
Subject: Re: The issues for agreeing on a virtualization/namespaces implementation.

Posted by [Hubertus Franke](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 18:31:08 GMT

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

Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

> Quoting Hubertus Franke (frankeh@watson.ibm.com):

>

>>IMHO, there is only a need to refer to a namespace from the global context.

>>Since one will be moving into a new container, but getting out of one

>>could be prohibitive (e.g. after migration)

>>It does not make sense therefore to know the name of a namespace in

>>a different container.

>

>

> Not sure I agree. What if we are using a private namespace for a

> vserver, and then we want to create a private namespace in there for a

> mobile application. Since we're talking about nested namespaces, this

> should be possible.

>

> Now I believe Eric's code so far would make it so that you can only

> refer to a namespace from it's *creating* context. Still restrictive,

> but seems acceptable.

>

That's what I meant .. as usually used the wrong word..

s/global context/spawning context/g .. because that's the only

place where you have a pid to refer to the newly created container !

> (right?)

>

Yes, seriii .. ahmm serue

> -serge

>
