

## pfSense - Bug #4300

### Can not enter outbound NAT destination port range

01/26/2015 07:34 AM - Eric Hoffman

<b>Status:</b>	Resolved	<b>Start date:</b>	01/26/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>		<b>% Done:</b>	100%
<b>Category:</b>	Rules / NAT	<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	2.2.1	<b>Affected Version:</b>	2.2
<b>Plus Target Version:</b>		<b>Affected Architecture:</b>	
<b>Release Notes:</b>	Default		

#### Description

In pfSense 2.1.5, I could enter an outbound NAT rule with destination port range, and in pfSense 2.2, I get error that destination port is invalid.

For example, I wish to create NAT from localhost to WAN on ports 1025:65535...

#### Steps:

- Add new outbound NAT rule
- Select interface: WAN
- Select source: Network - 127.0.0.0/8 - (port blank)
- Select destination: any - (ip blank) - port 1024:65535
- Description: (anything)
- Save

You get: The following input errors were detected: You must supply either a valid port or port alias for the destination port entry.

This used to work fine in prior version.

Workaround: Create an alias for your desired port range.

#### Associated revisions

##### Revision b601f897 - 01/28/2015 12:45 PM - Renato Botelho

Accept port range on Outbound NAT. Fixes #4300

##### Revision 340e8bc5 - 01/28/2015 12:46 PM - Renato Botelho

Accept port range on Outbound NAT. Fixes #4300

#### History

##### #1 - 01/26/2015 08:44 AM - Phillip Davis

That behavior was changed by <https://github.com/pfsense/pfsense/commit/9060f420a9444c68fc8db926787d0bb37d77ed72>  
Not sure if it was intentional to remove the ability to directly type a port range in that field - one of the devs can comment on that.

##### #2 - 01/26/2015 09:10 AM - Eric Hoffman

Thanks for the head-up. It seem to be to fix bug [#3857](#). I concur that the edit box is a single port entry, and should probably be validated the same as other single-ports edit boxes throughout the firewall. The validator is probably the same for other port edit boxes, and the firewall may have assumption elsewhere.

The devs can probably comment on that but I tend to be in favor of the new validation (to stay consistent with single-port vs port range GUI elements). If we wish to have port ranges entered directly, we could have multiple edit boxes/combo, like for the port forwarding port ranges.

**#3 - 01/26/2015 09:36 AM - Eric Hoffman**

One note, it is to be noted that this does NOT seem to break update, nor backup/restore. I.e. on upgrade, from 2.1.5, the rules were kept as is. I was also able to restore a config in which I had the port range directly set for this field. So that's a good thing! But further editing of the "legacy" rule will whine until the port is set using an alias.

**#4 - 01/26/2015 09:38 AM - Jim Pingle**

In the meantime, that field may also be left blank so that it affects all ports, not only that specific range.

**#5 - 01/27/2015 03:06 AM - Chris Buechler**

- *Category set to Rules / NAT*
- *Status changed from New to Confirmed*
- *Target version set to 2.2.1*

**#6 - 01/28/2015 01:00 PM - Renato Botelho**

- *Status changed from Confirmed to Feedback*
- *% Done changed from 0 to 100*

Applied in changeset [b601f897a5f6acfb4abc8beeedf0bb0d5cfa3193](#).

**#7 - 01/28/2015 01:00 PM - Renato Botelho**

Applied in changeset [340e8bc5cf67a2e826df28d1ac3a1eb70ed2c5c5](#).

**#8 - 02/17/2015 11:43 PM - Chris Buechler**

- *Status changed from Feedback to Resolved*

fixed