

# Re: Best desktop OS for VS 2005

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/VisualStudio/microsoft.public.vsnnet.general/2006-04/msg00073.html>

---

- *From:* "Kevin Spencer" <[kevin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kevin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 5 Apr 2006 06:57:25 -0400
- 

2. Never put VS2005 on a Windows Server 2003; this is completely and utterly stupid and breaks every rule of client/server computing.

"this is ... stupid" – good argument. I think the last time I used that argument was when I was about 19.

"breaks every rule of client/server computing" – Um. What? Visual Studio is not a client/server application. And we're not talking about using a server computer. We're talking about putting a server OS on a development computer.

We still use Win2000 client for VS2005 as it's superior to XP in every way

ROFLMOD.

our developers run with user rights, NOT admin rights. You should NEVER run with admin rights.

Considering that previous remark about the superiority of Windows 2000 over Windows XP, I'm not surprised. Perhaps we should revise that statement to read "\*I\* should NEVER run with admin rights." I could go along with that.

I guess I'll have to tell our network admin not to allow me to be a network admin any more. Of course, if he's out of town, who will fix the network when it goes down? BTW, what does this have to do with what OS one uses for development?

If your Server 2003 is a production server it should be set up by an expert from scratch as a custom build.

Again, nobody said anything about doing development work on "a production server." I recommended installing Windows 2003 Server on a development

Re: Best desktop OS for VS 2005

machine. Somehow I get the feeling that you don't know the difference between a production server and a server OS. One is hardware. One is software. They do not always share the same machine.

--

HTH,

Kevin Spencer  
Microsoft MVP  
Professional Numbskull

Show me your certification without works,  
and I'll show my certification  
\*by\* my works.

"Gerry Hickman" <gerry666uk@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:O%23LkfKEWGHA.4212@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:O%23LkfKEWGHA.4212@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Hi,

Comments related to original post

1. I agree with Windows 2000 it was very neat with the client/server consistency. Same version of IIS and exact same DLLs for debugging. Unfortunately, this is not damaged forever by Microsoft's new mismatched o/s strategy.
2. Never put VS2005 on a Windows Server 2003; this is completely and utterly stupid and breaks every rule of client/server computing.
3. Client o/s Win2000/XP/Vista?

We still use Win2000 client for VS2005 as it's superior to XP in every way, but there will soon be things that will only work on XP or Vista so it's worth getting ready for the slow and bloated "home user" experience of a lifetime. We target Server 2003 with IIS6. I'm not aware of any security issues; our developers run with user rights, NOT admin rights. You should NEVER run with admin rights.

If your Server 2003 is a production server it should be set up by an expert from scratch as a custom build.

If wrote:

Kevin,

Thanks for your quick response. So, is it safe to assume that all the potential security issues that we could encounter are not insurmountable for a development environment? "Kevin Spencer" wrote:

Re: Best desktop OS for VS 2005

Windows Server 2003 will be a great deal more difficult to set up due to the increased security. However, if you're doing a web application, I agree that it would be better to develop on the Windows Server 2003 platform, as your app will have to deal with these security issues as well. As for IIS 6.0, it will be better for the app when deployed, but not much different at design time.

--  
HTH,

Kevin Spencer  
Microsoft MVP  
Professional Numbskull

Show me your certification without works,  
and I'll show my certification  
\*by\* my works.

"lf" <lf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:4AE47428-95AC-4AF0-8ABB-DA2CBBBD6823C@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:4AE47428-95AC-4AF0-8ABB-DA2CBBBD6823C@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Not sure if this is the right group for this question, but it's kind a hybrid, so here goes. Our production environment is moving to Windows 2003. Presently, we have Windows 2000 server in production and all developers desktops have Windows 2000 as well. This works well because we can on our desktops using the same environment as production. Now, we are moving to Windows 2003 on production and developers will be using Visual Studio 2005. My question is this: What is the best OS for a developer. I have heard that people have had issues with Windows 2003 server on the desktop, so this would lead me to believe we should use XP Pro. However, I think XP Pro has IIS 5.0

Re: Best desktop OS for VS 2005

and Windows 2003 has IIS 6.0. Ideally, it would be great if developers could have the same level of IIS as production. What are other people using? Since most of our applications are web applications it seems important to have the same version of iis on our development machines. Thanks in advance for your help.

--

Gerry Hickman (London UK)