

Re: outlook on server

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2004-07/1117.html>

From: Kevin Weilbacher [SBS-MVP] (kweilbacMVP_at_gte.net)

Date: 07/06/04

Date: Mon, 5 Jul 2004 20:03:46 -0400

Gary,

I certainly understand the position you are in, and the bottom line is thaty each of us have to choose how we deal with our customers.

As to installing Office on a server, I truthfully cannot tell you if it will work or not, because I have never done it, and never will.

Personally, I make sure my customers understand up front that they are not hiring me just to do the grunt work of installing computers, but are relying on my expertise to make recommendations, and to be proactive when it comes to security and the like. Sure it's their money, and to a degree, the old adage that the 'customer is always right' applies – but not always, and not everytime.

It's similar to the fact that I don't just take my car to the cheapest mechanic in town, but rather to one that I trust will tell me the truth, give me an honest assessment and get the job done. Actually a better example is not my auto mechanic, but my doctor. I choose a doctor who knows the pros and cons of the issue at hand.

For me, using the server as a workstation is simply out of the question. I've been asked by my customers, and once I tell them why they can't, it's a mute issue. Same reasoning goes in to my refusal to install AOL on a business workstation. They say they need it – but I tell them there are alternatives to getting their AOL mail without installing AOL, and once I show them, they're happy.

And sure, I have customers, like yours, that refuse to do on going maintenance. And I deal with it. And sure enough they call after they did something stupid. But they understand that I may not be immediately available simply because this is the way they wish to operate their business. So, we agree there.

I can recall all the uproar here in SBS land when it was discovered that the built in POP3 connector would only pull down email every 15 minutes. People were all up in arms saying, "This is unacceptable ... there's jsut no way my

customers will settle for only getting their email every 15 minutes!".

My take on it was quite different ---- I didn't lie to my customers. I simply didn't tell them! And guess what? I had a law firm with 15 people that never once realized that this was happening.

Now, what if, instead, if I had gone in and told them at the beginning, "We're going to install this server, but because we are using a POP3 connector, mail will be delivered only every 15 minutes" - I'm sure they would have gone ballistic and tell me that that was totally unacceptable.

Using a server as a workstation? Rather than stirring up the pot, and saying it may be possible or not possible, or that there may be some problems in doing some things -- I'd simply tell my customer that the server was not designed to run end user apps - period, end of story.

But, as I said in the beginning - we each have to choose how we deal with our customers.

Good discussion. Good points from everyone all around. Certainly no easy answers.

--

Kevin Weilbacher [SBS-MVP]

"The days pass by so quickly now, the nights are seldom long"

"Gary Karasik" <gkarasik2fea.net> wrote in message

news:%23ON4hXuYEHA.716@TK2MSFTNGP11.phx.gbl...

> I already know all this.

>

> How does it help the client if I abandon him? How does it educate him if I
> walk away? He'll find someone else who will do what he wants, or he'll
> figure out himself how to do what he wants.

>

> If something bad happens about which I've warned him, it's on his head.
It's

> his server, his business. I tell him what the choices are, and he makes
the

> choice and lives with the consequences. It's his choice to pay me now or
pay

> me later.

>

> I have a client I've had for years now who wouldn't do any maintenance. He
> couldn't see the point, and I fixed his system as it broke. Then he lost
the

> whole system, and his business nearly didn't recover, not to mention the
> tens of thousands it cost him to get back up and running. Now he pays for
> regular maintenance. He said, "Well, you told me this might happen."

>

> Where's the percentage, for either of us, in walking away?

>

> GaryK

>

> "Chad A. Gross [SBS MVP]" <chad.gross@laytonflower.nospam.com> wrote in
> message news:umTES6rYEHA.3156@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl...

> > Hi Gary -

> >

> > It is very difficult to minimize the risk of someone using the server as

microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs: Re: outlook on server

a
> > workstation, especially if you have an application that requires
> > administrative rights - that user is now running in a Domain Admin
context
> > on your SBS . . . there's just no way to acceptibly minimize that risk
> .
> .
> > . it's just a ticking time bomb . . .
> >
> > I would rather see a client using an old Win98 - hell even Win95 PC as a
> > short-term solution until they can afford another PC than use the
server.
> I
> > know there are clients that insist on this - and in the end, it is their
> > decision. What we do is to sit down and spell out very clearly that we
> are
> > there to help, and we recommend not using the server as a workstation
> > because it is one of the single-most important steps any business can
take
> > to control their IT support costs. In addition, we point out that this
is
> > such a high-risk setup that we cannot support it, and that using the
> server
> > in that manner will void all of the warranties / guarantees we have
> provided
> > (with the obvious exception of the hardware warranty). Also, using the
> > server as a workstation renders the client ineligible for any of our
> support
> > contracts. We also point out that it is very possible that the server
> will
> > need to be reinstalled at a future date, and that we most likely will
not
> be
> > able to do a full system restore from backup as we cannot guarantee that
> we
> > are restoring to a known good configuration that isn't infected. As a
> > result, the cost of a reinstall will be at least equal to the initial
> > install price, plus a guaranteed x hours downtime where the system will
be
> > inaccessible. Bottom line is that this is our area of expertise, which
is
> > why you hired us. We have seen the effects of the server being used as
a
> > workstation and cannot overstate the damage potential. Then, if they
> decide
> > they still want to do this, we have them sign a document indicating that
> > they have chosen to do this despite our recommendation. The document
also
> > includes our reasons for recommending against this setup and states that
> the
> > customer understands that with the exception of the hardware warranty,
all
> > warranties & guarantees with this system are null & void, they are
> > ineligible for service agreements with us until we are able to return
the
> > network to a known good configuration (which is billable time) and that
> any
> > and all future support calls will be billed based on time and materials
at
> > our then current published rates.
> >
> > Gary - the question here really isn't how best to secure the server when

microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs: Re: outlook on server

> it
> > is used as a workstation. The question is do you really want this kind
of
> > customer. One of the hardest things to do is to dump a customer -
> > especially when you're working with small businesses - because if you're
> > like me, you see the opportunity to really help a business increase
their
> > productivity and give them the tools to make their lives easier. But is
> it
> > really worth your time and energy if all this client wants is the
cheapest
> > solution (in upfront costs)? From someone who's been down this road,
all
> it
> > is going to do is to cause you stress - you're going to be fixing
problems
> > that wouldn't exist if your advice was followed, and in the very short
> > future it would have been less expensive for the client to purchase the
> new
> > machine. Then as time progresses, the client starts getting upset with
> the
> > money they're spending getting the same problem fixed month after month,
> but
> > fail to see that their insistence on doing it this way is the cause of
the
> > problem. It just gets ugly.
> >
> > I do understand the predicament - unfortunately, there's not a whole
hell
> > of a lot you can do to secure the server if it's used as a workstation.
> Be
> > prepared for recurring problems and an unhappy client.
> >
> > --
> >
> > Chad A. Gross - SBS MVP
> > SBS ROCKS!
> >
> > www.msmvps.com/cgross
> > www.gosbs.org
> >
> >
> > Gary Karasik wrote:
> > > I'm not doing this because I want to. I'd like nothing better than a
> > > client who says, "Do whatever you need to, and I'll pay for it." In
> > > twenty years, I've had one of those.
> > >
> > > While using the server as a workstation is arguably a "Worst
> > > Practice," consultants usually have to make the best of bad
> > > situations. Necessity, reality, and unreasonable clients dictate that
> > > we do things we wouldn't do in an ideal world. So then my job is to
> > > provide the client with alternatives, explain the issues and dangers,
> > > and then implement the clients' decisions. I don't often have the
> > > luxury of saying, "That's a bad way to go, so you have to buy an
> > > extra workstation that no one but me is going to use to check Outlook
> > > once in a while." If I don't get fired, the what I'll get is a
> > > response like, "No. I can't afford that. We'll use the server."
> > >
> > >
> > > In some ways worse is the situation where they really don't intend to
> > > use the server, but then they get in a situation where they think
> > > they have to. Some in-office guru will figure out how to load Office

microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs: Re: outlook on server

> > > on the server and will do it without involving me. (I have to give
> > > the owner of a business the admin passwords if he/she demands them.)
> > > I have clients whom I don't see for months at a time because they
> > > don't want to pay for regular maintenance. Sometimes I go to the site
> > > and find people have loaded Office (or worse) on the server. I went
> > > to a client recently whose teen-aged son had loaded Kazaa on the
> > > server.
> > >
> > > While I appreciate the warnings that everyone has provided, if a
> > > client insists on using the server as a workstation, I can either
> > > refuse to work there anymore ("Sorry, you don't live up to my
> > > principles of safe computing, so you'll have to find someone else) or
> > > I need to set it up in the safest way possible. Intimations of
> > > generalized disaster are of little use. What is of use is specific
> > > information that might help to set up the server in the safest way
> > > possible so as to avoid or at least mitigate these potential
> > > disasters. After pointing out that MS recommends against it, Kevin's
> > > citing the technote about side-by-side implementations was extremely
> > > helpful. Putting an empty file named "OUTLOOK.EXE.LOCAL" in the
> > > Outlook directory will direct Outlook to use only its local .DLLs so
> > > they won't interfere with Exchange .DLLs.
> > >
> > > In addition to ISA, the server already has a good hardware firewall
> > > and a good anti-virus program. I will try to run Outlook (and IE)
> > > through ISA to lessen those dangers. But considering that the server
> > > WILL be used as a workstation and that putting Outlook on the server
> > > is required, is there anything else you can think of that might limit
> > > the exposure.
> > >
> > > GaryK
> > >
> > > "Tobias Redelberger" <T.Redelberger@starnet-services.net> wrote in
> > > message news:Okp8grmYEHA.556@tk2msftngpl3.phx.gbl...
> > >> Hi Gary,
> > >>
> > >> beside Frank McCallisters answer, sharing outlook for your users,
> > >> you have to give them admin-rights to logon SBS2003 and because
> > >> local admins on a Domain-Controller are always Domain-Admins too,
> > >> you will get into big trouble e.g. if one of your "users" get a
> > >> virus via outlook, because it has instantly full right to (almost)
> > >> everything.
> > >>
> > >> So take our advice and install an extra workstation with Windows XP
> > >> Pro for remote desktop sharing (reachable through Remote Web
> > >> Workplace - "Connect to my computer at work"), and even better
> > >> spend the budget for a Terminal-Server. Maybe you can even save some
> > >> money if you buy cheaper (but recommendable) used Terminal-clients
> > >> (e.g. as early mentioned Compaq's Evo T20/30 CE.NET for about
> > >> 100.200\$ each) for both your local AND remote users.
> > >>
> > >> With this in mind first you will have to spend some extra money, but
> > >> at last you can sleep well at night and don't have to spend your
> > >> budget for trouble-shooting your solution.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> Tobias Redelberger
> > >>
> > >> StarNET Services (HomeOffice)
> > >> Schoenbornstr. 57
> > >> D-97440 Werneck
> > >> Germany
> > >>

microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs: Re: outlook on server

> > >> Tel: +49-(0)9722-4835
> > >> Fax: +49-(0)9722-4836
> > >> Mobil: +49-(0)179-25 98 341
> > >>
> > >> Email: T.Redelberger@starnet-services.net
> > >> Web-Tel: +49-(0)1212-5-11651621
> > >> Web-Fax: +49-(0)1212-5-11651621
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> "Gary Karasik" <gkarasik2fea.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > >> news:uTFzaUiYEHA.2500@TK2MSFTNGP09.phx.gbl...
> > >>> Tobias,
> > >>>
> > >>> Just out of curiosity, what might happen if Outlook is loaded on
> > >>> the server?
> > >>>
> > >>> GaryK
> > >>>
> > >>> "Tobias Redelberger" <T.Redelberger@starnet-services.net> wrote in
> > >>> message news:OI9UEAeYEHA.556@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...
> > >>>> Hi Keith,
> > >>>>
> > >>>> don't tell us later nobody has warned you.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> What you want to do is a NO NO ... no, better.. it's a NO NO NO
> > >>>> NO NO!!!
> > >>>>
> > >>>> It's like buying a Ferrari (congratulations to M.Schuhmacher btw.)
> > >>>> and driving it on a bumpy dirt road with high highspeed.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Try to use SBS2003 as it meant to be. Use Exchange-Server as your
> > >>>> Central-Mail-Service. Configuring it is like a snap if you use the
> > >>>> wizards.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Let your Users connect to it via OWA (Outlook Web Access). If you
> > >>>> want to share appliaction, use Remote-Desktop but NOT on a SBS2003
> > >>>> in ADMIN-MODE!!!!. It's much cheaper (long term view - TCO) buying
> > >>>> an extra Workstation (Windows XP Pro) or better Windows 2003
> > >>>> Terminal Server for Remote Application Sharing then killing
> > >>>> yourself with your suggested solution.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> We warned you..
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Tobias Redelberger
> > >>>>
> > >>>> StarNET Services (HomeOffice)
> > >>>> Schoenbornstr. 57
> > >>>> D-97440 Werneck
> > >>>> Germany
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Tel: +49-(0)9722-4835
> > >>>> Fax: +49-(0)9722-4836
> > >>>> Mobil: +49-(0)179-25 98 341
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Email: T.Redelberger@starnet-services.net
> > >>>> Web-Tel: +49-(0)1212-5-11651621
> > >>>> Web-Fax: +49-(0)1212-5-11651621
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>> "Keith" <webappl@pulleninc.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> > >>>> news:2613301c461d8\$342bc350\$a401280a@phx.gbl...

microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs: Re: outlook on server

> > >>>> I can tell you why we want Outlook on the server. The
> > >>>> reason we purchased SBS is so a few users could connect to
> > >>>> resources in the office while they are on the road. We
> > >>>> all use Outlook 2000 with pop accounts at a reliable ISP.
> > >>>> (no webmail) We could disable Exchange, but it's nice to
> > >>>> have the administrator account be able to mail out alerts,
> > >>>> among other things. And we may move to Exchange email at
> > >>>> some point in the future. But we don't want to move all
> > >>>> our mail services to Exchange at this point. Too many
> > >>>> points of failure and don't have the time or resources to
> > >>>> setup multiple back systems like our ISP has in place.
> > >>>> They are never down. (at lease not in the last 10 years)
> > >>>> Anyway, the users need to be able to open Outlook on the
> > >>>> server when they connect remotely.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Also, this is a very small office and the server is also
> > >>>> used as a workstation. The user at the server needs to
> > >>>> use Outlook as well.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> We're looking into having Exchange pull email from accouts
> > >>>> at the isp. That way email won't bouce back to senders
> > >>>> even if our local system was down for some reason. But one
> > >>>> thing at a time.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>> -----Original Message-----
> > >>>>> Gary,
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> The KB article I believe you are referring to actually
> > >>>>> strongly warns that
> > >>>>> you do NOT install Outlook on SBS2003, and instead urges
> > >>>>> you to use OWA if
> > >>>>> you must access mail from the server. But that if you
> > >>>>> wish to proceed, it
> > >>>>> does give you a link with more info.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Here is the KB article:
> > >>>>> [http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-](http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;828050)
> > >>>>> [us;828050](http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;828050)
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Can you tell us why you wish to install Outlook on your
> > >>>>> server?
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> --
> > >>>>> Kevin Weilbacher [SBS-MVP]
> > >>>>> "The days pass by so quickly now, the nights are seldom
> > >>>>> long"
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> "Gary Karasik" <gkarasik2fea.net> wrote in message
> > >>>>> news:OPnLgCdYEHA.2736@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...
> > >>>>> Hi,
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>> Some months back there was a reference to a KB article
> > >>>>>> explaining how to
> > >>>>>> safely load Outlook on the Exchange server. I have lost
> > >>>>>> the reference. Can
> > >>>>>> anyone point me in the right direction?
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> GaryK
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>>

microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs: Re: outlook on server

> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> .
> >
> >
>
>