Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 7/7] containers (V7): Container interface to nsproxy subsystem
Posted by serue on Tue, 03 Apr 2007 15:41:13 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
Quoting Eric W. Biederman (ebiederm@xmission.com):
> Srivatsa Vaddagiri <vatsa@in.ibm.com> writes:
>> On Mon, Apr 02, 2007 at 09:09:39AM -0500, Serge E. Hallyn wrote:
>>> Losing the directory isn't a big deal though. And both unsharing a
>>> namespace (which causes a ns container clone) and mounting the hierarchy
>>> are done by userspace, so if for some installation it is a big deal.
>>> the init scripts on initrd can mount the hierarchy before doing any
>>> unsharing.
> >
>> Yes I thought of that after posting this (that initrd can mount the
> > hierarchies), so this should not be an issue in practice ...
>>> Can you think of a reason why losing a few directories matters?
>> If we loose directories, then we don't have a way to manage the
> > task-group it represents thr' the filesystem interface, so I consider
>> that bad. As we agree, this will not be an issue if initrd
> > mounts the ns hierarchy atleast at bootup.
> I suspect that could be a problem if we have recursive containers.
> Even by having a separate mount namespace for isolation you really
> don't want to share the mount. If you can see all of the processes
> you do want to be able to see and control everything.
Are you asking about what happens if inited in a vserver asks to
mount -t container -o ns,cpusets /containers
?
```

I suppose in that case it would make sense to allow a separate mount instance with it's own superblock, with s_root pointing to the dentry for the container the vserver is in?

- > I guess I want to ask before this gets to far. Why are all of the
- > namespaces lumped into one group? I would think it would make much
- > more sense to treat each namespace individually (at least for the
- > user space interface).
- > Eric