Subject: Re: [patch -mm 08/17] nsproxy: add hashtable
Posted by Cedric Le Goater on Tue, 12 Dec 2006 07:09:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dave Hansen wrote:
> On Mon, 2006-12-11 at 16:23 +0100, Cedric Le Goater wrote:
>>> Even letting the concept of nsproxy escape to user space sounds wrong.
>>> nsproxy is an internal space optimization. It's not struct container
>>> and I don't think we want it to become that.
>> i don't agree here. we need that, so does openvz, vserver, people working
>> on resource management.
>
> I think what those projects need is _some_ way to group tasks. I'm not
> sure they actually need nsproxies.

not only tasks. ipc, fs, etc.

> Two tasks in the same container could very well have different
> nsproxies. The nsproxy defines how the pid namespace, and pid<->task
> mappings happen for a given task.

not only. there are other namespaces in nsproxy.

> The init process for a container is
> special and might actually appear in more than one pid namespace, while
> its children might only appear in one. That means that this init
> process's nsproxy can and should actually be different from its
> children's. This is despite the fact that they are in the same
> container.
>
> If we really need this 'container' grouping, it can easily be something
> pointed to _by_ the nsproxy, but it shouldn't _be_ the nsproxy.

ok so let's add a container object, containing a nsproxy and add
another indirection ...

C.
_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers