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Description

Once we've finalized the deployment of the vagrant based build setup in Jenkins and have polished it so that it's robust enough, we'll have to move part of what is written in the blueprint in a design documentation.

Associated revisions

Revision f2201a63 - 10/17/2017 01:34 PM - bertagaz
Move part of the vagrant setup explanations from blueprint to design page.
This part is already in production.
Refs: #12616

Revision 3a1edab1 - 10/17/2017 01:40 PM - bertagaz
Document specific aspects of using Vagrant in Jenkins.
Refs: #12616

Revision 4aa55151 - 10/19/2017 11:25 AM - bertagaz
Reword explanation about sharing of Tails repo to the Vagrant buildbox.
Refs: #12616

Revision 6c959022 - 10/19/2017 11:40 AM - bertagaz
s/clean/delete/ obsolete baseboxes.
Refs: #12616

Revision 2dc498cb - 10/19/2017 11:40 AM - bertagaz
Be more precise about which baseboxes we're talking about.
Refs: #12616
Revision acd1152c - 10/19/2017 04:02 PM - bertagaz
Fix end of phrase.
Refs: #12616

Revision bb8925b7 - 10/19/2017 04:02 PM - bertagaz
Remove unnecessary reason to use nested VMs to build Tails in Jenkins.
Refs: #12616

Revision 16046e78 - 10/19/2017 04:02 PM - bertagaz
Aerate a bit the layout and point to Jenkins specifics page for build setup.
Refs: #12616

Revision ceb58920 - 10/19/2017 04:02 PM - bertagaz
Clarify syntax.
Refs: #12616

Revision b2ad965b - 10/19/2017 04:02 PM - bertagaz
Clarify and add links showing how we use our build options in Jenkins.
Refs: #12616

Revision 764289ed - 10/19/2017 04:02 PM - bertagaz
Clarify extproxy usage in our Jenkins infra.
Refs: #12616

Revision fc94ebba - 10/19/2017 04:44 PM - bertagaz
Link back moved parts of reproducible build's blueprint.
Refs: #12616

Revision 9de3812a - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Fix typo (refs: #12616).

Revision ab3df30b - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Fix wrong info (refs: #12616).
We don't do that for "every Tails release".

Revision 60e2b31d - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Be more accurate (refs: #12616).
There's no such thing as an apt-cacher-ng "shared in our infra"; that's only correct in the context of the lizard virtualization host.

Revision 760c09bc - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Restructure to explain why we do garbage collection (refs: #12616).

Previously we described the implementation details without explaining the purpose.

Revision 3e12fcef - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Improve phrasing and Markdown formatting (refs: #12616).

Revision 8c9fb392 - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Use consistent tenses (refs: #12616).

Revision aabc31e6 - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Be more direct (refs: #12616).

Revision 3581453e - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Add TOC (refs: #12616).

Revision bbabc91c - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Fix wrong filesystem name (refs: #12616).

Revision 85e83f76 - 10/20/2017 08:32 AM - intrigeri
Fix typo and grammar mistake (refs: #12616).

Revision a7b83e8b - 10/20/2017 09:23 AM - bertagaz
Reimport removed necessary parts to keep in the blueprint.
Refs: #12616

I've pushed two commits referencing this ticket that move some of the content from the blueprint to two different pages: contribute/build/vagrant for the generic parts, and contribute/working_together/roles/sysadmins/automated_builds_in_jenkins for what is specific to the deployment of Vagrant in Jenkins. How does it sound?

History

#1 - 09/28/2017 06:29 PM - anonym
- Target version changed from Tails_3.2 to Tails_3.3

#2 - 10/17/2017 01:47 PM - bertagaz
- Status changed from Confirmed to In Progress
- Assignee changed from bertagaz to intrigeri
- % Done changed from 0 to 50
- QA Check set to Ready for QA

#3 - 10/18/2017 09:31 AM - intrigeri
Hi,

contribute/build/vagrant for the generic parts

I think you mean contribute/build/vagrant-setup.

There's a broken link on the first line of contribute/working_together/roles/sysadmins/automated_builds_in_jenkins. Again, please build & check the output locally before submitting for QA.

Taking a step back, it's not obvious what "clean obsolete baseboxes" means. I suggest s/clean/delete/.

s/one copy of a basebox/one copy of a given basebox/ to remove some ambiguity.

"and would result in failures of subsequent builds" does not work grammatically speaking. I suggest making the subject of the verb explicit (and thus correct).

I don't think "mountpoints" are a problem, but mounted filesystems are.

"For simplicity and security reasons, we are using nested virtualization": I don't think we have a strong case for simplicity here; I can see how one could argue this way, but it's not obvious and not spelled out in the doc, so I suggest dropping the "simplicity" part.

"In our Jenkins setup we instead use" builds an opposition between something undefined and our Jenkins setup. Either specify what is that undefined other thing, or drop the comparison. Also, please point to the place where "use an existing, external apt-cacher-ng" is implemented for Jenkins builds. Finally, I don't get how #11979 has anything to do with the Jenkins setup.

In various places you mention using this or that Rake target; good. But I think this should link to the actual pieces of https://git-tails.immerda.ch/jenkins-jobs/ (or whatever relevant repo) where things are actually set up as described.

Dropping stuff from the "How we will make it happen" section of wiki/src/blueprint/reproducible_builds.mdwn has two problems:

1. this text was our proposal for MOSS and I think it should remain there;
2. you dropped "First of all" and left "Secondly", which doesn't work.

I could not find any place where we link to contribute/working_together/roles/sysadmins/automated_builds_in_jenkins so right now it's not discoverable on our website (== well-hidden except for people who'll find it by change in Git). Please take the PoV of the target audience (i.e. user-centric approach) when self-evaluating your work before sending for QA.

Is "The Vagrantfile shares the local clone of the Tails repository inside the basebox" correct? Or is this sharing only happening when we actually start a VM based on a build basebox? (I'm not 100% clear with the Vagrant terminology myself, sorry.)
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There's a broken link on the first line of contribute/working_together/roles/sysadmins/automated_builds_in_jenkins. Again, please build & check the output locally before submitting for QA.

Taking a step back, it's not obvious what "clean obsolete baseboxes" means. I suggest s/clean/delete/.

s/one copy of a basebox/one copy of a given basebox/ to remove some ambiguity.

"and would result in failures of subsequent builds" does not work grammatically speaking. I suggest making the subject of the verb explicit (and thus correct).

I don't think "mountpoints" are a problem, but mounted filesystems are.

"For simplicity and security reasons, we are using nested virtualization": I don't think we have a strong case for simplicity here; I can see how one could argue this way, but it's not obvious and not spelled out in the doc, so I suggest dropping the "simplicity" part.

"In our Jenkins setup we instead use" builds an opposition between something undefined and our Jenkins setup. Either specify what is that undefined other thing, or drop the comparison. Also, please point to the place where "use an existing, external apt-cacher-ng" is implemented for Jenkins builds. Finally, I don't get how #11979 has anything to do with the Jenkins setup.

In various places you mention using this or that Rake target; good. But I think this should link to the actual pieces of https://git-tails.immerda.ch/jenkins-jobs/ (or whatever relevant repo) where things are actually set up as described.

Dropping stuff from the "How we will make it happen" section of wiki/src/blueprint/reproducible_builds.mdwn has two problems:

1. this text was our proposal for MOSS and I think it should remain there;
2. you dropped "First of all" and left "Secondly", which doesn't work.

I could not find any place where we link to contribute/working_together/roles/sysadmins/automated_builds_in_jenkins so right now it's not discoverable on our website (== well-hidden except for people who'll find it by change in Git). Please take the PoV of the target audience (i.e. user-centric approach) when self-evaluating your work before sending for QA.

Is "The Vagrantfile shares the local clone of the Tails repository inside the basebox" correct? Or is this sharing only happening when we actually start a VM based on a build basebox? (I'm not 100% clear with the Vagrant terminology myself, sorry.)

#7 - 10/19/2017 04:48 PM - bertagaz

intrigeri wrote:

1. this text was our proposal for MOSS and I think it should remain there;
2. you dropped "First of all" and left "Secondly", which doesn't work.

Sorry, forgot this one. What about f0c9e18ba87b243644fe0a2afa0cd0a575a558bb ?

#8 - 10/20/2017 08:38 AM - intrigeri

- Assignee changed from intrigeri to bertagaz
- % Done changed from 60 to 80
- QA Check changed from Ready for QA to Dev Needed
Thanks for fixing all these problems! I've pushed a bunch of other fixes and improvements => please review.

bertagaz wrote:

intrigeri wrote:

1. this text was our proposal for MOSS and I think it should remain there;
2. you dropped "First of all" and left "Secondly", which doesn't work.

Sorry, forgot this one. What about fc94ebba87b438641fe0a2afa0cd6a575e5538bb ?

That commit goes a bit further in treating our proposal as a working document that we can update incrementally. This could have been an option, but we didn't do that so far, and doing it for one part of the implementation and not for the other bits is confusing. So I'd rather not do that at all => please revert our proposal to its original state. It's fine if some text is duplicated between our original proposal and the final design doc. For extra clarify, again this comment of mine is only about the "How we will make it happen" section (some bit further down on the blueprint were WIP design documentation and it's great that you moved it to a better place :)

#9 - 10/20/2017 09:25 AM - bertagaz
- Assignee changed from bertagaz to intrigeri
- QA Check changed from Dev Needed to Ready for QA

intrigeri wrote:

Thanks for fixing all these problems! I've pushed a bunch of other fixes and improvements => please review.

fine with me.

bertagaz wrote:

Sorry, forgot this one. What about fc94ebba87b438641fe0a2afa0cd6a575e5538bb ?

That commit goes a bit further in treating our proposal as a working document that we can update incrementally. This could have been an option, but we didn't do that so far, and doing it for one part of the implementation and not for the other bits is confusing. So I'd rather not do that at all => please revert our proposal to its original state. It's fine if some text is duplicated between our original proposal and the final design doc. For extra clarify, again this comment of mine is only about the "How we will make it happen" section (some bit further down on the blueprint were WIP design documentation and it's great that you moved it to a better place :)}
#10 - 10/20/2017 09:44 AM - intrigeri

- Status changed from In Progress to Resolved
- Assignee deleted (intrigeri)
- % Done changed from 80 to 100
- QA Check changed from Ready for QA to Pass

LGTM, thanks!