

Re: sms 2003 patch management is brutal!

Source: <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SMS/microsoft.public.sms.admin/2004-11/0514.html>

From: James (lee.james_at_spartan.ab.ca)

Date: 11/13/04

Date: 13 Nov 2004 13:42:18 -0800

Hi Cathy,

I seriously hope you meant to say 'will have to wait for SP2 or a forthcoming add-on'.....I would be seriously choked if I implement SMS with it's less than ideal patch management only to find if I want it to work properly I'll have to upgrade to SMS 2005.

J.

"Cathy Moya [MS]" <camoya@online.microsoft.com> wrote in message news:<ebMO0VPyEHA.2892@TK2MSFTNGP14.phx.gbl>...

> *You did, it just isn't called a synch host in the setup interface.*

> <*restraining myself from a tirade on interface design*>

>

> *It is screen #7 of the setup process and the text is:*

> -----

> *Database Updates*

> *If you have internet acces, setup can configure a task to automatically*

> *obtain the latest database. Please specify the NetBIOS name of an existing*

> *SMS client computer to run this taks. This computer will be added to a*

> *collection, and a weekly assignment will run while you are logged into the*

> *computer you specify below. Leave the space below blank if you do not want*

> *to use this feature.*

> *Obtain updates using:*

> <*field*>

> -----

> *Look ma, no synch host mentioned, but that's what it is. Office uses exactly*

> *the same setup wizard, and the same screen. There may be slight improvements*

> *in the screens when we release the WUS scanner (believe me, we're trying),*

> *but the real improvements will have to wait for another version of SMS. And*

> *we're working on it.*

>

>

> --

> *Cathy Moya, MCSE: Security*

> *Technical Writer, Enterprise Management Content Group*

>

> *Check out the SMS Technical FAQ:*

microsoft.public.sms.admin: Re: sms 2003 patch management is brutal!

> <http://www.microsoft.com/technet/prodtechnol/sms/sms2003/techfaq/default.msp>
> *This posting is provided AS IS with no warranties and confers no rights.*
>
>
> "yaba daba doo" <yabadabadoo@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message
> news:EB574130-5307-4DD6-98F1-CF11DE5A6EFE@microsoft.com...
> > Cathy,
> >
> > I never got the option to setup synch host during installation of scan
> > tools.
> >
> > "Cathy Moya [MS]" wrote:
> >
> >> The sync host is only selected once, during installation of the scan
> >> tool.
> >> You don't re-select it when running the Distribute Software Updates
> >> Wizard.
> >>
> >> --
> >> Cathy Moya, MCSE: Security
> >> Technical Writer, Enterprise Management Content Group
> >>
> >> Check out the SMS Technical FAQ:
> >> <http://www.microsoft.com/technet/prodtechnol/sms/sms2003/techfaq/default.msp>
> >> *This posting is provided AS IS with no warranties and confers no rights.*
> >>
> >> "yaba daba doo" <yabadabadoo@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message
> >> news:B649B4D0-B6BA-43AB-B65D-E0A9CAA73260@microsoft.com...
> >> >I am actually going thru implementing Patch Mgmt myself and I am running
> >> >into
> >> >alots of problem. Specially the wizard is not giving me the options
> >> >that
> >> >it's suppose to give me. I am not able to select a synch host, it
> >> >never
> >> >gives me that option in the wizard.
> >> >
> >> >But I do have to say that people on this newgroup are quite helpfull
> >> >with
> >> >answering the questions. I haven't given up on it yet.
> >> >
> >> >"Allan Tee" wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> i agree, i would rather also use SUS than SMS's software updates. but
> >> >> then
> >> >> again, SUS can only handle OS/IE patches. SMS patch management is
> >> >> extremely
> >> >> hard to implement!
> >> >>
> >> >>"Kim Oppalfens" wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >>> inline

Re: sms 2003 patch management is brutal!

> >> >> >
> >> >> > *I just started to play with patch management. I created an*
> >> >> > *advertisement for the latest IE cumulative update (834707) using*
> >> >> > *the*
> >> >> > *Software Update Wizard. I then targeted it at my 'servers'*
> >> >> > *collection.*
> >> >> > *In the options I told it to defer rebooting for servers.*
> >> >> >
> >> >> > *Here's my experience with it:*
> >> >> >
> >> >> > *– The program ran on servers that already had the patch installed*
> >> >> > *previously (isn't that the point of the scan tool, to determine*
> >> >> > *what*
> >> >> > *patches are needed?)*
> >> >> > *Yes, it is, are you sure the patch was installed and active? That*
> >> >> > *means*
> >> >> > *was the machine rebooted after the patch if needed? If a patch that*
> >> >> > *requires a reboot is installed without rebooting the patch isn't*
> >> >> > *really*
> >> >> > *alive and the scan tool will report it as such. By consequence the*
> >> >> > *patch*
> >> >> > *will reinstall.*
> >> >> >
> >> >> > *– Despite telling it to not reboot the servers, lo and behold all*
> >> >> > *the*
> >> >> > *servers tell me they are rebooting and gave me the countdown timer*
> >> >> > *How did you tell it not to reboot the servers? I assume in the*
> >> >> > *distribute software updates wizard. Did you also use the suppress*
> >> >> > *reboot*
> >> >> > *switch on the patch? The wizard actually waits for the result of*
> >> >> > *every*
> >> >> > *patch you install if you suppress the reboot in the patch it will*
> >> >> > *write*
> >> >> > *to a log file that the reboot was suppressed. Once all patches have*
> >> >> > *installed the wizard will check the log file and verify whether any*
> >> >> > *reboots were suppressed. If so, the wizard tool might trigger a*
> >> >> > *reboot,*
> >> >> > *unless you suppress that reboot during the wizard.*
> >> >> >
> >> >> > *– There's absolutely no logging in Event Viewer on the clients to*
> >> >> > *say*
> >> >> > *that the patch was installed*
> >> >> > *Not really an sms issue, this is something that the patches should*
> >> >> > *take*
> >> >> > *care of if we want that. Sms does generate a log file called*
> >> >> > *patchinstall.log and registers in wmi.*
> >> >> >
> >> >> > >
> >> >> > > *I think I'll stick with SUS.....it's free, it's intuitive in*
> >> >> > > *comparison, and it works as it's designed.*
> >> >> > > *I agree with all your observations on SUS, just want to add that sms*

microsoft.public.sms.admin: Re: sms 2003 patch management is brutal!

> >> >> > *works as designed as well.*
> >> >> >
> >> >> > *I think Microsoft is well aware of the not so intuitive way sms*
> >> >> > *patch*
> >> >> > *management works.*
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > *J.*
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> > --
> >> >> > *Kim Oppalfens*
> >> >> > *Proud father of Lennart Oppalfens*
> >> >> > *Since 05/11/2004 08.53 GMT+1*
> >> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >>