

Re: bridging

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.networking/2004-07/1788.html>

From: Greg Brewer (greg-spam_at_brewer.net)

Date: 07/23/04

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 2004 13:42:11 -0500

If working with the ISP is what I have to do then I will do it. My goal is to look at all possibilities. We have reasons for doing as we do.

On the internet as a whole, if there are multiple routes to a destination and one route becomes unavailable then the second route will be used. Using this gives me my "fail-over" capability. All I should have to do is establish two routes over the two separate physical devices.

Greg

"Phillip Windell" <@.> wrote in message

news:ewfIkXMceHA.4024@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...

> *This doesn't make any sense at all to me. The Servers don't have anything to*

> *do with this.*

>

> *It is not about IP#s. It is about physical links and what devices have*

> *control over them.*

>

> *If the two links come into the same physical device (a router) then that*

> *physical device can handle the "fail-over" (if it is capable). If two links*

> *come into two separate physical devices than "fail over" is not typically*

> *possible. Routers perform this by using redundant physical links and use*

> *their own built in abilities combined with routing protocols (RIP, IGRP,*

> *EIGRP, etc) to perform the "fail over". It is the routing protocols that*

> *determine a link is no longer operational and causes changes to the "routing*

> *tables" in the next routing table update, and the new changes in the*

> *routing tables cause a different route to be taken to a given destination if*

> *a redundant path exists.*

>

> *This is why the ISP has to be the one to build a solution. It is thier*

> *lines, it is their equipment (in part), it is their service, and it is*

> *they*

> *you have to work together with to create a solution.*

>
> --
>
> Phillip Windell [MCP, MVP, CCNA]
> www.wandtv.com
>
> "Greg Brewer" <greg-spam@brewer.net> wrote in message
> news:41011d15\$0\$449\$be864849@news.hal-mli.net...
>> Someone pointed out a flaw in my plans. I was figuring on being able to
> use
>> the internal network to go around a T1 failure. Of course, that won't
> work
>> because it is the router that has the IP address; not the server.
>>
>> My new idea is to get a couple of new public IP addresses for the
routers
>> and move the current ones to the servers. But that would mean they
aren't
>> on the same subnet. Hmmmm, perhaps a second NIC with a private IP
address.
>>
>> Any thoughts?
>>
>> Greg
>>
>>
>>
>> "Phillip Windell" <@.> wrote in message
>> news:u1db8ybEHA.2660@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...
>>> "Greg Brewer" <greg-spam@brewer.net> wrote in message
>>> news:40fd8d65\$0\$447\$be864849@news.hal-mli.net...
>>>> time they could check it out. What I want to do is set the thing up
>>> that
>>> if
>>>> the primary T1 for either Web Server or Mail Server goes down, it
will
>> go
>>>> around.
>>>
>>> You can not easily do "fail over" with those T1s and still uses them
> like
>>> you currently are at the same time. You can manually switch them, but
> the
>>> way you do that depends on the methods you are currently using now in
> the
>>> "normal" operation.
>>>
>>> I could do ours with one toggle on one device because my Default
Gateway
>> for
>>> all machines is a LAN Router (not a firewall) and the firewall is the

> LAN
>>> Router's DFG. So if a link went down I would simply change the DFG on
> the
>>> LAN Router and would be all done, assuming both links had firewalls
> using
>>> the same subnet.
>>>
>>> You could have the T1s setup for "fail over" themselves but that
> requires
>>> they both be from the same ISP and the ISP would actually be the one
to
>> rig
>>> it up since those lines are more their "territory" than yours. This
> would
>>> change the whole way you are now running your stuff. Most likely the
> ISP
>>> would run both lines into the same Internet Router and would use a
> Router
>>> capable of doing the fail-over between redundant links. From your side
> of
>>> the network it would appear as a single Internet link rather than two
as
>> you
>>> have now. Now if the T1s are from different ISPs then you would have
> very
>>> few if any options.
>>>
>>> --
>>>
>>> Phillip Windell [MCP, MVP, CCNA]
>>> www.wandtv.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>