

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 00/10] Containers(V10): Generic Process Containers  
Posted by [Paul Jackson](#) on Mon, 04 Jun 2007 21:05:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> Would it then make sense to just  
> default to (parent\_set - sibling\_exclusive\_set) for a new sibling's  
> value?

Which could well be empty, which in turn puts one back in the position of dealing with a newborn cpuset that is empty (of cpus or of memory), or else it introduces a new and odd constraint on when cpusets can be created (only when there are non-exclusive cpus and mems available.)

> An option is fine with me, but without such an option at all, cpusets  
> could not be applied to namespaces...

I wasn't paying close enough attention to understand why you couldn't do it in two steps - make the container, and then populate it with resources.

But if indeed that's not possible, then I guess we need some sort of option specifying whether to create kids empty, or inheriting.

--

I won't rest till it's the best ...  
Programmer, Linux Scalability  
Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com> 1.925.600.0401