in this state without impacting any branches by performing another checkout.

If you want to create a new branch to retain commits you create, you may do so (now or later) by using -b with the checkout command again. Example:

```
git checkout -b new_branch_name
```

```
HEAD is now at a94b4c4... Fixing broken URL to the slides from the main README file.  
Was missing the end round bracket.
```

When you check out a commit, you will be detaching from the connected history for a particular branch. It's not really as scary as it sounds, though. Normally when we work in Git we are working in a linear representation of history. When we check out a single commit, we are working in a suspended state ([Figure 6-5](#)).




Figure 6-5. In a detached HEAD state, you are temporarily disconnected from the linear history of a branch

This is typically where people start to freak out a bit—understandably—your HEAD is DETACHED! Following the instructions Git provides will set you right. If you want to save the state you are in, check out a new branch and your state will be recorded in that new branch:

```
$ git checkout -b restoring_old_commit
```

At this point you can continue to add a few fix-ups in the new branch if there's anything missing you want to add (or old work that is no longer relevant and that you want to remove). Once you are finished, you will need to decide how you want to incorporate the new branch back into your working branch. You could choose to `merge` the new branch into an existing branch, or just `cherry-pick` a few commit(s) that you want to keep. Let's start with a merge, because this is something you should already be familiar with from [Chapter 5](#):

```
$ git checkout working_branch  
$ git merge restoring_old_commit
```

With the merge complete, you should now tidy up your local repository by deleting the temporary branch:

```
$ git branch --delete restoring_old_commit
```

If you have published the temporary branch and wish to delete it from the remote repository, you will need to do that explicitly:

```
$ git push --delete restoring_old_commit
```

This method has the potential to make an absolute mess of things if the temporary branch contains a lot of unrelated work. In this case, it may be more appropriate to use the command `cherry-pick` ([Example 6-6](#)). It can be used in a number of different ways—check the documentation for this command with `git help cherry-pick`. I tend to use the commit ID that I want to copy into my current branch. The optional parameter `-x` appends a line to the commit message letting you know this commit was cherry-picked from somewhere else, as opposed to having been originally created on this branch at this point in history. This addition makes it easier to identify the commit later.

Example 6-6. Copying commits onto a new branch with cherry-pick

```
$ git cherry-pick -x commit
```

Assuming the commit was cleanly applied to your current branch, you will see a message such as the following:

```
[master 6b60f9c] Adding office hours reminder.  
Date: Tue Jul 22 08:36:54 2014 -0700  
1 file changed, 2 insertions(+)
```

If things don't go well, you may need to resolve a merge conflict. The output for that would be as follows:

```
error: could not apply 9d7fbf3... Lesson 9: Removing lesson stubs from  
subsequent lessons.  
hint: after resolving the conflicts, mark the corrected paths
```

```
hint: with 'git add <paths>' or 'git rm <paths>'  
hint: and commit the result with 'git commit'
```

Merge conflicts are covered in more detail in [Chapter 7](#). Skip ahead to that chapter if you encounter a conflict while cherry-picking a commit.

Another output you may encounter is when the commit you want to incorporate is actually a merge commit. You will need to select the parent branch in this case. You can recognize this case by the following output from Git when you attempt to cherry-pick a commit:

```
error: Commit 0075f7eda6 is a merge but no -m option was given.  
fatal: cherry-pick failed
```

Confirm the parent branch you want to keep is the first branch lanes on the graphed output of your log (counting from left to right):

```
$ git log --oneline --graph
```

Then, run the command `cherry-pick` again, this time identifying the parent branch to keep with the parameter `--mainline`:

```
$ git cherry-pick -x commit --mainline 1
```

Finally, if you decide you don't want to keep the recovered work, you can obliterate the changes:

```
$ git reset --merge ORIG_HEAD
```



Published History Should Not Be Altered

The command `reset` should not be used on a shared branch to remove commits that have already been published. Undoing changes on shared branches is covered later in this chapter.

If you have worked on each of the examples in this section, you should now be able to check out a single commit, create a new branch to recover from a detached HEAD state, merge changes from one branch into another, cherry-pick commits into a branch, and delete local branches.

Restoring Files

You are working along and you just deleted the wrong file. You actually wanted to keep the file. Or perhaps you edited a file that shouldn't have been edited. Before the changes are locked into place (or *committed*), you can *check out* the files. This will restore the contents of the file to what was stored in the last known commit for the branch you are on:

```
$ rm README.md
```

```
$ git status

On branch master
Changes not staged for commit:
  (use "git add/rm <file>..." to update what will be committed)
  (use "git checkout -- <file>..." to discard changes in working directory)

    deleted:    README.md

no changes added to commit (use "git add" and/or "git commit -a")
```

The status message explains how to reverse the changes and recover your deleted file:

```
$ git checkout -- README.md
```

If you have already staged the file, you will need to unstaged it before you can restore the file by using the command `reset`. To try this, you will need to first delete a file, then use the command `add` to add the changes to the staging area, and finally use the command `status` to verify your next action:

```
$ rm README.md
$ git add README.md

$ git status

On branch master
Changes to be committed:
  (use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)

    deleted:    README.md
```

At this point, the command you used previously, `checkout`, will not work. Instead, follow the instructions Git provides to unstaged the file you want to restore. Instead of selecting a specific commit, use the Git short form `HEAD`, which refers to the most recent commit on the current branch:

```
$ git reset HEAD README.md
```

Once the file is unstaged, you can use the command `checkout` as you did previously to restore the deleted file:

```
$ git checkout -- README.md
```

If you prefer, you can combine these two commands into one:

```
$ git reset --hard HEAD -- README.md
```

If you want to undo all of the changes in your working directory, restoring the version of the files that was saved in the previous commit, you don't need to make the changes one at a time. You can do it in bulk:

```
$ git reset --hard HEAD
```

You should now be able to restore a deleted file in the working directory.

Working with Commits

A commit is a snapshot within your repository that contains the state of all of the files at that point in time. Each of these commits can be manipulated within your history. You can remove the commit entirely with the command `reset`, you can reverse the effects of a commit (but maintain it in your history) with the command `revert`, and you can change the order of the commits with the command `rebase`. Altering the history of your repository is a big no-no if you've already published the commits. This is because even the slightest change will result in a new commit SHA being stored in the repository—even if the code itself is exactly the same at the tip of the branch. This is because Git assumes that all new commit IDs contain new information that must be incorporated, regardless of the contents of the files stored in those commits.

In this section, it is assumed you are working with commits that have *not* been shared with others yet (i.e., you haven't pushed your branch). Tips for working on changing history for shared branches are covered separately.

Amending Commits

If you realize a commit you've just made is just missing one little fix, you can amend the commit to include additional files, or update the message that was used for the commit. I use this command frequently to convert my terse one-line commit messages into well-formed summaries of the work I've completed.



Do Not Change Shared History

If you have already pushed the work, it is considered bad form to go back and “fix” shared history.

If you have made any changes to the files in your working directory, you will need to add the files to the staging area before amending your commit ([Example 6-7](#)). If you are just updating the commit message, and there are no new, or modified files, you can omit the command `add`, and jump straight to the command `commit`.

Example 6-7. Updating the previous commit with --amend

```
$ git add --all  
$ git commit --amend
```

Your new changes will be added to the previous commit, and a new ID will be assigned to the revised commit object.



Even More Commit Options Are Available

There are even more ways to construct your commit object. I've outlined the options I use most frequently. You may find additional gems by reading the relevant manual page for `commit`. This information is accessible by running the command: `git help commit`.

If you want to amend more than just the previous commit, though, you will need to use either `reset` or `rebase`.

Combining Commits with Reset

The command `reset` appears in many different forms during the undo process. In this example, we will use it to mimic the effects of `squash` in rebasing. The most basic explanation of what `reset` does is essentially a pointing game. Wherever you point your finger is what Git is going to treat as the current `HEAD` (or tip) of your branch.



Reset Alters Your Logged History

This is going to alter history because it removes references to commits. If someone were to merge their old copy of the branch, they would reintroduce the commits you had tried to remove. As a result, it's best to only use `reset` to alter the history of branches that are not shared with others (this means you created the branch locally, and you haven't pushed it to the server yet).

Previously you used the command `reset` to unstage work before making a commit. This time you are using `reset` to remove commit objects from your branch's history. Think of a string of beads. Let's say the string is 20 beads long. Holding the fourth bead, allow the first three beads to slide off the string. You now have a shorter string of beads *as well as* three loose beads. The parameters you use when issuing the `reset` command are part of what determines the fate of those beads.

If you want to discard the content contained in the commit objects you removed, you need to use `reset` with the mode `hard`. This mode is enabled by using the parameter `--hard`. When you use the mode `hard`, the commit objects will be removed, and the working directory will be updated so that all content stored in those commit objects are also removed. If you do not use `--hard` when you reset your work, Git keeps the content of the working directory the same, but throws away the commit objects back to the reference point. It will be as if you typed all of the changes from the previous commits into one giant piece of work. It's now waiting to be added and committed.



Reset Reestablishes the Tip of a Branch

Somewhere along the way, I got it stuck in my head that `reset` ought to reverse the action applied in a given commit. This definition is correct for the command `revert`, but not `reset`. The command `reset` resets the tip of the branch *to* the specified commit. Perhaps if it were named “restore” or “promote” or even just “set” my brain would have made a better separation between the two commands. Remember: the target for `reset` is on what’s being kept, and the target of `revert` is what is lost.

Using our previous bead example, let’s say you wanted to reset your string of beads so that the most recent three beads were replaced by a single big bead. You would use the command `reset` to point the new end for your string to the fourth bead from the end. You would then slide the three beads off the end of the string. (If you used the parameter `--hard`, these beads would be discarded.) Instead, we’re going to remodel these beads, and put them back on the string as a new commit.



Commits Must Be Consecutive, and End with the Most Recent Commit

For this operation to work, you need to be compressing consecutive commits leading up to your most recent commit. What we are doing is essentially a stepping stone to interactive rebasing. With this use of `reset` you will be limited to the most recent commits. With rebasing, you will be able to select any range of commits.

Using the command `log`, identify the most recent commit that you want to keep. This will become the new tip for your branch:

```
$ git log --oneline  
  
699d8e0 More editing second file  
eabb4cc Editing the second file  
d955e17 Adding second file  
eppb98c Editing the first file  
ee3e63c Adding first file
```

Sticking with the three-bead analogy, the bead that I want to have as the new tip of my necklace is `eppb98c`. (This is the fourth bead from the end—not entirely intuitive if you are completely focused on removing three beads.) We’re going to put our finger on the bead we want to keep, and slide the rest off of the string:

```
$ git reset eppb98c
```

The are now three loose beads rattling around. These beads will appear as *untracked changes* in our repository. The content of the files will not have changed.

You can view what will be in your new commit by using the command `diff`:

```
$ git diff
```

To combine all of the edits that were made in those three commits into a single commit, use the command `add` to capture the changes in the staging area:

```
$ git add --all
```

Ensure the files are now staged and ready to be saved:

```
$ git status
```

Now that the files have been staged, the command `diff` will no longer show you what you are about to commit to your repository. Instead, you will need to examine the staged version of the changes:

```
$ git diff --staged
```



Staging Is Also Caching

The parameter `--staged` is an alias of `--cached`. I choose to use the aliased version because it more closely matches the terms I use when talking about *staging changes*. If you are searching for more documentation about this parameter, be sure to also look for the original parameter name.

Once you are satisfied with the contents of your new commit, you can go ahead and complete the commit process:

```
$ git commit -m "Replacing three small beads with this single, giant bead."
```

The three commits will now be combined into one single commit.

If you are having a hard time with the word `reset` and having to go one *past* the commit you are looking for, I encourage you to use relative history instead of commit IDs. For example, if you wanted to compress three commits from your branch into one, you would use the following command:

```
$ git reset HEAD~3
```

This version of the command puts your repository into the same state as the previous example, but it's as if the pointer was using another language. Either approach is fine. Use whichever one makes more sense to you. I personally find if there are more than a handful of commits that I want to reset, using the commit ID is a lot easier than counting backward.

If you've been following along with the examples in this section, you should now be able to restore a file that was deleted, and combine several smaller commits into one.

Altering Commits with Interactive Rebasing

Rebasing is one of those topics that has gained a strong positive following—and strong opponents. While I have no technical problems using the command, I openly admit that I don't like what it does. Rebasing is primarily used to change the way history is recorded, often without changing the content of the files in your working directory. Used incorrectly, this can cause chaos on shared branches as new commit objects with different IDs are used to store work identical work. But my complaints are more to do with the idea that it's okay to rewrite history to suit your fancy. In the nonsoftware world **historical revisionism** is wrong.

Complaints aside, rebasing is simply the model Git has decided on and so it fits quite well into many workflows. (I use it when it is appropriate to do so—even for my solo projects where its use is not being enforced by an outside team.) One of the times it is appropriate to use rebasing is when bringing a branch up-to-date (as was discussed in “[Rebasing Step by Step](#)” on page 113 and in [Chapter 3](#)); the second is before publishing your work—interactive rebasing allows you to curate the commits into an easier-to-read history. In this section you will learn about the latter of these two methods.

Interactive rebasing can be especially useful if you've been committing micro thoughts—leaving you with commits in your history that only capture partial ideas. Interactive rebasing is also useful if you have a number of commits that, due to a peer review or sober second thought, you've decided were not the correct approach. Cleaning up your history so there are only good, intentional commits will make it easier to use the command `bisect` in [Chapter 9](#). To help explain the concept, I created a [simple animation](#) showing the basic principles of squashing several small commits into one whole idea.

The first thing you need to do is select a commit in your history that you want to have as your starting point (I often choose one commit older than what I think I'll need—just in case). Let's say your branch's history has the following commits:

```
d1dc647 Revert "Adding office hours reminder."  
50605a1 Correcting joke about horses and baths.  
eed5023 Joke: What goes 'ha ha bonk'?  
77c00e2 Adding an Easter egg of bad jokes.  
0f187d8 Added information about additional people to be thanked.  
c546720 Adding office hours reminder.  
3184b5d Switching back to BADCamp version of the deck.  
bd5c178 Added feedback request; formatting updates to pro-con lists  
876e951 Removing feedback request; added Twitter handle.
```

You have decided that the three commits about jokes should be collapsed into a single commit. Looking to the commit *previous* to this, you select `0f187d8` as your starting point. You are now ready to begin the rebasing process:

```
$ git rebase --interactive 0f187d8
```

```

pick 77c00e2 Adding an Easter egg of bad jokes.
pick eed5023 Joke: What goes 'ha ha bonk'?
pick 50605a1 Correcting joke about horses and baths.
pick d1dc647 Revert "Adding office hours reminder."

# Rebase 0f187d8..d1dc647 onto 0f187d8
#
# Commands:
# p, pick = use commit
# r, reword = use commit, but edit the commit message
# e, edit = use commit, but stop for amending
# s, squash = use commit, but meld into previous commit
# f, fixup = like "squash", but discard this commit's log message
# x, exec = run command (the rest of the line) using shell
#
# These lines can be re-ordered; they are executed from top to bottom.
#
# If you remove a line here THAT COMMIT WILL BE LOST.
#
# However, if you remove everything, the rebase will be aborted.
#
# Note that empty commits are commented out

```

The list of commits has been reversed and the oldest commit is now at the top of the list. Edit the list and replace the second and third use of the word `squash` to `pick`. In my case, the edited list would appear as follows:

```

pick 77c00e2 Adding an Easter egg of bad jokes.
squash eed5023 Joke: What goes 'ha ha bonk'?
squash 50605a1 Correcting joke about horses and baths.
pick d1dc647 Revert "Adding office hours reminder."

```

Save and quit your editor to proceed. A new window commit message editor will open. You will now need to craft a new commit message that represents all of the commits you are combining. The current messages are provided as a starting point:

```

# This is a combination of 3 commits.
# The first commit's message is:
Adding an Easter egg of bad jokes.

```

You should add your bad jokes too.

```
# This is the 2nd commit message:
```

Joke: What goes 'ha ha bonk'?

```
# This is the 3rd commit message:
```

Correcting joke about horses and baths.

```

# Please enter the commit message for your changes. Lines starting
# with '#' will be ignored, and an empty message aborts the commit.
#

```

```
# Date:      Wed Sep 10 06:12:01 2014 -0400
#
# rebase in progress; onto 0f187d8
# You are currently editing a commit while rebasing branch 'practice_rebasing'
on '0f187d8'.
#
# Changes to be committed:
#       new file:  badjokes.md
#
```

In this case, it is appropriate to update the commit message as follows:

```
Adding an Easter egg of bad jokes.
```

```
- New Joke: What goes 'ha ha bonk'?
```

You don't need to remove lines starting with #. I have done this to make it a little easier to read.

When you are happy with the new commit message, save and quit the editor to proceed:

```
[detached HEAD 1c10178] Adding an Easter egg of bad jokes.
Date: Wed Sep 10 06:12:01 2014 -0400
1 file changed, 7 insertions(+)
create mode 100644 badjokes.md
Successfully rebased and updated refs/heads/practice_rebasing.
```

The rebasing procedure is now complete. Your revised log will appear as follows:

```
$ git log --oneline

ef4409f Revert "Adding office hours reminder."
1c10178 Adding an Easter egg of bad jokes.
0f187d8 Added information about additional people to be thanked.
c546720 Adding office hours reminder.
3184b5d Switching back to BADCamp version of the deck.
```

In the second example, we are going to separate changes that were made in a single commit so they are available as two commits instead. This would be useful if you added made several changes to a single file and committed all of those changes as a single commit but they should have have actually been saved as two separate commits.

To separate a commit into several, begin the same way as you did before. This time when presented with the list of options, change pick to edit for one of the commits. When you save and close the editor this time, you will be presented with the option to amend your commit (you know how to do this! yay!), and then proceed with the rebase process:

```
Stopped at 0f187d831260b8e93d37bad11be1f41aaeca835e... Added information
about additional people to be thanked.
You can amend the commit now, with
```

```
git commit --amend
```

Once you are satisfied with your changes, run

```
git rebase --continue
```

At this point you are in a detached HEAD state (you've been here before! it's okay!), but the files are all committed. You need to reset the working directory so that it has uncommitted files that you can work with. Do you remember the command we used previously to accomplish this? It's `reset!` Instead of selecting a specific commit, it's okay to use the shorthand for "one commit ago," which is `HEAD~1`:

```
$ git reset HEAD~1
```

```
Unstaged changes after reset:  
M README.md
```

Now you have an uncommitted file in your working directory that needs to be added before you can continue the rebasing.

At this point, you can stage your files interactively by adding the parameter `--patch` when you add your files. This allows you to separate changes saved into one file into two (or more) commits. You do this by adding one hunk of the change to the staging area, committing the change, and then adding a new hunk to the staging area:

```
$ git add --patch README.md
```

You will be asked if you want to stage each of the hunks in the file:

```
diff --git a/README.md b/README.md  
index 291915b..2eceb48 100644  
--- a/README.md  
+++ b/README.md  
@@ -49,3 +49,5 @@ Emma is grateful for the support she received while employed at  
Drupalize.Me (Lullabot) for the development of this material.  
The first version of the reveal.js slides for this work were posted at  
[workflow-git-workshop](https://github.com/DrupalizeMe/workflow-git-workshop).  
+  
+Emma is also grateful to you for watching her git tutorials!  
Stage this hunk [y,n,q,a,d,/ ,e,?]?
```

If you want to include the hunk, choose `y`; otherwise, choose `n`. If it's a big hunk and you want to only include some of it, choose `s` (this option isn't available if the hunk is too small). Proceed through each of the changes in the file and select the appropriate option. When you get to the end of the list of changes, you will be returned to the prompt. Use the command `git status`, and assuming there was more than one hunk to change, you will see your file is ready to be committed *and* not staged for commit:

```
$ git status
```

```
rebase in progress; onto bd5c178
You are currently splitting a commit while rebasing branch 'practice_rebasing'
on 'bd5c178'.
(Once your working directory is clean, run "git rebase --continue")
```

```
Changes to be committed:
(use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)
```

```
    modified: README.md
```

```
Changes not staged for commit:
(use "git add <file>..." to update what will be committed)
(use "git checkout -- <file>..." to discard changes in working directory)
```

```
    modified: README.md
```

Proceed by committing your staged changes:

```
$ git commit
```

If the remainder of the changes can all be included in the same commit, you can omit the parameter `--patch` and add and commit the file to the repository:

```
$ git add README.md
$ git commit
```

With all of your changes committed, you are ready to proceed with the rebase. It seems like there aren't any hints, but if you check the status, Git will remind you you are not done yet:

```
$ git status

rebase in progress; onto bd5c178
You are currently editing a commit while rebasing branch 'practice_rebasing'
on 'bd5c178'.
(use "git commit --amend" to amend the current commit)
(use "git rebase --continue" once you are satisfied with your changes)

nothing to commit, working directory clean
```

To complete the rebase, follow the command as Git has described in the status message:

```
$ git rebase --continue

Successfully rebased and updated refs/heads/practice_rebasing.
```

Phew! You did it! That was a lot of steps, but they were all concepts you have previously tried; this time they were chained together. Well done, you.

If you have followed each of the examples in this section, you should now be able to amend commits, and alter the history of a branch using interactive rebasing.

Unmerging a Branch

Mistakes can happen when you are merging branches. Maybe you had the wrong branch checked out when you performed the merge; or maybe you were supposed to use the `--no-ff` parameter when merging, but you forgot. So long as you haven't published the branch, it can be quite easy to "unmerge" your branches.



There Is No Such Thing as an Unmerge

"Inconceivable!" he cried. "I do not think that word means what you think it means," the other replied. With apologies to *The Princess Bride*, it's true; there's no six-fingered man in Git, and there's not really a way to "unmerge" something. You can, however, reverse the effects of a merge by resetting the tip of your branch to the point immediately before you used the command `merge..`. Hopefully this doesn't happen to you often, because it's possible it will take years off your life just like The Machine does to our hero, Westley.

Ideally, you will notice you have incorrectly merged a branch immediately after doing it. This is the easiest scenario to reverse. Git knows some of its commands are more dangerous than others, so it stores a pointer to the most recent commit right before it performs the dangerous maneuver. Git considers a merge to be dangerous, and so you can easily undo a merge right after it occurs by running `reset`, and pointing the tip of your branch back to the commit *right before* the merge took place:

```
$ git reset --merge ORIG_HEAD
```

If you did not notice your mistake right away, you will need to ask yourself a few more questions before proceeding. [Figure 6-6](#) summarizes the considerations you will need to make in order to select the correct commands to unmerge your work.

You will need to think carefully about what work you may want to retain, and what work can be thrown out, before proceeding. If you have deleted the branch you are removing, you may wish to create a backup copy of the commits in a separate branch. This will save you from having to dig through the reflog to find the lost commits.

Let's say the branch you are working on is named `master`, and you want to create a backup branch named `preservation_branch`:

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git checkout -b preservation_branch
```




Figure 6-6. Before unmerging your branch, consider what may happen to the lost commits

You now have a branch with the good commits and the bad commits, and you can proceed with removing the bad commits. This assumes there are no additional commits you want to save on the branch that needs cleaning:

```
$ git checkout master
$ git reset --merge ORIG_HEAD
```

If you do want to save some of the commits, you can now cherry-pick them back from the backup branch you created.

```
$ git cherry-pick commit_to_restore
```

The method of using ORIG_HEAD as a reference point will only work if you notice right away that you need to unmerge the bad branch. If you have been working on other

things, it's possible that Git will have already established a new ORIG_HEAD. In this case, you will need to select the specific commit ID you want to return to:

```
$ git reset last_correct_commit
```

As [Figure 6-6](#) shows, there are a few different scenarios for unmerging branches. Take your time and remember, the reflog keeps track of everything, so if something disappears, you can always go back and check out a specific commit to center yourself and figure out what to do without losing any of your work.

Undoing Shared History

This chapter has been focused on altering the unpublished history of your repository. As soon as you start publishing your work you will eventually publish something that needs to be fixed up. There are lots of reasons why this can happen—new requirements from a client; you notice a bug; someone else notices a bug. There is nothing to be ashamed of if you need to make a change and share it with others, and you almost certainly don't need to hide your learning! Sometimes, however, it's appropriate to clean up a commit history that has already been shared. For example, lots of minor fixes can make debugging tools, such as `bisect`, less efficient; and a clean commit history is easier to read. The most polite way to modify shared history is to not modify it at all. Instead of a “roll back” to recover a past working state, think of your actions as “rolling forward” to a future working state. You can do this by adding new commits, or by using the command `revert`. In this section you will learn how to fix up a shared history without frustrating your teammates.

Reverting a Previous Commit

If there was a commit in the past that was incorrect, it is possible to apply a new commit that is the exact opposite of what you had previously using the command `revert`. If you are into physics, `revert` is kind of like noise-canceling headphones. The command applies the exact opposite sound as the background noise, and the net effect to your ears is a silent nothingness.

When you use the command `revert`, you will notice that your history is not altered. Commits are not removed; rather, a new commit is applied to the tip of your branch. For example, if the commit you are reverting applied three new lines, and removed one line, the revert will remove the three new lines and add back the deleted line.

For example, you have the following history for your branch:

```
50605a1 Correcting joke about horses and baths.  
eed5023 Joke: What goes 'ha ha bonk'?  
77c00e2 Adding an Easter egg of bad jokes.  
0f187d8 Added information about additional people to be thanked.  
c546720 Adding office hours reminder.
```

```
3184b5d Switching back to BADCamp version of the deck.  
bd5c178 Added feedback request; formatting updates to pro-con lists
```

You decide that you want to remove the commit made about the reminder for the office hours, because that message was only relevant for that particular point in time. This message was added at c546720:

```
$ git revert c546720
```

The commit message editor will open. A default message is provided, so you can save and quit to proceed:

```
[master d1dc647] Revert "Adding office hours reminder."  
 1 file changed, 2 deletions(-)
```

Your logged history now includes a new commit to undo the changes that were added in c546720:

```
d1dc647 Revert "Adding office hours reminder."  
50605a1 Correcting joke about horses and baths.  
eed5023 Joke: What goes 'ha ha bonk'?  
77c00e2 Adding an Easter egg of bad jokes.  
0f187d8 Added information about additional people to be thanked.  
c546720 Adding office hours reminder.  
3184b5d Switching back to BADCamp version of the deck.
```

Repeat for each commit that you want to revert.

If you have followed along with each of the examples in this section, you should now be able to reverse the changes that were implemented in a previous commit.

Unmerging a Shared Branch

Previously in this chapter you learned how unmerge two branches using the command `reset`. This command deletes commits from a branch's history. As a result, Git will treat them as *new* commits if it encounters them again. This happens if people merge their (now out of date) branch into the main repository.

To know which commands to use, you will first need to determine what kind of merge it is. [Figure 6-7](#) compares a fast-forward merge and a true merge. A fast-forward merge is aligned with the commits from the branch it was merged into; a true merge, however, is displayed as a hump on the graph and includes a commit where the merge was performed.

Using the command `log`, look for the point where the incorrect branch was merged in ([Example 6-8](#)). If there is a merge commit, you're in luck! If there is no merge commit, you are going to have to do a lot more work to get the branch unmerged.




Figure 6-7. When graphed, a fast-forward merge loses the visual of a branch; a true merge maintains it.

Example 6-8. The graphed log of your commit history will show you if it's a true merge

```
$ git log --oneline --graph
* 4f2eaa4 Merge branch 'ch07' into drafts
|\ \
| * c10fbdd CH07: snapshot after editing draft in LibreOffice
| * 9716e7b CH07: snapshot before LibreOffice editing
| * 8373ad7 App01: moving version check to the appendix from CH07
```

```
| * d602e51 CH7: Stub file added with notes copied from video recording lessons.  
* | 1ae7de0 CH08: Incorrect heading formatting was creating new chapter  
* | 7907650 CH08: Draft chapter. Based on ALA article.  
* | ad6c422 CH8: Stub file added with notes copied from video recording lessons.
```

You may also want to look at a single commit to confirm if it is a true merge using the command `show`. This will list SHA1 for the branches that were merged:

```
$ git show 90249389  
commit 902493896b794d7bc6b19a1130240302efb1757f  
Merge: 54a4fdf c077a62  
Author: Joe Shindelar <redacted@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon Jan 26 18:30:55 2015 -0700  
  
Merge branch 'dev' into qa
```

Thanks, Joe, for this tip!



Being Consistent Makes It Easier to Search Successfully

The default commit message for a merge commit is “Merge branch *incoming* into *current*,” which makes it easier to spot when reading through the output from the `log` command. Your team might choose to use a different commit message template; however, you can add the optional parameters `--merges` and `--no-merges` to further filter the logged history.

Once you know if there is a merge commit present, you can choose the appropriate set of commands. [Figure 6-8](#) summarizes these options as a flowchart.

If the branch was merged using a true merge, and not a fast-forward merge, the undo process is as follows: use the command `revert` to reverse the effects of the merge commit ([Example 6-9](#)). This command takes one additional parameter, `--mainline`. This parameter tells Git which of the branches it should keep while undoing the merge. Take a look at your graphed log and count the lanes from left to right. The first lane is 1. You almost always want to keep the leftmost lane, and so the number to use is almost always 1.

Example 6-9. Reversing a merge commit

```
$ git checkout branch_to_clean_up  
$ git log --graph --oneline  
$ git revert --mainline 1 4f2eaa4
```

The commit message editor will open. A default commit message is provided indicating a revert is being performed, and including the commit message from the commit it is reversing ([Example 6-10](#)). I generally leave this message in place due to sheer

laziness; however, the upside is that it is quite easy to search through my recorded history and find any commits where I've reverted a merge.




Figure 6-8. Depending on how your branch was merged, you will use different commands to unmerge the shared branch

Example 6-10. Sample commit message for a revert of a merge commit

```
Revert "Merge branch 'video-lessons' into integration_test"
```

This reverts commit 0075f7eda67326f174623eca9ec09fd54d7f4b74, reversing changes made to 0f187d831260b8e93d37bad11be1f41aaeca835e.

```
# Please enter the commit message for your changes. Lines starting
# with '#' will be ignored, and an empty message aborts the commit.
# On branch master
# Your branch and 'origin/master' have diverged,
# and have 23 and 2 different commits each, respectively.
# (use "git pull" to merge the remote branch into yours)
#
# Changes to be committed:
#       deleted:  lessons/01-intro/README.md
#       deleted:  lessons/02-getting-started/README.md
#       deleted:  lessons/03-clone-remote/README.md
```

```
#      deleted:  lessons/04-config/README.md
(etc)
#
```

Occasionally you will run into conflicts when running a revert. No reason to panic. Simply treat it as any other merge conflict and follow Git's on-screen instructions:

```
$ git revert --mainline 1 a1173fd

error: could not revert a1173fd... Merge branch 'unmerging'
hint: after resolving the conflicts, mark the corrected paths
hint: with 'git add <paths>' or 'git rm <paths>'
hint: and commit the result with 'git commit'
Resolved 'README.md' using previous resolution.
```

Something went wrong—check the status message to see which files need reviewing:

```
$ git status

On branch master
Your branch and 'origin/master' have diverged,
and have 20 and 2 different commits each, respectively.
  (use "git pull" to merge the remote branch into yours)
You are currently reverting commit a1173fd.
  (fix conflicts and run "git revert --continue")
  (use "git revert --abort" to cancel the revert operation)

Changes to be committed:
  (use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)

    deleted:  badjokes.md
    modified: slides/slides/session-oscon.html

Unmerged paths:
  (use "git reset HEAD <file>..." to unstage)
  (use "git add <file>..." to mark resolution)

    both modified: README.md
```

The messages about the repository being out of sync with `origin` is unrelated to this issue. Skip that, and keep reading. The first useful bit of information starts at: You are currently reverting. You are given the options on how to proceed, and on how to abort the process. Don't give up! Keep reading. The next bit looks like a regular ol' dirty working directory with some files that are staged, and some that aren't. If you were just making edits to your files, you would know how to deal with this. First you add your changes to the staging area, and then you commit them:

```
$ git add README.md
$ git commit -m "Reversing the merge commit a1173fd."
[master 291dabe] Reversing the merge commit a1173fd.
  2 files changed, 2 insertions(+), 7 deletions(-)
  delete mode 100644 badjokes.md
```

If there is no merge commit, you will need to deal with each of the commits you want to undo individually. This is going to be especially frustrating because a fast-forward merge does not have any visual clues in the graphed log about which commits were in the offending branch. (After the first time unpicking an incorrect merge, you'll begin to see the logic in using a `--no-ff` strategy when merging branches.)



Consider Your Options by Talking to Your Team

Before unpicking the commits one at a time, you may want to check if there is anyone on the team with an unpublished, unsullied version of the branch they can share. Sometimes it is easier to break history with a well-placed `push --force`.

The first thing you need to do is get a sense of where the bad commits are. If you are not entirely sure how things went wrong, you can get a list of all the branches a commit is contained within by using the command `branch` with the parameter `--contains`:

```
$ git branch --contains commit
```

Assuming the merged-in branch hasn't been deleted, you should be able to use the information to figure out which branch you are trying to unmerge, and what commits were applied to that branch that you might want to remove. Remember, though, the commits are going to be in *both* branches, so you won't be able to run a comparison to find which commits are different. This step isn't necessary if you already know which commits you are targeting.

If the commits you need to revert are sequential, you're in luck! The command `revert` can accept a single commit, or a series of commits. Remember, though, that a revert is going to make a new commit for each commit it is reversing. This could get very noisy in your commit history, so instead of reversing each commit individually, you can group them into a single reversal by opting to save your commit message to the very end:

```
$ git revert --no-commit last_commit_to_keep..newest_commit_to_reject
```

After running this command you will end up with a dirty working directory with all of the files reverted back. Review the changes. Then, complete the revert process:

```
$ git revert --continue
```

Review the commit message and make any necessary updates to improve the clarity of the message. By default the message will be "Revert" followed by the quoted text of what was in the newest of the commits you are reversing. Often this will be sufficient, but you may want to be more descriptive if the original message was subpar.

If the commits are not sequential, you will need to revert the offending commits one at a time. Send me a tweet at @emmajanehw and I will commiserate and cheerlead.

```
$ git revert commit
```

Unmerging a merged branch is not something Git is designed to do unless a very specific workflow has been followed. Your team may never need to unmerge a branch. I have definitely had the occasional bad merge on a personal project where I was a solo developer and opted to swear a bit, and then shrug and move on. Sometimes history doesn't really matter all that much; sometimes it does. With experience and hindsight, you know for sure which commands you *should* have been using.

Really Removing History

In this chapter, you've learned about updating the history of your repository, and especially retrieving information you thought was lost. There may be times when you actually *do* want to lose part of your history—for example, if you accidentally commit a very large data file or a configuration file that contains a password. Hopefully you never need to use this section, but just in case your “friend” ever needs help, I've included the instructions. You know, just in case.



Published History Is Public History

If you have published content to a publicly available remote repository, you should make the assumption that someone out there cloned a copy of your repository and has access to the secrets you did not mean to publish. Update any passwords and API keys that were published in the repository immediately.

If you need to do your cleanup on a published branch, you should notify your team members as soon as you realize you need to clean the repository. You should let them know you are going to be doing the cleanup, and will be “force pushing” a new history into the repository. Developers will need to evaluate their local repository and decide which state it is in. Have each of the developers search for the offending file to see if their repository is tainted:

- If the file you are trying to remove is not in their local repository, they will not be affected by your cleanup.
- If their repository does have the file, in any of their local branches, it is tainted. However, if they have not done any of their own work since the file was introduced, they will not be affected by your cleanup. This may be true for QA managers who are not also local developers. In this case, have them remove their local copy of the repository and re-clone the repository once the cleanup is done.

- If their repository is tainted, and they *do* have local work that was built from a branch that includes the tainted history, they will need to bring these branch(es) up-to-date through rebasing. If they use `merge` to bring their branches up-to-date, they will reintroduce the problem files back into the repository and your work will have been for naught. This can be a little scary for people if they are not familiar with rebasing, so you may want to suggest that they push any branches that have work they need to keep so that you can clean it up for them. (Have them clone a new repository once the cleanup is done.)

While you are working on the cleanup, your coworkers could **have a sword fight** or something.

With everyone on the team notified, and with a plan of what will happen before, during, and after the cleanup on everyone else's repositories, you are ready to proceed.

For this procedure, you will use the command `filter-branch`. This command allows you to rewrite branch histories and tags. The examples provided in the Git documentation are interesting, and worth reading. You can, for example, use this command to permanently remove any code submitted by a specific author. I cannot think of an instance when I would choose to remove everything from someone without reviewing the implications, but it's interesting that the command can be used in this way. (Perhaps you know *exactly* how it would be useful, though?)

Assuming the file you want to remove is named `SECRET.md`, the command would be as follows (this is a single command, but it's long; the \ allows you to wrap onto two lines):

```
$ git filter-branch --index-filter \  
  'git rm --cached --ignore-unmatch SECRET.md' HEAD
```

With the file completely removed from the repository, add it to your `.gitignore` file so that it doesn't accidentally sneak in again. Instructions on working with `.gitignore` are available in [Appendix C](#).

Unlike the other methods in this chapter, we are aiming to *permanently* remove the offending content from your repository. For a brief period of time the commits will still be available by using the command `reflog`. When you are *sure* you do not need the commits anymore, you can obliterate them from your system by cleaning out the local history as well and doing a little garbage collection (`gc`):

```
$ git reflog expire --expire=now --all  
$ git gc --prune=now
```

Your repository is now cleaned, and you are ready to push the new version to your remote repositories:

```
$ git push origin --force --all --tags
```

Once the new version of history is available from the shared repository, you can tell your coworkers to update their work. Depending on the conversation you've had previously, they will incorporate your sanitized changes into their work by one of the following methods:

- Cloning the repository again from scratch. This method is better for teams that are not currently using rebasing and are intimidated by it.
- Updating their branches with `rebase`. This method is better for teams that are already comfortable with rebasing because it is faster than starting a new clone, and allows them to keep any work they have locally:

```
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
```

Both [GitHub](#) and [Bitbucket](#) offer articles on how to do this cleanup for repositories stored on their sites. Both are worth reading because they cover slightly different scenarios.

Now that you know Git's built-in way of sanitizing a repository, check out this stand-alone package, [BFG Repo Cleaner](#). It delivers the same outcome as `filter-branch`, but it is much faster to use, and once it is installed, it's much easier, too. If you are dismayed by the amount of time a cleanup is taking with `filter-branch`, you should definitely try using BFG.

Command Reference

Table 6-2 lists the commands covered in this chapter.

Table 6-2. Git commands for undoing work

Command	Use
<code>git checkout -b <i>branch</i></code>	Create a new branch with the name <i>branch</i>
<code>git add <i>filename(s)</i></code>	Stage files in preparation for committing them to the repository
<code>git commit</code>	Save the staged changes to the repository
<code>git checkout <i>branch</i></code>	Switch to the specified branch
<code>git merge <i>branch</i></code>	Incorporate the commits from the branch <i>branch</i> into the current branch
<code>git branch --delete</code>	Remove a local branch
<code>git branch -D</code>	Remove a local branch whose commits are not incorporated elsewhere

Command	Use
<code>git clone URL</code>	Create a local copy of a remote repository
<code>git log</code>	Read the commit history for this branch
<code>git reflog</code>	Read the extended history for this branch
<code>git checkout commit</code>	Check out a specific commit; puts you into a detached HEAD state
<code>git cherry-pick commit</code>	Copy a commit from one branch to another
<code>git reset --merge ORIG_HEAD</code>	Remove from the current branch all commits applied during a recent merge
<code>git checkout -- filename</code>	Restore a file that was changed, but has not yet been committed
<code>git reset HEAD filename</code>	Unstage a file that is currently staged so that its changes are not saved during the next commit
<code>git reset --hard HEAD</code>	Restore all changed files to the previously stored state
<code>git reset commit</code>	Unstage all of the changes that were previously committed up to the commit right before this point
<code>git rebase --interactive commit</code>	Edit, or squash commits since <i>commit</i>
<code>git rebase --continue</code>	After resolving a merge conflict, continue with the rebasing process
<code>git revert commit</code>	Unapply changes stored in the identified commit; this creates a sharing-friendly reversal of history
<code>git log --oneline --graph</code>	Display the graphed history for this branch
<code>git revert --mainline 1 commit</code>	Reverse a merge commit
<code>git branch --contains commit</code>	List all branches that contain a specific commit object
<code>git revert --no-commit last_commit_to_keep..newest_commit_to_reject</code>	Reverse a group of commits in a single commit, instead of creating an object for every commit that is being undone
<code>git filter-branch</code>	Remove files from your repository permanently
<code>git reflog expire</code>	Forget about extended history, and use only the stored commit messages

Command	Use
<code>git gc --prune=now</code>	Run the garbage collector and ensure all noncommitted changes are removed from local memory

Summary

Throughout this chapter you learned how to work with the history of your Git repository. We covered common scenarios for some of the commands in Git which are often considered “advanced” by new Git users. By drawing diagrams summarizing the state of your repository, and the changes you wanted to make, you were able to efficiently choose the correct Git command to run for each of the scenarios outlined. You learned how to use the three “R”s of Git:

Reset

Moves the tip of your branch to a previous commit. This command does not require a commit message and it may return a dirty working directory if the parameter `--hard` is not used.

Rebase

Allows you to alter the way the commits are stored in the history of a branch. Commonly used to *squash* multiple commits into a single commit to clean up a branch; and to bring a branch up-to-date with another.

Revert

Reverses the changes made in a particular commit on a branch that has been shared with others. This command is paired with a commit and it returns a clean working directory.

In the next chapter, you will take the lessons you’ve been working on in your local repository and start integrating them with the rest of the team’s work.

CHAPTER 7

Teams of More than One

The first few times you work with others on a project will shape how you approach version control. If your collaborators are patient and empathetic, you are more likely to use version control with confidence. Empathetic teammates will document the procedure they want you to use, and support you with questions (updating the documentation as necessary). If you are responsible for starting a project, think of that scene when Jerry Maguire says to his star player, “help me help you.” As a project lead, this should be your mantra. Find the sticking points and remove them. Where you want consistency, provide detailed instructions, templates, and automated scripts. When something comes in that is not up to your standard, consider it a process problem that is yours to solve.

In this chapter, we have the culmination of everything covered in this book so far. In [Part I](#), you learned about the different considerations for setting up a project. Now you will learn how to implement those decisions. In Chapters [5](#) and [6](#), you learned how to run the commands you’ll use on a daily basis as a developer. In this chapter, you will learn how to set up a connection to a remote project, and share your work with others.

By the end of this chapter, you will be able to:

- Set up a new project on a code hosting system
- Download a remote repository with `clone`
- Upload your changes to a project with `push`
- Refresh the list of branches available from the remote repository with `fetch`
- Incorporate changes from the remote repository with `pull`
- Explain the implications of updating your branches with `pull`, `rebase`, and `merge`

Where possible, this chapter includes templates you can use to help onboard new developers. The easier it is for people to contribute usable work, the more likely they are to enjoy working on your project. Even if it's *just* a job, there's no reason we shouldn't all have a little more delight in our lives.

Those who learn best by following along with video tutorials will benefit from [Collaborating with Git](#) (O'Reilly), the companion video series for this book.

Setting Up the Project

The context for your project will dictate a lot of how the repository will be set up. A super-secret internal-only covert code base will be set up so as to ensure privacy; a free and open source code library will be set up for transparency and probably participation. Once the project is established, the commands the developers use daily will likely be quite similar.

This section covers the basic process for creating a new project on a code hosting system. The specifics for GitHub, Bitbucket, and GitLab are covered in [Part III](#) (Chapters 10, 11, and 12, respectively).

Creating a New Project

In order to share your work with your team, you will need to establish a new project in your code hosting system of choice. These days most code hosting systems offer more than a place to dump a shared repository. They also include ticketing systems, basic workflow enhancements, project documentation repositories, and more! In the communities and teams I participate in, one of the following three services are generally used: GitHub (typically used by open source projects), Bitbucket (typically used by internal teams and small teams who need free hosting for private projects), and GitLab (typically used by medium-sized companies that need to host their code in house for security reasons).

No matter which system you choose, the basics of setting up a project are going to be the same. The first question you'll need to ask yourself is: which account should you use to create the repository? The standard format for project URLs on a web-based system is as follows: <https://<hosting-url.com>/<project-owner's-name>/<project-name>>. If the project is really and truly yours—for example, the repository for your personal blog—it's appropriate for the URL to include your username. If, however, the project belongs to an agency of developers, it would be more appropriate for the project owner's name to be the name of the agency. And finally, if the project belongs to a number of agencies, such as an open source software project, the most appropriate project owner name would be the name of the software project.

The decisions you choose here may also affect who is able to write directly to the project, and may be dependent on the code hosting system you're using. For example,

if you choose to start the project under your personal name, you might not want to allow “just anyone” to write to the project without a review from you—especially so for public projects where others could be evaluating the body of work under the assumption it was yours.



What's in a Name?

The support repository for this book has existed in a number of different places over the years, including my personal account, a team account, and three different code hosting systems (for a total of six different repositories that need to be maintained). Although the work has been developed by me, it becomes a question of branding on which URL I want to distribute. If I want others to think of the repository as *theirs* (such as in a set of abstract learning materials where people don't have direct access to me), I might use the project URL; but when I want people to think of me as the author because it's also a promotional piece, I might give people my personal URL. It's quite possible I overthink this, but you should give the naming of things at least a little consideration.

You are probably reading this book as a member of a team (even if it's a very tiny team of one!), and so you'll want to select the name of your company, agency, or team as the project owner, or the name of the project if you are working on an open source project. Fortunately, you can move the code base to a new name or even a new code hosting platform very easily, so it's not absolutely critical to get it right from the beginning. It is, however, more difficult to transfer any of the metadata for your project from one account to another. Metadata could include the history of tickets for your project, and any documentation stored outside of the repository.

With the project owner selected, go ahead and create a new empty project under this account. Don't worry about uploading files just yet.

Establishing Permissions

There are two types of permissions you will need to set for your project: who can see the project (“read”); and who can commit to the project (“write”—this was discussed in greater detail in [Chapter 2](#)). If you are an ultra-transparent team, the project should be visible to the world. Otherwise, create a private project.



The Cost of a Free Service

Some code hosting services will charge a small fee for private repositories, and some provide this service for free. If your code and its history are important, consider paying for hosting. You might choose to pay with your time and self-host the code internally, or you may choose to pay a small monthly fee to a third-party service. The advantage of paying is that the hosting company is more likely to be accountable to you as a customer, and you are more likely to keep them in business by helping to pay their expenses. Of course, if you can't afford to pay the fee, there are plenty of free options available—and there's no sense feeling guilty if a company has chosen to offer a free service. Do what you can.

Additionally, some hosting systems will allow you to set per-branch restrictions. At this time Bitbucket and GitLab offer this functionality. Configuration options are described in Chapters 11 and 12, respectively.

As a distributed version control system, Git is inherently good at dealing with incoming requests for changes to a repository. Generally, team projects will have a single repository that is considered The Project, and many spin-off projects that contain the work of the individual developers for the project. If your project is internal, you may choose to have everyone working directly in The Project repository; but if you prefer to maintain a cleaner central repository, you may choose to have each of your developers work in a fork of The Project.



The Project

Throughout this chapter, you will see reference made to “The Project.” I use this shorthand to refer to the canonical, or official, repository for a software project. This is the repository that the community has agreed to use for official releases of the software. Git itself has no internal hierarchy that forces one repository to be more important than another—only the declaration by the community makes a repository the official one.

Based on the decisions you made about your team structure in Chapter 2, assign the appropriate permissions for any contributors who should be allowed write access to The Project—additional contributions can be accepted from non-authorized developers via pull requests (these are also referred to as *merge requests* by some services).

Uploading the Project Repository

As a distributed version control system, Git is a bit of a social butterfly. It loves to connect with all kinds of repositories. It loves sharing stories, and making new

friends along the way. Git maintains its connections with its faraway friends through a stored connection referred to as a *remote*. A local repository may have zero, one, or many remote connections. It is typical for Git repositories to have only one remote connection—the origin. You’ve probably seen this term used before. It’s the nickname assigned to the remote repository from which you downloaded, or cloned, your local copy. It’s just a nickname, though. You can use whatever names you like for your remote connections.

When you first start a new project, you may have no code written, or some code written. (Seems obvious, right?) If you have no code written, you may choose to start your project by following the instructions from your code hosting system and cloning the empty project to your local development environment. If, however, you already have some code locally, you will want to upload what you’ve already got. To do this, you will need to make a new connection from your local repository to the project hosting service.

From your local copy of the project repository, take a look to see if you already have a remote connection set up:

```
$ git remote --verbose
```

If you started locally, you won’t see any remotes listed, so it’s okay if nothing shows up at this point. If you do have a remote set up for this repository, you will see something like the following:

```
origin https://github.com:emmajane/gitforteams.git (fetch)
origin https://github.com:emmajane/gitforteams.git (push)
```

Each line begins with the nickname for the remote connection (*origin*), as well as the source for the remote repository. These lines will always appear in pairs: the first line of the pair indicates where you will retrieve new work from (*fetch*), and the second indicates where you will upload new work to (*push*).

Project owners will need to have a connection to the official copy of a project; they may also have a connection to a fork of a project if they require themselves to go through a peer review process before incorporating their own work (peer reviews are covered in [Chapter 8](#)). As soon as you start adding multiple remote repositories for a project, the default nickname (*origin*) can get a bit confusing. As a result, I tend to name my remotes according to their purpose; for example, *official* and *personal*, which have meaning to me. When I upload work, I then decide between these two options. The standard Git terms for my nicknames are *upstream* and *origin*, although *origin* is assigned to the source of a cloned repository by default, regardless of whether or not you can write to it.



Name It to Claim It

I've been working with Git a very long time, and I still screw up the command `git remote show origin` on an embarrassingly regular basis. Four words. It shouldn't be that hard for me to remember the order, right? I can never seem to get the order of `show` and `origin` right. By assigning my own names to the remote repositories, I am more likely to make more sense of the command, and thus get the order right. `git remote show official` just seems to make better sense to my brain. You may never have this problem, but if you struggle to remember this command, you might want to personalize your remote names and change the name `origin` to something that resonates.

To add a new remote connection, you will first need to know the URL for the project. The structure is generally <https://<hosting-url.com>/<project-owner's-name>/<project-name>.git>. In newer versions of Git, the protocol `https` will be available to you, but in older documentation the first block may be replaced with something like `git@hosting-url.com`. Once you know the URL for the remote repository, you can make a connection to it ([Example 7-1](#)).

Example 7-1. Add a connection to a remote repository

```
$ git remote add nickname project-url
```

After a connection is made to a remote, you should see two new lines when you list your remote connections. If you want to use Git's terminology, you would use the nickname `upstream` for the official project repository; if you are using my naming convention, you would use `official`. This name will never be published, and there are no Git police so you can use whatever you want and no one will ever know. (You could even call it `cookies` or `coffee` if that made you happy. It really doesn't matter.)

For example, if I was a participant in a project named *Mounties*, and it was run by the agency *Oh, Canada*, I might have a series of remotes as follows:

```
$ git remote --verbose

official https://github.com:ohcanada/mounties.git (fetch)
official https://github.com:ohcanada/mounties.git (push)
personal https://github.com:emmajane/mounties.git (fetch)
personal https://github.com:emmajane/mounties.git (push)
```

You can easily hook up as many new remote connections as you like. For example, you might have remote connections for `devserver`, `staging`, and `production`; or you may log directly in to those machines and pull code from The Project repository, instead of pushing code directly to those locations.

If you already have a remote connection set up in your local repository that you no longer need, you can easily delete it ([Example 7-2](#)).

Example 7-2. Remove a remote connection

```
$ git remote remove nickname
```



You can easily rename remotes, and even set up default remotes for each of the branches in your local repository. Git's built-in documentation for this command is easy to understand. You should read through the documentation if you want to personalize your list of remotes even further.

With the remote connection established for your project, you can now upload your local copy of the repository to the remote server:

```
$ git push nickname branch_name
```

If you want to share all local branches with others, you can update this command as follows:

```
$ git push --all nickname
```

Once you have uploaded your work, navigate to the project page to ensure the repository was uploaded as expected. By default, most code hosting systems will display the branch *master* if there is more than one branch present in the repository. If your local repository uses nonstandard branch names, check to see if your code hosting system allows you to assign the default branch for the repository. This branch is typically the most stable version of the project, with experimental work existing in other branches. Every project is a little different, though. Your project may use the *master* branch as the fire hose of new work and it might *not* be the most stable version of your software. Be explicit in your documentation.

To upload a local name under a new name on the remote server, use the following syntax:

```
$ git push nickname branch_local:branch_remote
```

For example, if you wanted to upload your branch *main* to the remote repository *official* and rename it to *master* in the remote repository, you would use the following command:

```
$ git push official main:master
```

Your local repository should now be uploaded to the remote project repository and with the desired branch names.

Document the Project in a README

When you navigate to your project page, you will notice most code hosting systems will display the contents of the file *README* if one is present in your project. This file should be used to give people an overview of the project. If it is a development project with dependencies, those should be listed here. If there are installation instructions, those should be listed here as well (or a link should be provided to a more complete installation guide). If you would like people to contribute to the project, or report bugs to the project, those instructions should be listed here, too.

The following projects have excellent *README* files that clearly explain what the repository is about, how you can use the code within it, and how you can contribute to it:

- [Sculpin](#)
- [Sass](#)
- [Rails](#)



Apply a License to Your Project

There is no single international copyright law. As a result, any project that does not include an explicit license is assumed to be fully copyrighted, and not intended for reuse. I openly admit that a number of my projects do not include licenses. This is usually because I simply haven't made the decision of how I want others to use my work. (I'm typically producing training materials in environments where copyright ownership is more restricted than in code communities where open licensing is more prevalent.) The license for a given repository is typically located in the file *LICENSE* or *LICENSE.txt* file.

If your local repository didn't already have a *README* file, now would be a good time to add one! Today, new projects tend to use Markdown format for the *README* file, and therefore rename the file to *README.md* to ensure the file is correctly formatted.

With the project uploaded and the instructions established, it is now time to start on-boarding contributors to your project. The process you use in the remainder of this chapter should be added to your project repository as documentation. This will allow developers to have a copy locally, and will allow them easier access to the information instead of having to refer to an external wiki page.

Now that your project is in place, it's time to flip the tables and look at things from a contributor's perspective.

Setting Up the Developers

When you think about projects from a developer's perspective, it's not always entirely clear what the participation level is going to be. When it comes to publicly available projects, a developer might engage in three levels of participation:

- Download a zipped package of the project, never to return to the project page again. This might be seen in true forks of a project where the downstream developers have no intention of checking back to see how the code has progressed. It might also be used for projects that are designed to be a starting point—where the intention is to hack up the code and modify the source significantly.
- Clone the project repository with the intention of keeping the code up to date locally, but without the intention of making modifications. This could be true of any developer who is incorporating an open source library into his or her project. The developers might extend the library, and perhaps make little changes to the cloned library, but for the most part they are using the project code as is, relying on upstream developers for enhancements and security updates.
- Clone the project repository with the intention of contributing work back. This will be true for open source project volunteers and staff, in-house developers on a software project, as well as staff at an agency who are contributing to a build for a particular project.

The main distinction between the latter two options is that a noncontributor will typically clone The Project directly, whereas a contributor will likely have a personal remote repository in addition to the project repository. The rationale for these choices was described in greater detail in [Chapter 2](#).



Consumers Versus Contributors

Forward-thinking (intermediate to advanced) developers will always assume they are going to contribute back to a project at some point and create their own intermediate remote repository. Most novice developers, however, will aim to streamline their workflow where possible and omit the intermediate step of creating their own remote repository. This also means they are perceiving of themselves only as a consumer, rather than a potential contributor, to your project.

Once developers identify themselves as consumers or contributors (including primary maintainers), they will be ready to choose a method to download your project repository.

Consumers

Consumers have no intention to contribute back to a project. They don't expect to have write access to the code base, and they can't imagine a possible future where they would want to upload their changes to a project. This type of developer might download your repository in one of two ways:

- As a zipped package.
- As a clone of the repository directly from The Project page.

A zipped package has no connection back to The Project, and contains no history of the changes that have happened over time. A clone, on the other hand, maintains a connection to the project, and can be updated to the latest version by running a few Git commands. The structure to clone a remote repository is as follows:

```
$ git clone https://<hosting-url.com>/<project-owner's-name>/<project-name>.git
```

For example, if you wanted to download a copy of the project repository for the *Git for Teams* workshop, you would issue the following command:

```
$ git clone https://github.com/gitforteams/gitforteams.git
```

To update your local copy of the repository, first you would need to fetch the latest changes to The Project (for now, we'll assume you have only one remote connection):

```
$ git fetch --all
```

Once you've fetched the changes, you can compare what's changed in the latest version to what you have locally before choosing to update your local copy.

First, get a list of all branches in your repository:

```
$ git branch --all
```

You will see two groups of branches: your local branches and the remote tracking branches. The currently checked-out branch will be marked with *. My personal copy of the project repository cloned previously is as follows:

```
gh-pages
* master
  video-lessons
  remotes/personal/gh-pages
  remotes/personal/master
  remotes/personal/video-lessons
```

This list shows three local branches as well as three branches connected to a remote that has been nicknamed `personal`.

For even more detail for each branch, use the parameter `--verbose`:

```
$ git branch --all --verbose
```

The output includes the commit message as well as the status for each branch compared to its remote repository:

```
gh-pages          629b54f Resolving merge conflict; ...
* master          2db982d Changes to "Undo" graphic: ...
video-lessons    7798eb1 [ahead 11] Lesson 00: ...
remotes/personal/gh-pages 629b54f Resolving merge conflict; ...
remotes/personal/master   2db982d Changes to "Undo" graphic ...
remotes/personal/video-lessons 653f875 Lesson 7: Added intro on ...
```

To see a history of the changes that have been added to the repository on the branch *master*, you can use the command `log`:

```
$ git log personal/master
```

To compare your local copy of a branch to what was just downloaded, you can add the parameter `--patch` to see the per-commit changes, or use the command `diff` to see a summary of all changes:

```
$ git log --patch personal/master
$ git diff master personal/master
```

This will show you all of the changes in patch format. Look for lines that have been added (marked with +), or deleted (marked with -). If you prefer to check out the code base as a whole, you can check out the branch tip:

```
$ git checkout personal/master
```

This will put you into a detached HEAD state. To return to the local copy of the *master* branch, check it out:

```
$ git checkout master
```

Once you've reviewed the changes, you can update your local copy of the *master* branch by rebasing to add the new changes:

```
$ git rebase personal/master
```

Using the command `rebase` provides a cleaner graphed history; however, if your team has opted to use merging, you can use the command `merge` to bring your local branch up to date:

```
$ git merge personal/master
```

If you have multiple local branches that you want to update, you will need to check out each one individually and then use this same procedure to incorporate the changes. This needs to be done one branch at a time because if there are conflicts between the two copies of the branch, Git needs to give you a working directory to resolve the conflicts.

These few commands are the only ones that a consumer of a project will need to use. If, however, the developer makes a little change to her copy of the repository locally,

and wants to contribute that change back to the project, she will be limited to submitting a patch, or requesting access as a developer (which is probably not appropriate to grant for one-off contributors). Although it is possible to submit patches, it is not preferred. (Yes, there are some projects that still use patches, including Git itself!) Instead, many projects have come to prefer *pull requests*. Originally used by GitHub, this term has become popular on other systems as well. A pull request is a meta feature—it is not something built into Git itself, but rather it is a feature of software that sits alongside Git. It provides a visual prompt for a project maintainer to incorporate a branch of work from a remote repository. The connection between the two repositories exists only for that one particular request; it is not a persistent connection like a developer would set from his or her local workstation to a remote repository.

Contributors

So you think you're interested in contributing to a software project. Cool! (This is where, as the author of this book, I let out a huge sigh of relief. If you've made it this far into the book and *weren't* interested in working on a software project, I'd feel *really* bad.) As a distributed version control system, Git is focused on what you can do locally. The built-in tools for direct collaboration on shared repositories are extremely coarse—either you have full write access to a project, or you have none. There are no per-branch permissions, and indeed, without the support of SSH, there's no authentication system at all in Git. Git relies on wrapper software to provide the access control.

In order for wrapper software to make the connection between two repositories, it needs them to both be accessible from the same place. The easiest way to design for this is to have developers upload their changes to the same system that hosts The Project repository. GitHub, as well as every other web-based system, does this by having you create a clone, or a fork, of The Project, and upload your changes to the copied repository. Then, you use the wrapper software to request that your changes be pulled into The Project repository.

Using GitHub terms:

1. An aspiring contributing developer (The Developer) forks The Project repository.
2. The Developer then makes her proposed changes in her copy of The Project.
3. When finished, The Developer initiates a pull request from a branch in her copy of the project to a branch in The Project repository.
4. Using comments in GitHub's web interface, a conversation will take place between The Developer and The Maintainer. Sometimes additional updates will be required by The Developer before The Maintainer is ready to accept the proposed changes into The Project.

- When the proposed changes are deemed worthy, The Maintainer will incorporate the pull request into The Project.



GitHub Does Not Require a Local Clone of The Project

GitHub now allows developers to make minor edits directly to files through a web interface; however, many developers will choose to clone their copy of The Project so they can work on it locally. Then, when they have completed their work, they will push their updates to their own copy of the project and initiate a pull request from their copy of the project to the main project repository.

The process for submitting a pull request will vary slightly depending on the wrapper software being used (e.g., GitHub, Bitbucket, GitLab, etc.); however, the basic process is covered in [Part III](#).

Maintainers

A developer who has direct commit access to The Project repository is a special kind of developer, known as The Maintainer. Depending on how your team is structured, The Maintainers might be only those on the quality assurance team, or they may be handpicked developers from the community. For smaller internal projects, The Maintainers may be everyone who is working on the project.

In [Chapter 2](#), you learned a little bit about project governance models. The way The Maintainer will interact with the project is a political, not technical, decision. Git doesn't actually care how you structure your project, and so you will need to develop a system that works best for you. Defining the workflow for Consumers and Contributors is relatively easy because you aren't really working with Git, but rather the workflow defined by the wrapper software (in the case of Consumers, they're not even really working with Git at all).

If everyone on your team is a Maintainer (i.e., they are allowed to commit directly into the repository), it's your choice as to whether you require developers to create a separate clone of the repository. The only limitation would be if your code hosting system does not have the capacity to accept incoming branches for merging from within a single repository. Check with your system of choice to see if it has a recommended workflow.

Generally I work with teams of fewer than 10 developers. Some of these teams I've worked with have opted for separate remote repositories for each developer, and some have allowed developers to commit their in-progress work directly to The Project repository. In the Drupal project, where there are thousands of developers, only a handful of people can commit into the main project repository; however, there

are an additional 30,000 contributed modules, each with its own maintainers who have direct access to the project repository.



The Only Rules Are the Ones You Document

If there are no documented rules, your project *will* become anarchic so write down the exact steps you would like people to follow when contributing to the project.

Project maintainers will need to have at least a clone of The Project repository locally. If you were the developer who started the project, you already have a local clone of this repository. If you aren't, you will need to clone the repository using the following:

```
$ git clone https://<hosting-url.com>/<project-owner's-name>/<project-name>.git
```

You learned how to create a clone of a project repository as a team of one in [Chapter 6](#) with the following command:

```
$ git clone https://gitlab.com/gitforteams/gitforteams.git
```

This will create a local copy of the repository, with the remote nickname *origin*.

If your project requires it, you may also need to create a clone of The Project on the code hosting system. This is covered in the previous section, or you may wish to follow the more detailed instructions available in [Part III](#). Once you've created the remote clone, you can add this remote connection to your local repository. This will allow you to switch between the two from within the same directory. If you prefer, you can keep two local directories, but I personally enjoy the efficiency of not having to jump around as much. You are welcome to use your own naming conventions for the remotes. The syntax for adding a new remote is as follows:

```
$ git remote add nickname https://<hosting-url.com>/<your-name>/<project>.git
```

If I were to add my personal clone from GitLab, to follow the previous example, I would use the following command. Because this connection was being made to my personal copy of the repository, I would choose to use the nickname *personal* here:

```
$ git remote add personal https://gitlab.com/emmajane/gitforteams.git
```

To avoid confusion, I might also choose to rename the nickname for The Project remote from *origin* to *official*:

```
$ git remote rename origin official
```

These nicknames are completely arbitrary and are personal to your system. They will not be shared with others, so use whatever names make sense to you. Generally the convention is to use *origin* for the remote copy that most closely resembles your local work, and *upstream* for the copy of the repository that has the most new fea-

tures being added by other developers that you might want to incorporate into your own work.

Once you've set up the remote connections to the project, and to your own personal copy of the repository, you should verify the names and URLs are what you are expecting:

```
$ git remote --verbose
```

In my case, the output is as follows:

```
official      git@gitlab.com:gitforteams/gitforteams.git (fetch)
official      git@gitlab.com:gitforteams/gitforteams.git (push)
personal     git@gitlab.com:emmajane/gitforteams.git (fetch)
personal     git@gitlab.com:emmajane/gitforteams.git (push)
```

You are now ready to work on your project as both a Contributor and a Maintainer.

Participating in Development

There are four main activities you will engage in when working with Git: working on new proposed changes, keeping your branches up to date, reviewing proposed changes, and publishing completed worked. Inevitably, you will also need to work on resolving conflicts when you update your branches, or when you attempt to incorporate proposed changes into The Project.

Constructing the Perfect Commit

There are two basic approaches to commits: demonstrate the thinking process and present the final solution. When I'm programming in a language I'm not very familiar with, I think in small increments focusing on little pieces of the system at a time. As I work, I commit snapshots of my work as I get to critical points. These snapshots act as lifelines, allowing me to track how I thought through a problem. If you were to read my commit messages when I code, you would be able to easily unpack my thinking. Commits might represent units of work in increments as small as 15–30 minutes of effort. The commit messages are unlikely to explain *why* I've done something. The initial commit might include a docblock of code comments which outline what I'm about to do, the next commit might have the scaffolding for what I was about to build, and it would proceed from there. The commit messages would add very little value above and beyond what is shown in the diff for each commit.

When I'm working in on a task I feel more confident about, I'm more likely to make radical changes to the working directory without those tiny lifeline commits. Then, when my work is finished, I'll take a look at the overall changes, and shape smaller, relevant commits. This might be done by committing single changed files at a time, or perhaps I might make an even more granular commit using the `--patch` mode to add hunks of each file at a time to the staging area in preparation for a commit. These

curated commits will be much more useful to me later if I need to dig through history using the command `bisect`. For example, in order to use a function, it must already be created somewhere, so I might choose to separate the creation, and use of a function into two separate commits even if I wrote them at the same time.

I hesitate to refer to these two approaches as novice and advanced, but that phrasing does ring true. Different source control management systems will have different ways of presenting commits in the history of your project. Git is very granular in how it shows you the commit history, and as a result, thinking in tiny commit increments gets messy and frustrating to work with. This is why we say that as you mature with Git, you will be more likely to adopt the second approach.

You don't need to give up your tiny commits though. You can use `rebase` to combine many little unpublished commits into a history that is more like the second version. Work the way you want to work, then reshape history so that it stores information in a useful way.



Rewriting History

Yes, I hate with a screaming passion that Git allows you to rewrite history, and then tells you how dangerous it is. To me it feels too much like arrogant history revisionism. But that's the model that Git uses. To work effectively with Git, I set aside my frustrations and adopt the techniques that the original software set out as best practices. I'm not afraid of rebasing; I just don't like that it exists to begin with. I give you permission not to like it either; however, not liking what it represents isn't a valid reason for not using it. It's deeply ingrained in the philosophy of how Git stores metadata about code's history. Have a cookie, it'll be okay.

If you accidentally do too much work between commits, you don't need to forgo a granular commit history. Previously you learned to add individual files to the staging area. You can get even more granular, assigning edits within a single file to multiple commits. To add a partial change within a file, instead of the whole file, use the command `git add --patch filename`. This command will walk through your file, line by line, and ask you if you would like to include each changed line in the commit you are building.



Rewriting History as It Happens

If you have a culture of showing work in progress on a centralized server, you will need to be careful in how you rebase your work. When a commit is rebased, the metadata for any commit object that is altered is assigned a new identifier. For example, if you are bringing a branch up to date, your local commits now have new parents and get a new ID. If you are trying to clean up the history of a branch, and you squash two commits, a new ID will be assigned to the resulting commit object even though the content is identical! This dual timeline can confuse Git and cause conflicts. To avoid these conflicts, limit your use of interactive rebasing to short-lived branches, such as ticket branches.

Excellent commit objects have the following characteristics:

- Contains only related code. No scope creep, no “just fixing white space issues too.”
- Conforms to coding standards for your project, including in-code documentation.
- Are just the right size. Perhaps this is 100 lines of code. Or perhaps it’s a mega refactoring where a function name changed and 1,000 lines of code were affected.
- Work is described in the best-ever commit message (see the next section).

The best rule of thumb I’ve heard for commit *messages* is “Whatever it takes to make future me not get pissed off at past me for being lazy.”

Your commit messages should include:

- A terse description (fewer than 60 characters) in a standard format to make it easy to scan logs.
- A longer explanation of why the current code is problematic, and the rationale for *why* the change is important.
- A high-level description of how the change addresses the issue at hand.
- An outline of the potential side effects the change may have.
- A summary of the changes made, so that reading the diff of the code confirms the commit message, but reading the diff is not guesswork on what/why something has changed.
- A ticket number, or other reference to sources where discussion about the proposed change can/has/will happen.
- Who will be affected by the change (e.g., an optimization for developers; a speed improvement for users).

- A list of places where the documentation will need to be updated.

A bad commit message would be as follows:

```
git commit -am "rewrote entire site in angular.js - it's faster now, I'm sure"
```

This commit is insufficient for the following reasons:

- By using the `-a` parameter, all files will be committed as part of this commit en masse, and without consideration of whether or not they should be included.
- By using the `-m` flag, the tendency will always be to write only a terse message that does not describe why the change is necessary, and how the change addresses this necessary change.
- The commit message does not reference a ticket number, so it's impossible to know which issue(s) are now resolved and can be closed in the ticket tracker.

To compare, a good commit message would be as follows:

```
$ git commit  
[#321] Stop clipping trainer meta-data on video nodes at small screen size.  
- Removes an unnecessary overflow: hidden that was causing some clipping.  
Resolves #321
```

This is a good message for the following reasons:

- It includes the ticket number, in square brackets, at the beginning of the terse commit message, making it easier to read the logs later.
- The terse description (for the short log view) explains the symptom that was seen by site visitors.
- A detailed explanation explains the technical implementation that was used to resolve the problem.
- The final line of the commit message (`Resolves #321`) will be captured by the ticketing system and move the ticket from *open* to *needs review*.

When making a proposed change, you should keep the proposal small, and focused on solving a single problem. This will make it easier for The Maintainer of the project to review your submission, and accept your work. For example, if you are fixing a specific bug in one part of the code base, don't also fix an extra line ending you found elsewhere in the code. While projects likely have naming conventions for their branches, if you are donating a drive-by fix that doesn't already have an identified issue in The Project repository, name your branch using a terse description of the

problem you are solving—perhaps, for example, `css_button_padding` or `improved_test_coverage` ([Example 7-3](#)).

Example 7-3. Make a change to the code base

```
$ git checkout -b terse_description
(edits files)

$ git add filename(s)
$ git commit
```

At this point, the commit message editor will open and you will need to provide the best commit message you've ever written.

With the proposed change in place, you can now publish it to your copy of the repository using the command `push`:

```
$ git push
```

Your personal branch has been uploaded, so it is now time to work with a team member to have your changes incorporated into the main branch for the project.

Keeping Branches Up to Date

Branches stored in Git can generally be thought of as one of two things: official project branches or short-lived suggestion branches. Shared project branches are used to integrate reviewed and approved code from multiple developers and contain the official history of a project's code. Your local copy of these branches should always be up to date and should always be used as the base branch for your ticket branches. By convention, it is not appropriate to write new commits to the local copy of an official branch. Instead, you would create a new branch, complete your work, and then merge that branch back into the official branch. Several branching strategies are discussed in [Chapter 3](#)—you may want to go back and review that chapter if your team doesn't already have a branching strategy. The second type of branch is essentially a developer's sandbox. This is where you test out new ideas and get your code ready for review. These short-lived work branches must also be kept up to date, but they need a slightly different approach.



Rebase Versus Merge...Again

There are still no rebasing police who are going to show up at your team meetings. You'll need to figure out, as a team, how you're going to tackle bringing branches up to date. (I still think you need to do whatever is best *for your team*, but I'm going to show you the instructions for rebasing where it so that you can see it's not significantly more difficult to use this method.) Regardless of what you choose, document your solution carefully, and support those who are new to Git to ensure they are able to perform the commands consistently. The easiest way I've found to ensure consistency this is to provide copy/paste-friendly documentation, and have people work at the command line. Additionally, **flowcharts can be quite effective.**

To reduce the number of conflicts you need to deal with when bringing short-lived branches together, you should keep your working branch up to date with the project branch you will eventually be merging into. How often is "regularly"? I recommend updating your branches at least as often as you drink coffee. If you don't drink coffee, I would recommend you update your working branches at least daily using the commands in [Example 7-4](#). Yes, this is going to seem tedious, but it can save you a lot of time in the long run to keep your work as up to date as possible.

Example 7-4. Update your local copy of this project's branches

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
```

Git will update your local copy of the master repository to incorporate the changes from the upstream repository.

Once the project branches are up to date, you can now update your work branches. When you are bringing your work branches up to date, however, there will not be an upstream branch that you can pull your changes from like you used for the shared project branches. So how do you know if you should be merging or rebasing at this point? The rule of thumb is as follows: if you started your work *right now* would the change you're about to incorporate into your work branch already be in place? If it's a feature you wrote, it wouldn't already be in the branch you're bringing up to date and therefore you should merge the branch to incorporate the new work. If it's a feature someone else wrote, you almost definitely want to rebase (if you are on Team Rebase). Another helpful tip is to match the names. If the changes you want to incorporate are coming from a branch with the same name, but on a different remote, you almost definitely want to rebase.

In Git, rebasing and fast-forward merges both result in a linear timeline, as they replay your commits onto the work that was done in a different branch. As each commit is replayed, there is the potential for a merge conflict, which needs to be resolved. As a result, developers who are less confident in their ability to deal with a merge conflict will opt to simplify the process, and use the `merge` command to bring their work up to date. Using `merge` does make your historical record more difficult to read; it is, however, also technically less complicated because it generally involves fewer merge conflicts.

If you are working with a complicated code base and it is important to be able to run debugging tools quickly, you should spend the time to get a clean history by using the command `rebase` to bring your work branches up to date. If, however, it is more important for contributions to be as easy as possible, you may want to allow your developers to use the `merge` command to bring their work up to date. (The Gittiest of Git readers just gritted their teeth while reading that last bit. But you know what? There are no Git police who will show up at your door if your team decides they just want things to be easier. Promise. Insert picture of a honey badger not caring here, and let's move on.)

The first thing you need to do when bringing your work branches up to date is to ensure your project branches are up to date. Keeping a *shared branch* up to date is typically done with the command `pull` (which uses the optional parameter `--rebase`). To bring your *personal work branch* up to date, you will need to remember the *source branch* where you initially branched from and copy the changes made to this branch over to your work branch. If you are following the GitFlow model described in [Chapter 3](#), this will likely be the branch `dev` or `development`.

For example, if your work branch was named `2378-add-test` and your source branch was named `development`, the commands would be as follows:

```
$ git checkout development
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
$ git checkout 2378-add-test
$ git rebase development
```

Each of the commits you have made in your work branch will now be reapplied as if the new commits from the branch `development` had always been in place. These commits may apply cleanly, or you may need to deal with merge conflicts. Because rebasing is the preferred method in Git for keeping a branch up to date, I will passively-aggressively omit giving you the commands for how to merge a branch. I am hopeful you will forgive me.

In addition to keeping your branches up to date, you should also remember to update your personal repositories whenever your own work is incorporated into The Project because its main branch will now contain new commits. This will be helpful when

you are responsible for reviewing someone else's work and merging it into the *master* branch. The commands you run are exactly as they were described previously:

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
```

Regardless of how you choose to keep your branches up to date, I hope you'll at least try to incorporate rebasing into your workflow. As frustrating as it can be, it will help you to have a cleaner history if you need to use the debugging techniques described in [Chapter 9](#).

Reviewing Work

In order to review someone else's work, you must first get a local copy of that work into your own repository. This might be work that has already been incorporated into the official project branches, or it might be a new feature, or a bug fix that a colleague has asked you to review and merge into the main project.

Peer reviewing new work is a multistep process and is covered in greater detail in [Chapter 8](#). The basic process is as follows:

1. Add a remote connection to the relevant repository.
2. Fetch the available branches for that repository.
3. Create a local copy of any branch you want to examine in depth.
4. Incorporate any changes from the other branch that you would like to adopt into your own work.
5. Push the revised branch back to the relevant remote repository.

The first thing you will need to do is find the repository that holds the work you want to incorporate. To list each of the remote repositories, use the `remote show` ([Example 7-5](#)). Just like listing branches, all available remotes will be listed as the output to the command. In [Example 7-5](#), the two remotes I added in the previous section are displayed. This gives me a quick reminder of which repository I want to look at in more depth.

Example 7-5. A terse list of remote repositories

```
$ git remote show
```

```
official  
personal
```

Once you have the name of the repository, you can get a full listing for the remote by adding the name of the nickname to the previous command ([Example 7-6](#)).

Example 7-6. Full details about the remote repository, personal

```
$ git remote show personal

* remote personal
  Fetch URL: git@gitlab.com:emmajane/gitforteams.git
  Push  URL: git@gitlab.com:emmajane/gitforteams.git
  HEAD branch: master
  Remote branches:
    2-bad_jokes    tracked
    master         tracked
    sandbox        tracked
    video-lessons  tracked
  Local branch configured for 'git pull':
    master merges with remote master
  Local ref configured for 'git push':
    master pushes to master (up to date)
```

Here I can see there are four branches stored in the remote repository, all of which I have a copy of locally (this is indicated by the word tracked).



Update Your Local List of Branches

If you already have a connection to the remote repository, and you don't see the branch your partner has asked you to review, ensure the list of remote branches is up to date by first running the command `git fetch`.

If you don't want the extra overhead of getting all the information about the remote repository, you can choose to show only remote branches by using the command `branch` and adding the parameter `--remotes` ([Example 7-7](#)). This will allow you to locate the branch with the work you need to review. I like using this variation for `branch` instead of the `--all` parameter because it gives the actual name of the branch, instead of adding on the reference information of `remotes`.

Example 7-7. Listing remote branches

```
$ git branch --remotes
```



Branches Group Commits

A branch is a line of development that links individual commit objects. Different instances of a branch may have commits made by different developers, and therefore repositories are not identical until they are synced. It's basically anarchy, but limited to each little repository. The conventions we establish as software teams are what bring order to the chaos and allow us to share our work in a sane manner. Remember the branching strategies we learned in [Chapter 3](#)? They'll keep the work sorted into logical thought streams. Remember the permission strategies from [Chapter 2](#)? They'll keep people locked into the right repository, unable to make changes without the community gatekeeper's help.

If you add the parameter `--verbose` to `branch`, the one-line commit message for the tip of the branch will be included in the output. For example, I had several active work branches, an integration branch, and the official branch for the project ([Example 7-8](#)). Although I uploaded my commits occasionally to the remote server, mostly I just worked in the chapter branches, incorporating my work into the integration branch, *drafts*, and then the main branch, *master*.

Example 7-8. Selected output from git branch --verbose while working on this chapter

```
ch02 7313755 CH02: Adding patching workflow diagram.  
ch04 69a3ded CH4: Stub file added with notes copied from Drupalize.Me.  
* ch05 80b5200 [official/ch05: ahead 2] CH05: Fixing URL for image 05fig01.  
drafts 80b5200 CH05: Fixing URL for image 05fig01.  
master 319bb53 [official/master] Merge branch 'drafts'. Updates for CH05.
```

The first column contains the branch name, the second column contains the commit ID, and the third column contains the first line of the most recent commit message. If the branch is tracked remotely, the name of the remote branch is included in square brackets between the commit ID and the commit message.

Once you've located the remote branch that contains the work you want to review, you can either copy the branch into your local repository ([Example 7-9](#)), or examine the reference to it with the commands `log` and `diff` ([Example 7-10](#)).

Example 7-9. Copy a remote branch into your local repository

```
$ git checkout --tracking remote_nickname/branch
```

Example 7-10. Examine a remote branch without creating a working copy

```
$ git log --oneline remote_nickname/branch  
$ git diff current_branch...remote_nickname/branch
```

Assuming the work passes review, it's time to merge it into the main project branch.

Merging Completed Work

Before merging the new work into your project branch, you will need to first ensure all branches are up to date. This is necessary because Git won't allow you to push your copy of a remote repository if the destination branch (on the remote) contains commits which are not in your local copy.

When uploading new work to a remote server, Git will only accept work as a fast forward merge. This means you don't have to worry about having a merge conflict when you push your work. Because of this restriction, your local branch needs to contain all of the remote commits before you can push your branch. To update your work, you will need to use the command `pull` to retrieve the changes from the remote server and incorporate any new work into your local branches.

First, update your local copy of the destination branch ([Example 7-11](#)) by using the command `pull` with the parameter `--rebase`.

Example 7-11. Incorporate updates from a project branch

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
```

Once the public branch is up to date, you will need to bring the feature branch up to date as well ([Example 7-12](#)).

Example 7-12. Merge a completed ticket branch into a public project branch

```
$ git checkout 2378-add-test  
$ git rebase master
```

Finally, you can merge the ticket branch into the main project branch ([Example 7-13](#)).

Example 7-13. Merge the completed ticket branch into the public project branch.

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git merge --no-ff 2378-add-test
```

If the changes that were being introduced were unique from previous work that had been completed, the merge will now be completed; however, if there was overlapping work in the same area, Git will not know how to complete the merge and ask for your guidance. The language is a little scary as asking for help in Git terminology is better known as a *merge conflict*.

Resolving Merge and Rebase Conflicts

Conflict sounds hard and scary, but in Git, a merge conflict is actually a very small problem and you won't need to spend a lot of money on a mediator or a therapist to resolve it. Any time a file is changed in *exactly* the same place, Git can be unsure of which version is the correct version, so it will ask you to make that decision. Git refers to this uncertainty as a *conflict*.

When you bring together two branches, there is always a chance that you will have changes in both *our* and *their* version of the code on the exact same lines within a file.

Git will add three lines into any file that has lines with conflicting information at exactly the same point:

```
<<<<<  
=====  
>>>>>
```

This represents the *our* code, and *their* code separated by a dividing row of =. To resolve a conflict you will need to edit the files, select the appropriate content to keep, and remove the markers. When you open the file to examine the conflict, look at the surrounding areas as well. Sometimes Git will have misjudged where to put the markers, so you shouldn't just delete one whole section, or the other whole section. Read carefully, and you may find you need to take a little bit from each when you look at the surrounding code:

```
<<<<< HEAD  
    $p++;  
}  
=====  
}  
  
>>>>> 2378-add-test
```

We don't have enough information to resolve this merge conflict without understanding what the code update is trying to accomplish. Probably the end brace should be kept because it's in both sides of the conflict, but what about the new line? And what about the increment of the variable? If you run into merge conflicts you are not sure how to resolve, you should talk to the author of the original code if you cannot figure it out just from reading the code itself. Misunderstanding the code and deleting too much (or too little) may end up unintentionally adding new bugs to the code if you resolve the conflict incorrectly.



Resolving Merges Step by Step from Very Divergent Branches

There is a complementary program, [git-imerge](#), which works to merge the commits leading up to the tip of the two branches you are attempting to merge. Working with the incremental commits can make it easier to see how the conflict should be resolved because there is less to compare at each point. This is not part of Git core, and you will need to download and install the software separately. Check your favorite package manager if you want to reduce the install hassle. I installed my copy via OS X's [Brew](#).

When your edits are complete, you can remove the markers Git placed into the file and continue using the on-screen instructions which Git provides in its status message:

```
$ git status
```

If you were completing a merge, you will need to add the updated files and commit them to your repository:

```
$ git add filename(s)
```

By adding the files one at a time, you can use the `status` command as a TODO list of files with outstanding merge conflicts that need to be resolved:

```
$ git status
```

Once all the merge conflicts have been cleaned up in each of the files, you can commit your staged changes:

```
$ git commit
```

At this point, the default text editor for Git will open with additional information about the commit you are completing. When you have finished writing your message, save the changes and quit the editor to resume.

If you were attempting a rebase when the merge conflict occurred, you may be in the middle of a multistep process. In this case, you'll need to proceed with the rebasing procedure:

```
$ git rebase --continue
```

If, before starting the merge, you know without a doubt that you will always want to use either the incoming work (`theirs`) or your own work (`ours`), you can preemptively instruct Git on how you want to address the proposed changes from the two branches. For example, if you wanted to merge in a branch that you knew contained fixes for the problem you were having, you could force Git to use the other branch when making its updates to your own branch:

```
$ git checkout branch_to_update
$ git merge --strategy-option=theirs incoming_branch
```

Publishing Work

The first time you upload your changes for a given branch, you will need to specify the remote repository that you want to use, as well as the branch name. The convention is to keep the branch names the same on the local and remote repositories. You will need to include the nickname for the remote repository. In [Example 7-14](#), it is assumed the name of the remote is *origin*.

Example 7-14. Upload your branch with the proposed changes to your remote repository

```
$ git push --set-upstream origin branch
```

Once you've set up the branch for the remote repository, you can upload your work to the same remote again using the command `push`:

```
$ git push
```

If you have multiple remotes set for your repository, you will need to explicitly push to each of the remote repositories separately. By default, *origin* is used:

```
$ git push remote_nickname
```

The next part of the procedure will depend on the hosting system you're using. Generally, though, you navigate to The Project page where you will locate a link for *pull requests* (the language may be slightly different on your system of choice). From this link you should be able to initiate a request to have your proposed updates included in the project. The system should already know which of your repositories was cloned from The Project, and it should include a list of all the branches you've worked on in your copy that might include proposed changes for The Project. You'll select the branch you want to submit for inclusion and walk through any additional steps necessary. This process is covered in depth in [Part III](#).

Once your pull request has been submitted, The Maintainer will review your proposed update. He may accept your work as is, or request changes and ask you to resubmit your work. If additional changes are needed, repeat the steps outlined in this section until the pull request is accepted.

To publish new work into a shared branch, the first thing you should do is check that the branch you are going to be merging into is up to date. This will ensure you can push your work after merging your changes. If the branch isn't up to date, you will not be able to upload the revised copy of the shared branch until you have downloaded the new updates and incorporated them into the branch:

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
```

Once your local copy of the main project branch is up to date, you should ensure these changes are also copied into the feature branch you have been working on so

that there is the smallest amount of difference between the two branches before the merge is performed:

```
$ git checkout 2378-add-test  
$ git rebase master
```

Once the working branch is up to date, you are ready to merge in the reviewed and accepted changes:

```
$ git merge --no-ff 2378-add-test  
$ git push
```

The work branch can now be deleted from your local repository and any remote repositories you have write access to:

```
$ git branch --delete 2378-add-test  
$ git push remote_nickname --delete 2378-add-test
```

Your branches should now be up-to-date and ready for your teammates to download.

What happens next will vary greatly depending on the type of software you are building. Web developers who want to connect Git with a continuous integration build server may benefit from watching Lorna Mitchell's videos *Git Fundamentals for Web Developers* (O'Reilly).

Sample Workflows

The remainder of this chapter serves as a template for working with teams. You should discuss with your team how they would like to work, and write down the commands each contributor and maintainer will need to use during the project.

Sprint-Based Workflow

This process is more or less what I've used for several teams working in a sprint-based release cycle. It is a variation on GitFlow and it works well for weekly website deployments. The schedule for the sprint follows a weekly routine (as opposed to the more "traditional" two-week sprint). This encourages granular tickets and helps the developers see their work in production as fast as possible. Some tickets will take several "sprints" to complete if they are larger in scope.

The repository is set up with five different types of branches: development, ticket, qa, master, and hotfix ([Table 7-1](#)). These branches are used either as single-issue development branches, or as integration branches.

Table 7-1. Branch types in a weekly deployment workflow

Branch name / convention	Type of branch	Description	Branched from
<i>dev</i>	Integration	Used to collate peer reviewed code	<i>ticket branches</i>
<i>ticket#-descriptive-name</i>	Development	Used to complete work identified in tickets	<i>dev</i>
<i>qa</i>	Integration	Used for quality assurance testing at the end of each sprint; code that does not pass QA testing is removed from the branch	<i>dev</i>
<i>master</i>	Integration	Used to deploy fully tested code	<i>qa</i>
<i>hotfix- ticket#-description</i>	Development	Used to develop solutions for urgent problems identified on production	latest release tag on <i>master</i>

For the developers, every day is a development day. In addition, there are three days in the week when all team members rally toward the same goal.

The workflow is not overly complex ([Example 7-15](#)) for developers: all work begins on a fresh ticket branch from the parent branch *dev*. Once completed, the work in a ticket branch is pushed up to the shared project repository. Branches are kept up-to-date through rebasing, which allows for a cleaner branch history than merging.

Example 7-15. Git commands to work on tickets

In this example, substitute *origin* for the name of your remote, and *1234-new_ticket_branch* for the name of your ticket branch:

```
$ git checkout dev
$ git pull --rebase=preserve origin dev
$ git checkout -b 1234-new_ticket_branch
// do work
$ git add --all
$ git commit
```

Before sharing the work, ensure the branch contains any new commits:

```
$ git checkout dev
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
$ git checkout 1234-new_ticket_branch
$ git rebase dev
```

Finally, share the new work with others:

```
$ git push origin 1234-new_ticket_branch
```

Once completed, a ticket branch is reviewed by another person on the team ([Example 7-16](#)). If the code passes review, the reviewer merges the ticket branch into the development branch and removes the ticket branch from the main repository. The review process is covered in depth in [Chapter 8](#).

Example 7-16. Git commands to complete a peer review

```
$ git checkout dev
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
$ git checkout 1234-new_ticket_branch
// review process goes here
$ git merge --no-ff 1234-new_ticket_branch master
$ git branch --delete 1234-new_ticket_branch
$ git push --delete origin 1234-new_ticket_branch
```

Quality Assurance (Monday–Tuesday):

- Automated test suite is run on *dev* to catch any regressions that may have snuck in while feature branches were being added up to this point.
- All work in the branch *dev* is merged into the branch *qa* for testing ([Example 7-17](#)). Development work continues in the branch *dev*.
- A sprint checklist is created in a shared document, such as Google Docs, by copying and pasting the user stories from the tickets that were merged into the *qa* branch. Typically, this is the first line of the ticket description—a convention that should be adopted to make the QA process faster.
- All team members are responsible for running through the list of tickets to be tested in the shared document. In addition to the weekly tickets, there may be rolling tests that need to be completed by a person.
- Anything that fails quality assurance has a new ticket created so that it can be fixed, or reverted, prior to release ([Example 7-18](#)).

Example 7-17. Commands to set up the qa branch

```
$ git checkout dev
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
$ git checkout qa
$ git merge --no-ff dev
$ git push
```

Example 7-18. Commands to remove tickets that have failed to pass QA in time for release

```
$ git log --oneline --grep ticket-number  
(locate the commits that need to be reversed)
```

```
$ git revert commit
```

```
$ git revert --mainline 1 merge_commit  
(ideally, however, you are merging work branches with --no-ff, which forces a commit ID  
that can be easily undone)
```

Release Day (Wednesday):

- The branch *qa* is merged into the branch *master* and tagged ([Example 7-19](#)).
- From the live site, the repository is updated to use the tagged commit for release.
- The work for the next week is prioritized with the development team.

Example 7-19. Commands to prepare for deployment

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git merge qa  
$ git tag  
(locate the latest tag so that you can determine the next tag's number)
```

```
$ git tag --annotate -m tag_name  
$ git push --tags
```

When the tag is added, it is signed with the `--annotate` parameter, and a message is added with the `-m` parameter. This ensures the tag will not be ignored.

Announcement Day (Thursday):

- A public announcement is made to the community of users about the changes that were launched on the previous day. The extra day gives the team a chance to deal with any unexpected regressions, or bugs, when the code was moved to the production environment.
- Development continues on the new list of priorities established on the previous day.

In the unlikely event that a serious bug or regression is introduced to the production environment, a hotfix is completed. Serious is, of course, a relative term. In this system, deployments are made weekly, so a hotfix, generally speaking, is an update that cannot wait a week to be deployed.

Each deployment is tagged as such, so the first step is to get a list of all tags and locate the current live version of the code base ([Example 7-20](#)). A new branch is created from this point, the updated code is applied, and then uploaded for review before deployment.

Example 7-20. Commands to create a hotfix branch

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git tag  
(review list of tags to determine the currently live tag)  
  
$ git checkout -b hotfix-issue-description tag_name
```

The hotfix branch would then be worked on as if it were a regular development branch, undergoing a peer review and quality assurance test. When it passes testing, it would then be immediately incorporated back into the *master* branch and tagged for deployment ([Example 7-21](#)).

Example 7-21. Commands to prepare a hotfix for deployment

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git merge --no-ff hotfix-issue-description  
$ git tag --annotate -m new_tag_name  
$ git push --tags
```

In this system, semantic versioning is not used. Instead, tag names are incremented using the format *<launch_version>. <sprint_week>. <hotfix>*. For example, 1.4.3 would be used to represent the third hotfix on the fourth week of development (in other words: a bad week for the team!).

Trusted Developers with No Peer Review

While writing this book, I worked with the O'Reilly automated build tool, [Atlas](#). This system also has a web-based GUI that allows editors to work on book files directly. Saved files are immediately committed to the *master* branch. Due to the GUI, there is no peer review process because anyone on my team is able to make edits directly to a file. My preference, however, is to work locally, and not through a web GUI. I had been keeping the branch overhead low locally and had just been working in *master* as well. It only took me one local merge conflict to alter the way I was working locally.

When I wanted to update my work, I would use the command `fetch` to see if any changes had been made by my editors. With the `fetch` completed, I would compare my copy of the *master* branch with their copy of the *master* branch (`origin/master`). Assuming I agreed with all their edits, I would merge in their copy of the branch. If I disagreed, I would merge in their branch with the strategy `ours`, effec-

tively throwing out their changes but letting Git think that the two branches were up to date:

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git fetch origin  
$ git diff origin/master
```

Depending on whether or not I wanted to keep the changes, I would merge the work in one of three ways: combine all work, overwrite their work with mine, or overwrite my work with theirs.

To combine all work (true merge):

```
$ git merge origin/master
```

To keep my own work:

```
$ git merge -X ours origin/master
```

To discard my own work in favor of the reviewer's:

```
$ git merge -X theirs origin/master
```

This can be done on a per-commit basis, or if there is a merge conflict, it can be done on a very granular change-by-change basis with a merge tool. (It feels a bit passive-aggressive to be throwing stuff out, but really it's just the limitation of a single branch system where you don't have the ability to talk about the proposed changes in a separate branch.) Depending on the granularity of the commits, I might also choose to cherry-pick some commits to keep them, while discarding other commits. Cherry-picking commits was covered in [Chapter 6](#).

Finally, I would upload the new version of the book to the repository, and update my local working branch `drafts`:

```
$ git push origin master  
$ git checkout drafts  
$ git rebase master
```

Then I started getting reviews as marked-up PDFs and realized, once again, I had another way that I wanted to separate work. I wanted to be able to write a chapter and keep those commits nice and tidy, but sometimes I was mid-chapter when an edit came in that I wanted to address immediately. Instead of intermingling these commits I set up the following structure for my branches: `master`, `drafts`, and one branch per chapter:

```
$ git checkout ch04  
// write chapter  
$ git add ch04.asciidoc  
$ git commit  
$ git checkout drafts  
$ git merge ch04
```

The branch `drafts` gave me a place to integrate all of the work that I'd been doing. It was kept up to date by merging in chapters as they were completed, or rebasing the `master` branch if changes had been made by one of my editors. When I was first writing chapters on my own, without others contributing, multiple branches would have been a lot of overhead to maintain, but as more contributors started offering different kinds of contributions, more granularity in branches allowed me to pick and choose how I wanted the manuscript to progress.

Untrusted Developers with Independent Quality Assurance

If your team is mostly trusted developers, but you have a few contractors as well, you might want to have your contractors working in a fork of the repository, instead of giving them write access to the main project. For some types of software, this split might even be a requirement for your own staff. For example, if you were working on firmware for a medical device, you might have very strict government regulations you need to follow on who is allowed to check in work, and how that work must be reviewed before it is added to a repository.

This model is the same as what was described for Contributors (as opposed to Maintainers) earlier in this chapter.

A second example was given in the description of the forking strategy in [Chapter 2](#). Here I included a description of how I offered a patch back to the `reveal.js` project. To do this, I made a fork of the project, and then cloned the project so that I could edit the files at my workstation. I then reversed the chaining to push my changes back to the original project through a push to upload my work, and then a pull request to submit my work for review.

Based on your reading to date, put together the commands that would be necessary for these workflows. Hint: there's nothing here that you haven't read about already in this chapter. Start by drawing yourself a diagram, then add arrows to show the progression of work through the process, and finally, add the Git commands for each of the arrows.

Summary

To work on a new project, you must first decide on the governance structure for the project. This will inform whether or not developers need to create a remote clone of the project, or just a local clone of the project. The way Consumers, Contributors, and Maintainers set up their access to the project may prevent them from doing some tasks; however, by adding remote repository connections, you can easily promote a Developer into a Maintainer.

CHAPTER 8

Ready for Review

Growing up I learned there were two kinds of reviews I could seek out from my parents. My parents were predictable in their responses. One of my parents gave reviews in the form of a shower of praise. The other parent, the one with a degree from the Royal College of Art, would put me through a design crit. I'll be honest and tell you that to this day I both dread and crave the review process.

Unfortunately, developers are rarely exposed to the peer review process in schools. The typical review process is the final submission of work to the instructor—with no room for discussion on how to improve. This methodology doesn't teach students to iterate based on feedback. Graduates released into the workforce may quietly scoff at shoddy workmanship they find around them, passing silent judgment when it's too late to make changes.

Completing a peer review is time consuming. At the last project where I introduced mandatory peer reviews, we estimated that it doubled the time to complete each ticket. It introduced more context switching to the developers, and was the source of increased frustration when it came to keeping the branches up to date while waiting for a code review. The benefits, however, were huge. Junior coders were exposed to a wider amount of the code base than just the portion they were working on, senior developers had better opportunities to ask why decisions were being made in the code base that could potentially affect future work, and by adopting an as-you-go peer review process we reduced the amount of time needed for human quality assurance testing at the end of each sprint. We felt the benefits were worth the time invested.

Types of Reviews

During the life cycle of a project, several types of reviews should be undertaken. While the majority of this chapter focuses on peer *code* reviews, you should be aware of the other types of reviews to ensure you're not commenting too early (or too late) on various aspects of the project:

Design critique

Typically developers are not involved at this stage of the project; however, including a developer's input may result in minor user interface enhancements that *radically* simplify the build.

Technical architecture review

A peer review of the underlying foundation for the code that is about to be built. At this stage, developers should be ensuring the data model is complete and can easily accommodate all parts of the build, and perhaps future features as well.

Automated self-check

Like spell-check, but for code; an automated self-check allows developers to ensure their code is following coding standards for the project. You may have additional testing suites that you want to run. The purpose of this type of review is to automate any type of review that could easily be caught by a machine check, instead of wasting time performing human checks.

Ticket-based peer code review

The majority of this chapter will be spent discussing this type of review.

Quality assurance/user acceptance testing

After the code review, the new feature will be merged into the development branch and make it available for testing by human testers. This user interface review is typically conducted on a special, nonproduction server.

Types of Reviewers

Depending on the size of your project, you probably have a variation on one of the following types of review processes (or maybe a combination of several):

Peer Review

We are all equals and equally able to review code and accept it to the project. We learn from one another and do our best work when we know our peers will be judging it later.

Automated Gatekeeper

Our code has test coverage. We trust our tests and only submit work we know will pass a comprehensive test suite. Typically we ask for a second opinion before the code is pushed into the test suite (for automated deployment).

Consensus Shepherd

Our community of coders is vigilant, and opinionated. We require consensus from interested parties before code can be marked as *reviewed by the community*. We may also have a testbot that is part of our community, making it easier for human coders to know when a suggested change meets minimum standards.

Benevolent Dictator

My code, my way. You are welcome to submit your suggestions, but I will review or have my lieutenants review your work with a fine-tooth comb. I enjoy finding your mistakes and rejecting your work. Only perfection is good enough.

Peer reviews should not be limited to those who are of equal stature on a team. The benefits will vary, but they can be extended to any combination of skill levels ([Table 8-1](#)).

Table 8-1. Benefits to junior and senior reviewers and developers

	Junior Developer	Senior Developer
Junior Reviewer	Find bugs; compliance with standards	Learn to read good code; suggest simplifications; exposure to the whole code base
Senior Reviewer	Suggest new techniques; improve architecture	Improve architecture; cross-functional team (exposure to more code)

Software for Code Reviews

The commands outlined in this chapter can be used with any Git hosting system. Detailed instructions for code hosting systems are outlined in [Part III](#)—including instructions on using GitHub ([Chapter 10](#)), Bitbucket ([Chapter 11](#)), and GitLab ([Chapter 12](#)). The code review capabilities of these systems are managed by *pull requests* or *merge requests*, and they are relatively lightweight, making them easy to use and integrate into most workflows.

If your reporting requirements are more explicit due to industry regulations, you may need to consider using a more formal code review and sign-off process. The following software packages focus explicitly on code review and sign-off. They are appropriate for the code review of extremely large software projects, and are likely more software than the typical project needs:

Gerrit

Used by Android, OpenStack, and Typo3, this review system is best for very large projects. There is a nice [video presentation about its design \(and limitations\)](#) by Dave Borowitz.

Review Board

Used by LinkedIn, the Apache Software Foundation, and Yelp, this software includes additional information about when lines of code were moved within the code base.

In addition to manual, peer review of code, it can also help developers to have automated tests to check their work against before requesting a peer review. Some open source projects, such as Drupal, have tools that can be used to verify that code conforms to coding standards ([Coder](#)). There are also for-pay services, such as [PullReview](#) for Ruby and [bitHound](#) for JavaScript, which are language specific but project agnostic.

Although we will be focusing on technical code reviews, increasingly non-technical reviewers are being included as part of the review process through customizable, on-demand build servers. A public example of this is the [SimplyTest.Me service for Drupal](#). This platform allows people to deploy a test machine for 30 minutes at a time with a specific patch applied to the code so that they can review the changes proposed in the Drupal issue queue. These build servers can also benefit developers. Instead of conducting reviews sequentially, a reviewer can initiate the build process for a number of reviews all at once. Now the reviewer can avoid the (sometimes lengthy) procedure of building a local environment for each code review he or she is completing, by running the build process in parallel for all reviews that need to be completed. If this sounds appealing, you should read the Lullabot article on [working with its pull request builder](#). Assuming your technology stack is a little different than theirs, a web search for “pull request builder” should get you pointed in the right direction.

Reviewing the Issue

Before beginning the local code review process, you should read through the description of the proposed changes in your team’s issue tracker to discover why the change was proposed. Is it a bug fix? How was the software broken? Is it adding a new feature? Who (and how) does the feature help? Understanding the problem before you look at the code will help you to answer “is this code the best way to solve this problem?” when the time comes.



Investigate Your Code Hosting Platform

Most code hosting systems also have a web interface that allows you to easily review the proposed changes online. Use this interface to quickly review the code before setting up your local environment. If, for example, the proposed change is just adding a missing code comment, or fixing a spelling mistake, you might be able to review the proposed changes online without the hassle of downloading everything to your local environment.

Once you have a good understanding of what the code is supposed to be doing, it is time to set up your local environment so that you can replicate the “before” state. In other words, if it’s a bug, you should make sure you can replicate the bug in your testing environment. If it’s a new feature, you should make sure the feature doesn’t already exist (to be fair, it is pretty unlikely that two people will implement the exact same new feature).

The first step in reviewing someone else’s work is to verify how the code works currently. If you are testing a fix to a specific bug, that means you should start by replicating the bug. This is the only way you’ll know for sure that the new code fixes the problem, and it isn’t just a difference of environments making things *appear* to work. When you apply the new code, you also want to be able to catch any regressions, or problems, it might introduce. You can only do this if you know for sure that the problems were introduced in the code you *just* applied.

Once you’ve got your environment set up and you have confirmed the current state of the code, you can now check out a copy of the code you need to review.

Applying the Proposed Changes

In [Chapter 2](#) you learned about several different access control models for Git. Your project might be setup such that the proposed review branch is in the main project repository (“[Shared Repository Setup](#)” on page 189), or it might be in a forked copy of the project repository (“[Forked Repository Setup](#)” on page 190). The instructions for the initial setup are different, so skip ahead to the section which is relevant to you.

Shared Repository Setup

If you are working from a shared repository, you have a very easy setup. Simply update your local list of branches:

```
$ git fetch
```

If you have more than one remote, you may need to explicitly name the remote you would like to update. Assuming the name of the remote you want to update is named *origin*, the command is as follows:

```
$ git fetch origin
```

If you are working in an automated build environment you may need to explicitly fetch the branch you want to review if you don't have the complete history for the remote repository locally. Replace *origin* with the name of your remote and *61524-broken-link* with the name of the branch you want to review:

```
$ git fetch origin 61524-broken-link:61524-broken-link
```

The third parameter, *61524-broken-link:61524-broken-link* is a *refspec* which maps the name of the remote branch to a local branch name (*[remote_branch_name]:[local_branch_name]*). Convention leaves the branch name the same because it is easier to remember, but it does make for a complicated-looking command to have things doubled up.

You are now ready to proceed to “[Checking Out the Proposed Branch](#)” on page 191.

Forked Repository Setup

There are two ways to approach a forked repository scenario. The first method is to clone a new copy of the remote repository which contains the proposed branch. This method is appropriate if we are just conducting a review, and we will not be responsible for incorporating the proposed changes back into the main project repository. The second method is to add a new remote repository to our own local repository and pull the changes into a new branch within our own repository. This second method will also allow us to merge the approved work back into the main project repository. You should proceed with the method that is appropriate for your situation. If you aren't sure, choose the second method and add the remote repository reference to your own local repository.

For both methods we will need to know the URL for the remote repository which holds the changes you want to review. It may be in the format of `https://example.com/username/project.git` or `git@example.com:username/project.git`. Once you have the remote URL, you are ready to proceed.

If you are using the first method of creating a new clone, navigate away from your own copy of the project repository, perhaps to your desktop folder. Then, create a clone of the repository you want to review with the following command:

```
$ git clone https://example.com/<username>/<project>.git
```

Navigate into the new repository you have just cloned:

```
$ cd project
```

You are now ready to proceed to “[Checking Out the Proposed Branch](#)” on page 191.

If you are using the second method of adding a remote repository to your own copy of the project repository, you will need to begin from within your project repository. At the command line, navigate to that directory now.

Once situated in your project folder, add a new remote repository for the fork that contains the branch you need to review. For the name of the remote, use the username of the person whose work you are reviewing. For example, if you are reviewing Donna’s work and her repository is available at <https://example.com/donna/likesgin>, the command would be as follows:

```
$ git add remote donna https://example.com/donna/likesgin
```

Update the list of branches available to you now that you have a new connection to a new remote repository:

```
$ git fetch donna
```

You are now ready to proceed to “[Checking Out the Proposed Branch](#)” on page 191.

Checking Out the Proposed Branch

You should now be situated inside a project repository which contains the branch you need to review. The next step is to check out a copy of the branch you need.

List all branches for your repository:

```
$ git branch --all
```

A list of branches will be returned. It may appear something like this:

```
* master
remotes/origin/master
remotes/origin/HEAD -> origin/master
remotes/origin/61524-broken-link
```

The code we need to review is located within the last branch on that list. If you have added an additional remote to download the branch you want to review, the word *origin* may be something like *donna* instead. Simply substitute the word *origin* in the instructions that follow with the nickname you have assigned the remote which contains the branch you are reviewing.

```
$ git checkout --track origin/61524-broken-link
```

We now have our own copy of the proposed changes in a local branch. This new local copy of the branch will be named *61524-broken-link*. By adding the parameter *--track*, we made an explicit connection as we switched to the new branch. This means if we need to run the command *push* to upload our changes, Git will know which repository we want to upload our changes to.

We can now begin our review.

Reviewing the Proposed Changes

First, let's take a look at the commit history for this branch with the command `log`:

```
$ git log master..
```

This gives us the full log message of all the commits (starting with the most recent) *that differ from the branch you're comparing yours to*. If there are not descriptive commit messages, return the work to the developer and ask her to add commit messages. There are instructions in [Chapter 8](#) on how to write a great commit message, and instructions in [Chapter 6](#) on how to reshape history (including adding new commit messages to previous commits with interactive rebasing).

To get a terse, but more complete history, examine only the current branch with the command `log`, but in graph form. By using the parameter `--graph`, you will get a sense of how this branch fits into the recent historical context of the project:

```
$ git log --oneline --graph
```

And finally, use the command `diff`. This command shows the difference between two points in your repository. These points can include commit objects, branch tips, and the staging area. We want to compare the current work to where you'll merge the branch “to”—by convention, this is the `master` branch:

```
$ git diff master
```

When you run the command to output the difference, the information will be presented as a patch file. Patch files are ugly to read. You're looking for lines beginning with `+` and `-`. These are lines that have been added or removed, respectively. You can scroll through the changes using the up and down arrows. When you have finished reviewing the patch, press `q` to quit. If you need an even briefer comparison of what's happened in the patch, consider listing only the files, and then looking at the changed files one at a time:

```
$ git diff master --stat  
$ git diff master filename
```

Let's take a look at the format of a patch file:

```
diff --git a/jokes.txt b/jokes.txt  
index a3aa100..a660181 100644  
--- a/jokes.txt  
+++ b/jokes.txt  
@@ -4,5 +4,5 @@ an investigator.  
The Past, The Present and The Future walked into a bar.  
It was tense.  
  
-What did one hat say to another's
```

```
-You stay here, I'll go on a head!  
+What's the difference between a poorly dressed man on a tricycle and a  
well dressed man on a bicycle?  
+Attire.
```

The first five lines tell us we are looking at the difference between two files, with the line number of where the files begin to differ. There are a few lines of context provided leading up to the changes. These lines are indented by one space each. The changed lines of code are then displayed with a preceding - (line removed), or + (line added).

You can also get a slightly better visual summary of the same information we've looked at to date by starting a Git repository browser. I use gitk, which ships with the brew-installed version of Git (but not the version Apple provides). Any repository browser will suffice and many [GUI clients are available on the Git website](#):

```
$ gitk
```

When you run the command, `gitk`, a graphical tool will launch from the command line. Click each commit to get more information about it. Many ticket systems will also allow you to look at the changes in a merge proposal side by side. Even if you love the command line as I do, I highly recommend getting an additional graphical tool to compare changes. For OS X, I like [Kaleidoscope App](#) because it also allows me to spot differences in images as well as code.

Now that you've had a good look at the code, jot down your answers to the following questions:

- Does the code comply with your project's identified coding standards?
- Does the code limit itself to the scope identified in the ticket?
- Does the code follow industry best practices in the most efficient way possible?
- Has the code been implemented in the best possible way according to all of your internal bug-a-boos? It's important to separate your *preferences* and stylistic differences from actual problems with the code.

With a sense of what the code changes are, you should go ahead and apply the changes to your local environment. In other words, display the rendered code however is appropriate for your project. Assuming it's a website, now is the time to launch your browser and view the proposed change. How does it look? Does your solution match what the coder thinks he's built? If it doesn't look right, do you need to clear the cache, perhaps rebuild the Sass output to update the CSS for the project based on the changes you're reviewing?

Now is the time to also test the code against whatever test suite you use:

- Does the code introduce any regressions?
- Is the new code as performant as the old code? Does it still fall within your project's performance budget for download and page rendering times?
- Are the words all spelled correctly, and do they follow any brand-specific guidelines you have (e.g., sentence case versus title case for headings)?

Depending on the nature of the original problem for this particular code change, there may be other obvious questions you need to address as part of your code review. Ideally, your team will develop its own checklist of things to look for as part of a review.

Preparing Your Feedback

Do your best to create the most comprehensive list of everything you can find wrong (and right) with the code. It's annoying to get dribbles of feedback from someone as part of the review process, so we'll try to avoid "just one more thing" wherever we can.

Let's assume you've now got a big juicy list of feedback. Maybe you have no feedback, but I doubt it. Release your inner critique and let's get your review structured in a usable manner for your teammates. For all the notes you've assembled to date, separate them into the following categories:

The code is broken

It doesn't compile, introduces a regression, it doesn't pass the testing suite, or in some way actually fails demonstrably. These are problems that absolutely must be fixed.

The code does not follow best practices

You have some conventions, the web industry has some guidelines. These fixes are pretty important to make, but they may have some nuances the developer might not be aware of.

The code isn't how you would have written it

You're a developer with battle-tested opinions; but you can't actually prove you're right without getting out your rocking chair and launching into story time.

Submitting Your Evaluation

Based on this new categorization, you are ready to engage in passive-aggressive coding. If the problem is clearly a typo and falls into one of the first two categories, go ahead and fix it. You'll increase the efficiency of the team by reducing the number of

round trips the code needs to take between the developer and the reviewer. Obvious typos don't really need to go back to the original author, do they? Sure, your teammates will be a little embarrassed, but they'll appreciate you having saved them a bit of time. Hopefully the next time they won't be so sloppy. However, if it's the fourth or fifth time, do not fix the mistake. Your time is also valuable and your teammates need to check their own code before it gets to you.

If the change you are itching to make falls into the third category: stop right now. Do not touch the code. Instead, update the ticket where the problem was first identified and find out why your teammate took that particular approach. Asking "Why did you use this function here?" might lead to a really interesting conversation about the merits of the approach taken. It might also reveal limitations of the approach to the original developer. By starting a conversation, reviews can increase the institutional level of knowledge. By starting the conversation you're also leaving yourself open to the possibility that, *just maybe*, your way of doing things isn't the only viable solution.

If you "needed" to make any changes to the code they should be absolutely tiny and minor. You should not be making substantive edits in a *peer review* process. Make the tiny edits and then add the changes to your local repository as follows:

```
$ git add --all  
$ git commit -m "Correcting <list problem> identified in peer review."
```

You can keep it brief because your changes should be minor. At this point, you should push the reviewed code back up to the server for the original developer to test and review. Assuming you've set up the branch as a tracking branch, it should just be a matter of running the command as follows:

```
$ git push
```

Update the issue queue as is appropriate for your review. Perhaps the code needs more work, or perhaps it was good as written and it is now time to close the issue queue.

Repeat the steps in this section until the proposed change is complete, and ready to be merged into the main branch.

Completing the Review

Up to this point, we've been comparing a ticket branch to the *master* branch in the repository. The final step in the review process will be to merge the ticket branch into the designated main branch (*master*) for the repository, and clean up the corresponding ticket branches.

Let's start by updating our *master* branch to ensure we can publish our changes after the merge:

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git pull --rebase=preserve origin master
```

Take a deep breath, and merge your ticket branch back into the main branch for your project's repository. As written, this command will create a new commit in your repository history, which can be used to unmerge a public copy of the branch using the command `revert` if necessary:

```
$ git merge --no-ff 61524-broken-link
```

The merge will either fail, or it will succeed. If the merge fails, the original coders are often better equipped to figure out how to fix the merge errors, and you may need to ask them to resolve the conflicts for you. Tips on dealing with merge errors are covered in [Chapter 6](#).



Which Branching Strategy is Your Team Using?

Those who are using a streamlined mainline branching strategy ([Chapter 3](#)) should ensure they bring their working branch (`61524-broken-link`) up to date with the destination branch (`master`) using the command `rebase`. After checking out the destination branch, the new work should be merged in using the parameter `--ff-only` instead of `--no-ff`. This will omit the merge commit, remove the trace of the ticket branch, and leave a bump-free graphed history. Check with your team to see which branching strategy you are using, and therefore which convention you should use to merge in your work.

Once the branch is merged, you are ready to share the revised `master` branch by uploading it to the central repository:

```
$ git push
```

Once the new commits have been successfully integrated into the `master` branch, you can delete the old copies of the ticket branches both from your local repository and the central repository. It's just basic housekeeping at this point:

```
$ git branch --delete 61524-broken-link  
$ git push origin --delete 61524-broken-link
```

Summary

The peer review process can help your team. I have found it improves communication before ideas are committed to code. It fosters a mentoring attitude among team members. As a side benefit, it often encourages developers to start looking for ways to automate the process of testing to improve the efficiency of the reviews. Yes, it will take more time, but if you factor in the improvements I believe it's time well spent.

Finding and Fixing Bugs

Even the best review processes will sometimes allow a bug into production. Perhaps the bug was introduced by a bad merge, or a scenario your tests didn't cover. Whatever the cause of the problem, Git will be able to help you uncover at what point, and by whom, the offending code was introduced. This will allow you to understand the context of how the code ended up in the system, and tell you who the best person is to help you unpack a problem in an area of the code base you might not be familiar with.

There are two main ways to apply your forensic investigating skills: use the existing code to locate the problem and use the history of the code to locate the problem. You will be most effective when you use both of these techniques. When I'm debugging code, for example, I almost always start by looking at the code itself. This is left over from all of the frontend web development I've done, where it's easiest to use a tool like Firebug to pick apart a web page to find the offending CSS. It's definitely not the only way to debug code—and for many projects it will not be a viable strategy.

In this chapter, you will learn how to:

- Set aside your current work with `stash` so you can check out another branch
- Find the history of a file with `blame`
- Find the last working commit with `bisect`

By the end of this chapter, you will also have a better understanding of how you store history in Git now will affect how you can recover from mistakes tomorrow. You will hopefully have a new appreciation for how useful a really great commit message can be, and see how a rebasing workflow can help you create a history that is easier to decipher with `bisect`. This chapter does not include instructions on how you undo mistakes you find, because that was covered in [Chapter 6](#).

Those who learn best by following along with video tutorials will benefit from [Collaborating with Git](#) (O'Reilly), the companion video series for this book.

Using stash to Work on an Emergency Bug Fix

In [Chapter 6](#), you learned how to adjust commit messages, but in cases of emergency, it may actually be more appropriate to put your work on hold temporarily. This can be accomplished with the command `stash`. This command allows you to temporarily put aside something you are in the middle of, and which you want to return to at some point in the future.



Real-World Git Applications

One of my favorite Git-related one-liners was dropped by a friend, Jeff Eaton, at DrupalCon Prague. He made a comment, at exactly the right moment, about “having a git stash for morality.” I wish I could remember the context now (horror movies? beer gardens?), but the one-liner itself has stuck with me.

In the code sense of the command, `stash` allows you to avoid useless commits that need to be undone later. These useless commits are often introduced if you are currently working on a problem, but need to switch to a different branch temporarily because you can only switch branches when you have a clean working directory. Unlike a branch, or an individual commit, a stash cannot be shared; it is specific to your local repository.

To create a new stash that holds the changes currently in your working directory, you need to issue the command `stash`. If you prefer the clarity, you can include the parameter `save`. It is implied, though, so you don't need to include it if you want to save a few keystrokes:

```
$ git stash save  
  
Saved working directory and index state WIP on master: \  
d7fe997 [9387] Adding test: check user exists  
HEAD is now at d7fe997 [9387] Adding test: check user exists
```

You'll notice this command will only stash files Git already knows about. If you have new files that have not been committed previously, these files will not be incorporated into the stash as the other changes are tucked into a stash—making it impossible for you to switch to a different branch until all untracked changes have been cleaned up. To include untracked files, add the parameter `--include-untracked`:

```
$ git stash save --include-untracked
```

Alternatively, if you want to throw out those new files instead of putting them into your stash, you can run the commands as follows:

```
$ git stash save  
$ git clean -d
```

Each time you issue the command `stash` in a dirty working directory, a new stash will be created. You can see a list of your saved stashes by adding the parameter `list`:

```
$ git stash list  
  
stash@{0}: WIP on master: d7fe997 [9387] Adding test: check user exists
```

If you only need to remember one stash, and only for a few minutes, this is probably okay. Your short-term memory may be able to retain *exactly* what happened to you a minute ago, but the longer you need to hold this memory, and the more memories you need to recall, the harder it's going to be to remember what is in each stash.

To see the contents of a stash, use the command `show`. The patch for the selected stash will be displayed including meta data and the stashed changes from your working directory:

```
$ git show stash@{0}
```

If you don't think you will remember what you were working on from looking at the code, you can replace the commit message with a terse description of what you were working on when you stashed your working directory.



Adding a Description

If you want to include a description, you will need to explicitly include the parameter `save`.

Git allows you to store multiple stashes, so it can be especially helpful to name your stashes if you are working on a large problem and end up creating a stash multiple times from the same branch:

```
$ git stash save --include-untracked "terse description of the stashed work"
```

Now if you check your list of stashes again, you will see your previous stash as well as the new stash:

```
$ git stash list
```

```
stash@{0}: On master: terse description of the stashed work  
stash@{1}: WIP on master: d79e997 Revert "Merge branch 'video-lessons' ...
```

The newest stash will appear at the top of the list. Notice how the numbers used to refer to the stashes change as you create more stashes—it's a variable assignment, not a permanent reference number. This can be a little confusing if you create multiple

stashes in the same branch—but if you give each stash a terse description, it can be easier to recall which stash you want to apply when you’re ready to get back to work, and which stashes are now old and ready to be deleted.



Stashed Work Can Be Applied to Any Branch

This command can also be used if you realize you are working in the wrong branch, but have not made any commits yet. You can stash your work, switch branches, and then reapply the work you brought with you in your stash.

Once you’re ready to return to work, you determine which stash you’d like to use, and then apply it:

```
$ git stash list  
$ git stash apply stash@{0}
```

If you use the command `apply`, the stash will persist. This can be a little confusing if you start hoarding stashes. To remove a stash, use the command `drop` to delete it:

```
$ git stash drop stash@{0}
```

If you know you’re a bit of a hoarder, and you think you might not be very good at cleaning up old stashes, you should use `apply` and `drop` the stash with the single command, `pop`. Assuming you have only one stash, the command is as follows:

```
$ git stash pop
```

You can also pop off specific stashes using the same structure as `apply` and `drop`:

```
$ git stash pop stash@{0}
```



When in Doubt, Git Assumes You Meant the Latest Stash

If you have only one stash stored, you don’t need to list the stash you want to work with. If you omit the name of the stash, and there is more than one, Git will use the most recent stash (the top one on the list; it will be named `stash@{0}`).

You should now be able to put your work on hold temporarily using the command `stash`. Although you can stash your work whenever you’d like, you should only use this command if you are truly interrupted. If you have a coherent unit of work completed, use `commit` instead. If you decide to add more work later, you can always choose to `rebase` your branch and combine the commits you’d made previously.

Comparative Studies of Historical Records

One of the most basic tools you can use to start the search for why code isn't working is to compare the broken code to another instance of the code. You can do this easily by working with relative history. Instead of reading through the log for a particular branch, you can compare a branch to another branch, or to another point in time.

Most of these commands have appeared previously, but this time, look at them with specific questions in mind. Consider the commit history graph in [Figure 9-1](#). There are two branches with a common history: one with a known bug and one that is known to be working. The branch with the non-working code has four commits that differ from the branch with the code that works. The working branch only has two new commits, which are not included in the broken branch.




Figure 9-1. Two branches diverged from a common ancestor with an unequal number of commits



Need a Sample Repository to Practice On?

If you want to try the following exercises, download a copy of the repository from [the Git for Teams website](#). This repository has the necessary branches set up so that you don't need to replicate the scenario.

Using the command `log`, you can isolate many pieces of history. Draw the diagram in a notebook, and create circles around commits each of the commands are showing. You can also try each of these commands with `diff` instead of `log` for a variation on the output.

On the current branch, this is how I would view everything except the most recently committed work:

```
$ git log HEAD^
```

On the current branch, this is how I would view everything except the three most recent commits:

```
$ git log HEAD~3
```

You can also make comparisons as if you were standing at different vantage points. You're standing at the window of a tall building, looking out onto the street. You can see the rooftops of other, shorter buildings. Now imagine you're standing on the street looking up at the tall building. You can see people sitting under the café umbrellas. In the context of Git, this means you can make comparisons using either branch as the vantage point:

```
$ git log since_last_merge_to..what's_been_added_here --oneline
```

For example, this is how I would see what's in the working branch; but not on the broken branch:

```
$ git log working..broken
```

What about the opposite? How would I show which commits are in the broken branch, but missing from the working branch? Like this:

```
$ git log working..broken
```

If I wanted to see the code that was included in the broken branch, but missing in the working branch, I would do this:

```
$ git difftool working..broken
```

You can also make these comparisons with remote branches. Don't forget to download the latest versions with `fetch` before making the comparisons:

```
$ git fetch  
$ git log working..remote_nickname/broken
```

If you aren't able to uncover sufficient information, you can use `log` with the parameter `-S` to search for a specific string of text with the commit message, or the text that was applied (or removed) as part of that committed change. Searching through your repository in this way is made significantly more useful if you use controlled vocabularies for your commit messages. For example, I always try to include the name of the file, or an equivalent shorthand, in the commit message so that I can easily filter on it later (when this file is added to the repository for the book, it will get a commit message which includes the text CH09):

```
$ git log -S foo
```

If you were excited by the parameter `-S`, have I got news for you! There is also the ability to search based on regular expressions. Use the parameter `-G`.

Using these commands should help you to isolate which files might be causing the problems. Once you have the filenames, you can investigate them more closely.

Investigating File Ancestry with blame

When working with teams, it can be very useful to see who has worked on a file over time. The people working on files are the ones best equipped to walk through the history of why something was changed—especially if the commit messages aren’t giving any additional clues. Normally we use the command `log` to reveal how a repository has changed over time, but this doesn’t give a very good overview of how all of those changes have come together to make the file you are currently looking at.

The command `blame` allows you to look at a file line by line, showing the last time each line was changed, by whom, and in which commit it was changed ([Figure 9-2](#)).

commit id	line number	text at that line
3e524e0b	4)	[partintro]
3e524e0b	5)	--
3e524e0b	6)	This section approaches the commands in Git
8baf4735	7)	
7f2550a8	8)	Hands-on activities are sprinkled throughout ...
8baf4735	9)	
3e524e0b	10)	This section is divided into the following ...
8baf4735	11)	
3e524e0b	12)	* <<ch05>> covers the basics of distributed ...
3e524e0b	13)	* <<ch06>> allows you to explore history re ...

lines modified as part of the same commit

The diagram shows a bracket grouping lines 4, 5, and 6 under the heading 'lines modified as part of the same commit'. Lines 4 and 5 are from commit 3e524e0b, and line 6 is from commit 3e524e0b. Lines 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 are from commit 8baf4735. Line 10 is from commit 3e524e0b. Line 13 is from commit 3e524e0b.

Figure 9-2. `blame` allows you to list when each line was introduced into a file, by its commit ID and author

To examine the file `README.md`, use the `blame` command as shown in [Example 9-1](#).

Example 9-1. Output of the command `blame`

```
$ git blame README.md
```

```
3e9dd558 (emmajane          2014-04-23 22:11:40 -0400 1) Git for Teams of One...
^00de359 (Emma Jane        2014-04-23 18:54:03 -0700 2) =====
^00de359 (Emma Jane        2014-04-23 18:54:03 -0700 3)
3e9dd558 (emmajane          2014-04-23 22:11:40 -0400 4) Supporting files for ...
7874193c (emmajane         2014-06-26 00:37:41 -0400 5) developer work flow for ...
```

```
3e9dd558 (emmajane      2014-04-23 22:11:40 -0400 6) version control system, git
3e9dd558 (emmajane      2014-04-23 22:11:40 -0400 7)
00000000 (Not Committed Yet 2015-01-15 21:08:09 +0000 8) Test edit!
00000000 (Not Committed Yet 2015-01-15 21:08:09 +0000 9)
3e9dd558 (emmajane      2014-04-23 22:11:40 -0400 10) ## Contents
3e9dd558 (emmajane      2014-04-23 22:11:40 -0400 11)
5cc35764 (emmajane      2014-06-25 17:45:38 -0400 12) */slides*
3e9dd558 (emmajane      2014-04-23 22:11:40 -0400 13)
```

From left to right, the columns show:

- Commit hash ID
- Author name
- Date
- Line number
- Content for that particular line within the file

In [Example 9-1](#), you may have noticed there were three authors listed: Not Committed Yet, emmajane, and Emma Jane. Hopefully the first is self-explanatory: these are changes that are in my working directory but that are not yet committed. The two variations of my name are a simple inconsistency in how I've configured Git over time. You can read more about how to customize your attributed name in [Appendix C](#).

Two of the lines begin with ^. These lines have not been edited since the initial commit.



Beware! The Word “blame” May Condition You into Negative Thinking

The command `blame` is poorly named. It immediately, and unnecessarily, creates an antagonistic view of the code. I much prefer the commands used in one of Git's competitors, Bazaar: `annotate`, also available under the alias `praise`. (Full disclosure, Bazaar also has an alias of `blame` for `annotate`.) Git does have an `annotate` command, but the documentation for this command states that it is only for compatibility reasons. It is not a true alias and the output of `blame` and `annotate` differs slightly.

The last person who changed a line of code is often the person most qualified to explain what they were trying to accomplish; coming to them with a fight on your hands is going to decrease the likelihood they'll come to you for help in the future, which increases the chance of you needing to deal with their future mistakes as well. Check your attitude when using this command, and see if you can shift from *blame* thinking to simple annotation.

Once you've located the line in the file that looks interesting, you can investigate further using the commit ID along with the commands `log`, `diff`, and `show`. [Table 9-1](#) outlines what each of the commands can help you to isolate.

Table 9-1. Reason to use log, diff, and show

Description	Command
Show the metadata for a particular commit	<code>log commit</code>
Show the code changed <i>in</i> a particular commit	<code>show commit</code>
Show the code changed <i>since</i> a particular commit	<code>diff commit</code>

Start by using the command `log` to look at the commit message:

```
$ git show <commit>
```

If the commit message was well written, it should give you an explanation for *why* the changes were made in this particular commit. If the detailed commit message includes a reference back to a ticket number in your project management system, you may even be able to read a discussion for the changes made—giving you even more insight into what the developers were thinking when they created the fix. In the tracking system, you may also see other developers who were involved, and anyone who was on the review team for this particular change.

To see the same amount of detail, but in all commits since that point, use the command `log` as follows:

```
$ git log --patch <commit>
```

The parameter `--patch` in this context shows you the changes between each of the commits, as opposed to the command `diff`, which shows you the difference between the referenced commit, and the files in the working directory.



blame Only Tells You About What Is Visible

`blame` is not perfect. If the bug was introduced in a line that is not present in the version of the file you are looking at, `blame` will not be able to notify you about who last edited the file. So it is a good tool to use, but it is not magic.

Using a combination of `blame`, `log`, and `diff`, you should now be able to review the history of a single file in the context of the total combined history of that file, and in the context of other changes made at the same time. Using the commit message, you may also be able to trace the rationale of why the changes were made. With a little bit

of forensic investigation, you can turn your questioning of the author of the code into a productive conversation—instead of a Columbo-style interrogation.

Historical Reenactment with `bisect`

Often it can be difficult to figure out exactly when a bug was introduced in your code if you don't know *which file* is the problem. If the error message you are looking for is printed to the screen, it can be relatively easy to search through the files in your code base to locate the right file. Sometimes the error message will include the filename and line number where the problem occurred. In any of these cases, you can use the commands `diff`, `log`, and `blame` to gain a better understanding of what has gone wrong. Sometimes the problem code does not leave sufficient clues in the error messages to use these tools. Introducing `bisect`!

`bisect` performs a binary search through past commits to help you find the commit where the code went from a known working state to a known broken state. Unlike a regular checkout of a commit, `bisect` continues to wander through your history (in a very methodical way!) until you have given it enough clues to identify which commit introduced the dysfunctional code. It's sort of like a historical reenactment of what the developers have done in a code base. At each point in the bisect process, you can launch the product (compile the code; load it in a browser; install the app on your phone; whatever is appropriate for your code base) and determine whether the code *at this moment in history* was right, or wrong. Once you find the point where things went wrong, you can fix history at that exact moment. It's like *Back to the Future*—and Git is your DeLorean.

To begin, you need to be in the top-level directory of your repository. This is the folder where the hidden `.git` folder resides. Begin the bisect process, and notify Git of one commit ID where the code is known to be good and one commit ID where the code is known to be bad ([Example 9-2](#)).

Example 9-2. Identify good and bad commits to bisect

```
$ git bisect start  
$ git bisect good <commit-id>  
$ git bisect bad <commit-id>
```

Git will now proceed to check out a series of commits one at a time, looking for the commit where the code went from bad to good:

```
$ git bisect start  
$ git bisect bad c04f374  
$ git bisect good 93b64fc  
  
Bisection: 10 revisions left to test after this (roughly 4 steps)  
[0075f7eda67326f1746] Merge branch 'video-lessons' into integration_test
```

The repository is now in a detached HEAD state. At this point, you need to confirm if the code is good or bad and report back your findings:

```
$ git bisect bad
```

```
Bisecting: 5 revisions left to test after this (roughly 3 steps)
[ed8056eb4b2aaaf00e6d] Lesson 4: Adding details on using git config
```

```
$ git bisect bad
```

```
Bisecting: 2 revisions left to test after this (roughly 1 step)
[c88a02babcb42bb00a83] Lesson 4: Adding new lesson on configuring Git
```

```
$ git bisect good
```

```
Bisecting: 0 revisions left to test after this (roughly 1 step)
[f1fa8e7e382f68c0558] Lesson 3: Extended descriptions for cloning a ...
```

```
$ git bisect good
```

```
ed8056eb4b2aaaf00e6d is the first bad commit
commit ed8056eb4b2aaaf00e6d9d183f974ed612d6f10e6
Author: emmajane <emma@emmajane.net>
Date:   Sun Sep 7 12:50:58 2014 +0100
```

Lesson 4: Adding details on using git config

Added commands to customize the following:

- username (or real name, as you prefer)
- email address
- enable color helpers within the git messages

Added a self-study piece on customizing your command prompt to include additional color and branch information.

```
:040000 040000 e927a1263e6e23eb5237a363a20640f62349b27d
31bc6c57d6acd8de214a63a47914b32d6809a866 M      lessons
```

The problem commit has been located. At this point, you are in a detached HEAD state, but you also know which commit you need to come back to. To return to the tip of your branch, with the new information, use the subcommand `reset`. This command can also be used at any point during the bisect process to abandon the search and return to the most recent commit on your branch:

```
$ git bisect reset
```

If you have not done a lot of programming, the binary search process can feel a bit like magic. (Really freaking cool magic, mind you.) If you want to remove some of

the mystery, you can use the subcommand `visualize` to show you the current status of the bisect process ([Figure 9-3](#)). The outer good and bad commits will be identified in the GUI you have configured for `gitk`.




Figure 9-3. Running `git bisect visualize` shows you the current status of the bisect process



Bisect Assumes Bad Things Have Happened

It is assumed that the current work is bad. So, you can't go back and find when something is fixed—you need to go back and find where something broke. It can be very confusing if you try to find where a *fix* was introduced, although it is possible. You just need to remember to reverse the definitions of good and bad.

Summary

I will happily admit that I am a crime drama TV junkie, so the chapter on using Git for forensic investigation appeals to me *greatly*. In this chapter, you have been exposed to a few of the commands I include in my detective toolkit:

- `stash` allows you to set aside your current work so you can check out another branch.
- `blame` allows you to find the line-by-line history of a file.
- `bisect` allows you to search methodically through history to find the spot where things went wrong.

These tools, when paired with the information in [Chapter 6](#) on recovering from mistakes, will help you dig into, and recover from, just about any crime scene you may end up investigating.

PART III

Git Hosting

The first two parts of the book included commands specific to Git, not any one particular code hosting platform. In [Part III](#), you will learn about three popular collaboration platforms: GitHub, Bitbucket, and GitLab. In the many projects I've worked on, I find that my work often falls into these divisions: open source projects are often hosted on GitHub; private, client work is often hosted on Bitbucket; and projects that are concerned with autonomy are often hosted internally on GitLab.

There are no formal restrictions that say you must use these systems in this way. Indeed, there is an enterprise version of GitHub, which allows you to purchase a “locally hosted” instance of GitHub; and there is a community edition of GitLab, which offers free hosting of private and public Git repositories.

Entire books have been written on how to use each of these three platforms. Instead of trying to replicate these works, each of the subsequent chapters is designed as a “Getting Started” guide for the ways I most commonly see these platforms used. [Chapter 10](#) covers using GitHub for public, open source projects; [Chapter 11](#) covers using Bitbucket for private, closed source projects; and [Chapter 12](#) covers using GitLab to host private, internal repositories.

Open Source Projects on GitHub

With more than nine million users, GitHub is the largest code hosting platform in the world today. If you are a web developer, or involved in open source software development, chances are good you have at least visited the GitHub website to download some code, if not created an account and participated in a development community. Those who are working on proprietary code development may know less about GitHub, but that doesn't make it less relevant as a code hosting platform, because GitHub also allows you to create private repositories if you don't want to share your code.

The focus of this chapter will be using GitHub for open project development, because this tends to be how most newcomers will first be exposed to the system. By the end of this chapter, you will be able to complete the following on GitHub:

- Create a new account
- Create an organization
- Create a new project
- Solicit contributions from new collaborators
- Accept pull requests from collaborators

Up to this point, the repository examples you've been working with were hosted on GitLab. Unlike GitLab, GitHub's platform is not based on open source software. GitHub can definitely improve your experience with Git, but has several of its own GitHub-isms that can make it difficult to know when you're working with Git terms, and when you're working with GitHub terms.

GitHub has a few great features that I have been able to take advantage of as a web builder. I have used GitHub to publish simple, static websites, and even HTML-based slide decks. Taking the same approach as we have previously in this book, you will

first learn to use GitHub as a team of one, and then you will learn how to use its features to collaborate with others. Of course, if you are already working on a team, I encourage you to skip to the section of this chapter that is most relevant to you.

Those who learn best by following along with video tutorials will benefit from [Collaborating with Git](#) (O'Reilly), the companion video series for this book.

Getting Started on GitHub

In this section, you will learn how to create an account on GitHub, and publish a repository to your own GitHub account. The goal is to get yourself familiarized with GitHub as a team of one, so that some of the actions feel a little more natural when you start participating in larger teams.

Creating an Account

You don't need an account on GitHub to access public repositories. If you want to upload code, or participate in conversations about the code, you will need to create an account. It is, fortunately, very straightforward to set up an account; and for public repositories, it is free. A free account is sufficient for everything covered in this chapter.

Step 1: Create your account

1. Navigate to <https://github.com> ([Figure 10-1](#)).
2. Enter a unique username. GitHub will let you know if the name has already been selected.
3. Enter a valid email address.
4. Enter a secure password.
5. Click the button Sign up for GitHub to proceed.

After passing the validation tests for a unique username, a valid email, and a secure password, you will be directed to the next screen.

Step 2: Select a plan

At this point, you may choose to financially support GitHub by paying for a plan. There is absolutely no requirement to pay for this code hosting service. By default, GitHub chooses the free plan for you ([Figure 10-2](#)). You'll need to follow these steps:

1. Confirm the plan type you would like to enable. By default, the free plan is selected.
2. Complete the account creation process by clicking Finish sign up.




Figure 10-1. Sign up for a GitHub account



Supporting Businesses so They Stay in Business

If you would like to help ensure GitHub stays in business, you may want to pay for a plan at some point in the future. One of the benefits of a paid plan is that you can create private repositories that are only available to the developers you choose to include in your project.

After you have created your account, you will receive an email from GitHub asking you to confirm your email. You will need to click the link in this email to complete the account creation process. If you do not verify your email, you will not be able to complete some tasks.

You are now ready to use your account to perform a range of tasks, including creating new repositories, and contributing code to your own and other repositories.

SSH Keys

If you use a very secure password, you may be using a password generator and have a password that is 45 characters including letters, numbers, and special characters. No one wants to retype this kind of password, but in order to authorize uploads, you will be prompted for your password when you try to push code up to GitHub. By uploading your SSH key, you can avoid retyping your password each time you want to publish code.

Welcome to GitHub

You've taken your first step into a larger world, @gitforteams.

The screenshot shows the GitHub sign-up process. At the top, there are three steps: 'Completed' (Set up a personal account), 'Step 2: Choose your plan' (the current step), and 'Step 3: Go to your dashboard'. The 'Choose your personal plan' section lists five plans: Large (\$50/month, 50 repos, 'Choose' button), Medium (\$22/month, 20 repos, 'Choose' button), Small (\$12/month, 10 repos, 'Choose' button), Micro (\$7/month, 5 repos, 'Choose' button), and Free (\$0/month, 0 repos, 'Chosen' button). To the right, a box titled 'Each plan includes:' lists 'Unlimited collaborators', 'Unlimited public repositories', and a bulleted list of features: 'Free setup', 'SSL Protection', 'Email support', and 'Wikis, Issues, Pages, & more'. A red arrow points from the 'Free' plan row to the 'Each plan includes' box. Another red arrow points from the 'Help me set up an organization next' checkbox area to the 'Finish sign up' button at the bottom.

Plan	Cost (view in GBP)	Private repos	Action
Large	\$50/month	50	Choose
Medium	\$22/month	20	Choose
Small	\$12/month	10	Choose
Micro	\$7/month	5	Choose
Free	\$0/month	0	Chosen

Charges to your account will be made in **US Dollars**. Converted prices are provided as a convenience and are only an *estimate* based on *current* exchange rates. Local prices will change as the exchange rate fluctuates.
Don't worry, you can cancel or upgrade at any time.

Help me set up an organization next
Organizations are separate from personal accounts and are best suited for businesses who need to manage permissions for many employees.
[Learn more about organizations.](#)

Finish sign up

Figure 10-2. Select a plan for your GitHub account

Appendix D includes instructions on how to create and retrieve SSH keys. Once you have the public key copied to your clipboard, you are ready to proceed to GitHub:

1. Navigate to <https://github.com/settings/ssh>. You can also access this screen by logging in to your account, clicking the configuration cog (top right), and then clicking SSH Keys from the set of navigation options for your account.
2. On the SSH Keys summary screen, click Add SSH key.
3. Optionally, add a title for your SSH keys. For example, you might have a personal set of SSH keys, rather than the keys you generated for your work computer.
4. Paste the public key that you copied previously into the Key field.

5. Click the button Add key.



SSH Keys Must Be Unique

GitHub will only allow key pairs to be added once on its system. If you have already used these keys on a different account, you will get an error message when you try to save the keys.

You will now be able to perform actions from your local computer that require authentication without typing your GitHub password.

Creating an Organization

Assuming you will be working on an open source project, you may want to create an organization at this point as well. An organization is able to own projects. Multiple people are able to join (or be assigned to) an organization. This allows you to manage a project without having to create a second GitHub account. Organizations are free to create, so you may as well take advantage of them.



Naming Your Organization

Generally you will create an organization name that is the same as the main project repository. So, for example, if your library is currently available in the repository named *evilrooster*, the name you would aim to secure for the new project account would also be *evil-rooster*. Once the new organization is created, you can reassign ownership from your personal account to the organization for the repository. This will allow you to maintain the project history for the repository.

To create an organization, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu, click the + symbol next to your avatar.
2. Click New organization. You will be redirected to the setup form for new organizations.
3. On the form Create an organization, enter the following:
 - Organization Name: This will be the URL for your organization.
 - Billing email: This is a required field even if you are selecting the free plan.
 - Plan: Open source is selected by default.
4. Click Create organization to proceed.

On the next screen you can add team members to your organization. Your own account is added by default. To add additional accounts, complete the following steps:

1. In the search field, enter the name or username of the person you want to add.
2. To the right of the person's name, click the + symbol.
3. Repeat steps 1 and 2 for each person you would like to add.
4. Click Finish to send the invitations.

Your organization has been created, and it has been assigned new members as you designated while setting up the organization.

Personal Repositories

This section is a brief overview of putting your own repositories on GitHub. You will use your personal account to create a new repository, which is appropriate for projects you do not intend to have others contributing to on a regular basis, because they are essentially yours. For example, when I deliver conference presentations with HTML slides, I often publish them to a GitHub repository to share them.

Creating a project

A repository on Git is so much more than what you get locally on your computer when you run the command `init` in a directory. It has an issue tracker, the ability to convert Markdown files into web pages, supplemental wiki pages, charts, graphs, and more. GitHub, however, still refers to the process as creating a repository.

To begin the process of creating a new repository, locate and click the + icon in the top-right corner of the screen, and then select New repository (Figure 10-3).




Figure 10-3. Create a new repository

Alternatively, you can log in and then navigate to the home page of GitHub; then locate and click the button Create new repository.

Once you've initialized the process, you will be redirected to a screen where you are asked to fill out the details for this project (Figure 10-4). The information you will need is also summarized in Table 10-1.

The screenshot shows the GitHub repository creation interface. At the top, there's a 'Owner' dropdown set to 'gitforteams'. The 'Repository name' field is empty. Below it is a note: 'Great repository names are short and memorable. Need inspiration? How about `freezing-batman`.'. A 'Description (optional)' field is also present. Under 'Visibility', 'Public' is selected (indicated by a blue radio button). The description for 'Public' says: 'Anyone can see this repository. You choose who can commit.' Below that, 'Private' is shown with the description: 'You choose who can see and commit to this repository.' There's a checkbox for 'Initialize this repository with a README', which is unchecked. The note next to it says: 'This will let you immediately clone the repository to your computer. Skip this step if you're importing an existing repository.' At the bottom, there are buttons for 'Add .gitignore: None' and 'Add a license: None', followed by a help icon. A large green 'Create repository' button is at the very bottom.

Figure 10-4. Enter the details for your new repository

Table 10-1. Details needed to create a new GitHub repository

Field	Notes	Use if importing?
Repository name	Your new project will be available at the URL <a href="https://github.com/<username>/<repo-name>">https://github.com/<username>/<repo-name> . Choose something short, but descriptive.	Yes
Repository description	This text will appear at the top of the repository home page, above the list of files.	Yes
Visibility	Choose public (selected by default) or private (requires a paid account).	Yes
Initialize this repository with a README	Add an empty file that can be used for details about your project. This file will be rendered as HTML on the home page for your repository, but can be written in Markdown.	No
Add .gitignore	Many programming languages will generate compiled files during the build process that should not be included in the repository. You can generate a <code>.gitignore</code> file now, which has typical file extensions for your language already included.	No

Field	Notes	Use if importing?
Add license	Without a license file, you do not give people permission to download and use your code. You retain full copyright, and do not grant permission for others to use your work. Ideally, your project will have a license. If you would like to include a license, but aren't sure which one to choose, Choose a License may help.	Maybe

If you have already started a repository locally, you may choose to upload it to this new project; however, if you have created files during the initialization process, you will need to first download these changes, incorporate them into your local repository, and then push them back up to GitHub. To avoid this extra step, if I already have a repository locally, I will omit the creation of the files for *README*, *.gitignore*, and the license.

Once you have selected values for each of the items in [Table 10-1](#), locate and click the button Create repository. Your new repository will be created, and you will be redirected to a summary page with suggestions on what to do next ([Figure 10-5](#)).




Figure 10-5. Your new repository is ready for use

Because there were not any files initialized during the repository creation process, you have only two options at this point: upload a repository from your local computer, or import a project from a publicly available URL. If, for example, you wanted

to copy your GitLab project from earlier in the book, you could. These options will be covered next.

Importing a repository

If you have been following along from the beginning of this book, you will have created a repository on GitLab that was a clone of the workshop files for the *Git for Teams* workshop. You can easily import this repository into GitHub. This process can only be completed if there are no files in your GitHub repository:

1. Navigate to your project home page.
2. If the repository is empty, you will be able to locate and click the button Import code. Clicking on this button will redirect you to the GitHub importer.
3. Enter the URL for the repository you want to import. This must be a public project, but it does not need to be a Git repository. You can also import Subversion and Mercurial repositories. If you are importing a Git project, ensure you get the full URL, including the `.git` extension—this is the same URL structure that you would use to clone a repository locally. [Figure 10-6](https://gitlab.com/gitforteams/gitforteams.git) shows a valid URL for a project (<https://gitlab.com/gitforteams/gitforteams.git>).




Figure 10-6. Enter a valid URL for a Git repository to import it to GitHub

- Click Begin import. The import process will begin.
- When the import process has completed, click Continue to repository. Your files will have been imported from the remote repository ([Figure 10-7](#)).

The screenshot shows the GitHub repository page for 'gitforteams / freezing-batman'. At the top, there are buttons for 'Unwatch', 'Star', and 'Fork'. On the left, there's a 'Description' field and a 'Website' field. In the center, it displays '148 commits', '4 branches', '0 releases', and '4 contributors'. Below this, a list of recently pushed branches is shown: 'sandbox' (less than a minute ago) and '1-bad_jokes' (less than a minute ago). To the right, there are links for 'Issues', 'Pull requests', 'Wiki', 'Pulse', 'Graphs', and 'Settings'. A 'HTTPS clone URL' field is also present. The main content area shows a list of commits, including 'handouts', 'lessons', 'resources', 'slides', '.gitignore', and 'README.md'. At the bottom, there's a large section titled 'Git for Teams of One or More'.

Figure 10-7. The repository files and history have been successfully imported from GitLab into GitHub

Connecting a local repository

In [Chapter 7](#), you learned how to connect a local repository to a new remote repository on GitLab. We'll repeat those steps here for our new GitHub repository. GitHub gives you copy/paste-friendly commands to complete these steps from the project home page if there were no files created during the initialization process. The structure for the remote repository is <https://github.com/<username>/<repo-name>.git>. For example, I created a new repository using the sample name given to me by GitHub (*glowing-octo-dangerzone*) with the account *gitforteams*. If I then wanted to connect a repository on my own computer to this repository, I would complete steps outlined in [Example 10-1](#).

Example 10-1. Cloning a repository

```
$ git remote add origin https://github.com/gitforteams/glowing-octo-dangerzone.git
```

Once you have completed these steps, navigate to the project page, and you should see all of your files uploaded. You are now ready to start working with your repository as a GitHub project.

Publishing changes to your GitHub repository

Once you've connected your local repository to your GitHub repository, you can upload committed changes to any tracked branch using the command `push`. To publish a *new* branch to GitHub, you will need to explicitly tell Git which remote you want to use as the upstream for your branch ([Example 10-2](#)).

Example 10-2. Set the upstream branch for a remote repository

```
$ git push --set-upstream origin master
```

After setting the upstream connection, you do not need to add the parameter `--set-upstream` again. If you want to publish your changes to more than one remote repository, you will need to continue specifying which remote.

Making Commits via the Web

One of the nice things about using a code hosting system such as GitHub, and not just working at the command line, are the tiny enhancements that are built into the system. For example, GitHub allows you to edit any of the files in your repository through a web user interface. While I recommend you *do not* use this as your regular code editor, it can be really handy if you just want to fix a typo as a fly-by commit.

To make an edit via the web editor, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to the specific instance of the file you want to edit. The URL for this file will include the branch name. For example, <https://github.com/gitforteams/freezing-batman/blob/master/README.md>.
2. Locate and click the pencil icon to edit this file ([Figure 10-8](#)); alternatively, press `e` on your keyboard.

You will be redirected to a browser-based text editor ([Figure 10-9](#)). You are now ready to make changes to the file in your repository.

After making edits you can click the button `Preview changes`. New lines have a green bar to the left of the changed text (wrapped in the HTML element `ins`); lines that have been removed have a red bar to the left (wrapped in the HTML element `del`). In [Figure 10-10](#), the first paragraph with a bar has been removed; the second para-

graph is new. Apart from color and the HTML elements, there does not currently appear to be a way to perceive the difference in what's been added or removed.




Figure 10-8. You can edit any text file by clicking the pencil icon




Figure 10-9. The browser-based text editor includes an optional preview

Once the edits have been made to the file, you are ready to commit your changes back to your repository (Figure 10-11). A default value is provided for a short commit message, which states which file is being updated. You should provide a more descriptive description of the edits being made. An optional extended message can also be added. You will need to decide if you want to *just* commit the changes to the current branch, or if you want to create a new pull request from this change. By default, GitHub assumes you would like to commit this change directly to the repository, and on the same branch.

Because you are working with your own project at this point, it's fine to commit the change back to the *master* branch; leave the default option selected and click the button Commit changes.




Figure 10-10. The preview shows which lines have been changed (the first line has been removed; the second has been added)




Figure 10-11. Committing your changes back to the repository



Why You Might Want to Submit Yourself a Pull Request

If you are the sole editor for your project, you probably don't need to create a pull request for your changes. Pull requests, however, are merged back into the *master* branch with the parameter `--no-ff`. This means it will show up in your graphed history as a blip outside of the straight line of the *master* branch. If you don't mind if this commit appears exclusively on the main branch, it's fine to omit the pull request step. The step-by-step instructions for creating and closing pull requests are covered later in this chapter.

Once you've committed your changes to the repository, you will need to update your local repository to reflect these changes.

Updating Your Local Repository

If you do use the web-based editor to update your branch, your local repository will become out of date. (Don't try to redo the same edits in your local branch; Git needs to have exactly the same commit at exactly the same time to understand the two commits are the same.) You will need to download these changes and integrate them into your local repository before GitHub will allow you to upload new changes. This can be completed with the following sequence.

You should begin from within your local project repository directory. Next, ensure you are using the same branch as the remote edits. This is likely the branch *master*:

```
$ git checkout master
```

Next, incorporate the remote changes into your local work. Because the changes are being copied into the same branch, and because these are minor updates and not new features, I will use the option `--rebase` to incorporate the changes, instead of `merge`. This will keep my graphed history cleaner to read:

```
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
```

Your local branch should now be up to date and ready for new work.

Using Public Projects on GitHub

When working with projects, you can choose to download a zipped package of files, or you can maintain a connection to the remote repository, downloading new changes when they are available, and potentially contributing your own changes back to the project. In this section you will learn how to consume projects from GitHub, but not contribute to them. This will be covered in the next section.

Downloading Repository Snapshots

As your Git superpowers continue to grow, you will be less likely to download a package from GitHub. This option does exist if you want to share the code with someone who just wants a *.zip* package (perhaps even for your own project).

To download the *.zip* package for a project, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to the project page you want to download the code for.
2. Locate and click the button Download ZIP. This button ([Figure 10-12](#)) is conveniently located near the URL for cloning the project locally, or through the GitHub desktop application (which is available for Windows and OS X).

The downloaded package of files will be named according to the project and branch you downloaded. To change which branch you download, complete the following steps:

1. Locate and click the branch drop-down button near the top left of the repository home page ([Figure 10-13](#)).
2. Select the branch you would like to download. Wait a moment for the page to refresh.
3. Locate and click the button Download ZIP.

There will not be an indication in the user interface that you are downloading a different branch; however, the filename will reflect the name of the branch (*repository_name-branch_name.zip*).




Figure 10-12. Download a snapshot of the repository




Figure 10-13. Change the branch you download by first selecting a different branch

Working Locally

Connecting to someone else's project on GitHub is almost the same process as using your own, except you won't have write access to the project (unless you are added to the project team, of course). In this section, you will learn how to create a local clone. I use this technique for the [Git for Teams website](#), which uses Sculpin, a static site generator.



Get Started with Sculpin

Sculpin is a static site generator built in PHP. The instructions in this section aren't enough to get you up and running. If you're interested in trying Sculpin, start at the [Get Started guide](#).

In this case, I want a local copy of the Sculpin templates for my site. Although I'm also a volunteer on the Sculpin project, this repository is *just* for my website. I'm unlikely to have contributions back to the project in the local copy. I do, however, want to maintain a connection to the main project so that I can incorporate the latest updates into my website easily. Although the commands are specific to the Sculpin project, you can substitute the URLs for your project of choice.

The first step is to create a local clone of the project ([Example 10-3](#)):

1. Navigate to the project page for the repository you want to download.
2. Locate and click the copy-to-clipboard icon ([Figure 10-14](#)) to get the URL for the repository.
3. Open a terminal window (or Git Bash window on Windows) and navigate to the directory where you'd like to download the project to.
4. Create a local copy of the project repository using the command `clone` and the URL you copied in step 2. Optionally, add the directory name to the end of this command.
5. Change the name of the directory to a name that is relevant to your project. You can optionally do this as part of the previous step by adding the new directory name to the end of the command.
6. Navigate into the local repository.

Example 10-3. Create a clone of the repository

```
$ git clone https://github.com/sculpin/sculpin-blog-skeleton.git  
$ mv sculpin-blog-skeleton gitforteams.com  
$ cd gitforteams.com
```

The second step ([Example 10-4](#)) is to create an upstream, or “vendor branch” that will be kept free from changes relevant only to your project. You will be able to keep this branch up to date with any changes to the main project. For the project I'm working with, the default branch is *master*. You can choose whatever name makes sense for you; sometimes I use the project name, sometimes I use the generic nickname *upstream*. I don't think there's an advantage of one over the other (although Shakespeare might have said something about my naming whimsies). By moving the branch instead of creating a new one, I maintain the relationship between my local

branch and the remote repository. Optionally, if you prefer to work on the master branch, you may recreate the branch *master* branch.




Figure 10-14. The copy-to-clipboard icon is located immediately above the download button

Example 10-4. Create an upstream branch

```
$ git branch --move master upstream  
$ git checkout -b master
```

The final step is to add a remote repository for your working copy of the project (Example 10-5). This new remote repository will hold all of the changes that you are making for your instance of the project. The Sculpin project shouldn't keep a record of all the changes I'm implementing for the *Git for Teams* website, but I need to keep track of them. In real life, I keep the *Git for Teams* repository on Bitbucket as a private repository. I don't use the issue tracker, I just toodle away in the repository and upload it after commits, almost like a backup plan. It's not taking advantage of the features Bitbucket offers, but it does give me peace of mind.

When the project was first cloned, the remote name *origin* was assigned to the remote repository. We're going to swap that nickname for *upstream*, because the convention is to use *origin* for the repository that most closely mimics our own.

To prepare for adding the new remote, you will need to determine its URL. If you don't already have a remote repository set up, follow the steps for creating a project earlier in this chapter and ensure the repository does not have any files added during the initialization process. Once you've created the new project, follow the on-screen instructions to add the remote information to your repository and then upload the changes. For example, if your GitHub username was *gitforteams* and your new repository was named *superhero-freda*, you would add the remote repository as shown in Example 10-5.

Example 10-5. Add a remote repository for the working copy

```
$ git remote rename origin upstream  
$ git remote add origin https://github.com/gitforteams/superhero-freda.git  
$ git push -u origin master
```

You now have both a branch named *upstream* and a remote named *upstream*.

Check the upstream repository regularly for updates ([Example 10-6](#)). You do this by checking out the branch you designated as the upstream for the project, and pulling in changes.

Example 10-6. Check the upstream project for updates

```
$ git checkout upstream  
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
```

Assuming there have been updates to the main project, you can read the changes to see if you want to incorporate them into your own project ([Example 10-7](#)).

Example 10-7. Compare the changes in upstream to your local work

```
$ git diff master upstream
```

Or you can just look for a summary of the specific commits with these fancy parameters added to the command log:

```
$ git log --cherry-mark --left-right --oneline master...upstream
```

We've seen variations on this command before; the only real new piece is `--cherry-mark --left-right`. These parameters add a symbol to the beginning of the commit that indicates whether the change was introduced by the first branch on the list (points left), or the second (points right).

Once you have an understanding of the changes, you can bring your own branch up to date with the upstream changes ([Example 10-8](#)). This should be completed as if the changes were already in place and your own work was starting fresh today. In other words, you should bring your working branch up to date by rebasing the changes from upstream repository onto your own branch. (As I've mentioned previously, if you are working alone, you can also merge the changes in if you find this easier than using `rebase`. I won't judge you.)

Example 10-8. Incorporate upstream changes

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git rebase upstream
```

If conflicts arise, take them one at a time. There are additional tips for dealing with rebase conflicts in [Chapter 6](#).

Contributing to Projects

You have decided to make the leap and submit a contribution to a project. Huzzah! Congratulations! This is not significantly different than what you've done previously. The main difference is that you will be submitting a pull request, which will be reviewed by someone else before it is incorporated into the main project.

Tracking Changes with Issues

On public projects, issues are generally opened by users who have uncovered a bug. A much smaller set of contributors will create issues for new features they are interested in contributing, or design changes they are interested in developing.



Issues Are Disabled by Default for Forks

Issues are disabled by default for repository forks. If you want to track issues for your fork, you can enable the feature from the Settings screen.

To create an issue, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to the project page.
2. Locate and click the tab labeled Issues. It appears on the right sidebar ([Figure 10-15](#)). You will be redirected to the issues page.
3. Locate and click the button New issue. It appears on the right side of the screen ([Figure 10-16](#)). You will be redirected to an issue creation form.
4. Enter a title, a description of the problem that you want solved ([Figure 10-17](#)), and the ticket number of the issue that this pull request is being submitted to solve. The more descriptive you can be about the problem, the more likely it is to be solved.
5. When you are satisfied with your issue description, locate and click the button Submit new issue.

With the issue created, you can now go about creating the pull request that solves the issue.

Forking a Project

If you want to contribute your changes back, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to the project page.
2. Locate and click the button Fork. The repository will be forked, and you will receive a copy of the repository set up under your own account.




Figure 10-15. Navigation icon for Issues




Figure 10-16. Navigation button to create new issue

You can now clone this copy of the project to your local computer, just as you did in “[Personal Repositories](#)” on page 216. Once the repository is downloaded, you can make changes to the project, commit them to your repository, and then push them back up to your forked copy of the remote repository.

Once the changes you'd like to incorporate into the main project have been pushed back to GitHub, you are now ready to initiate a pull request.




Figure 10-17. Creating a new issue

Initiating a Pull Request

When you make a fork of a project, GitHub maintains a connection to the upstream project. This allows you to easily send your changes from your forked repository back to the main project.

Complete the following steps to initiate a pull request:

1. Navigate to the project page for your forked repository.
2. Locate and click the button pull request ([Figure 10-18](#)). It is located near the top left of the project description, below the title. You will be redirected to a summary of branches that can be used for a pull request. If there are not four drop-down menus displayed, click the link compare across forks before proceeding.
3. From the list of branches, select the branch you want to submit to the upstream project from the final drop-down menu ([Figure 10-19](#)). The differences between your branch and the upstream branch will be displayed.




Figure 10-18. The pull request button is located below the project title




Figure 10-19. Choose the branch you want to submit to the upstream project in your pull request

4. Locate and click the button Create pull request (Figure 10-20). A new form will open.
5. Enter a title, and a description for why you are submitting this change to the project (Figure 10-21).
6. Locate and click the button Create pull request to complete your request to have your changes included in the upstream project.

Once you have completed your pull request, the maintainers of the project will be notified through their GitHub interface for the project, and also via email if they have notifications enabled.

A screenshot of the GitHub 'Comparing changes' interface. At the top, it says 'Comparing changes'. Below that, a message says 'Choose two branches to see what's changed or to start a new pull request. If you need to, you can also compare across forks.' A green button labeled 'Create pull request' is highlighted with a red arrow. Below the message are three dropdown menus: 'base: master', '...', and 'compare: gitforteams-patch-1'. To the right of the dropdowns, a green checkmark icon and the text 'Able to merge. These branches can be automatically merged.' are displayed. The main area shows a commit history: 'Commits on Apr 05, 2015' with one commit from 'gitforteams' updating 'README.md'. The commit hash is 4f66567. Below the commit history, it says 'Showing 1 changed file with 1 addition and 4 deletions.' On the right, there are 'Unified' and 'Split' view options. The diff view shows changes to 'README.md':

```
5 README.md
...
@@ -1,10 +1,7 @@
 Git for Teams of One or More
 =====
 4 -Supporting files for workshops and sessions about creating a
```

Figure 10-20. To initiate the pull request process, locate and click button Create pull request




Figure 10-21. Enter a title and summary that explain the reason for your proposed change

Running Your Own Project

The technical part of running a project on GitHub is very easy. GitHub provides you with an issue queue, supplementary documentation pages (wiki), support for incoming code changes via pull requests, and the ability to grant write access to the repository. The difficult part, therefore, is the social part of creating a community of consumers and contributors around your software project. You should refer back to [Chapter 2](#) to refresh your memory on how to run a good project.

Creating a Project Repository

Most of my public GitHub projects are very tiny—slide decks for various conference presentations and the like. I do not expect to have regular contributors, although I happily accept contributions if people are interested in submitting a new fix. If you are working on a software package, chances are better that others will be interested in contributing to your project. If you are creating a library or software package that you think will be of interest to a larger group, you should not set it up under your personal account, but instead use an organization. By not using your personal account, it will allow other developers to feel a greater sense of ownership over the project, and be more committed to contributing to it.

To create a new project, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu, click the + symbol.
2. Click on New repository. You will be redirected to the new project form.

3. Beneath the label Owner, click your account and change it to your organization.
4. Enter a repository name. Generally this is the same name as the organization for single repository projects.
5. Enter a terse description for your project.
6. Click Create repository.

Your new repository has been created and you are now ready to begin using it as if it were one of your personal GitHub repositories.

If the project already exists under your personal account, you can reassign it using the following steps:

1. Navigate to the project page under your personal account.
2. Locate and click the link labeled Settings.
3. Locate and click the button labeled Transfer. A modal window will appear.
4. Enter the name of the repository; and the organization, or account name, for the new owner.
5. Click I understand, transfer this repo.

Your project will be reassigned to the new account holder.

Based on your rules of governance, you will now need to decide if you are going to submit yourself to pull requests, or if you will continue to submit your work directly to the project. Both have advantages, but they also follow different leadership models (it is faster to commit directly; but more *equal* for all contributors if you also submit pull requests, which undergo a review).

Granting Co-Maintainership

To share the burden of maintenance, you can grant write access for the repository to others. This is a big responsibility. You should decide ahead of time how you will deal with the thorny issues, such as disagreement on the direction the code should take; and other types of bad behavior, such as being rude to other contributors. Assuming you have worked through all of those difficult decisions, you can add contributors to your project as follows:

1. Navigate to the project page.
2. From the utility links in the top right of the page, click the + and then choose New collaborator (**Figure 10-22**).
3. You will be prompted to add your password. Do this and then click Continue.

4. Enter the GitHub username of the person you would like to assign co-maintainership to ([Figure 10-23](#)).




Figure 10-22. Navigating to the Collaborators page for your project




Figure 10-23. Adding a collaborator to your project

The person you've designated as being a co-maintainer will now have all the same authoring powers as yourself. You may wish to put together a maintenance cheat sheet to ensure you make decisions consistently for all community members.

To remove a collaborator, follow the instructions as outlined previously. Next to the collaborator's name, click the symbol x ([Figure 10-24](#)). The collaborator will no longer have commit access to the repository.

Reviewing and Accepting Pull Requests

Congratulations! You've received your first pull request to a project. GitHub provides you with an easy-to-use interface to review incoming pull requests. From here you

can add comments to the request, reject the pull request outright, or accept the pull request.



Figure 10-24. Remove contributors from your project

GitHub will notify you if accepting the pull request will result in a merge conflict, and in this case will *disable* the button to accept the incoming request.



Test It Out by Submitting Yourself a Pull Request

You can also test this out by making a fork of your own work and then submitting yourself pull requests.

Pull Requests with Merge Conflicts

If the pull request cannot be accepted without a merge conflict, you will be unable to accept the pull request through the Web interface. Instead, you will need to download the branch, resolve the conflict locally, and then push the new branch to the project repository.

The first step is to check out the branch where you want to receive the incoming pull request. For example, you may want to land this into the main branch for your project:

```
$ git checkout master
```

Currently your branch doesn't know anything about the contributor's repository. You will need to add it as a remote repository before you can download the proposed changes. Instead of using a generic nickname as we have in the past (e.g., *origin* or *upstream*), be optimistic and use the contributor's GitHub username. This will ensure you are ready to accept more changes from them in the future.

In the following example, replace *<username>* and *<repository-name>* with the appropriate values for the incoming pull request branch:

```
$ git remote add username git://github.com/<username>/<repository_name>
```

With the remote repository added, you must now download the contributor's work:

```
$ git fetch username
```

The branch will now be downloaded and available for local review. You should use the guidelines from [Chapter 7](#) on how to conduct a peer review. You may need to provide feedback to the reviewer and request he or she submit a new pull request if the code isn't quite right. Refer back to your governance model to see if it's appropriate for you to make the updates yourself, or if you are required to reopen the issue for further development. A good rule of thumb is this: if the contributors will learn something by doing the work, give them the opportunity to learn. If it's a silly mistake (a typo, or a coding standard violation), it might make more sense to make the change yourself (still crediting the original author) instead of rejecting a pull request for a trivial fix. Where possible, reduce round-trips the code needs to make, and be respectful of the intentions of the contributor.

When you are satisfied with the proposed change, you can merge it into the main branch for your project:

```
$ git merge --no-ff username/branch_name
```

If, however, you would like to make a few cleanup changes for minor whitespace issues, or to fix a typo, you can optionally add the parameter `--no-commit`. Using this option may not be appropriate for your project if you've decided every change must go through the pull request process:

```
$ git merge --no-ff --no-commit username/branch_name
```

Regardless of which method you choose, once the branch is merged, you may push the updated *master* branch up to the server:

```
$ git push origin master
```

The change will now appear in the main repository for the project.

If you find you are working with pull requests a lot for your project, and frequently have to deal with merge conflicts, you may find [Hub](#) useful. It is a command-line wrapper that allows you to perform more tasks from the comfort of the command line instead of having to switch between GitHub's web interface, and Git.

Summary

Throughout this chapter, you learned how to use GitHub as a team of one, as a consumer of other projects, as a contributor to projects, and finally, as a project lead:

- As the owner of the repository, you can choose to contribute directly to it.

- As the leader of a project, you can choose to commit directly to the project, or pass your own contributions through a personal repository to maintain the illusion of fairness.
- Issues to your project can be used to track new features, or bugs. Issues are conversations and may result in a pull request being initiated.
- A pull request is a request to merge a branch from either an outside repository or the nonmain branch. It can be completed by anyone with write access to the repository.
- If a pull request will not result in a merge conflict, it can be completed through the web-based user interface; otherwise, you will need to download the relevant branch, merge the request locally, and push the resulting change back to the main project repository.

Although this chapter focused on public repositories, you can also apply the techniques you learned in this chapter to private repositories.

For even more information on using GitHub, you may enjoy the title *Introducing GitHub* by Peter Bell and Brent Beer (O'Reilly).

Private Team Work on Bitbucket

Bitbucket is a popular code hosting system by the same folks who built JIRA. With approximately three million users, it may have a smaller user base than GitHub, but for small teams it has two very big advantages: free private repositories and per-branch access control. In addition to these features, I generally find Bitbucket's interface intuitive, and its documentation comprehensive. This commitment to usability will go a long way to keep internal teams running smoothly.

By the end of this chapter, you will be able to complete the following on Bitbucket:

- Get set up as a solo developer
- Share your repository with other developers
- Limit access control per-branch for a given project

This chapter is not meant to be a comprehensive guide to Bitbucket. Rather, it is an *up and running* overview of several important features that you may want to use with your team.

Those who learn best by following along with video tutorials will benefit from [Collaborating with Git](#) (O'Reilly), the companion video series for this book.

Project Governance for Nonpublic Projects

The default options for Bitbucket repositories have interesting implications when compared to GitHub's. Depending on your point of view, you may think of them as "discreet" or "antisocial." By default, Bitbucket assumes the repository you are about to create is a private repository, and that forks of the repository should also be private. This is the opposite to what GitHub chooses (public repository, and public forks). Where GitHub coined the term "social coding," Bitbucket takes a very differ-

ent approach, but it's not just the opposite of social. That is to say, it does not mean that Bitbucket is *anti-social*. Instead, it chooses discretion by default.

While private and public projects may have similarities in the commands you use to move code from one place to another, they often have a very different political feeling to them when everyone who is involved on the project is there by invitation. Open source projects tend to follow whole-repository access controls. A very small number of maintainers may update any part of the code. The conventions of how code is accepted into the project will vary, of course, but generally there is a submission made, some kind of review period, and then the code is adopted into the main repository for the project. Private projects, on the other hand, tend to have very specific governance requirements. Sometimes these requirements are outlined by a regulatory body, such as Payment Card Industry (PCI) compliance for those handling financial transactions, or regulations for those building biomedical devices. In some cases, these regulations have strict requirements around auditing and accepting contributions into a code base.

Currently, Bitbucket offers much finer-grained access control than GitHub. On Bitbucket, you are able to prevent individuals, or groups of individuals, from pushing to specific branches and whole repositories. If you are accustomed to per-branch access in Subversion, your team will find this feature quite useful. Some of these features are also available in GitLab, which is covered in [Chapter 12](#).

Getting Started

In this section, you will learn how to create an account on Bitbucket and your own, private repository. All developers on your team should be able to complete the steps included in this section before they begin collaborating on projects with you.

Creating an Account

The signup process for Bitbucket is straightforward:

1. Navigate to <https://bitbucket.org>.
2. Locate and click the button labeled Get started ([Figure 11-1](#)). (There may be more than one. Either is fine.)




Figure 11-1. From the home page, locate and click one of the Get started buttons

You will be presented with the option to create a new account, or to sign up with your Google account:

1. Enter your first name and last name. These two fields are optional.
2. Enter your preferred username. Bitbucket will let you know if the name has already been selected.
3. Enter a secure password.
4. Enter a valid email address.
5. Select a plan. By default the free personal account plan is selected, which is appropriate for solo developers and very small teams.
6. Enable the checkbox confirming you are not a robot. You may also be presented with a CAPTCHA challenge if Bitbucket isn't convinced you're human.
7. Enable the checkbox for the privacy policy and customer agreement. Obviously, you should also click the links and read the agreements you're signing.
8. When you have completed all of the fields, click Sign up to proceed ([Figure 11-2](#)).
9. You will be sent an email asking you to confirm your email address. Click the button Confirm this email address.

Sign up

Sign up with your Google account

First name

Last name

Username gitforteams 

Password

Email emma@gitforteams.com

Plan

 I'm not a robot reCAPTCHA
Privacy - Terms

Accept our [privacy policy](#) and [customer agreement](#)




Figure 11-2. Complete each of the fields in the registration form and click Sign up

Your account is now set up and ready to use; however, to save some time later on, you should also add your SSH keys so that you can work with private repositories without having to re-authenticate yourself each time:

Complete the following steps to add your SSH key to your account:

1. Using the instructions in [Appendix D](#), locate and copy your SSH public key.
2. Navigate to the [dashboard for your Bitbucket account](#).
3. In the top-right corner of the Bitbucket website, locate and click the user icon.
4. From the drop-down list, click Manage account.
5. From the sidebar navigation, locate and click SSH keys.
6. Click on Add key. A modal window will appear.
7. Into the form field, Key, paste your public SSH key.
8. Click Add key.

Your SSH keys have been added to your Bitbucket account.

Creating a Private Project from the Welcome Screen

Immediately after creating your account, Bitbucket will redirect you to a welcome screen (Figure 11-3). This screen is always available at <https://bitbucket.org/welcome>.




Figure 11-3. After completing the registration form, you will be redirected to a Get started welcome screen

Create a new repository by completing the following steps:

1. Click on the bucket icon with the dashed outline which is labeled Empty.
2. Enter a name for this repository. For example, *johannes*.
3. Leave the checkbox This is a private repository selected.
4. Click Create. Your new repository has been created.

5. Click Done. You will be redirected to the repository setup configuration screen.

Once you have completed these steps, proceed to Configuring Your New Repository.

Creating a Private Project from the Dashboard

When you log into your Bitbucket account, you will be redirected to a dashboard summarizing your projects ([Figure 11-4](#)). From this dashboard you can get an overview of what is happening in each of your projects, and create a new repository.




Figure 11-4. The dashboard also gives a clear indication of how to create a new repository

If you are starting from the dashboard (this is also the home page when you are authenticated), create a new repository by completing the following instructions:

1. Locate and click the link to Create a repository. You will be redirected to the form shown in [Figure 11-5](#).
2. Enter a name for this repository. For example, *junio*.
3. Optionally, enter a description for the repository.
4. Leave the default settings in place for the following:
 - Access level (checkbox should be enabled for this is a private repository)
 - Forking (drop-down menu should be set to Allow only private forks)

- Repository type (radio button should be set to Git)
5. Optionally turn on Issue tracking, or Wiki pages. For personal projects I rarely turn these on because I'm typically just using Bitbucket as a remote backup for my code, and not as a project management tool.
 6. Finally, locate and click Create repository.

Create a new repository

Name*

Description

Access level This is a private repository

Forking

Repository type Git
 Mercurial

Project management Issue tracking
 Wiki

Language

Repository integrations

HipChat Enable HipChat notifications

Figure 11-5. The form to create a new repository also has some configuration options for sharing

Your new repository has been created, and you have been redirected to the repository setup configuration screen. Proceed to Configuring Your New Repository.

Configuring Your New Repository

You will be redirected to a setup page (Figure 11-6).




Figure 11-6. Setup instructions are available for GUI, and command-line (new projects, or existing projects).

Assuming you have been following along in this book, you likely already have a local repository, or you know how to create one! I find the final set of instructions ([Figure 11-7](#)) most useful when setting up new repositories on Bitbucket.

To connect your local repository to the new repository on Bitbucket, complete the following steps:

1. Locate and click on the link I have an existing project. A set of additional instructions will appear on-screen
2. At the command line, navigate to a local Git repository. It's okay if it is already connected to a different hosting system, you are allowed to have multiple connections to remote repositories.
3. Copy and paste the commands beginning with `git` from the instructions ([Example 11-1](#)).

Example 11-1. Sample instructions from Bitbucket to add newly created repository as a remote to a local repository

If the repository is already connected to a remote, you may need to substitute `origin` for `bitbucket`.

```
git remote add origin https://gitforteams@bitbucket.org/gitforteams/junio.git
git push -u origin --all # pushes up the repo and its refs for the first time
git push -u origin --tags # pushes up any tags
```



Use Your Instructions, Not Mine

Do not simply copy the instructions in the preceding snippet. Instead, copy the instructions provided by Bitbucket on the summary page for the repository you just created.

▼ I have an existing project

Already have a Git repository on your computer? Let's push it up to Bitbucket.

```
$ cd /path/to/my/repo
$ git remote add origin https://gitforteams@bitbucket.org/gitforteams/junio.git
$ git push -u origin --all # pushes up the repo and its refs for the first time
$ git push -u origin --tags # pushes up any tags
```

Want to grab a repo from another site? Try our [importer!](#)

Figure 11-7. Setup instructions to connect existing projects to Bitbucket.

You are now set up to work as a solo developer with a private repository. You can push your code changes to Bitbucket as frequently as you like. And, because it's a private repository, you *never* have to worry about corrupting public history! If you do rebase a branch and Bitbucket stamps its feet and refuses to accept the new version of the branch, add the parameter `--force` to the command you were attempting:

```
$ git push --force
```

Working with a team? A more polite version is as follows:

```
$ git push --force-with-lease
```

We will be exploring the web interface in subsequent sections. In the meantime, you may find some value in looking at the options that are available to you. If you have already been working within GitHub or GitLab from the previous sections in the book, I think you will find a lot of the options are quite familiar.

Exploring Your Project

Once your repository has been pushed to Bitbucket, the project page will update itself from a set of instructions to a project browser.

If your repository has a file named `README`, this file will be displayed on the project home page. Figure 11-8 shows my project home page for the *Git for Teams* website.

The screenshot shows the Bitbucket project home page for 'gitforteams.com'. The left sidebar contains icons for project management: a blue circle, a gear, a list, a document, a person, a clone, a fork, and a plus sign. The main content area has a header 'Overview' with a download icon, SSH link, and share options. Below is a summary table:

Last updated	36 minutes ago	1	0
Language	—	Branches	Tags
Access level	Admin	0	1
		Forks	Watcher

[Edit README](#)

gitforteams.com

A Sculpin-based site containing Emma's current thinking on best practices for developer workflows.

Content is output into the following directories:

- `_lessons` => `lessons` - contains the activities workshop participants need to complete.
- `_resources` => `resources` - contains articles, offsite resources, and downloadable handouts.
- `_posts` => `blog` - contains updates about what's been added to the site

New content types are defined in: `[app/config/sculpin_kernel.yml]`

Generating the Site

Test the site locally using:

```
sculpin generate --watch --server
```

Recent activity

- 1 commit
Pushed to emmajane/gitforteams.com
`68536a3` publish.sh: updating publish scri...
emmajane · 37 minutes ago
- 1 commit
Pushed to emmajane/gitforteams.com
`4c79e5c` README.md: removed arbitrary l...
emmajane · 39 minutes ago
- 1 commit
Pushed to emmajane/gitforteams.com
`4d64478` README.md edited online with ...
emmajane · an hour ago
- 1 commit
Pushed to emmajane/gitforteams.com
`392b277` README.md edited online with ...
emmajane · 4 hours ago

Figure 11-8. The project home page displays a summary of the status of your site, as well as the contents of the file README

The following summaries are available from the project home page:

- Last updated date
- Language, if one is set
- Access level (will be set to Admin if the repository is yours)
- Branches (click on the number above Branch for a list of all branches)
- Tags (click on the number above Tags for a list of all tags)
- Forks (click on the number above Fork for a list of all public forks)
- Watchers (click on the number above Watcher for a summary of accounts who are following this repository)
- Recent activity (visible in the right sidebar; includes recent commits, and merged branches)

The left sidebar has the following icons (from top to bottom):

- Link to the project home page
- Quick actions (includes clone, create branch, create pull request)

- Overview (appears to be the same content as the project home page)
- Source (a list of all files in the repository)
- Commits (the logged history for this repository)
- Branches (only available if you have pushed more than one branch to the project)
- Pull requests (irrelevant for personal projects)
- Downloads (provides a list of zipped packages of the current branch; you may also add untracked binaries for your project here)
- Settings (includes access details, repository name, integrations)

At the bottom of the screen there is also the option to expand the icons to display a text label for each of the icons. Once you've expanded the sidebar, you can collapse it again by clicking the double arrows ([Figure 11-9](#)).

Editing Files in Your Repository

Bitbucket allows you to edit text-only files from within its web-based text editor:

1. Click on the sidebar link Source.
2. Navigate to the page you want to edit.
3. Locate and click the button Edit. A text editor will appear ([Figure 11-10](#), or [Figure 11-11](#) for the project *README* file).
4. Across the bottom of the editor, confirm the Syntax mode, Indent mode, and Number of spaces (not available for all file types) are correctly set.
5. Edit the file to make the necessary changes.
6. Locate and click the button View diff.
7. Confirm the changes made are complete, correct, and do not introduce unwanted spaces.
8. Locate and click the button Commit. A modal window will appear ([Figure 11-12](#)).
9. Enter a commit message. You will need to add your own formatting. The first line should be a terse description not longer than 80 characters. Subsequent lines should provide more detail.
10. Locate and click the button Commit.

Your changes have been saved to the repository on Bitbucket.




Figure 11-9. Project sidebar expanded

The screenshot shows a web-based text editor interface. At the top, there's a header with a dropdown menu, a download icon, and the URL "gitforteams.com / source / _posts / 2014-06-15-peer-review.md". To the right of the URL are three buttons: "Source", "Diff", and "History". Below the header is a toolbar with icons for bold, italic, lists, and other document operations. The main area is a code editor with syntax highlighting for Markdown. The code content is as follows:

```

1  ---
2  title: Peer Review Process
3  ---
4
5 While working on a resources page for commit best practices, I
6 ended up in [an interesting
7 conversation](https://twitter.com/mmajanehw/status/478280621018865664) with [Scott Murray](https://twitter.com/alignedleft) and [Camille Four
8
9 What a great question! How subjective! How arbitrary! How do we define "good"!
10
11 I took the time to combine a few of the resources I've worked
12 on in the last year into a single resource page,
13 [The Review Process](/resources/review-process.html). Right now
14 the document builds on the documentation that I worked on with
15 Joe Shindlar last year when I was the Project Manager at
16 [Drupalize.Me](http://drupalize.me). (New to PMing? You might
17 also be interested in reading [Things I Learned From Managing
18 My First
19 Project](http://drupalize.me/blog/201312/things-i-learned-managing-my-first-project).) It adds some resources on dealing with additional remot
20
21 The resource is far from done, especially considering it only
22 covers one of the four models for review outlined at the
23 beginning of the document; however, if you're looking for a
24 starting place to begin [incorporating peer reviews into your
25 own workflow](/resources/review-process.html), I think there are
26 some valuable tips waiting for you in this new resource.
27

```

Below the code editor are two buttons: "Syntax mode: Markdown" and "Indent mode: Tabs". To the right are buttons for "View diff", "Commit", and "Cancel".

Figure 11-10. In-repository text editor

The screenshot shows a rich text editor interface for a project home page. At the top, there's a toolbar with buttons for H1, H2, H3, bold, italic, lists, and other document operations. To the right of the toolbar are a help icon and a "Preview" button. The main content area contains the following text:

```

gitforteams.com
=====

A Sculpin-based site containing Emma's current thinking on
best practices for developer workflows.

Content is output into the following directories:

- `lessons` => `lessons` - contains the activities workshop participants need to complete.
- `resources` => `resources` - contains articles, offsite resources, and downloadable handouts.
- `posts` => `blog` - contains updates about what's been added to the site

New content types are defined in: `app/config/sculpin_kernel.yml`

# Generating the Site

Test the site locally using:

```
sculpin generate --watch --server
```

```

At the bottom are "Save" and "Cancel" buttons.

Figure 11-11. Project home page editor




Figure 11-12. Add a message that describes the changes you have made to the project home page

With your changes saved to Bitbucket, your local repository will now be out of date. You will need to update your local repository. Because the repository is entirely your own, it is appropriate to pull the changes into your local copy without review ([Example 11-2](#)). Assuming you have followed the instructions outlined in this section, the work has been completed in the main branch for the project, which is most likely to be *master*.

Example 11-2. Pull changes made in Bitbucket into your local repository

```
$ git checkout master  
$ git pull --rebase
```

The changes should apply cleanly. If, however, you end up with a conflict, refer back to [Chapter 6](#).

Your local repository is now up to date.

Project Setup

You've been reading this book for a while. Maybe you even started at the beginning. So, you know I like to write about Git. I also know that a lot of people find documentation tedious to write, and a complete pain to maintain, so I know that when I say this next part, your inner Clay Davis is going to pipe up and say, "well sheeeeeeeeeeeeit." Ready for it? I think process documentation is one of the most important things a team can do to ensure happy, healthy relationships. Now you go ahead and give me your best Clay Davis and then we'll move on.

Documenting your process:

- Makes it easier for people to participate in your team.

- Sets the expectations for how the work should get done.
- Serves as a starting point for conversations about *why* certain methodologies and commands are preferred.

Good documentation puts up guard rails on the bowling alley that is your project. It makes it virtually impossible for developers to throw a gutter ball, and it makes it more likely they'll succeed in knocking down all the pins when it's their turn. While the most experienced people on your team might have the loudest opinions about how something should be done, they may not write the best instructions. Pair the team's lead with a new developer and have them co-create the documentation. Then, make sure the entire team can consistently follow the documentation without outside support.

Getting people into consistent habits will make it easier during high-pressure times to ensure no steps are missed. This documentation may also extend beyond the commands a developer needs to run to clone a repository and submit a pull request. Once you see how valuable documentation can be for the mundane tasks, you may even start to look at other processes that could use some proactive documentation ([incident response plan](#), anyone?).

In addition to the amazing commit messages you're already in the habit of writing, Bitbucket offers two tools that will help you to document your work: wiki pages and issues. In the remainder of this section, you will learn how to enable each of these tools.

Project Documentation in Wiki Pages

To begin collaborating with others, it can be as simple as granting repository access to another Bitbucket account. Hold up, though! Before you go jumping into a new relationship with a new developer, you should invest some time into stating how you would like to work. These steps should be documented, and they should be steps you yourself are willing to use. Fortunately, wiki pages on Bitbucket are much easier to edit than stone tablets, so you should consider your documentation to be a starting point, not the final word.

To enable wiki pages for your project:

1. Locate and click the settings cog for your project.
2. Locate and click the link [Wiki settings](#).
3. Change the settings from No wiki to Private wiki ([Figure 11-13](#)).
4. Locate and click [Save](#).

Wiki pages are now enabled for your project. A new icon will appear in the sidebar ([Figure 11-14](#)).

In Bitbucket, wiki pages are also repositories which you can download and edit locally. Documentation is included on the welcome page for your wiki (Figure 11-15). At the top of each wiki page is a breadcrumb trail. By clicking on the name of the project, you will be redirected to a list of all wiki pages for this project.

The editor for the wiki pages is a typical toolbar for Markdown files (Figure 11-16).




Figure 11-13. Enable a private wiki for your project

At a minimum, you should document the following for your project:

- Branch conventions
- Step-by-step instructions for submitting new work to the project
- Step-by-step instructions for peer reviews
- Deployment instructions, including who to email, and copy/paste email templates




Figure 11-14. The Wiki icon appears in the project sidebar

A screenshot of the Bitbucket Wiki default page. The page title is 'Wiki' and the URL is 'gitforteams.com / Home'. On the left is a sidebar with icons for Home, All, Recent, Tags, Create, and Settings. The main content area has a heading 'Welcome' with the subtext 'Welcome to your wiki! This is the default page we've installed for your convenience. Go ahead and edit it.' It includes sections for 'Wiki features' (Markdown syntax, cloning, live updates), 'Syntax highlighting' (Pygments library), and a code snippet for cloning the repository: '\$ git clone https://emmajane@bitbucket.org/emmajane/gitforteams.com.git/wiki'. There are also 'View', 'History', and 'Edit' buttons at the top right.

Figure 11-15. The default page provided for a Bitbucket wiki

Whenever you think there is a *possibility* for people to have different opinions, or where there's a possibility a person *could* forget a step, you should have documentation. It doesn't need to be long, but it does need to be correct. Check it regularly if your team likes process hacking. It's possible the team has found an even more efficient way to do something that is not recorded in the documentation.




Figure 11-16. The Markdown editor for wiki pages

Tracking Your Changes with Issues

Issue tracking is another form of documentation. Although issues are much more ephemeral than wiki pages, capturing the information in a ticket provides the direct link from the business value, or rationale for building a feature, to the development tasks that are happening in code.

To enable the issue tracker, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to your project repository.
2. Locate and click on the Settings icon.
3. Locate and click on the link Issue tracker settings.
4. Change the form option from No issue tracker to Private issue tracker.
5. Optionally, enter a new issue message.
6. Locate and click the button Save.

As you can see in **Figure 11-17**, I have added a default message for all new issues in the field New issue message.

The message reminds people to follow the Agile convention of Card, Conversation, Confirmation. This text will appear above the new issue form. Your team may have a

different format they prefer to follow. Another format I've worked with and quite liked uses the headings: QA Test; Rationale; Details.

The screenshot shows the GitHub Settings interface. On the left, there's a sidebar with various project management options like Repository details, Access management, and Branch management. The 'Issue tracker settings' link is highlighted with a green arrow. The main content area is titled 'Issue tracker settings' and contains a brief description of what it does. It has three radio buttons for 'Issue tracker': 'No issue tracker' (unchecked), 'Private issue tracker' (checked, highlighted with a green arrow), and 'Public issue tracker' (unchecked). Below this is a 'New issue message' input area with a WYSIWYG editor toolbar. The message template includes placeholders for '# Card #', 'As a ...', 'I want to ...', 'so I can ...', '# Conversation #', and '# Confirmation #'. A note at the bottom says it's displayed when creating an issue. A 'Save' button is at the bottom right.

Figure 11-17. Enabling the issue tracker, and adding a default message for new issues



Creating Great Issues

Make sure the card clearly defines who benefits and how from this feature being built — in other words: what is the business value? This will allow people who are working on the task to ask questions with the stakeholder about the implementation detail. Understanding the context of how this issue fits into the larger project will ensure the right scaffolding gets built and that the entire project isn't held together with duct tape.

Not all issues begin as new features. Occasionally bugs will sneak into your software. Excellent bug reports include: the steps to repeat the problem; the desired outcome; the actual outcome of the steps, including a screen shot, or movie of the result.

More information on creating great issues is available from [Creating Tickets and Reporting Issues](#).

Issue tracking will now be enabled for your project (Figure 11-18).

To create a new issue, complete the following steps:

1. In the project sidebar, locate and click the icon Issues.
2. If this is your first time accessing the issue tracker, you will be directed to a welcome screen. Click Create your first issue to continue. If it is not your first time, you will be redirected to the summary page for all issues. From this screen, locate and click the button Create Issue. You will be redirected to an issue creation form.
3. On the new issue creation form (Figure 11-19), add a title and a description for your issue. The default values for Assignee, Kind, and Priority may be appropriate.
4. When you have described your new issue as best as possible, click the button Create issue.




Figure 11-18. The Issues icon now appears in the project sidebar

Your issue has been created (Figure 11-20), and is available from the Issues icon in the sidebar of the project. You are now ready for someone to begin work on this issue. First, though, you will need to grant access to the project so that you don't need to complete every ticket yourself.

The screenshot shows the Jira 'Create issue' interface. On the left is a sidebar with various icons for filters, search, and settings. The main area has a title 'Issues' and a 'Create issue' button in the top right. Below that is a 'Card' template section with a sub-section titled 'As a (actor) I want to (action) so I can (business value for adding this feature)'. There are three other template options: 'Conversation' and 'Confirmation'. The main form area contains fields for 'Title' (with a placeholder 'Title*' and a file attachment icon), 'Description' (with rich text editor buttons for H1, H2, H3, B, I, etc., and a preview button), 'Assignee' (a dropdown menu with 'Select user' and 'Assign to me' buttons), 'Kind' (a dropdown menu with 'bug' selected), 'Priority' (a dropdown menu with 'major' selected), and 'Attachments' (a 'Select files' button). At the bottom are 'Create issue' and 'Cancel' buttons.

Figure 11-19. New issue creation form

The screenshot shows the Jira 'Issue summary page' for a new issue. The sidebar on the left is identical to Figure 11-19. The main area starts with 'Issue #1 [NEW]'. Below it is a 'Confirm instructions' section where a user named 'emmajane [REPO OWNER]' has created an issue 55 seconds ago. This section includes a 'Card' template note about testing instructions and a 'Conversation' note from the author. Further down is a 'Confirmation' note asking for proofreading. A 'Comments (0)' section with a text input field is at the bottom. To the right of the main content is a sidebar with buttons for 'Resolve', 'Workflow', 'More', and 'Edit'. It also displays issue details: Assignee (empty), Type (bug), Priority (major), Status (new), Votes (0), and Watchers (empty). A callout box encourages users to 'Vote for this issue' or 'Stop watching'. At the bottom right is a 'JIRA' logo with a 'Learn more about JIRA' link.

Figure 11-20. Issue summary page

Access Control

Although I don't have statistics to say this is the most popular way to use Bitbucket, the most common way I've seen teams use Bitbucket is to keep the defaults: a private repository with private forks allowed. The workflow I have most commonly seen for small teams then has developers creating their own forks, and submitting their pull requests from their personal version of the repository (Figure 11-21). Teams of only one or two people, however, will generally omit the step of creating individual repositories for each person on the team and, instead, essentially collaborate directly into the main repository (Figure 11-22).




Figure 11-21. Multiperson teams often use an intermediate repository within Bitbucket

Having a separate repository for each developer does not prohibit people from contributing to the main project repository. If you are conducting *peer reviews*, this is, in fact, exactly what you will want: every developer is able to commit to the main project repository, but the *convention* will dictate they do not commit their own work without a review first. If, however, you are working with a quality assurance team, you may want to restrict write-access to the main project repository to only the QA

team. In this case, each developer will *need* to create a fork of the project to be able to submit their work.




Figure 11-22. Teams of one or two often work directly in a shared repository

Shared Access

If you are working with a team of very trusted developers, you may choose to have them all commit into the same repository, and maintain a convention of which branches should be used for what purpose.

To grant a developer access to your repository, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to Settings → Access management.
2. In the field labeled Users add the Bitbucket username or email address for the developer you want to add.
3. Change the access level from read to write.
4. Click Add.

Repeat these steps for each developer you would like to share this repository with. Developers will be able to do everything *except* administer the project. You've got your documentation in place, right? Because the only things holding this project together right now are the social conventions you've documented and have agreed to follow rigorously yourself.

Per-Developer Forks

As your team grows, you may want to prevent some parts of the team from having direct write access to the repository. Perhaps you would prefer if only the QA team were allowed to write to the main repository. In this case, developers will need to create a fork of the project first, and submit their work through a pull request.

Complete the following steps to create a fork of the project:

1. Locate and click the Actions icon in the project sidebar. These are the three dots directly below the logo.
2. Click on the link labeled Fork.
3. You will be redirected to a repository creation screen that very closely matches the one you saw when you were first creating your own Bitbucket repository. On this form it is acceptable to leave all of the defaults in place.
4. Optionally disable the Wiki and Issues options. You should use the main project repository to track this information.
5. To complete the process, click Fork repository.

You are now ready to create a *local* clone and begin your work:

1. Click the Actions icon in the project sidebar.
2. Select Clone. A modal window will appear.
3. From the pop-up window, select and copy the command line instructions.
4. At the command-line, navigate to the directory where you would like to place your copy of the cloned repository.
5. Paste the command provided by Bitbucket. The repository will begin downloading.

Once the repository has downloaded, you are ready to create a new branch and begin working on your ticket.

Limiting Access with Protected Branches

If you have worked with Subversion, you may have been quite surprised when you came to Git and found virtually no access controls. Instead of building in this func-

tionality, Git has built in the ability for you to build your own access controls through hooks. These hooks allow you to script a response before or after a commit takes place, or before or after a push to a remote repository takes place. If you are hosting your own Git repository, you might think to take advantage of these hooks, but if you have become accustomed to using code hosting systems, you may not have known about this functionality. (And even if you did, it's not necessarily something that you would have thought to script if you were just learning the basics of Git.)

Fortunately, Bitbucket has done the work for you. Through the web interface, you are able to grant write access per-person or per-team. In Chapters 2 and 3, you worked through your governance strategy with your team, and perhaps also your branching strategy. I won't cover that again here. You should go back and review those chapters if you aren't sure how you might want to take advantage of these access control options.

Previously you learned how to grant access to an entire repository. In this section, you will learn how to refine this access per-branch. Before proceeding with this section, ensure you've given repository access to the developers you want to work with.

To limit branch access, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to Settings → Branch management.
2. In the first field under the heading limit pushes to specific users and groups, enter the name of the branch you want to limit control to; in the second field, enter the name of the person who should be allowed to update files in this branch.
3. Click the button Add.

The ability to push code to this branch has now been limited from all people *except* the person listed. [Figure 11-23](#) shows that once you have added a person, you are welcome to add more.

The screenshot shows a configuration interface for limiting pushes to a specific branch. At the top, there is a header 'Limit pushes to specific users and groups'. Below the header, there are two input fields: 'Branch name (wildcards permitted)' containing 'master' and 'Start typing to search for a user or group' containing 'emmajane'. To the right of these fields is a 'Add' button. Below the input fields, there is a list with one item: 'emmajane' with an 'Edit' link and a delete 'x' icon. At the bottom of the interface, a message states 'Remaining branches accept pushes from any user or group with write access.'

Figure 11-23. Prevent others from pushing code to a branch

From the same configuration screen, Bitbucket also gives you the option to prevent the deletion of any branch, or prevent history rewrites on any branch. Although these two options are of less interest to you now that your team knows how to safely work

with Git, you might need them “for a friend.” (It’s okay, I understand. And so does [Atlassian](#), which is why it built you these two nifty features.)

Once implemented, an error will be returned if someone tries to perform a restricted action. [Example 11-3](#) shows an example of what happens when I tried to delete a protected branch named `master`.

Example 11-3. Error when deleting a locked branch

```
$ git push bitbucket master --delete
remote: permission denied to delete branch master
To git@bitbucket.org:emmajane/gitforteams.git
 ! [remote rejected] locked (pre-receive hook declined)
error: failed to push some refs to 'git@bitbucket.org:emmajane/gitforteams.git'
```

If you do decide to implement access controls, make sure you clearly communicate these restrictions to your team. This will help to avoid absolute frustration by developers who cannot figure out *why* they can’t push their code to the project repository. You don’t need to provide lengthy tomes no one will read, but you do need to give people the rationale for why decisions were made, and any gotchas that make your system a unique and special snowflake to work with.

More information about [Branch management](#) is available from Bitbucket. You may also be interested to read Atlassian’s overview of working with [Git’s hooks](#).

Pull Requests

For your developers to add their work back into the project, they need to have access. If this access is not available (either through a social convention of completing a peer review, or through an enforced access control), the developers will need to create a pull request to have their work considered for inclusion in the main project.

The official documentation from Atlassian on working with Bitbucket is exceptional. [Work with pull requests](#) covers a few extra features, and will be up to date if the instructions I’ve covered in this section ever go stale.

Submitting a Pull Request

After completing your issue-specific work in your ticket branch, and pushing your code to the server, you are ready to issue a pull request to have your work incorporated into the main project repository. The interface options will vary slightly depending on which access control method you’ve chosen. The basic process, however, is as follows:

1. Locate and click the sidebar icon Pull requests.

2. Locate and click the link Create pull request. A new form will appear for your request (**Figure 11-24**).
3. Your current repository will be located on the left. From this option, select the branch that has the change you would like to have incorporated into the main project.
4. The destination branch is located on the right. If your repository is a fork, you will be able to choose the destination repository as well as the destination branch.
5. Add a title, and description for your pull request. Ideally, your description should reference the issue you are aiming to close.
6. If you would like someone specific to review your work, you can enter his or her name into the pull request.
7. You can optionally have Bitbucket do a little maintenance for you and delete the ticket branch after the pull request has been accepted and the ticket is closed.
8. Finally, when the form is complete, click the button Create pull request.

The screenshot shows the Bitbucket interface for creating a pull request. On the left, there's a sidebar with various icons. The main area is titled "Pull requests" and contains a sub-section titled "Create a pull request". It shows two repository branches: "emmajane / gitforteams.com fork" on the left and "emmajane/gitforteams.com" on the right, separated by a right-pointing arrow. Below these are input fields for "Title*" and "Description" (with a rich text editor toolbar). There's also a "Reviewers" field with a placeholder "Start typing to search for a user". At the bottom, there's a "Close branch" checkbox with the option "Close master after the pull request is merged" and a prominent blue "Create pull request" button.

Figure 11-24. The pull request creation form

As a developer, you must now wait for your work to be reviewed and accepted into the project, or kicked back with requested updates.

Accepting a Pull Request

Once a pull request has been submitted, it's up to a reviewer to decide if the proposed changes are worthy of inclusion in the main branch. [Chapter 8](#) covered the review process in detail. The pull request summary page allows reviewers to comment on the work that is being proposed. The conversation may result in the pull request being updated, or it may confirm the work is complete, correct, and ready to be incorporated into the project.

Assuming there are no conflicts, you will be able to accept a pull request by clicking the button Merge from the request itself.

If, however, there *are* going to be merge conflicts, the process is a bit more complicated. Often the best person to resolve a conflict is the developer of the new code that is being added. Typically what happens is that the code has become stale while waiting for its review. Have the developer update her ticket branch so that it includes the latest changes from its parent (or source) branch:

```
$ git pull --rebase=preserve
```

If the person who submitted the pull request is not available to resolve the merge conflicts, you may need to complete this step yourself. Fortunately, Bitbucket gives you some copy-paste commands for downloading the ticket branch and resolving the conflict.

Extending Bitbucket with Atlassian Connect

In addition to all of the functions Bitbucket offers out of the box, there is also Atlassian Connect, an API for add-ons that includes a marketplace of free and paid add-ons.

To find relevant add-ons for your project, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to your account management page by clicking your user icon in the top-right corner of the page, then selecting Manage account.
2. From the left sidebar of your account, locate and click Find new add-ons. A list of all add-ons will appear in the main content area ([Figure 11-25](#)).

You can filter this list further by category. For example: Code analytics, Code quality, Collaboration, Deployment. This is a new service, so by the time you are reading this book, there will be a lot more add-ons to explore. A few to investigate include:

bitHound


Rates your Javascript projects based on code quality, maintainability, and stability. Paid service for closed source projects; free for open source projects.

Aerobic Hosting

Allows you to deploy static websites, much like GitHub Pages, except from a private Bitbucket repositories.

Pull Request Auto Reviewers

Allows you to automatically assign reviewers to specific types of pull requests.



The screenshot shows the Bitbucket 'Manage' interface. On the left, there's a sidebar with sections for General, Plans & Billing, Access Management, Security, and Add-ons. The 'Add-ons' section has two links: 'Find new add-ons' (which is highlighted with a red arrow) and 'Manage add-ons'. The main area is titled 'Find new add-ons' and shows a list of available add-ons:

- Aerobic Hosting** by Aerobatic (DEPLOYMENT | PREVIEW): Host and manage your web app directly from your Bitbucket repo. **Install**
- Awesome Graphs for Bitbucket** by StillSoft (CODE ANALYTICS | PREVIEW): Awesome Graphs adds graphs which let you visualise information about your repository, commits and committers. **Install**
- Bitbucket for HipChat** by Atlassian (COLLABORATION): Let your codebase join the conversation. Get notifications from your Bitbucket for commit pushes, pull requests, pull request merges, and issues. **Install**
- bitHound** by bitHound (CODE QUALITY | PREVIEW): Build resilient, remarkable software. **Install**
- CloudCannon** by CloudCannon (DEPLOYMENT | PREVIEW): **Install**

Figure 11-25. A list of available add-ons available through Atlassian Connect

In addition to the Connect add-ons, you can also install add-ons you've created from a custom URL. You can learn more about [developing for Connect](#) on the Atlassian Developers' portal. Chances are good that if your extension is useful to your team, it will be useful to other teams as well. As you are building it, consider making it abstract so that it can be shared with (or sold to) others in the marketplace.

Summary

Throughout this chapter, you learned how to use Atlassian's popular code hosting system, Bitbucket. You learned how to set up a personal repository, and share your repositories with others. To work successfully with a team on a private project, there are several points you learned about in this chapter, and which you should keep in mind:

- Get to know your tools by creating a personal, private repository first.

- Prepare for new people to be added to your team by creating excellent onboarding documentation that is easily accessible from the project repository.
- Use issue-based updates to your repository, describing all proposed changes in issues before creating new branches in the repository.
- Make decisions around access control clear and transparent. If you are limiting access, document the rationale for the decisions you've made.

Over the years I have been impressed by Atlassian as a company. It consistently provides a positive experience with easy-to-understand, organized documentation, and helpful staff. On the rare occasion when it has slipped up, it has taken ownership of the problem in a mature and respectful way. A++, Atlassian!

Self-Hosted Collaboration with GitLab

GitLab is an open source code hosting system for repository management. It allows you to track issues for your Git repository, conduct code reviews, and create supplementary project documentation on wiki pages—in other words, it's much the same as GitHub and Bitbucket. GitLab's unique advantage is that as an open source product, you are able to install the software wherever you'd like, without paying licensing fees; and you are welcome to extend the software directly, instead of being restricted to creating add-ons via APIs, and other hooks.

By the end of this chapter, you will be able to:

- Locate relevant install instructions for your setup
- Create new projects, users, and groups
- Configure access control for projects
- Establish cross-project milestones

This chapter focuses on some of the unique tasks you can perform as an administrator of a GitLab instance, as opposed to just using the software as a mere project lead.

Getting Started

If you have followed the activities in this book from the beginning, you will have already created an account, and played around with a GitLab repository on the publicly available instance of GitLab at [GitLab.com](https://gitlab.com). (If you need a refresher, the instructions on using GitLab as a team of one are covered in [Chapter 5](#).)

Installing GitLab

To take advantage of the administrative functions covered in the remainder of this chapter, you should create a local instance of GitLab so that you can log in as the Administrative account holder. This chapter covers the Community Edition, not the Enterprise Edition of GitLab. The Enterprise Edition is available for a fee and includes additional functionality, such as JIRA integration. You can read about the differences at [the feature comparison list](#).

The recommended way to install GitLab is through one of its [Omnibus installer packages](#). These packages can be downloaded directly and placed onto a Linux server, or can be deployed via a one-click install on some provisioning services.

DigitalOcean offers a one-click install package for GitLab. This package uses the Omnibus installer for GitLab, which means you will be able to upgrade GitLab easily if there are new features or security releases. At the time this was written, DigitalOcean was the only service offering a one-click installer for the Omnibus package. Bitnami and the AWS marketplace only offered deployments from source packages, which cannot be upgraded once deployed. Read the descriptions carefully to ensure you are not getting trapped into installing only a specific version.

To avoid the hosting fees while evaluating GitLab, you can also install it locally using the power of virtual machines. (It's not as scary as it sounds.) Virtualbox and Vagrant are the easiest way that I have found to set up a Linux server on my Windows and OS X computers. The written documentation for Vagrant is phenomenal; however, if you prefer hands-on videos, I did put together a [video series for a slightly older version of Vagrant](#). The basics haven't changed.

Loosely, the steps are as follows:

1. Install [Virtualbox](#).
2. Install [Vagrant](#).

If you are on OS X, there is already a brew recipe for Virtualbox and Vagrant; it is appropriate to use it.

With those two packages installed, you now have the capacity to have an Ubuntu server running on your local machine. The virtual machine will not have GitLab installed, though. At this point, you could install GitLab using the Omnibus package referenced previously, but I found the following [GitLab Installer](#) really straightforward to use.

At the command line, complete the following steps:

1. Clone the installer project from GitHub:

```
$ git clone https://github.com/tuminoid/gitlab-installer.git
```

2. Inside the project repository, change the name of the Ruby configuration file from *gitlab.rb.example* to *gitlab.rb*.
3. Start the virtual machine:

```
$ vagrant up
```

The new virtual machine will be provisioned. The username and password will be printed at the end of the startup message from Vagrant. If you can't remember it, or have closed the window, the information is also available at the **end of the install script**.



Installing from Source

If you really prefer to install GitLab from source, there are instructions on how to proceed in the [installation guide](#). This is strongly discouraged because GitLab releases a new version of its software every month on the 22nd. Using packages will make it a lot easier to keep your instance of GitLab up to date.

Regardless of the installation method you choose, you will need to be able to log in as an administrator on your new GitLab instance to take advantage of the remainder of this chapter. Once you have logged in, you should be redirected to the welcome screen shown in [Figure 12-1](#).




Figure 12-1. The welcome screen for GitLab

If you aren't able to complete the installation, I encourage you to skim through the rest of the chapter to see what *would* have been available to you so that you can verify if it's worth the effort to get it figured out.

Configuring the Administrative Account

You may choose to keep the admin account generic, or use it as your own account when developing software with your team. Out of habit, I tend to create an account with fewer privileges for daily use and maintain the root account for tasks such as installing new add-ons, upgrading the software, and other administrative tasks.

To configure your account, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu, locate and click the icon profile settings (head and shoulders of a person).
2. From the left sidebar, review each of the profile settings pages:

Profile

Name, and public details about yourself, such as Skype or Twitter.

Account

Private token, Two Factor Authentication, Username, and the ability to delete your account.

Applications

Manage applications that can use GitLab as an OAuth provider, and applications that you've authorized to use your account.

Emails

Primary email (avatar, commit credits), notification email, public email (displayed email). Any of these addresses can be used to connect a commit to you.

Password

Reset your password.

Notifications

Your notification email as well as your notification level. By default, you will only receive emails for related resources (your commits, your assets, etc). You may also choose from Watch (all notifications for a given project); Mention (only when you are @referenced on an issue or comment); or Disabled (never receive a notification).

SSH Keys

Note: you will not be able to work with repositories over SSH unless you are logged in to an account with SSH keys. A reminder will appear until it is dismissed, or your SSH keys are uploaded.

Design

Color settings for the sidebar, and code syntax highlighting.

History

All events created by this account. Includes actions you've taken such as commits, creating new projects, etc.

Once you've configured the administrative account, you are ready to proceed. If you decide to set up a secondary account immediately, jump ahead to “[User Accounts](#)” on [page 280](#).

Administrative Dashboard

When logged in as the administrative user, you will have access to some additional screens, and functions that are not available to nonadministrators on the public GitLab.com site. Most of these are available from the Admin area.

From the top menu, click the gear icon labeled Admin area. You will be redirected to the page shown in [Figure 12-2](#).

Component	Version
GitLab	7.11.4
GitLab Shell	2.6.3
GitLab API	v3
Ruby	2.1.6p336
Rails	4.1.9

Figure 12-2. The administrative dashboard includes a summary of site details, and a status report showing which version of GitLab is installed

This screen gives a summary of the components installed for this instance of GitLab, including the software version you have installed for GitLab, GitLab shell, GitLab API, Ruby, and Rails. There is also a list of all available features, with a status indicator showing which ones are enabled. In [Figure 12-2](#), you can see that Sign up and Gravatar are enabled; LDAP and OmniAuth are disabled. Gloriously, they do not rely on color alone. The closed circle is green to indicate “on”; the “off” symbol is the icon for standby. Unfortunately these symbols are provided by CSS alone, and there does not currently appear to be a text equivalent.

Each of the options down the left sidebar are fairly self-explanatory:

Overview

This is the screen you see in [Figure 12-2](#). Provides a quick overview of stats for the site, along with quick links to create new users, projects, and groups.

Projects

Search for projects within the site, including filters for per-user, in-active (no activity in the last 6 months), and visibility level (private, internal, or public).

Users

Search for accounts within the site. Includes filters for administrators, blocked accounts, and people without projects.

Groups

Search by name for groups or add a new group. There are no filters available for this screen.

Deploy keys

A list of all keys that are being used for deployments; you can also add new ones from this screen.

Logs

The last 2,000 lines for each of *githost.log*, *application.log*, *production.log*, and *sidekiq.log*.

Messages

The ability to add a timed broadcast message to all system accounts. Useful for scheduled maintenance, recent upgrades, and more.

System hooks

A list of all existing system hooks. From the list of hooks, you can test a hook or remove it. You can also add new hooks (URLs) at this screen.

Background jobs

A summary of background jobs running in [sidekiq](#).

System OAuth applications

A list of existing applications, and the ability to add new ones (fields for a title, and redirect URIs).

Service templates

Service templates allow you to set default values for project services. Depending on the service, different configuration options are available. For example, external services such as Asana and Buildkite have fields for API keys. Some services, such as JIRA and Redmine also have configuration fields (Project URL, Issues URL, New Issue URL). Some services, such as Emails on push, also have toggles for the triggers (push events versus tag push events). This is a good screen to skim through if you want to integrate with third-party services.

Application settings

Includes settings for default project settings and site-wide configuration options.

To lock down your instance of GitLab, you will need to use several of the options on the Application settings screen. The settings on GitLab are fairly liberal. By default, the application is open to new registrants, who are restricted to 10 repositories, but the default setting for a new repository is private.

The Features section includes the following settings (all are enabled by default):

Signup

Allow people to create accounts.

Signin

Allow people to authenticate themselves. If you wanted a read-only public repository, it would be appropriate to use this option.

Gravatar

Integration for user profile pictures—needs a connection to the Internet.

Twitter

Show users a button to share their newly created public or internal projects on Twitter.

Version check enabled

Checks to see if a newer version of GitLab is available.

Visibility and access control includes the following settings:

Default branch protection

Options are:

- Not protected (developers and “masters” can push commits; delete branches; and force push new commits to a branch)

- Partially protected (developers can only push new commits; masters can make any changes)
- Fully protected (only “masters” can make changes to the repository).
By default, Fully Protected is selected.

Default project visibility

Options are:

- Private (project access must be granted explicitly for each user.)
 - Internal (the project can be cloned by any logged-in user.)
 - Public (the project can be cloned without any authentication).
- Private is selected by default.

Default snippet visibility

Options are Private, Internal, or Public. Private is selected by default.

Restricted visibility levels

Selected levels cannot be used by nonadmin users for projects *or* snippets.

Restricted domains for sign-ups

Only allow accounts to be created by those who hold email accounts for the selected domain names. Wildcards are allowed.

There are limit settings:

Default projects limit

By default, each account is only permitted to have 10 repositories; this includes the private forks a developer may need to submit a merge request to a project. If developers are working on several internal projects at once, this number might need to be increased.

Maximum attachment size (MB)

By default, this is set to 10MB. This should be sufficient for most screenshots, but may not be high enough if you are also attaching design assets to issues.

And finally, sign-in restrictions:

Home page URL

The URL people should be redirected to when they visit any page other than the sign-in page as a nonauthenticated user. If left unset, people will be redirected to the sign-in page.

Sign in text

This text appears on the sign-in page, below the description of GitLab. You should begin with a heading to separate your text from the GitLab description.

By configuring each of these settings, you can create an appropriate starting point for your instance of GitLab. For example, if you wanted to make it for official work only by approved individuals, you might adjust the settings as follows:

- Disable the signup feature.
- Disable the Twitter feature (removes the button from the interface that encourages tweeting about projects).
- Set the Restricted visibility levels so that public repositories and snippets are disabled (sign-in will be required to view all repositories).

If you wanted to make your instance a bit more open, you might adjust the settings as follows:

- Enable the signup feature.
- Disable the Twitter feature.
- Disable public repositories for nonadmins.
- Restrict domains for signups to your organization.

In addition to these settings, you can further customize the setup of each project to suit your needs.

Projects

Your organization probably already has a number of code projects, which may or may not be versioned using Git. To begin your setup process within GitLab, you may wish to begin with people, or with projects. The advantage of starting with projects is that there's something in place for people to engage with when they first log in. If you are working with experienced Git users, you may want to grant access to a few early adopters first to set up the projects.

Creating a Project

A project is effectively a repository with the accompanying support tools such as issue queues and wiki pages. When creating a new project in GitLab, you will have the option to import from GitHub, Bitbucket, Gitorious, Google Code, or any other repository that is available to your GitLab instance via a URL.

To create a new project, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu, locate and click the icon New repository. This is a +. You will be redirected to the project creation form.
2. Complete each of the fields for the new project as shown in [Figure 12-3](#):

Project path

This will be the URL for your project page. Use lowercase letters and hyphens only.

Namespace

The name of the account, or group, this project should belong to. By default, your own account is selected.

Import project from

If the project already exists, you can import it from one of the listed services. GitLab must have access to the service in order to complete the import—in other words, you can't be behind a firewall without access to the Internet; and you will need to enable OAuth access to the project. The instructions in the pop-up window ([Figure 12-4](#)) will take you to the relevant documentation page for the service you want to connect to.

Description

Information about your project to be used in listings. This is not a complete *README*.

Visibility Level

Choose between Private (only visible to authorized users), Internal (visible to all logged in users), or Public (visible to anyone visiting the site).

3. Locate and click the button Create project.

Your new project will be created. If you have selected the option to import from an external service, the repository, issues, and wiki pages will be imported if supported. You will be redirected to the new project page.

With the project imported, you are now able to add administrators and developers to the project.

User Accounts

GitLab allows you to create users with specific roles. These roles can be used to adjust read/write access to projects. If you are accustomed to Subversion's branch locking, these access restrictions will feel familiar to you. In this section, you will learn how to set up individual user accounts and add people to projects.

The screenshot shows the 'New Project' form in the GitLab interface. At the top, there's a search bar and a user profile icon. Below it, the 'Project path' is set to 'my-awesome-project' and the 'Namespace' is 'Administrator'. Under 'Import project from', there are buttons for GitHub, Bitbucket, GitLab.com, Gitorious.org, and Google Code, with a 'git Any repo by URL' input field below them. A 'Description (optional)' field contains 'Awesome project'. The 'Visibility Level' section has three options: 'Private' (selected), 'Internal', and 'Public'. The 'Create project' button is at the bottom left, and a note about creating a group is at the bottom right.

Figure 12-3. New project creation form



Figure 12-4. After clicking the button GitHub, this pop-up window appears letting you know GitLab does not have access to import from GitHub

Creating User Accounts

To create a new user account, you can begin from a number of different places. The easiest to access is via the Admin area overview:

1. From the top right, click the gear icon labeled Admin area. You will be redirected to the admin area overview page.
2. Locate and click the button New user. You will be redirected to the new user creation form.

The form, as shown in [Figure 12-5](#), is divided into three sections: Account, Access, and Profile.

The fields in the *Account* section are all required:

Name

Display name for this account.

Username

Login name for the account.

Email

The email address for this account.

The default values for the *Access* details fields are typically appropriate:

Project limit

The default quantity is whatever you have previously set site-wide. GitLab ships with a default of 10.

Can create group

The ability to cluster projects. This functionality is referred to as a *team* or *organization* in other systems. This is enabled by default.

Admin

Allow this person to administer the GitLab software. This is disabled by default.

Finally, there is the *Profile* section, which includes a field to upload a photo and social media links:

- Avatar—if Gravatar is enabled, it may not be necessary to include a separate user profile picture
- Skype
- LinkedIn
- Twitter
- Website

Although you can take the time to fill in the Profile details, not all employees will want to link their social media accounts to a work system. It may be more appropriate to leave them blank.

To create a user account, complete the following steps:

1. Fill in the Account details as described previously.
2. Confirm the Access details are correct.
3. Review the Profile details to ensure they should be left blank. Fill in any details that are appropriate to add now.

- Locate and click the button Create user.

New user

Account

Name * required

Username * required

Email * required

Password

Password Reset link will be generated and sent to the user.
User will be forced to set the password on first sign in.

Access

Projects limit

Can create group

Admin

Profile

Avatar No file chosen

Skype

LinkedIn

Twitter

Website

Create user **Cancel**

Figure 12-5. The new user account creation form is divided into three sections: Account (required fields), Access, and Profile

The new user account has been created; and a notification email has been sent to the person with a one-time login link she can use to set up her password.

In addition to this manual account creation, GitLab also offers **LDAP** and **OmniAuth** integration. Setting up this type of access is covered in the GitLab documentation. As

of the time of this writing, supported OAuth providers included GitHub, Twitter, and Google.

Adding People to Projects

To add people to a project, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to the project page.
2. From the sidebar, locate and click Settings.
3. From the left sidebar, locate and click Members.
4. Locate and click Add members. A new form will open ([Figure 12-6](#)).
5. In the field labeled People, enter the username or email of the person you want to add to this project.
6. Adjust the field labeled Project Access to one of the following:

Guest

Able to view the project, create issues, leave comments

Reporter

Able to clone the repository, create code snippets

Developer

Able to commit code to approved branches

Master

Project administrator

Owner

Able to remove the project

7. Locate and click Add users to project.

The accounts have been granted appropriate access to your new project. If the email was not already registered in this instance of GitLab, an invitation will have been sent, asking that person to register.

Groups

To collect projects, you can use groups. You may choose to think of a Group as a Division, Team, Organization, or Software Project (with subprojects). By default, Groups are private, and only members of that group may view projects in the group.



Anyone Can Create Groups

By default, anyone with an account on GitLab is permitted to create a group. You can disable this per-account when the account is created, or from the account's settings screen.

New group

Group path open-source

Details

Group avatar File name...
The maximum file size allowed is 200KB.

A group is a collection of several projects
Groups are private by default
Members of a group may only view projects they have permission to access
Group project URLs are prefixed with the group namespace
Existing projects may be moved into a group

Create group **Cancel**

Figure 12-6. Adding users to projects; search for a person, and set the appropriate access level

To create a new group, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu bar, click the gear icon for Admin area.
2. Locate and click New group. You will be redirected to the Group creation form ([Figure 12-7](#)).
3. Enter the details for each of the form fields:

Group path

The URL fragment used for this group. You are limited to lowercase letters and hyphens. In URLs, this will be used in the same way as the usernames.

Details

A short description of your team, organization, software project—essentially “about” or “bio” field.

Group avatar

The display logo for this group.

4. Locate and click Create group. You will be redirected to the administration screen for the group.

The screenshot shows the 'New group' creation interface. At the top, there's a 'Group path' field containing 'https://127.0.0.1:8443/open-source'. Below it is a 'Details' text area. Under 'Group avatar', there's a file upload section with a placeholder 'Choose File ...' and a note about a 200KB file size limit. A blue callout box contains bullet points about group characteristics. At the bottom are 'Create group' and 'Cancel' buttons.

Group path	https://127.0.0.1:8443/ open-source
Details	
Group avatar	<input type="file"/> Choose File ... File name... The maximum file size allowed is 200KB.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">A group is a collection of several projectsGroups are private by defaultMembers of a group may only view projects they have permission to accessGroup project URLs are prefixed with the group namespaceExisting projects may be moved into a group	
<button>Create group</button> <button>Cancel</button>	

Figure 12-7. Creating a new group

Your new group has been created. You can now add people and projects to your group.

Adding People to Groups

Permissions are set primarily on the projects, not the groups. There are, however, some additional actions that users can take if they are granted group-specific roles:

- Everyone is able to browse the group.
- Only the Owner is allowed to edit the group, manage the group's members, and remove the group.
- Group Masters are also able to create projects within group.

To add a person to a group and assign a role to the person, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu, click the gear icon for the Admin area.
2. From the left sidebar, click the menu link Groups. You will be redirected to the Group administrative page.
3. Locate the form to add a user to the group ([Figure 12-8](#)).

4. Enter the details for each user you want to add to the group:

Username

You can add multiple people with the same role ([Figure 12-9](#)).

Role

Choose one of Guest, Reporter, Developer, Master, or Owner.

5. Click Add users to group.

The screenshot shows the 'neverending-story' group settings page. On the left, there's a 'Group info:' section with fields for Name (neverending-story), Path (neverending-story), Description, and Created on (June 15, 2015). Below that is a 'Projects' section showing 0 projects. On the right, there's an 'Add user(s) to the group:' section with a search bar, a dropdown menu set to 'Guest', and a large green 'Add users to group' button. At the bottom, there's a 'Members' section showing 1 member: 'Administrator' with an 'Owner' checkbox checked.

Figure 12-8. Add a user to a group

The group will not be visible until there is at least one project added to it.

Adding Projects to Groups

Adding a project to a group is a simple matter of adjusting the namespace to be a group, instead of an individual account.

To create a new project within a group, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu, click the icon + with the label New project.
2. Enter a Project path, using only lowercase letters and hyphens.
3. Next to the label Namespace, click the down arrow and select the appropriate group ([Figure 12-10](#)).
4. Complete each of the fields as you did previously to create a new project.
5. Click Create project.

The new project has been created and is available for development.

Add user(s) to the group:

Read more about project permissions [here](#)




Figure 12-9. You can add multiple people to a group at the same time as long as they have the same role

Project path .git

Namespace

Groups
coffee-shops
neverending-story
Users
Administrator



Figure 12-10. The project Sea of Possibilities has been added to the group Neverending Story

If the project already existed, and you want to move it to a different namespace (individual account, or group), complete the following steps:

1. In the top menu, click gear icon for the Admin area.
2. From the left sidebar, click Projects.
3. Locate the project you want to reassign and click its name. You will be redirected to an admin summary for the project.
4. Locate the transfer form (Figure 12-11).

5. In the transfer form, click the down arrow on the drop-down box. A list of groups and users will appear. Select the group you want to transfer this project to.
6. Click Transfer.

The screenshot shows a user interface titled "Transfer project". At the top, there is a label "Namespace" followed by a dropdown menu. Below the dropdown is a blue rectangular button with the word "Transfer" in white text. The entire interface is contained within a light gray box with a thin black border.

Figure 12-11. The project transfer form allowing you to move a project to a different namespace

The project has been transferred to the new group. Previous group members will no longer have access to the project. Anyone with a local clone of the project will need to update the URL to use the new namespace for the project. (See [Chapter 5](#) for details on working with remotes.)

Access Control

To limit access to projects, there are both project visibility settings and per-account roles. With these two options, you have a fair degree of flexibility over how a project is managed. In [Chapter 2](#), you learned about a number of different ways to chain together repositories so that people had the correct level of access. With GitLab's finer-grained controls, you can ensure everyone has only exactly the access you would like them to have.

Project Visibility

Within a given project, you can control the level of access per-project and per-role:

Private

Project access must be granted explicitly for each user.

Internal

The project can be cloned by any logged-in user.

Public

The project can be cloned without any authentication.

To adjust the project visibility settings, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu, click the gear icon for Admin area.
2. From the left sidebar, click Projects.
3. Locate the project you wish to adjust and click its title.
4. From the project admin summary page, locate and click the button edit.
5. Locate the section of the form Visibility Level (**Figure 12-12**) and adjust the settings as appropriate for the access level you wish people to have (Private, Internal, or Public).
6. Locate and click Save changes.



Figure 12-12. Update the project visibility to one of Public, Internal, or Private

The visibility settings for your project have been adjusted.

Limiting Activities with Project Roles

Once users are able to see a project, you can further control the activities they can perform within the repository by assigning each person a specific role. A comprehensive checklist of all permissions is available from within your GitLab installation from [help/permissions/permissions](#).

A quick summary of the functionality available to each role is as follows:

Guest

Able to create new issues and leave comments, and that's it! This role may be appropriate for stakeholders who do not need access to the code, but should be involved in the development of the project.

Reporter

In addition to the Guest permissions, a Reporter is able to clone the project and create code snippets. You may want to grant CTOs this role because they should not be working on code anymore. (I'm mostly joking. I do think it's great when

managers are able to jump in and help out; I also think that managers should be focusing on the outward-facing tasks only they can accomplish.)

Developer

In addition to all of the previous permissions, Developers can also create new branches, create merge requests, push to nonprotected branches, add tags, write wiki pages, manage the issue tracker, and more! Most people on the team will likely be assigned this role. You can still limit their access to specific branches, so it's okay to be generous with permissions at this point.

Master

In addition to the previous permissions, Masters are also able to create milestones, add new team members, push to protected branches, add deploy keys to the product, and edit the project itself. This role is appropriate for team leaders, and *possibly* savvy project managers who might need to change the team composition/access from time to time.

Owner

The final role is also able to change the project visibility, transfer the project to another namespace, and remove the project altogether. It is appropriate for non-team administrators to have this role.

To update a person's role within a group, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu, click the gear icon for Admin area.
2. From the left sidebar, click Projects.
3. Locate the name of the project you want to update. Next to the name of the project there is a button labeled edit. Click this button. You will be redirected from the admin area to the project.
4. From the left sidebar, click Members.
5. Locate and click Edit group members. The list of members will be converted into a configuration list.
6. Locate the person whose role you want to change, and click the pencil icon. A new drop-down box will appear ([Figure 12-13](#)).
7. Update the drop-down box so that it contains the appropriate role for this person.
8. Click Save.

User	Role
Bastian bastian	Developer
Engywook engywook	Developer
Falkor falkor	Developer
Atreyu atreyu	Developer
Morla morla	Developer

Figure 12-13. Update the role for a given team member

The new role has been applied.

Limiting Access with Protected Branches

The final level of access that GitLab offers is a per-branch setting. By default, the branch *master* is protected, and people with the role Developer cannot push to this branch. Instead, they are required to use the Merge Request process to have their work incorporated into the branch *master* for the repository. If you prefer having a shared access model, you can remove this protection.

To update which branches are protected within a given project, the branch must already exist. Once it exists within the repository, you can open or close the access. (Remember that when you first created the project you selected the *default* access setting for new branches.)

To set up access control for a given branch, complete the following steps:

1. From the top menu, click the gear icon for Admin area.
2. From the left sidebar, click Projects.
3. Locate the project you wish to adjust, and click the button labeled edit next to its name. This will take you to the project page, instead of the admin page.
4. From the left sidebar, click Settings, then Protected branches.
5. From the drop-down menu, select the branch you would like to protect ([Figure 12-14](#)).
6. Locate and click the button Protect.



Figure 12-14. Lock a branch so that it can only receive updates from accounts with the Role “Master” or “Owner” for this project or team

The branch can no longer be updated by the role Developer.

To remove this restriction, complete the following steps from the same screen:

1. Locate the section titled Already Protected ([Figure 12-15](#)).
2. Locate the branch you would like to update.
3. Click the button Unprotect.

Already Protected:		
Branch	Developers can push	Last commit
master <small>default</small>	<input type="checkbox"/>	13c7f5f1 · about an hour ago

A red 'Unprotect' button is located on the right side of the last row.

Figure 12-15. Branches that have already been protected can be unprotected

Now people with the role Developer will be able to push commits to the branch you just updated.

Milestones

Within each project, you are able to create milestones. These can be used to collect issues, participants, and deadlines. If you are working in a Scrum fashion, you may find them useful for sprint loading. Milestones for projects that are shared by a group can also be seen from a single report page. This can make it easier to coordinate between projects; however, it is still per-repository so it is not as flexible as a full-featured project management tool, which allows you to collect all issues for different code bases into a single project for management purposes. If you use the same names within a group across all of the projects, you can cheat a little and collate related items.

To create a new milestone for your project, complete the following steps:

1. Navigate to the project page.
2. From the left sidebar, click Milestones.
3. Locate and click the button New milestone.
4. Complete the form fields for your new milestone (**Figure 12-16**):
 - Title
 - Description, with optional files attached
 - Date
5. Locate and click the button Create milestone.

The screenshot shows the 'New Milestone' creation interface. At the top, there's a title 'New Milestone' and a link '← To milestones'. The main form has a 'Title' field containing 'Moon Child' (marked as required) and a 'Description' field with the text 'Bastian must save Fantasia!'. Below the description is a note: 'Milestones are parsed with *GitLab Flavored Markdown*. Attach files by dragging & dropping or selecting them.' To the right of the description is a 'Due Date' section with a calendar for June 2015. The date '15' is selected. At the bottom of the form are 'Create milestone' and 'Cancel' buttons.

Figure 12-16. You can create date-based milestones for your project

Your new milestone has been created.

To see a list of all milestones for one of your groups, complete the following steps:

1. In the top-right corner on the screen, click your user avatar.
2. From the left sidebar, click Groups.
3. From the list of groups, click the name of the group you want to see the milestones for.

4. From the left sidebar, click Milestones.

You will be redirected to a list of all milestones for this group ([Figure 12-17](#)).

The screenshot shows a list of milestones for a group. At the top right, it says "2 milestones". On the left, there's a sidebar with buttons for "Open" (selected), "Closed", and "All". Below that, the milestones are listed:

- Pass the Three Gates**
0 Issues 0 Merge Requests 100% complete
southern-oracle
[Close Milestone]
- Moon Child**
0 Issues 0 Merge Requests 100% complete
sea-of-possibilities
[Close Milestone]

Figure 12-17. A list of all milestones for a given group

Summary

GitLab is a robust, open source code hosting system that rivals the functionality offered by GitHub and Bitbucket. It is available for you to install on your own network free of charge.

- Access control can be customized per repository (visibility settings), per account (with role settings), and per branch (with branch protection).
- You can collect both Projects (repositories) and Users (people) into Groups for easier management.
- If you do not want the responsibility of maintaining your own software, GitLab also offers a free cloud hosting service at [GitLab.com](https://gitlab.com).

APPENDIX A

Butter Tarts

In Git, branches can be used to maintain variations in code. These variations might be a work in progress, or they may be a completely different direction. These branches can feel similar to variations of family recipes. This appendix contains two variations of a recipe from my family of a classic Canadian dessert: **butter tarts**. (For the non-Canadians reading this, the inclusions are what make this dessert controversial. It's like rebasing; but worse.)

Austin Butter Tarts

This is my mother's recipe, passed down to her from her grandmother, Granny Austin. It is always made with currants, and never anything else.

Pastry

- 2-½ cups flour
- 1 cup shortening
- Pinch salt
- Ice water (enough to bind)

1. Cut shortening into flour.
2. Add ice water (approximately ½ cup).
3. Mix with fork.
4. Roll out.
5. Prick and bake in a muffin tin, unfilled, at 450° F for 12 minutes.

Filling

- 1 cup sugar
 - $\frac{1}{2}$ cup soft butter
 - 3 eggs
 - 1 cup currants
 - 2 tablespoons sweet or sour cream
1. Mix together the filling ingredients.
 2. Bake in the pastry-filled muffin tin at 400° F for about 25 minutes.

van der Heyden Butter Tarts

This is my aunt's recipe, passed down to her from her mother, Pat van der Heyden. It is usually without additions, but can have roasted nuts, chocolate chips, or raisins.

Filling

- $\frac{2}{3}$ cup softened butter
- 3 cups brown sugar
- 3 cups corn syrup
- 12 eggs

Cream together butter and sugar. Add corn syrup, then eggs. Mix well together. Using your favorite pastry recipe, roll out and cut into suitable size for your tart, like a muffin tin. Using a fork, prick holes into the bottom of each pastry. Ladle in butter tart filling. Bake at 400° F for 21 minutes (or thereabouts).

Options:

- Roasted nuts
- Chocolate chips
- Raisins

Pastry

- 6 cups all-purpose flour
- 3 cups shortening (Karin uses Crisco; her mother used lard)
- 2 eggs
- Splash of vinegar plus 2 cups cold water

Mix flour with shortening, leave it somewhat lumpy. Whisk eggs, add vinegar and water. Add wet to dry until you get a workable consistency. Freeze any unused pastry in plastic for next time.

APPENDIX B

Installing the Latest Version of Git

This book primarily covers the basics in Git, so there aren't a lot of new features that you'll be missing out on if you don't upgrade. In general, I find newer versions of the software to be increasingly more friendly to use. The error messages are clearer, and provide better "next action" suggestions. The syntax of some tricky commands has improved, making the commands easier to remember. (For example, the ability to delete a remote branch using the parameter `--delete`, and not some weird syntax involving a colon.)

So you think you have Git installed. Sweet!

But the version that ships with your operating system is 90% likely to be 100% old. "It's all Git to me!" I hear you saying. I know, I know. I used to think the same thing: Git is old and complicated and hasn't changed in a million Internet years. And then I went to a Git developer conference. At the conference, I met wonderful developers who were friendly and welcoming and patient and funny and very much actively engaged in making Git better. At the time, the maintainer of Git was Junio Hamano, and the Windows maintainer was Johannes Schindelin. They were both at the conference and were genuinely interested in making Git easier for you to use. You won't see what the community has been up to if you don't install the latest version!

You should always try to use the latest stable version of software, and you definitely owe it to yourself to ensure you are using at least version 2.5 of Git. As of this version of Git, the command `git help` is *much* more useful. I'm very excited about this change as it was one of the things that bugged me about Git from the very first time I used it. Then, at the Git developer conference, I made passing comment, which turned into an unofficial bug report...and a few months later Sébastien Guimara and Eric Sunshine made my wish into the command you use today. Incredible!

I'm often a few patches out of date (e.g. if the latest version is 2.5.2, I might be on 2.5.0), but I do make a careful effort to stay *relatively* current. If you don't remember having installed Git in the last few months, you will almost definitely want to upgrade. You may also need to install Git if it's not already on your system (it's not hard! there are installers you can use!).

Installing Git and Upgrading

There are human-friendly Git installers available for Windows and OS X. The installer will generally attempt to keep your settings in place when you upgrade Git.

These installers are available from:

<http://git-scm.com/downloads>

If you are on Linux or Unix, you probably already have Git installed, but you should upgrade to the latest version. Use your package manager to do this (tips in “[Upgrading on *nix Systems](#)” on page 303). OS X users may also want to use a package manager to install Git and keep it up to date.

Finding the Command Line

This book is focused on using Git from the command line. I make no apologies about this. There are two critical reasons I think you should give it a try:

1. It's easier to copy and paste documentation that works on *all* operating systems when everyone is working from the command line.
2. You get better error messages when you're working from the command line. In a graphical interface it's harder to copy and paste the sequence of commands you ran right before getting into the pickle you're now in. By working from the command line, you will be able to get help faster from others when things go wrong.

As you gain comfort with the concepts in this book, I encourage you to transfer that knowledge to graphical interfaces if you prefer.

OS X

1. Open Spotlight. Spotlight is available from the magnifying glass in the top-right corner of the menu bar, or by pressing Control + Space.
2. Into the Spotlight search window, type **terminal** and press Return. A new terminal window will appear.

Linux

The location of a terminal window will vary depending on which distribution of Linux you are using, and the window manager you are using. If you don't know how to open a terminal window for your version of Linux, a quick search with your favorite search engine should be able to help out.

Windows

The method you use will vary slightly depending on the version of Windows you are running.

Windows 7:

1. Click the button labeled "Start."
2. Select Program Files → Accessories → Command Prompt. A terminal window will open.

Windows 8:

1. Navigate to the Apps screen (swipe up; or use a mouse and click the down arrow at the bottom of the screen).
2. Locate the section heading Windows System by swiping or scrolling to the right.
3. Under Windows System, press or click Command Prompt.

Upgrading on *nix Systems

Package managers are a great way to ensure you are using an up-to-date version of Git on your system. On Linux and Unix-variants, you will upgrade Git using the same package manager that you used to install Git previously (well, Git was probably already installed, and you might have needed to upgrade).



Homebrew Is a Package Manager for OS X.

If you are using OS X, and already have **Homebrew** installed, you should use this package manager to keep Git up to date.

When working with a package manager, you need to remember to keep your list of packages up to date. Generally this is with the subcommand update for your package manager. For example, on Ubuntu I would use `apt-get update`, on Fedora I would use `yum check-update`, and on OS X, I would use `brew update`.

Once the list of packages is up to date, you can install the latest packaged version of the software for your system. This is typically done with the subcommand `install` or `upgrade`.

OS X:

```
$ brew install git
```

Ubuntu, and Linux distributions using the package manager `apt`:

```
$ apt-get install git
```

Fedora, and Linux distributions using the package manager `yum`:

```
$ yum install git
```

To ensure your packages are kept up to date, you can upgrade them individually or on demand ([Example B-1](#)). This is typically done with the subcommand `upgrade`, although running the `install` command again will generally also work to upgrade the software if a newer package is available.



Upgrade with Caution.

Careful! Package managers are only *mostly* awesome, and sometimes upgrading everything isn't the smartest thing when you're running towards a deadline.

Example B-1. Update packages with Brew

OS X upgrade only Git:

```
$ brew upgrade git
```

OS X upgrade all packages installed via Homebrew:

```
$ brew upgrade
```

OS X Gotchas

When I started getting more involved in the Git community, I began working with custom builds instead of using installers so that I could test out neat new features and upgraded documentation. When I tried to push code to remote repositories, I sometimes ran into the following error:

```
git: 'credential-osxkeychain' is not a git command. See 'git --help'.
```

For some reason, my environment variable for `$PATH` wasn't behaving quite the way I anticipated. After getting tired of trying to sort it out, I downloaded another copy of the keychain helper and put it in a known location on my hard drive.



It is Unlikely You've Lost Your Keychain.

I very, very highly doubt you will ever need to take advantage of this section. It's mostly a love note to my future self on how I solved this problem previously. (Yes, I use my own books as reference. I write down the important stuff so that I don't have to store it all in my own head.)

First, verify that you have the correct authentication tool set up in your global Git configuration file. This file is located at `~/.gitconfig` and should contain the following settings:

```
[credential]
    helper = osxkeychain
    useHttpPath = true
```

If this is not visible in the configuration file, set it up now by running the following command:

```
$ git config --global credential.helper osxkeychain
```

Check to see if this solved the problem by running the following command:

```
$ git credential-osxkeychain
```

You should not receive the error message you had been receiving previously.

If you do receive the error message again, proceed with the following instructions. You will download and “install” a copy of the helper application `osxkeychain`:

```
$ curl -s -O http://github-media-downloads.s3.amazonaws.com/
    osx/git-credential-osxkeychain
```

Adjust the permissions so that you are able to run the program:

```
$ chmod u+x git-credential-osxkeychain
```

Move the helper program to the application folder for Unix-y programs. This program is run as root, so you will need to enter your OS X login password to run the command:

```
$ sudo mv git-credential-osxkeychain /usr/local/git/bin
```

Now when you run the following command, you shouldn't get the error you received previously about a missing command:

```
$ git credential-osxkeychain
```

This documentation is adapted from the instructions at [“Beginner’s Setup Guide for Git & Github on Mac OS X”](#). Chris Chernoff, if you ever read this, thank you! Your tips saved me from having to enter the 42-character random password I’d set up each time I wanted to push updated branches for this book to the Atlas build server while running custom builds of Git.

Accessing Git Help at the Command Line

Git includes built-in documentation from the command line. This information is accessible by running the following command:

```
$ git help
```

You can read all of the available documentation for a given topic by specifying the topic name:

```
$ git help topic
```

To navigate the help page, you can use your keyboard's arrow keys to scroll up and down. When you are finished reading the documentation page, press **q** to exit.

For a list of all topics, use the following command:

```
$ git help --all
```

A handy glossary of Git terms is also available:

```
$ git help glossary
```

APPENDIX C

Configuring Git

Over time, you will find little shortcuts that help you use Git at the command line. Personally I've found those who are the most frustrated with it are the ones with the least amount of customization. There are two types of configuration settings you will be making when working with Git: global settings, which apply to all repositories that you work on; and local settings, which only apply to the current repository. An example of a global setting might be your name, whereas your email might be customized based on personal projects and work projects.

Global settings are stored in the file `~/.gitconfig`, and local settings are stored in the file `.git/config` for the specific repository you are working in. You will always be able to go back and edit your settings if you want to.

You can check to see what value is set. For example, [Example C-1](#) shows you how to check what your name is set to.

Example C-1. Display a configured value

```
$ git config --get user.name
```

You can also get list of all values currently set ([Example C-2](#)).

Example C-2. Display all configuration values currently set

```
$ git config --list
```

A list of all variables is available from the command page for `config`. This is also available by running the command:

```
$ git help config
```

Identifying Yourself

In order to get credit for your work, you will need to tell Git who you are. We will store your name ([Example C-3](#)) and email ([Example C-4](#)) globally. Because it's a global setting, you don't need to be in a specific repository to make the change.

Example C-3. Configure your name

```
$ git config --global user.name 'Your Name'
```

Example C-4. Configure your email address

```
$ git config --global user.email 'me@example.com'
```

It might be appropriate to use specific email addresses for some repositories (for example, if you are working on a work versus personal project). You can specify the changes should only be applied to a specific repository by completing the following steps:

1. Navigate to the directory that holds the repository you want to configure.
2. Apply the configuration command, substituting `--global` for `--local`.

For example:

```
$ git config --local user.email 'me@work.com'
```

Changing the Commit Message Editor

By default, Git will use the system editor. On OS X and Linux, this is typically Vim. I really like Vim, so that's what I use. It is a bit hardcore though, so you might want to change your editor to something else.

Check to see which editor Git will use by running the following command:

```
$ git config --get core.editor
```



You Must Quit to Commit

The commit will only be stored in Git when you *quit* the editor, not just save the commit message. This may affect your choice of text editors.

If you would like to use Textmate, use the following command:

```
$ git config --global core.editor mate -w
```

If you would prefer to use Sublime, use the following command:

```
$ git config --global core.editor subl -n -w
```

If you want to change the editor for Windows, you will need to include the full path to the application file. As applications are typically installed in the folder *C:\Program Files*, you will need to wrap the path in quotes. Additionally, when you use Bash to call `git config`, you must quote the value, resulting in a double quoted string:

```
$ git config --global core.editor '"C:\Program Files\Vim\gvim.exe" --nofork'
```

For additional editors, check the configuration instructions for your editor of choice.

Adding Color

Reading huge walls of text can be difficult. Add some color helpers to your command line to make it easier to see what Git is doing:

```
$ git config --global color.ui true  
$ git config --global diff.ui auto
```

Customize Your Command Prompt

If you are working from the command line, you get *zero* clues about what is going on with your files, until you explicitly ask Git about them. This is tedious to keep having to ask. It's like when you were eight and sat in the back of the car whining at the driver saying, "Are we almost there yet?"

Instead of having to explicitly ask, I've modified my command-line prompt to tell me which branch I currently have checked out and whether or not I've made changes to any of the files in my repository. This is a fairly common hack, but every developer will have their own little quirks on how they implement it. Searching the Web for "bash prompt git status" will yield lots of results. My own prompt is fairly simple, but others have added a lot more details to their prompt. For example: [Show your git status and branch \(in color\) at the command prompt](#) or [local file status](#). As with all things technical, the more you add initially, the more you will need to debug if it does not work right away.

I have found the fancy prompts to be quite fussy to set up, and ended up giving up on the really detailed ones. I recommend starting with something really simple and then adding to it if you *really* need more information. The simple change in color, along with the name of the branch, actually suits me just fine and is less distracting without all the extra information.

Ignoring System Files

We have all done it: accidentally added one of OS X's `.DS_Store` system files, or a temporary `.swp` text editor file. You can save yourself a little embarrassment by setting up a global ignore file so that Git prevents these files from being committed to any local repository you create or work on. A [comprehensive list of files to ignore](#) is available. Pick and choose the most appropriate for your system and your projects.

Once you have a list of the files you want to ignore, complete the following steps:

1. Create a new text file named `.gitignore_global` and place it in your home directory.
2. Notify Git of the configuration file to use by running the following command:

```
$ git config --global core.excludesfile ~/.gitignore_global
```

You may also have project-specific files, or even output directories (such as build directories), that you don't want to commit to your repository. For each repository, you can have a custom "ignore" file that will further limit which files can be tracked by Git:

1. Create a new text file named `.gitignore` and place it in the root directory for your repository.
2. To this file add the names of the files you want Git to never add to the repository. Each filename should have its own line. You can use pattern matching as well, such as `*.swp` for temporary editor files.

This change will need a new commit in your Git repository:

```
$ git add .gitignore  
$ git commit -m "Adding list of files to be ignored."
```

Line Endings

This section is *especially* important if you work on a cross-platform team with developers on OS X, Linux, and Windows.

You should set the line endings globally, but adding the setting to each repository as well will ensure greater success for those who may not have explicitly set line endings:

```
$ git config --global core.autocrlf input
```

To explicitly have all contributors use the right line endings, you will need to add a `.gitattributes` file to your repository that identifies the correct line ending, text files that should be corrected, and binary files that should never be modified.

Create a new text file named `.gitattributes` in the root directory of your repository (the same directory the `.git` folder is in). An example of a new file is as follows:

```
# Set the default behavior for all files.  
* text=auto  
  
# List text files that should have system-specific line endings on checkout.  
*.php text  
*.html text  
*.css text  
  
# List files that should have CRLF line endings on checkout, and not  
# be converted to the local operating system.  
*.sln text eol=crlf  
  
# List all binary files which should not be modified.  
*.png binary  
*.jpg binary  
*.gif binary  
*.ico binary
```

Add the file to the staging index:

```
$ git add .gitattributes
```

Commit the file to the repository:

```
$ git commit -m "Require the right line endings for everyone, forever."
```

Fixing Line Endings

If you are in the unfortunate position of having to standardize line endings mid-project, you will need to complete the following steps:

1. Decide on the “official” line ending for your repository with your team.
2. Edit each of the affected files to reset the line endings. When this happened to my “friend,” she used Vim and the setting `:set ff=unix`. You may prefer to reset the line endings by simply opening each of the files with your text editor and re-saving each file; or use a command line utility such as `dos2unix`.
3. Add and commit the updated files to the repository.
4. Add the file `.gitattributes` to your repository as described in the previous section.
5. Push the changes to the code hosting server.
6. Ask everyone else on your team to update their work using the command `rebase` so that the “bad” line endings are not reintroduced into the repository accidentally.
7. Pour yourself a hot chocolate or whisky. You’ve earned it.

APPENDIX D

SSH Keys

SSH keys allow you to make a connection to a remote machine without having to enter a password every time. The keys themselves come in pairs: a public-facing key and a private key. The private key should be treated like a password, and never shared with anyone. The public-facing key will be “installed” elsewhere, such as a code hosting system.

Create Your Own SSH Keys

To create an SSH key, you will need to run a program, which will save a pair of files. The necessary software is already installed on *nix-based systems, but Windows users will need to download additional (free) software.

Linux, OS X, and Unix-variants

To generate a key pair, run the following command:

```
$ ssh-keygen -t rsa -b 4096 -C "your_email@example.com"
```

You will be prompted for the following information:

File location

Accept the default location by pressing Return to continue.

Password

It's optional, but you really should have one. Make it memorable or store it in a very secure password keeper that you use regularly.

The fingerprint for your key will be printed to the screen, and the key pair will be saved to the appropriate location in `~/.ssh/`.

You will now need to register this key with your system so that you can begin using it.

This is where things get a little secret agent. You need to register your keys with the local “agent” (using OS X? think “keychain,” but different). Begin the ssh-agent application and redirect it to use a Bourne shell:

```
$ eval "$(ssh-agent -s)"
```

Register your SSH key with the agent:

```
$ ssh-add ~/.ssh/id_rsa
```

Your key has been registered.

If you need to use the key immediately, skip ahead to [“Retrieving Your Public SSH Key” on page 315](#).

Windows

To generate an SSH key-pair on Windows you will need to use the software, PuTTYgen:

1. Locate the latest binary for PuTTY from [the PuTTY Download Page](#). The file is named *puttygen.exe*.
2. Right-click the link *puttygen.exe* and choose “Save link as.” The text may vary slightly depending on your browser.
3. When prompted, select a folder that you can find easily (for example, your desktop folder).
4. Locate the PuTTYgen application on your desktop. Double-click the icon to run the program.
5. At the bottom of the window, below “Type of key to generate,” select SSH-2 RSA.
6. Locate and click the button “Generate.”
7. Wiggle your mouse. Seriously. You’ll be making random data (noise), which helps with the key-generation process. Continue doing so until the progress bar is full.
8. You will be prompted for a passphrase. It’s optional, but you should add one.
9. Locate and click the button “Save private key.”
10. Locate and click the button “Save public key.”

This should save the keys to the appropriate location in `~/.ssh/`.

If you are ready to use the SSH key immediately, complete the following steps as well:

1. Locate the heading “Public key for pasting into OpenSSH authorized_keys file.”
2. Right-click the random string below the heading.

3. Choose “Select all,” and then “Copy.”

Your public key has been copied to the clipboard. You are ready to proceed.

Retrieving Your Public SSH Key

When your code hosting system asks for your “Public SSH Key,” it needs the contents of the file *id_rsa.pub*. This file is usually stored in a hidden folder of your home directory: *.ssh*. To locate this file, and copy its contents to your clipboard, complete the commands outlined next as is relevant for your operating system. By working from the command line, you can avoid trying to find an editor that recognizes a *.pub* file. It’s just text, but the text editors you have installed probably don’t know that.

OS X:

1. Open a terminal window.
2. Run the following command: `cat ~/ssh/id_rsa.pub | pbcopy`

Linux:

1. Open a terminal window.
2. Run the following command: `cat ~/ssh/id_rsa.pub`. You should have a very long string of characters printed to the screen. It should stretch the entire width of the terminal, and it should not include the words “PRIVATE KEY.” If the file is not found, you will need to create an SSH key first.
3. Copy all of the text that was printed to the screen.

Windows:

1. Open a Git Bash window.
2. Run the following command: `clip < ~/ssh/id_rsa.pub`. This will copy your public SSH key to the clipboard.

Your public SSH key is now copied to the clipboard and you are ready to paste it into the configuration screen for your code hosting system of choice.

Index

Symbols

- *nix systems
 - SSH key creation on, 313
 - upgrading Git on, 303
- .NET, 17

A

- access control
 - Bitbucket, 262-266
 - GitLab, 289-293
 - per-developer forks, 264
 - protected branches, 264
- access models, 20-31
 - collocated contributor repositories, 25-28
 - custom, 30
 - dispersed contributor, 22-25
 - shared maintenance, 28
- account creation
 - Bitbucket, 242-245
 - GitHub, 212-215
- add command, 105, 146
 - patch [filename], 105
 - add files, 104
- Aerobic Hosting, 269
- Agile environment, 3, 58
- Android, 188
- Ansible, 3
- antisocial coding, 241
- Apache, 18, 19
 - Apache License, 18
 - Apache Software Foundation, 188
- Asana, 277
- Atlas, 70, 181
- Atlassian, 265

Atlassian Connect, 268

automated gatekeepers, 187

automated self-check, 186

B

- backward compatibility (see semantic versioning)
- ball-and-chain diagrams, 36
- Balsamiq, 59
- Benevolent Dictator For Life (BDFL) governance model, 19
- benevolent dictators, 187
- BFG Repo Cleaner, 146
- bisect command, 206-208
- bisect inefficiencies, 137
- Bitbucket, 146
 - access control in, 262-266
 - account creation for, 242-245
 - and Atlassian Connect, 268
 - creating private project with, 245-249
 - editing files in repository, 251-254
 - exploring your project on, 249-251
 - getting started with, 242-254
 - per-developer forks, 264
 - private team work on, 241-270
 - project documentation in wiki pages, 255-257
- project governance for nonpublic projects on, 241
- project setup with, 254-260
- protected branches, 264
- pull requests, 266-268
- shared access, 263
- tracking changes with issues, 258-260

bitHound, 188, 268
blame command, 203-206
branch command, 13
 --contains, 148
 delete branches, 146
 delete branches, -D, 146
 list all branches, 104
 list branches, 104
 list remote branches, 104
branch deployment
 advantages, 38
 disadvantages, 39
branch types, 177
branch, create (see checkout command)
branch-per-feature deployment, 39-42
 advantages, 41
 disadvantages, 42
branches
 butter tart recipe example, 13, 297-299
 creating new, 88-90
 defined, 33
 for experimental work, 110
 for teams of one, 85-90
 keeping up to date, 167-170
 listing, 86
 unmerging, 135-137, 138-144
 updating list of remote branches, 87
 using different, 87
 working with, 85-90
branching strategies, 33-56
 and review process, 196
branch-per-feature deployment, 39-42
conventions for, 35
mainline branch development, 36-39
 scheduled deployment, 45-51
 state branching, 42-45
 updating branches, 51-55
Brew, 175
broken branches, 201
Brown, Sunni, 7
browser-based text editor
 for Bitbucket files, 251-254
 for quick commits, 221-224
bugs, finding and fixing (see debugging)
Buildkite, 277
butter tart recipes (forking/branching example), 13, 297-299

C

 cached parameter, 129
 Canonical, 17
 cd shell command, 104
 cd [directory name] shell command, 104
 Chacon, Scott, 40
 changes, proposed
 applying, 189-194
 reviewing, 189
 checkout command, 146
 checkout branch, 104
 checkout [commit], 146
 create branch, -b, 105, 146
 tracking branch, 104
 Chef, 3, 17
 Chernoff, Chris, 305
 cherry-pick command, 123
 cherry-pick [commit], 146
 clone command, 158, 162
 clone [URL], 104, 146
 clones, zipped packages vs., 158
 cloning (see git clone [URL] command)
 cloning repositories, 12
 co-maintainership, 235-236
 Code of Conduct (CoC) document, 20
 code reviews, software for, 187
 Coder, 188
 codes of conduct, 19
 coding teams, 3
 collaboration, 3
 collocated contributor repositories access
 model, 22, 25-28
 color, adding to Git, 309
 command and control, 15-31
 access models, 20-31
 project governance, 16-20
 command prompt customization, 309
 commands (see individual command names)
 commit command, 146
 --amend, 105
 -m, 104
 commit messages
 changing editor for, 308
 detailed, 95
 commit process, 13
 commitment meetings, 9
 commits
 altering with interactive rebasing, 130-134
 amending, 126

and rollbacks, 126-137
combining with reset, 127-129
publishing perfect, 163-167
reverting, 137
unmerging a branch, 135-137
via Web, 221-224

company-wide stand-up meetings, 10
configuration, Git, 307-311
 adding color, 309
 command prompt customization, 309
 ignoring system files, 310
 line endings, 310
 user name/email configuration, 308

consensus shepherds, 187

consensus-driven development, 3

consensus-driven, leader-approved governance model, 19

consumers
 contributors vs., 157-163
 developers as, 158-160

continuous delivery, 37

Continuous Delivery (Humble and Farley), 39

continuous deployment, 37

continuous integration, 37

contractors
 copyright and, 16
 untrusted developers with independent quality assurance, 183

contributors
 consumers vs., 157-163
 developers as, 160

conventions, branching strategy, 35

copyright agreements, 16

creating clones, 12

Creative Commons license, 17, 18

creative thinking, 4

custom access models, 30

CVS, 20

D

debugging, 197-208
 comparative studies of historical records, 201-203
 file ancestry with blame command, 203-206
 historical reenactment with bisect command, 206-208
 stash command for emergency fixes, 198-200

decision thinking, 6

default branches, 36
deleted file, mid-rebase conflict from, 115-118
deployment, 39

design critique, 186

detached HEAD state, 52

developers
 as consumers, 158-160
 as contributors, 160
 as maintainers, 161-163
 setup for multi-person teams, 157-163
 trusted, with no peer review, 181-183
 trusted, with peer review, 64
 untrusted, with independent quality assurance, 183
 untrusted, with QA gatekeepers, 66

development
 by teams of more than one, 163-177
 keeping branches up to date, 167-170
 publishing perfect commits, 163-167
 publishing work, 176
 resolving merge conflicts, 174-175
 reviewing work, 170-173
 sprint-based workflow, 177-181
 untrusted developers with independent quality assurance, 183
 with trusted developers with no peer review, 181-183

Dia, 59

diff command, 192

diff program, 22

DigitalOcean, 272

dir shell command, 104

directed acyclic graph (DAG), 36

discreet repositories, 241

dispersed contributor access model, 22-25

distributed version control, 15

distribution licenses, 18

Docker, 2

documentation
 in Bitbucket wiki pages, 255-257
 of encoded decisions, 59
 of workflow process, 58
 README file for, 156

Driessen, Vincent, 45

Drupal, 19

Drupal Code of Conduct, 20

Drupal Project module, 59

Dymitruk, Adam, 40

E

Eaton, Jeff, 198
empathy, cultivating, 10
encoded decisions, documentation of, 59
Etsy, 39
experimental work, branches for, 110

F

Facebook, 39
Farley, David, 39
Fedora, upgrading Git on, 303
feedback (review process), 194
fetch command, 13, 70, 153, 158, 171, 181
files, restoring, 124
filter-branch command, 145, 148
Flickr, 20, 39
forks/forking, 12
 butter tart recipe example, 13, 297-299
 for public projects on GitHub, 230
 Git vs. GitHub terminology, 27
 issue tracking, 230
 per-developer (Bitbucket), 264
Free Libre Open Source Software (FLOSS), 16
freelancers, copyright and, 16

G

Gamestorming (Gray, Brown, Macanufo), 7
gc command
 --prune, 148
Gerrit, 188
Git
 adding color to, 309
 command prompt customization, 309
 commit message editor changes, 308
 configuring, 307-311
 configuring to ignore system files, 310
 converting an existing project to, 81-83
 finding command line for, 302
 GitHub terminology vs., 27
 installers for, 302
 installing latest version of, 301-305
 line ending configuration, 310
 OS X installation issues, 304
 teamwork in terms of, 12-14
 upgrading on *nix systems, 303
 user name/email configuration, 308
git command (see individual command names)
git commands, summary, 104, 146

Git for Knitters, 13

Git for Teams, 226

Git Fundamentals for Web Developers (Mitchell), 177

Git hosting

 open source projects on GitHub, 211-239
 private team work with Bitbucket, 241-270
 self-hosted collaboration with GitLab,
 271-295

git-merge, 175

GitFlow

 and sprint-based workflow, 177
 for release schedule workflow, 67
 scheduled deployment branching with,
 45-51

GitHub

 account creation on, 212-215
 contributing to projects, 230-233
 downloading repository snapshots, 225
 forking, 230
 getting started on, 212-224
 Git terminology vs., 27
 granting co-maintainership, 235-236
 open source projects on, 211-239
 organization creating on, 215
 personal repositories on, 216-224
 public projects on, 224-230
 pull request initiation, 232-233
 pull requests with merge conflicts, 237
 repository creation for, 234
 reviewing/accepting pull requests, 236
 running your own project, 234-238
 SSH keys for, 213
 tracking changes with issues, 230-233
 working locally, 226-230

GitHub Flow, 40

gitk command, 193

GitLab, 77

 access control, 289-293
 adding people to groups, 286-287
 adding people to projects, 284-284
 adding projects to groups, 287-289
 administrative account configuration, 274
 administrative dashboard, 275-279
 creating a project with, 279
 creating user accounts, 281-284
 getting started with, 271-279
 groups, 284-289
 installing, 272-274

limiting access with protected branches, 292
limiting activities with project roles, 290
milestones, 293
project visibility, 289
projects, 279
self-hosted collaboration with, 271-295
user accounts for, 280-284
GitLab Flow, 42
Gitorious, 279
Google, 100, 283
Google Calendar, 9, 17
Google Code, 279
Google Docs, 179
Google Hangouts, 9
GoToMeeting, 9
governance (see project governance)
governance models, 19
GPL, 18
Gravatar, 277
Gray, Dave, 7

H

Hamano, Junio, 301
Harmony Agreements, 17
history
 comparative studies of historical records, 201-203
 file ancestry with blame command, 203-206
 reenactment with bisect command, 206-208
 removing completely, 144-146
 reviewing, 84-85
 rewriting, 164
history undoing shared (see shared history, undoing)
Homebrew, 303
hotfixes
 branch creation for, 181
 post-launch, 69
 prioritizing, 48, 180
Humanitarian ID Code of Conduct, 20
Humble, Jez, 39

I

ideation meetings, 7
init command, 104
Inkscape, 59
integration branches, 44
interactive rebasing, 130-134
issue tracking

Bitbucket, 258-260
GitHub, 230-230
issue-based version control, 76-78

J

Jenkins instance, 65
JIRA, 59, 241, 277
jQuery, 18
junior developers, benefits to, 187
junior reviewers, benefits to, 187

K

Kaizens, 58
Kaleidoscope, 193
kickoff meetings, 8

L

LDAP, 283
Lead and Succeed in 4 Different Dimensions (program), 4
leadership models, 19
leadership training programs, 4
licensing, 156
line endings, Git configuration for, 310
LinkedIn, 188
Linux, 18
 finding Git command line with, 303
 SSH key creation on, 313
 SSH key retrieval on, 315
 upgrading Git on, 303
list parameter, 86
local repositories
 connecting to personal GitHub repository, 220
 converting an existing project to Git, 81-83
 creating, for teams of one, 78-85
 downloading an existing project to, 80
 initializing an empty project on, 83
 reviewing project history, 84-85
log command, 104, 146
 --graph, 148
 --oneline, 104, 148
ls -a shell command, 104
Lullabot, 10

M

Macanufo
James, 7

mainline branch method, 36-39
maint (maintenance) integration branch, 44
maintainers
 developers as, 161-163
 granting co-maintainership, 235-236
Managing Chaos (Welchman), 19
master integration branch, 44
meetings
 and empathy, 10
 for teams, 7-12
 for tracking progress, 8
 kickoff, 8
 wrap-up/retrospective, 11
mentoring, 3
merge command, 13, 105, 146
merge conflicts
 mid-rebase conflict, 118-120
 pull requests with, 237
 resolving, 174-175
merge requests, 25, 27
merge, rebase vs., 168
Microsoft, 16
mistakes, undoing (see rollbacks)
MIT License, 18
Mitchell, Lorna, 177
mkdir shell command, 104

N

next integration branch, 44
nonpublic projects (Bitbucket), 241
NuGet, 18

O

OAuth, 283
Omnibus, 272
OmniGraffle, 59
one-on-one meetings, 10
open source projects, GitHub, 211-239
 account creation on, 212-215
 and personal repositories, 216-224
 contributing to projects, 230-233
 downloading repository snapshots, 225
 forking, 230
 getting started on, 212-224
 granting co-maintainership, 235-236
 organization creating on, 215
 public projects on, 224-230
 pull request initiation, 232-233
 pull requests with merge conflicts, 237

repository creation for, 234
reviewing/accepting pull requests, 236
running your own project, 234-238
SSH keys for, 213
tracking changes with issues, 230-230
working locally, 226-230
OpenStack, 188
operations teams, 2
organizations (GitHub), 215
origin command, 153
OS X
 finding Git command line with, 302
 SSH key creation on, 313
 SSH key retrieval on, 315
 upgrading Git on, 303
overcategorization, avoiding, 61

P

patch files, 22
patch parameter, 93
Payment Card Industry (PCI), 242
peer reviews, 2
 defined, 186
 trusted developers, 64
Pencil, 59
permissions, establishing, 151
personal repositories, GitHub, 216-224
 connecting a local repository, 220
 creating project on, 216-219
 importing a repository, 219
 making quick commits via the Web,
 221-224
 publishing changes to, 221
 updating local repository, 224
Pivotal Tracker, 59
private projects (see nonpublic projects)
private teams (Bitbucket), 241-270
product backlog, 60
Product Owner (see team composition)
progress, tracking, 8
project deep dive meetings, 9
project governance, 16-20
 codes of conduct, 19
 copyright and contributor agreements, 16
 distribution licenses, 18
 for nonpublic projects on Bitbucket, 241
 leadership models, 19
Project Management Committee
 PMC, 19

project setup
 creating new project, 150
 developer setup, 157-163
 documentation in README, 156
 establishing permissions, 151
 for teams of more than one, 150-156
 uploading project repository, 152-155
 with Bitbucket, 254-260

protected branches, 264

pu integration branch, 44

public projects, GitHub, 224-230
 contributing to projects, 230-233
 downloading repository snapshots, 225
 forking, 230
 granting co-maintainership, 235-236
 pull request initiation, 232-233
 pull requests with merge conflicts, 237
 repository creation for, 234
 reviewing/accepting pull requests, 236
 running your own project, 234-238
 tracking changes with issues, 230-230
 working locally, 226-230

public SSH key, retrieving, 315

pull command, 13, 169

pull request auto reviewers, 269

pull requests
 accepting (Bitbucket), 268
 Bitbucket, 266-268, 266
 for public projects on GitHub, 232-233
 GitHub and, 160
 reviewing and accepting, 236
 with collocated contributor repositories
 model, 25, 27
 with merge conflicts, 237

PullReview, 188

Puppet, 3, 17

push
 delete branch, --delete, 105

push command, 13, 105, 153
 --set-upstream, 105

Q

quality assurance (QA) teams, 2
quality assurance testing, 186

R

Rails, 18
README files, 156
reasonable restraint, 17

rebase command, 114, 126, 168
 --abort, 120
 --continue, 115, 146
 --interactive, 130, 146

rebasing, 52, 113-120
 altering commits with interactive rebasing, 130-134
 beginning, 114
 mid-rebase conflict from deleted file, 115-118
 mid-rebase conflict from single file merge conflict, 118-120

Redmine, 59, 277

reflog command, 146
 expire, 148

release schedules
 and ongoing development, 68
 and post-launch hotfix, 69
 stable release publication, 67
 workflow for, 67-69

remote branches, updating list of, 87

remote command
 --verbose, 105
 add, 105

remote repositories
 branch maintenance, 103
 connecting to, 99-103
 creating new projects, 100
 pushing changes to, 102
 second remote connection for, 100

repositories, 12-13
 adding changes to, 90-97
 adding partial file changes to, 93
 branch maintenance, 103
 cloning, 12
 collocated contributor model, 25-28
 committing partial changes to, 94
 connecting to remote, 99-103
 creating, 234
 creating new projects, 100
 detailed commit messages, 95
 downloading snapshots of, 225
 ignoring files, 96
 local, for teams of one, 78-85
 personal, 216-224
 pushing changes to, 102
 removing file from stage, 94
 removing history of, 144-146
 second remote connection for, 100

reset command, 124, 127-129, 146
 --hard HEAD, 146
 --merge, 146
 HEAD, 105, 146
restoring files, 124
restraint of trade clause, 17
retrospective meetings, 11
reverse engineering, 17
revert command, 126, 137, 148
 --mainline, 148
 --no-commit, 148
Review Board (software), 188
review process, 185-196
 applying proposed changes, 189-194
 completion of, 195
 evaluation submission, 194
 feedback preparation, 194
 reviews of proposed changes, 189
 software for code reviews, 187
 types of reviewers, 186
 types of reviews, 186
rollbacks, 107-148
 altering commits with interactive rebasing, 130-134
 amending commits, 126
 best practices for, 108-113
 combining commits with reset, 127-129
 command reference for, 146-148
 commits and, 126-137
 describing your problem, 108-110
 locating lost work, 120-124
 removing history completely, 144-146
 restoring files, 124
 undoing shared history, 137-144
 unmerging a branch, 135-137
 unmerging a shared branch, 138-144
 using branches for experimental work, 110
senior developers, benefits to, 187
senior reviewers, benefits to, 187
shared branches, unmerging, 138-144
shared history, undoing, 137-144
 reverting a previous commit, 137
 unmerging a shared branch, 138-144
shared maintenance access model, 22, 28
shell commands, 104
show command
 [commit], 105
 [tag], 105
sidekiq, 276
single repository, shared access model, 22
Skype, 274
social coding, 241
solo developers (see teams (one member))
sprint demo meetings, 9
sprint planning meetings, 8
sprint-based workflow, 177-181
sprints, 37
SSH keys, 213, 313-315
 creating your own, 313-315
 retrieving your public key, 315
staged parameter, 129
staging changes, 129
stand-ups (see commitment meetings)
stash
 about, 13
 crafter analogy for, 13
 for emergency bug fixes, 198-200
 for side projects, 36
state branching, 42-45
 advantages, 45
 disadvantages, 45
status command, 104
Subversion, 18, 20, 264
system files, ignoring, 310

S

scheduled deployment branching, 45-51
 advantages, 50
 disadvantages, 51
Schindelin, Johannes, 301
Scrum, 60
ScrumMaster (see team composition)
Sculpin, 12, 226
security reviews, 2
self-managing teams, 3
semantic versioning, 43

T

tab completion, 91
tag command, 105
tags
 for teams of more than one, 97
 for teams of one, 97-99
 working with, 97-99
team composition
 architects, 3
 backend developers, 3
 business analysts, 3

designers, 3
frontend developers, 3
Product Owner, 3
project managers, 3
ScrumMaster, 3
teams (multiple-member), 149-183
and empathy, 10
creating new project, 150
developer setup for, 157-163
establishing permissions, 151
for nonsoftware projects, 69
kickoff meetings, 8
meetings for, 7-12
members of, 2
participating in development, 163-177
progress-tracking meetings, 8
project setup, 150-156
sample workflows for, 177-183
teamwork in terms of Git, 12-14
thinking strategies for, 3-7
trusted developers with no peer review, 181-183
uploading project repository, 152-155
working in, 1-14
wrap-up/retrospective meetings, 11
teams (one-member), 75-106
adding changes to a repository, 90-97
commands for, 103-105
connecting to remote repositories, 99-103
creating local repositories for, 78-85
issue-based version control, 76-78
tags for, 97-99
technical architecture review, 186
technical review board governance model, 19
testing process, 2
testing teams, 2
text editor, browser-based
for Bitbucket files, 251-254
for quick commits, 221-224
thinking strategies, 3-7
ticket progression, 59
ticket-based peer code review, 186
ticketing systems, 59
touch shell command, 104
track command, 13
tracking progress, meetings for, 8
true merges, 103
trusted developers
with no peer review, 181-183

with peer review, 64
Twitter, 100, 274, 277
Typo3, 188

U

Ubuntu
Git upgrades with, 303
GitLab and, 272
Ubuntu Code of Conduct, 20
understanding thinking, 5
undo methods, 109
undoing (see rollbacks)
Unfuddle, 59
Unix
SSH key creation on, 313
upgrading Git on, 303
unmerging a branch, 135-137
untracked changes, 128
untrusted developers
with independent quality assurance, 183
with QA gatekeepers, 66
updating branches, 51-55
upstream branch, 227
upstream project, 25
urgent (term), 49
user acceptance testing, 186

V

Vagrant, 2, 272
vendor branch, 227
Vim
alternatives to, 308
key commands for, 96
Virtualbox, 272

W

web editor
for Bitbucket files, 251-254
for quick commits, 221-224
Welchman, Lisa, 19
Wiele, Bob, 4
wiki pages, Bitbucket, 255-257
Windows
finding Git command line with, 303
SSH key creation on, 314
SSH key retrieval on, 315
WordPress, 18, 28
work for hire copyright arrangements, 16

- work, reviewing, 170-173
- workflow
- and teamwork in terms of Git, 12-14
 - basic example, 62-67
 - branching strategies, 33-56
 - command and control, 15-31
 - debugging, 197-208
 - effective styles, 57-71
 - encoded decision documentation, 59
 - evolving, 57-60
 - for ongoing development, 68
 - for releasing software according to schedule, 67-69
 - for teams of more than one, 1-14, 149-183
 - for teams of one, 75-106
 - nonsoftware projects, 69
 - ongoing development, 68
 - post-launch hotfix, 69
 - process documentation, 58
- review process, 185-196
- rollbacks, 107-148
- sprint-based, 177-181
- stable release publication, 67
- ticket progression, 59
- trusted developers with peer review, 64
- untrusted developers with QA gatekeepers, 66
- working branches, 201
- wrap-up meetings, 11
- write access, 27

Y

Yelp, 188

Z

zipped packages, clones vs., 158

About the Author

Emma Jane Hogbin Westby has been developing websites since 1996—initially as a developer, and now as a team leader. She has been teaching web-related technologies since 2002 and has delivered over 100 conference presentations, courses, and workshops around the world on frontend web development, accessibility standards, distributed version control, virtualization, and change management. She has previously authored two books on web development.

Emma encourages nontraditional participation in technology through craft, and is an amateur beekeeper. You can follow her on Twitter at [@emmajanehw](#).

Colophon

The animals on the cover of *Git for Teams* are the pied wagtail (*Motacilla alba*), the grey wagtail (*Motacilla cinerea*), and the yellow wagtail (*Motacilla flava*).

The genus name *Motacilla* means “moving tail,” and as their common name suggests, these small, energetic birds are known for fanning their long tails up and down, though the reasons for this behavior are not certain. On average, these birds measure 6 inches long and weigh up to .8 ounces.

The wagtail feeds on small insects and occasionally forages near groups of cattle in order to capture the insects they disturb. It also nests on the ground, laying 4–7 eggs at a time.

Wagtails are widely distributed, breeding throughout Europe and Asia and sometimes migrating to tropical areas of Africa. They favor open country, such as farmlands and grasslands. However, all three species have suffered severe declines in recent years, possibly due to changes in agriculture.

Many of the animals on O'Reilly covers are endangered; all of them are important to the world. To learn more about how you can help, go to [animals.oreilly.com](#).

The cover image is from *Wood's Illustrated Natural History*. The cover fonts are URW Typewriter and Guardian Sans. The text font is Adobe Minion Pro; the heading font is Adobe Myriad Condensed; and the code font is Dalton Maag's Ubuntu Mono.