Subject: Re: strict isolation of net interfaces Posted by Cedric Le Goater on Fri, 30 Jun 2006 08:56:13 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

- > The last one in your diagram confuses me why foo0:1? I would
- > have thought it'd be

just thinking aloud. I thought that any kind/type of interface could be mapped from host to guest.

```
> host
    guest 0 | guest 1 | guest2
|-> eth0 |
 |-> veth0 <-----+-> eth0 |
> | |
|-> veth1 <-----+-> eth0
>
 |-> veth2 <----+-> eth0 |
```

- > I think we should avoid using device aliases, as trying to do
- > something like giving eth0:1 to guest1 and eth0:2 to guest2
- > while hiding eth0:1 from guest2 requires some uglier code (as
- > I recall) than working with full devices. In other words,
- > if a namespace can see eth0, and eth0:2 exists, it should always
- > see eth0:2.

>

- > So conceptually using a full virtual net device per container
- > certainly seems cleaner to me, and it seems like it should be
- > simpler by way of statistics gathering etc, but are there actually
- > any real gains? Or is the support for multiple IPs per device
- > actually enough?

> Herbert, is this basically how ngnet is supposed to work?