Subject: Re: [netns] sysfs: issues porting shadow directories on top of 2.6.21-mm2 Posted by gregkh on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 21:16:37 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> Dave Hansen <hansendc@us.ibm.com> writes: &gt; &gt; On Mon, 2007-06-18 at 19:57 +0200, Benjamin Thery wrote: &gt; &gt;&gt; /sys/class/net/ ("real" net class) &gt; &gt;&gt; /sys/class/net-shadow1/ &gt; &gt;&gt; /sys/class/net-shadow2/ &gt; &gt; &gt; This seems like a nice "quick fix", but do we really want to be hacking &gt; &gt; sysfs around like this? &gt; &gt; &gt; We have the backing sysfs_* entries that are separate from the vfs &gt; &gt; entities already. Why can't we simply have different /sys vfsmounts</hansendc@us.ibm.com>	
>> On Mon, 2007-06-18 at 19:57 +0200, Benjamin Thery wrote: >>> /sys/class/net/ ("real" net class) >>> /sys/class/net-shadow1/ >>> /sys/class/net-shadow2/ >> >> This seems like a nice "quick fix", but do we really want to be hacking >> sysfs around like this? >> >> We have the backing sysfs_* entries that are separate from the vfs >> entities already. Why can't we simply have different /sys vfsmounts	On Thu, Jun 21, 2007 at 02:48:10PM -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote: > Dave Hansen <hansendc@us.ibm.com> writes:</hansendc@us.ibm.com>
>> This seems like a nice "quick fix", but do we really want to be hacking >> sysfs around like this? >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >>	> > On Mon, 2007-06-18 at 19:57 +0200, Benjamin Thery wrote: > >> /sys/class/net/ ("real" net class) > >> /sys/class/net-shadow1/
<ul> <li>&gt; This seems like a nice "quick fix", but do we really want to be hacking</li> <li>&gt; sysfs around like this?</li> <li>&gt; &gt;</li> <li>&gt; &gt; We have the backing sysfs_* entries that are separate from the vfs</li> <li>&gt; &gt; entities already. Why can't we simply have different /sys vfsmounts</li> </ul>	
> > We have the backing sysfs_* entries that are separate from the vfs > > entities already. Why can't we simply have different /sys vfsmounts	
> > entities already. Why can't we simply have different /sys vfsmounts	>>
	<ul> <li>&gt; We have the backing sysfs_* entries that are separate from the vfs</li> <li>&gt; entities already. Why can't we simply have different /sys vfsmounts</li> <li>&gt; with different views of the backing sysfs_* entries?</li> </ul>

> 9

- > So far this has been easier. sysfs is so tightly coupled to the kobject
- > tree decoupling them is seriously non-trivial.

Tejun just decoupled them, that's why this all changed in the -mm tree, so it might be a whole lot easier to do now.

thanks,

greg k-h

Containers mailing list

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