
Subject: Re: [PATCH 0/6] containers: Generic Process Containers (V6)

Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Fri, 05 Jan 2007 00:25:59 GMT

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

Hi Serge,

On 1/3/07, Serge E. Hallyn <serue@us.ibm.com> wrote:

> From: Serge E. Hallyn <serue@us.ibm.com>

> Subject: [RFC] [PATCH 1/1] container: define a namespace container subsystem

>

> Here's a stab at a namespace container subsystem based on

> Paul Menage's containers patch, just to experiment with

> how semantics suit what we want.

Thanks for looking at this.

What you have here is the basic boilerplate for any generic container subsystem. I realise that my current containers patch has some incompatibilities with the way that nsproxy wants to work.

>

> A few things we'll want to address:

>

> 1. We'll want to be able to hook things like

> rmdir, so that we can rm -rf /containers/vserver1

> to kill all processes in that container and all

> child containers.

The current model is that rmdir fails if there are any processes still in the container; so you'd have to kill processes by looking for pids in the "tasks" info file. This was behaviour inherited from the cpusets code; I'd be open to making this more configurable (e.g. specifying that rmdir should try to kill any remaining tasks).

>

> 2. We need a semantic difference between attaching

> to a container, and being the first to join the

> container you just created.

Right - the way to do this would probably be some kind of "container_clone()" function that duplicates the properties of the current container in a child, and immediately moves the current process into that container.

>

> 3. We will want to be able to give the container

> attach function more info, so that we can ask to

> attach to just the network namespace, but none of

> the others, in the container we're attaching to.

If you want to be able to attach to different namespaces separately, then possibly they should be separate container subsystems?

Paul
