

---

Subject: Re: [patch -mm 2/4] mqueue namespace : add unshare support

Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Thu, 29 Nov 2007 21:49:40 GMT

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

---

Oren Laadan <[orenl@cs.columbia.edu](mailto:orenl@cs.columbia.edu)> writes:

> Two comments:

>

> 1) Does it ever make any sense to clone the IPC namespace \*without\* doing  
> so also for the MQ namespace or vice versa ? Unless there is a good  
> reason for doing so, a single CLONE\_IPCMQ flag would suffice.

SYSVIPC and POSIX IPC are different, and I don't see any argument for why they would be in the same namespace. So for maintenance, testing, and the fact that we have already shipped a stable version of the IPC namespace and we would be breaking the ABI if we were to add messages queues into it now.

Frankly I find it a shame that we had to do more than implement multiple mounts of the mq filesystem to make this work.

In general when we use the filesystem namespace for new global objects visible to user space is a design bug.

> 2) Before coming up with a new clone2() or other solution, what about the  
> proposed (and debated) sys\_indirect() -- if it gets merged it can provide  
> the solution.

Bleh. We have to have the flag parameters and modify all of the code anyway so I'm not quite certain that sys\_indirect make sense.

Certainly in this case if we have namespaces that can not be combined with CLONE\_THREAD we could double assign a field really easily. Trouble is that is just a bit icky.

Eric

---

Containers mailing list

[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---