Subject: Re: [PATCH] net: Add etun driver
Posted by Johannes Berg on Tue, 10 Apr 2007 11:02:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tue, 2007-04-10 at 12:46 +0200, Patrick McHardy wrote:

> Not totally different, so far I think we should use the same attributes
> as for RTM_SETLINK messages and include the device-specific stuff in
> IFLA_PROTINFO, which is symetric to what the kernel sends in RTM_NETLINK
> messages (see br_netlink.c for an example). The easiest case would be an
> empty IFLA_PROTINFO attribute, which would simply create a device
> without any configuration.

I'll have to look up these things.

> The main advantage that we don't get more weird sysfs/proc/ioctl based
> interfaces

Please don't put me into a corner I don't want to be in ;) The new wireless stuff was completely designed using netlink. The sysfs interface to these two specific things was a concession since it used to exist before and we don't really have a fully functional userspace tool yet.

> and use the same interface that is used for all other network
> configuration, which f.e. will allow to add support for all software
> devices to iproute without much effort, so you don't need 30 different
> tools for configuring the different software device types anymore.
> Additionally we get atomic setup/dumps and extensibility.

I don't think wireless can get away without a new tool. So much stuff there. Look at http://git.kernel.org/?p=linux/kernel/git/linville/wireless-dev.git;a=blob;f=include/linux/nl80211.h;hb=HEAD

johannes

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers