

Re: XP remote connect to Win2K PC?

Source:

http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.work_remotely/2004-10/0503.html

From: Jonathan Finney (*jon_at_isotrack.com*)

Date: 10/18/04

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 18:44:49 +0100

Spot on, Bill.

My work network is a Win2k peer-to-peer network, so there's no server, although one machine is not worked on and acts as a server as the 'data' drive is on this machine and printers etc. are connected to it. It also remains on all the time to receive faxes.

It's not strictly necessary to have a copy of the data folder on my home machine, although an extra copy of valuable data is always a good idea. I could just work on the data files directly, but it could be desirable to have simultaneous access to the same file and the 'two copies sync' scenario would avoid problems.

I've posted newsgroups and read help files and MS KB articles it seems like a common enough need with many features such as Briefcase, Sync Folders, Offline Folders and programs such as Second Copy all of which will achieve something like I need, but all take for granted that a connection between the 2 machines already exists. At this point I get drowned in articles about VPN tunnels and servers none of which seems to be aimed at the likes of me.

Thanks for your continued patience and attention. There must be many people in this position. I hope they can benefit from this.

--

Jonathan Finney

"Bill Sanderson" <Bill_Sanderson@msn.com.plugh.org> wrote in message news:els\$plxsEHA.2136@TK2MSFTNGP11.phx.gbl...

> Hmm - let's start over--can you describe the basic thing you are planning to

> do from scratch?

>

> My vision so far is that you have a workgroup of two physically separated (by

> the Internet) machines on which you wish to keep a set of files in synch for

> some purpose.

>

> These machines don't travel, they'll never be on a direct high-speed

> connection with each other--the "network" will be a VPN connection between

microsoft.public.windowsxp.work_remotely: Re: XP remote connect to Win2K PC?

> them?
>
> Am I close?
> (and I'm not sure I know the answer, although I could try it as an
> experiment and see how it works.)
>
> "Jonathan Finney" <jon@isotrack.com> wrote in message
> news:416fef02\$0\$109\$65c69314@mercury.nildram.net...
> > Thanks again, Bill.
> >
> > I have read some MS articles on using Offline Files and have also
> > downloaded
> > and installed the Second Copy trial. The problem with both is that they
> > assume that you already have access to the other computer and refer to
> the
> > different locations as if they were connected via a LAN. This is not the
> > case and I have no idea how to set this up or where to find help with
> > this.
> > My ISP was not much help - he was able to show me where to enter the IP
> > addresses and port numbers to program my Zyxel router, but wasn't able
> to
> > tell me what they should be.
> >
> > Since this is obviously a very common need, I assume I must have been
> > asking
> > the wrong questions because I have seen nothing that begins to cover the
> > procedure for setting up the connection in the first place (VPN
> tunnel?).
> >
> > Any ideas how I find help on this?
> >
> > --
> >
> > Jonathan Finney
> >
> >
> > "Bill Sanderson" <Bill_Sanderson@msn.com.plugh.org> wrote in message
> > news:07euLcssEHA.2196@TK2MSFTNGP14.phx.gbl...
> >> I've a user who keeps a laptop at home and only brings it to the office
> >> to
> >> synch every few months. She'd like to use a (1 gig) USB key to do the
> >> synching by carrying that back and forth.
> >>
> >> I'm looking at SC for that functionality. I see that some USB key
> >> vendors
> >> have (usually extra cost) apps to do this job that are tied to their
> >> hardware.
> >>
> >> It seems to me that the devil is in the details in this kind of an
> > app--and
> >> I don't have a solid enough feeling for how SC works to be
> unequivocally
> >> positive. Lanwench does have that level of experience, I believe!
> >>
> >> The strength I see in Offline Files is that they've made it
> simple--very
> >> little user interface--no complicated sets of options to set, etc.
> > Because
> >> the underlying process is, in fact, rather complex, this can lead to
> some
> >> issues which are hard to manage--although the number of tools needed
> are

microsoft.public.windowsxp.work_remotely: Re: XP remote connect to Win2K PC?

> >> quite small--there's a KB article on how to blow away and reestablish the
> >> cache if there are issues of corruption with it, and there's a Windows
> >> Server 2003 Resource Kit applet that allows for manual control of several
> >> crucial details of the cache behavior which is sometimes useful.
> >>
> >> I haven't seen the data loss issues directly, but I've only a few users
> >> using the feature--I have certainly seen threads here with such issues,
> >> but
> >> don't have a clear fix on what went wrong. For example, the cache files
> >> are
> >> tied to a serial number for the user in a domain, and if the domain
> >> changes
> >> (as with a neighbor who changed jobs)--the cache becomes inaccessible.
> >> He
> >> was sure he was OK because he synched carefully before leaving the job,
> >> but,
> >> in fact, the files were inaccessible. I now suspect this could have been
> >> fixed with the Resource Kit applet, but I didn't know about that at the
> >> time, and he was able to get the old job to send him the files.
> >> So--there
> >> are "legitimate" causes for the cache becoming inaccessible, and then
> >> there
> >> are the other kind--which I haven't followed the feature in enough
depth
> >> to
> >> try to pin down.
> >>
> >> I like offline files--it is dead simple to use, and the users find it
> >> easy
> >> to understand. However, if I'd been having data lost issues, I'd go
> >> elsewhere quickly, or if I needed more flexibility--as with the USB key
> >> transfer system.
> >>
> >>
> >> "Jonathan Finney" <jon@isotrack.com> wrote in message
> >> news:416ea2a1\$0\$103\$65c69314@mercury.nildram.net...
> >> > Thanks for a very comprehensive explanation, Bill.
> >> >
> >> > I can see that this could be an issue where large amounts of data had
> >> > to
> >> > be
> >> > transferred, but once the initial copy of several GB of data had been
> >> > performed, hopefully the relatively small number of files changed
> >> > within
> >> > a
> >> > day would not present too much of a problem.
> >> >
> >> > I'm concerned about the instances of data loss mentioned by Lanwench
> >> > and
> >> > have asked her for more details. Have you heard of similar
> >> > occurrences?
> >> > If
> >> > we're talking about the possibility of files at both ends becoming
> >> > damaged,
> >> > I'll pay the \$30 and go for the SC option. It also sounds like it
> >> > might
> >> > be
> >> > easier to set up and manage with a dedicated application as a front

microsoft.public.windowsxp.work_remotely: Re: XP remote connect to Win2K PC?

```
> >> > end.
> >> > Would you agree?
> >> >
> >> > --
> >> >
> >> > Jonathan Finney
> >> >
> >> > "Bill Sanderson" <Bill_Sanderson@msn.com.plugh.org> wrote in message
> >> > news:eSfvXbTsEHA.2632@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...
> >> >> SMB is Server Message Block, apparently invented by IBM:
> >> >>
> >> >> http://www.javvin.com/protocolSMB.html
> >> >>
> >> >> It is what any windows networking implementation has used since time
> >> >> immemorial.
> >> >>
> >> >> The current standard is CIFS which is also mentioned in this
> > definition.
> >> >>
> >> >> VPN is not necessarily slow--the speed depends on the infrastructure
> > you
> >> > are
> >> >> connecting across.
> >> >>
> >> >> If you have a 100mbps full duplex ethernet, and use a VPN connection
> >> > across
> >> >> that, for security, the speed difference may be negligable, I
suspect,
> >> >> but
> >> >> haven't tested. There's processor power going into the
> >> >> encryption/decryption at both ends, but if more than enough of that
is
> >> >> available, it shouldn't impact speed. I haven't looked up the
details
> > of
> >> >> the overhead in individual packets--versus unencrypted traffic. I'm
> > sure
> >> >> there's some.
> >> >>
> >> >> What I meant by slow is that if you are connecting across the
> >> >> Internet,
> >> > many
> >> >> common connection types these days are not equally fast in both
> >> > directions.
> >> >> The "A" in ADSL is for assymetric, meaning that the connection is
> > faster
> >> > in
> >> >> one direction than in the other. The same is true for common cable
> >> >> connections, as I understand it.
> >> >>
> >> >> So--the speed of your connection may be limited by the uplink speed
at
> >> >> the
> >> >> site the data is flowing from. Using Remote Desktop, for example,
> > speed
> >> >> issues are almost unnoticable--because of compression and great care
> >> >> bandwidth use. However, when you are using normal networking
> >> >> protocols
> >> > over
> >> >> that same connection and moving large amounts of data--as you may be
> >> >> in
> >> >>
> >
```

microsoft.public.windowsxp.work_remotely: Re: XP remote connect to Win2K PC?

```
> > > doing an initial synch on offline files, the basic link speed is
going
> > to
> > > limit how fast things go.  If you are lucky, and the source is a
> > > workplace
> > > with a large upload speed to the Internet, this may not be a
problem.
> > >
> > > Many here are accustomed to the speeds that RDP achieves over such
> > > connections and are startled when they try an actual file transfer
or
> > > other
> > > bulk data movement over the same underlying connection and are
bitten
> > by
> > > the
> > > relative speed (or lack thereof!) of the link--so I try to remind
> > folks.
> > >
> > > "Jonathan Finney" <jon@isotrack.com> wrote in message
> > > news:416d31ac$0$112$65c69314@mercury.nildram.net...
> > > > Sorry, Bill.
> > > >
> > > > I've heard of VPN, but didn't know it was slow.  Where can I read
> > more
> > > > about
> > > > this?
> > > >
> > > > What's SMB?
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > >
> > > > Jonathan Finney
> > > >
> > > > "Bill Sanderson" <Bill_Sanderson@msn.com.plugh.org> wrote in
message
> > > > news:e7JMGx8rEHA.3728@TK2MSFTNGP09.phx.gbl...
> > > > > Offline files works with any source offering SMB networking--this
> > > > > includes
> > > > > the 9.x versions of Windows, and, I suspect, Linux
implementations
> > > of
> > > > > SMB.
> > > > >
> > > > > As Lanwench mentions, it isn't available in XP Home, but that
isn't
> > > > what
> > > > > you
> > > > > have at home.
> > > > >
> > > > > I don't have experience with trying to use this feature in a
> > > > > situation
> > > > > > where
> > > > > > you are only connecting via a slow VPN link, but you can
definitely
> > > > > > try
> > > > > > it
> > > > > > out.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You might want to try both mechanisms--the third-party one and
the
> > > > > > native
```

