
Subject: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup
Posted by [git.user](#) on Tue, 19 Jun 2007 19:08:47 GMT

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

G'day

/etc/vz/dists/scripts/gentoo-add_ip.sh of vzctl v3.0.16 has a stupid but rather nasty bug.

short description:

when a function add_ip() looking for the ip(s) to be assigned to vps it use a simple grep for each of the ip(s) in conf.d/net. btw gentoo conf.d/net is some more tricky then just an ip storage, so any presence of ip in this file will breaks a logic thus an ip will not be added to conf.d/net at all.

testcase:

something like

```
postup() { route add -net 192.168.0.0/16 gw 192.168.1.1 }
```

preventing of address 192.168.1.1 being added to conf.d/net

I guess, bug itself is stupid and fix is trivial

something like:

```
- grep -qw "${ip}" ${IFCFG} || \
```

```
+ grep -qw "config_${VENET_DEV}=$(.*"${ip}["V].*)" ${IFCFG} || \
```

works for me, so really the questions are:

why we do something `_inside_` a guest system from `_outside_` at every startup if/when it can be done by guest system itself?

I mean, why we updating i.g. configuration files any time when guest system starting up?

Yes, we should assign some parameters (i.g. ip) to the guest for the first time just because root of the guest can't do this himself, or do every time something what he can't to do but it's only up to guest root to do anything what he want and can to do `_after_` startup, nop?

and on the second place wouldn't it be worth to let distro maintainers to provide/maintains scripts like `{DISTRO}-add_ip.sh`? (though i suspect this proposal may be realized not so easily...)

Subject: Re: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup

Posted by [seyko2](#) on Wed, 20 Jun 2007 13:12:53 GMT

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

Quote:

why we updating i.g. configuration files any time when guest system starting up?

Yes, we should assign some parameters (i.g. ip) to the guest for the first time just because root of the guest can't do this himself, or do every time something what he can't to do but it's only up to guest root to do anything what he want and can to do `_after_` startup, nop?

Yea, I like to get answer to this question too (from openvz team of course)

PS: I am Gentoo user too. Last time I tested rhel5-openvz kernels (and in Xen version). My opinion: rhel5-version of openvz is much more suitable for a production usage.

Subject: Re: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup

Posted by [kir](#) on Wed, 20 Jun 2007 15:30:43 GMT

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

Thanks, I have committed the patch to git:

<http://git.openvz.org/?p=vzctl;a=commit;h=695ebe56ca59d3380942d9db91b360f052e8758e>

Subject: Re: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup

Posted by [kir](#) on Wed, 20 Jun 2007 15:35:41 GMT

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

Quote:why we do something `_inside_` a guest system from `_outside_` at every startup if/when it can be done by guest system itself?

I mean, why we updating i.g. configuration files any time when guest system starting up?

We want things to "just work", and inside configuration to be in sync with the configuration we have on the node.

In general, if you need lower level functionality, try to deal with `libvzctl` -- perhaps it also needs pieces to be separated out but I guess it's a better way to start (than from scratch). One can hack a handful of low-level utils on top of `libvzctl` -- like `ubctl` for UBC, `fsctl` for fair scheduler etc. -- the same way it's separated out for `vzquota`.

Subject: Re: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup

Posted by [git.user](#) on Wed, 20 Jun 2007 19:34:13 GMT

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

[kir](#) wrote on Wed, 20 June 2007 11:35

We want things to "just work", and inside configuration to be in sync with the configuration we have on the node.

Tnx for your reply, Kir.

I'm sorry but seems like i've not understood something...

Can you explain, how a things will 'just work' if a guest root blocks incoming traffic by iptables inside the vps on per-IP basis? According to 'just work' logic you should patch an iptables config and restart iptables instead of root, nop? how it will works when somebody for god known reasons `bind()` his service to IP provided at vps startup while root of the nod change vps ip on the fly? i'm sorry but i think u just can't keep guest configuration in sync with the node. pls, pls don't protect me from my stupidity, don't protect anybody, it's not a right way...

Subject: Re: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup

Posted by [kir](#) on Wed, 20 Jun 2007 19:49:14 GMT

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

Patches are always welcome

Subject: Re: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup

Posted by [git.user](#) on Wed, 20 Jun 2007 20:10:43 GMT

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

Argh... just forget it, it's of cours only up to openvz team how they see openvz should works.

Subject: Re: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup

Posted by [git.user](#) on Wed, 20 Jun 2007 20:11:50 GMT

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

&& ok, i gothcha

Subject: Re: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup

Posted by [seyko2](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 05:37:57 GMT

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

Quote:

We want things to "just work", and inside configuration to be in sync with the configuration we have on the node.

And what wrong with concept: get config data from VE, change it, and put back? In this case we don't need to setup guest any time we start it...

Subject: Re: gentoo-add_ip.sh breaks gentoo net startup

Posted by [git.user](#) on Thu, 21 Jun 2007 06:46:03 GMT

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

just bacause u should in most generic case include gentoo baselayout-vserver into vzctl tarball to be sure u get/parsed it correctly. This nothing to do with minimal functinality provided at first startup it's all about more and more tricky configs. and even worse baselayout already has nothing to do with sysv-init thus nobody in gentoo should takes care to be compatible with the shell at all. It's unlikely but absolutely is not impossible if one day baselayout will be rewritten with hmm... python. what's wrong with python?
