
Subject: Re: strict isolation of net interfaces

Posted by [Daniel Lezcano](#) on Tue, 04 Jul 2006 12:29:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Andrey Savochkin wrote:

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

Andrey,

some people are interested by a network full isolation/virtualization like you did with the layer 2 isolation and some other people are interested by a light network isolation done at the layer 3. This one is intended to implement "application container" aka "lightweight container".

In the case of a layer 3 isolation, the network interface is not totally isolated and the debate here is to find a way to have something intuitive to manage the network devices.

IHMO, all the discussion we had convinced me of the needs to have the possibility to choose between a layer 2 or a layer 3 isolation.

If it is ok for you, we can collaborate to merge the two solutions in one. I will focus on layer 3 isolation and you on the layer 2.

Regards

- Daniel
