Subject: Re: [RFC PATCH 0/31] An introduction and A path for merging network namespace work
Posted by Daniel Lezcano on Thu, 01 Mar 2007 13:53:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Eric W. Biederman wrote:

[cut]
> Dmitry? Daniel? What do you think.
>

Hi Eric,

I agree with all the points you presented but I am still 50/50 for both approaches.

The major argument in favor of the explicit parameter is that it allows to keep track of the network namespace. But the argument against is it touchs a lot of files and that can makes the patch less attractive. Furthermore, everybody should not be aware of what a network namespace is and should not know how to handle the parameter function.

The implicit network namespace has the advantage to reduce considerably the impact on the code and to have network developer to be unware of the network virtualization. But in the same way the network developer should "forget" in which network namespace he is running. Another point is the race condition we have while doing network namespace switching and that can make a contention point.

Concerning the network namespace compile out, that can be done by both approaches.

In the [1/31] patch description, you mention you tryed zero sized structure on x86_64, and the optimization works for all architectures. Does it mean, you tested it with s390, PowerPC, ia64, etc ... ?

IMHO, both approaches are equivalent in terms of pros/cons. Perhaps we should ask netdev@ ...

Regards.

-- Daniel