

Re: Two Nics really needed?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/BackOffice/microsoft.public.backoffice.smallbiz2000/2005-01/0022.html>

From: SBSuser (anonymous_at_discussions.microsoft.com)

Date: 12/31/04

Date: Fri, 31 Dec 2004 10:07:06 -0800

OK Merv, that sounds good. Considering my scenario and adding the other NIC. How would you rearrange my layout keeping the PIX in there? How would you connect the devices (sequence)? What changes in configuration?

Thanks

>-----Original Message-----

>Security in layers... 2 NICs are a better insurance policy. If your PIX is
>breached, your entire LAN is exposed. If you implemented SBS 2000 with 2
>NICs, you could have ISA running in "integrated (firewall) mode" on the
>server. This gives you the PIX as the first line of defense and ISA on the
>external NIC as a second line of defense. Of course, there's a learning
>curve with ISA and the complexity of administering your network is
>marginally increased. But it all comes down to risk assessment.

>

>--

>Merv Porter [SBS MVP]

>=====

>

>"SBSuser" <anonymous@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message

>news:0b6301c4ef55\$7d385940\$a401280a@phx.gbl...

>> I have the following scenario:

>> T-1 Router - Cisco PIX firewall - Switch - Server and

>> Workstations

>> The PIX, server and WS's connect to the Switch.

>>

>> The PIX connects Ethernet 0 to Internet thru the router

>> and connects Ethernet 1(internal) to the Switch

microsoft.public.backoffice.smallbiz2000: Re: Two Nics really needed?

>>

>> *My boss insists I need to implement two Nic's on the SBS
>> server. I think we do not need it.*

>>

>> *What's your opinion?*

>>

>

>

>.

>