[Link to UC PTG planning doc](#)

Key notes from UC Meeting - 01/29/2018

VW - We focus on release cycle, upgrade skips etc - when the thing people are worked about is the pain of upgrade

Jimmy - We've had a couple of users that are working off of master saying they see no reason to change the cycle...not indicative of a larger sample set.

Saverio - I think the all point here, is making Openstack able for Operations consume

Shamail - It would be great if we could summarize the user feedback (not one view but the various views offered) and highlight some trade offs to stir conversation

Saverio - the problem statement is that is difficult to consume Openstack for the industry. In sydney the person from AT&T made a presentation about this (https://wiki.openstack.org/wiki/Governance/Foundation/5Nov2017BoardMeeting - possibly the presentation by Chris Price [Ericcson] and Kandan [AT&T] - can reach out to them for more)

Jimmy - Can we target a set of operators from different industry size and type to see if we can get specific feedback around release cycles and upgrades?

Shamail - Last time PWG had a discussion on this topic about 2 years ago... there was a big difference not based on just organization size but cloud type as well...Public operators were much more comfortable with more frequent releases while end user operators didn't want to go through change control that often

Shamail - The survey should give data points for discussion and not an outcome/decision

VW - get a list of the 5 or 6 things that make upgrades painful for a wide range of operators...then use the survey to have folks "vote" on the consolidated list..."here are 28 painful issues with upgrades. You have 5 dollars to spend on fixing them. You can spend all 5 on one or 1 on 5 or something in between. Ready - go!"

Suggested Next Steps

- Summarize long email threads
  - http://lists.openstack.org/pipermail/openstack-dev/2017-November/124308.html
  - http://lists.openstack.org/pipermail/openstack-operators/2017-November/014519.html
  - http://lists.openstack.org/pipermail/openstack-dev/2017-November/124498.html
  - MISSING thread on the SIG mailing list
- Mini-survey

Thread Summaries

- http://lists.openstack.org/pipermail/openstack-dev/2017-November/124308.html
  - Link: https://etherpad.openstack.org/p/SYD-forum-upstream-lts-releases
  - Link https://etherpad.openstack.org/p/LTS-proposal
  -
  - **Summary**:
    Initial proposal to shift the responsibility for patches from Stable Branch team to Operators/Packages/Deployers.
    The infra people are concerned about keeping up the CI/CD infra for this branches.

Current stable branch policy does not satisfy all operators.
Distribution packages do carry local patches:
https://git.launchpad.net/~ubuntu-server-dev/ubuntu/+source/neutron/tree/debian/patches?h=stable/newton
Industry standard is to have a 4 years LTS, with upgrade possible from 1 LTS to another.
Our current model just encourages all of that work to happen
downstream in the dark in varying divergent ways.
The pressure for longer release cycle comes from the inability to skip upgrades and the fact that upgrades are hugely time consuming still.
Operators with Vendors for network plugins and cinder drivers are most likely to be operating releases 18 months behind, because they are blocked to upgrade by vendor components.
Upgrade is hard because devs only work on freshly created devstack and they dont have pressure to test any upgrade procedure.
Devs work with fresh databases. Operators have databases started back in old releases, so the real testing of database migrations happens only when operators hit bugs.

- ○

- ● http://lists.openstack.org/pipermail/openstack-operators/2017-November/014519.html
- ● http://lists.openstack.org/pipermail/openstack-dev/2017-November/124498.html
  - ○ Stable policy does not mean bugfix policy.
    Some operators expect bugs fix to be accepted in stable branches. It is not always very clear if a patch will be accepted or not. It is good to discuss patches in the mailing list to have them accepted. This requires of course work from the operator that just proposes a simple cherry pick.
- ● MISSING thread on the SIG mailing list
- ●

Mini-Survey Draft/Outline

- Please participate to this Mini-Survey if your deployment is:
  - Production use
  - At least 10 compute nodes (we want to filter out all small deployments that might have easier upgrade paths because of smaller number of compute nodes and homogeneous hardware).
  - Need to upgrade (reinstall next version from scratch is not an option)
  - You are spending more than 50% of your work day not developing

Questions:
- Release of Openstack currently running in production as of 01/01/2018
  - Master
  - Queens
  - Pike
  - Ocata
  - Newton
  - Mitaka
  - Older than mitaka
- Do you carry backported BUGFIX patches from newer releases ?
  - No
  - Yes, I patched the deployment myself
  - Yes bugfix provided by vendor/distribution packages
  - I dont know
- Do you carry backported NEW FEATURE patches from newer releases ?
  - No
  - Yes, I patched the deployment myself
  - Yes bugfix provided by vendor/distribution packages
  - I dont know
- Are you blocked in the upgrade by a vendor ? (eg Cinder volume driver or Neutron plugin ?)
  - Yes
  - No
- How many months does it take for you to upgrade Openstack ?
  - 0 to 1 months
  - 1 to 3 months
  - 3 to 6 months
  - More than 6 months
  - I never managed to upgrade
- What is most important for you (rank the following)
  - bug-fix branch where all bug-fix patches should be accepted by the branch policy, so I can keep running an old release for longer.
  - A LTS release, that I can upgrade to a new LTS release after years.
  - Releases less often
  - A documented and tested skip upgrade process, so when I upgrade I can skip a few releases.