
Subject: Re: [PATCH 4/9] namespaces: utsname: switch to using uts namespaces
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 09:05:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Randy.Dunlap" <rdunlap@xenotime.net> writes:

> On Thu, 18 May 2006 10:49:36 -0500 Serge E. Hallyn wrote:
>
>> Replace references to system_utsname to the per-process uts namespace
>> where appropriate. This includes things like uname.
>>
>> Changes: Per Eric Biederman's comments, use the per-process uts namespace
>> for ELF_PLATFORM, sunrpc, and parts of net/ipv4/ipconfig.c
>>
>> Signed-off-by: Serge E. Hallyn <serue@us.ibm.com>

>
> OK, here's my big comment/question. I want to see <nodename> increased to
> 256 bytes (per current POSIX), so each field of struct <variant>_utsname
> needs be copied individually (I think) instead of doing a single
> struct copy.

Where is it specified? Looking at the spec as SUSV3 I don't see a size specified for nodename.

> I've been working on this for the past few weeks (among other
> things). Sorry about the timing.
> I could send patches for this against mainline in a few days,
> but I'll be glad to listen to how it would be easiest for all of us
> to handle.
>
> I'm probably a little over half done with my patches.
> They will end up adding a lib/utsname.c that has functions for:
> put_oldold_uname() // to user
> put_old_uname() // to user
> put_new_uname() // to user
> put_posix_uname() // to user

Sounds reasonable, if we really need a 256 byte nodename.

As long as they take a pointer to the appropriate utsname structure these patches should not fundamentally conflict.

Eric
