

---

Subject: Relationship between openVZ and cgroup; general structure about the patch

Posted by [mifritscher](#) on Sat, 12 Dec 2009 11:10:59 GMT

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

---

hi,

I saw that openVZ does already use cgroups.

Does it use them for all "core" things lxc does?

If so, why is it problematic to bring openVZ into the mainline kernel?

lxc is extremely lightweight - they seem to use plain cgroup.

And it's working fairly well - ok, a few problems exist like compatibility with init-script, console and the like, but I think that could be solved in usermode.

OpenVZ has internal routing, but I guess that these could be replaced with simple route/arp calls.

The only advantages I see in the kernel-piece of openVZ are better controlling of the resources, but I think that this could be ported to the cgroups very easily, and ability to have distinct iptables in the guests, but I think that this could be ported to the network namespaces, too.

Freeze/unfreeze seems to be supported, too, at least the lxc-usermode tools provide them - so adding migration shouldn't be a big problem, too.

Do I miss anything?

---