

# Re: Networking

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Access/microsoft.public.access.gettingstarted/2008-05/msg00421.html>

---

- *From:* "aaron.kempf@xxxxxxxx" <aaron.kempf@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 16 May 2008 13:10:45 -0700 (PDT)
- 

re:

I certainly wouldn't even consider it for any database with under a hundred users.

you mean.. if you had 99 users, then you would just run around and change the server names (IN FOUR DIFFERENT AREAS) on 99 different desktops?

that sure sounds to me -- like you don't know WTF you're talking about

-Aaron

On May 16, 9:35 am, "Arvin Meyer [MVP]" <a...@xxxxx> wrote:

A CName or Canonical name is the fully qualified domain name and has nothing at all to do with a particular server other than being listed by a responsible DNS server. ALL servers within that domain share that CName. If you are an enterprise with a large number of users (many times more than would ever be using an Access database), it might save a slight amount of time to create a CName of a database server, or for a cluster of servers. I wouldn't bother for a single server which hosted less than a few hundred user connections. The performance hit for it to resolve a CName, especially on a LAN is totally unnecessary. I certainly wouldn't even consider it for any database with under a hundred users. The technique that you mentioned is new and untested by more than a few, and I doubt that you've ever seen a first-hand implementation. If you'd bother to look, this is an Access forum, where most questions have to do with less than 20 users. It is NOT a SQL-Server forum, although we can and do answer relevant questions concerning structure and connectivity.

The reason you are here is more than likely the SQL-Server experts have roundly laughed you out of their newsgroups. The Access experts are doing the same. Reading a new technique and spouting unrelated answers is a waste of your own time, as well as ours. Do something useful for this newsgroup or go away.



Re: Networking

Son, go find somewhere else to play. You have no idea what you're talking about. I can't image any responsible DBA doing that. DNS records are used to publish domain and mail server IPs, and that's it.

The number of inaccurate answer you post is nothing short of phenomenal. It sounds like you've read a book or 2 and remember some key words but nothing else. We all know better. Do us all a favor and take your nonsense somewhere where no one has any idea what you are talking about and thinks you might be intelligent. How about alt.abuse.offender? Perhaps you can learn some manners and good sense there as well.

--  
Arvin Meyer, MCP,  
MVP <http://www.datastrat.com> <http://www.mvps.org> <http://www.accessmv...>

<aaron.ke...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

[news:8230d2d2-930d-4714-be8c-4ef39710b7f8@xx](mailto:news:8230d2d2-930d-4714-be8c-4ef39710b7f8@xx)  
and for the record, I usually implement DNS C Names in order to use pointers for all my apps.  
Then instead of changing the connection string (IN ONE PLACE) I just change the DNS pointer.

now THAT is an enterprise level idea!

-Aaron

On May 15, 1:07 am, "Arvin Meyer [MVP]" <a...@xxxx> wrote:

Linking an ADP is no different than linking an MDB to SQL-Server or any other RDBM for front-end changes. It isn't easier at all since if one

Re: Networking

moves  
the server, because one needs to build a new DSN or rewrite  
the  
connection  
strings, and one only needs to relink to the native JET  
DBMS.

--  
Arvin Meyer, MCP,  
MVP <http://www.datastrat.com> <http://www.mvps.org/access> <http://www.accessmv...>

<aaron.ke...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

[news:4cb4f3b0-5ad5-4f67-bbaa-a1860bbc2ca6@xx](mailto:news:4cb4f3b0-5ad5-4f67-bbaa-a1860bbc2ca6@xx)  
yes, if you change a table, then you've got to relink it in 5  
different places.

that is why it is considerably easier to move to SQL Server /  
ADP.

-Aaron

On May 8, 3:55 am, Roger Bell  
<RogerB...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

I have designed a data base which I wish to  
install on 5 remote  
computers.

My idea is to link the Backend (Tables). My  
question is if i change  
any  
reports/mailling labels etc on the server data  
Base, do I then have to  
change  
the design on each of the remotes.

Re: Networking

Is there any difference between splitting and linking, or is there a way to change any report designs that will automatically update on the remotes.

Many thanks for any help– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text — Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text — Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –