

---

Subject: Re: [patch -mm 08/17] nsproxy: add hashtable  
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Thu, 14 Dec 2006 21:08:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Cedric Le Goater <clg@fr.ibm.com> writes:

>>> Let me try : you would add a 'struct pid pid' field to all namespaces and  
>>> assign that 'pid' field with the struct pid of the task creating the  
>>> namespace ?  
>>  
>> Yes a struct pid \*pid field, that we did the proper reference counting  
>> on.  
>  
> sure.  
>  
>> As for which pid to assign, that is a little trickier. The struct pid  
>> of the task creating the namespace is the obvious choice and that will  
>> always work for clone. For unshare that would only work if we added  
>> the restriction you can't unshare if someone already has used that pid  
>> for that kind of namespace.  
>  
> clone will also be an issue if more than one namespace is unshared. Do  
> you use the same 'struct pid\*' for each namespace ? hmm, it feels also  
> wrong.  
>  
> having an id field in the namespace and using a bind\_ns like syscall  
> to let the user assign whatever id he wants to, doesn't seem to be  
> such a bad idea.

I think I would probably have suggested simply taking the next available id in that case in practice. Partly it depends on exactly what we are trying to do with these.

But I do agree getting that last little details right so some corner case doesn't feel wrong is hard. That is why I try and put off this kind of things until as much is known about how we are going to use it as possible. So we can make a good decision and solve practical problems, and not theoretical ones.

Eric

---

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

---