
Subject: Re: Re: [RFC] [PATCH 0/7] Some basic vserver infrastructure
Posted by [Sam Vilain](#) on Wed, 29 Mar 2006 21:30:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed, 2006-03-29 at 07:47 -0600, Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

> Alas, the spacing on the picture didn't quite work out :) I think that
> by nested containers, you mean overlapping nested containers. In your
> example, how are you suggesting that cont1 refers to items in
> container1.1.2's shmem? I assume, given your previous posts on openvz,
> that you want every shmem id in all namespaces "nested" under cont1 to
> be unique, and for cont1 to refer to any item in container1.1.2's
> namespace just as it would any of cont1's own shmem?
>
> In that case I am not sure of the actual usefulness. Someone with
> different use for containers (you? :) will need to justify it. For me,
> pure isolation works just fine. Clearly it will be most useful if we
> want fine-grained administration, from parent namespaces, of the items
> in a child namespace.

The overlapping is important if you want to pretend that the namespace-able resources are allowed to be specified per-process, when really they are specified per-family.

In this way, a process family is merely a grouping of processes with like namespaces, and depending on which way they overlap you get the same behaviour as when processes only have one resource different, and therefore remove the overhead on fork().

Sam.
