

Re: Domain Name same as Web page

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/BackOffice/microsoft.public.backoffice.smallbiz2000/2005-02/0264.html>

From: Marina Roos [SBS-MVP] (marina_at_roos.nodontwantspam.nl.com)

Date: 02/03/05

Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 14:01:38 +0100

Hi,

Did you contact Jeff directly about this? He does support his kit.

--

Regards,

Marina

Microsoft SBS-MVP

One of the Magical M&M's

"IBC" <spamityspam@spam.spam> schreef in bericht

news:eXLJMKHCFHA.2196@TK2MSFTNGP14.phx.gbl...

> Marina,

>

> As Jeff can attest, I'm no AD wiz, so if its written between the lines in
> the documentation I'm not going to get it. I believe the response to my
> question about this very thing was "not recommended" and not supported. If
> you know otherwise and can point me to what I'm missing I'd be happy to
> revisit it.

>

> I don't want to state too much else for fear of misrepresenting something
> due to my lack of understanding. Jeff has produced a fine kit that I would
> recommend to others.

>

>

>

> "Marina Roos [SBS-MVP]" <marina@roos.nodontwantspam.nl.com> wrote in
message

> news:OURayj%23BFHA.2104@TK2MSFTNGP14.phx.gbl...

> > Hi,

> >

> > Are you sure the Swing It prevents you from changing the domain name?

> Check

> > again.

> >

> > --

> > Regards,

> >

> > Marina

> > Microsoft SBS-MVP

> > One of the Magical M&M's

> >

> > "IBC" <spamityspam@spam.spam> schreef in bericht

> > news:exkjm69BFHA.1292@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...

> > > Thanks for the leads, I'll do more reading.

> > >

Re: Domain Name same as Web page

microsoft.public.backoffice.smallbiz2000: Re: Domain Name same as Web page

> > > I'm not happy at all about the .com ending but I wasn't in control at
> the
> > > time. Now we're upgrading and I thought we would have our chance to
fix
> > it,
> > > but I'm using the Swing It! Kit, and that precludes me from fixing the
> DN.
> > > If ANYBODY can figure out how to change it and still Swing It, I'm all
> > ears.
> > >
> > > So unless I can find a way to fix it without having to recreate a
whole
> > new
> > > server from scratch I'll be stuck with the cruddy one.
> > >
> > >
> > > "SuperGumby [SBS MVP]" <not@your.nellie> wrote in message
> > > news:07sLtv9BFHA.2428@TK2MSFTNGP14.phx.gbl...
> > > > Frequently asked questions about Windows 2000 DNS and Windows Server
> > > 2003
> > > > DNS
> > > > <http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;291382>
> > > >
> > > > You may have noticed that I'm somewhat opinionated on the subject of
> > > AD
> > > > DNS
> > > > namespace <http://imho.dyndns.org/addns.htm>
> > > >
> > > > IMHO (sorry to shout) THERE IS NOT ONE LEGITIMATE REASON WHY YOUR AD
> > > > DNS
> > > > > NAMESPACE SHOULD BE IN ANY WAY CONNECTED TO YOUR INTERNET FQDN.
> > > > >
> > > > > Never, no-one, home user, SOHO, SMB, Corporate OR International
world
> > > > > power.
> > > > >
> > > > > You are creating a namespace purely for the operation of your AD, it
> > > > > should
> > > > > be WHOLLY private. If you wish to make resources inside the AD
> > > > > available
> > > > > to
> > > > > > external requesters you will, in most cases, not actually be
> > > > > publishing
> > > > > the
> > > > > > internal address of the object but the address of the firewall which
> > > > > > makes
> > > > > > the object available in a secure manner.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If I could, I would flatten your server and set it up correctly.
I've
> > > > > worked
> > > > > > a couple of sites where we were not allowed to correct problems of
> > > > > > this
> > > > > > > type. Yes, you can normally work around it but it's always there. It
> > > > > > > costs
> > > > > > > you a few minutes here, a few minutes there, continuously. By
> > > > > > > addressing
> > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > problem you not only make life easier but actually save in the long
> > > > > > > > term.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "IBC" <spamityspam@spam.spam> wrote in message

