

Re: ICS questions and confusion

Source:

http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.network_web/2005-08/msg01230.html

- *From:* Chuck <none@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 15 Aug 2005 15:29:01 -0500
-

On Mon, 15 Aug 2005 12:42:39 -0700, DWalker <none@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>Chuck <none@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
>news:thl1g157gv113d1rt1gms0h9ikaocj3lh1@xxxxxxxxx:
>
>> On Mon, 15 Aug 2005 10:33:13 -0700, DWalker <none@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>
>>>My own followup question, sort of a general ICS "how-to" question:
>>>
>>>In ICS, if you have an Ethernet connection to the DSL modem/router,
>>>should that connection be in the same 192.168.0.x subnet as the host's
>>>Ethernet connection (192.168.0.1) that connects the clients (this is
>>>the wireless PCI card in my case)?
>>>
>>>I take it the host's wireless PCI card that the client uses to
>>>connect, is the one that gets the 192.168.0.1 address. My DSL
>>>modem/router was originally shipped with address 192.168.0.1, so I
>>>changed it to 192.168.0.254. I put the Ethernet connection that's
>>>cabled to the DSL modem/router at 192.168.0.50.
>>>
>>>Should I put the DSL modem/router's internal IP address, and the local
>>>Ethernet card in a different subnet from 192.168.0.x?
>>>
>>>
>>>Thanks.
>>
>> David,
>>
>> Since your Host to client LAN uses ICS, you have to keep 192.168.0/24
>> on that LAN. The LAN connecting your router to host has to be another
>> subnet altogether.
>>
>> It would really be better for everybody if you would work on your
>> problem, instead of putting in a workaround (ie NetBEUI) and
>> recommending it to everybody. Alternate protocols like IPX/SPX and
>> NetBEUI won't really help the situation in the long run.
>> <[http://nitecruzr.blogspot.com/2005/07/windows-networking-and-](http://nitecruzr.blogspot.com/2005/07/windows-networking-and-alternate)
>alternate

Re: ICS questions and confusion

>> .html>
>>
>> There is really no reason why a supported solution like NetBIOS Over
>> TCP/IP can't work in your case.
>>
>> I haven't seen any previous posts from you in this forum. Or did you
>> post long ago, or maybe use a different nym?
>>
>
>I wasn't recommending anything to anybody; I really just installed
>NetBEUI to make sure to my satisfaction that the wireless cards were
>properly making the peer-to-peer connection. I would prefer to take the
>NetBEUI back out, and I understand the issues you bring up in your Web
>page.
>
>I called this a followup because it was a reply to my own message of a
>few minutes previous. Were you replying to both my messages? Other
>than those two, I haven't posted in this newsgroup before; I'm usually
>in the SQL Server newsgroups.
>
>Question: WHY does the LAN connection that connects my router to the
>host have to be on a different subnet than the 192.168.0.x one? And
>where is that documented in all the how-to's on ICS, and in the
>Microsoft documentation? I have never seen that documented.
>
>It doesn't HAVE to be on a different subnet, because I was running the
>pervious setup for years (with the host being Windows 2000) and it
>worked fine. It doesn't work now that I upgraded the host to Windows
>XP.
>
>If you saw my other post, do you have any comments on the issues I
>raised there, other than NetBEUI? Is the same-subnet issue the reason
>for the system telling me that another connection in the network is
>already using 192.168.0.1 (which, if that's the case, is an incorrectly
>worded error message. Just because another adapter is on the same
>subnet, doesn't mean that another connection is already using
>192.168.0.1.)

David,

I was replying to your earlier post also, and I was sort of in the process of figuring it out when you posted the follow-up.

You CAN have the "router to host", and the "host to client", LANs in the same subnet, but that requires that the ICS host become a bridge. ICS is a software based NAT router, and routers work best when the different interfaces are on separate LANs. And, if you want to use ICS, that means that the "host to client" LAN WILL use 192.168.0/24. That's one of the "features" (limitations) of ICS.

I agree with you that the message "some other connection on the network already

Re: ICS questions and confusion

had the required address 192.168.0.1" is confusing. Not having seen your network, I can't say for sure, but I'd be almost willing to bet that both the connection to the router, and the connection to the client, are creating a bridge. And since ICS insists on using 192.168.0.1 for its hosts LAN address, it's having the problem there. If you setup the host as a bridge, you still won't be able to use 192.168.0.1 anywhere else.

There are so many things about Microsoft Networking that are confusing. One of the subjects I try to help with is Windows Networking and Network Neighborhood. If I had a dollar for every time I've mentioned the Browser as a problem and someone replies "My Internet connection is fine" or similar, I'd have a lot of dollars.

The "Allow other network users to connect through this computer's Internet connection" is relative to the host, and the Internet connection is the network adapter that this computer uses to access the Internet. In order to share Internet service, you have to have service. And that's the LAN that should not be on the 192.168.0/24 subnet.

Anyway, if I had a dollar for every time I've thought how confusing their documentation is, I'd have a hell of a lot of dollars. But that's one of the side benefits of the MVP program, I now have a contact in Microsoft, and I can ask him questions. And I have an avenue for suggesting documentation improvements (ie KB articles). So instead of cursing the darkness, I'm now in a position to light a couple candles. And I've lit a couple so far, and maybe I will get to light some more during the next few months.

So, to your situation. I strongly recommend that you:

Change your router LAN to another subnet, say 192.168.1/24.

Identify the problem with Windows Networking in your laptop LAN, and restore NBT / TCP/IP as the transport there.

Once you get everything working, then play with the features and fine tune everything. Maybe figure out why it used to work with the router on the 192.168.0/24 subnet. But get it working first.

—

Cheers,

Chuck, MS-MVP [Windows – Networking]

<http://nitecruzr.blogspot.com/>

Paranoia is not a problem, when it's a normal response from experience.

My email is AT DOT

actual address pchuck mvps org.

.

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ *Re: ICS questions and confusion*

◇ *From: DWalker*

- **References:**

- ◆ **ICS questions and confusion**
 - ◇ From: DWalker
- ◆ **Re: ICS questions and confusion**
 - ◇ From: DWalker
- ◆ **Re: ICS questions and confusion**
 - ◇ From: Chuck
- ◆ **Re: ICS questions and confusion**
 - ◇ From: DWalker

- Prev by Date: **Re: Need Port open**
- Next by Date: **Re: Need Port open**
- Previous by thread: **Re: ICS questions and confusion**
- Next by thread: **Re: ICS questions and confusion**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**