
Subject: Re: Re: Which of the virtualization approaches is more suitable for kernel?
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Wed, 22 Feb 2006 15:26:25 GMT

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

Kir Kolyshkin <kir@openvz.org> writes:

> Please stop seeding, hmm, falseness. OpenVZ patches you mention are against
> 2.6.8 kernel, thus they contain tons of backported mainstream bugfixes and
> driver updates; so, most of this size is not virtualization, but general
> security/stability/drivers stuff. And yes, that size also indirectly tells how
> much work we do to keep our users happy.

I think Herbert was trying to add some balance to the equation.

> Back to the topic. If you (or somebody else) wants to see the real size of
> things, take a look at broken-out patch set, available from
> <http://download.openvz.org/kernel/broken-out/>. Here (2.6.15-025stab014.1 kernel)
> we see that it all boils down to:

Thanks. This is the first indication I have seen that you even have broken-out patches. Why those aren't in your source rpms is beyond me. Everything seems to have been posted in a 2-3 day window at the end of January and the beginning of February. Is this something you are now providing?

Shakes head. You have a patch in broken-out that is 817K. Do you really maintain it this way as one giant patch?

> Virtualization stuff: diff-vemix-20060120-core 817K
> Resource management (User Beancounters): diff-ubc-20060120 377K
> Two-level disk quota: diff-vzdq-20051219-2 154K

As for the size of my code, sure parts of it are big I haven't really measured. Primarily this is because I'm not afraid of doing the heavy lifting necessary for a clean long term maintainable solution.

Now while all of this is interesting. It really is beside the point because neither the current vserver nor the current openvz code are ready for mainstream kernel inclusion. Please let's not get side tracked playing whose patch is bigger.

Eric
