
Subject: Re: Re: [RFC] Container mini-summit agenda for Sept 3, 2007

Posted by [dev](#) on Fri, 31 Aug 2007 15:59:15 GMT

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

Cedric Le Goater wrote:

>>>Many of these were discussed in a recent Zap paper present in USENIX:

>>>http://www.ncl.cs.columbia.edu/publications/userix2007_fordist.pdf

>>>The paper describes important design choices in Zap (but I'm biased ...).

>>>I think it may serve as an appetizer for the discussion :P

>>

>>Thanks, I hope we all have time to read it.

>

>

> The abstract says :

>

> "...

> Our results show checkpoint and restart times 3 to 55 times faster than

> OpenVZ and 5 to 1100 times faster than Xen."

>

> I'm impressed ! :) When can we play it ?

>

> Thanks for the appetizer !

It is totally unfair to compare full virtualization solution such as OpenVZ

with sync on VE stop (for quotas consistency) and which doesn't require shared storage for migration

with POC which uses shared storage in the paper.

I'm not sure why author didn't pay attention to these HUGE differences in configuration...

Maybe because 1100x times is so incredible :@)

Thanks,

Kirill

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
