

---

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 0/5] uts namespaces: Introduction

Posted by [serue](#) on Fri, 07 Apr 2006 19:28:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quoting Eric W. Biederman (ebiederm@xmission.com):

> "Serge E. Hallyn" <serue@us.ibm.com> writes:

>

> > Introduce utsname namespaces. Instead of a single system\_utsname

> > containing hostname domainname etc, a process can request it's

> > copy of the uts info to be cloned. The data will be copied from

> > it's original, but any further changes will not be seen by processes

> > which are not it's children, and vice versa.

> >

> > This is useful, for instance, for vserver/openvz, which can now clone

> > a new uts namespace for each new virtual server.

> >

> > This patchset is based on Kirill Korotaev's Mar 24 submission, taking

> > comments (in particular from James Morris and Eric Biederman) into

> > account.

> >

> > Some performance results are attached. I was mainly curious whether

> > it would be worth putting the task\_struct->uts\_ns pointer inside

> > a #ifdef CONFIG\_UTS\_NS. The result show that leaving it in when

> > CONFIG\_UTS\_NS=n has negligible performance impact, so that is the

> > approach this patch takes.

>

> Ok. This looks like the best version so far.

>

> I like the utsname() function thing to shorten the

> idiom of current->uts\_ns->name.

>

> We probably want to introduce utsname() and an init\_utsname()

> before any of the other changes, and then perform the substitutions,

This is the same as what Sam is saying, right? Just making sure I understand.

> before we actually change the code so the patchset can make it

> through a git-bisect. This will also allows for something

Ok, I've finally got the rest of git doing my bidding, I'll go read up on git-bisect.

thanks for the comments,

-serge

---