

Re: PPPoE vs Double-NAT?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2005-06/msg04067.html>

- *From:* ckennylin <ckennylin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 14 Jun 2005 14:37:07 -0700
-

Hi Frank:

Thanks for the quick response, and your preference is the consensus best practice. However, whether the Home-SBS's external NIC is static or dynamic, I still have the same problem with running RWW-RDP to the Work-SBS from the Home-PC. On the Westell DSL Modem/Router that I use, there is an option called "IP Passthrough" which gives the Home-SBS's external interface the public IP (a DMZ-like setting), but that didn't do much for this problem.

On the Home-PC, I run a netstat when attempting to connect to the RDP session and see that it's sending SYN to port 4125 before the attempt fails. This I am allowing 4125 on the Home-SBS's ISA packet filter, and I do not see any entries in the ISA Logs.

The Home-SBS CAN run the RWW-RDP session however, and shutting the 4125 filter will make the session fail, so from the perspective of Home-SBS, everything is cool.

I hesitate to repeat this experiment with SP1 :-). Alternatively, is there any way to have the server automatically bring up the PPPoE connection upon boot?

---K

"Frank McCallister SBS MVP" wrote:

- > My preference is PPPoE with the External NIC Static on the Routers LAN
- > Subnet with DHCP disabled. ie if Router LAN is 192.168.1.1 I set the NIC to
- > 192.168.1.2 and then Port forward the ports I want to that IP
- >
- > --
- > Frank McCallister SBS MVP
- > COMPUMAC
- > "ckennylin" <ckennylin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
- > news:0F020DC2-81C5-4312-A618-92FE355958A2@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
- >> Hi All:
- >>
- >>
- >> I have an SBS 2003 Premium server that I need to relocate and reconnect to

Re: PPPoE vs Double-NAT?

>> the Internet. It currently has 2 nics with a public and private IP
>> address,
>> and its internet connection is a DSL router, with multiple public IPs and
>> a
>> gateway. I'm running ISA as well as some basic packet filters on the
>> router
>> for security.
>>
>> The new location will have DSL as well, with a DSL router that can be
>> reconfigured as a bridge. It will have a static public IP, but that will
>> be
>> assigned upon PPPoE authentication.
>>
>> From what I've been able to gather from the newsgroup and various MVP
>> sites,
>> the accepted best practice is to do a double-NAT i.e. have the router
>> establish & maintain the PPPoE link, and let the SBS's external adapter
>> pick
>> up a DHCP address from the router.
>>
>> As a dry run, I tried doing that at my DSL connection at home with an SBS
>> box (Action Pack, Yay!) and ran into some weird behavior when running RWW.
>> To make the rest of this post easier to decipher, here's the entire chain
>> of
>> machines:
>>
>> HPC -> HSBS -> DSL -> Internet -> DSL -> WSBS -> WTS
>>
>> Where:
>>
>> HPC = Home client PC
>> HSBS = Home SBS Server
>> WSBS = Work SBS Server
>> WTS = Work Term Server
>>
>> Note the Work SBS network hasn't changed yet, and it has a public IP
>> address
>> on the external interface. ISA is running on both SBSs.
>>
>> * Scenario 1: Best Practices using double-NAT on HSBS
>>
>> On the HSBS, I can remote into WSBS via RWW and run a RDP session on WTS.
>>
>> On the HPC, I can remote into WSBS via RWW, but CANNOT run the RDP
>> session.
>> It made no difference whether the HC is a SecureNAT or Firewall Client.
>>
>> * Scenario 2: Configuring the DSL Router as a Bridge, and using CEICW to
>> create a PPPoE Connection on HSBS
>>
>> On both HSBS and HPC, RWW to WSBS/WTS runs as expected.

Re: PPPoE vs Double-NAT?

