

So, there have been various options suggested over the course of this thread:

--

1) no code changes, just stake out all names matching a certain regexp (e.g. "[a-z].*") as being potentially used by the kernel in the future; document this, and let users who are worried about name clashes avoid these names

pros: no work involved, avoids potentially complex changes to solve a possibly non-problem.

cons: leaves an intermingled namespace; since this would be a convention rather than an enforced rule, users might be unaware that they're setting themselves up for a fall

--

2) separate out the kernel-generated names and user-generated names by putting the user-generated names in a "groups" sub-directory (can be a mount option that's automatically disabled for cpusets).

pros: completely solves problem of intermingled namespaces; makes it easier to see sub-groups at a glance

cons: extra code, slightly more awkward to deal with in the general case, is incompatible with the code that was in mainline in the brief period of time since 2.6.24 was finalized.

--

3) prefix all cgroup-provided files with "cgroup."

pros: hardly any extra code; mostly solves the namespace problem since user names are much less likely to begin with "cgroup."

cons: changes name of "tasks" file visible in 2.6.24; doesn't help if a future new subsystem is introduced with a commonly-used name that might clash with existing user-generated names.

--

4) prefix all future cgroup files with "cgroup." (possibly including existing `notify_on_release` and `release_agent` files?)

pros: no extra code, just involves slightly longer strings for future new files; no incompatibility issues

cons: ugly inconsistency between new cgroup files and grandfathered old ones, plus same clash problems as option 3

--

Paul

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