
Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view
Posted by [Ben Greear](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 23:08:23 GMT

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

Herbert Poetzl wrote:

> On Mon, Jun 26, 2006 at 03:13:17PM -0700, Ben Greear wrote:

> yes, that sounds good to me, any numbers how that
> affects networking in general (performance wise and
> memory wise, i.e. caches and hashes) ...

I'll run some tests later today. Based on my previous tests,
I don't remember any significant overhead.

>>Using the mac-vlan and source-based routing tables, I can give a
>>unique 'interface' to each process and have each process able to bind
>>to the same IP port, for instance. Using source-based routing (by
>>binding to a local IP explicitly and adding a route table for that
>>source IP), I can give unique default routes to each interface as
>>well. Since we cannot have more than 256 routing tables, this approach
>>is currently limited to around 250 virtual interfaces, but that is
>>still a substantial amount.

>

>

> an typically that would be sufficient IMHO, but
> of course, a more 'general' hash tag would be
> better in the long run ...

I'm willing to offer a bounty (hardware, beer, money, ...)
if someone will 'fix' this so we can have 1000 or more routes....

Being able to select these routes at a more global level (without
having to specifically bind to a local IP would be nice as well.)

Ben

--

Ben Greear <greearb@candelatech.com>
Candela Technologies Inc <http://www.candelatech.com>
