

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] Virtual ethernet device (v2.1)  
Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 13:32:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Patrick McHardy wrote:

> Pavel Emelianov wrote:

>> Patrick McHardy wrote:

>>

>>> Mhh doing it later means dealing with compatibility issues, which

>>> is why I'm asking now. We currently support IFLA\_NAME, IFLA\_MTU,

>>

>> Oh, I see.

>>

>>

>>> IFLA\_TXQLEN, IFLA\_WEIGHT, IFLA\_OPERSTATE and IFLA\_LINKMODE, and

>>> with my patch additionally IFLA\_ADDRESS and IFLA\_BROADCAST.

>>> AFAICT they are all applicable for the partner link as well.

>>

>> Agree. Maybe it is better to make some generic routine to create the

>> device with the parameters specified in the netlink packet. Then the

>> generic code creates one end of a tunnel and calls ->new\_link callback.

>> This callback extracts the PARTNER packet part and calls this generic

>> routine to create the second pair.

>

>

> Something like that. Moving the part between NLM\_F\_CREATE and the

> ops->newlink call of rtnl\_newlink to a new function should work.

>

> For now you could even parse the IFLA\_PARTNER attribute and nested

> IFLA\_NAME/IFLA\_ADDRESS attributes yourself and ignore the rest,

> this will at least leave us the option of handling it generically

> later.

OK. I'll try to make the generic call. Could you please send me the  
patches with IFLA\_ADDRESS support for booth kernel and ip utility.

Thanks,

Pavel

---