
Subject: Received IP address
Posted by [KurtSch](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 12:55:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi

NST receives the correct IP address from the sender but transforms it to the servers IP address (mostly 192.168.1.x) before transferring the mail to the mail-server. Why do you do that?

Is it not useful to keep the senders address because NST works like a proxy and not like a MTA.

In my mail-server i have additional antispam-tests based on the ip-address which i cannot use at the moment.

Thanks for your answer
KurtSch

besser.

Subject: Re: Received IP address
Posted by [KurtSch](#) on Sat, 09 Sep 2006 09:46:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi

I just wanted to ask when i can expect an answer for my question.

why do you forward the NST servers IP instead of the received IP in the header? i would be happy to have the received IP address in my mail-server because i do some additional testing.

Thanks
KurtSch

Subject: Re: Received IP address
Posted by [support](#) on Tue, 12 Sep 2006 07:27:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> I just wanted to ask when i can expect an answer for my
> question.
>
> why do you forward the NST servers IP instead of the received

> IP in the header? i would be happy to have the received IP
> address in my mail-server because i do some additional testing.

With NST running in front of your mail server, you have this setup:
Sender MTA ---> NST ---> Receiver MTA (your mail server)
This means that your mail server actually talks to NST and not to
the sending MTA directly.

Subject: Re: Received IP address
Posted by [KurtSch](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 21:01:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi

I agree with you if NST is a mailserver. But it is not, it is more a proxy than a server and a proxy can be hidden between both MTAs.

So please think about the option to transfer the senders IP to the mailserver instead of replacing it with NSTs IP address.

Thanks
KurtSch

Subject: Re: Received IP address
Posted by [gtojon](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 00:04:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I would like the option of passing the real IP to the Mail server!!!! All my DNS balcklists are worthlees to my customers that don't pay for the NST filter!!!! Maybe NST & MailEnable can reach an agreement??? Be nice to have an answer!!!! Many threads on this forum go unanswered & their really is no KB!! Happy answer is to look at SpamAssassin for answers!

Subject: Re: Received IP address
Posted by [Heidner](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 05:07:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

FWIW, Not including the ip address for the NST proxy server might be construed as not being RFC compliant. Specifically RFC 2505, section 2. 2)

" 2) MUST be able to provide "Received:" lines with enough

information to make it possible to trace the mail path, despite spammers use forged host names in HELO statements etc."

In part since NST is only a proxy server -- the mail could potentially travel through several more MTA's within an organizations mail servers before actually getting to the recipient.

"2.2.1. Direct MTA-to-MTA connections

Internet mail was designed such that the sending host connects directly to the recipient as described by MX records (there may be several MX hosts on a priority list). To assure traceability back to the sending host (which may be a firewall/gateway, as described later) each MTA along the path, including the final MTA, MUST prepend a "Received:" line. For such a "Received:" line we have:

It MUST contain:

- o The IP address of the caller.
- o The 'date-time' as described in RFC822, [2], pp 18."

... more ... in RFC ... but dropped to make this short

Since NST is receiving the mail from the external MTA and reporting the NST host IP address - back to the sender -- you really need to have NST prepending its IP address on incoming mail -- so that if you need to work with the external mailers about mail problems -- there is a way to connect the two hosts.

You are correct in that message gateways do not necessarily (per RFC) need to prepend their IP address... but at the same time -- even in my small network... I have other MTA's that send mail into my exchange server - without going through NST. Because NST prepends the host IP to the e-mail it is easy to determine the route of the incoming mail... be it through NST or from another mail server within the network to my exchange server...

In larger enterprises - it is very common to have multiple e-mail points of presence on the internet that then feed into internal mailservers that synch up. If there is a problem with spam filtering -- you would need to know which filtering agent (NST) is has a configuration problem so you can fix it. Another example of why prepending the IP would be important.

Subject: Re: Received IP address
Posted by [gtojon](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 05:36:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Is there any way to divert communication directly to the Mail Server Port for unlicensed user emails? Sorry if I am not understanding this more! I know that I have gained a lot by using NST.....it truly is a great front end for SpamAssassin. It just hurts a little when we lose all control after NST forwards it.

Subject: Re: Received IP address
Posted by [Heidner](#) on Sat, 11 Nov 2006 00:19:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In the e-mails I've checked -- the senders domain is the first line...

"Received: from mx11.ezinedirector.net (the-nt.xyz.net [192.168.31.1]) by the-nt.xyz.net with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 123.123) id WT6C5HA7; Fri, 10 Nov 2006 14:55:35 -0800"

While it isn't the IP...the domain is there... and MailEnable should be able to check to see if "mx11.ezinedirector.net" is on a blocklist.

Or is MailEnable seeing only the IP address of the NST host? And not the original sender?

A short example would make it clearer...

But it also sounds like you want a feature added in a future version of NST so you can specify the e-mail addresses that should be sent through without checking and modification...

Post Edited (11-11-06 01:26)

Subject: Re: Received IP address
Posted by [gtojon](#) on Sat, 11 Nov 2006 04:21:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That would be a great feature!!

Thanks!
