
Subject: Re: There is great concern that OpenVZ is no longer being supported.
Posted by [kir](#) on Tue, 10 Nov 2009 23:19:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ales wrote on Wed, 11 November 2009 01:49: Is the difference between the redhat's 2.6.18-128.x and 2.6.18-164.x kernel so great, that it's easier for your team to backport fixes into an older base?

I have already answered this elsewhere (<http://bugzilla.openvz.org/1358>) so below is semi copy-paste.

The last update was a high priority security update, and for such updates we prefer to not do a full rebase, but rather take the proven stable already well-tested kernel and just patch the security hole(s) in order to minimize potential stability problems and make a QA cycle faster. This is exactly what we did this time. The CVE is dated Nov 3, our updates were published Nov 7 -- we just can not achieve it with a full QA cycle.

Quote: I assumed that because of Redhat's consistency of the kernel ABI/API, moving on should be pretty straightforward. I guess it isn't?

Now it's not -- internal kernel changes are quite significant and we have to port our code.

Having said that, we already have some test builds based on that kernel, they are in QA and will eventually be released. It is indeed a lot of changes and therefore requires a lot of testing (i.e. a full QA cycle). During the QA we usually find bugs in both our code and Red Hat's code (I blogged about it about a year ago), so it's definitely worth it.
