

---

Subject: Re: semantics for namespace naming  
Posted by [serue](#) on Thu, 14 Dec 2006 15:47:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quoting Sukadev Bhattiprolu (sukadev@us.ibm.com):  
> Serge E. Hallyn [serue@us.ibm.com] wrote:  
> | Let's say we have a vserver, from which we start some jobs  
> | which we want to checkpoint/restart/migrate. These are two  
> | of the usages we currently foresee for the namespaces, though  
> | I'd say it's safe to assume there will be more.  
> |  
> | I'll want to be able to address the c/r jobs by some ID in  
> | order to checkpoint and kill them. I'll also want to be  
> | able to address the entire vserver by some ID, in order to  
> | kill it. In that case the c/r jobs should also be killed.  
> | So those jobs are known by at least two id's.  
>  
> For your calculate\_pi example below, are the two ids "calculate\_pi"  
> and "/sergevserver/calculate\_pi" (ie. are the two plus ids basically  
> like relative and absolute pathnames or are they independent ?

Right, so if you're inside /servervserver, you will just know the namespace as 'calculate\_pi', but if you're in the initial namespace, '/', then you know it as /servervserver/calculate\_pi.

> And unrelated to the namespace naming - by "job" do you mean a single  
> process or can a job include multiple processes ? If it can include

Multiple processes.

> multiple, can we checkpoint/restart/migrate just the job ? I am  
> thinking that we would need to migrate the entire vserver to  
> preserve process relationships - no ?

So presumably when you did your

```
/bin/checkpointable_exec -nsid calculate_pi /bin/calculate_pi
```

then /bin/checkpointable\_exec would have unshared the pid namespace.  
So /servervserver and /servervserver/calculate\_pi would have different pidspaces. If they don't, then presumably you knew what you were doing.

Whether you do have to checkpoint/restart an entire pidspace I'm not sure, though I guess it mainly depends on what the applications do. So long as they only talk to each other, I don't see why the restore couldn't just recognize that pid 245, which was the one to start the job, but which itself is not in the container

and therefore not checkpointed. So it can tweak the children of pid 245 so their ->parent pointers point to the container init task. But maybe not. I haven't really thought through that all.

thanks,  
-serge

---

Containers mailing list  
Containers@lists.osdl.org  
<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---