
Subject: Re: [PATCH 0/7] containers (V7): Generic Process Containers
Posted by [Sam Vilain](#) on Tue, 20 Feb 2007 23:08:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Paul Menage wrote:

>> No. A reverse mapping is not needed and is not interesting.

>>

> ... to you.

>

You're missing the point of Eric's next sentence. If you can achieve everything you need to achieve and get all the information you are after without it, then it is uninteresting.

>> As long as I can walk all processes and ask what namespace are
>> you in I don't care.

>>

>

> How do you currently do that?

>

Take a look at /proc/PID/mounts for example.

>> All that is necessary to have a group of processes do something
>> in an unnamed fashion is to hang a pointer off of the task_struct.
>> That's easy.

>>

> Right, adding a pointer to task_struct is easy. Configuring how/when
> to not directly inherit it from the parent, or to change it for a
> running task, or configuring state associated with the thing that the
> pointer is pointing to, naming that group, and determining which group
> a given process is associated with, is something that's effectively
> repeated boiler plate for each different subsystem, and which can be
> accomplished more generically via an abstraction like my containers
> patch.

>

So make helpers. Macros. Anything, just don't introduce model limitations like the container structure, because we've already got the structure; the nsproxy.

Sam.

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