Subject: Re: [patch 0/1] [RFC][net namespace] veth ioctl management
Posted by ebiederm on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 21:01:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Kirill Korotaev <dev@sw.ru> writes:

> Eric,
>
>> Mostly it is six of one half a dozen of the other as far as the actual
> implementation
>> is concerned. The practical difference is etun is not tied in any way shape
> or
>> form to namespaces, whereas veth appears to be.
> veth is not tied to namespaces as well.
> it is possible to create a pair of veth devices in host system for example.

But the code is because it has that push/pop thing in it. At least it
did last time I looked. Daniels changes sound like there where making
namespace assumptions in the veth configuration code, but I could
be wrong there. I do agree that there is no fundamental reason why
namespace assumptions should be made it just that they were :(

>> Currently the L2 stuff derived from OpenVZ appears to be completely
>> unmergable because of how the patchset is constructed.
> you didn't say it before... :)
> can you point to *exact* issues we can fix?
> I really think that commenting each other approaches
> and fixing this we can go quicker.

Agreed.

Eric

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers