

---

Subject: Re: Pid namespace patchsets review  
Posted by [serue](#) on Sun, 11 Mar 2007 13:36:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quoting Eric W. Biederman (ebiederm@xmission.com):

- >
- > 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.
- >
- > 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.
- >
- > - 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.

If we're going to put the resource stuff in, then I agree let's rename.

If we stick to this being a namespace proxy (my preference) then calling it nsproxy is more accurate.

(I can't keep up with that thread so maybe that's been decided by now :)

-serge

---

Containers mailing list  
[Containers@lists.osdl.org](mailto:Containers@lists.osdl.org)  
<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---