

Re: Julian's netowrking challenge 2005

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/net/2005-06/0332.html>

From: Max Laier (max_at_love2party.net)

Date: 06/28/05

To: Jeremie Le Hen <jeremie@le-hen.org>

Date: Tue, 28 Jun 2005 12:37:56 +0200

On Tuesday 28 June 2005 12:27, Jeremie Le Hen wrote:

> > *Wouldn't a more general approach be better. e.g. a way to "tag" a packet*
> > *before it is sent to divert and a matching tag-lookup that can do further*
> > *action. This would make it very easy to do all kinds of stuff that needs*
> > *to know the original address instead of the translated one while avoiding*
> > *code duplication.*

>

> *Having the possibility to tag a packet would be worth indeed. But I*
> *think that Milan wants to bring network stack virtualization in*
> *newer release of FreeBSD IIUC. This would be, IMO, a great improvement*
> *of FreeBSD networking, although I'm pretty sure this would make Netgraph*
> *people react a bit ;-).*

Stack virtualization is independent of this. All I am trying to say here, is that I think it is better to have a general mechanism to do thing like that, instead of a special solution for fwd (i.e. set-nextthop).

> > *pf does something along these lines in case you are looking for*
> > *references.*

>

> *Would it be possible to share this tag among pf and ipfw ?*

Sure, it's a simple mbuf tag with a (at this point) 16bit cookie. The downside of this approach is that you need to malloc the tag, but on the other hand it's even more complicated for set-nextthop where you need to allocate a route and maybe even hold it for some time and make sure you properly GC it ... tags seem way simpler to me.

--

/"\ Best regards,	mllaier@freebsd.org
\ / Max Laier	ICQ #67774661
X http://pf4freebsd.love2party.net/	mllaier@EFnet
/ \ ASCII Ribbon Campaign	Against HTML Mail and News

-
- application/pgp-signature attachment: [stored](#)