

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH] UBC: user resource beancounters  
Posted by [Arjan van de Ven](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 09:57:48 GMT

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

---

On Tue, 2006-08-22 at 11:02 +0100, Alan Cox wrote:

> Ar Llu, 2006-08-21 am 18:45 -0700, ysgrifennodd Rohit Seth:  
> > I think as the tasks move around, it becomes very heavy to move all the  
> > pages belonging to previous container to a new container.  
>  
> Its not a meaningful thing to do. Remember an object may be passed  
> around or shared. The simple "creator pays" model avoids all the heavy  
> overheads while maintaining the constraints.

Hi,

there is one issue with the "creator pays" model: if the creator can decide to die/go away/respawn then you can create orphan resources. This is a leak at least, but if a malicious user can control the death/respawn cycle it can even be abused to bypass the controls in the first place. Keeping the owner alive until all shared users are gone is not always a good idea either; if a container significantly malfunctions (or requires a restart due to, say, a very urgent glibc security update), keeping it around anyway is not a valid option for the admin. (And it forms another opportunity for a malicious user, keep a (vulnerable) container alive by hanging on to a shared resource deliberately)

A general "unshare me out" function that finds a new to-blame owner might work, just the decision whom to blame is not an easy one in that scenario.

Greetings,  
Arjan van de Ven

--

if you want to mail me at work (you don't), use [arjan \(at\) linux.intel.com](mailto:arjan@linux.intel.com)

---