

Re: Multihoming Windows 2000

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.networking/2004-11/1207.html>

From: Mikey (*mwest_at_intrex.net*)

Date: 11/29/04

Date: 29 Nov 2004 07:59:49 -0800

Hi Phillip,

I was glad to find your reponse on this topic. The company I work for is looking to multihome the hosts that are part of a big project. Most will be Windows Server 2003 boxes and IBM RISC server. After reading your reponse, I wanted to get your take on this scenario.

They are looking to connect all hosts to the core network via 1 NIC. They generally refer to this as the Public network. The second NIC will connect to another switch and this network is considered the Private network. They plan to totally isolate the Private network. It will have no connection to the core network and the only route off of the Private network will be via the hosts connected to it. You make mention of the one part of multihoming that I'm a little concerned about....and that is that some traffic is going to use the adapter listed first in the connection order. Can you give me some examples of when that might occur?

And, would it not be better to connect all hosts via one NIC to the second switch and then connect that switch to the core network? That way....all hosts only use one adapter and all the traffic is seperated from the core switch. It just seems to me it would be better doing that and allow the switches to control the data flows....expecially since the core switch is a layer 3 Cisco 6509. The multihoming, to me, just doesn't seem to be worth the trouble.

Thanks in advance Phillip,

Mike

"Phillip Windell" <@.> wrote in message news:<eiSabwl0EHA.3840@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl>...
> "rj3b" <rj3b@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message
> news:80712690-C3EE-41C7-AED0-FA7CD99F44C5@microsoft.com...
>> *This is not implemented yet, so no problems, just want to know if any*
> *static*
>> *entries are needed in the routing table etc. Also, gateways, any*
> *metrics.*

- > > *What would be the "best" way to implement.*
- >
- > *One "public" Nic would always be the Default "outbound" path. The other*
- > *"public" nic would only work for "specified" routes/destinations. So, yes*
- > *you might need static routes to force certain "destinations" to go out the*
- > *second public Nic.*
- >
- > *Keep in mind that "random" or "unknown" requests that my come inbound on the*
- > *second "public" Nic will *still* go out the first or "default" public Nic*
- > *even though that isn't the one they came in on. It is just the way TCP/IP*
- > *and Routing Tables work,...it is not MS's or Window's fault. Only*
- > *destinations that you statically specify in the Routing Table will use the*
- > *second public Nic for outbound. There is no "state" that is maintained*
- > *between the inbound and outbound paths, each works independently.*