

Subject: Routing tables (Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view)

Posted by [Kari Hurtta](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 09:45:29 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 ?

One application may be following. Consider firewall



