

---

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](mailto:kir@openvz.org)> wrote:

> Enrico Weigelt wrote:

> > \* Kirill Korotaev <[dev@sw.ru](mailto: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](http://wiki.metux.de/public/OpenSource_QM_Taskforce)  
Patches / Fixes for a lot dozens of packages in dozens of versions:  
<http://patches.metux.de/>  
-----

---