Subject: Re: linux-2.6.20-openvz tree
Posted by Carl-Daniel Hailfinge on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 18:29:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 22.03.2007 16:59, Kirill Korotaev wrote:
> Speaking about upstream merges:
> there are 2 network virtualization implementations currently exist.
> I'm not sure how much time it will take to merge this work,
> it is very much depends on netdev@ maintainers. Maybe 2-3 month.

OK, so the target is 2.6.22 or 2.6.23, if the usual time between
releases is used as a basis for the estimation.

> Why are you interested in that? Do you want to use some particular
> feature?

Yes. I currently use Linux policy routing for ONE machine performing
double/triple/... NAT. Many people state that this is impossible,
but it works fine unless two connections from the different subnets
have identical 5-tuples. In that case, the connection tracking code
gets confused. Unfortunately, the 5-tuple used by connection tracking
and NAT has no means to incorporate the NF mark, so I hope I can
use different containers for that.

However, last time I checked, all network virtualization attempts
did NOT consider one aspect I consider important for double NAT and
virtual routers: Efficiency. Once I use virtualization, I am
constrained to virtual network interfaces and suffer the overhead
of multiple routing/bridging decisions for one packet.
It would be great if I could make physical interfaces accessible
in a VE without resorting to bridging or routing. For example,
move eth0 and eth1 to one VE, eth2 and eth3 to another VE and
keep eth4 under control of the HN.
I admit that most of this can be done with policy routing and NF
marks, but connection tracking cares about neither of them.

Regards,
Carl-Daniel
--
http://www.hailfinger.org/