
Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/2] iptables 32bit compat layer
Posted by [Arnd Bergmann](#) on Mon, 20 Feb 2006 15:55:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Monday 20 February 2006 09:10, Mishin Dmitry wrote:

> @@ -118,6 +125,10 @@ struct xt_match

> +#ifdef CONFIG_COMPAT

> +#endif

Is CONFIG_COMPAT the right conditional here? If the code is only used for architectures that have different alignments, it should not need be compiled in for the other architectures.

> @@ -154,6 +165,10 @@ struct xt_target

> +#ifdef CONFIG_COMPAT

> +#endif

> @@ -233,6 +248,34 @@ extern void xt_proto_fini(int af);

> +#ifdef CONFIG_COMPAT

> +#include <net/compat.h>

> +

> +/* FIXME: this works only on 32 bit tasks

> + * need to change whole approach in order to calculate align as function of

> + * current task alignment */

> +

```
> +struct compat_xt_counters
> +{
> +};
```

Hmm, maybe we should have something like

```
typedef u64 __attribute__((aligned(4))) compat_u64;
```

in order to get the right alignment on the architectures where it makes a difference. Do all compiler versions get that right?

+0300

```
> @@ -364,5 +365,62 @@ extern unsigned int ipt_do_table(struct
```

```
> +
> +#ifdef CONFIG_COMPAT
> +#include <net/compat.h>
> +
> +struct compat_ip_t_getinfo
> +{
```

```
> +};
```

This structure looks like it does not need any conversions. You should probably just use struct ip_t_getinfo then.

```
> +
> +struct compat_ip_t_entry_match
> +{
```

```
> +};  
> +  
> +struct compat_ipt_entry_target  
> +{
```

```
> +};
```

Dito

```
> +  
> +extern int ipt_match_align_compat(void *match, void **dstptr,  
  
> +extern int ipt_target_align_compat(void *target, void **dstptr,  
  
> +  
> +#endif /* CONFIG_COMPAT */
```

```
> @@ -23,6 +23,14 @@ struct compat_msgsghdr {
```

```
> +#if defined(CONFIG_X86_64)  
> +#define is_current_32bits() (current_thread_info()->flags & _TIF_IA32)  
> +#elif defined(CONFIG_IA64)  
> +#define is_current_32bits() (IS_IA32_PROCESS(ia64_task_regs(current)))  
> +#else  
  
> +#endif  
> +
```

This definition looks very wrong to me. For x86_64, the right thing to check should be TS_COMPAT, no _TIF_IA32, since you can also call the 64 bit syscall entry point from a i386 task running on x86_64. For most other architectures, is_current_32bits returns something that is not reflected in the name. I would e.g. expect the function to return '1' on i386 and the correct task state on other compat platforms, instead of a bogus '0'.

There have been long discussions about the inclusions of the 'is_compat_task' macro. Let's at least not define a second function that does almost the same but gets it wrong.

I would much rather have either an extra 'compat' argument to to sock_setsockopt and proto_ops->setsockopt than to spread the use of is_compat_task further.

```
> @@ -308,107 +308,6 @@ void scm_detach_fds_compat(struct msghdr
```

```
> - * For now, we assume that the compatibility and native version
```

```
> - */
```

```
> -struct compat_ipt_replace {
```

```
> -};
```

Is the FIXME above the only reason that the code needs to be changed?
What is the reason that you did not just address this in the compat_sys_setsockopt implementation?

Arnd <><
