Subject: Re: Namespaces exhausted CLONE_XXX bits problem Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 08:25:56 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
Dave Hansen wrote:
```

> On Mon, 2008-01-14 at 16:36 -0500, Oren Laadan wrote: >> I second the concern of running out of 64 bits of flags. In fact, the >> problem with the flags is likely to be valid outside our context, and >> general to the linux kernel soon. Should we not discuss it there >> too ? > > It would be pretty easy to make a new one expandable: > > sys_newclone(int len, unsigned long *flags_array) > Then you could give it a virtually unlimited number of "unsigned long"s > pointed to by "flags_array". > Plus, the old clone just becomes: > sys_oldclone(unsigned long flags) > > do_newclone(1, &flags); > > > > We could validate the flags array address in sys_newclone(), then call > do_newclone().

Hmm. I have an idea how to make this w/o a new system call. This might look wierd, but. Why not stopple the last bit with a CLONE_NEWCLONE and consider the parent_tidptr/child_tidptr in this case as the pointer to an array of extra arguments/flargs?

> -- Dave > >

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