
Subject: Re: [RFC] Transactional CGroup task attachment

Posted by [serue](#) on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 15:34:21 GMT

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

Quoting Paul Menage (menage@google.com):

> On Fri, Jul 11, 2008 at 7:27 AM, Serge E. Hallyn <serue@us.ibm.com> wrote:

> >

> > It does feel like it may be too much designed for one particular user

> > (i.e. is there a reason not to expect a future cgroup to need a check

> > under a spinlock before a check under a mutex - say an i_sem - in the

> > can_attach sequence?),

>

> It would be fine as long as the code didn't want to *keep* holding the

> spinlock after the first check, while taking the mutex - and since

> that style of code is invalid under the existing locking rules, I

> don't see that as a problem. There's nothing to stop a

> prepare_attach_sleep() method from taking a spinlock as long as it

> releases it before it returns.

>

> Paul

Good point. For some stupid reason i was thinking don't take a spinlock at all.

Have you started an implementation?

thanks,

-serge

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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