

---

Subject: OpenVZ vs Anything Else

Posted by [sjdean](#) on Tue, 20 Apr 2010 18:19:54 GMT

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

---

I wanted to run OpenVZ a couple of years back, but falling apart with getting Smoothwall on there and I switched to Xen on FX8 (I think).

Im putting together a new server (its what I do with my old PC's) and would like to revisit OpenVZ.

Im not sure at this stage whether to use OpenVZ, Xen or KVM.

I plan to host the following containers:

Smoothwall

Various Fedora/CentOS for Email, DHCP/DNS, Web Hosting

This is just a private server.

When it comes to Smoothwall, I plan to mimic the setup I have with Xen and bridge two eth interfaces using Veth (hope that gives me eth0 and eth1 in the container). Smoothwall looks for specific interfaces see.

I want to be able to do migrations too - not necessarily live, but certainly migrations. Is that possibly with veth?

With Xen, I had terrible throughput on the network interfaces, and also I detest a fixed disk size, although credit where it's due, it's been rock solid for 400 days.

Will OpenVZ meet my requirements now?

Thanks

Simon

---

---

Subject: Re: OpenVZ vs Anything Else

Posted by [devonblzx](#) on Fri, 23 Apr 2010 20:20:03 GMT

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

---

Haven't ever had network issues related to OpenVZ using venet. Not sure about veth. Migrations are easy with the vzmigrate tool. Search the wiki. What exactly didn't meet your requirements before?

---

---

Subject: Re: OpenVZ vs Anything Else

Posted by [sjdean](#) on Fri, 23 Apr 2010 21:08:33 GMT

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

---

I want to be able to run a firewall, dhcp server, and samba on the same box without any of the nasty slowdowns I had with Xen in network speed.

---

Subject: Re: OpenVZ vs Anything Else

Posted by [devonblzx](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2010 01:59:30 GMT

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

If your using Samba then you will need to use veth. I haven't done too much with veth but why don't you test it out? I have yet to see any network degradations with openvz, from my testing with Xen, OpenVZ proved to have a lot less overhead and ease of use.

The wiki is great, it will pretty much guide you to do whatever you need to do.

Maybe this guide will help you get started: <http://wiki.openvz.org/DHCP>

---

Subject: Re: OpenVZ vs Anything Else

Posted by [lars.bailey](#) on Fri, 21 May 2010 19:33:39 GMT

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

You are talking "apples and grapefruit",and not "apples and apples".

OVZ and XEN,cannot be compared in the same sentence. They are nothing alike.

I tried XEN,and I did not like the overhead.

OVZ fits well into my production network,and I'm totally satisfied with the software.

In running your Smoothwall VE,you will need to use VETH with bridged Ethernet.(yes you can have two interfaces)

As a side note,VETH adapter interfaces mimic real network interfaces,and provide more options in networking possibilities.

From a personal note,don't try to virtualize everything you can.

Some network services perform and work better,running on the Node.

---

Subject: Re: OpenVZ vs Anything Else

Posted by [lars.bailey](#) on Sat, 29 May 2010 14:08:00 GMT

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

I thought about creating a new topic entitled "PERCEUS vs. OpenVZ" but decided to respond here,as it would be a duplication of subject matter.

In another thread,I wanted to used CAOS LINUX with OpenVZ,and experiment with PERCEUS Clustering.

<http://forum.openvz.org/index.php?t=msg&th=8594&star t=0&>

In the end, this method proved to be a back-assward approach and foolish looking on my part. PERCEUS, is a clustering software, that supports both statefull and stateless Nodes. It is provided on CAOS 2.0 and CAOS 1.0 NSA, but can be used with RHEL 4 and 5. Stateless "nodes" using PERCEUS, are represented as containers, much like OpenVZ. You can access them directly or indirectly, and install packages via RPM and YUM. Supplied toolkits, create "capsules", for Node deployment(s). This in principle, is no different than using an OS template and "vzctl". Provisioning for Nodes, can be done statically or dynamically. Is my remarks above, meant to sway away individuals from not using OpenVZ? Of course not. Not everyone needs clustering. For those who do, it may be a better approach than using REDHAT clustering, with OpenVZ.

---