
Subject: Re: [PATCH] Remove CTL_UNNUMBERED
Posted by [Alexey Dobriyan](#) on Fri, 27 Jul 2007 14:52:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, Jul 26, 2007 at 11:24:12AM -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Alexey Dobriyan <adobriyan@sw.ru> writes:
>
> > CTL_UNNUMBERED is unneeded, because it expands to
> >
> > .ctl_name = 0
> >
> > The same effect can be achieved by skipping .ctl_name initialization,
> > saving one line per sysctl.
> >
> > Update docs and headers telling people to not add CTL_ numbers and
> > giving example.
> >
> > This is probably all we can do to stop the flow of new CTL_ numbers,
> > because most of sysctls are copy-pasted. CTL_UNNUMBERED doesn't solve
> > this problem at all.
> >
> > Signed-off-by: Alexey Dobriyan <adobriyan@sw.ru>
>
> Nack. Not unless you update the documentation and explanations
> properly.

They are left in place:

Assigning binary sysctl numbers is an endless source of conflicts in sysctl.h, breaking of the user space ABI (because of those conflicts), and maintenance problems. A complete pass through all of the sysctl users revealed multiple instances where the sysctl binary interface was broken and had gone undetected for years.

> The important part is that we stop assigning binary numbers. You
> are removing part of the description of why we can not assign binary
> numbers and how that is important.

You want me to rewrite that paragraph actually mentioning CTL_UNNUMBERED?

> CTL_UNNUMBERED may be an irritant to you but as for actually using the
> code I have look and it is about 6 of 1 half dozen of the other.

Sorry, -EPARSE.
