Subject: Re: [RFC] Prefixing cgroup generic control filenames with "cgroup."
Posted by Paul Menage on Fri, 29 Feb 2008 01:03:33 GMT

On Thu, Feb 28, 2008 at 3:36 PM, Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com> wrote:
>
> We could accomplish that much by decreeing that future new kernel
> generated names that we might add follow some stronger convention,
> such as the cgroup_ or appropriate subsystem prefix.

Subsystem-created files already have an appropriate prefix.

> No need to
> change the existing well known names for this reason.

But that's part of my point - is it reasonable to describe a system
that was only introduced in 2.6.24 as "well-known"?

>
>   Actually, in terms of 'common names used
> by humans' some of these names, "tasks" and "notify_on_release", date
> back much earlier than that. Please don't rename these two files in
> cgroups; and of course absolutely don't rename them in cpusets.

No, I wasn't planning to make any changes to cpusets.

>
> Please don't end up with different names of these files, depending on
> whether you're in cgroups or cpusets, either.

That already happens - when mounted as the "cpuset" filesystem, we
have names like "mems_allowed". When mounted as cgroups, we have names
like cpuset.mems_allowed.

>
> > Could we do something like auto-prefixing user-created directories with a
> > fixed string so that there is no way in which the user can cause a
> > collision with kernel-created files?
>
> Lordy lordy -- a bunch of intrusive, complicating crap to solve a
> non-existent problem (sorry for the indelicate choice of words ;).

No, I don't like that idea either.

Paul

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers