
Subject: OpenVZ tools

Posted by [Dag Wieers](#) on Mon, 16 Oct 2006 14:27:57 GMT

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

Hi,

We modified the vzyum tool and created a similar vzapt tool. But while doing that I figured that the current infrastructure (written in shell) is somewhat insufficient to create clean, proper reusable code.

Also the config-files are pretty shell-oriented.

Are there any plans to redo them ?

Kind regards,

-- dag wieers, dag@wieers.com, <http://dag.wieers.com/> --
[all I want is a warm bed and a kind word and unlimited power]

Subject: [Devel] Re: OpenVZ tools

Posted by [kir](#) on Mon, 16 Oct 2006 14:51:36 GMT

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

Dag Wieers wrote:

> Hi,

>

> We modified the vzyum tool and created a similar vzapt tool. But
> while doing that I figured that the current infrastructure (written in
> shell) is somewhat insufficient to create clean, proper reusable code.

>

> Also the config-files are pretty shell-oriented.

>

> Are there any plans to redo them ?

>

Dag,

To be honest -- I'd love to. I suppose you want Python -- this is fine with me. It'd be great to start from scratch, but be aware that developing/maintaining package management tools leads to endless pain and suffering (I assume you probably know that already:)).

So, we can set up a git repo (and a component in bugzilla) and start working on some "next-generation package management tools".

Although I do not see any problem with "shell-oriented" config files. They are easy to edit and can be easily read from any code (be it C or Perl or Python or whatever). So, can you be more specific and tell us why you don't like such configs?

Finally, I propose to move the discussion to devel@ list (to'ed). If you agree, please reply to devel@ only.

Devel mailing list
Devel@openvz.org
<https://openvz.org/mailman/listinfo/devel>

Subject: Re: [Users] OpenVZ tools
Posted by [Dag Wieers](#) on Mon, 16 Oct 2006 15:02:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 16 Oct 2006, Kir Kolyshkin wrote:

> Dag Wieers wrote:
>
> > We modified the vzyum tool and created a similar vzapt tool. But
> > while doing that I figured that the current infrastructure (written in
> > shell) is somewhat insufficient to create clean, proper reusable code.
> >
> > Also the config-files are pretty shell-oriented.
> >
> > Are there any plans to redo them ?
>
> To be honest -- I'd love to. I suppose you want Python -- this is fine with
> me. It'd be great to start from scratch, but be aware that
> developing/maintaining package management tools leads to endless pain and
> suffering (I assume you probably know that already:)).

I have found that pain bearable. :)

I do prefer python, but any similar language will do.

> So, we can set up a git repo (and a component in bugzilla) and start working
> on some "next-generation package management tools".

That's fine.

> Although I do not see any problem with "shell-oriented" config files. They are
> easy to edit and can be easily read from any code (be it C or Perl or Python
> or whatever). So, can you be more specific and tell us why you don't like such
> configs?

I understand that switching would be hard. But a better syntax would allow

more interesting things. I like python's configuration format and syntax, but anything better would do.

The shell-variable way of doing things is limited and prone to errors. Plus I generally do not prefer the lowest common denominator as a standard ;-)

Kind regards,

-- dag wieers, dag@wieers.com, <http://dag.wieers.com/> --
[all I want is a warm bed and a kind word and unlimited power]

Subject: Re: Re: [Users] OpenVZ tools
Posted by [kir](#) on Tue, 17 Oct 2006 11:38:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dag Wieers wrote:

>> Although I do not see any problem with "shell-oriented" config files. They are
>> easy to edit and can be easily read from any code (be it C or Perl or Python
>> or whatever). So, can you be more specific and tell us why you don't like such
>> configs?

>>

>

> I understand that switching would be hard. But a better syntax would allow
> more interesting things. I like python's configuration format and syntax,
>

What is python's configuration format? Something like yum.conf? I.e.
almost-shell-style with sections denoted by [sectname]?

Or something else?

> but anything better would do.

>

> The shell-variable way of doing things is limited and prone to errors.
> Plus I generally do not prefer the lowest common denominator as a standard
I'm a bit scared by language-specific config formats. Seen a number of
cases when people use perl hashes in a config and just source those.

Subject: Re: Re: [Users] OpenVZ tools
Posted by [Ola Lundqvist](#) on Tue, 17 Oct 2006 18:58:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi

Do you plan to do something based on debootstrap or something else?

Regards,

// Ola

On Mon, Oct 16, 2006 at 05:02:51PM +0200, Dag Wieers wrote:

> On Mon, 16 Oct 2006, Kir Kolyshkin wrote:

>

> > Dag Wieers wrote:

> >

> > > We modified the vzyum tool and created a similar vzapt tool. But

> > > while doing that I figured that the current infrastructure (written in

> > > shell) is somewhat insufficient to create clean, proper reusable code.

> > >

> > > Also the config-files are pretty shell-oriented.

> > >

> > > Are there any plans to redo them ?

> >

> > To be honest -- I'd love to. I suppose you want Python -- this is fine with

> > me. It'd be great to start from scratch, but be aware that

> > developing/maintaining package management tools leads to endless pain and

> > suffering (I assume you probably know that already:)).

>

> I have found that pain bearable. :)

>

> I do prefer python, but any similar language will do.

>

>

> > So, we can set up a git repo (and a component in bugzilla) and start working

> > on some "next-generation package management tools".

>

> That's fine.

>

>

> > Although I do not see any problem with "shell-oriented" config files. They are

> > easy to edit and can be easily read from any code (be it C or Perl or Python

> > or whatever). So, can you be more specific and tell us why you don't like such

> > configs?

>

> I understand that switching would be hard. But a better syntax would allow

> more interesting things. I like python's configuration format and syntax,

> but anything better would do.

>

> The shell-variable way of doing things is limited and prone to errors.

> Plus I generally do not prefer the lowest common denominator as a standard

> ;-)

>

> Kind regards,

> -- dag wieers, dag@wieers.com, <http://dag.wieers.com/> --

> [all I want is a warm bed and a kind word and unlimited power]

>

--

----- Ola Lundqvist -----
/ opal@debian.org Annebergsslingan 37 \
| opal@lysator.liu.se 654 65 KARLSTAD |
| +46 (0)54-10 14 30 +46 (0)70-332 1551 |
| http://www.opal.dhs.org UIN/icq: 4912500 |
\ gpg/f.p.: 7090 A92B 18FE 7994 0C36 4FE4 18A1 B1CF 0FE5 3DD9 /
