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Background

• F8 – 2.6.23 kernel vs. 2.6.21 kernel-xen
• F9 – 2.6.25 vs. maybe 2.6.22?
• Untenable – e.g. SELinux + squashfs
Forward Porting

- `linux-2.6.18-xen.hg` base
- Constant battle to keep pace
- Investing in a dead-end
- At odds with Fedora's goals
Tough Decisions

- x86_64 DomU not complete
- No Dom0 support
- Feature regressions
- “Who needs Xen?”
Goals

- 32/64 bit Dom0/DomU
- Same kernel image for bare-metal
- HV in separate package
Upstream Issues

- Prelink
- Execshield conflict
- Paravirt FB and kbd
- Console handling
Userland Impact

- Console: xvc -> hvc
- Network: xennet -> xen_netfront
- Block: xenblk -> xen_blkfront
- /proc/xen
x86_64 DomU

• Fairly stable, but WIP
• No SMP
• Breaks bare-metal and 32 bit
• Not pv_ops
Dom0

- Boots on Xen and bare-metal
- DMA working
- Can launch DomU
- No backend drivers
- x86_64 conflict
Userland Interfaces

- /proc/xen
- /sys/hypervisor
- /dev/xen/evtchn
Future

- CPU/memory hotplug
- PV drivers for HVM
- Save/restore/migrate
- PCI passthrough
Fedora 10

- Fedora 8 not supported
- Dom0 support not certain
- Pressure from KVM
What Now?

- Xen staging tree
- Abandon the 2.6.18 tree
- Focus on upstream