
Subject: Re: Pid namespace patchsets review

Posted by [Sukadev Bhattiprolu](#) on Sat, 10 Mar 2007 18:24:05 GMT

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

Eric W. Biederman [ebiederm@xmission.com] wrote:

|
| It is good to see these patches are starting to come together.

| Be patient a good review is going to take me a little bit.

Ok.

| A couple of immediate things I see that would be nice to address before
| we aim at merging these patches upstream.

| - Since there are known cases that we still need to convert to use struct
| pid can we disable the clone/unshare unless we have the CONFIG_EXPERIMENTAL
| flag set. And a comment in Kconfig saying we are almost but not quite
| there yet. With that in place I would have no problems with the idea
| of merging all of the bits needed to have multiple pid namespaces before
| we finish making the code pid namespace safe.

Agree.

|
| - When we do the rename can we please rename it task_proxy and have the functions
| follow that naming. The resource limiting conversation seems to be going in
| that direction, and it more general then what we are using now.

Agree.

|
| - At a first skim the patches didn't quite feel like they were git-bisect safe.
| I haven't looked closely enough to be certain yet.

Yes. They were safe until my most recent changes :-) We are working on
cleaning that up.

| Eric

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.osdl.org

<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
