

---

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 symmetric 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](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---