Subject: Re: Pid namespace patchsets review
Posted by serue on Sun, 11 Mar 2007 13:36:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quoting Eric W. Biederman (ebiederm@xmission.com):
>
> It is good to see these patches are starting to come together.
>
> Be patient a good review is going to take me a little bit.
>
> A couple of immediate things I see that would be nice to address before
> we aim at merging these patches upstream.
>
> - Since there are known cases that we still need to convert to use struct
>   pid can we disable the clone/unshare unless we have the CONFIG_EXPERIMENTAL
>   flag set. And a comment in Kconfig saying we are almost but not quite
>   there yet. With that in place I would have no problems with the idea
>   of merging all of the bits needed to have multiple pid namespaces before
>   we finish making the code pid namespace safe.
>
> - When we do the rename can we please rename it task_proxy and have the functions
>   follow that naming. The resource limiting conversation seems to be going in
>   that direction, and it more general then what we are using now.

If we're going to put the resource stuff in, then I agree let's rename.
If we stick to this being a namespace proxy (my preference) then calling
it nsproxy is more accurate.

(I can't keep up with that thread so maybe that's been decided by now :)

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