
Subject: Re: [PATCH] Routing table change in vps-functions for complex setups
Posted by [Christian Hofstaedtle\[1\]](#) on Thu, 13 Mar 2008 21:07:32 GMT

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

Kir,
Alexey,

Thanks for your comments.

> >This is legal. This makes sense. I would not do this, because local
> >table was not supposed to be used to hardwire some routes except for
> >truly local ones.
> >I am not quite sure what problem it solves. It looks like it reduces
> >flexibility instead of increasing it.

It solves this problem:

If you add routing rules for multiple local subnets which are shared with the VEs, the VEs will be unreachable, because the subnet routing rules would come before the main table (and therefore before the VE routes).

> >The first question: if we create one more table and one more rule with
> >priority only a bit less than priority of local sure, sort of:
> >
> >SPECIAL=250
> >ip rule add from any to any table \$SPECIAL pref 1
> >and add all the routes for VE addresses there. Would not it be the same?
> >
> >If it would, then such option can be added.
>
> So, if using a separate table helps, would you please implement it (with
> some global parameter making it optional, i.e. only then this param is set).

Yes, having a separate routing table will work, too. One needs to create the routing rule (ip rule, as specified by Alexey), though. This leads to the question, where/when to create this rule.

I've had this working with a separate table already, and chose to do the "ip route add" in the vz-initscript, but this seemed quite fragile.

I'll incorporate this.

- Christian

--
