
Subject: Re: Namespaces exhausted CLONE_XXX bits problem
Posted by [Cedric Le Goater](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 07:53:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

> Quoting Cedric Le Goater (clg@fr.ibm.com):

>> to be more precise :

>>

>> long sys_clone_something(struct clone_something_args args)

>>

>> and

>>

>> long sys_unshare_something(struct unshare_something_args args)

>>

>> The arg passing will be slower bc of the copy_from_user() but we will

>> still have the sys_clone syscall for the fast path.

>>

>> C.

>

> I'm fine with the direction you're going, but just as one more option,

> we could follow more of the selinux/lsm approach of first requesting

> clone/unshare options, then doing the actual clone/unshare. So

> something like

>

> sys_clone_request(extended_64bit_clone_flags)

> sys_clone(usual args)

>

> or

>

> echo pid,mqueue,user,ipc,uts,net > /proc/self/clone_unshare

> clone()

For my information, why selinux/lsm chose that 2 steps approach ?

What kind of issues are they trying to solve ?

Thanks,

C.

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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