
Subject: Re: The issues for agreeing on a virtualization/namespaces implementation.

Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 03:52:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Serge E. Hallyn" <serue@us.ibm.com> writes:

>

> What I tried to do in a proof of concept long ago was to have
> CLONE_NETNS mean that you get access to all the network devices, but
> then you could drop/add them. Conceptually I prefer that to getting an
> empty namespace, but I'm not sure whether there's any practical use
> where you'd want that...

My observation was that the network stack does not come out cleanly as a namespace unless you adopt the rule that a network device belongs to exactly one network namespace.

With that rule dealing with the network stack is just a matter of making some currently global variables/data structures per container.

A pain to do the first round but easy to maintain once you are there and the logic of the code doesn't need to change.

Eric
