Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/2] signal checkpoint: define /proc/pid/sig/
Posted by Carl-Daniel Hailfinge on Tue, 12 Jun 2007 15:29:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 11.06.2007 19:05, Serge E. Hallyn wrote:
> Quoting Cedric Le Goater (clg@fr.ibm.com):
>
>> should we continue to use /proc ? or switch to some other mechanisms
>> like getnetlink (taskstats) to map kernel structures.
>
> We want to avoid 'map'ping kernel structures, though, right? We can
> dump the data in a more generic fashion through netlink, dunno what we
> prefer. But this is very definately process information :), so /proc
> does seem appropriate.

While I agree that /proc seems appropriate, I see a few benefits of
dumping the data through netlink:
* Speed. IIRC there were benchmarks showing an advantage of netlink
  over /proc when communicating with userspace. Sorry, no idea where
  I read that.
* Versioning. While we strive to have the perfect interface on the
  first try, changes might be necessary. I see no way to handle
  multiple versions of an interface in /proc without big headaches.
* Conformity. With /proc, people often see a file, take a look at
  it and try to infer the structure of the file from what they see.
  This has led to multiple problems in the past when the content of
  some files in /proc changed slightly and tools broke. With
  netlink, implementers have to look at the spec to achieve anything
  useful.

Regards,
Carl-Daniel

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