

microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics: Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics/2004-03/6689.html>

From: pjp (*pjp_is_located_at__at__hotmail__com*)

Date: 03/29/04

Date: Mon, 29 Mar 2004 18:58:25 -0400

Well, I personally don't think I want the corporate stuff as that's what actually dictates DHCP, Domain and all that other crap being forced upon you. Also, quickly glancing through that page gives the impression that most of that is also within XP.

Seems to me I want just about what every home user would want, e.g. to be able to dictate what each and every user can do on an individual basis and not through "groups".

Basically, I do think you've answered my original question though. In essence it's NO and XP offers nothing to encourage me to upgrade from 98SE..

"David Candy" <david@mvps.org> wrote in message
news:e#SntYdFEHA.692@TK2MSFTNGP09.phx.gbl...
<http://msdn.microsoft.com/library/en-us/gp/gpref.asp>

I haven't seen Doug's thing but it would use the registry settings above. These are the results of group policy, ie what it does to the machine. You can do it by hand.

You'd be happier buying Win 2000 Server. You want corporate stuff.

Note most of these restrictions work on 98 as well.

There are some new ones in XP as well but I know of no list.

--

<http://www.q2mil.com/Dec2003.htm>

"pjp" <pjp_is_located_at__hotmail__com> wrote in message
news:ehfE8QdFEHA.692@TK2MSFTNGP09.phx.gbl...

> Sounds then like we are all paying for a feature set only large companies
> actually need, want or use. That doesn't seem right to me.

>

> I'll state what I have , what I want and what I found.

>

> I presently have five networked pc's running 98SE. One of them is more
than

> capable of being upgraded to XP Pro. In fact I've done the dual-boot then
> thrown it all away in frustration 4/5 times already now. All the pc's are

Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics: Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

> networked, running both Netbuie and TCP/IP. The Netbuie for file and print
> sharing and TCP/IP so I can test etc. internet stuff without having to
> actually connect to Internet as I live in a rural area with only slow
dialup
> access.
>
> Two of the pc's have a dialup connection setup. The "main" pc's dialup is
> used solely by itself but one of the 98SE pc's runs a proxy server to
> accomodate the other 3 pc's being able to also connect to the net (they
> don't have modems). The "proxy server" pc is actually an older box stuffed
> with hard disks, both ide and scsi and is used primarily as a hard disk
> server (for lack of a better term). Hardly ever does anyone actually sit
> down and use that pc (as a side note, 98SE on it and it typically goes
> months between reboots). Note none of this is setup using Window's
Internet
> Connection Sharing but rather the "traditional" way with my filling in all
> the appropriate blanks, distributing Hosts file (so a "named" pc's IP can
be
> determined), installing and setting up the proxy, http, ftp, irc, news,
> email and media servers (all 3rd party apps). There is no domain, ip or
> whatever server running on this network, instead each pc has been manually
> assigned an ip address, e.g. 192.168.0.x; 255,255,255,0.
>
> None of it is password protected, instead being ... if it's shared it's
> available to all. Hence, basically the "proxy server" pc is more or less
> wide open to ethernet connections (some apps are "installed" on it for all
> to use) but the other 4 pc's all only share a "temp" folder. Printers are
> shared and available to all (four total in house). I do not allow NetBios
> over TCP/IP and I have Netbuie as my primary protocol, the TCP/IP being
used
> only for the "internet" type stuff.
>
> I had hoped that when I upgraded this "main" pc to XP pro I could
>
> -----
>
> Expectation #1) keep the ethernet more or less as is.
>
> Experienced : I accomplished that by installing the third party Netbuie
> protocol provided on the install cd. I had some frustration setting it up
> and getting the "defaults" out of the way but without changing anything on
> the 98SE boxes, I successfully had all printers working as expected (2
> inkjets, laser and dot matrix) and all shared folders etc. working as
> expected. I didn't like that I couldn't seem to be able to disabled
Netbios
> over TCP/IP like I could within 98SE but as none of the other boxes use
it,
> I let that one slide. I also noticed "browsing" the ethernet wasn't as
> "smooth" as under 98SE.
>
> Conclusion : Felt I had accomplished task #1
>
> -----
>
> Expectation #2) I could setup individual user accounts with separate
> "abilities" for each account, e.g. I'm administrator, wife is a "power
user"
> and my two kids are each only allowed access to specific "features etc."
> with them not neccessarily being "identical", e.g. older kid is allowed
more
> "access" and to different apps than younger. The kids account would be
> restricted in their browsing abilities so they couldn't access folders

Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics: Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

etc.
> I didn't want them to.
>
> Experienced : I was able to change the wife's account to Power User but then
> all the normal change password dialogs etc. didn't seem to know what group
> she even belonged to!!! Regarding limiting the kids individually, NO clue
> except figure out how to create additional restrictions in newly created
> groups and then assign each user to their own "group". I haven't figured
> out
> how to do that and have basically dumped XP Pro because without this it's
> adds nothing to what I can now do under 98SE.
>
> Conclusion : Without this, XP pro's useless to me as it adds nothing but
> obstruction, compromise and loss of speed to equation. Note : XP Pro did a
> couple of nice crashes on me during testing so it's really no better than
> 98SE at it. Rebooting instead of blue screen isn't a solution to the
> problem.
>
> -----
>
> Expectation #3) could allow a Guest account with VERY restricted feature
> set. Specifically do nothing AND see nothing but what I placed on the
> desktop, e.g. can't browse folders, right-click anything, no start menu
> (just logoff) and a host of other things.
>
> Experienced : Seems you can do some of the above, but couldn't find
anywhere
> to dictate many restrictions I'd want placed on this account (for example,
> no right click on desktop to even see anything let alone be able to change
> anything). Note : creating a "normal" user account for "anyone" and
disable
> this Guest account just moves the problem to item #2.
>
> Conclusion : why did they bother then?
>
> -----
>
> Expectation #4) allow the guest account access to internet thru IE but not
> allow downloading anything etc. etc. Guest account refused to have
anything
> to do with the dialup connection even though it's specified as "Allow all
to
> use". I assume this is a built-in restriction.
>
> Experienced : I was blown away by how easy this was circumvented!!! When
> logged in as Guest I was allowed to fill in the blanks to get to the proxy
> server over the ethernet and then had internet no problem!!!
>
> Conclusion : So much for well though out security if I could do that
> without any real underlying knowledge and NO prior experience with XP at
> all.
>
> -----
>
> All I want is to allow my wife to do things my older kids can't and for
the
> youngest to be even further restricted in what they 1) can do and 2) they
> can even see. I expected individual control over features as detailed as
> "allow right click", "home folder is root folder", dictate specific apps
can
> only be run, restrict even being able to "detect" there's other drives on

Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics: Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

> system (e.g. burner doesn't even show in MY Computer) etc. etc.
>
> That's what I expected from XP Pro.
>
> What I didn't expect was that some of what I want demands NTFS formatted
> hard disk(s). Something I definitely don't want until such a day that I
can
> put in a simple floppy disk (e.g. ala DOS days) with enough tools on it
etc.
> that I can manually retrieve data with no obstructions in place of any
sort)
> if the need arises. Least staying Fat32 assures me of that, e.g. boot
using
> DOS and copy whatever you like. If I don't want to allow that there's 1)
> take floppies physically out of system and 2) set BIOS password and 3) get
> box that can still use a physical key ala old AT days so there's no
keyboard
> and/or mouse even if/when connected if pc's "locked".
>
> My experiences to date have simply confirmed a friend of mine (pc vendor)
> who said (and I quote) 'XP holds nothing for you.'. Appears he was right
as
> all it seems to do is place more incumbrances on my using my own pc, e.g.
> take Cryptology and DRM etc. crap and shove it. I don't want, need or
plan
> to use any of that so why should it even be included let alone
(presumably)
> have my purchase price reflect the cost to put it there.
>
> Problem #2 is the big killer for me. In fact, what I've repeatedly been
> asking for "how to do" since I did the first XP install. It's my primary
> reason for any interest in XP. To the extent that as it stands now I'm not
> even considering getting an OS for my next box, I'll put 98SE on it also
> (and probably put Linux on the freed up pc, I've never sold an old one
yet)
> if it's really as it's seemed to me so far. Note : ten pc site license
here,
> 98 beta testing gift so it's no additional expense and in fact saves me
> money as I wouldn't be buying anything OEM anyway, I buy exclusively
clones
> with components I specify or I buy elsewhere..
>
> Further questions ask please.
>
> "David Candy" <david@mvps.org> wrote in message
> news:eP8FBMcFEHA.2576@TK2MSFTNGP11.phx.gbl...
> Because it designed to work with a domain server. It has some basic
> facilities if there is no server available.
>
> You can't apply policy, only security, to security groups. Without a
domain
> server you can only apply policy to everyone. You can never apply policy
to
> a user only to organisation units in a domain..
>
> There are ways of forcing more granular application. But you don't say if
> it's a domain or not.
>
> This is why network admins get paid a lot.
>
> Actually you don't say anything at all just generalities. It is not
possible

Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics: Re: Same question, still no answer!!!

> to answer. Employ someone or state exactly what you want.
> --
> -----
> <http://www.g2mil.com/Dec2003.htm>
> "pjp" <pjp_is_located_at_hotmail_com> wrote in message
> news:edZLG4bFEHA.1376@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...
> > Please, some one tell me how to "control" a specific individual user
> rather
> > than the whole group?
> >
> > Group polociies obviously control every user in that group and yet
> > although I've "think" I've found how to create new groups it appears
> > actually specifying policy for that group is "problamatic".
Additionally,
> > it seems absurd one would have to basuicallly create a new group to place
> > every single login user into their own group so that the policies for
that
> > group would only be applied to only that user.
> >
> > Is it really "all of nothing" for everyone in that group and that's
it!!!
> >
> > If you can't tell me how, can someone at least answer if it's even
> possible
> > using "right out of the box" tools. Even if it has to be direct registry
> > editing acceptable. 3rd party tools seems an unacceptable solution but
> > obviously if they exist (which Doug's tool seems to suggest) then the
> > documentation at least for doing what I want must exists somewhere. The
> > question then becomes where?
> >
> > It's a pretty simple idea, given two user logins ...
> >
> > I want user1 to be able to do this1, this2, this3 and not this4
> >
> > where-as
> >
> > I want user2 to be able to do this1, not this2, not this3 but allow
this4.
> >
> > Supposedly a modern, multi-tasking, multi-user operating system (XP Pro
at
> > least is touted as such) and it seems damn near impossible to get that
> done
> > "out of the box" which has me completely confused about what the hell is
> > going on?
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >