

pfSense - Bug #1233

License Error for ipw_bss, ipw_ibss, wpi, ipw_monitor, etc.

01/26/2011 07:33 PM - Steve Vigneau

Status:	Rejected	Start date:	01/26/2011
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:		% Done:	0%
Category:	Wireless	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:		Affected Architecture:	
Affected Version:	2.0		

Description

While watching 2.0-BETA5 (i386) built on Wed Jan 26 10:45:46 EST 2011 boot I noticed this. It can also be seen in dmesg on a freshly booted alix 2d3.

```
ipw_bss: You need to read the LICENSE file in /usr/share/doc/legal/intel_ipw/.
ipw_bss: If you agree with the license, set legal.intel_ipw.license_ack=1 in /boot/loader.conf.
module_register_init: MOD_LOAD (ipw_bss_fw, 0xc0700de0, 0) error 1
ipw_ibss: You need to read the LICENSE file in /usr/share/doc/legal/intel_ipw/.
ipw_ibss: If you agree with the license, set legal.intel_ipw.license_ack=1 in /boot/loader.conf.
module_register_init: MOD_LOAD (ipw_ibss_fw, 0xc0700e80, 0) error 1
wpi: You need to read the LICENSE file in /usr/share/doc/legal/intel_wpi/.
wpi: If you agree with the license, set legal.intel_wpi.license_ack=1 in /boot/loader.conf.
module_register_init: MOD_LOAD (wpi_fw, 0xc0873b60, 0) error 1
ipw_monitor: You need to read the LICENSE file in /usr/share/doc/legal/intel_ipw/.
ipw_monitor: If you agree with the license, set legal.intel_ipw.license_ack=1 in /boot/loader.conf
.
module_register_init: MOD_LOAD (ipw_monitor_fw, 0xc0700f20, 0) error 1
```

History

#1 - 01/26/2011 07:35 PM - Jim Pingle

- Status changed from New to Rejected

Those have always been there.

It's an unfortunate requirement for certain Intel cards. If you have the card you have to set a sysctl to ACK the license and let it work. Nothing we can really do to suppress that.

#2 - 01/26/2011 07:37 PM - Steve Vigneau

Wouldn't it be possible to present the user with the license file during install, then have a check box they explicitly have to mark which sets that for them?

#3 - 01/26/2011 07:41 PM - Jim Pingle

Maybe (I think there is a really old ticket for that) but it was considered beyond the scope of what we wanted to do for 2.0, especially given that so few people use those on pfSense, and I don't think any of them support hostap.