Subject: Re: [PATCH 03/16] net: Basic network namespace infrastructure. Posted by ebiederm on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 06:40:15 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Krishna Kumar2 < krkumar2@in.ibm.com > writes:

```
> Eric W. Biederman wrote on 09/09/2007 02:45:34 AM:
> Hi Eric,
>> +static int register_pernet_operations(struct list_head *list,
               struct pernet operations *ops)
>> +{
>> <snip>
>> +out:
>> + return error;
>> +
>> +out_undo:
>> + /* If I have an error cleanup all namespaces I initialized */
>> + list del(&ops->list);
>> + for each net(undo net) {
        if (undo net == net)
>> +
          goto undone;
>> +
        if (ops->exit)
>> +
          ops->exit(undo_net);
>> +
>> + }
>> +undone:
>> + goto out;
>> +}
> You could remove "undone" label (and associated) goto with a "break".
I could but there is there is no guarantee that the for_each_net macro is
implemented with standard C looping construct such that break will work,
and in one of the earlier versions that wasn't the case. So my paranoia
says an explicit label safer and just as clear.
>> +static void unregister pernet operations(struct pernet operations *ops)
>> +{
>> + struct net *net;
>> +
>> + list_del(&ops->list);
>> + for_each_net(net)
>> +
        if (ops->exit)
          ops->exit(net);
>> +
>> +}
> Don't you require something like for each net backwards to 'exit' in
```

- > reverse order? Same comment for unregister_subnet_subsys(). Should this
- > be done for failure in register_pernet_operations too?

There are no ordering guarantees between the initialization and cleanup of different network namespaces. The only real guarantee is that the initial network namespace is always present. Which means any order will work so always doing it in a forwards order in the list should be fine.

Eric

Containers mailing list Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers