

Re: The ole "Linux vs Windows Server 2003" question – help?

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.misc/2004-04/1244.html>

From: Joe (joe_at_jretrading.com)

Date: 04/12/04

Date: Mon, 12 Apr 2004 20:02:30 +0100

In message <1595339b99dd0358b70a80f544418aca@news.teranews.com>, Bob Mariotti <r.mariotti@financialdatacorp.com> writes

>*Gents;*

>

>*I have a client with about 50 desktops all running Windows XP. We also have AIX and Linux servers running Samba providing file storage service and the Linux box runs Lotus Notes.*

>

>*Another firm has made a proposal to install a Windows Server 2003 machine which is supposed to solve all my clients woes by providing a more secured file storage environment and centralized print management.*

>

>*I say "Bogus"!*

>

>*As I create my detailed response to this unfortunate scenario I was hoping that if any of my fellow Linux gurus could provide some detail, insight or advise my way it would help with my response.*

>

>*I know that some say "let them install the Windows server and then charge them when they come back". But the actual truth is that there is not room for multiple vendors supporting different platforms.*

>

>*Thanks for any assistance/advise provided.*

>

So what kind of woes does your client have at the moment? Why is he proposing to spend GBP3000+ on software, and presumably pay a similar amount again to this other business to install it?

And why would anyone in their right mind want a single point of failure for the printing needs of 50 users? Someone prints something gigantic, runs the temp file partition out of space and nobody prints anything for the next half hour. Or more, if nobody local knows how to fix it.

Not that there's anything really wrong with W2003, the question is why fix something that isn't broken, especially at Microsoft prices?

comp.os.linux.misc: Re: The ole "Linux vs Windows Server 2003" question – help?

--
Joe