
Subject: Re: [RFC] Virtualization steps

Posted by [Bill Davidsen](#) on Wed, 29 Mar 2006 20:56:38 GMT

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

Sam Vilain wrote:

> On Tue, 2006-03-28 at 09:41 -0500, Bill Davidsen wrote:

>>> It is more than realistic. Hosting companies run more than 100 VPSs in
>>> reality. There are also other usefull scenarios. For example, I know
>>> the universities which run VPS for every faculty web site, for every
>>> department, mail server and so on. Why do you think they want to run
>>> only 5VMs on one machine? Much more!

>> I made no commont on what "they" might want, I want to make the rack of
>> underutilized Windows, BSD and Solaris servers go away. An approach
>> which doesn't support unmodified guest installs doesn't solve any of my
>> current problems. I didn't say it was in any way not useful, just not of
>> interest to me. What needs I have for Linux environments are answered by
>> jails and/or UML.

>

> We are talking about adding jail technology, also known as containers on
> Solaris and vserver/openvz on Linux, to the mainline kernel.

>

> So, you are obviously interested!

>

> Because of course, you can take an unmodified filesystem of the guest
> and assuming the kernels are compatible run them without changes. I
> find this consolidation approach indispensable.

>

The only way to assume kernels are compatible is to run the same distro.
Because vendor kernels are sure not compatible, even running a
kernel.org kernel on Fedora (for instance) reveals the the utilities are
also tweaked to expect the kernel changes, and you wind up with a system
which feels like wearing someone else's hat. It's stable but little
things just don't work right.

--

-bill davidsen (davidsen@tmr.com)

"The secret to procrastination is to put things off until the
last possible moment - but no longer" -me
