

Re: Network Configuration

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.networking/2004-05/0790.html>

From: Phillip Windell (_at_)

Date: 05/10/04

Date: Mon, 10 May 2004 15:59:23 -0500

The scope of this is so large it is nearly impossible to answer in a simple newsgroup message. You have the physical topology, the logical topology, and the capabilities of the individual hardware device just to even begin the conversation.

Now if you are getting about 200 machines then you may need to look at subnetting just because of that. Broadcasts are the biggest killer of a LAN and those aren't effect by "where the user usually goes", and the user doesn't even have to be at their machine doing anything. Broadcasts don't cross routers, therefore the routers will recover lost bandwidth.

You can also design the system using VLANs. In this case where the user is physically located doesn't even matter. The users are segmented "logically" by what they do and what they use, and not where they are or what floor they are on.

--

Phillip Windell [MCP, MVP, CCNA]
www.wandtv.com

"Carl Hilton" <someone@microsoft.com> wrote in message
news:%23A1HHEsNEHA.2844@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...

```
> We currently have three router/hub/switches one, for each floor of our
> building. We have numerous subnets which are now randomly scattered all
over
> the building using static IP's. I am contemplating going to DHCP and am
> interested in knowing if there is a technical reason, why I should try to
> keep the subnets focused on each floor. Currently the majority of the
> traffic is going either out to the internet or to our computer room
servers,
> all located off of one of the routers/switch/hubs. This means that the
> majority of traffic on the other two router/switch/hubs is just being
> pushed to the third, which is leaning me to believe that there is NO
reason
> to try to create a DHCP configuration whereby each floor will get their
own
> subnet.
>
> Carl
>
>
```