Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/4] Virtualization/containers: introduction
Posted by dev on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 15:42:05 GMT

> My point was to mainly identify the performance culprits and provide
> an direct access to those "namespaces" for performance reasons.
> So we all agreed on that we need to do that..
After having looked at Eric's patch, I can tell that he does all these
dereferences in quite the same amount.

For example, lot's of skb->sk->host->...
while in OpenVZ it would be econtainer()->... which is essentially
current->container->...

So until someone did measurements it looks doubtfull that one solution
is better than the another.

> Question now (see other's note as well), should we provide
> a pointer to each and every namespace in struct task.
> Seem rather wasteful to me as certain path/namespaces are not
> exercise heavily.

> Having one object "struct container" that still embodies all
> namespace still seems a reasonable idea.
> Otherwise identifying the respective namespace of subsystems will
> have to go through container->init->subsys_namespace or similar.
> Not necessarily bad either..

why not simply container->subsys_namespace?

Kirill