

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 4/9] namespaces: utsname: switch to using uts namespaces  
Posted by [rdunlap](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 17:37:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, 19 May 2006 03:05:23 -0600 Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> "Randy.Dunlap" <[rdunlap@xenotime.net](mailto: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](mailto: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.

It's actually for hostname. It looks to me like they are used interchangeably. yes/no?

gethostname:

<http://www.opengroup.org/onlinepubs/009695399/functions/gethostname.html>

sysconf:

<http://www.opengroup.org/onlinepubs/009695399/functions/sysconf.html>

unistd.h:

<http://www.opengroup.org/onlinepubs/009695399/basedefs/unistd.h.html>

limits.h:

<http://www.opengroup.org/onlinepubs/009695399/basedefs/limits.h.html>

>From the latter:

{HOST\_NAME\_MAX}

Maximum length of a host name (not including the terminating null) as returned from the gethostname() function.

Minimum Acceptable Value: {\_POSIX\_HOST\_NAME\_MAX}

(and)

{\_POSIX\_HOST\_NAME\_MAX}

Maximum length of a host name (not including the terminating null) as returned from the gethostname() function.

Value: 255

> > 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.

---

~Randy

---