
Subject: Re: [PATCH] Virtual ethernet device (v2.1)
Posted by [Patrick McHardy](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 12:53:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pavel Emelianov wrote:

> Patrick McHardy wrote:

>

>>Pavel Emelianov wrote:

>>

```
>>>+static const struct nla_policy veth_policy[VETH_INFO_MAX + 1] = {  
>>>+ [VETH_INFO_MAC] = { .type = NLA_BINARY, .len = ETH_ALEN },  
>>>+ [VETH_INFO_PEER] = { .type = NLA_STRING },  
>>>+ [VETH_INFO_PEER_MAC] = { .type = NLA_BINARY, .len = ETH_ALEN },  
>>>+};
```

>>

>>

>>Looks good, just one question. What happened to the IFLA_PARTNER
>>attribute idea? I have a patch to allow specifying the initial
>>MAC address for a device, IFLA_PARTNER would make the whole thing
>>symmetrical.

>

>

> Well, the notion of a partner is not applicable to any generic link
> unlike the device name, physical (MAC) address or MTU value. So i
> think that it's better to keep this as a specific driver information
> not to confuse the generic code. I think it's worth making this as
> some more generic code than it is now, but since this driver is the
> only user of "partner" maybe it's better not to make it right now.
> Later, when we do know what do we want "partner" to be.

Mhh doing it later means dealing with compatibility issues, which
is why I'm asking now. We currently support IFLA_NAME, IFLA_MTU,
IFLA_TXQLEN, IFLA_WEIGHT, IFLA_OPERSTATE and IFLA_LINKMODE, and
with my patch additionally IFLA_ADDRESS and IFLA_BROADCAST.
AFAICT they are all applicable for the partner link as well.
