Subject: Re: Re: [RFC] network namespaces
Posted by Herbert Poetzl on Sun, 10 Sep 2006 19:22:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Sun, Sep 10, 2006 at 11:45:35AM +0400, Dmitry Mishin wrote:
> On Sunday 10 September 2006 06:47, Herbert Poetzl wrote:
> > 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,
> [snip]
> > I do not think that folks would want to recompile
> > their kernel just to get a light-weight guest or
> > a fully virtualized one

> In this case light-weight guest will have unnecessary overhead. For
> example, instead of using static pointer, we have to find the required
> common namespace before.

this is only required at 'bind' time, which makes
a non measurable fraction of the actual connection
usage (unless you keep binding ports over and over
without ever using them)

> And there will be no advantages for such guest over full-featured.

the advantage is in the flexibility, simplicity of
setup and the basically non-existant overhead on
the hot (conenction/transfer) part ...

> > best,
> > Herbert
> >
> > > --
> > > Thanks,
> > > Dmitry.
>
> --
> Thanks,
> Dmitry.