
Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 16:40:59 GMT

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

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

>> Then you lose the ability for each namespace to have its own routing entries.
>> Which implies that you'll have difficulties with devices that should exist
>> and be visible in one namespace only (like tunnels), as they require IP
>> addresses and route.
>
> I mean instead of having the route tables private to the namespace, the routes
> have the information to which namespace they are associated.

Is this an implementation difference or is this a user visible difference?
As an implementation difference this is sensible, as it is pretty insane
to allocate hash tables at run time.

As a user visible difference that affects semantics of the operations
this is not something we want to do.

Eric
