
Subject: Re: Network virtualization/isolation

Posted by [Daniel Lezcano](#) on Mon, 04 Dec 2006 17:41:33 GMT

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

Dmitry Mishin wrote:

> On Monday 04 December 2006 19:43, Herbert Poetzl wrote:

>> On Mon, Dec 04, 2006 at 06:19:00PM +0300, Dmitry Mishin wrote:

>>> On Sunday 03 December 2006 19:00, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

>>>> Ok. Just a quick summary of where I see the discussion.

>>>>

>>>> We all agree that L2 isolation is needed at some point.

>>> As we all agreed on this, may be it is time to send patches

>>> one-by-one? For the beginning, I propose to resend Cedric's

>>> empty namespace patch as base for others - it is really empty,

>>> but necessary in order to move further.

>>>

>>> After this patch and the following net namespace unshare

>>> patch will be accepted,

>> well, I have neither seen any performance tests showing

>> that the following is true:

>>

>> - no change on network performance without the

>> space enabled

>> - no change on network performance on the host

>> with the network namespaces enabled

>> - no measureable overhead inside the network

>> namespace

>> - good scaleability for a larger number of network

>> namespaces

> These questions are for complete L2 implementation, not for these 2 empty

> patches. If you need some data relating to Andrey's implementation, I'll get

> it. Which test do you accept?

tbench ?

With the following scenarii:

- * intra host communication (one time with IP on eth and one time with 127.0.0.1)

- * inter host communication

Each time:

- a single network namespace

- with 100 network namespace. 1 server communicating and 99 listening but doing nothing.

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