## Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view Posted by jamal on Fri, 30 Jun 2006 00:15:52 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Fri, 2006-30-06 at 09:07 +1200, Sam Vilain wrote: > jamal wrote:

- > > Makes sense for the host side to have naming convention tied
- >> to the guest. Example as a prefix: guest0-eth0. Would it not
- > > be interesting to have the host also manage these interfaces
- > > via standard tools like ip or ifconfig etc? i.e if i admin up
- > y guest0-eth0, then the user in guest0 will see its eth0 going
- > > up.

>

- > That particular convention only works if you have network namespaces and
- > UTS namespaces tightly bound.

that would be one approach. Another less sophisticated approach is to have no binding whatsoever, rather some translation table to map two unrelated devices.

- > We plan to have them separate so for
- > that to work, each network namespace could have an arbitrary "prefix"
- > that determines what the interface name will look like from the outside
- > when combined. We'd have to be careful about length limits.

>

- > And guest0-eth0 doesn't necessarily make sense; it's not really an
- > ethernet interface, more like a tun or something.

>

it wouldnt quiet fit as a tun device. More like a mirror side of the guest eth0 created on the host side

i.e a sort of passthrough device with one side visible on the host (send from guest0-eth0 is received on eth0 in the guest and vice-versa).

Note this is radically different from what i have heard Andrey and co talk about and i dont wanna disturb any shit because there seems to be some agreement. But if you address me i respond because it is very interesting a topic;->

- > So, an equally good convention might be to use sequential prefixes on
- > the host, like "tun", "dummy", or a new prefix then a property of that
- > is what the name of the interface is perceived to be to those who are in
- > the corresponding network namespace.

>

- > Then the pragmatic question becomes how to correlate what you see from
- > `ip addr list' to guests.

on the host ip addr and the one seen on the guest side are the same. Except one is seen (on the host) on guest0-eth0 and another is seen on eth0 (on guest).

Anyways, ignore what i am saying if it is disrupting the discussion.

cheers, jamal