
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
