Subject: Re: [patch 0/2][NETNS49][IPV4][IGMP] activate multicast per namespace Posted by ebiederm on Fri, 12 Oct 2007 21:37:59 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Daniel Lezcano <dlezcano@fr.ibm.com> writes:

```
> Eric W. Biederman wrote:
>> Daniel Lezcano <dlezcano@fr.ibm.com> writes:
>>
>>> The following patches activate the multicast sockets for
>>> the namespaces. The results is a traffic going through differents
>>> namespaces. So if there are several applications
>>> listenning to the same multicast group/port, running in
>>> different namespaces, they will receive multicast packets.
>>
>> At a first glance this feels wrong. I don't see any per
>> namespace filtering of multicast traffic. Unless the
>> multicast traffic is routed/bridged between namespaces
>> it should be possible to send multicast traffic in one
>> namespace and listen for that same traffic in another
>> namespace and not get it.
> The described behavior is the case were the namespaces are communicating via
> veth like:
>
> eth0
> l
        ----- nsA
> veth0 <--|--> veth1
>
      ----nsB
> |
> veth2 <--|--> veth3
```

- > If an application is listening in nsA and nsB. And if in nsA, an application
- > sends multicast traffic, both will receive the packets because they are routed
- > by the pair device.
- > As you said this is the correct behavior, if we have two machines hostA and
- > hostB in the same network and both are listening on the multicast address and if
- > an application on hostA send multicast packets, both should receive the
- > multicast packets.
- > If the traffic is not routed, multicast will not pass through the namespaces.

>

- > The description I gave in the patchset introduction was to describe such
- > behavior which is, IMHO, important for inter-container communication.
- > Perhaps, I should have not gave this description which seems to sow confusion in

> mind, sorry for that.

>

> Anyway, I hope the patchset is ok :)

Sounds more reasonable. I didn't see the second patch when I replied which was part of the reason I was worried. So at least at first glance that patchset looks reasonable.

Thanks, Eric

Containers mailing list Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers