

---

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 1/5] Virtualization/containers: startup  
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Tue, 07 Feb 2006 01:57:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Cedric Le Goater <clg@fr.ibm.com> writes:

> Eric W. Biederman wrote:

>

>> As someone said to me a little bit ago, for migration or checkpointing  
>> ultimately you have to capture the entire user/kernel interface if  
>> things are going to work properly. Now if we add this facility to  
>> the kernel and it is a general purpose facility. It is only a matter  
>> of time before we need to deal with nested containers.

>>

>> Not considering the case of having nested containers now is just foolish.  
>> Maybe we don't have to implement it yet but not considering it is silly.

>

> That could be restricted. Today, process groups are not nested. Why do you  
> think nested containers are inevitable ?

process groups are a completely different kind of beast.

A closer analogy are hierarchical name spaces and mounts.

If we didn't need things like waitpid outside one pid namespace  
to wait for a nested namespace they would be complete disjoint  
and the implementation would be trivial.

>> As far as I can tell there is a very reasonable chance that when we  
>> are complete there is a very reasonable chance that software suspend  
>> will just be a special case of migration, done complete in user space.

>

> Being able to software suspend one container among many would be a very  
> interesting feature to have.

That is what checkpointing. And that is simply the persistent form of  
migration.

Eric

---