
Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 4/6] Initialize struct pid_nr for swapper
Posted by [Herbert Poetzl](#) on Sun, 11 Mar 2007 14:36:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, Mar 11, 2007 at 05:27:59AM -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Herbert Poetzl <herbert@13thfloor.at> writes:

>

> > On Fri, Mar 09, 2007 at 07:59:24PM -0800, sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

> >>

> >> From: Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com>

> >> Subject: [RFC][PATCH 4/6] Initialize struct pid_nr for swapper.

> >>

> >> Statically initialize a struct pid_nr for the swapper process.

> >

> > does that actually satisfy procfs needs too, or

> > just the abstract internal references?

> >

> > because if it is enough to make procfs happy, this

> > would be a viable solution for the lightweight guest

> > case (as fake init process) too, which doesn't require

> > a blend through functionality anymore, and would allow

> > to make the pid isolation complete without wasting

> > any resources ...

>

> Herbert I'm not quite certain what you are asking but

> largely I think the answer is yes. Making procfs work

> on top of something like this patchset is pretty straight

> forward.

okay, then please lets make sure that this actually works, because I think it might solve most of the lightweight guest issues the suggested pid spaces would introduce ...

I tried that some time back, but the procfs really provides _a lot_ of deep linked details for each process, and I postponed that approach back then when I realized that I would have to fill in quite a lot of static data to make procfs happy (with a static initialized fake init)

TIA,
Herbert

> Eric

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org

