

Re: Expectations in UPgrade from NT4 to Win2K/2003 Srv

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.migration/2005-05/msg00234.html>

- *From:* Doc <pc-dc-doc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 15 May 2005 13:12:03 -0700
-

Jeff Middleton [SBS-MVP] typed this:

Jeff,
Thank you for the input.

I am not any longer worried about DDNS and the records being on D drive. NT coming over (as I recall) can be expanded to 8GBs (right?) and so after I get my first good boot (and will keep a copy of the boot.ini to be checked - many thanks, seem to recall Powerquest stuff doing that on several workstations clones I did once - nice to have the 'old' drives still onboard) I'll enlarge the copied over to '4GB' partition to 8GB (indeed, if I think about it, believe I can do that out of the gate - I'm forgetting all the old 2GB on install to 4GB after and if the BIOS supports it 8GB "NT" install stuff) -

Figured I'd have to re-do a lot of the print stuff... currently have four Win2K servers and might just make one of them the 'print server' for a bit - I will be engaging IP direct printing after the upgrade is complete... nicer overall and faster for what we do...

Understand what you say about the 'naming' of DNS - I guess that I should've said, "we have an external domain named www.whydoyouask.org and our CURRENT NT internal domain is called RTBNET - I want to make the internal DNS name RTBNET.org or .com or whatever... see what I mean. I was just wondering if there were any drawbacks between Win2K's management of the 'domain naming' and the old (we'll have two NT machines still active - mixed mode here - for another two months) NT manners?

Thanks again.

Doc

Re: Expectations in UPgrade from NT4 to Win2K/2003 Srv

Doc,

I followed everything you posted until I got to the very last line, and it may not be important regardless.

These are two NetFrame 3100s with dual 400s and 1 GB ram (nice in their day but "should" be okay for DDNS and a DC - will point the records to a large D drive "if" this all works)

I'm interpreting that to read you are moving Dynamic DNS database to the D drive. Are you really concerned about performance or space for this being an issue?

To answer your question, what you propose to do will not have an impact upon the scripts.

Print server operations may or may not work without effort, but basically this isn't predictable because the drivers all have to be changed out in the process. I would expect you get to keep your settings, but no promises.

The cloning should have no impact on the process provided you don't introduce the annoying habit of Powerquest to redefine an entry in the boot.ini causing a boot error on the next boot. You will need to ensure that your boot.ini matches the configuration of the hardware, but beyond that, should be fine.

Regarding the DNS Domain, you normally wouldn't prefer to name this exactly as your public domain is named simply because it can be confusing and doesn't actually simplify anything about your configuration. Normally, if you are running DNS to only support your internal AD activity and to provide forwarding support for web browsing, you don't care what the internal domain is named. Something like domain.local is preferred in the SBS world, or domain.lan, or even domain.corp. Naming your internal domain which is private space the same as your public domain is great until you have a reason to not want them to match, and then you are stuck with a full reinstall of the domain to solve that AD problem....or a painful Rendom process.

Re: Expectations in UPgrade from NT4 to Win2K/2003 Srv

--
Rich "Doc" Colley

mailto: pc-dc-doc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx