

The OpenOffice.org Roadmap

Thoughts on

“Release Early and Often”

versus

“It's Done When It's Done”



Agenda

- About speaker and session
- History of releases and features
- Current status of milestone releases
- Lessons learned so far
- Stakeholders
- Q & A



About...

- Matthias Huetsch, v2.0
 - *Sun Microsystems, Inc.*
 - [<matthias.huetsch@sun.com>](mailto:matthias.huetsch@sun.com)
 - *StarOffice Architect*
 - ...
 - *OpenOffice.org*
 - [<mhu@openoffice.org>](mailto:mhu@openoffice.org)
 - *Universal Content Broker (UCB) Project lead*
 - *Community Council member*
- Matthias Huetsch, v1.0
 - *In a recent millennium*
 - *Ph.D. in Physics*



About...

- Open Source Software development principles
- “Release Early and Often”
 - *Release what you have: The “feedback” principle*
- “It's Done When It's Done”
 - *Release when it works: The “quality” principle*
- Questions:
 - *Do OOo releases follow any of these principles?*
 - *Are these principles mutually exclusive, or can they co-exist?*
 - *Can these principles help defining a roadmap for future OOo releases?*



History: Releases

- <http://development.openoffice.org/releases/>
- OOo project established [10/00]
- OOo 1.0 [05/02]
 - *Beta and Update Releases with Release Candidates*
 - 1.0.1 [07/02], 1.0.2 [01/03], 1.0.3 [04/03]
 - => *The “quality” principle*
- OOo 1.1 [10/03]
 - *Beta and Update Releases with Release Candidates*
 - 1.1.1 [03/04], 1.1.2 [06/04], 1.1.3 [<autumn>/04]
 - => *The “quality” principle*
- OOo 2.0 [<spring>/05]
 - *Milestone Releases*



History: Features

- Overlapping development and release cycles
 - *OOo 1.0.x releases – OOo 1.1 development*
 - *OOo 1.1.x releases – OOo 2.0 development*
 - *=> but: long feature release cycle*
- Continuous feature increments
 - *OOo 1.0: Globalization (CJK), API (UNO), XML*
 - *OOo 1.1: Globalization (CTL), Accessibility, PDF*
 - *OOo 2.0: MS Interoperability, Ease of Use*
 - *=> but: large feature increments*



Current Status: Milestones

- Development and delivery method
 - *Child Workspaces (CWS) and Master Workspaces (MWS)*
- Updates of “Current Release”
 - *Quarterly CWS [fixes] integration into MWS*
 - *Released when it's done*
 - *Via release candidates (RC)*
 - *=> The “quality” principle*
- Milestones of “Next Release”
 - *Weekly CWS [features] integration into MWS*
 - *Released early and often*
 - *Bi-weekly, since 21/10/03, public OOo audience*
 - *Monthly, since April/04, “Sun-on-Sun” audience*
 - *=> The “feedback” principle*



Current Status: Feedback

- Public OOo audience
 - *Bug reports and comments*
 - *Mailing lists: comments on “what's new”*
 - *Number of downloads \geq OOo 1.1*
- “Sun-on-Sun” audience
 - *Feedback and issue forms*
 - *Mailing lists*
- Milestones, Updates
 - *Error [crash] reports*
 - *Classical bug reports*



Lessons Learned: Challenges

- Highly parallel Child Workspaces
 - *Organization*
 - *Planning ahead*
- Multiple Master Workspaces
 - *Current Release: Updates*
 - *Next Release: Milestones*
- Questions:
 - *Can this be combined into “feature update” releases?*
 - *What would be the “best” feature update release cycle?*



Lessons Learned: Limitations

- Feedback cycles [milestones]
 - *User acceptance: <TBD>*
- Release cycles [product]
 - *User expectation: 12 – 24 months*
- Feature increments [product]
 - *User expectation: Compelling upgrade story*
- Questions:
 - *Is this past experience still true?*
 - *Does it apply to all stakeholder groups?*



Stakeholders

- Consumers
 - *Users at home, in education, enterprises, governments*
- Integrators
 - *SI, ISV business models*
 - *Targeting their customers*
- Distributors
 - *OEM, VAR business models*
 - *Targeting their customers*
- Developers
 - *Individuals, organizations*



Q & A

- Question:
 - *Would a GNOME style “feature update” release cycle of 6 months fit the needs of all stakeholders?*
 - Answers:
 - ?
- 
- 