

---

Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view  
Posted by [Daniel Lezcano](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 15:49:41 GMT

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

---

> 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.

>  
> - keep a "flat" model where network ressources have a new identifier  
>>which is the network namespace pointer. The idea is to move only some  
>>network informations private to the namespace (eg port range, stats, ...)  
>  
>  
> Sorry, I don't get the second idea with only some information private to  
> namespace.  
>  
> How do you want TCP\_INC\_STATS macro look?

I was thinking in TCP\_INC\_STATS(net\_ns, field)  
SNMP\_INC\_STATS(net\_ns->tcp\_stat, field)

> In my concept, it would be something like  
> #define TCP\_INC\_STATS(field) SNMP\_INC\_STATS(current\_net\_ns->tcp\_stat, field)  
> where tcp\_stat is a TCP statistics array inside net\_namespace.

---