
Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 0/7] Clone PTS namespace

Posted by [hpa](#) on Wed, 09 Apr 2008 18:01:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

- > We want to provide isolation between containers, meaning PTYs in container
- > C1 should not be accessible to processes in C2 (unless C2 is an ancestor).

Yes, I certainly can understand the desire for isolation. That wasn't what my question was about.

- > The other reason for this in the longer term is for checkpoint/restart.
- > When restarting an application we want to make sure that the PTY indices
- > it was using is available and isolated.

OK, this would be the motivation for index isolation.

- > A complete device-namespaces could solve this, but IIUC, is being planned
- > in the longer term. We are hoping this would provide the isolation in the
- > near-term without being too intrusive or impeding the implementation of
- > the device namespaces.

I'm just worried about the accumulation of what feels like ad hoc namespaces, causing a very large combination matrix, a lot of which don't make sense.

-hpa

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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