Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 4/5] utsname namespaces: sysctl hack
Posted by ebiederm on Wed, 19 Apr 2006 17:37:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> writes:

> 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?

Because it doesn't affect what happens in /proc/sys !
Strategy routines only affect sys_sysctl.

As strategy routines I have no real problems with them.
I haven't looked terribly closely yet.

>> 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.

Exactly.   I have a patch I will be sending out shortly that
make sys_sysctl a compile time option (so we can seriously start killing it)
and it compiles out the strategy routines and /proc/sys still works :)

Eric