
Subject: Re: SSH package for U++
Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 09 Aug 2018 14:49:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oblivion wrote on Thu, 09 August 2018 16:24Hello Mirek,

Quote:

Sure, as I said that was the point where I decided that fully non-blocking mode is "blocking" this kind of interface.

I'm sorry but I really don't understand this one.

Well, if you are about to have such Get in the interface, you expect it to be usable with multiple streams at the same time. Storing into single ftp->done is no go then.

Really, let us wait for `co_await` and do it right then

Quote:

If you find it reasonable, I'll rewrite the SSH package with only blocking mode in mind (but with necessary thread safety, and add its components gradually).

"Pseudoblocking" - we still would like to have `WhenWait` and `Abort` (afaik it is now named "Cancel", but `TcpSocket` is using `Abort`, so maybe it should have the same name). `WhenWait` and `Abort` will allow GUI around it.... (That said, I think each channel should have its own `WhenWait`).

In reality, I do not think that there is a lot of new things to develop. This is mostly simplifying and removing.... Probably `Cmd` will get simplified, `ComplexCmd` probably can be removed.

I have today developed `SFtpStream` (based on new blocking `Get/Put`) and tried to add a "new schema" `SaveFile / LoadFile`. It is a good feeling to load file over sftp line by line. Anyway, but supporting the standard stream, most of those specialised methods become unnecessary IMO.

Quote:

But as I already wrote in my previous messages, let us not change the "single session-multiple channels model" and not exclude any components.

Yes, after you have explained the reason, I agree. (Well, maybe it could have "private Ssh session" and both modes, but probably not worth it)

Quote:

Is this OK?

Absolutely, except I might want to work on it a bit too. So please at least check what happens in svn.

Mirek
