

## Re: Dual nic with DMZ via firewall

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2007-03/msg03911.html>

---

- *From:* [dsellinger@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dsellinger@xxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 27 Mar 2007 07:56:07 -0700
- 

On Mar 27, 5:48 am, Leythos <V...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Tue, 27 Mar 2007 01:08:17 -0700, dsellinger wrote:

I will be installing sbs standard next week and I would like to setup the WAN NIC to be in our firewalls DMZ. (currently zywall100 dmz port – switch -> 2 web servers)

Are there any problems with this? Local web access should continue to use firewall as gateway, but web facing sbs services like incoming email or rww would be protected via DMZ firewall rules.

Somehow I feel a lot safer poking holes into the DMZ then onto the LAN. But then the usual protection of the DMZ doesn't exist anymore. If the SBS box is compromised then it also exists on the LAN so maybe it makes no difference. I still think i would prefer to have SBS on the DMZ so that it can use it's own IP address and not just share the firewalls. I guess I would rather not have it's IP resolve to any name either.

Also will there be routing problems with LAN users checking email etc. if exchange is bound to an external IP?

Thanks for your suggestions/expertise .

(btw zywall100 is a good firewall with a real DMZ port)

## Re: Dual nic with DMZ via firewall

No, it's not.

If you have the SBS Server in your DMZ and in your LAN, then you don't really have a DMZ.

If you have the SBS server WAN port in the DMZ and your Firewalls LAN is not used, then it's the same as using the LAN with the SBS Wan ports.

You do understand, if your firewall is a quality device that there is NO difference between the firewall LAN and DMZ protection ability – they both have rules, they both isolate traffic, they are no different in functionality.

If you have a cheap, crappy, firewall device that really isn't a firewall, the DMZ port just gets