

Re: route/nat

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.networking/2005-10/0704.html>

From: Tauno Voipio (*tauno.voipio_at_INVALIDiki.fi*)

Date: 10/26/05

Date: Wed, 26 Oct 2005 16:52:49 GMT

Hendrik Greving wrote:

- > Are you sure, that nat is done prior routing? I thought it's different
- > because I'm in the POSTROUTING chain using iptables. Currently,
- > everything works like that.
- >
- > The problem is, currently, the default route goes to interface "vpmlink"
- > (interface of vpnc) and I use
- >
- > `iptables -t nat POSTROUTING [...] -o vpmlink MASQUERADE`
- >
- > What I'd like to have is, to determine a certain group of ip addresses,
- > say 0-127 is applied with nat and are routed to vpmlink, and the rest,
- > say 128-254 should be routed (and nat) to my DSL (ppp) interface ppp0.
- >
- > I'm not very familiar with this stuff, hope everything is correct. Is
- > the rule above possible to achieve?

Add routing rules to your routing table for the desired address ranges, and another NAT line for the direct interface (ppp0). (I guess that the DSL is running PPPoE).

The interface specifications will pick the packets for different NAT rules.

Which IP addresses do you mean: local net or destination addresses?

In principle, the default route picks all packets which are not routed by any other routing rule, so it is sufficient to pick those destination IPs that are intended to be sent via the tunnel. The selection is made based on the destination IP and netmask in the routing rule. The rules are scanned with the tightest rules first (those with most '1' bits in mask). This makes it possible to pick a subrange off

comp.os.linux.networking: Re: route/nat

some other range.

--

Tauno Voipio
tauno voipio (at) iki fi