Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view Posted by Cedric Le Goater on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 10:14:28 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi!

Eric W. Biederman wrote:

[...]

- > So just to sink one additional nail in the coffin of the silly
- > guest to guest communication issue. For any two guests where
- > fast communication between them is really important I can run
- > an additional interface pair that requires no routing or bridging.
- > Given that the implementation of the tunnel device is essentially
- > the same as the loopback interface and that I make only one
- > trip through the network stack there will be no performance overhead.
- > Similarly for any critical guest communication to the outside world
- > I can give the guest a real network adapter.

>

- > That said I don't think those things will be necessary and that if
- > they are it is an optimization opportunity to make various bits
- > of the network stack faster.

just one comment on the 'guest to guest communication' topic:

guest to guest communication is an important factor in consolidation scenarios, where containers are packed on one server. This for maintenance issues or priority issues on a HPC cluster for example. This case of container migration is problably the most interesting and the performance should be more than acceptable. May be not a top priority for the moment.

tr	nar	٦K	S,
----	-----	----	----

C.