Hi,

When physical routers are used, they allow VRF based forwarding. They can be made of Linux namespace.

However, when a container is being used to virtualize routers, it prevents from running within each containers some VRF based packet processing. For instance, assume that you have 10 containers running MP-BGP into each containers; using MP-BGP, each container can manage 1 to few thousands of VRF (routing table).

With the current assumptions, assuming than MP-BGP uses namespace to index the routing table, then it cannot support the combination of VRF forwarding within each container/namespace.

A workaround can be to add a VRF attribute into each namespace so any packet processing can be prefixed by an VR index (routing table, IPsec SAD/SPD lookup, etc.).

Have you ever considered any other options like adding a VRF index into each namespace?

Thank you,
Vincent
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As anyone any concerns about VRF exclusivity versus containers? Or should I send it on devel@ mailing list instead?

Thank you,
Vincent
On 18/10/2012 10:31, Vincent JARDIN wrote:
> Hi,
> >
When physical routers are used, they allow VRF based forwarding. They can be made of Linux namespace.

However, when a container is being used to virtualize routers, it prevents from running within each containers some VRF based packet processing. For instance, assume that you have 10 containers running MP-BGP into each containers; using MP-BGP, each container can manage 1 to few thousands of VRF (routing table).

With the current assumptions, assuming than MP-BGP uses namespace to index the routing table, then it cannot support the combination of VRF forwarding within each container/namespace.

A workaround can be to add a VRF attribute into each namespace so any packet processing can be prefixed by an VR index (routing table, IPsec SAD/SPD lookup, etc.).

Have you ever considered any other options like adding a VRF index into each namespace?