
Subject: Re: [PATCH 5/5] net: Make AF_UNIX per network namespace safe.
Posted by [Patrick McHardy](#) on Sat, 29 Sep 2007 17:50:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Patrick McHardy <kaber@trash.net> writes:

>

>>>Currently I don't fold the namespace into the hash so multiple
>>>namespaces using the same socket name will be guaranteed a hash
>>>collision.

>>

>>

>>That doesn't sound like a good thing :) Is there a reason for
>>not avoiding the collisions?

>

>

> Two reasons. Minimizing the size of the changes to make review
> easier, and I don't know if hash collisions are likely in practice
> or if they matter. I don't believe we can't physically collide and
> have the same inode because we make a node in the filesystem. The
> abstract domain is local to linux and so people don't use it as much.

>

> All of which boils down to. I don't see it matter a heck of a lot
> especially initially. So I did the traditional unix thing and started
> with a simple and stupid implementation. But it didn't quite feel
> right to me either so I documented it.

>

> Whipping up a patch to take the namespace into account in mkname
> doesn't look too hard though.

It doesn't look like it would increase patch size significantly
(about 4 more changed lines), but it could of course be done in
a follow-up patch.

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
