

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2008-03/msg01864.html>

- *From:* "Henrik \ (Hear\)" <hear01@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 14 Mar 2008 20:08:03 +0100
-

Therence,

Can you pls provide me with correct working links to your references below?

I would appreciate that very much. This thread and your information has been

very educating and I would like to read more about the subject.

And I wish to thank SuperG for arguing for and against facts.

- | > 261968 Explanation of the Server List Management Feature in the Domain
- | > Name
- | > <http://support.microsoft.com/?id=261968>
- | > <http://www.microsoft.com/resources/documentation/WindowsServ/2003/standard/p>
- | > [roddocs/en-us/sag_DNS_und_HowDnsWorks.asp](http://www.microsoft.com/resources/documentation/WindowsServ/2003/standard/p)
- | >
- | >
- | > <http://www.microsoft.com/resources/documentation/WindowsServ/2003/standard/p>
- | > [roddocs/en-us/sag_DNS_ovr_ClientFeatures.asp](http://www.microsoft.com/resources/documentation/WindowsServ/2003/standard/p)
- | >
- | > 135919 DNS Server Search Order Functionality in Windows
- | > <http://support.microsoft.com/?id=135919>

Regards

--

Henrik Arenblad, MCP SBS,

"Terence Liu [MSFT]" <v-terliu@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:VnWXzhygIHA.1500@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Hello SuperGumby,

Thank you for helping me to correct the misunderstanding of DNS query process.

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

Thank you again for your supplement about the client DNS cache issue. I hope all of them are help for Joe.

Have a nice day.

Best regards,

Terence Liu(MSFT)

Microsoft CSS Online Newsgroup Support

Get Secure! – www.microsoft.com/security

=====
This newsgroup only focuses on SBS technical issues. If you have issues regarding other Microsoft products, you'd better post in the corresponding newsgroups so that they can be resolved in an efficient and timely manner.

You can locate the newsgroup here:

<http://www.microsoft.com/communities/newsgroups/en-us/default.aspx>

When opening a new thread via the web interface, we recommend you check the

"Notify me of replies" box to receive e-mail notifications when there are any updates in your thread. When responding to posts via your newsreader, please "Reply to Group" so that others may learn and benefit from your issue.

Microsoft engineers can only focus on one issue per thread. Although we provide other information for your reference, we recommend you post different incidents in different threads to keep the thread clean. In doing

so, it will ensure your issues are resolved in a timely manner.

For urgent issues, you may want to contact Microsoft CSS directly. Please check <http://support.microsoft.com> for regional support phone numbers.

Any input or comments in this thread are highly appreciated.

=====
This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no rights.

| From: "SuperGumby [SBS MVP]" <not@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
| References: <FA164BBD-4DB2-452C-ADF2-9AE5BCEA6430@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
<ebUjegfIHA.2540@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
<33796A03-8F47-4D52-AC09-1046343B1ABA@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
<ekU3lVsfIHA.3940@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
<26E842FE-6BEF-4E0F-BE4E-B60A50CB6D3A@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
<vw0WxA0fIHA.6616@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

<#r7HpK0fIHA.4684@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
<A6\$vBqAgIHA.5204@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
<#wOIJCgIHA.484@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
<9ZSSxzpgIHA.4672@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
| Subject: Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC
| Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2008 23:21:40 +1100
| Lines: 657
| X-Priority: 3
| X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
| X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.3790.3959
| X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.3790.4133
| X-RFC2646: Format=Flowed; Original
| Message-ID: <#SwFNlqgIHA.5752@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
| Newsgroups: microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs
| NNTP-Posting-Host: cpe-121-217-134-196.nsw.bigpond.net.au
121.217.134.196
| Path: TK2MSFTNGHUB02.phx.gbl!TK2MSFTNGP01.phx.gbl!TK2MSFTNGP03.phx.gbl
| Xref: TK2MSFTNGHUB02.phx.gbl microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs:97405
| X-Tomcat-NG: microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs
|
| G'day Terence,
|
| we all learn my friend, and I am glad to see your response, not for
the
| 'admitted mistake' but to see that you have gone looking for the right
| answers.
|
| You also now explain why and the possible 'workarounds'. High points
for
| doing so.
|
| You are not the 1st, nor last, person to misunderstand this before
| looking more closely at the process.
|
| I will again argue that turning off the client DNS cache (0 refresh
| time) is not a good idea, causing the DNS client to pass all queries to
a
| server rather than using locally cached information may slow things
down.
| This argument results in what I consider a 'foregone conclusion', AD
members
| should only look to AD aware DNS servers for name resolution (WINS is
| almost dead, and the Browser Service should be dead but is needed in
some
| circumstances). Processes which require name resolution will normally
'fall
| back' through available name resolution methods, it is the timeouts and
| delays that cause us grief. If a name isn't available by one mechanism,
or
| appears not to be available (slow DNS response), it is likely that the
OS

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

| will satisfy the query by another mechanism but this may happen outside
the
| application's timeout period. If the app regenerates the query and
cached
| information is available the query will not timeout.
|
| "Terence Liu [MSFT]" <v-terliu@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
| news:9ZSSxzpgIHA.4672@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
| > Hello SuperGumby and Joe,
| >
| > I'm sorry for the delay response and I had discussed this DNS query
issue
| > with DNS support engineers.
| >
| > I need to say I'm wrong. I was misunderstanding the DNS query process.
I
| > get the KB261968 to describe this process.
| >
| > 261968 Explanation of the Server List Management Feature in the Domain
| > Name
| > <http://support.microsoft.com/?id=261968>
| >
| > We can configure an external DNS server entry in the clients TCP/IP
| > properties as an alternate DNS. The clients will be able to access the
| > Internet when the SBS server is offline. However, after we reload the
SBS
| > server into the network, we need to reboot the client computers so
that
| > the
| > clients will go back to use the SBS server as DNS service provider.
| >
| > If you are using Windows 2000 or Windows XP as the client OS, the
| > computers
| > will build a DNS server search list. This mechanism is used to improve
the
| > DNS query performance of the client computers. All the DNS servers you
| > configured for the client computer will be put into the list. The
client
| > computer queries the DNS server from the top of the list. If there is
no
| > response from the first DNS server, the client computer will then
query
| > the
| > second DNS server and move the first DNS server to the bottom of the
list.
| > This causes the DNS query still goes to the second server after
recovering
| > the primary server.
| >
| > More information:
| > How DNS query works

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|>
<http://www.microsoft.com/resources/documentation/WindowsServ/2003/standard/p>
|> roddocs/en-us/sag_DNS_und_HowDnsWorks.asp
|>
|>
<http://www.microsoft.com/resources/documentation/WindowsServ/2003/standard/p>
|> roddocs/en-us/sag_DNS_ovr_ClientFeatures.asp
|>
|> 135919 DNS Server Search Order Functionality in Windows
|> <http://support.microsoft.com/?id=135919>
|>
|>
|> Hello Joe,
|>
|> I'm sorry for my mistake.
|>
|> I would suggest that we have a second DC in the SBS domain. The second
DC
|> would also have to be a DNS server and a GC, and as long as it's DNS
its
|> set as secondary for the clients, the clients should still be able to
|> authenticate using the second DC if SBS goes down. Of course there
would
|> be
|> no access to any resources hosted on SBS, such as Exchange or the User
|> shared folders.
|>
|> As to the DNS query doesn't get back to the first listed DNS server
issue,
|> DNS client will use a single server (per NIC) and not change that
server
|> unless it gets no response. When it receives no response from the
primary
|> DNS server on a NIC it will loop through the servers in order timing
out
|> each one until it receives a valid response. The server that gives it
a
|> valid response will be tagged as the primary DNS server for that NIC
until
|> one of 4 events:
|>
|> 1. Reboot
|> 2. Disable/re-enable the NIC
|> 3. Stop/start the DNS client service
|> 4. The server fails to respond to a DNS request in which case the
above
|> process starts again with the next server on the list.
|> 5. The DNS client is forced to query the first listed DNS server (see
|> below.)
|>
|> I. There's a registry key in Windows 2000 that allow this "client" to

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

hold

|> its DNS server priority for a certain time period before querying the
|> failed primary DNS server again. If the value is zero which means it
|> always

|> queries the primary DNS before trying the others IP on the list:

|>

|> Note: On W2k sp3 and later, the key is not shown, unless it was
manually

|> entered or a hotfix was applied that entered the key.

|>

|> 1. In the Windows registry of the Exchange server, go to the Key:

|>

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\SYSTEM\CurrentControlSet\Services\Dnscache\Parameters.

|>

|> 2. Look for the value: ResetServerPrioritiesTimeInterval or

|> ServerPriorityTimeLimit.

|>

|> 3. Please note whether either of these values are found and their data

|> value. If neither keys are found, proceed below:

|> a) Enter in new value: ServerPriorityTimeLimit

|> b) Set Data type to REG_DWORD

|> c) Range: 384 (HEX)

|>

|> This will hold the DNS server priority list for 900 seconds (384 Hex)

|> before querying the top of the DNS list again: "286834 The DNS Client

|> Service Does Not Revert to Using the First Server in the –

|> <http://support.microsoft.com/?id=286834>".

|>

|> II. For Windows XP and above:

|>

|> 320760 The DNS Client Service Does Not Revert to Using the First

Server

in

|> the list in Windows XP

|> <http://support.microsoft.com/?id=320760>

|>

|> 318803 How to Disable Client–Side DNS Caching in Windows XP and

Windows

|> Server

|> <http://support.microsoft.com/?id=318803>

|>

|> I hope the above information helps. If you have any questions, please

feel

|> free to let me know.

|>

|> Have a nice day!

|>

|> Best regards,

|>

|> Terence Liu(MSFT)

|>

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> Microsoft CSS Online Newsgroup Support
|>
|> Get Secure! – www.microsoft.com/security
|>
|> =====
|> This newsgroup only focuses on SBS technical issues. If you have
issues
|> regarding other Microsoft products, you'd better post in the
corresponding
|> newsgroups so that they can be resolved in an efficient and timely
manner.
|> You can locate the newsgroup here:
|> <http://www.microsoft.com/communities/newsgroups/en-us/default.aspx>
|>
|> When opening a new thread via the web interface, we recommend you
check
|> the
|> "Notify me of replies" box to receive e-mail notifications when there
are
|> any updates in your thread. When responding to posts via your
newsreader,
|> please "Reply to Group" so that others may learn and benefit from your
|> issue.
|>
|> Microsoft engineers can only focus on one issue per thread. Although
we
|> provide other information for your reference, we recommend you post
|> different incidents in different threads to keep the thread clean. In
|> doing
|> so, it will ensure your issues are resolved in a timely manner.
|>
|> For urgent issues, you may want to contact Microsoft CSS directly.
Please
|> check <http://support.microsoft.com> for regional support phone numbers.
|>
|> Any input or comments in this thread are highly appreciated.
|> =====
|>
|> This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no
|> rights.
|>
|> -----
|> | From: "SuperGumby [SBS MVP]" <not@xxxxxxxxxxx>
|> | References: <FA164BBD-4DB2-452C-ADF2-9AE5BCEA6430@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> <ebEUjegfIHA.2540@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> <33796A03-8F47-4D52-AC09-1046343B1ABA@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> <ekU31VsfIHA.3940@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> <26E842FE-6BEF-4E0F-BE4E-B60A50CB6D3A@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> <vw0WxA0fIHA.6616@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> <#r7HpK0fIHA.4684@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> <A6\$vBqAgIHA.5204@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> | Subject: Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC
|> | Date: Fri, 7 Mar 2008 18:11:20 +1100
|> | Lines: 378
|> | X-Priority: 3
|> | X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
|> | X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.3790.3959
|> | X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.3790.4133
|> | X-RFC2646: Format=Flowed; Original
|> | Message-ID: <#wOI0JCgIHA.484@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> | Newsgroups: microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs
|> | NNTP-Posting-Host: cpe-121-217-134-196.nsw.bigpond.net.au
|> | 121.217.134.196
|> | Path:
TK2MSFTNGHUB02.phx.gbl!TK2MSFTNGP01.phx.gbl!TK2MSFTNGP06.phx.gbl
|> | Xref: TK2MSFTNGHUB02.phx.gbl
microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs:97004
|> | X-Tomcat-NG: microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs
|> |
|> | and read my reply, and look into how the DNS Client operates.
|> |
|> | The DNS client will not switch back to using SBS until a timeout is
|> | reached
|> | or the machine is restarted. During normal operation when SBS DNS is
|> | available, if it is delayed for some reason (busy SBS) the alternate
DNS
|> | server will be used and AD queries will not be satisfied, again, not
|> | changing back immediately the SBS DNS Server becomes available but
at
|> | some
|> | later time. Yes, there is a reg change that can reduce and/or
eliminate
|> | the
|> | delay in switching from the 'alternate' back to the 'primary',
please
do
|> | not
|> | promote it's use either, the behaviour defaults to what it is
because
it
|> | should.
|> |
|> | The mixed use of AD + non-AD aware DNS servers is a major
contributor
to
|> | 'odd problems', things going wrong intermittently, NOT on SBS
networks
|> | but
|> | on _ANY_ AD (ie. the problem is not SBS specific, it affects all
Windows
|> | DNS
|> | clients needing to query AD)

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |
|> | "Terence Liu [MSFT]" <v-terliu@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
message
|> | [news:A6\\$yBqAgIHA.5204@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:A6$yBqAgIHA.5204@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
|> |> Hello SuperGumby,
|> |>
|> |> Thank you for your reply.
|> |>
|> |> Please read my reply carefully.
|> |>
|> |> In my suggestion, we try to make the DHCP on SBS to assign TWO DNS
|> servers
|> |> to all client computers. The first (Primary) DNS is pointing to
SBS
|> (AD),
|> |> the second (Alternate) DNS is pointing to ISP.
|> |>
|> |> Note: After the client gets IP configuration from SBS, we can run
|> |> "ipconfig
|> |> /all" on client to verify it gets TWO DNS servers.
|> |>
|> |> 1. When the SBS in work, the client uses the first (Primary) DNS
to
|> |> resolve
|> |> AD related names and Internet domain names.
|> |>
|> |> 2. When the SBS shutdown, the client unable to use the first
(Primary)
|> |> DNS,
|> |> it will try to use the second (Alternate) DNS to resolve Internet
|> domain
|> |> names.
|> |>
|> |> 3. When the SBS starts again, the client will automatically use
the
|> first
|> |> (Primary) DNS instead of second (Alternate). We do not need to do
|> |> anything,
|> |> and we will not experience any AD related name resolution issue.
|> |>
|> |> Hope that clearly.
|> |>
|> |> Thanks and have a nice day!
|> |>
|> |> Best regards,
|> |>
|> |> Terence Liu(MSFT)
|> |>
|> |> Microsoft CSS Online Newsgroup Support
|> |>
|> |> Get Secure! – www.microsoft.com/security

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |>
|> |> =====
|> |> This newsgroup only focuses on SBS technical issues. If you have
|> issues
|> |> regarding other Microsoft products, you'd better post in the
|> corresponding
|> |> newsgroups so that they can be resolved in an efficient and timely
|> manner.
|> |> You can locate the newsgroup here:
|> |> <http://www.microsoft.com/communities/newsgroups/en-us/default.aspx>
|> |>
|> |> When opening a new thread via the web interface, we recommend you
|> check
|> |> the
|> |> "Notify me of replies" box to receive e-mail notifications when
there
|> are
|> |> any updates in your thread. When responding to posts via your
|> newsreader,
|> |> please "Reply to Group" so that others may learn and benefit from
your
|> |> issue.
|> |>
|> |> Microsoft engineers can only focus on one issue per thread.
Although
|> we
|> |> provide other information for your reference, we recommend you
post
|> |> different incidents in different threads to keep the thread clean.
In
|> |> doing
|> |> so, it will ensure your issues are resolved in a timely manner.
|> |>
|> |> For urgent issues, you may want to contact Microsoft CSS directly.
|> Please
|> |> check <http://support.microsoft.com> for regional support phone
numbers.
|> |>
|> |> Any input or comments in this thread are highly appreciated.
|> |> =====
|> |>
|> |> This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers
no
|> |> rights.
|> |>
|> |> -----
|> |> | From: "SuperGumby [SBS MVP]" <not@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> |> | References: <FA164BBD-4DB2-452C-ADF2-9AE5BCEA6430@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> |> | <ebEUjefIHA.2540@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> |> | <33796A03-8F47-4D52-AC09-1046343B1ABA@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> |> | <ekU3IVsfIHA.3940@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |> <26E842FE-6BEF-4E0F-BE4E-B60A50CB6D3A@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> |> <vw0WxA0fIHA.6616@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> |> | Subject: Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC
|> |> | Date: Thu, 6 Mar 2008 15:29:22 +1100
|> |> | Lines: 211
|> |> | X-Priority: 3
|> |> | X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
|> |> | X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.3790.3959
|> |> | X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.3790.4133
|> |> | X-RFC2646: Format=Flowed; Original
|> |> | Message-ID: <#r7HpK0fIHA.4684@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
|> |> | Newsgroups: microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs
|> |> | NNTP-Posting-Host: cpe-121-217-134-196.nsw.bigpond.net.au
|> |> | 121.217.134.196
|> |> | Path:
|> |> | TK2MSFTNGHUB02.phx.gbl!TK2MSFTNGP01.phx.gbl!TK2MSFTNGP06.phx.gbl
|> |> | Xref: TK2MSFTNGHUB02.phx.gbl
|> |> | microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs:96665
|> |> | X-Tomcat-NG: microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs
|> |> |
|> |> | Terence, you're gonna make me hot under the collar.
|> |> |
|> |> | _ALL_ members of a Windows AD should use _only_ AD aware DNS
servers
|> |> | for
|> |> | name resolution. Should Joe perform the action you describe and
|> |> | restart
|> |> | his
|> |> | SBS any client machine which makes a name query while SBS' DNS
is
|> |> | unavailable will switch to querying his AD-ignorant router/ISP
for
|> |> | name
|> |> | queries. The PC's will then experience problems requesting AD
|> |> | resources
|> |> | until they switch back to using SBS DNS.
|> |> |
|> |> | Whoever suggested you should pass on this advice needs to talk
to
MS
|> |> | Active
|> |> | Directory development, then be shot.
|> |> |
|> |> | "Terence Liu [MSFT]" <v-terliu@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
|> |> | message
|> |> | news:vw0WxA0fIHA.6616@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
|> |> |> Hello Joe,
|> |> |>
|> |> |> Thank you for posting here. Let's also thank others for the
input.
|> |> |>

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |> |> According to your description, I understand that you want to
|> client
|> |> |> computers could access Internet when you shutdown or restart
the
|> SBS
|> |> for
|> |> |> maintenance. If I have misunderstood the problem, please don't
|> |> hesitate
|> |> to
|> |> |> let me know.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> Based on my research, this is a DNS and DHCP issue. By default
the
|> SBS
|> |> is
|> |> |> the DNS server for all clients. After you shutdown the SBS,
the
|> client
|> |> |> computers unable to resolve the domain name of Internet. So
the
|> |> Internet
|> |> |> access fail.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> For this, we can make the DHCP on SBS to assign second DNS
server
|> to
|> |> all
|> |> |> client computers. When the primary DNS (SBS) is not available,
the
|> |> clients
|> |> |> will try the alternate DNS server.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> 1. Run command "dhcpmgmt.msc" on SBS to open DHCP console
|> |> |> 2. Extend DHCP -> SBS.domain.local -> Scope -> Scope Options
|> |> |> 3. Double click "006 DNS Servers" in right pane
|> |> |> 4. Input the second DNS (your ISP DNS), click Add
|> |> |>
|> |> |> Note: Ensure the SBS IP is above your ISP IP in the list.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> 5. Click OK
|> |> |> 6. Restart the clients
|> |> |>
|> |> |> Note: If you rerun the CEICW, the above configuration will be
|> reset
|> to
|> |> |> default value. Therefore, you need to perform the above steps
|> again
|> |> after
|> |> |> your rerun the CEICW.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> Of course, this workaround does not work when the client

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

restarts

|> at

|> |> the

|> |> |> SBS shutdown time. The client gets IP address from SBS, if the SBS

|> |> |> shutdown, the client unable to detect the DHCP server, and unable

|> to

|> |> get

|> |> |> IP. The whole network of client will be unavailable.

|> |> |>

|> |> |> To workaround this scenario, you only have to disable DHCP on SBS

|> and

|> |> make

|> |> |> your router work as DHCP server. However, this is not recommended.

|> If

|> |> you

|> |> |> like, you can try it yourself.

|> |> |>

|> |> |> I hope these steps will give you some help.

|> |> |>

|> |> |> Thanks and have a nice day!

|> |> |>

|> |> |> Best regards,

|> |> |>

|> |> |> Terence Liu(MSFT)

|> |> |>

|> |> |> Microsoft CSS Online Newsgroup Support

|> |> |>

|> |> |> Get Secure! – www.microsoft.com/security

|> |> |>

|> |> |> =====

|> |> |> This newsgroup only focuses on SBS technical issues. If you have

|> |> |> issues

|> |> |> regarding other Microsoft products, you'd better post in the

|> |> |> corresponding

|> |> |> newsgroups so that they can be resolved in an efficient and timely

|> |> |> manner.

|> |> |> You can locate the newsgroup here:

|> |> |>

|> |> |> <http://www.microsoft.com/communities/newsgroups/en-us/default.aspx>

|> |> |>

|> |> |> When opening a new thread via the web interface, we recommend you

|> |> |> check

|> |> |> the

|> |> |> "Notify me of replies" box to receive e-mail notifications

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

when

|> there

|> |> are

|> |> |> any updates in your thread. When responding to posts via your

|> |> newsreader,

|> |> |> please "Reply to Group" so that others may learn and benefit

from

|> your

|> |> |> issue.

|> |> |>

|> |> |> Microsoft engineers can only focus on one issue per thread.

|> Although

|> |> we

|> |> |> provide other information for your reference, we recommend you

|> post

|> |> |> different incidents in different threads to keep the thread

clean.

|> In

|> |> |> doing

|> |> |> so, it will ensure your issues are resolved in a timely

manner.

|> |> |>

|> |> |> For urgent issues, you may want to contact Microsoft CSS

directly.

|> |> Please

|> |> |> check <http://support.microsoft.com> for regional support phone

|> numbers.

|> |> |>

|> |> |> Any input or comments in this thread are highly appreciated.

|> |> |> =====

|> |> |>

|> |> |> This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and

confers

|> no

|> |> |> rights.

|> |> |>

|> |> |> -----

|> |> |> | Thread-Topic: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |> |> | thread-index: Ach+7Ycor51Gr0zTRzilimYCEQJBpQ==

|> |> |> | X-WBNR-Posting-Host: 207.46.19.168

|> |> |> | From: =?Utf-8?B?Sm9l?= <Joe@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

|> |> |> | References:

|> <FA164BBD-4DB2-452C-ADF2-9AE5BCEA6430@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

|> |> |> | <ebEUjefIHA.2540@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

|> |> |> | <33796A03-8F47-4D52-AC09-1046343B1ABA@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

|> |> |> | <ekU3IVsfIHA.3940@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

|> |> |> | Subject: Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |> |> | Date: Wed, 5 Mar 2008 10:20:01 -0800

|> |> |> | Lines: 73

|> |> |> | Message-ID:

<26E842FE-6BEF-4E0F-BE4E-B60A50CB6D3A@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |> |> | MIME-Version: 1.0
|> |> |> | Content-Type: text/plain;
|> |> |> | charset="Utf-8"
|> |> |> | Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
|> |> |> | X-Newsreader: Microsoft CDO for Windows 2000
|> |> |> | Content-Class: urn:content-classes:message
|> |> |> | Importance: normal
|> |> |> | Priority: normal
|> |> |> | X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.3790.2992
|> |> |> | Newsgroups: microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs
|> |> |> | Path: TK2MSFTNGHUB02.phx.gbl
|> |> |> | Xref: TK2MSFTNGHUB02.phx.gbl
|> |> |> | microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs:96557
|> |> |> | NNTP-Posting-Host: tk2msftsbm01.phx.gbl 10.40.244.148
|> |> |> | X-Tomcat-NG: microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs
|> |> |> |
|> |> |> | Lanwench, thanks again for your input. I attempt to do as
|> |> |> | little
|> |> |> |> maintainence
|> |> |> |> as possible during the work hours of course. However 2 of my
|> |> |> |> clients
|> |> |> |> are
|> |> |> |> large churches and they have extended hours 7 days a wekk
|> |> |> |> plus
|> |> |> |> some
|> |> |> |> of
|> |> |> |> the
|> |> |> |> programs they run require maintance by the software support
|> |> |> |> personel
|> |> |> |> during
|> |> |> |> the 8-5 time frame.
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> When I don't use ISA I typically intall a Sonicwall as my
|> |> |> |> gateway
|> |> |> |> and
|> |> |> |> more
|> |> |> |> recently a newer firewall by Calyptix Security (it also has
|> |> |> |> an
|> |> |> |> internal
|> |> |> |> hard
|> |> |> |> drive and will hold mail when the server is offline)
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> Joe
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> "Lanwench [MVP - Exchange]" wrote:
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> > Joe <Joe@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
|> |> |> |> > > Lanwrench that is one the problem with the dual nic
|> |> |> |> > > setup,
|> |> |> |> > > The
|> |> |> |> > > users

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |> |> |> > get to the internet thru the SBS box. If it is down,
while
|> they
|> |> can
|> |> |> |> > log on to their own box they have no access to the
outside
|> |> world.
|> |> I
|> |> |> |> > am looking for a way to make my systems a little more
|> |> "bulletproof"
|> |> |> |> > and at the same time allow me to do some server
maintainance
|> |> without
|> |> |> |> > totally shutting down the office.
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> Well, I don't think you should be doing server maintenance
|> during
|> |> the
|> |> |> |> business day, myself – but your server shouldn't be the
|> gateway
|> if
|> |> you
|> |> |> don't
|> |> |> |> have ISA. Set all clients to point at your router's LAN IP
as
|> |> default
|> |> |> |> gateway.
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> > "Lanwench [MVP – Exchange]" wrote:
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> >> Joe <Joe@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
|> |> |> |> >>> In the past Most of my systems have been dual NIC
usually
|> with
|> |> ISA
|> |> |> |> >>> but due to many reasons I am now considering going to
a
|> single
|> |> NIC
|> |> |> |> >>> and moving away from ISA.
|> |> |> |> >>>
|> |> |> |> >>> Currently with my existing setup, if the SBS server is
|> down,
|> |> for
|> |> |> |> >>> what ever reason, my customers can't even get to the
|> internet.
|> |> |> |> >>>
|> |> |> |> >>> Yes they can.....they just can't resolve names :)
|> |> |> |> >>>
|> |> |> |> >>> If I had a second member server set up as the backup
DC, a

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |> single
|> |> |> |> >>> NIC SBS server, and a hardware firewall wouldn't that
|> allow
|> my
|> |> |> |> >>> customer to log on and access the internet if the SBS
|> server
|> |> was
|> |> |> |> >>> offline temporarily? I would still want the SBS server
to
|> run
|> |> the
|> |> |> |> >>> DHCP and DNS roles but would assume that would not
matter
|> as
|> |> long
|> |> |> |> >>> as the SBS machine was not down for more than a few
hours
|> at a
|> |> |> time.
|> |> |> |> >>>
|> |> |> |> >>> Yes. If you have another DC running AD-integrated DNS,
and
|> your
|> |> |> |> >>> client workstations have the secondary DNS server
listed,
|> they
|> |> |> |> >>> should work.
|> |> |> |> >>>
|> |> |> |> >>> The above seems logical to me, but then since I have
not
|> done
|> |> it I
|> |> |> |> >>> am checking for any "gotchas" lying around that I
might
|> not
|> be
|> |> |> |> >>> aware of.
|> |> |> |> >>>
|> |> |> |> >>> By the way I would be running SBS2003R2 on such an
install
|> |> that
|> |> |> |> >>> would assist me in the licencing issue of the second
|> server
|> |> which
|> |> |> |> >>> would be running server 2000 or 2003 as a member of
the
|> SBS
|> |> box.
|> |> |> |> >>>
|> |> |> |> >>> You'd need to buy Windows 2000 or 2003 but I believe
you

Re: Dual NIC vs Single NIC

|> |> wouldn't
|> |> |> |> >> need additional CALs.
|> |> |> |> >>
|> |> |> |> >> That all being said, if you're having regular problems
with
|> |> your
|> |> |> SBS
|> |> |> |> >> box going down, I'd rather address those – add as much
|> |> redundancy
|> |> |> to
|> |> |> |> >> the server hardware as you can. That would be a better
use
|> of
|> |> |> money,
|> |> |> |> >> in my opinion, although it's true that outside of SBS,
it's
|> |> always
|> |> |> |> >> recommended to have more than one DC.
|> |> |> |> >>
|> |> |> |> >>>
|> |> |> |> >>>> Joe
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |
|> |> |>
>	>
>	>
>	>
>	>
>	
>	
>	
>	