

Silly question of the day #2: Hosted e-mail vs. Exchange on SBS2003

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2008-04/msg00541.html>

- *From:* "Cary W. Shultz" <cshultz@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 3 Apr 2008 13:47:05 -0400
-

Good afternoon!

I know that this question is asked and answered often, but:

Question: why would it be a better idea to leave the e-mail with the current hosting company (who also hosts their web site) vs. moving to Exchange 2003 SP2 when we are moving a client to SBS2003? Now, Internet connection at the facility is excellent...we are not in Timbuktu! They are just down the road from Virginia Tech....

Reason behind the question: same client, same setup (see previous question). The guy who is kinda in charge of this new account does not want to move them over to Exchange. Currently their e-mail is hosted by the same company that hosts their web site and the e-mail "just works". They are using various Clients (he does not know what they use...he *thinks* they use the web mail "client" provided by the Hosting Company) to access e-mail remotely. A couple of the guys at this client travel frequently (that is an understatement).

Anyway, my points are that if we use Exchange 2003 SP2 then we can use IMF v2 for anti-spam and, when the guys are on the road, have the option of OWA (I can only image that OWA is 100% better than their current web mail 'client'. I have not seen what they use so I can not be sure, but I have seen 12 - 15 different web mail clients in my time and they all blow!) or RPC over HTTPS.

Thanks,

Cary

.