

Re: Windows 2000 Service Packs?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.general/2005-10/msg00266.html>

- *From:* Bob I <birelan@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 10 Oct 2005 16:39:37 -0500
-

How about no. But then you knew that didn't you. ;-)

Bill wrote:

"Bob I" <birelan@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:%232RDPKryFHA.4032@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

The question was the equivalent of "Will you get hit by a bus tomorrow?"

In other words, you don't know anything about this, and you are emphasizing it by using a bad metaphor.

Let me rephrase the issue in a much simpler manner. Is upgrading to a particular Win2000 service pack, IN AND OF ITSELF, a bad move for reasons of security, stability, or flexibility.

To repeat my examples, which you seemed to have missed:

Example: One of the Office 2000 patches, SR-(something), blocked access to
almost all Outlook attachments (which smacks of a Microsoft lawyer thing,
but whatever). This reduced functionality.

Although it's another company, since 2001, Symantec's yearly editions of
SystemWorks have had less and less "Norton" functionality (presumably to
make it easier for less sophisticated users).

Re: Windows 2000 Service Packs?

```
#  
# The moral of this story is that it's not uncommon for modern updates,  
# upgrades, and service packs to reduce functionality or introduce problems.  
#  
# Simply speaking, I just want to be aware of any difficulties, or  
# (unofficial) incompatibilities, that the Windows 2000 service packs might  
# cause.
```

Is there clear enough for you now?