
Subject: Re: Re: [RFC] network namespaces

Posted by [Herbert Poetzl](#) on Sun, 10 Sep 2006 02:47:09 GMT

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

On Sat, Sep 09, 2006 at 11:57:24AM +0400, Dmitry Mishin wrote:

> On Friday 08 September 2006 22:11, Herbert Poetzl wrote:

> > actually the light-weight ip isolation runs perfectly

> > fine `_without_ CAP_NET_ADMIN`, as you do not want the

> > guest to be able to mess with the 'configured' ips at

> > all (not to speak of interfaces here)

> It was only an example. I'm thinking about how to implement flexible

> solution, which permits light-weight ip isolation as well as

> full-fledged network virtualization. Another solution is to split

> `CONFIG_NET_NAMESPACE`. Is it good for you?

well, I think it would be best to have both, as
they are complementary to some degree, and IMHO

both, the full virtualization `_and_` the isolation

will require a separate namespace to work, I also

think that limiting the isolation to something

very simple (like one IP + network or so) would

be acceptable for a start, because especially

multi IP or network range checks require a little

more effort to get them right ...

I do not think that folks would want to recompile

their kernel just to get a light-weight guest or

a fully virtualized one

best,

Herbert

> --

> Thanks,

> Dmitry.
