Subject: Re: The issues for agreeing on a virtualization/namespaces implementation.
Posted by dev on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 15:34:41 GMT

>>Eric W. Biederman wrote:
>>So it seems the clone(flags) is a reasonable approach to create new
>>namespaces. Question is what is the initial state of each namespace?
>>In pidspace we know we should be creating an empty pidmap !
>>In network, someone suggested creating a loopback device
>>In uts, create "localhost"
>>Are there examples where we rather inherit ? Filesystem ?
> Of course filesystem is already implemented, and does inheret a full
> copy.

why do we want to use clone()? Just because of its name and flags?
I think it is really strange to fork() to create network context. What
has process creation has to do with it?

After all these clone()'s are called, some management actions from host
system are still required, to add these IPs/routings/etc.
So? Why mess it up? Why not create a separate clean interface for
container management?

Kirill