
Subject: patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable)

Posted by [Enrico Weigelt](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 00:40:27 GMT

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

Hi folks,

I've made a patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable branch).
Its mostly the same than the release against 2.6.8, but without
some little things already done in 2.6.8.1.

<http://patches.metux.de/linux-ovz/linux-ovz-2.6.8.1-20060722.diff.bz2>

cu

--

Enrico Weigelt == metux IT service

phone: +49 36207 519931 www: <http://www.metux.de/>
fax: +49 36207 519932 email: contact@metux.de
cellphone: +49 174 7066481

Subject: Re: patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable)

Posted by [dev](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 11:21:48 GMT

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

> Hi folks,

>

> I've made a patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable branch).

> Its mostly the same than the release against 2.6.8, but without

> some little things already done in 2.6.8.1.

>

>

> <http://patches.metux.de/linux-ovz/linux-ovz-2.6.8.1-20060722.diff.bz2>

actually 022stabXXX kernels are based on 2.6.8.1.

what is your goal?

Thanks,

Kirill

Subject: Re: patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable)

Posted by [Enrico Weigelt](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 13:33:57 GMT

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

* Kirill Korotaev <dev@sw.ru> wrote:

Hi,

> actually 022stabXXX kernels are based on 2.6.8.1.
> what is your goal?

The latest patch I found is based on 2.6.8 (as also written on the website), but contains the patch to 2.6.8.1. There also were some fuzzy matches, so it wasn't done against vanilla 2.6.8.

cu

--

Enrico Weigelt == metux IT service - <http://www.metux.de/>

Please visit the OpenSource QM Taskforce:
http://wiki.metux.de/public/OpenSource_QM_Taskforce
Patches / Fixes for a lot dozens of packages in dozens of versions:
<http://patches.metux.de/>

Subject: Re: patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable)
Posted by [dev](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 13:42:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>>actually 022stabXXX kernels are based on 2.6.8.1.
>>what is your goal?
>
>
> The latest patch I found is based on 2.6.8 (as also written on the
> website), but contains the patch to 2.6.8.1. There also were some
> fuzzy matches, so it wasn't done against vanilla 2.6.8.

we have also patches for 2.6.16 on the site and for FC5/SUSE10.1
what kernel do you need? or you try to help in porting it to other kernel versions?

Kirill

Subject: Re: patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable)
Posted by [Enrico Weigelt](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 19:36:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

* Kirill Korotaev <dev@sw.ru> wrote:

> we have also patches for 2.6.16 on the site and

Is this already stable ? I've just seen the testing patch.

cu

--

Enrico Weigelt == metux IT service

phone: +49 36207 519931 www: http://www.metux.de/
fax: +49 36207 519932 email: contact@metux.de
cellphone: +49 174 7066481

Subject: Re: patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable)
Posted by [kir](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 20:42:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Enrico Weigelt wrote:

> * Kirill Korotaev <dev@sw.ru> wrote:

>

>> we have also patches for 2.6.16 on the site and

>>

>

> Is this already stable ? I've just seen the testing patch.

>

1. Stability is not binary thing -- I mean it can be more or less stable.

2. Our stable branch can be thought of as "super stable", and our devel branch can be thought of as "it works".

3. Devel branch will not be declared stable for at least a few more months -- just because the kernel it is based on is quite new. New stuff contains bugs. Old stuff can have those bugs fixed. What we do in our 'stable' series is we backport all the security fixes from the newer kernels, we also backport essential/relevant bug fixes and some driver updates as well.

4. In fact, both stable and devel branches are based on the roughly same code (the only difference is new functionality in devel, like veth device and checkpointing). So, there are several bug sources/reasons:

- mainstream kernel bugs;
- bugs sneaked in while forward-porting stuff (caused by uncatched mistakes done while porting);

- bugs in or caused by new features.

While we can bash out last two categories by extensive testing and bugfixing, bugs from the first category (i.e. mainstream bugs) are harder to find. They just need some time to be found, and this is mostly out of our hands.

5. Can you tell us what is your final intention, i.e. what do you need?
We can probably help...

Regards,
Kir.

Subject: Re: patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable)
Posted by [Enrico Weigelt](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 23:10:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

* Kir Kolyshkin <kir@openvz.org> wrote:
> Enrico Weigelt wrote:
> > * Kirill Korotaev <dev@sw.ru> wrote:
> >
> >> we have also patches for 2.6.16 on the site and
> >>
> >
> > Is this already stable ? I've just seen the testing patch.
> >
> 1. Stability is not binary thing -- I mean it can be more or less stable.

Yeah, of course. But can it be trusted as stable as the branch called "stable" ? Is it suited for use in production environments ?

> 2. Our stable branch can be thought of as "super stable", and our devel
> branch can be thought of as "it works".

hmm, so "stable" should better be called "mature" ?

> 3. Devel branch will not be declared stable for at least a few more
> months -- just because the kernel it is based on is quite new. New stuff
> contains bugs. Old stuff can have those bugs fixed. What we do in our
> 'stable' series is we backport all the security fixes from the newer
> kernels, we also backport essential/relevant bug fixes and some driver
> updates as well.

So, can I assume, the "stable" patch against an quite old kernel brings the fixes of newer (vanilla) kernels by itself ?

I like to keep my kernels as new as possible, therefore I did some experiments on porting the "stable" patch to newer versions.

> 4. In fact, both stable and devel branches are based on the roughly
> same code (the only difference is new functionality in devel, like veth
> device and checkpointing).

Yeah, these new features may have bugs, and this is the reason for
differentiating between "stable" and "devel" branches :)

I would be happier if I could choose between an these two branches
but both against an new kernel.

> So, there are several bug sources/reasons:
> - mainstream kernel bugs;

hmm, aren't they a job for kernel folks ? or maybe some separate
kernel QM project ? (many distros are maintaining their own fixes
for the kernel and also dozens of other packages - perhaps try
to concentrate these works in one QM project ?)

<snip>

> 5. Can you tell us what is your final intention, i.e. what do you need?
> We can probably help...

As said above: I like to have most recent kernels, as on all my
other machines, since I feel its the greatest chance for the best
kernel. Maybe I've been wrong all these years.

cu

--

Enrico Weigelt == metux IT service - <http://www.metux.de/>

Please visit the OpenSource QM Taskforce:

http://wiki.metux.de/public/OpenSource_QM_Taskforce

Patches / Fixes for a lot dozens of packages in dozens of versions:

<http://patches.metux.de/>

Subject: Re: patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable)
Posted by [kir](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 09:21:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Enrico Weigelt wrote:

>> 3. Devel branch will not be declared stable for at least a few more
>> months -- just because the kernel it is based on is quite new. New stuff

>> contains bugs. Old stuff can have those bugs fixed. What we do in our
>> 'stable' series is we backport all the security fixes from the newer
>> kernels, we also backport essential/relevant bug fixes and some driver
>> updates as well.

>>

>

> So, can I assume, the "stable" patch against an quite old kernel
> brings the fixes of newer (vanilla) kernels by itself ?

>

As you can see from our changelogs, we have backported a lot of
bugfixing stuff from newer kernels, and we are keeping an eye on that.

> I like to keep my kernels as new as possible

What is your intention? I. e. why you like to keep your kernels as new
as possible?

> , therefore I did some

> experiments on porting the "stable" patch to newer versions.

>

The porting itself can bring in different sorts of bugs, so after
porting the result can not be considered "stable" anymore.

>> 4. In fact, both stable and devel branches are based on the roughly
>> same code (the only difference is new functionality in devel, like veth
>> device and checkpointing).

>>

>

> Yeah, these new features may have bugs, and this is the reason for
> differentiating between "stable" and "devel" branches :)

>

> I would be happier if I could choose between an these two branches
> but both against an new kernel.

>

As I tried to explain above, an OpenVZ kernel based on a new mainstream
Linux kernel (such as 2.6.16) can not be considered stable just because
the new mainstream kernel is not stable enough by itself.

>> So, there are several bug sources/reasons:

>> - mainstream kernel bugs;

>>

>

> hmm, aren't they a job for kernel folks ? or maybe some separate
> kernel QM project ? (many distros are maintaining their own fixes
> for the kernel and also dozens of other packages - perhaps try
> to concentrate these works in one QM project ?)

>

So that is what we do as well, in our stable kernel series. Ours 2.6.8
is not just 2.6.8 + openvz patchet; rather it is 2.6.8 + tons of fixes +
driver updates + openvz patchset.

>> 5. Can you tell us what is your final intention, i.e. what do you need?

>> We can probably help...

>>

>
> As said above: I like to have most recent kernels, as on all my
> other machines, since I feel its the greatest chance for the best
> kernel. Maybe I've been wrong all these years.
>
newer kernel != better kernel
newest kernel != best kernel

Still, if you want new kernel, I suggest you try our devel kernel. It is fairly stable; and if it will be not stable enough for you, we will fix it.

Subject: Re: patch against 2.6.8.1 (stable)
Posted by [Enrico Weigelt](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 10:59:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

* Kir Kolyshkin <kir@openvz.org> wrote:

Hi,

> > So, can I assume, the "stable" patch against an quite old kernel
> > brings the fixes of newer (vanilla) kernels by itself ?
> >
> As you can see from our changelogs, we have backported a lot of
> bugfixing stuff from newer kernels, and we are keeping an eye on that.

hmm, I'm sure if its wise to mix up two different jobs - ovz patches and kernel QM here.

> > I like to keep my kernels as new as possible
> What is your intention? I. e. why you like to keep your kernels as new
> as possible?

Because I always felt, it is wise to keep it up to date, so bugs are quickly fixed. Maybe I'm totally wrong, but I worked good with that all these years.

> >, therefore I did some
> > experiments on porting the "stable" patch to newer versions.
> >
> The porting itself can bring in different sorts of bugs, so after
> porting the result can not be considered "stable" anymore.

Yeah, but fetching in some upstream patches may also bring new bugs and requires much, much works.

> As I tried to explain above, an OpenVZ kernel based on a new
> mainstream Linux kernel (such as 2.6.16) can not be considered

> stable just because the new mainstream kernel is not stable
> enough by itself.

hmm, so you have higher stability requirements for openvz than the vanilla kernel has. That's okay, but it sometimes confuses people.

> >hmm, aren't they a job for kernel folks ? or maybe some separate
> >kernel QM project ? (many distros are maintaining their own fixes
> >for the kernel and also dozens of other packages - perhaps try
> >to concentrate these works in one QM project ?)
> >
> So that is what we do as well, in our stable kernel series. Ours 2.6.8
> is not just 2.6.8 + openvz patchet; rather it is 2.6.8 + tons of fixes +
> driver updates + openvz patchset.

hmm, I felt better with it, if these were two things:

- a) an fixed kernel with high QM requirements, done by more people than just the ovz team
- b) the openvz patches, against the QM kernel

The audience for such an QM kernel is probably much, much greater than openvz's. So, why not trying to use this potential ?

<snip>

> >As said above: I like to have most recent kernels, as on all my
> >other machines, since I feel its the greatest chance for the best
> >kernel. Maybe I've been wrong all these years.
> >
> newer kernel != better kernel
> newest kernel != best kernel

:(

Seems to be a common problem. Therefore I'm maintaining patches for lots of packages, and I've founded an distro-independent QM project. Maybe you like to have a look at it:

* http://wiki.metux.de/public/OpenSource_QM_Taskforce
* <http://patches.metux.de/>

cu
--

Enrico Weigelt == metux IT service - <http://www.metux.de/>

Please visit the OpenSource QM Taskforce:

http://wiki.metux.de/public/OpenSource_QM_Taskforce

Patches / Fixes for a lot dozens of packages in dozens of versions:

<http://patches.metux.de/>
