

# Re: Can't get L2TP VPN working with NAT...PPTP works fine

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.networking/2006-12/msg00075.html>

---

- *From:* Kurt <[kurtl@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kurtl@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 10 Dec 2006 17:52:18 -0800
- 

Ned wrote:

This is insane. I can't believe that Microsoft can't get this to work. My wife uses a VPN client over the same network connection that I use. She uses VPN1 and while I am not 100% sure I would guess she uses IPSEC because she works for a large organization that is big on security. This is a joke. I'll just buy a vpn appliance so I can get back to work and not have to continue playing with this mickeymouseware

Kurt wrote:

Ned wrote:

I can only connect to my L2TP vpn if my home pc (XP sp2 with nat-t registry edit) has a public ip address. I had the same problem when I was at XP sp1. The second I put my pc behind a router with nat (netgear fwag114) I get a timeout. PPTP works just fine either way (nat or public ip)

At work I have a Windows 2003 server with the latest service pack behind a cisco 2600 router without NAT. The server has a public IP address on its external nic and a private IP on the internal nic. The external nic has a default gateway pointing to the cisco router and the internal nic has static routes for my lan. I am using PSK with l2tp.

I have tried everything and I need to have this working tomorrow. Has anyone gotten this to work? am I missing something?

Re: Can't get L2TP VPN working with NAT...PPTP works fine

I have never got L2TP to work through a NAT. Some routers provide "NAT Traversal" that is supposed to work, but I've never tried one. Even so, you'd have to be able to guarantee one of those routers be available everywhere you're connecting from. If this is for road warriors, I'd stick with PPTP. IF this is for a fixed remote site, go with a hardware IPSec solution.

I'm not any kind of authority here, if someone else knows how to "dummy-down" the header authentication so that it will work through a NAT, I'd like to know.

...kurt

It's not Microsoft thing. It's an L2TP thing. Think about it – L2TP requires an authentication header for both the "phase 1" and "Phase 2" portions. This provides great security, but means that the outer layer of encapsulation must not be tampered with. What does NAT do? It alters the header. That's how it works. So the two would seem to be incompatible. IPSec can be used with or without L2TP (tunnel mode vs transport mode). Odds are your wife's VPN is not over an L2TP tunnel. Besides L2TP requires a certificate where IPSec can use just a shared secret. As far as Microsoft goes, their tunneling protocols work just fine although a bit too slow for me. But if you put your hardware tunneling device behind a NAT, it wouldn't work any better than the MS one.

....kurt

.