
Subject: Re: Re: [RFC] network namespaces

Posted by [Daniel Lezcano](#) on Wed, 06 Sep 2006 21:44:35 GMT

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

Kir Kolyshkin wrote:

> Herbert Poetzl wrote:

>

>> my point (until we have an implementation which clearly

>> shows that performance is equal/better to isolation)

>> is simply this:

>>

>> of course, you can 'simulate' or 'construct' all the

>> isolation scenarios with kernel bridging and routing

>> and tricky injection/marketing of packets, but, this

>> usually comes with an overhead ...

>>

>

> Well, TANSTAAFL*, and pretty much everything comes with an overhead.

> Multitasking comes with the (scheduler, context switch, CPU cache, etc.)

> overhead -- is that the reason to abandon it? OpenVZ and Linux-VServer

> resource management also adds some overhead -- do we want to throw it away?

>

> The question is not just "equal or better performance", the question is

> "what do we get and how much we pay for it".

>

> Finally, as I understand both network isolation and network

> virtualization (both level2 and level3) can happily co-exist. We do have

> several filesystems in kernel. Let's have several network virtualization

> approaches, and let a user choose. Is that makes sense?

Definitely yes, I agree.
