

Re: NdisQueryBufferSafe question

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.development.device.drivers/2005-01/1201.html>

From: Alireza Dabagh [MS] (*alid_at_online.microsoft.com*)

Date: 01/26/05

Date: Tue, 25 Jan 2005 18:27:33 -0800

Yes it is normal to have a chained buffer of length zero. This is an optimization for some layers in the stack that based on some situation may or may not have a header to add to the packet.

I think you should see this even without psched being installed.

As for specifying priority when mapping memory, the right thing to do is to ask for lowest priority. If the call fails, the worst that can happen is that we lose network connectivity (after TCP retries and time out, etc.). On the other hand if a component like file system fails to allocate memory, the worst that can happen is data corruption. So there is really no justification for a network driver to ask for high priority resource allocation when we have components out there that for them the result of failure to allocate resources could be far more devastating. As for what to do with the packet if allocation fails, just drop it and fail the send. Don't bother with queuing because that could make the low resource situation even worse.

-ali

--

This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no rights.

"Gabriel Bogdan" <na@na.na> wrote in message

news:uvSYJLyAFHA.3336@TK2MSFTNGP11.phx.gbl...

> Thanks for the replays,

>

> I just so this, It's not the mapping that is failning, the function

> returns

> a valid pointer, but the lenght is 0; (my assert was for pointer && lenght

> ..)

> :(

>

> Still, is it normal to have a chained buffer of 0 lenght?

>

> And, since there is not resource problem, I guess I should send as much

> data

> as I have...

>

>