

Re: VPN versus Terminal Server for remote workers

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2007-11/msg03614.html>

- *From:* "Larry Struckmeyer" <lstruckmeyer(at)mis-wizards(dot)com>
 - *Date:* Sat, 24 Nov 2007 20:56:43 -0500
-

Claus:

That looks good. I've never understood why some of the others, un named here, do not allow one to use both the tunnel and the default gw at the "same" time. I will message "un named here", (whose initials are WG) to see if they have revised this since I last visited this issue.

Strangely, with hw to hw, it is not a problem. But with sw to hw, using their mobile client, you get one or the other, in my admittedly limited experience.

Thanks for your help.

--

Larry

"Claus" <cjobs@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:OAgJ7UwLIHA.2024@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

3060 supports about 100 simultaneous connections. Only traffic to the subnet goes through the VPN. The rest goes out to your default GW.

--

Claus

"Larry Struckmeyer" <lstruckmeyer(at)mis-wizards(dot)com> wrote in message
<news:e1hgiLwLIHA.4684@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

What about the simultaneous use of the tunnel and the default gateway?

--

Larry

"Claus" <cjobs@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:OyTSsDwLIHA.1212@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Larry,

Re: VPN versus Terminal Server for remote workers

We are using SonicWall 3060 at several locations. They have something called GlobalVPN client. It works very well. Once the software is installed, you can email the key file to the user to give them access. They import the file and select "enable". It is very easy for the user.

--

Claus

"Larry Struckmeyer"

<lstruckmeyer(at)mis-wizards(dot)com> wrote in message

[news:OkYaV\\$tLIHA.2432@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:OkYaV$tLIHA.2432@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Hi Kevin:

Hoping you can help here. With the "solid" hardware that supports VPN that I have used, you have to have either a corresponding piece of that same flavor hw at both ends, or a mobile user software client from that mfg, say Watchguard or NetGear.

If all the remote users are in one, or even two places, the hardware to hardware route seems perfect. But if there are 15 single users at 15 distinct locations, this has proved impractical for our folks. The mobile software that I have used and tried is a pita to configure and maintain, and when it is active you can only use the tunnel, not your browser independently.

Please tell me there is a better way and that I have missed it.

--

Larry

"Kevin Weilbacher"

<kw@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:E8F65A78-3F6D-453A-8AA3-D7F10D5B8ADF@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Re: VPN versus Terminal Server for remote workers

for 10–15 users, if you wanted to go VPN, then I would say look for a solid hardware box that supports VPN.

as far as using Term Server, the question really is: does the app that they will be using work in a term server environment? the advantage of Term Server is that the remote users are connecting to a separate server, and not directly to the SBS server.

--

Kevin Weilbacher [SBS MVP]

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

*

"Orlando Bob"

<OrlandoBob@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote in message

news:3907BC27-BE28-40E7-8E54-91C1061AA639@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

What are the pros and cons of using VPN versus Terminal Server to support 10–15 remote workers? The primary application is a .NET Windows Forms application that seems to run fairly well over a

Re: VPN versus Terminal Server for remote workers

VPN
connection.
I
am
inclined to
use VPN
unless there
are
compelling
reasons to
set up a
Terminal
Server.