

IEEE Standards Interpretation for IEEE Std 1003.1™-1990 IEEE Standard for Information Technology--Portable Operating System Interfaces (POSIX®)

Copyright © 2001 by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. 3 Park Avenue New York, New York 10016-5997 USA All Rights Reserved.

Interpretations are issued to explain and clarify the intent of a standard and do not constitute an alteration to the original standard. In addition, interpretations are not intended to supply consulting information. Permission is hereby granted to download and print one copy of this document. Individuals seeking permission to reproduce and/or distribute this document in its entirety or portions of this document must contact the IEEE Standards Department for the appropriate license. Use of the information contained in this document is at your own risk.

IEEE Standards Department Copyrights and Permissions 445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855-1331, USA

Interpretation Request #115

Topic: mprotect v mmap **Relevant Sections:** 12.2.3.2 , 12.2.1.2, p272 line 220, p278 line 416 PASC

It would appear that the two paragraphs should be saying the same thing (identically) and they do not, particularly the bit about the `_POSIX_MEMORY_PROTECTION` option.

At least reconcile the two paragraphs. However, it would be better to remove the duplication (by moving it to a section of general concepts) and refer to the resultant text there. (I suspect that one or the other paragraphs (probably the one at 23167) is correct as it stands.)

Interpretation Response

The standard is clear; `_POSIX_MEMORY_PROTECTION` covers all of mprotect but only part of mmap. No change is required.

Rationale for Interpretation

None. Forwarded to Interpretations group: 19 June 2000 Proposed resolution: 25 July 2000 Finalised interpretation: 29 August 2000 [note, not part of this interpretation: an observation on 10 above, one reason they do not have a statement about the Memory Protection option in mprotect() is that the whole function is only supported in .1-1996 when the option is supported, hence specifying semantics in that case makes no sense]