

Re: localgroup administrators

Source:

http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.group_policy/2007-04/msg00346.html

- *From:* "Roger Abell [MVP]" <mvpNoSpam@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 28 Apr 2007 15:05:36 -0700
-

"Jeremy" <jeremy@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:3EA5841B-4C19-4019-9916-3E5A84C4A00A@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

True. In most cases where I have implemented restricted groups it has lasted a little while and then someone comes up and says, hey we want Bob to be a local admin on these 5 machines and not the rest and alice to be local admin only on her machine, etc..

Pretty much the same experience here. The attempt either gets dumped or leads to a small explosion in single purpose GPOs targetting few machines each. Just one of the shortcomings in the original GP design capabilities (i.e. lack of a metalevel that gets specialized at apply time to handle the "everywhere conceptually the same, but actualized with per-machine uniqueness"). Thankfully things are changing.

"Roger Abell [MVP]" <mvpNoSpam@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:eo708PaiHHA.872@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

"Jeremy" <jeremy@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:E1E8A67D-0B85-426F-80C8-25D3717A23A3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Is your Domain Win2k? You could use a restricted groups policy, but I'm not sure that it works on Windows 2000.

It does, and the ability to use only the Member Of list also does if it is W2k Sp4.

However, I do not believe this is a viable solution. As I attempted to describe in other post this thread, using the Members list of restricted group definition replaces the complete and total membership on the

Re: localgroup administrators

impacted system. This is in my experience more often than not a non-useful capability as one often needs per-machine uniquenesses.

But you are correct, if p