

---

Subject: Re: current state of netns

Posted by [Daniel Lezcano](#) on Thu, 18 Oct 2007 08:57:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> "Denis V. Lunev" <den@sw.ru> writes:

>

>> Hello, Eric!

>>

>> I see that you quite busy and there is no reaction from Dave for your latest  
>> portion of netns patches. Right now, me and Pavel are working exclusively for  
>> mainstream.

>>

>> May be we could bring a torch from your hands and start to push Dave Miller even  
>> with IPv4 stuff. 3 weeks passed, no reaction for you latest code. Looks like it  
>> has been missed somehow... I even have to stop my fingers every day from  
>> touching a generic structures like flowi :)

>

> Short summary.

> - The merge window opened late.

> - All of the netns code needs to be to Dave Miller before the merge window.

> - My last round of changes were not bug fixes and were sent after Dave

> had stopped accepting feature additions for 2.6.24

>

> Therefore after the merge window when Dave Miller is ready to queue up  
> more networking patches I expect progress can be made again.

>

> I think the only thing that is happening is unfortunate timing.

>

> I'm not really opposed to people taking my patches or something like  
> them cleaning them up and running with them, I just think the current  
> slow down bad timing. We have achieved the hard part which is to  
> get the core network namespace infrastructure accepted.

>

> On another note. While I think using CONFIG\_NET\_NS is nice. I really  
> only introduced it so that production kernels can avoid enabling an  
> experimental feature. So far it still looks sane to me to remove  
> CONFIG\_NET\_NS when things are solid and we can remove the experimental  
> tag.

>

> As for ipv4 and ipv6. However we do that we want to very carefully  
> sequence the patches so that we increasingly make the network  
> namespace infrastructure fine grained. Similar to make locks fine  
> grained. I did that for my core network namespaces patches but that  
> careful ordering still needs to happen for my ipv4 patches.

Denis, Pavel,

this is great to have you with us for netns. Do you mind if we follow the rule : "patches sent to netdev@ are coming from Eric's git tree, any enhancements are posted to Eric/containers" ?  
So at least, we have the patches stacked and that give us time to review and to test.

Eric, what do you think about that ?

By the way, Benjamin and I, we are making ipv6 per namespace. We will send a first patchset for addrconf, ndisc, ip\_fib6, fib6\_rules probably at the end of the week or at the begin of the next week.

We are also planning to choose a small patch subset from Eric's tree for ipv4 to be proposed to containers@ before sending it to netdev@ (we should be here very careful and send ipv4, piece by piece, and ensure at all cost init\_net\_ns will not be broken).

I don't have a clear idea when the merge window will be closed. I guess, we should resend af\_netlink, af\_unix and af\_packet before sending anything new, like af\_inet.

Can we coordinate our effort, what do you plan to do ?

Regards.

-- Daniel

---