Posted by serue on Mon, 09 Jun 2008 18:19:12 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message Quoting Dave Hansen (dave@linux.vnet.ibm.com): > On Mon, 2008-06-09 at 11:23 -0500, Serge E. Hallyn wrote: > > > > >> Yeah that's insurmountable - notice the stack in the process which was > > fork()ed to be the restarted process topped at bfcab000, while the > > checkpointed stack topped at bfdae000. You're not allowed to write > > above the stack. So the only things to do are 1. keep trying the restart in the hopes you get a task with > > stack topping at or above bfdae000 > > 2. if the checkpointed stack is too high to be likely to be > > restartable, generate a new checkpoint image and you should get a lower stack top. > > > > >> (Dave, maybe you had other ideas I haven't considered) > Have you tried turning of stack randomization? It should make the stack > more dependable at exec. We could also provide a hint somewhere on > exec() where to place the stack. Yup, that should prevent the spurious -EFAULTS. Suka, you were getting these too last week, so I recommend doing echo 0 > /proc/sys/kernel/randomize va space on startup. -serge Containers mailing list Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers

Subject: Re: restarting tests/sleep