Subject: libcgroup and RHEL/CentOS/SL 6
Posted by LightDot on Sun, 30 Sep 2012 01:03:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just a heads up to all whom this might concern - libcgroup from openvz repo is now replacing the original libcgroup on RHEL 6.

This kind of invasive OS changes should be announced somewhere, really. Just a silent drop in the repo isn't a good way to introduce such packages.

Is there a specific reason for this upgrade? I know libcgroup is being provided for RHEL 5, but why is it now also replacing the existing RHEL 6 package? Is there a specific functionality that's missing in the original?

Wouldn't perhaps a separate RHEL 5 / 6 repo be the right thing to do here in the first place? So ploop on RHEL 5 could perhaps be obsoleted, libcgroup properly handled, etc...?

Subject: Re: libcgroup and RHEL/CentOS/SL 6
Posted by Todd Lyons on Mon, 01 Oct 2012 15:33:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Sat, Sep 29, 2012 at 6:03 PM, LightDot <lightdot@gmail.com> wrote:
> Just a heads up to all whom this might concern - libcgroup from openvz
> repo is now replacing the original libcgroup on RHEL 6.
> This kind of invasive OS changes should be announced somewhere,
> really. Just a silent drop in the repo isn't a good way to introduce
> such packages.

Look back in this mailing list 2 days before your post. Kir explained the need for it there.

...Todd
--
The total budget at all receivers for solving senders' problems is $0.
If you want them to accept your mail and manage it the way you want, send it the way the spec says to. --John Levine

Subject: Re: libcgroup and RHEL/CentOS/SL 6
Posted by LightDot on Tue, 02 Oct 2012 12:43:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Mon, Oct 1, 2012 at 5:33 PM, Todd Lyons <tlyons@ivenue.com> wrote:

> On Sat, Sep 29, 2012 at 6:03 PM, LightDot <lightdot@gmail.com> wrote:
>> Just a heads up to all whom this might concern - libcgroup from openvz
>> repo is now replacing the original libcgroup on RHEL 6.
>> This kind of invasive OS changes should be announced somewhere,
>> really. Just a silent drop in the repo isn't a good way to introduce
>> such packages.
>
> Look back in this mailing list 2 days before your post. Kir explained
> the need for it there.
>
> ...Todd

No, with all due respect, he didn't. I've seen the message, there is nothing there about RHEL 6. As far as I can see, this RHEL 6 update is a collateral damage caused by a quick fix to push the update trough on RHEL 5.

Wouldn't it be better to issue the <= version of libcgroup, so the stock version on RHEL 6 wouldn't get updated? Or to make a separate yum tools repos for RHEL 5 and 6 and properly fix the problem on RHEL 5..? It seems that the RHEL 5 / 6 gap is getting too big for one single repo, doesn't it?

I've been maintaining yum/up2date repos for longer I'd care to remember and IMHO, this vzctl / ploop upgrade didn't go very well. It's not my intention to bash anyone or to sound ungrateful for all the work openvz team is putting into openvz and the kernel itself, I just posted to warn other RHEL 6 users. So please take this as a simple heads up & some well intended and, hopefully, constructive criticism.

How about a openvz-utils-testing to help future updates..?

Regards,
Ales