

Re: AD 2003 – Empty root or Not!

Source:

http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.active_directory/2004-10/1233.html

From: Glenn L (*the.only_at_gmail.com*)

Date: 10/21/04

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 2004 03:26:19 -0700

Its a good question. I don't even know where I stand on this one anymore.

Pros

Seperates the sensitive enterprise admin and schema admin groups from the rest of the forest.

Provides a convenient placeholder domain to move objects into and out of during migration and restructuring activities.

DNS namespace politics. lets say you are contoso.com and you aquire nwtraders.com (notice I have been trolling practice exams lately ;-)

I suspect the nwtraders.com executives would raise an eyebrow if they were to be migrated into nwtraders.contoso.com child domain.

If you had a placeholder root domain....lets say corp.com

Then you would have contoso.corp.com, and you could migrate nwtraders into nwtraders.corp.com Nice and pretty right.....

Cons

You must maintain 2 computers and 2 Windows server licenses.

forest wide sensitive groups in a production domain. Future divisions that may require domains of their own may be adverse to that level of trust in your domain administrators.

DNS namespace management.

Take my example.

As an alternative to nwtraders.contoso.com, you could create a new tree in the forest called nwtraders.com (actually it would have to be slightly different to get trusts setup and to use ADMT to perform the migration)

Now you have two seperate namespaces you must manage and setup properly to create seamless name resolution throughout your forest.

Of course it is possible to setup multiple tree roots even if there is an empty placeholder root domain. I can't think of a good reason to have that.

my 2c :-)

--

Glenn L

CCNA, MCSE 2000, MCSE 2003 + Security

"Mike" <Mike@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message news:FA60B8D8-7C62-4E28-8D9E-0352B7B8C727@microsoft.com...

> Guys,

>

microsoft.public.win2000.active_directory: Re: AD 2003 – Empty root or Not!

> I'm trying to bottom out the definitive answer to creating a dedicated
root
> domain OR not.
>
> Having an empty root domain seems to be AD / Win 2000 design best
practice,
> however since 2003 the idea appears to have faded away..
>
> I'm looking at creating a pristine forest for the migration of 4 MUD's
(2200
> users approx..) and a couple of Exchange 5.5 sites.. The organisation is
> largely centrally managed by a 3rd party however has a few in-house teams
> responsible for their own Wintel systems..
>
> So, for my new pristine forest should I go for a dedicated root (which
will
> in turn will be namespace root for subsequent children domains, which I
plan
> only to create one). Hardware costs aside, (the cost of 2 low end servers)
> what else is holding me back? Right now I see it as a sensible step to
secure
> the EA and Schema forest wide groups.
>
> If I didn't go for a dedicated root (as I've read a few people are
starting
> to do) how should you secure the forest wide groups? OR is the back to the
> point that your Domain Admin group should contain few users and you
delegate
> control over OU's for specific functionality!
>
> Comments and thoughts would be most appreciated!
>
> Mikey.