

---

Subject: Re: L2 network namespace benchmarking  
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Wed, 28 Mar 2007 12:06:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Kirill Korotaev <dev@sw.ru> writes:

>> Ideally we can optimize the bridge code or something equivalent to  
>> it so that we can take one look at the destination mac address and  
>> know which network namespace we should be in. Potentially moving this  
>> work to hardware when the hardware supports multiple queues.  
> yes, we can hack the bridge, so that packets coming out of eth devices  
> can go directly to the container and get out of veth devices from  
> inside the container.  
>  
>> If we can get the overhead out of the routing code that would be  
>> tremendous. However I think it may be more realistic to get the  
>> overhead out of the ethernet bridging code where we know we don't need  
>> to modify the packet.  
> Why not optimize both? :)

If the optimizations are safe and correct I don't have a problem.

When we seem to have multiple copies of a packet in circulation and we skip a what appears to be a required copy on write, I'm dubious.

Although the more I look at suggested optimization the less dubious I am as it appears all we are skipping is a ttl decrement and the cow flag exclusively applies to the data chunk and not the header chunk of the packet whatever that means.

However we still need to guard against a loop in our routing table setup between multiple guests.

Eric

---

Containers mailing list  
[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---