

---

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.

---