The tunnel64_protocol uses the tunnel4_protocol's err_handler and
thus calls the tunnel4_protocol's handlers.

This is not very good, as in case of (icmp) error the wrong error
handlers will be called (e.g. ipip ones instead of sit) and this
won't be noticed at all, because the error is not reported.

Was that made deliberately and I miss something?

Signed-off-by: Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org>

```
diff --git a/net/ipv4/tunnel4.c b/net/ipv4/tunnel4.c
index c71617c..7938430 100644
--- a/net/ipv4/tunnel4.c
+++ b/net/ipv4/tunnel4.c
@@ -145,6 +145,17 @@ static void tunnel4_err(struct sk_buff *skb, u32 info)
   break;
 }

+#if defined(CONFIG_IPV6) || defined(CONFIG_IPV6_MODULE)
+static void tunnel64_err(struct sk_buff *skb, u32 info)
+{
+ struct xfrm_tunnel *handler;
+
+ for (handler = tunnel64_handlers; handler; handler = handler->next)
+  if (!handler->err_handler(skb, info))
+   break;
+}
+#endif
+
 static struct net_protocol tunnel4_protocol = {
  .handler = tunnel4_rcv,
  .err_handler = tunnel4_err,
@@ -154,7 +165,7 @@ static struct net_protocol tunnel4_protocol = {
 #if defined(CONFIG_IPV6) || defined(CONFIG_IPV6_MODULE)
 static struct net_protocol tunnel64_protocol = {
  .handler = tunnel64_rcv,
- .err_handler = tunnel4_err,
+ .err_handler = tunnel64_err,
  .no_policy = 1,
 };
 #endif
```

--
1.5.3.4

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/4] Add missed tunnel64_err handler
Posted by davem on Sun, 11 Nov 2007 05:48:24 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

From: Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org>
Date: Fri, 09 Nov 2007 16:14:12 +0300

> The tunnel64_protocol uses the tunnel4_protocol's err_handler and
> thus calls the tunnel4_protocol's handlers.
>
> This is not very good, as in case of (icmp) error the wrong error
> handlers will be called (e.g. ipip ones instead of sit) and this
> won't be noticed at all, because the error is not reported.
>
> Was that made deliberately and I miss something?
>
> Signed-off-by: Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org>

This definitely was doing the wrong thing for the SIT
case, for example. So this looks legitimate to me.

Patch applied, thanks!