

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] pidns: Place under CONFIG\_EXPERIMENTAL (take 2)  
Posted by [Adrian Bunk](#) on Sat, 27 Oct 2007 02:04:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, Oct 26, 2007 at 07:31:04PM -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Adrian Bunk <bunk@kernel.org> writes:

>  
> > CONFIG\_EXPERIMENTAL is a weak hint that some code might not (yet) be in  
> > a perfect state, but it does not have any semantics regarding  
> > userspace ABIs.

>  
> Code that might not (yet) be in a perfect state sums it up pretty  
> well. There is not plan or expectation to change magic numbers or  
> things like that but the behavior of the code may change as bug and  
> such are fixed.

>  
> > A dependency on BROKEN seems more appropriate.

>  
> Since you can't select that it seems a little strong.

>  
> ...

>  
> One of the things we talked about at the kernel summit is how  
> almost inevitably when new user space interfaces are introduced  
> there are problems. Someone over looks something, something  
> gets changed to get through the review something like that. There was  
> discussion but no consensus on how do introduce something like that  
> but still allow our selves the ability to fix it. Keeping the  
> code under CONFIG\_EXPERIMENTAL is the best suggest I have seen  
> so far. Even if it is slightly expanding the definition of  
> CONFIG\_EXPERIMENTAL.

>  
> Every place the kernel uses pids is a huge scope. It is very  
> easy to miss something with a scope that wide. So the engineer  
> in me says chances of us missing something are pretty huge.  
> Especially since I know we have bugs in -rc1.

>  
> If it turns out that making multiple pid namespaces work is  
> hopeless we can always change the dependency to BROKEN later.

No, we can't after 2.6.24 got released.

Let me make an example:

- looking at the timelines, e.g. Ubuntu 8.04 LTS is likely to ship with 2.6.24
- this experimental feature might be enabled there
- this Ubuntu release with this kernel will be supported and used for five years

> As for ABI and behavioral characteristics currently that is  
> largely well defined. You are supposed to get the exact  
> same thing as you would on the system if you only had a  
> single pid namespace. The places where we have questionable  
> semantics is in the intersections between namespaces.  
>  
> That is not an area I am willing to stand up and say we got  
> it perfect the first time, I'm going to support our behavior  
> quirks forever if I can find soon enough. Very few applications  
> will care, and the differences might really matter at some point.  
>  
> So does any one have any better suggestions on how to deal  
> with features that are enough work you aren't going to get them  
> perfect the first time. You need the code merged or else you  
> can not complete the feature (too many dependencies through out the  
> code). You want early adopters to start playing with the feature  
> so you can get feed back and you can test to make certain everything  
> is going ok. You want to retain the ability to fix implementation  
> details even if those details are user visible, for a time until  
> things seem as good as they can reasonably get.  
>  
> Roughly that sounds like CONFIG\_EXPERIMENTAL to me. But I would  
> be happy to hear if someone has a better idea.

There is a difference between "complete the feature" and "early adopters to start playing with the feature" on the one side, and making something available in a released kernel on the other side.

For development and playing with it it can depend on BROKEN (perhaps with the dependency removed through the first -rc kernels), but as soon as it's available in a -final kernel the ABI is fixed.

> Eric

cu  
Adrian

--

"Is there not promise of rain?" Ling Tan asked suddenly out of the darkness. There had been need of rain for many days.

"Only a promise," Lao Er said.

Pearl S. Buck - Dragon Seed

---

Containers mailing list  
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

