

Re: Complaint about update site

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windowsupdate/2005-09/msg00581.html>

- *From:* "Rodger & Tedi MacKendrick" <rmack@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 6 Sep 2005 15:52:36 -0500
-

PA Bear the 23 I downloaded came from a list that I wrote down while downloading them on both machines. I just wrote down the knowledge base number and compiled the list. I did fresh installs on both machines, and both windows xp included sp1. I had previously downloaded SP2 which I have on a CD along with windows installer update 3.1, dotnet 1.1 sp1, directx 9.0c, windows media player 10, MSN messenger 7.0, and others. These I immediately applied to the new windows installation. Some don't want the dotnet update and the installation tells me so. The 23 I downloaded today and installed this weekend on the two fresh windows xp sp2 are installed on the three computers I have here in the office and I will check are probably installed on my home machines as well. I know there have been at least two dozen updates to windows xp since sp2. I'm just trying save download time. Especially if I run into a machine like my mother's who doesn't have a high speed connection. I would be faster to accept the EULA, click install, check do not restart, then start the process all over again for the next installation, then it would be to download and install all the updates over dialup. Wouldn't you agree?

"PA Bear" <PABearMVP@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:eHvtjxxsFHA.3040@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

- > If you've downloaded them at work to install manually on your friends'
- > machines, you must install each one manually, yes. SUS would require the
- > machines to be connected to the server.
- >
- > It'd prolly be better to have enabled Automatic Updates on the machines
- > and let it take care of what updates each machine should have, rather than
- > you picking & choosing ones you think they may need.
- >
- > How to configure and use Automatic Updates in Windows XP:
- > <http://support.microsoft.com/?kbid=306525>
- >
- > [As you obviously installed WinXP or WinXP SP1 on these machines, you
- > could've slipstreamed SP2 onto the CD and saved yourself a lot of time &
- > agita. <wink>]
- > --
- > ~Robear Dyer (PA Bear)

Re: Complaint about update site

> MS MVP–Windows (IE/OE, Shell/User, Security), AH–VSOP
>
>
> Rodger & Tedi MacKendrick wrote:
>> PA Bear
>>
>> The social security and Medicare thing will be a few years. I just
>> thought Microsoft wasted an excessive amount of "continue and install"
>> buttons on two updates. I have a more serious question for you. I've
>> download the 23 plus files that both of those computers this weekend
>> required after SP2 was installed (yes I had nothing to do at work today).
>> Now that I have them is there a way to install them all without having to
>> double click on each one except the EULA, click install, and click don't
>> restart. Can something like WSUS be adapted to a CDROM to install the
>> updates one after another. I'm not at all familiar with WSUS so I don't
>> know the in's and outs of the program. Is there a way to do that?
>>
>> thanks
>> Rodger
>>
>>
>> "PA Bear" <PABearMVP@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> news:eWSgZ5wsFHA.3404@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>> > [If you think that's bad, wait till you apply for Social Security and
>> > Medicare benefits.]
>> >
>> > Yes, you have to jump through quite a number of hoops to get a new
>> > install fully up–to–date. You can thank the millions who are using
>> > pirated copies of Windows for this.
>> >
>> > Understand, too, that some updates require a previous update to be
>> > installed and the machine rebooted before these can be installed.
>> > --
>> > ~PA Bear
>> >
>> > Rodger & Tedi MacKendrick wrote:
>> > > Over the weekend I helped several friends with their computer
>> > > problems. In
>> > > two cases they decided they would like to upgrade to windows xp which
>> > > was ok with me. We installed both XP's with little or no problems.now
>> > > I'm for redundancy when your deleting a file. But someone should take
>> > > a look at the windows update site. After installing fresh windows xp
>> > > in both computers and then you go to the windows update site your
>> > > greeted with a message saying "Windows update is downloading and
>> > > installing the updated software". You are asked twice to install the
>> > > software update. Saying install once wasn't enough. The your greeted
>> > > with the Windows Genuine Advantage Validation Tool a 433kb file that
>> > > after installation requires five, yes five interactions from the user
>> > > to complete. Those two updates along takes three windows update
>> > > scans, two downloads and seven customer interactions to complete.
>> > > Then and only then can you get to the 23 or more updates required

Re: Complaint about update site

>>> after SP2. Why couldn't Microsoft make those processes a little more
>>> painless?
>

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ *Re: Complaint about update site*
◇ *From: PA Bear*

• *References:*

- ◆ *Complaint about update site*
◇ *From: Rodger & Tedi MacKendrick*
- ◆ *Re: Complaint about update site*
◇ *From: PA Bear*
- ◆ *Re: Complaint about update site*
◇ *From: Rodger & Tedi MacKendrick*
- ◆ *Re: Complaint about update site*
◇ *From: PA Bear*

- Prev by Date: *Re: Windows 2000 Update Problem -- BITS Properties?*
- Next by Date: *Re: agent fails to connect - part 2*
- Previous by thread: *Re: Complaint about update site*
- Next by thread: *Re: Complaint about update site*
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*