

pfSense - Bug #5625

CARP VHID auto-incremented ?

12/10/2015 09:54 PM - Stéphane Lapie

Status:	Not a Bug	Start date:	12/10/2015
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:		% Done:	0%
Category:	CARP	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:		Affected Version:	
Plus Target Version:		Affected Architecture:	i386
Release Notes:			
Description			
<p>I am running pfSense as a virtual machine in VMware, and stumbled upon the following scenario :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Several pfSense clusters running spanned on an existing ESXi cluster, and using the same subnet for CARP2. A new host was added to the ESXi cluster, which did not have the proper setting for Net.ReversePathFwdCheckPromisc3. One instance of pfSense was moved to said new host <p>This of course led to CARP going haywire (both nodes in the same cluster reporting BACKUP) We realized our mistake quickly and set up the Net.ReversePathFwdCheckPromisc to make CARP work. But then another cluster started acting up, and a tcpdump indicated that we had a VHID conflict. Even though I initially had set the VHID for this cluster as 1, upon looking back, now the VHID had been incremented to 54, which overlapped with the VHID used by another cluster, bringing that VIP down.</p> <p>I reckon encountering something similar two years ago, precisely while fumbling around with ESXi configuration for CARP, and stumbled upon it this week again. Does this behavior ring bells with anyone?</p>			

History

#1 - 12/10/2015 09:55 PM - Stéphane Lapie

If this behavior is really caused by pfSense, could there be an option to deactivate that auto-increment? (If this is, as I suspect, a way to avoid VHID problems or conflicts)

#2 - 12/11/2015 04:00 PM - Chris Buechler

- Status changed from New to Not a Bug

- Affected Version deleted (2.2.5)

you have to take care to not cause conflicts with other CARP systems plus anything running VRRP on the same broadcast domain. Nothing anywhere in our code changes the VHID, someone set it the way you found it. Everything we do in this regard is correct.