

Re: POP3 Connector undisclosed recipients

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Exchange/microsoft.public.exchange.admin/2004-09/0701.html>

From: Rich Matheisen [MVP] (*richnews_at_rmcons.com.NOSPAM.COM*)

Date: 09/05/04

Date: Sat, 04 Sep 2004 21:03:58 -0400

bconneely@yahoo.com (BC) wrote:

>"Rich Matheisen [MVP]" <richnews@rmcons.com.NOSPAM.COM> wrote in message
news:<j1mfj0tgr29q45e53itt0gs5rc5id90h4@4ax.com>...

>> bconneely@yahoo.com (BC) wrote:

>>

>> [snip]

>>

>> >*Slap*

>> >

>> >How many times I have to tell you low tech MS toadies

>>

>> Low tech? MS toadies? And you still use POP3? HA!

>>

>Is that all you got? *Slap* *Slap*

Nope. But I'm not trying to sell something, either. :)

>I you want speed, reliability, and flexibility it's POP3

>and IMAP.

IMAP, sure. Flexibility and POP3? Geeze.

>If you want weird, sluggish behavior and

>incompatibility, there's MAPI, which of course is crappy

And if all you want is messages then IMAP it is. Let me know when you

can do scheduling, calendars, notes, journals, etc. with an IMAP

client (or server). Oh, and as much as I dislike them, try public

folder applications with IMAP.

>*Slap*

>> >

>> >that POP3 connectors work extremely well, especially

>>

>> No they don't. At least not if you define "extremely well" as "the

>> same as SMTP".

>
>By "extremely well" I mean set-it and forget-it low
>maintenance and low cost -- which are extremely strange
>concepts to MCSE's

Hardly. I'm not a consultant, or a tech support guy. I manage the e-mail system for a medium sized company. Cost is at the forefront of what I do every day. But cost is more than the hardware and software dollars.

>who think the all-purpose solution to
>flaky Exchange Servers is a massively expensive -- and
>profitable -- software and hardware upgrade to Microsoft's
>latest and lamest.

Sounds like you've got an ax to grind. I'd suggest you take it one of the advocacy groups.

> *Slap*
>
>> >
>> >for smaller businesses, where they provide extra
>>
>> The size of the business has no effect on how well they work.
>
>Yahoo with 52 million customers might possibly have different
>needs from a regional ISP with 50,000 customers, which in turn
>might have different needs from a large company with 5,000
>employees,

A "large" company would have substantially more than 5,000 employees. You're describing the top end of the "small" company profile. But that may help explain your mindset.

And Yahoo (Outblaze) offers pretty much the low end of mail features, as does MSN, Juno, etc. The way mail is used in an enterprise is quite different to the way mail is used by the general public.

>whose needs would be different from a small firm
>with 50 employees. In all these cases, though Exchange Server
>would not be the best choice if speed, scalability, and
>reliability are important.

Hmmm . . . reliability? I get 3-1/2 to 4-9's out of unhardened and unoptimized Exchange servers. And that's not subtracting the maintenance time.

Speed? I can deliver a message of up to 100KB in less than 10 minutes anywhere in the company (and that covers six continents, not all of which are "well connected").

Scalability needs some definition, and an understanding of the way the system is used. It's easy to put 50,000 mailboxes on one server if only a small percentage of the users are connected at one time, and the messages they send are relatively small (under 50KB). We've got few Exchange servers with >5,000 mailboxes on them, and the way those mailboxes is used is quite different to the way your parents might use Yahoo.

> *Slap*
>
>> >
>> >protection against viruses and hackers, compared to
>>
>> Really? Wow. I didn't know that POP3 included any AV scanners. MAYbe
>> I'll go back and reread that RFC. How you're proteted from hackers by
>> this sort of software is also a mystery. But, I'm just a low tech MS
>> toadie, so what do *I* know? Perhaps you can tell us how this
>> wonderful POP3 "cloak of invincibility" works?
>
> *Slap* Try reading the post first before responding. By having
>the email come to a foreign mail host first, you can have it
>scanned there first before pulling it down into your local
>system.

You still have to connect to get the mail. Go figure.

>> > *Slap*
>> >
>> >MX pointing, especially to that sorry-ass pile of
>>
>> What's having a MX record got to do with viruses or hackers? Is ther
>> an "A" record? If so, then how's the two differ?
>
> *Slap* See the previous response. And an extra *Slap* for
>your disengenuousness.

Ohhh, a big word!

>> >programming code known as Exchange Server.
>>
>> You won't hear me disagree that no Exchange server shoud be connected
>> to the Internet.
>
> *Slap* It shouldn't even be connected to a large internal
>network

That's a personal opinion. Now tell us why.

>> >There are some issues with some list server mailings
>> >
>> > *Slap*

>> >
>> *>but mappings will take care of this. Also, you have*
>>
>> *>Not if yu have al the mail delivered to a single mailbox.*
>
> **Slap* Read the manual or help file before making a dim*
> *>comment like. It works. Did it. Inconvenient with a large*
> *>number of list server mailings, but that's about it.*

If you're happy with it, that's okay. How long did it take to make it work? How long would it take to do it for 100K mailboxes and thousands of mailing lists? What would be the running cost of maintaining it?

>> > **Slap**
>> >
>> *>the option of pulling down from now widely available*
>> >
>> > **Slap**
>> >
>> *>email hosting sites with antispam & antivirus checking*
>> >
>> > **Slap**
>> >
>> *>done at their end. Also, if this wasn't enough, some*
>>
>> *>Which is, of course, free -- right? Gotta keep those small businesses*
>> *>in mind. But, there are better ways of doing this than some kludge of*
>> *>POP3-to-SMTP.*
>
> **Slap* Exchange Server *is* the kludge. The TCO of that easily*
> *>pays for having email being scanned externally.*

Have you ever done a TCO analysis yourself? Or do you just read stuff in magazines?

For a small number of mailboxes using a service like Postini (not the best for outbound mail, BTW) is inexpensive. But it's a constant cost, month after month.

[snip]

>> > **Kick Butt**
>> >
>> *>Now go 'way and download some critical update or such.*
>>
>> *>I'd rather go fiddle with Ironmail and Postfix, thanks.*
>
> *>"Fiddle" is the right word, no doubt. I'll skip a slap for*
> *>your inadvertent honesty.*

microsoft.public.exchange.admin: Re: POP3 Connector undisclosed recipients

I suppose I could have used another word. But you'd take wrong no matter what i said.

--

Rich Matheisen

MCSE+I, Exchange MVP

MS Exchange FAQ at http://www.swinc.com/resource/exch_faq.htm