
Subject: Re: [PATCH 00/10] Containers(V10): Generic Process Containers
Posted by [serue](#) on Wed, 06 Jun 2007 22:39:52 GMT

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

Quoting Paul Jackson (pj@sgi.com):

> > Would it then make sense to just
> > default to (parent_set - sibling_exclusive_set) for a new sibling's
> > value?
>
> Which could well be empty, which in turn puts one back in the position
> of dealing with a newborn cpuset that is empty (of cpus or of memory),
> or else it introduces a new and odd constraint on when cpusets can be
> created (only when there are non-exclusive cpus and mems available.)
>
> > An option is fine with me, but without such an option at all, cpusets
> > could not be applied to namespaces...
>
> I wasn't paying close enough attention to understand why you couldn't
> do it in two steps - make the container, and then populate it with
> resources.

Sorry, please clarify - are you saying that now you do understand, or
that I should explain?

> But if indeed that's not possible, then I guess we need some sort of
> option specifying whether to create kids empty, or inheriting.

Paul (uh, Menage :) should I do a patch for this or have you got it
already?

thanks,
-serge
