

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/4] Virtualization/containers: introduction

Posted by [dev](#) on Tue, 07 Feb 2006 11:49:18 GMT

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

---

>>> We are never going to form a consensus if all of the people doing  
>>> implementations don't talk.

>>

>> Speaking of which - it would be interesting to get Kirill's

>> comments on Eric's patchset ;)

I'll do comment.

>> Once we know what's good and bad about both patchsets, we'll

>> be a lot closer to knowing what exactly should go upstream.

I'm starting to think that nothing in upstream can be better for all of  
us :)

> Let's compare approaches of patchsets before the patchsets themselves.

> It seems to be, should we:

>

> A) make a general form of virtualising PIDs, and hope this assists

> later virtualisation efforts (Eric's patch)

>

> B) make a general form of containers/jails/vservers/vpses, and layer

> PID virtualisation on top of it somewhere (as in openvz, vserver)

>

> I can't think of any real use cases where you would specifically want A)

> without B).

Exactly! All these patches for A) look weird for me without containers  
itself. A try to make half-solution which is bad.

> Also, the problem space in B) is now very well explored. To start with

> A) would mean to throw away 4+ years of experience at this approach

> (just counting vserver and variants - not FreeBSD Jail, etc). Trying to

> re-base B) atop a massive refactoring and new patch like A) would incur

> a lot of work; however fitting it into B) is natural and solved

> conceptually and in practice, with the only drawback I see being that

> the use cases mentioned above wouldn't suffer from the side-effects of

> B).

Have you saw my patches?

This is B) :) This is what we should start with IMHO.

Having a containers and isolation all these talks about A) will be much  
more precise.

Kirill

---