Subject: Re: strict isolation of net interfaces
Posted by Sam Vilain on Tue, 04 Jul 2006 03:00:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Andrey Savochkin wrote:
>> Why special case loopback?
>>
>> Why not:
>>
>> host | guest 0 | guest 1 | guest2
>> ----------+----------+----------+---------- -
>> | | | |
>> |-> lo | | |
>> | | | |
>> |-> vlo0 <---------+-> lo | |
>> | | | |
>> |-> vlo1 <---------+----------+----------+-> lo
>> | | | |
>> |-> vlo2 <--------+----------+-> lo |
>> | | | |
>> |-> eth0 | | |
>> | | | |
>> |-> veth0 <--------+-> eth0 | |
>> | | | |
>> |-> veth1 <--------+----------+----------+-> eth0
>> | | | |
>> |-> veth2 <-------+----------+-> eth0 |
>>
>
> I still can't completely understand your direction of thoughts.
> Could you elaborate on IP address assignment in your diagram, please? For
> example, guest0 wants 127.0.0.1 and 192.168.0.1 addresses on its lo
> interface, and 10.1.1.1 on its eth0 interface.
> Does this diagram assume any local IP addresses on v* interfaces in the
> "host"?
>

Well, Eric already pointed out some pretty good reasons why this thread
should die.

The idea is that each "lo" interface would have the same set of
addresses. Which would make routing on the host confusing. Yet another
reason to kill this idea. Let's just make better tools instead.

Sam.

> And the second question.
> Are vlo0, veth0, etc. devices supposed to have hard_xmit routines?

>