Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/4] Virtualization/containers: introduction Posted by Sam Vilain on Tue, 07 Feb 2006 22:43:08 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Eric W. Biederman wrote [note: quoting sections out of order]:

- > Sam Vilain <sam@vilain.net> writes:
- >>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)
- >>I can't think of any real use cases where you would specifically want A) >>without B).
- > You misrepresent my approach.

ok, after reading more of your post, agreed.

> What user interface to export is a debate worth having.

This is the bit that needs a long period of prototyping and experimental use IMHO. So in essence, we're agreeing on that point.

- > First there is a huge commonality in the code bases between the
- > different implementations and I have already gotten preliminary
- > acceptance from the vserver developers, that my approach is sane. The
- > major difference is what user interface does the kernel export,
- > and I posted my user interface.
- > Second I am not trying to just implement a form of virtualizing PIDs.
- > Heck I don't intend to virtualize anything. The kernel has already
- > virtualized everything I require. I want to implement multiple
- > instances of the current kernel global namespaces. All I want is
- > to be able to use the same name twice in user space and not have
- > a conflict.

Right, well, I think our approaches might have more in common than I previously thought.

Indeed, it seems that at least one of the features of Linux-VServer I am preparing for consideration for inclusion into Linus' tree are your work :-).

- > Beyond getting multiple instance of all of the kernel namespaces
- > (which is the hard requirement for migration) my approach is to
- > see what is needed for projects like vserver and vps and see how
- > their needs can be met as well.

ok, but the question is - doesn't this just constitute a refactoring once the stable virtualisation code is in?

I'm just a bit nervous about trying to refactor-approach-and-concepts-as-we-go.

But look, I'll take a closer look at your patches, and see if I can merge with you anyhow. Thanks for the git repo!

Sam.