
Subject: Re: Re: Network virtualization/isolation
Posted by [Mishin Dmitry](#) on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 21:18:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday 09 December 2006 09:35, Herbert Poetzl wrote:
> On Fri, Dec 08, 2006 at 10:13:48PM -0800, Andrew Morton wrote:
> > On Sat, 9 Dec 2006 04:50:02 +0100
> > Herbert Poetzl <herbert@13thfloor.at> wrote:
> >
> > > On Fri, Dec 08, 2006 at 12:57:49PM -0700, Eric W. Biederman wrote:
> > > > Herbert Poetzl <herbert@13thfloor.at> writes:
> > > >
> > > > > But, ok, it is not the real point to argue so much imho
> > > > > and waste our time instead of doing things.
> > >
> > > > well, IMHO better talk (and think) first, then implement
> > > > something ... not the other way round, and then start
> > > > fixing up the mess ...
> > > >
> > > > Well we need a bit of both.
> > >
> > > hmm, are 'we' in a hurry here?
> > >
> > > until recently, 'Linux' (mainline) didn't even want
> > > to hear about OS Level virtualization, now there
> > > is a rush to quickly get 'something' in, not knowing
> > > or caring if it is usable at all?
> >
> > It's actually happening quite gradually and carefully.
>
> hmm, I must have missed a testing phase for the
> IPC namespace then, not that I think it is broken
> (well, maybe it is, we do not know yet)
Herbert,

you know that this code is used in our product. And in its turn, our product is tested internally and by a community. We have no reports about bugs in this code. If you have to say more than just "something to say", please, say it.

>
> > > I think there are a lot of 'potential users' for
> > > this kind of virtualization, and so 'we' can test
> > > almost all aspects outside of mainline, and once
> > > we know the stuff works as expected, then we can
> > > integrate it ...
> > >
> > > the UTS namespace was something 'we all' had already

> > > implemented in this (or a very similar) way, and in
> > > one or two iterations, it should actually work as
> > > expected. nevertheless, it was one of the simplest
> > > spaces ...
> > >
> > > we do not yet know the details for the IPC namespace,
> > > as IPC is not that easy to check as UTS, and 'we'
> > > haven't gotten real world feedback on that yet ...
> >
> > We are very dependent upon all stakeholders including yourself
> > to review, test and comment upon this infrastructure as it is
> > proposed and merged. If something is proposed which will not
> > suit your requirements then it is important that we hear about
> > it, in detail, at the earliest possible time.
>
> okay, good to hear that I'm still considered a stakeholder
>
> will try to focus the feedback and cc as many folks
> as possible, as it seems that some feedback is lost
> on the way upstream ...
>
> best,
> Herbert
>
> > Thanks.
>

--
Thanks,
Dmitry.

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
