

---

Subject: Re: [RFC] network namespaces

Posted by [Daniel Lezcano](#) on Wed, 06 Sep 2006 09:10:23 GMT

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

---

Hi Herbert,

> well, the 'ip subset' approach Linux-VServer and  
> other Jail solutions use is very clean, it just does  
> not match your expectations of a virtual interface  
> (as there is none) and it does not cope well with  
> all kinds of per context 'requirements', which IMHO  
> do not really exist on the application layer (only  
> on the whole system layer)  
>  
> IMHO that would be quite simple, have a 'namespace'  
> for limiting port binds to a subset of the available  
> ips and another one which does complete network  
> virtualization with all the whistles and bells, IMHO  
> most of them are orthogonal and can easily be combined  
>  
> - full network virtualization  
> - lightweight ip subset  
> - both  
>  
> IMHO this requirement only arises from the full system  
> virtualization approach, just look at the other jail  
> solutions (solaris, bsd, ...) some of them do not even  
> allow for more than a single ip but they work quite  
> well when used properly ...

As far as I see, vserver use a layer 3 solution but, when needed, the  
veth "component", made by Nestor Pena, is used to provide a layer 2  
virtualization. Right ?

Having the two solutions, you have certainly a lot of information about  
use cases. From the point of view of vserver, can you give some examples  
of when a layer 3 solution is better/worst than a layer 2 solution ? Who  
wants a layer 2/3 virtualization and why ?

These informations will be very useful.

Regards

-- Daniel

---