

# Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2005-08/msg07743.html>

---

- *From:* Dvord Direwood <[dvord@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dvord@xxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 27 Aug 2005 14:17:27 -0700
- 

"Steve Foster [SBS MVP]" <[steve.foster@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:steve.foster@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in [news:xn0e6hu238m07tv032@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:xn0e6hu238m07tv032@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx):

<<SNIP>>

>>So, you are ok with a company developing a product which has problems  
>>and to fix them you either BUY a new version or use a Workaround??  
>>Shouldn't they be FIXING the PROBLEM? Why can't the product work AS  
>>ADVERTISED??

>

> Can't say as I recall any advertisements for SBS that proclaimed "See  
> some IP address in your logs each time your website is visited". <g>

I do. It says it's a web server. Web servers can do this. SBS can't.

> If you want to take issue with how software is developed and released,  
> that's fine. No software company (or individual) on the planet  
> produces bug-free software. Ideally, we \*would\* have a better way of  
> producing software, but it's not been invented yet (feel free to do  
> so, and do the world a favour!). In the meantime, we're pretty much  
> stuck with what we have. People produce software, other people find  
> bugs/unintended features, the first lot improve/fix their software,  
> etc. Sometimes the improvements/fixes are available in current  
> versions, sometimes they have to go in new versions.

If you are content paying for what amounts to BETA software (I say Beta because Microsoft products frequently have problems which should have been found in beta), and remain content paying for an upgrade to that product which may or may not correct the issue preventing the product from doing what it was designed to in the first place, then fine and dandy. I'm not, and when people pull the blinders off they won't be either.

> Other industries work this way too – you don't see GM/Ford etc fixing  
> every single problem with particular models of car. Some get fixed,  
> others are dealt with in new versions.

A car isn't vulnerable to intelligent environmental threats (not yet,

Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly

Microsoft is working on the software which may run some cars in the future which I will avoid like the plague).

If a car has a problem which will result in destruction or serious damage, that model line is recalled. When's the last time Microsoft did a recall? When's the last time Microsoft's products had bugs and vulnerabilities which resulted in the loss of business information and intellectual property? I can bet you can find quite a few of the latter question and NONE of the former.

>>>Um, Microsoft Business Partners tend to focus on enterprise level >>>stuff. They mostly aren't interested in SBS – they perceive the >>>customers as being too small/low value to be of interest.

>>

>>I suppose Microsoft trains that into their business partners too? I >>mean they have to meet a standard to be a partner right? Is it >>business practice to ignore, mislead or refuse to help small >>businesses who might someday be large businesses? Oh yes I forgot. >>Microsoft is not interested in the future, they want to make large >>money, and make it right now. No wonder they developed a product like >>SBS which on the surface caters to small business, yet hamstring them >>with little-known upgrades and workarounds instead of fixes...

>

> What was that about "fervor" ? <g>

I have plenty of fervor. I hope some of it is eye-opening to some of the people out there who are not completely blinded by MVP's (Microsoft Valued Propagandists), and other people who refuse to break out of the "throw money at the problem" culture.

>>Yes, I see that now. You see, most companies call them "upgrades", so >>when you look to UPGRADE your software to look for UPGRADES. >>Microsoft doesn't sell UPGRADES, they sell "transition packs", and >>"software assurance". I assume this culture of misrepresentation and >>deciet is acceptable?

>

> Scalability improvements (which is essentially what the > Transition/Migration Pack are about) aren't usually called upgrades.

> At least not by any vendor I'm familiar with.

>

> Not sure why you mention Software Assurance, since it's not relevant > to the topic at hand.

Software Assurance is referred to in various upgrade documents in regards to SBS2000. I found mention of it in the Transition pack documentation offered in this thread as well.

In case you didn't know, "Software Assurance" is a fancy word for "insurance" which the colloquial of gangsters really seems to apply in this case. You see, "Software Assurance" is the extra money you pay so that IF Microsoft happens to turn out an "upgrade" to a product, you can

Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly

then get that product for free/diminished cost.

Of course if Microsoft does not turn out a product or turn one out in the limited time included in the Software Assurance terms, then you're just out of luck.

>>Where did I say that I would run services on a single Linux box? You >>copied the text of my words, but I don't see that concept.

>

> You said that "if" you installed a MS solution, you'd use 3-4 servers.  
> That implied that you'd use fewer servers for a non-MS solution (I  
> suppose it's possible you meant that you'd advocate a higher number of  
> servers, but that seemed unlikely). There aren't a great deal of  
> options for a number of servers less than 3. Therefore, there would  
> have to be multiple services installed on a single server.

Yes, so again, where did "whole bunch of equivalent services" play into this? Are you suggesting that I'm trying to say no two services should exist on the same box regardless of purpose? Your assumptions take great leaps. I will assume you seek to discredit me, I expect my assumption is much closer to the mark. Nice try.

<SNIP>

>>

>>>>Really? Well if you believe that I haven't, based on those  
>>>>paragraphs I'm afraid you'd be wrong. Since convincing you  
>>>>otherwise in a newsgroup would be impossible, based on the fervor  
>>>>you've returned in your message, discussing that point any further  
>>>>would be counterproductive.

>>>

>>>Well, lets see:

>>>

>>>p1 - IIS on SBS is no more vulnerable to attack than any other IIS  
>>>deployment

>>

>>Yes it is. Try enabling the tracking features to be able to see who's  
>>visiting your website. This is a feature perfectly secure and  
>>built-in to other FREE web servers on the market. If you CAN do it  
>>with IIS then it usually breaks something else like OWA, or simply  
>>exposes you to greater risk than on another platform. Oh but wait,  
>>that's a conflict. Properly configured versus industry standard  
>>features...

>

> You stated that IIS6 on SBS is "more vulnerable" - the ability to  
> track an external IP with each web request has no impact on this.

Wow, you again take assumption to a whole new level. Where did I say IIS6? I remind you again, IIS6 cannot be installed on SBS2000.

> BTW, no webserver on the planet can accurately track visitors using IP  
> (v4) addresses. At least, not today. You won't get my IP address if I

Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly

Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly

- > visit a website you host, at least not without persuading me to let
- > you run code on my machine. You might get the address of a firewall or
- > proxy server that's between your site and my machine though.

I am fully aware of the limitations. We wanted to be able to track a few because we knew we SHOULD be able to with a WEB SERVER. We just wanted to get an idea. Nothing accurate, nothing even close, just get a feel for usage. In fact, something less than an industry standard web server would do the trick for us. Well I take that back, I apparantly do have a substandard web server and it doesn't do that.

- >>>p2 – all the flaunted features are available, downtime on a properly
- >>>configured SBS is practically non-existent, and SBS has the same
- >>>status as
- >>> any other MS product vis-a-vis vulnerabilities.
- >>
- >>Out of the box SBS doesn't deliver. See point above.
- >>
- >>>p3 – I think we've covered all that ground, either in p2 or earlier
- >>>in the
- >>> discussion of the Transition Pack.
- >>
- >>Which doesn't work for SBS2000.
- >
- > I believe I said "discussion of", and I did mention the Migration Pack
- > in that discussion. Tell you what, to save my typing, any time you see
- > reference to Transition Pack from now on, you can take it as
- > "Transition Pack (Migration Pack for SBS2000)". Better?

It would be if that pack still existed for SBS2000. It doesn't.

---

• **References:**

- ◆ **isaserver.org gets SBS friendly**  
◇ From: Steve Flynn
- ◆ **Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly**  
◇ From: Dvord Direwood
- ◆ **Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly**  
◇ From: Frank McCallister SBS MVP
- ◆ **Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly**  
◇ From: Dvord Direwood
- ◆ **Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly**  
◇ From: Steve Foster [SBS MVP]
- ◆ **Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly**  
◇ From: Dvord Direwood
- ◆ **Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly**  
◇ From: Steve Foster [SBS MVP]
- ◆ **Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly**  
◇ From: Dvord Direwood

Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly

◆ **[Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly](#)**

◇ *From:* Steve Foster [SBS MVP]

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Remote Web Workspace question.](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: SBS2K, Exch. 2K, Public Folder error 80040e19](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: isaserver.org gets SBS friendly](#)**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **[Date](#)**
  - ◆ **[Thread](#)**