Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view
Posted by Andrey Savochkin on Tue, 27 Jun 2006 09:38:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tue, Jun 27, 2006 at 11:34:36AM +0200, Daniel Lezcano wrote:
> Andrey Savochkin wrote:
> > 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?
>
> Yes.
>
> >
> > 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.
>
> Right. What is the advantage of having separate the routing tables ?

Routing is everything.
For example, I want namespaces to have their private tunnel devices.
It means that namespaces should be allowed have private routes of local type,
private default routes, and so on...

Andrey