Subject: netns49
Posted by Daniel Lezcano on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 15:14:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Eric,

I noticed that you have a netns49 in your tree. Shall we use it ?

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

Subject: Re: netns49
Posted by ebiederm on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 15:30:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Daniel Lezcano <dlezcano@fr.ibm.com> writes:

> Hi Eric,
>
> I noticed that you have a netns49 in your tree. Shall we use it ?

Yes. That is the latest snapshot of my tree.
Sorry for not putting out an announcement last night.

Eric

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

Subject: Re: netns49
Posted by ebiederm on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 15:32:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Daniel Lezcano <dlezcano@fr.ibm.com> writes:

> Hi Eric,
>
> I noticed that you have a netns49 in your tree. Shall we use it ?

I haven't pulled in your timewait socket work as it looked incomplete
but I should have removed the unnecessary tests for &init_net that
you noticed in your other patchset.

Eric

_____

Subject: Re: netns49
Posted by Daniel Lezcano on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 15:32:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Eric W. Biederman wrote:
> Daniel Lezcano <dlezcano@fr.ibm.com> writes:
>
>> Hi Eric,
>>
>> I noticed that you have a netns49 in your tree. Shall we use it ?
>
> I haven't pulled in your timewait socket work as it looked incomplete
> but I should have removed the unnecessary tests for &init_net that
> you noticed in your other patchset.

I think Denis and I we reached a complete patch posted a couple of hours
ago. Finally I didn't put the exit method in the inet_timewait_sock.c
file but I added it to the tcp.c file. There is a comment about that in
the header of the patch.

_____

Subject: Re: netns49
Posted by ebiederm on Fri, 28 Sep 2007 17:14:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Daniel Lezcano <dlezcano@fr.ibm.com> writes:

> I think Denis and I we reached a complete patch posted a couple of hours
> ago. Finally I didn't put the exit method in the inet_timewait_sock.c file but I
> added it to the tcp.c file. There is a comment about that in the header of the
> patch.

Yes. I saw that. At first glance it looks good and next time I'm through
that part of the code I will add your patches to my tree.

My priority list of the moment is:
rtnetlink, pf_packet, and improving /proc so I don't confuse find.

I'm really trying to reach the point where at a bare bones level
people can play with the functionality that is merged into the
net-2.6.24 tree and therefore into 2.6.24. That should make it
easier for more people to play with and test this code.

My ipv4 patches are at the very least going to require a reordering
and a careful review before I am satisfied with them. They aren't
exactly wrong but I think things could be done in a more obvious
and deliberate manner.

Eric