

Re: 2003 Server vs. Linux

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/alt.linux/2004-08/0213.html>

From: filesiteguy (*abuse_at_127.0.0.1*)

Date: 08/12/04

Date: Thu, 12 Aug 2004 05:01:32 -0700

someoneelse scratched out in the sand

- > *Suppose I have a machine with 2Gigs of RAM, 3Gig Processor and 100G Raid.*
- > *I'd like to start a hosting business with an online automated sign up*
- > *form.*
- >
- > *Would I be better off running Linux/Apache/PHP or Windows 2003*
- > *Server/IIS/dotnet?*

That entirely depends on what type of customers you want to target. If you search around you'll find you lower-priced hosts all run LAMP setups. This is, of course, cheaper to host because the entrance prices for the systems is cheaper. Most hosting providers' servers run – IIRC – Free BSD or some variant. You don't need a GUI taking up processor time.

- > *Which could host more domains?*

Per machine – *nix. That is really a no-brainer. IIS is not a true enterprise-level server and has issues on single-machines. That said, it also depends on your hosting throughput. I have IIS servers with hundreds of websites running, all getting <1000 hits/day. There is a reason Apache hosts more domains out there. It just can do more.

- >
- > *Which would require less maintenance hours?*

Tough call. I'd say *nix is probably better here. I've worked with shops where their Linux server doesn't even have a monitor attached. On the very rare occasion direct machine access is needed, they'd plug in whatever VGA monitor was found. I have little experience with Windows 2003, as I've moved more into development and away from server maintenance. FWIW, however, I'd trust a *nix system running in the background 24/7 better than a Windows system. I've seen too many times (In NT and @in2K) where a memory issue brought the whole machine down. It happens regularly at my office.

>

> *Which would cost less?*

Again, that depends. Linux would undoubtedly be cheaper at first. Over time, you may need support. I'd say Linux would be cheaper (see my above post) but that relies on your ability to learn the system and support it. If you need to hire bodies to support the system, Linux gurus are at a premium, whereas you can find any wet-behind-the-ears student or MCSE somewhat familiar with a Windows setup.

>

> *Which would require less development time?*

Toss a coin and pick one. As long as you do your homework up front, either platform will work here. It