
Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view
Posted by [Daniel Lezcano](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2006 09:34:36 GMT

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

Andrey Savochkin wrote:

> Daniel,

>

> On Mon, Jun 26, 2006 at 05:49:41PM +0200, Daniel Lezcano wrote:

>

>>>Then you lose the ability for each namespace to have its own routing entries.

>>>Which implies that you'll have difficulties with devices that should exist

>>>and be visible in one namespace only (like tunnels), as they require IP

>>>addresses and route.

>>

>>I mean instead of having the route tables private to the namespace, the

>>routes have the information to which namespace they are associated.

>

>

> I think I understand what you're talking about: you want to make routing

> responsible for determining destination namespace ID in addition to route

> type (local, unicast etc), nexthop information, and so on. Right?

Yes.

>

> My point is that if you make namespace tagging at routing time, and

> your packets are being routed only once, you lose the ability

> to have separate routing tables in each namespace.

Right. What is the advantage of having separate the routing tables ?
