

# The Internet Protocol *Journal*

September 1998

Volume 1, Number 2

*A Quarterly Technical Publication for  
Internet and Intranet Professionals*

## FROM THE EDITOR

### In This Issue

From the Editor .....	1
What Is a VPN?—Part II .....	2
Reliable Multicast Protocols and Applications.....	19
Layer 2 and Layer 3 Switch Evolution.....	38
Book Review.....	44
Fragments .....	47

We begin this issue with Part II of “What Is a VPN?” by Paul Ferguson and Geoff Huston. In Part I they introduced a definition of the term “Virtual Private Network” (VPN) and discussed the motivations behind the adoption of such networks. They outlined a framework for describing the various forms of VPNs, and examined numerous network-layer VPN structures, in particular, that of controlled route leakage and tunneling. In Part II the authors conclude their examination of VPNs by describing virtual private dial networks and network-layer encryption. They also examine link-layer VPNs, switching and encryption techniques, and issues concerning Quality of Service and non-IP VPNs.

*IP Multicast* is an emerging set of technologies and standards that allow many-to-many transmissions such as conferencing, or one-to-many transmissions such as live broadcasts of audio and video over the Internet. Kenneth Miller describes multicast in general, and reliable multicast protocols and applications in particular. Although multicast applications are primarily used in the research community today, this situation is likely to change as the demand for Internet multimedia applications increases and multicast technologies improve.

Successful deployment of networking technologies requires an understanding of a number of technology options ranging from wiring and transmissions systems via switches, routers, bridges and other pure networking components, to networked applications and services. *The Internet Protocol Journal* (IPJ) is designed to look at all aspects of these “building blocks.” This time, Thayumanavan Sridhar details some of the issues in the evolution of Layer 2 and Layer 3 switches.

Interest in the first issue of IPJ has exceeded our expectations, and hard copies are almost gone. However, you can still view and print the issue in PDF format on our Web site at [www.cisco.com/ipj](http://www.cisco.com/ipj). The current edition is also available on the Web. If you want to receive our next issue, please complete and return the enclosed card.

We welcome your comments, questions and suggestions regarding anything you read in this journal. We are also actively seeking authors for new articles. The Call for Papers and Author Guidelines can be found on our Web page. Please send your comments to [ipj@cisco.com](mailto:ipj@cisco.com)

—Ole J. Jacobsen, Editor and Publisher

Missed the first issue of IPJ?  
Download your copy in  
PDF format from:  
[www.cisco.com/ipj](http://www.cisco.com/ipj)

## What Is a VPN? — Part II

by Paul Ferguson, Cisco Systems  
and Geoff Huston, Telstra

In Part I we introduced a working definition of the term “Virtual Private Network” (VPN), and discussed the motivations behind the adoption of such networks. We outlined a framework for describing the various forms of VPNs, and then examined numerous network-layer VPN structures, in particular, that of controlled route leakage and tunneling techniques. We begin Part II with examining other network-layer VPN techniques, and then look at issues that are concerned with non-IP VPNs and Quality-of-Service (QoS) considerations.

### Types of VPNs

This section continues from Part I to look at the various types of VPNs using a taxonomy derived from the layered network architecture model. These types of VPNs segregate the VPN network at the network layer.

### Network-Layer VPNs

A network can be segmented at the network layer to create an end-to-end VPN in numerous ways. In Part I we described a controlled route leakage approach that attempts to perform the segregation only at the edge of the network, using route advertisement control to ensure that each connected network received a view of the network (only peer networks). We pick up the description at this point in this second part of the article.

### Tunneling

As outlined in Part I, the alternative to a model of segregation at the edge is to attempt segregation throughout the network, maintaining the integrity of the partitioning of the substrate network into VPN components through the network on a hop-by-hop basis. Part I examined numerous tunneling technologies that can achieve this functionality. Tunneling is also useful in servicing VPN requirements for dial access, and we will resume the description of tunnel-based VPNs at this point.


### Virtual Private Dial Networks

Although several technologies (vendor-proprietary technologies as well as open, standards-based technologies) are available for constructing a *Virtual Private Dial Network* (VPDN), there are two principal methods of implementing a VPDN that appear to be increasing in popularity—*Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol* (L2TP) and *Point-to-Point Tunneling Protocol* (PPTP) tunnels. From an historical perspective, L2TP is the technical convergence of the earlier Layer 2 Forwarding (L2F)<sup>[1]</sup> protocol specification and the PPTP protocol. However, one might suggest that because PPTP is now being bundled into the desktop operating system of many of the world’s personal computers, it stands to be quite popular within the market.

At this point it is worthwhile to distinguish the difference between “client-initiated” tunnels and “NAS-initiated” (Network Access Server, otherwise known as a Dial Access Server) tunnels. The former is commonly referred to as “voluntary” tunneling, whereas the latter is commonly referred to as “compulsory” tunneling. In voluntary tunneling, the tunnel is created at the request of the user for a specific purpose; in compulsory tunneling, the tunnel is created without any action from the user, and without allowing the user any choice in the matter.


L2TP, as a compulsory tunneling model, is essentially a mechanism to “off-load” a dialup subscriber to another point in the network, or to another network altogether. In this scenario, a subscriber dials into a NAS, and based on a locally configured profile (or a NAS negotiation with a policy server) and successful authentication, a L2TP tunnel is dynamically established to a predetermined endpoint, where the subscriber’s *Point-to-Point Protocol* (PPP) session is terminated (Figure 1).

Figure 1:  
PPP Tunnel  
Termination Model  
of L2TP



PPTP, as a voluntary tunneling model, on the other hand, allows end systems (for example, desktop computers) to configure and establish individual discrete point-to-point tunnels to arbitrarily located PPTP servers, without the intermediate NAS participating in the PPTP negotiation and subsequent tunnel establishment. In this scenario, a subscriber dials into a NAS, but the PPP session is terminated on the NAS, as in the traditional Internet access PPP model. The layered PPTP session is then established between the client end system and any upstream PPTP server that the client desires to connect to. The only caveats on PPTP connectivity are that the client can reach the PPTP server via conventional routing processes, and that the user has been granted the appropriate privileges on the PPTP server (Figure 2).

Figure 2:  
PPP Tunnel  
Termination Model  
of PPTP



Although L2TP and PPTP may sound extraordinarily similar, there are subtle differences that deserve further examination. The applicability of both protocols is very much dependent on what problem is being addressed. It is also about control—who has it, and why it is needed. It also depends heavily on how each protocol implementation is deployed—in either the voluntary or the compulsory tunneling models.

With PPTP in a voluntary tunneling implementation, the dial-in user can choose the PPTP tunnel destination (the PPTP server) after the initial PPP negotiation has completed. This feature is important if the tunnel destination changes frequently, because no modifications are needed to the client's view of the base PPP access when there is a change in the server and the transit path to the server. It is also a significant advantage that the PPTP tunnels are transparent to the service provider, and no advance configuration is required between the NAS operator and the overlay dial access VPN. In such a case, the service provider does not house the PPTP server, and simply passes the PPTP traffic along with the same processing and forwarding policies as all other IP traffic. In fact, this feature should be considered a significant benefit of this approach. The configuration and support of a tunneling mechanism within the service provider network would be one less parameter that the service provider has to operationally manage, and the PPTP tunnel can transparently span multiple service providers without any explicit service provider configuration. However, the economic downside to this feature for the service provider, of course, is that a "VPDN-enabled" network service can be marketed to yield an additional source of revenue. Where the client undertakes the VPDN connection, there is no direct service provider involvement and no consequent value added to the base access service.

From the subscriber's perspective, this is a "win-win" situation, because the user is not reliant on the upstream service provider to deliver the VPDN service—at least no more than any user is reliant for basic IP-level connectivity. The other "win" is that the subscriber does not have to pay a higher subscription fee for a VPN service. Of course, the situation changes when the service provider takes an active role in providing the VPDN, such as housing the PPTP servers, or if the subscriber resides within a subnetwork in which the parent organization wants the service provider's network to make the decision concerning where tunnels are terminated. The major characterization of PPTP-based VPDN is one of a roaming client base, where the clients of the VPDN use a local connection to the public Internet data network, and then overlay a private data tunnel from the client's system to the desired remote service point. Another perspective is to view this approach as "on-demand" VPDN virtual circuits.

With L2TP in a "compulsory" tunneling implementation, the service provider controls where the PPP session is terminated. This setup can be extremely important in situations where the service provider to whom

the subscriber is actually dialing into (let's call it the "modem pool provider" network) must transparently hand off the subscriber's PPP session to another network (let's call this network the "content provider"). To the subscriber, it appears as though the local system is directly attached to the content provider's network, when in fact the access path has been passed transparently through the modem pool provider's network to the subscribed content service. Very large content providers, for instance, may outsource the provisioning and maintenance of thousands of modem ports to a third-party access provider, who in turn agrees to transparently pass the subscribers' access sessions back to the content provider. This setup is generally called "wholesale dial." The major motivation for such L2TP-based wholesale dial lies in the typical architecture of the *Public Switched Telephone Network* (PSTN), where the use of wholesale dial facilities can create a more rational PSTN call load pattern with Internet access PSTN calls terminated in the local Central Office.

Of course, if all subscribers who connect to the modem pool provider's network are destined for the same content provider, then there are certainly easier ways to hand this traffic off to the content provider's network—such as simply aggregating all the traffic in the local Central Office and handing the content provider a "big fat pipe" of the aggregated session traffic streams. However, in situations where the modem pool provider is providing a wholesale dial service for multiple upstream "next-hop" networks, the methods of determining how each subscriber's traffic must be forwarded to his/her respective content provider are somewhat limited. Packet forwarding decisions could be made at the NAS, based on the source address of the dialup subscriber's computer. This scenario would allow for traffic to be forwarded along the appropriate path to its ultimate destination, in turn intrinsically providing a virtual connection. However, the use of assigning static IP addresses to dial-in subscribers is highly discouraged because of the inefficiencies in IP address utilization policies, and the critical success of the *Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol* (DHCP).

There are, however, some serious scaling concerns in deploying a large-scale L2TP network; these concerns revolve around the issue of whether large numbers of tunnels can actually be supported with little or no network performance impact. Since there have been no large-scale deployments of this technology to date, there is no empirical evidence to support or invalidate these concerns.

In some cases, however, appearances are everything—some content providers do not wish for their subscribers to know that when they connect to their service, they have instead been connected to another service provider's network, and then passed along ultimately to the service to which they have subscribed. In other cases, it is merely designed to be a matter of convenience, so that subscribers do not need to log into a device more than once.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.