Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] Do not set /proc inode->pid for non-pid-related inodes
Posted by Herbert Poetzl on Fri, 23 Mar 2007 01:10:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Thu, Mar 22, 2007 at 09:33:50AM -0500, Serge E. Hallyn wrote:
> Quoting Eric W. Biederman (ebiederm@xmission.com):
> ...
> > Back to the main subject I still don't understand the idea of running
> > a kernel daemon as pid == 1. What would that buy us?
>
> I think the idea is that for lightweight application containers, where
> there is no explicit /sbin/init process, the kthread would act as
> reaper for the pid_ns so that the first userspace process could freely
> exit while other processes continued.

ah, that might actually work, but the question
remains, what resources would such a kernel thread
consume?

think 500 containers with

 a) one process running inside
 b) one process and a kernel thread

if the kernel thread uses up only half the amount
of resources the actual process does, it will
increase the overall resource consumption by 50%
(which is quite suboptimal)

best,
Herbert

> I still prefer that we forego that kthread, and just work toward
> allowing pid1 to exit. Really I think the crufty /proc/<pid> handling
> is the only reason we were going to punt on that for now. So for our
> first stab I think we should have pid=1 exiting cause all other
> processes in the same pid_ns to be killed. Then when we get /proc fixed
> up, we can change the semantics so that pid=1 exiting just switches the
> pid_namespace's reaper to either the parent of the killed pid=1, or to
> the global init.
>
> -serge
> _____
> Containers mailing list
> Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
> https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers

_____
Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers