

---

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 4/5] utsname namespaces: sysctl hack  
Posted by [Dave Hansen](#) on Wed, 19 Apr 2006 17:19:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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?

> 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.

-- Dave

---