



Test case dependencies on immutable roots

1 Contents

2	Test case dependencies on immutable rootfs	2
3	Overview	2
4	Possible solutions	2
5	Overview of applicable approach	2
6	Rework tests to ship their dependencies in ‘/var/lib/tests’	2
7	OSTree branch or static deltas usage	3
8	OSTree overlay	4
9	Overall proposal	4
10	Create separate git repository for each test	5
11	Reduce dependencies	5
12	Make test relocatable	5

13 Test case dependencies on immutable rootfs

14 Overview

15 Immutable root filesystems have several security and maintainability advantages, and avoiding changes to them increases the value of testing as the system under test would closely match the production setup.

18 This is fundamental for setups that don’t have the ability to install packages at runtime, like OSTree-based deployments, but it’s largely beneficial for package based setups as well.

21 To achieve that, tests should then ship their own dependencies in a self-contained way and not rely on package installation at runtime.

23 Possible solutions

24 For adding binaries into OSTree-based system, the following approaches are possible:

- 26 • Build the tests separately on Jenkins and have them run from
27 /var/lib/tests;
- 28 • Create a Jenkins job to extract tests from their .deb packages shipped on
29 OBS and to publish the results, so they can be run from /var/lib/tests;
- 30 • Use layered filesystem for binaries install on top of testing image;
- 31 • Publish a separate OSTree branch for tests created at build time from the
32 same OS pack as image to test;
- 33 • Produce OSTree static deltas at build time from the same OS pack as
34 image to test with additional packages/binaries installed;
- 35 • Create mechanism for `dpkg` similar to RPM-OSTree project* to allow
36 installation of additional packages in the same manner as we have for now.

37 – Creation of `dpkg-ostree` project will use a lot of time and human
38 resources due to changes in `dpkg` and `apt` system utilities.

39 **Overview of applicable approach**

40 **Rework tests to ship their dependencies in ‘`/var/lib/tests`’**

41 Build the tests separately and have them run from `/var/lib/tests` or create a
42 Jenkins job to extract tests from their `.deb` packages to `/var/lib/tests`

43 **Pros:**

- 44 • ‘clean’ testing environment – the image is not polluted by additions, so
- 45 tests and dependencies have no influence on SW installed on image
- 46 • possibility to install additional packages/binaries in runtime

47 **Cons:**

- 48 • some binaries/scripts expect to find the dependencies in standard places
- 49 – additional changes are needed to create the directory with relocated test
- 50 tools installed
- 51 • we need to be sure if SW from packages works well from relocated directory
- 52 • additional efforts are needed to maintain 2 versions of some packages
- 53 and/or packaging for some binaries/libraries might be tricky
- 54 • can’t install additional packages without some preparations in a build time
- 55 (save `dpkg/apt`-related infrastructure or create a tarball from pre-installed
- 56 SW)
- 57 • possible versions mismatch between SW installed into testing image and
- 58 SW from tests directory
- 59 • problems in dependencies installation are detected only in runtime

60 **OSTree branch or static deltas usage**

61 Both approaches are based on native OSTree upgrade/rollback mechanism – only
62 transport differs.

63 **Pros:**

- 64 • test of OSTree upgrade mechanism is integrated
- 65 • easy to create and maintain branches for different groups of tests – so only
- 66 SW needed for the group is installed during the tests
- 67 • developer can obtain the same environment as used in LAVA in a few
- 68 `ostree` commands
- 69 • problems with installation of dependencies for the test are detected in a
- 70 buildtime
- 71 • the original image do not need to have `wget`, `curl` or any other tool for
- 72 download – `ostree` tool have own mechanism for download needed commit
- 73 from test branches

- 74 • with OSTree static deltas we are able to test ‘offline’ upgrades without
75 network access
76 • saves a lot of disk space for infrastructure due OSTree repository usage

77 **Cons:**

- 78 • ‘dirty’ testing environment – the list of packages is not the same as we
79 have in testing image; e.g. system places for binaries and libraries are used
80 by additional packages installed, as well as changes in system configura-
81 tion might occur (the same behavior we have in current test system with
82 installation of additional packages via `apt`)
83 • not possible to install additional packages at runtime
84 • additional branch(es) should be created at build time
85 • reboot is needed to apply the test environment
86 • in case of OSTree static deltas – creation of delta is an expensive operation
87 in terms of time and resources usage

88 **OSTree overlay**

89 Overlay is a native option provided by `ostree` project, re-mounting “/usr” direc-
90 tory in R/W mode on top of ‘overlays’. This allows to add any software into
91 “/usr” but changes will disappear just after reboot.

92 **Pros:**

- 93 • limited possibility to install additional packages at runtime (with saved
94 state of `dpkg` and `apt`) – merged “/usr” is desirable
95 • possibility to copy/unpack prepared binaries directly to “/usr” directory
96 • able to use OSTree pull/checkout mechanism to apply overlay

97 **Cons:**

- 98 • dirty testing environment – the list of packages is not the same as we have
99 in testing image
100 • OSTree branch should contain only “/usr” if used. In other case need to
101 use foreign for OSTree methods to store binaries and/or filesystem tree
102 • can’t apply additional software without some preparations in a build time
103 (save `dpkg/apt`-related infrastructure, create a tarball from pre-installed
104 SW or create an `ostree` branch)
105 • possible versions mismatch between SW installed into testing image and
106 SW from tests directory
107 • problems in dependencies installation are detected only in runtime

108 **Overall proposal**

109 The proposal consist of a transition from a full `apt` based test mechanism to a
110 more independant test mechanism.

111 Each tests will be pulled of `apertis-tests` and moved to its own git repository.
112 During the move, the test will be made relocatable, and its dependencies will
113 be reduced.

114 Dependencies that could not be removed would be added to the test itself.

115 At any time, it would still be possible to run the old tests on the non OSTree
116 platform. The new test that have already be transitionned could run on both
117 OSTree and apt platforms.

118 The following steps are envisioned.

119 **Create separate git repository for each test**

120 In order to run the tests on LAVA, the use of git is recommended. LAVA
121 is already able to pull test definitions from git, but it can pull only one git
122 repository for each test.

123 To satisfy this constraint, each test definition, scripts, and dependencies must
124 be grouped in a single git repository.

125 In order to run the tests manually, GitLab is able to dynamically build a tarball
126 with the content of a git repository at any time. The tarball can be retrieved
127 at a specific URL. By specifying a branch other than master, a release-specific
128 test can be generated. A tool such as `wget` or `curl` can be used, or it might be
129 necessary to download the test tarball from a host, and copy it to the device
130 under test using `scp`.

131 **Reduce dependencies**

132 To minimize impact of the tests dependencies on the target environment,
133 some dependencies need to be dropped. For example, Python requires several
134 megabytes of binaries and dependencies itself, so all the Python scripts will
135 need to be rewritten using Posix shell scripts or compiled binaries.

136 For tests using data files, the data should be integrated in the git repository.

137 **Make test relocatable**

138 Most of the tests rely on static path to find binaries. It is straightforward to
139 modify a test to use a custom `PATH` instead of static one. This custom `PATH` would
140 point to a subdirectory in the test repository itself.

141 This applies to dependencies which could be relocated, such as statically linked
142 binaries, scripts, and media files.

143 For the test components that might not be ported easily, such as For example
144 AppArmor profiles that are designed to work on binaries at fixed locations, a
145 case-by-case approach needs to be taken.