

Re: ISA and Separating Networks

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/BackOffice/microsoft.public.backoffice.smallbiz2000/2005-07/msg00376.html>

- *From:* "Chris Guimbellot" <cguimbellot@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 27 Jul 2005 09:47:49 -0400
-

Steve,

Thanks for the continued help. A few more questions though.

- > You need the switch to connect all the "outsides" together to the inside
- > of the cisco router. Creating network diagrams in ascii can be a little
- > tricky. <g>
- >
- > Lets try again (trying with ASCII box characters):

[DIAGRAM WAS HERE]

Thanks for taking the time to build the diagram. I understand exactly what you are talking about. The question I have is: we have switches all over the building and we have never had renters before. That said, when we wired the building, it was wired such where the main switch was wired to the nearby computers as well as other swtiches in other places in the building which, in turn, are wired to the nearby computers. Basically, this is a long explanation for saying that I do not have two sets of wires (one for us and one for them). I am thinking that this should not be a problem as long as the Cisco router, firewall, and SBS (the three elements in the diagram) are configured correctly. Is this correct. I hope it is, otherwise I have a big problem.

- > If the Cisco is performing NAT, then the "in-between" network (ie where
- > the switch connects the LAN side of the Cisco to the WAN sides of the
- > firewall and SBS) will be using a private IP range, and all of the Cisco
- > LAN nic, the firewall WAN nic, and the SBS external/WAN nic will have IPs
- > in that range.
- >
- > If the Cisco is not performing NAT, just regular routing, then the Cisco
- > will only have a single IP, and both the firewall WAN nic and SBS
- > external/WAN nic must have public IPs.

I am now thinking that the Cisco does not perform the NAT because my SBS has a public IP. From what I gathered from what you were saying, the external IP on the SBS signals no NAT. Is that correct. I have enought IPs to make this

happen.

- > Any firewall will do, just as long as it supports enough users to cover
- > their whole network. The SonicWall SOHO sounds fine (subject to user
- > counts).

I have a 25 user license on the firewall. By the way: why a firewall and not a router?

If everything I assumed is correct, it sounds like all I have to do is plug that SOHO in, configure it with the external IP with a gateway of the IP of the Cisco (that's what I did on the SBS), and then configure the leasees PCs to connect to the SOHO. Does that sound right.

Sorry for all the questions, but this is the first time I have done this. I appreciate the continued help. Thanks again,

Chris

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: ISA and Separating Networks**
◇ From: Steve Foster [SBS MVP]
- ◆ **Re: ISA and Separating Networks**
◇ From: Phil Partridge

• *References:*

- ◆ **ISA and Separating Networks**
◇ From: Chris Guimbellot
- ◆ **Re: ISA and Separating Networks**
◇ From: Steve Foster [SBS MVP]
- ◆ **Re: ISA and Separating Networks**
◇ From: Chris Guimbellot
- ◆ **Re: ISA and Separating Networks**
◇ From: Steve Foster [SBS MVP]

- Prev by Date: **Multiple Modem Configuration**
- Next by Date: **Re: Multiple Modem Configuration**
- Previous by thread: **Re: ISA and Separating Networks**
- Next by thread: **Re: ISA and Separating Networks**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**