On Wed, 2006-04-19 at 10:52 -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:
> Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> writes:
>
> > Besides ipc and utsnames, can anybody think of some other things in
> > sysctl that we really need to virtualize?
>
> All of the networking entries.
...
> Only in that you attacked the wrong piece of the puzzle.
> The strategy table entries simply need to die, or be rewritten
> to use the appropriate proc entries.

If we are limited to ipc, utsname, and network, I'd be worried trying to
justify _too_ much infrastructure.  The network namespaces are not going
to be solved any time soon.  Why not have something like this which is a
quite simple, understandable, minor hack?

> The proc entries are the real interface, and the two pieces
> don't share an implementation unfortunately.

You're saying that the proc interface doesn't use the ->strategy entry?
That isn't what I remember, but I could be completely wrong.

-- Dave