

---

Subject: Re: [patch 0/1] [RFC][net namespace] veth ioctl management  
Posted by [Mishin Dmitry](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 17:36:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Monday 19 February 2007 20:30, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Daniel Lezcano <dlezcano@fr.ibm.com> writes:  
> > I will have look to \*your\* etun interface. But, PLEASE, look at the net  
> > namespace network patches (L2/L3) which were rfc'ed, posted several  
> > months ago.  
>  
> I have, and I have commented.  
>  
> > Unfortunately, you didn't say that when Andrey sent it this summer and  
> > when Dmitry ported it to the namespaces and when it was integrated to lxc  
> > patchset by Cedric and when I put the L3 namespace on top of it.  
>  
> Mostly it is six of one half a dozen of the other as far as the actual  
> implementation is concerned. The practical difference is etun is not tied  
> in any way shape or form to namespaces, whereas veth appears to be.  
>  
> > Eric, opensource is about collaboration.  
>  
> Yes. Exactly. That is why I am suggesting that we try to use something  
> simpler than ioctl.  
>  
> The process is about collaborating to find the best technical solution  
> we can find in a timely manner.  
>  
> Currently the L2 stuff derived from OpenVZ appears to be completely  
> unmergeable because of how the patchset is constructed.  
Please, explain. For me, your code is not mergeable as well.

>  
> I am very frustrated that you are attacking me about not cooperating.  
> I have made comments (that were hopefully constructive) all along the  
> way. At some points in time I was busy so I could not look at things  
> in detail, but I have tried across the whole spectrum of the  
> namespaces effort. I finally sat down and wrote my own network  
> namespace implementation because some very important points were not  
> getting addressed and I had some novel ideas on how to solve some of  
> the problems. So I figured the contrast would be useful. The  
> containers list wasn't my primary audience of my RFC but I was  
> surprised that I received no comments there.  
>  
> Plus this is the biggest problem I see with the OpenVZ derived network  
> namespace effort is lack of cooperation with the people who matter.  
> The maintainers of the network stack. Sure people who are actually  
> going to use a network namespace have to agree that the code will

> solve the problem in a usable way but if the maintainers of the  
> network stack don't like or can't be interested the code is never  
> going anywhere.

Fully agree. But as I can see, your code arises no more comments, than ours.  
So, we need to find other ways. Do you have more ideas?

--

Thanks,  
Dmitry.

---

Containers mailing list  
Containers@lists.osdl.org  
<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---