Subject: Re: Which of the virtualization approaches is more suitable for kernel?
Posted by Dave Hansen on Mon, 27 Feb 2006 21:35:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Mon, 2006-02-27 at 14:14 -0700, Eric W. Biederman wrote:
> I like the namespace nomenclature. (It can be shorted to _space or _ns).
> In part because it shortens well, and in part because it emphasizes that
> we are *just* dealing with the names.

When I was looking at this, I was pretending to be just somebody looking at sysv code, with no knowledge of containers or namespaces.

For a person like that, I think names like _space or _ns are pretty much not an option, unless those terms become as integral to the kernel as things like kobjects.

> You split the resolution at just ipc_msgs. When I really think it should
> be everything ipcs deals with.

This was just the first patch. :)

> Performing the assignment inside the tasklist_lock is not something we
> want to do in do_fork().

Any particular reason why? There seem to be a number of things done in there that aren't _strictly_ needed under the tasklist_lock. Where would you do it?

> So it looks like a good start. There are a lot of details yet to be filled
> in, proc, sysctl, cleanup on namespace release. (We can still provide
> the create destroy methods even if we don't hook the up).

Yeah, I saved shm for last because it has the largest number of outside interactions. My current thoughts are that we'll need _contexts or _namespaces associated with /proc mounts as well.

> I think in this case I would put the actual namespace structure
> definition in util.h, and just put a struct ipc_ns in sched.h.

Ahhh, as in

```
struct ipc_ns;
```

And just keep a pointer from the task? Yeah, that does keep it quite isolated.

-- Dave