

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH][RFC] Cleanup in namespaces unsharing  
Posted by [Cedric Le Goater](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 12:01:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Pavel Emelianov wrote:

> Cedric Le Goater wrote:

>> Pavel Emelianov wrote:

>>> Currently we have two funtions to copy the namespaces:

>>> copy\_namespaces() and unshare\_nsproxy\_namespaces(). The

>>> second one checks for unsupported functionality with

>>>

>>> #ifndef CONFIG\_IPC\_NS

>>> if (unshare\_flags & CLONE\_NEWIPC)

>>> return -EINVAL;

>>> #endif

>>>

>>> -like constructions, while the first one does not. One

>>> of the side effects of this is that clone() with the

>>> CLONE\_NEWXXX set will return 0 if the kernel doesn't

>>> support XXX namespaces thus confusing the user-level.

>>>

>>> The proposal is to make these calls clean from the ifdefs

>>> and move these checks into each namespaces' stubs. This

>>> will make the code cleaner and (!) return -EINVAL from

>>> fork() in case the desired namespaces are not supported.

>>>

>>> Did I miss something in the design or this patch worth merging?

>> I've sent a more brutal patch in the past removing CONFIG\_IPC\_NS

>> and CONFIG\_UTS\_NS. Might be a better idea ?

>

> In case namespaces do not produce performance loss - yes.

>

> By that patch I also wanted to note that we'd better make

> all the other namespaces check for flags themselves, not

> putting this in the generic code.

yep. let's fix that in the coming ones if they have config option.

a similar issue is the following check done in

unshare\_nsproxy\_namespaces() and copy\_namespaces() :

```
if (!capable(CAP_SYS_ADMIN))
```

```
    return -EPERM;
```

it would be interesting to let the namespace handle the unshare

permissions. CAP\_SYS\_ADMIN shouldn't be required for all namespaces.

ipc is one example.

C.

---