

RE: Redundant DC's ?

Source:

http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.active_directory/2005-10/msg01006

- *From:* "Ulf B. Simon-Weidner [MVP]" <nospam2-ulf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 28 Oct 2005 04:21:02 -0700
-

Hello Johannes,

speaking about the DCs having two DCs which are both GC and DNS is sufficient for redundancy. The FMSOs such as the Schema Owner are not that important when the domain is up and running that you can't run without them for a certain time. E.g. the Schema Owner is only needed when you want to update the Schema, the Domain Naming master when you want to add new domains or application partitions, the PDC-Emulator for synching to NT BDCs, providing the reliable time source and a couple more things, the RID-Master if your DC runs out of SIDs (when adding 500-1000 users), and the infrastructure master is not needed anyways if you only have one domain and/or every DC is GC in that domain. So you usually can live without them until the other server is fixed and recovered. And the DC won't run inside the cluster anyways, it will always rely on each node.

File and print require a bit more work. Implementing clustering will be the best solution here, however if you don't have multiple users accessing the same files you can use DFS/FRS to anonymize the shares and replicate them between the servers. This would provide redundancy for the file services. Note that DFS in Windows Server 2003 R2 which is due this year works much better and is much better when it comes to replication.

The print services are not possible to keep as redundant, however you could install the printers on both servers, and if you experience issues you can instruct your users to map the printers on the other server.

—

Gruesse – Sincerely,

Ulf B. Simon-Weidner

Blog: <http://msmvps.com/ulfbsimonweidner>

"JSebastian" wrote:

> Hi

>

> I am to set up a couple of redundant services:

RE: Redundant DC's ?

- >
- > * Active Directory
- > * File service(DFS) and
- > * Print service
- >
- > I have considered clustering, but the Windows Server 2003 Enterprise
- > Edition seems pricy.
- >
- >
- > The setup I'm having in mind is as follows:
- > Two identical servers, both running 2003 Std. edition with AD and DNS,
- > constantly replicating data and AD/DNS content.
- >
- > A demand is of course that if one server fail partially or completely,
- > the other one is ready to step up on very short notice....
- >
- > But I think I'm beginning to realise that this setup will never work,
- > because of the AD domain "Schema Role", that has to be owned by of the
- > servers, will fail if the server having it, fails.
- >
- > Am I right?
- > Maybe there are other reasons why such a setup wouldn't work?
- >
- > What options to I have, is clustering the only way to ensure such
- > redundancy/availability?
- >
- > Many thanks in advance!
- >
- > Johannes S. Nielsen
- >
- >
- .

• **References:**

◆ **Redundant DC's ?**

◇ From: JSebastian

- Prev by Date: **RE: FOR command w/NET GROUP /ADD failing, I know why, therefore ?**
- Next by Date: **Re: Site Question**
- Previous by thread: **Redundant DC's ?**
- Next by thread: **Re: Limiting user logins**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**