Subject: Re: [PATCH 4/4] The control group itself
Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Fri, 22 Feb 2008 08:12:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Paul Menage wrote:
> On Thu, Feb 7, 2008 at 5:01 AM, Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:
>> +
>> +[cb] <major>:(<minor>|*) [r-][w-]
>> + ^ ^ ^
>> + | | |
>> + | | +--- access rights (1)
>> + | |
>> + | +-- device major and minor numbers (2)
>> + |
>> + +-- device type (character / block)
>> ...
>> +When reading from it, one may see something like
>> +
>> + c 1:5 rw
>> + b 8:* r-
>> +
>
> In the interest of avoiding proliferating cgroup control file formats,
> I'm wondering if we can abstract out the general form of the data
> being presented here and maybe simplify it in such a way that we can
> hopefully reuse the format for other control files in the future?
>
> For example, one way to represent this would be a map from device
> strings such c:1:5 to permission strings such as rw. Or maybe
> numerical device ids to numerical permission values.

You mean smth like <some_device_id><space><some_permissions_string>?

Well, I don't mind, but AFAIK the <major>:<minor> form is very common
for specifying the device. So I agree with the 'c:1:5 rw' form.

> The alternative might be to accept that there are two kinds of control
> files - those which are likely to be programmatically read (e.g.
> resource usage values), and those that are likely to be
> programmatically written but only actually read by humans for
> debugging purposes (like this one) and make it clear up-front when a
> control file is added which type they're considered to be. We could
> then ignore the API consistency requirements for the
> debugging-readable files.

Hmm, you mean make them a binary files? I thought that filesystem-based
API should be human readable and writable as much as possible...

> On a separate note, can you document the recommended way to completely
> overwrite the set of device permissions for a cgroup? Does this

There's not way to flush all the permissions in this implementation, but
I though about one. Maybe 'echo 0 > devices.permissions' would be good?

> involves writing a "--" permission for every device that you don't
> want in the cgroup?

Currently - yes.

> Paul
>

_____