Subject: Re: [RFC] network namespaces
Posted by ebiederm on Tue, 12 Sep 2006 03:26:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dmitry Mishin <dim@openvz.org> writes:

> On Sunday 10 September 2006 06:47, Herbert Poetzl wrote:
>> well, I think it would be best to have both, as
>> they are complementary to some degree, and IMHO
>> both, the full virtualization _and_ the isolation
>> will require a separate namespace to work,
> [snip]
>> I do not think that folks would want to recompile
>> their kernel just to get a light-weight guest or
>> a fully virtualized one
> In this case light-weight guest will have unnecessary overhead.
> For example, instead of using static pointer, we have to find the required
> common namespace before. And there will be no advantages for such guest over
> full-featured.

Dmitry that just isn't true if implemented properly.

Eric

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers