Subject: Re: [RFC] Prefixing cgroup generic control filenames with "cgroup."
Posted by serge on Thu, 28 Feb 2008 21:28:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quoting Paul Menage (menage@google.com):
> All control files created by cgroup subsystems are given a prefix
> corresponding to their subsystem name. But control files provided by
> cgroups itself have no prefix. Currently that set of files is just
> "tasks", "notify_on_release" and "release_agent", but that set is
> likely to expand in the future. To reduce the risk of clashes, it
> would make sense to prefix these files and any future ones with the
> "cgroup." prefix.
>
> The only reason that I can see *not* to do this would be for
> compatibility with 2.6.24. Do people think this is a strong enough
> reason to leave the existing names? If distros are planning to ship
> products based on 2.6.24, presumably they'd be adding their own
> patches anyway, so they could add a trivial prefix change patch too.
> (I realise this discussion would have been more useful *before* 2.6.24
> shipped, but I didn't quite get round to it ...)
>
> A compromise might be to keep "tasks" unprefixed, and say that future
> names get the "cgroup." prefix; in this case I'd be inclined to add
> the prefix to notify_on_release and release_agent on the grounds that
> there's much less chance of breaking anyone with those files since (I
> suspect) they're much less used.
>
> Note that if you mount a cgroup filesystem with the "noprefix" option,
> which is what the cpuset filesystem wrapper does, no subsystems have
> prefixes, and in this case the "cgroup." prefix wouldn't be used
> either. So this doesn't affect any users that explicitly mount cpusets
> rather than cgroups.
>
> Thoughts?

To me it seems quite logical that files belonging to the cgroup
subsystem would have no prefix, and I don't see any good reason to
do so.

-serge

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