

---

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] Do not set /proc inode->pid for non-pid-related inodes  
Posted by [Dave Hansen](#) on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 17:07:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tue, 2007-03-20 at 16:04 -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Dave Hansen <hansendc@us.ibm.com> writes:

>

> > On Tue, 2007-03-20 at 09:51 -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> >> Outlive is the wrong concept. Ideally we want something that will

> >> live as long as there are processes in the pid\_ns.

> >

> > How about they just live as long as there is a mount? Now that we

> \_can\_

> > have multiple superblocks and meaningful vfsmounts, I think it's

> time to

> > make it act like a normal filesystem.

>

> My concern is that the mount will outlive the pid namespace. In which

> case we need something that is safe to test when the pid namespace

> goes away.

So, doesn't that problem go away (or at least move to be umount's duty)  
if we completely disconnect those inodes' lifetime from that of any  
process or pid namespace?

-- Dave

---

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---