

User Interface - Bug #2909

Bug # 2677 (New): fix drawing and functional differences between P2J GUI and 4GL GUI

Fix key navigation for popup_ext.p

12/03/2015 12:34 PM - Vadim Gindin

Status:	Closed	Start date:	12/03/2015
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	Vadim Gindin	% Done:	100%
Category:		Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	GUI Support for a Complex ADM2 App	case_num:	
billable:	No		
vendor_id:	GCD		
Description			

History

#1 - 12/03/2015 12:42 PM - Vadim Gindin

1. Check if key navigation works even mouse pointer is not over the opened pop-up menu: somewhere else even outside of the window.
2. After pop-up menu is opened and I press down-arrow: the first item should be selected, not the second one.
3. When nested sub-menu is opened: all nested sub-menus become opened too.
4. Sometimes 2 items in one sub-menu becomes displayed highlighted.
5. disabled items are navigable by mouse and keyboard.

#2 - 12/03/2015 12:43 PM - Vadim Gindin

Described behaviour makes sense for GUI.

#3 - 12/04/2015 07:09 AM - Vadim Gindin

Disabled menu items are navigable.. It contravenes with the our approach, that only enabled isEnabled()==true widgets can process events.

#4 - 12/04/2015 02:27 PM - Vadim Gindin

Would it be correct to change our approach (replace isEnabled() with something other in ThinClient) or I should find some other approach..

#5 - 12/04/2015 02:29 PM - Greg Shah

Can you point out the menu/sub-menu code which you are proposing to change?

Constantin: please review this task.

#6 - 12/04/2015 02:45 PM - Vadim Gindin

Greg Shah wrote:

Can you point out the menu/sub-menu code which you are proposing to change?

At this moment I don't have working change. I'm only debugging. It's not so simple, so I proposed that this change could be not acceptable and I can spend some time in vain working on this.

#7 - 12/04/2015 02:59 PM - Greg Shah

It's not so simple, so I proposed that this change could be not acceptable and I can spend some time in vain working on this.

I understand. However, it is difficult to give you feedback without seeing the code that has to be changed. Once you find that code, mention it here. It will also give you a better idea of how reasonable it is to change.

#8 - 12/04/2015 03:13 PM - Vadim Gindin

- File *ThinClient.diff* added

Have a look at ThinClient diff. It's a draft.

#9 - 12/04/2015 04:31 PM - Greg Shah

It is hard to tell if such a change would be OK in those locations. It is possible. However, since the default version (in `AbstractWidget.focusTraversable()`) has this:

```
public boolean focusTraversable()
{
    return (enabled && visible && !hidden);
}
```

This is more restrictive than just checking `isEnabled()`. It MAY be OK, if in all these locations the `focusTraversable()` always returns the same thing as `isEnabled()`. I just don't know if that is the case.

Even if this was OK, you would have to change `focusTraversable()` for menu/sub-menu because they are currently like this (from `SubMenu.java`):

```
public boolean focusTraversable()
{
    // The same as AbstractWidget.focusTraversable().
    // children focusability doesn't affect sub-menu focusability.
    return isVisible() && isEnabled() && !hidden();
}
```

Changing that code could have unintended consequences elsewhere.

#10 - 12/17/2015 03:32 PM - Vadim Gindin

- File keynav.diff added

I didn't understand why I should change `SubMenu.focusTraversable()` (See previous note)?

I've fixed key navigation. Here is attached diff. I created 2909a branch, but I didn't committed changes there yet. Should I do that? Please review.

#11 - 12/22/2015 07:47 AM - Constantin Asofiei

Vadim, about the keynav.diff:

1. disabled menus can be selected via mouse or navigated via keys; in this case, `focusTraversable` for MENU should not check for ENABLED - only for VISIBLE and NOT HIDDEN. So you need to override `focusTraversable()` in MENU to fix this case.
2. please check all overrides of `focusTraversable()` for cases which do not return `enabled && visible && !hidden`. I ask this because replacing code like `!isEnabled()` with `!focusTraversable()` is OK, if the widget's `focusTraversable()` already checks for ENABLE. But code like `isEnabled()` replaced with `focusTraversable()` might be problematic: can FOCUS be set to a not-visible widget? Please try to find if this is possible or not.
3. same for code in FocusManager which replaces `isEnabled()` with `isFocusable()` - I don't think the replacement code is compatible with the existing logic. In P2J, `AbstractWidget.isFocusable()` impl just returns true, and other widgets override it to just return false. So is not OK, as `isEnabled()` is a widget state which is not static.

#12 - 12/23/2015 07:15 AM - Vadim Gindin

- File 1223.diff added

Constantin Asofiei wrote:

Vadim, about the keynav.diff:

1. disabled menus can be selected via mouse or navigated via keys; in this case, `focusTraversable` for MENU should not check for ENABLED - only for VISIBLE and NOT HIDDEN. So you need to override `focusTraversable()` in MENU to fix this case.

If you mean `MenuGuiImpl` I don't see necessity of that, because this widget itself can't have focus - only it's child.

If you mean a possibility to navigate through disabled items: thank you I've fixed it.

1. please check all overrides of `focusTraversable()` for cases which do not return `enabled && visible && !hidden`. I ask this because replacing code like `!isEnabled()` with `!focusTraversable()` is OK, if the widget's `focusTraversable()` already checks for ENABLE. But code like `isEnabled()` replaced with `focusTraversable()` might be problematic: can FOCUS be set to a not-visible widget? Please try to find if this is possible or not.

I've tried to check that using FOCUS handle and I didn't find such possibility. Whenever a widget becomes hidden it loses a focus immediately: next enabled widget gains a focus. I've tried to hide focused widget with a trigger or right before WAIT-FOR statement. Is that check sufficient or there is some other way to check that?

1. same for code in FocusManager which replaces `isEnabled()` with `isFocusable()` - I don't think the replacement code is compatible with the existing logic. In P2J, `AbstractWidget.isFocusable()` impl just returns true, and other widgets override it to just return false. So is not OK, as `isEnabled()` is a widget state which is not static.

I've replace `isFocusable` call with `focusTraversable()`.

Have a look at the last diff? Can I commit the changes as usual?

#13 - 01/06/2016 02:21 PM - Constantin Asofiei

Vadim Gindin wrote:

1. please check all overrides of `focusTraversable()` for cases which do not return `enabled && visible && !hidden`. I ask this because replacing code like `!isEnabled()` with `!focusTraversable()` is OK, if the widget's `focusTraversable()` already checks for `ENABLE`. But code like `isEnabled()` replaced with `focusTraversable()` might be problematic: can `FOCUS` be set to a not-visible widget? Please try to find if this is possible or not.

I've tried to check that using `FOCUS` handle and I didn't find such possibility. Whenever a widget becomes hidden it loses a focus immediately: next enabled widget gains a focus. I've tried to hide focused widget with a trigger or right before `WAIT-FOR` statement. Is that check sufficient or there is some other way to check that?

What concerns me is the `FocusManager.FOCUS_HIDDEN` state. I don't recall the exact case, but from how this state is used, I think it is possible to end up with a not-visible focused widget (or initial focus attempt, at least). More, this code in `TC:15468`:

```
if (cur != null && !cur.isEnabled())
```

checks only widget's enabled state, and not visible... and a `focusTraversable` will return false if the widget is `ENABLED` and `NOT VISIBLE`. This applies for all cases where previously `isEnabled()` is checked, was replaced with `focusTraversable()`, but there is no check for `isVisible()` in the same logical expression where `isEnabled()` used to be. Where both `isEnabled()` and `isVisible()` were checked like `!isEnabled() || !isVisible()` or `isEnabled() && isVisible()`, is OK to replace `isEnabled()` with `focusTraversable()`, as, considering the `(enabled && visible && !hidden)`:

- `focusTraversable() && isVisible()` expands to `enabled && visible && !hidden && visible`, which is equivalent with `isEnabled() && isVisible()`
- `!focusTraversable() || !isVisible()` expands to `!(enabled && visible && !hidden) || !visible`, which is equivalent with `!enabled || !visible || hidden || !visible`

But replacing a singular `isEnabled()` with `focusTraversable()` adds visibility check in the game, and the result is no longer equivalent.

Have a look at the last diff? Can I commit the changes as usual?

Yes, do add them to 2909a (also). I would suggest running a MAJIC runtime testing with this rev, to see if anything fails related to the `focusTraversable()` changes.

#14 - 01/08/2016 12:31 PM - Vadim Gindin

I've committed current changes and merged branch 2909a with trunk. Current rev #10963.

#15 - 01/08/2016 12:32 PM - Vadim Gindin

So what about runtime testing? Can I run it?

#16 - 01/08/2016 01:29 PM - Greg Shah

Vadim: as Constantin wrote in note 13, you can try running MAJIC regression testing on this branch. Please report the results here.

#17 - 01/10/2016 11:41 AM - Vadim Gindin

Runtime regression has failed. No results folder were created. Here is the log:

```
..
[exec] Result = STATUS_STOPPED
[exec]   remove_jar
[exec] -----
[exec]
[exec] (1 row)
[exec]
[exec]   install_jar
[exec] -----
[exec]
[exec] (1 row)
[exec]
[exec]   set_classpath
[exec] -----
[exec]
[exec] (1 row)
[exec]
[exec] ANALYZE
[exec] ** <confidential information redacted>
[exec] ** Starting GSO server...
[exec] ** Starting RFQ server...
[exec] ** Waiting for servers to start (60 seconds max)...
[exec] ..checking 1 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 2 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 3 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 4 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 5 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 6 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 7 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 8 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 9 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 10 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 11 out of 12
[exec] ..checking 12 out of 12
[exec] GSO server could not be started!
```

BUILD FAILED

/opt/secure/clients/timco/testing/build_rt.xml:473: exec returned: 1

Only rfq_server.log contains an exception:

```
..
dencode.p2j.persist.id.SequenceIdentityManager]
[01/10/2016 10:55:34 EST] (com.goldencode.p2j.persist.TempTableConnectionProvider:INFO) Temp table connection
provider configured; backed by com.goldencode.p2j.persist.UnpooledConnectionProvider
[01/10/2016 10:55:37 EST] (TemporaryAccountPool:WARNING) {00000000:00000001:rfq} Admin privileges are mandator
y to create temporary account pool.
[01/10/2016 10:55:44 EST] (SessionManager.listen():WARNING) {00000000:00000001:rfq} INSECURE sockets in use!
[01/10/2016 10:55:44 EST] (SessionManager.listen():INFO) {00000000:00000001:rfq} Server ready
[01/10/2016 10:55:52 EST] (LogicalTerminal:WARNING) No client parameters are set: calling the client-side to d
etermine the driver type is expensive!
[01/10/2016 10:55:52 EST] (com.goldencode.p2j.net.Protocol:WARNING) stopQueue
com.goldencode.p2j.net.SilentUnwindException: Connection ended abnormally
    at com.goldencode.p2j.net.RemoteObject$RemoteAccess.invokeCore(RemoteObject.java:1420)
    at com.goldencode.p2j.net.InvocationStub.invoke(InvocationStub.java:97)
```

```
at com.sun.proxy.$Proxy13.isChui (Unknown Source)
at com.goldencode.p2j.ui.LogicalTerminal.isChui (LogicalTerminal.java:8107)
at com.goldencode.p2j.ui.LogicalTerminal.init (LogicalTerminal.java:962)
at com.goldencode.p2j.security.ContextLocal.initializeValue (ContextLocal.java:578)
at com.goldencode.p2j.security.ContextLocal.get (ContextLocal.java:418)
at com.goldencode.p2j.security.ContextLocal.get (ContextLocal.java:373)
at com.goldencode.p2j.ui.LogicalTerminal.locate (LogicalTerminal.java:10073)
at com.goldencode.p2j.ui.LogicalTerminal.access$400 (LogicalTerminal.java:727)
at com.goldencode.p2j.ui.LogicalTerminal$3.createScopeable (LogicalTerminal.java:11034)
at com.goldencode.p2j.util.TransactionManager$ContextContainer.obtain (TransactionManager.java:5794)
at com.goldencode.p2j.util.TransactionManager.abortProcessing (TransactionManager.java:3754)
at com.goldencode.p2j.net.SessionManager.endSession (SessionManager.java:1120)
at com.goldencode.p2j.net.SessionManager.queueStopped (SessionManager.java:1587)
at com.goldencode.p2j.net.Queue.stop (Queue.java:410)
at com.goldencode.p2j.net.Protocol.stopQueue (Protocol.java:334)
at com.goldencode.p2j.net.Protocol.access$600 (Protocol.java:106)
at com.goldencode.p2j.net.Protocol$Reader.run (Protocol.java:439)
at java.lang.Thread.run (Thread.java:745)
```

Why it can happen?

LE: GES has removed from confidential information from this entry.

#18 - 01/11/2016 10:49 AM - Greg Shah

Sometimes the GSO server startup can time out. Did you try starting it again?

#19 - 01/11/2016 11:53 AM - Vadim Gindin

Greg Shah wrote:

Sometimes the GSO server startup can time out. Did you try starting it again?

I've tried to start it about a half hour ago - and I've got the same error.

#20 - 01/11/2016 12:27 PM - Greg Shah

Try it again. If it still fails, dig into the logs and determine the problem.

#21 - 01/11/2016 04:30 PM - Vadim Gindin

The third run was successful. Servers are started. I'll post results later.

#22 - 01/12/2016 02:38 PM - Vadim Gindin

Runtime regression testing is still running. Probably it hang up..

#23 - 01/12/2016 05:13 PM - Greg Shah

Wait for it to complete and then look at the results. Most likely things are badly broken because of the changes in your branch. As noted above, Constantin and I both thought your changes were dangerous. When things are badly broken, the testing takes a very long time because every test that fails must wait 10 minutes to timeout.

#24 - 01/14/2016 09:35 AM - Vadim Gindin

Greg Shah wrote:

Wait for it to complete and then look at the results. Most likely things are badly broken because of the changes in your branch. As noted above, Constantin and I both thought your changes were dangerous. When things are badly broken, the testing takes a very long time because every test that fails must wait 10 minutes to timeout.

It is still working.. How long it could be in a worst case?

#25 - 01/14/2016 09:38 AM - Constantin Asofiei

Vadim Gindin wrote:

Greg Shah wrote:

Wait for it to complete and then look at the results. Most likely things are badly broken because of the changes in your branch. As noted above, Constantin and I both thought your changes were dangerous. When things are badly broken, the testing takes a very long time because every test that fails must wait 10 minutes to timeout.

It is still working.. How long it could be in a worst case?

Did CTRL-C finish? I think you can assume the servers are either deadlocked or frozen. Please check a jstack log to see which tests are executing (if any) and for any deadlocks.

Also, try connecting manually with a client to your devsrv01 server - does it work? If so, try executing a few random scenarios (look in the generated logs from a previous good run).

#26 - 01/14/2016 02:56 PM - Vadim Gindin

- File *gso_stack.txt* added

CTRL-C tests are not finished. Here is jstack log for GSO server.

#27 - 01/14/2016 02:59 PM - Constantin Asofiei

Vadim Gindin wrote:

CTRL-C tests are not finished. Here is jstack log for GSO server.

OK, I think this means the harness has reached a deadlock. Please do this: start a client manually and execute the first steps in a CTRL-C test (i.e. from main-menu, V, C select RFQ, ENTER) see if screens are the same.

There should be a failure in the steps somewhere.

#28 - 01/14/2016 03:49 PM - Vadim Gindin

Constantin Asofiei wrote:

Vadim Gindin wrote:

CTRL-C tests are not finished. Here is jstack log for GSO server.

OK, I think this means the harness has reached a deadlock. Please do this: start a client manually and execute the first steps in a CTRL-C test (i.e. from main-menu, V, C select RFQ, ENTER) see if screens are the same.

There should be a failure in the steps somewhere.

I've executed proposed steps without errors.

#29 - 01/14/2016 04:14 PM - Constantin Asofiei

Vadim Gindin wrote:

I've executed proposed steps without errors.

Please re-start CTRL-C testing, maybe it was some load-issue on devsrv01...

#30 - 01/15/2016 02:15 AM - Vadim Gindin

- File testing_log added

Constantin Asofiei wrote:

Please re-start CTRL-C testing, maybe it was some load-issue on devsrv01...

Item seems, that was a real reason. Thank you! Btw, how did you see in the jstack log, that exactly harness is locked? I'm just interesting.

I restarted regression testing yesterday. It finished after 3 hours with the following failing tests (see also attached log):

```
gso_tests. 9 failed. 233, 214, 265, 279, 337, 358, 395, 480, logout_from_main menu
navigation. 5 failed. All
tc_tests. 36 failed (dependancy 33).
  tc_so_header_011,
    item_master_002, 024, 026 - 031, 033 - 041, 052, 057, 071, 085,
    item_stock_room_04,
    po_005,
    po_header_002, 005, 008, 009, 017,
    codes_employees_024,
    job_002,
    item_master_025,
    po_006,
    po_item_002, 003,
    gl_util_001
```

#31 - 01/15/2016 02:32 AM - Constantin Asofiei

Vadim Gindin wrote:

Constantin Asofiei wrote:

Please re-start CTRL-C testing, maybe it was some load-issue on devsrv01...

Item seems, that was a real reason. Thank you! Btw, how did you see in the jstack log, that exactly harness is locked? I'm just interesting.

It's a matter of exclusion, if P2J server is OK, then something must have happened with the harness.

I restarted regression testing yesterday. It finished after 3 hours with the following failing tests (see also attached log):

I think these are real issues. Please manually check the failed tests to find why they fail.

#32 - 01/15/2016 05:33 AM - Vadim Gindin

I'm looking at gso_233. The fail happen when I press "Page Down" in "System Code Browser". There is a paged files list and paging does not work: no effect of the "PgDwn" press. I've searched the string "System Code Browser" in the MAJIC sources and found src/syman/util/b-syst.p, that includes tools/stebrows.i containing description of DOWN-frame. Therefore I suppose that my changes could fail on all down-frames and I'm going to check that. Have I correctly reasoned?

#33 - 01/15/2016 05:37 AM - Constantin Asofiei

Vadim Gindin wrote:

I'm looking at gso_233. The fail happen when I press "Page Down" in "System Code Browser". There is a paged files list and paging does not work: no effect of the "PgDwn" press. I've searched the string "System Code Browser" in the MAJIC sources and found src/syman/util/b-syst.p, that includes tools/stebrows.i containing description of DOWN-frame. Therefore I suppose that my changes could fail on all down-frames and I'm going to check that. Have I correctly reasoned?

Yes, your reasoning is OK. You can look into the b-syst.p.cache file to see how the preprocessed 4GL program looks like. Also, beside writing a standalone test which duplicates the behaviour, you can debug the P2J client connected to MAJIC.

#34 - 01/15/2016 07:37 AM - Greg Shah

Vadim: as mentioned in our prior discussions, your changes were expected (by Constantin and myself) to be very dangerous. I really doubt there is simple fix that will resolve all the regressions.

This work has already gone on a very long time. My idea with having you run testing was to see how close you are to a solution that we can accept. I

think the result of the testing shows that the current proposed solution is not acceptable.

Instead of spending a lot of time on fixing regressions, please look to take a different (and much safer) approach to the original problem of this task.

#35 - 01/24/2016 04:53 AM - Vadim Gindin

I've made new solution. See branch 2909b. I've added new method navigable() to Widget that saves old implementation, and I override it for menu widgets to replace enabled() with focusTraversable(). I've ran regression testing. Here is the list of failed tests:

gso_tests: gso_375, gso_430, tc_codes_employees_024, tc_job_002, tc_po_item_003

I'm working on fixing regressions.

#36 - 01/24/2016 06:12 AM - Greg Shah

tc_job_002, tc_po_item_003

These are known issues, not your regressions.

gso_375, gso_430, tc_codes_employees_024

This may be real issues, but you should re-run testing (or manually check these tests).

#37 - 01/24/2016 07:08 AM - Vadim Gindin

I've manually checked these tests using run_single.sh script and manually running the client. Here are the results: gso_375 and tc_codes_employees_024 are passed, but gso_430 failed to run with the following log:

```
vig@devsrv01:~/testing/majic_baseline$ ./run_single.sh
Cannot load file (bad content).
No such mutex name job_transaction.

-----Automated TTY Test Harness-----

Syntax:

java com.goldencode.harness.Harness [options] <test_plan_filename>

Options:

-?                = display this help screen
-b <path_list>    = specify a default set of baseline search
                  paths; <path_list> is a list of one or more
                  paths separated by the platform specific
```

What does it mean?

Manual client testing gave the following result:

Manually and automatically :

```
01/22/2016          TIME & ATTENDANCE BADGE READER          17:45:49
                                                           SCAN BADGE
ClockIn 1745 XXXXXXXXXX, XXXX (confidential info redacted)
```

Must be:

```
08/23/2009          TIME & ATTENDANCE BADGE READER          18:26:55
                                                           SCAN BADGE
ClockIn 1826 XXXXXXXXXX, XXXX (confidential info redacted)
```

```
INFO: T&A post-time rounded to nearest 1/4 hour. (1)
```

#38 - 01/24/2016 07:16 AM - Greg Shah

Code Review Task Branch 2909b Revision 10965

This seems to be a much smarter approach.

Constantin: please review.

1. The references to "mouse" in this javadoc seem to be incorrect. This method is used in both key and mouse navigation.

```
/**
 * Returns true only if this widget is navigable using mouse.
 *
 * @return true if widget is navigable using mouse.
 */
@Override
public boolean navigable()
```

Please change this to be more accurate in all 4 locations where it occurs (AbstractWidget, Widget, MenuItemGuiImpl and SubMenuGuiImpl).

2. I think the debugging changes in AbstractGuiDriver should be reverted.

3. MenuItemChuiImpl needs a history entry.

#39 - 01/24/2016 07:24 AM - Greg Shah

What does it mean?

That test is dependent upon a mutex semaphore that doesn't exist. It isn't compatible with running in single mode.

Manual client testing gave the following result:

When you ran it, the time was 17:45 which is already at the quarter hour. For that reason the code doesn't have to round the value to the nearest quarter hour (and then print a notice about the rounding). If you test it again, I think it will pass.

#40 - 01/25/2016 01:45 AM - Vadim Gindin

I rerun full regression testing yesterday. Here are the failing tests: gso_269, tc_codes_employees_019, tc_job_002, tc_job_clock_002, tc_po_item_003.

Intersections with previous testing results are:tc_po_item_003, tc_job_002. As Greg wrote these regressions are not mine. So can I merge changes to trunk?

#41 - 01/25/2016 02:11 AM - Vadim Gindin

I've committed remarks fixes "javadoc fixes, history entry, removing debugging code". Branch revision 10966.

#42 - 01/25/2016 04:19 AM - Constantin Asofiei

Review for 2909b rev 10966:

- MenuItem: History entry says "Changed focusTraversable(): removed isEnabled() check." but actually the focusTraversable() is removed from

the class

- SubMenuGuiImpl: there is this comment which I think no longer applies to the code?

```
/* TODO: pop-up menu: when sub-menu become active using keyboard: don't show body.  
 * That is why this block is commented.  
 */
```

- SubMenuGuiImpl: you have a System.out.println on line 1254.

Have you tested with other menu-related tests (beside what you are working now)? The idea is to not regress something else, menu-related.

#43 - 01/25/2016 08:28 AM - Vadim Gindin

Constantin Asofiei wrote:

Review for 2909b rev 10966:

- MenuItem: History entry says "Changed focusTraversable(): removed isEnabled() check." but actually the focusTraversable() is removed from the class
- SubMenuGuiImpl: there is this comment which I think no longer applies to the code?
[...]
- SubMenuGuiImpl: you have a System.out.println on line 1254.

Have you tested with other menu-related tests (beside what you are working now)? The idea is to not regress something else, menu-related.

Yes, I've rechecked basic tests again. They work.

#44 - 01/25/2016 08:34 AM - Vadim Gindin

I've fixed header and removed specified comment and debug code.

#45 - 01/25/2016 08:46 AM - Greg Shah

Code Review Task Branch 2909b Revision 10967

The MenuItem history entry just says "focusTraversable() is.". I think it should say "focusTraversable() is removed." right?

What revision did you use for your regression testing?

#46 - 01/25/2016 09:19 AM - Vadim Gindin

Greg Shah wrote:

Code Review Task Branch 2909b Revision 10967

The Menultem history entry just says "focusTraversable() is.". I think it should say "focusTraversable() is removed." right?

Yes, sorry.

What revision did you use for your regression testing?

I used revision 10965. All subsequent commits are just comments and debug code removing and header and javadoc fixes.

#47 - 01/25/2016 10:27 AM - Constantin Asofiei

Vadi, you still have TODO's and commented code (like /* !oldFocus.isEnabled() */) in ThinClient and FocusManager - please clean these too.

#48 - 01/25/2016 10:54 AM - Vadim Gindin

Done. By the way EmulatedWindowState is also write a lot of debug info to System.err. Does it really needed or we can remove it too?

#49 - 01/25/2016 11:11 AM - Greg Shah

By the way EmulatedWindowState is also write a lot of debug info to System.err. Does it really needed or we can remove it too?

It is being used. Please leave it there.

#50 - 01/25/2016 11:28 AM - Greg Shah

Please merge task branch 2909b revision 10969 to trunk and then archive 2909b (normal archive as completed).

Please note that 2909a should be archived as a DEAD branch.

#51 - 01/25/2016 11:51 AM - Vadim Gindin

The branch 2909b is merged into trunk and committed as bzt revision #10965.

#52 - 01/25/2016 12:16 PM - Greg Shah

- % Done changed from 0 to 100
- Status changed from New to Closed
- Assignee set to Vadim Gindin
- Target version set to Milestone 12

#53 - 11/16/2016 12:12 PM - Greg Shah

- Target version changed from Milestone 12 to GUI Support for a Complex ADM2 App

Files

ThinClient.diff	1.34 KB	12/04/2015	Vadim Gindin
keynav.diff	13.3 KB	12/17/2015	Vadim Gindin
1223.diff	13.9 KB	12/23/2015	Vadim Gindin
gso_stack.txt	62.7 KB	01/14/2016	Vadim Gindin
testing_log	4.25 KB	01/15/2016	Vadim Gindin