

Re: terminal services quirky question

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2005-06/msg06827.html>

- *From:* "Frank McCallister SBS MVP" <anonymous>
 - *Date:* Fri, 24 Jun 2005 20:30:32 -0500
-

To reach computers remotely from outside the network use Remote Web Workplace in a SBS 2003 Network. See <http://www.smallbizserver.net/Default.aspx?tabid=241>

--

Frank McCallister SBS MVP
COMPUMAC

"tcatt" <tycatt@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:1119657238.110991.296790@xx

> Folks, howdy from cowtown!

>

> Perhaps someone wiser than myself can answer me something, more or less
> for curiosity's sake I guess. Here's the nutshell:

>

> Corporate network, Windows 2003 SBS domain controller x 2 with Exchange
> 2003 on a Windows XP Pro private network, connected through a NAT
> firewall/VPN router. Now, inside my network (as in, logged into my
> domain) I can remote desktop from any computer to any computer. That's
> fine and dandy.

>

>>>From outside of my network (from home for example), with NAT configured
> in the firewall, the only machine I can successfully connect to is the
> (what used to have been called) my primary domain controller. If I try
> to point the NAT to any other Windows machines, the ones I can connect
> to without a problem from the inside, the attempt fails. "The client
> could not connect to the remote computer. Remote connections might not
> be turned on or the computer might be too busy...."

>

> The funny thing is, this used to work. I would ssh into my firewall and
> feed the private ip address of the workstation I wanted to connect to
> into my NAT rule and blam, I would connect. Now suddenly out of the
> blue it doesn't connect (except to one of my two domain controllers),
> and I can't see why. I've not changed any security settings, and
> (though I may be wrong) I suspect a Microsoft security hotfix to be
> suspect.

>

> Has anyone else encountered anything like this... I googled but no luck
> yet.

Re: terminal services quirky question

>
> While I'm typing away to this group, I'm trying to determine why it's
> recommended not to run redundant exchange servers.. I just found this
> out this morning and it seems to defeat the purpose of having redundant
> servers. The Microsoft technician I spoke with told me that in the
> event of an emergency I could/should then install exchange onto the
> "secondary" domain controller, load the users' mailboxes and would be
> good to go from there but that seems like a pretty ineffective way of
> maintaining corporate email... ?
>
> Well anyways, thank in advance for any thoughts. :)
>

• **References:**

◆ **[terminal services quirky question](#)**

◇ From: tcatt

• Prev by Date: **[Re: Very SLOW network on my new SBS2003](#)**

• Next by Date: **[Re: XP Home and companyweb](#)**

• Previous by thread: **[terminal services quirky question](#)**

• Next by thread: **[Re: terminal services quirky question](#)**

• Index(es):

◆ **[Date](#)**

◆ **[Thread](#)**