
Subject: Re: Re: pspace name

Posted by [Herbert Poetzl](#) on Tue, 12 Sep 2006 10:59:13 GMT

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

On Mon, Sep 11, 2006 at 12:37:44PM +0200, Cedric Le Goater wrote:

> Herbert Poetzl wrote:

> > On Thu, Sep 07, 2006 at 01:52:39PM -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> > > Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com> writes:

> > >

> > > > I agree we should rename. I had suggested pid_space to "rhyme" wiht

> > > > pidmap, but received no ack/nack. I meant to send another mail,

> > > > specially after the is_init() collision recently.

> > > > |

> > > > | 'namespace' should probably be renamed to something like

> > > > | 'mnt_namespace' ?

> >

> > > > While at it, should we change CLONE_NEWNS to CLONE_MNTNS ?

> > > We need to retain the NEW in the clone flags. CLONE_NEWMNTNS

> > > perhaps. Otherwise with clone at least we get impression of

> > > backward semantics.

> >

> > > hmm, got no comment to my suggestion to use VFS instead

> > > of MNT or mount, was it silently ignored, disliked, or

> > > just lost?

>

> mount point namespace is probably a bit more 'intuitive' than VFS

> namespace ?

hmm, depends for whom, but yes, maybe CLONE_NEWMNTNS is more understandable than CLONE_NEWVFSNS ... of course, CLONE_NEW_MNT or CLONE_NEW_VFS would still be better ... anyway not a big deal, thanks for the feedback

best,

Herbert

> C.

> _____

> Containers mailing list

> Containers@lists.osdl.org

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