

Re: plans for multiple routing tables

# Re: plans for multiple routing tables

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/net/2007-11/msg00214.html>

---

- *From:* "Bruce M. Simpson" <[bms@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:bms@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 27 Nov 2007 08:49:05 +0000
- 

mosaic wrote:

I would like to ask, whether there are any plans to implement multiple route tables, like OpenBSD did:

<http://archives.neohapsis.com/archives/openbsd/2006-10/2665.html>

Yup, we're aware of these changes.

[The feature you're referring to is actually the ability to have multiple choices for next-hops, not multiple routing tables -- that's just how the next-hops might conceptually be presented to the user.]

I'm well aware of fact that i can do policy routing via pf/ipf/ipfw as well of

<http://imunes.tel.fer.hr/virtnet/>

Again, not entirely the same thing. IMUNES is overkill for most people's requirements, and is about more than 'just' the forwarding plane; it is however a novel and interesting way of doing network simulation or virtualization.

There are a whole bunch of potential issues with implementing multipath right.

I would suggest, for now, that we just import the OpenBSD changes to the existing BSD FIB, as it is a relatively low change in terms of code.

I've responded to Julian off-list about his plans as a number of groups and individuals have been looking at this issue.

I would like to see this work out OK, but I do not have 'copious free time' in which to do this at the moment -- I gotta earn a living!

regards,  
BMS

---

freebsd-net@xxxxxxxxxxx mailing list  
<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-net>

Re: plans for multiple routing tables

Re: plans for multiple routing tables

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-net-unsubscribe@xxxxxxxxxxx"