
Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 3/4]: Enable multiple mounts of /dev/pts
Posted by [Oren Laadan](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 19:25:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

> Quoting Pavel Emelyanov (xemul@openvz.org):

>> Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

>>> Quoting Pavel Emelyanov (xemul@openvz.org):

>>>> sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

>>>>> From: Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com>

>>>>> Subject: [RFC][PATCH 3/4]: Enable multiple mounts of /dev/pts
[SNIP]

>>>> That stuff becomes very very similar to that in proc :)

>>>> Makes sense to consolidate. Maybe...

>>> Yeah, and the mqns that Cedric sent too. I think Cedric said he'd

>>> started an a patch implementing a helper. Cedric?

>> Mmm. I wanted to send one small objection to Cedric's patches with mqns,

>> but the thread was abandoned by the time I decided to do-it-right-now.

>>

>> So I can put it here: forcing the CLONE_NEWNS is not very good, since

>> this makes impossible to push a bind mount inside a new namespace, which

>> may operate in some chroot environment. But this ability is heavily

>

> Which direction do you want to go? I'm wondering whether mounts

> propagation can address it.

>

> Though really, I think you're right - we shouldn't break the kernel

> doing CLONE_NEWMQ or CLONE_NEWPTS without CLONE_NEWNS, so we shouldn't

> force the combination.

>

>> exploited in OpenVZ, so if we can somehow avoid forcing the NEWNS flag

>> that would be very very good :) See my next comment about this issue.

>>

>>> Pavel, not long ago you said you were starting to look at tty and pty

>>> stuff - did you have any different ideas on devpts virtualization, or

>>> are you ok with this minus your comments thus far?

>> I have a similar idea of how to implement this, but I didn't thought

>> about the details. As far as this issue is concerned, I see no reasons

>> why we need a kern_mount-ed devptsfs instance. If we don't make such,

>> we may safely hold the ptsns from the superblock and be happy. The

>> same seems applicable to the mqns, no?

>

> But the current->nsproxy->devpts->mnt is used in several functions in

> patch 3.

>

>> The reason I have the kern_mount-ed instance of proc for pid namespaces

>> is that I need a vfsmount to flush task entries from, but allowing

>> it to be NULL (i.e. no kern_mount, but optional user mounts) means
>> handing all the possible races, which is too heavy. But do we actually
>> need the vfsmount for devpts and mqns if no user-space mounts exist?
>>
>> Besides, I planned to include legacy ptys virtualization and console
>> virtualization in this namespace, but it seems, that it is not present
>> in this particular one.
>
> I had been thinking the consoles would have their own ns, since there's
> really nothing linking them, but there really is no good reason why
> userspace should ever want them separate. So I'm fine with combining
> them.

If you want to run something like an X server inside each container
(eg each container holds a desktop session of a different user), then
you need a separate virtual-console namespace for each container.

(yes, X per-se needs to provide remote display as opposed to use
local hardware; see <http://www.ncl.cs.columbia.edu/research/thinc/>)

[SNIP]

Oren.

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