

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 00/10] Containers(V10): Generic Process Containers

Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 18:13:41 GMT

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

---

On 6/8/07, Serge E. Hallyn <serue@us.ibm.com> wrote:

>  
> I do fear that that could become a maintenance nightmare. For instance  
> right now there's the call to fsnotify\_mkdir(). Other such hooks might  
> be placed at vfs\_mkdir, which we'd then likely want to have placed in  
> our container\_mkdir() and container\_clone() fns. And of course  
> may\_create() is static inline in fs/namei.c. It's trivial, but still if  
> it changes we'd want to change the version in kernel/container.c as  
> well.

Do we need to actually need to respect may\_create() in  
container\_clone()? I guess it would provide a way for root to control  
which processes could unshare namespaces.

>  
> What would be the main advantage of doing it this way? Do you consider  
> the extra subys->auto\_setup() hook to be avoidable bloat?  
>

I was thinking that it would be nice to be able to atomically set up  
the resources in the new container at the point when it's created  
rather than later. But I guess this way can work too. Can we call it  
something like "clone()" rather than "auto\_setup()"?

Paul

---