
Subject: Re: [PATCH 0/5] NFS: create blocklayout pipe per network namespace context

Posted by [Stanislav Kinsbursky](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2012 17:23:14 GMT

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

> On Tue, 2012-01-10 at 16:58 +0400, Stanislav Kinsbursky wrote:

>>> The second problem that was highlighted was the fact that as they stand
>>> today, these patchsets do not allow for bisection. When we hit the Oops,
>>> I had Bryan try to bisect where the problem arose. He ended up pointing
>>> at the patch "SUNRPC: handle RPC client pipefs dentries by network
>>> namespace aware routine", which is indeed the cause, but which is one of
>>> the `_dependencies_` for all the PipeFS notifier patches that fix the
>>> problem.

>>>

>>

>> I'm confused here. Does this mean, that I have to fix patch "SUNRPC: handle RPC
>> client pipefs dentries by network namespace aware routine" to make it able to
>> bisect?

>

> What I mean is that currently, I have various ways to Oops the kernel
> when I apply "SUNRPC: handle RPC client pipefs dentries by network
> namespace aware routine" before all these other followup patches are
> applied.

>

> One way to could fix this, might be to add dummy versions of
> `rpc_pipefs_notifier_register()/unregister()` so that "NFS: idmap PipeFS
> notifier introduced" and the other such patches can be applied without
> compilation errors or Ooopses before the "handle RPC client pipefs
> dentries..." patch is applied. The latter could then enable the real
> `rpc_pipefs_notifier_register()/....`

>

> The point is to not have these patches add `_known_` bugs to the kernel at
> any point, so that someone who is trying to track down an unknown bug
> via "git bisect" doesn't have to also cope with these avoidable
> issues...

>

Ok, thanks for explanation.

I've sent rebased "v2" of the patch set, contains updated patch "SUNRPC: handle
RPC client pipefs dentries by network namespace aware routine", which, I
believe, fixes oops, spotted by Bryan (it was caused by excessive call of
`rpc_put_mount()` on PipeFS dentries unlink).

So, if I'm not mistaken here, there's no need in implementing of dummy versions
of `rpc_pipefs_notifier_(un)register()` or any other dummy stuff.

BTW, it looks like that in last 2 days I've sent all updates to the issues you

pointed out. If not, please, ping me once more.

--

Best regards,
Stanislav Kinsbursky
