Subject: Re: [patch 0/1] [RFC][net namespace] veth ioctl management
Posted by Daniel Lezcano on Tue, 20 Feb 2007 09:24:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Eric W. Biederman wrote:
> Daniel Lezcano <dlezcano@fr.ibm.com> writes:
>
>> I will have look to *your* etun interface. But, PLEASE, look at the net
>> namespace network patches (L2/L3) which were rfc'ed, posted several months ago.
>
> I have, and I have commented.
>
>> Unfortunatly, you didn't say that when Andrey sent it this summer and when
>> Dmitry ported it to the namespaces and when it was integrated to lxc patchset by
>> Cedric and when I put the L3 namespace on top of it.
>
> Mostly it is six of one half a dozen of the other as far as the actual implementation
> is concerned. The practical difference is etun is not tied in any way shape or
> form to namespaces, whereas veth appears to be.
>
>> Eric, opensource is about collaboration.
>
> Yes. Exactly. That is why I am suggesting that we try to use something
> simpler than ioctl.

Why, don't you send a patch with your etun driver on top of the network
namespace patches ? So we will be able to try it ...

> The process is about collaborating to find the best technical solution
> we can find in a timely manner.
>
> Currently the L2 stuff derived from OpenVZ appears to be completely
> unmergable because of how the patchset is constructed.
>
> I am very frustrated that you are attacking me about not cooperating.
> I have made comments (that were hopefully constructive) all along the
> way. At some points in time I was busy so I could not look at things
> in detail, but I have tried across the whole spectrum of the
> namespaces effort. I finally sat down and wrote my own network
> namespace implementation because some very important points were not
> getting addressed

Which ones ?
Why did you directly code before discussing with us about these points ?

>and I had some novel ideas on how to solve some of
> the problems. So I figured the contrast would be useful. The
> containers list wasn't my primary audience of my RFC but I was

> surprised that I received no comments there.

Probably because you send directly a *big* patch touching a lot of file.
Personnaly, I was quite surprise to discover you were working on your
own network namespace while we were all working togheter to find a
common solution L2/L3. This is an individualist behavior.

> Plus this is the biggest problem I see with the OpenVZ derived network
> namespace effort is lack of cooperation with the people who matter.
> The maintainers of the network stack. Sure people who are actually
> going to use a network namespace have to agree that the code will
> solve the problem in a usable way but if the maintainers of the
> network stack don't like or can't be interested the code is never
> going anywhere.

Sure.

_____

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers