

Re: 802.1x authentication for wireless issues w/ ISA 2004

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2007-04/msg03355.html>

- *From:* JP <JP@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 19 Apr 2007 17:04:00 -0700
-

The wireless config on both laptops show the same settings as were defined in the group policy for the preferred network section. I will start to look at the other fields that were troubling next.

I found where "Proxy-Policy-Name = Use Windows authentication for all users" comes from. This is found in IAS under Connection Request Policies (not remote access policies). If I edit the name of this policy, then that is what shows up in the Proxy-Policy-Name field. When I edit the profile of this policy there are two options to choose from. One is to authenticate on this server and the other is to Accept users without validating credentials. If I select Authenticate on this server I will see an information event saying that a LDAP connection was established with AD. The authentication events stop and so do the error events from the WAP but still no connection. If I select the Accept without validation (the way I found it) the events start again and of course still no access.

So, which one of these do you have checked, and if I go to the other server that has the RAS on it, what policies do you see listed under that "remote access policies" section? I don't see the policy I created on the IAS server computer listed here. When both IAS and RAS were on the same computer, the policies matched. Makes me think that the two are not communicating the way they should.

Dave, do you have IAS installed on the SBS server and the second server, or just on the second server only? Mine is only on the second server and not on the SBS as well. SBS has only the RAS.

I really apologize for all the trouble and I'm sorry to have been taking up so much of your time. I do feel like we are making slow and steady progress though and I am very grateful for all your advice.

—
Many thanks,

JP

"Owen Williams [SBS MVP]" wrote:

Re: 802.1x authentication for wireless issues w/ ISA 2004

In article <F8B6D665-521C-4D5C-80E2-C7E19F211D0B@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, JP@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx says...

No errors in the group policy update.

And you verified the wireless config on the two laptops is correct (i.e., matches the GPO config), right?

I rebuilt my cert authority completely from scratch and the certs rolled out as expected. Still no wireless connection. Just the connect and reconnect over and over on two different laptops that are extremely different.

If the wireless configs look correct, the fact the two laptops are different (and I assume you mean different manufacturers/models/wireless NICs) suggests we need to find a "common element." This would include:

- * The WAP(s)
- * The wired network (WAP <-> Switch <-> Servers)
- * The server(s)
- * IAS
- * ISA [have you tried _temporarily_ disabling ISA?]

I was happy to see the event log you sent of a successful connection. I think this may hold the key.

Me, too.

The part on my event that troubles me is below:

Proxy-Policy-Name = Use Windows authentication for all users

This is normal – it appears in all of the IAS "access granted" events I have seen from working secure wireless networks. I thought I knew where it was set but I can't find it after a quick look. (And I have never had to explicitly set it.) I vaguely recall it may only be changeable when ISA2000/04 is running and, since I don't use them, I am not seeing any other choices. Regardless, the setting is correct and you should not need to change it.

Re: 802.1x authentication for wireless issues w/ ISA 2004

Authentication-Provider = <none>
Authentication-Server = <undetermined>
Policy-Name = <undetermined>
Authentication-Type = <undetermined>
EAP-Type = <undetermined>

These are a problem – or at least suspicious – as my previous post indicated.

Where is a proxy policy coming from? It seems like we are trying to only authenticate the computer and this is trying to authenticate the user and not very well at that.

I believe the term "user" in the message is rather loose and also applies to computers in this context.

-- Owen Williams (SBS MVP)