Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/2][RFC] containers: improve automatic container naming Posted by serue on Fri, 01 Jun 2007 22:38:55 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
Quoting Andrew Morton (akpm@linux-foundation.org):
> On Fri, 1 Jun 2007 16:48:09 -0500
> "Serge E. Hallyn" <serue@us.ibm.com> wrote:
>> This compiles and boots, but is not intended for inclusion in -mm (yet),
> > just as an RFC for the naming scheme to fix the bug Andrew pointed out.
> > Seem ok overall?
> >
> > thanks,
> > -serge
> >
>> From 8e9b972f7482415777e982d3bc9a0d55cbaf862b Mon Sep 17 00:00:00 2001
> > From: Serge E. Hallyn <serue@us.ibm.com>
> > Date: Fri, 1 Jun 2007 15:32:15 -0400
> > Subject: [PATCH 1/2] containers: improve automatic container naming
>> The automatic naming of containers created using container clone()
> > is currently broken (not protected from wraparound) and inconvenient.
> > Add a per-container counter for use in naming children of the container.
>> Before two unshares in a row by one process, and a third in another,
> > would result in
>> /node1/node2
> > /node3
>> The current scheme should result in
>> /node1/node1
> > /node2
>> Also, keep a hash table populated with used names, to protect
> > against counter wrap-around.
> >
>> ...
> >
>> include/linux/container.h |
                             8 +++
>> kernel/container.c
                         > gad, what's all this stuff?
```

The sound of me starting over.

> I think an IDR tree would get you what you're after in much less code.

Ok, will look at that. Thanks for the tip!

```
> Although it means that container IDs would get recycled quickly across a
> remove+add.
> Be aware that there are IDR enhancements in Greg's driver tree (and hence
> in -mm) which are relevant to this application.
>
>
>> + if (cont->auto_cnt_set) {
> Can we please stop using "cnt" and "cont" to refer to containers? Let's
> use "container", OK?
Ok.
thanks,
-serge
```