
Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view
Posted by [Andrey Savochkin](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2006 09:11:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Daniel,

On Mon, Jun 26, 2006 at 05:49:41PM +0200, Daniel Lezcano wrote:

>
> > 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.

I think I understand what you're talking about: you want to make routing responsible for determining destination namespace ID in addition to route type (local, unicast etc), nexthop information, and so on. Right?

My point is that if you make namespace tagging at routing time, and your packets are being routed only once, you lose the ability to have separate routing tables in each namespace.

Andrey
