Subject: Re: [Ksummit-2010-discuss] checkpoint-restart: naked patch
Posted by Gene Cooperman on Mon, 29 Nov 2010 04:09:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Oren,

On Thu, Nov 25, 2010 at 11:04:16AM -0500, Oren Laadan wrote:
> On Tue, 23 Nov 2010, Kapil Arya wrote:
>
> > OL> Even if it did - the question is not how to deal with "glue"
> > OL> (you demonstrated quite well how to do that with DMTCP), but
> > OL> how should teh basic, core c/r functionality work - which is
> > OL> below, and orthogonal to the "glue".
> >
> > There seems to be an implicit assumption that it is easy to separate the DMTCP
> > "glue code" from the DMTCP C/R engine as separate modules. DMTCP is modular but
> > it splits the problems into modules along a different line than Linux C/R. We
> > look forward to the joint experiment in which we would try to combine DMTCP
> > with Linux C/R. This will help answer the question in our mind.
>
> I apologize for being blunt - but this is probably an issue specific to
> DMTCP's engineering...
>

I completely agree with you, Oren. DMTCP was never designed to be split into a userland and in-kernel replacement. We will want to re-factor DMTCP to make this happen.
I'm sorry if my e-mail came off as confrontational. That was not my intention. I was just looking forward to an interesting intellectual experiment --- how to go about combining DMTCP and Linux C/R. I was trying to guess ahead of time where there are interesting challenges, and my hope is that we will find a way to solve them together.

Best wishes,
- Gene

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containe rs