Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view
Posted by jamal on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 16:17:35 GMT

Andrey,

On Wed, 2006-28-06 at 18:19 +0400, Andrey Savochkin wrote:
> Hi Jamal,
>
> On Wed, Jun 28, 2006 at 09:53:23AM -0400, jamal wrote:
> >

>
> Seeing guestXX-eth0 interfaces by standard tools has certain attractive
> sides. But it creates a lot of undesired side effects.
>

I apologize because i butted into the discussion without perhaps reading
the full thread.

> For example, ntpd queries all network devices by the same ioctls as ifconfig,
> and creates separate sockets bound to IP addresses of each device, which is
> certainly not desired with namespaces.
>

Ok, so the problem is that ntp in this case runs on the host side as
opposed to the guest? This would explain why Eric is reacting vehemently
to the suggestion.

> Or more subtle question: do you want hotplug events to be generated when
> guest0-eth0 interface comes up in the root namespace, and standard scripts
> to try to set some IP address on this interface?..
>

yes, thats what i was thinking. Even go further and actually create
guestxx-eth0 on the host (which results in creating eth0 on the guest)
and other things.

> In my opinion, the downside of this scheme overweights possible advantages,
> and I'm personally quite happy with running commands with switched namespace,
> like
> vzctl exec guest0 ip addr list
> vzctl exec guest0 ip link set eth0 up
> and so on.

Ok, above may be good enough and doesnt require any state it seems on
the host side.
I got motivated when the word "migration" was mentioned. I understood it

to be meaning that a guest may become inoperative for some reason and that its info will be transfered to another guest which may be local or even remote. In such a case, clearly one would need a protocol and the state of all guests sitting at the host. Maybe i am over-reaching.

cheers,
jamal