

Hello,

> I worry that using something like "vps" obfuscates the real meaning a  
> bit. The reason that "owner\_vps" doesn't sound weird is that people, by  
> default, usually won't understand what a "vps" is.  
container or context sounds the same :) it is impossible to feel this  
notion naturally without getting into details. IMHO.

> (if you like acronyms a lot, I'm sure I can find a job for you at IBM or  
> in the US military :)  
We can talk about it separately :)))

>>Please, also note, in OpenVZ we have 2 pointers on task\_struct:  
>>One is owner of a task (owner\_env), 2nd is a current context (exec\_env).  
>>exec\_env pointer is used to avoid adding of additional argument to all  
>>the functions where current context is required.

>  
> That makes sense. However, are there many cases in the kernel where a  
> task ends up doing something temporary like this:

>  
> tsk->exec\_vnc = bar;  
> do\_something\_here(task);  
> tsk->exec\_vnc = foo;

>  
> If that's the case very often, we probably want to change the APIs, just  
> to make the common action explicit. If it never happens, or is a  
> rarity, I think it should be just fine.  
It is quite rare. In IRQ, softIRQ, TCP/IP stack and some timers. Not much.

>>VPS ID is passed to/from user space APIs and when you have a cluster  
>>with different archs and VPSs it is better to have something in common  
>>for managing this.

> I guess it does keep you from running into issues with mixing 32 and  
> 64-bit processes. But, haven't we solved those problems already? Is it  
> just a pain?

VPSs can live in clusters. It is good to have one VPS ID space.

Kirill

---