
Subject: Re: [PATCH] Virtual ethernet device (tunnel)
Posted by [Patrick McHardy](#) on Wed, 02 May 2007 12:59:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jamal wrote:

> On Wed, 2007-02-05 at 14:34 +0200, Patrick McHardy wrote:

>

>

>>Thats a lot better than using sysfs, but I think it would be
>>preferable to use rtnetlink instead of genetlink for network
>>configuration.

>

>

> or you can just hold rtnl while using genl.

> I do agree it would be easier to just use rtnetlink ...

The rtnl needs to be held in either case, but using a different netlink family introduces races in message processing. For example a simple:

```
ip link add dev veth0
```

```
ip route add 10.0.0.0/8 dev veth0
```

might fail because we have two different input queues and the routing message might get processed before the link message.
