Subject: Re: [RFC PATCH 0/4] Container Freezer: Reuse Suspend Freezer
Posted by Paul Menage on Thu, 03 Apr 2008 23:49:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Thu, Apr 3, 2008 at 2:03 PM, <matthltc@us.ibm.com> wrote:
>
> * "freezer.kill"
>
> writing <n> will send signal number <n> to all tasks
>

My first thought (not having looked at the code yet) is that sending a signal doesn't really have anything to do with freezing, so it shouldn't be in the same subsystem. Maybe a separate subsystem called "signal"?

And more than that, it's not something that requires any particular per-process state, so there's no reason that the subsystem that provides the "kill" functionality shouldn't be able to be mounted in multiple hierarchies.

How about if I added support for stateless subsystems, that could potentially be mounted in multiple hierarchies at once? They wouldn't need an entry in the css set, since they have no state.

> * Usage :
>
> # mkdir /containers/freezer
> # mount -t container -ofreezer freezer /containers/freezer
> # mkdir /containers/freezer/0
> # echo $some_pid > /containers/freezer/0/tasks
>
> to get status of the freezer subsystem :
>
> # cat /containers/freezer/0/freezer.freeze
> RUNNING
>
> to freeze all tasks in the container :
>
> # echo 1 > /containers/freezer/0/freezer.freeze
> # cat /containers/freezer/0/freezer.freeze
> FREEZING
> # cat /containers/freezer/0/freezer.freeze
> FROZEN

Could we separate this out into two files? One called "freeze" that's a 0/1 for whether we're intending to freeze the subsystem, and one called "frozen" that indicates whether it is frozen? And maybe a

"state" file to report the RUNNING/FREEZING/FROZEN distinction in a human-readable way?

Paul

_____

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