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