Advantages and disadvantages of windows server 2008

Windows Server Core offers a number of benefits, regardless of its intended use reduced maintenance. By default, a Windows Server Core system has very few binaries installed. When a role is added, only the components that are necessary for the role are installed. The binaries are still present on the system, which allows for those components to be updated during normal patch cycles. No longer will your Windows Servers need updates for little-used components.

Systems running Windows Server Core can see up to 40 percent fewer patches compared to systems running Windows Server 2003. Reduced attack surface. Because fewer applications and services are running on the server, there are fewer avenues to exploit. Exploits aimed at components that don’t exist on the server don’t get a chance to work. Reduced management uses fewer components that are installed on the system and there’s less administrative overhead. Less disk space required, because fewer binaries being installed on disk mean that less disk space is required. Windows Server Core requires only 10GB of disk space, as opposed to 20GB for a full installation of Windows Server 2008. (Author Unknown, 2009).

Disadvantages

Although the Server Core installation option sounds great in theory, administrators need to be aware of the following concerns. Remote management, because Windows Server Core provides no local GUI-based administration tools, you perform the bulk of administration for the system from another system with a full installation of Windows Server 2008 or enterprise-management tools. Many of the Windows administration tools that

are accessed through the Microsoft Management Console (MMC) can be configured to administer other computers in either a workgroup or a domain setting.

Command line, the only interface presented at a console or remote logon at a Windows Server Core system is the command line. For some administrators, that’s preferred—and those administrators probably use batch files (. BAT) and command scripts (. CMD) to perform mundane administration tasks. Not all administrators prefer that approach, however. No PowerShell, because Windows Server Core doesn’t include the . NET Framework, the PowerShell feature isn’t available. You can still use PowerShell from another system to perform administrative tasks against the Windows Server Core system via Windows Management Interface (WMI). Inability to transition from Core to full, because a Windows Server Core installation can’t be “ upgraded” to a full installation of Windows Server. To move to a full installation of Windows Server 2008, you must reinstall the system. (Author Unknown, 2009).

In nearly all environments today, servers are designated for a single purpose. Often when you go to a client’s site, the conversation is “ these are the domain controllers, here are the file servers” and so on. Microsoft recognizes this specialization of servers. This recognition can be seen in the role-based nature of Windows Server 2008. However, even though your domain controllers, for example, need only a limited number of services to function (and maybe domain name system [DNS]), the server has a plethora of unneeded components.

These components bloat the server, requiring the server to have more resources to function than are needed for its main function. Most importantly, the more components the system has installed, the more possible vulnerabilities it has. The more components there are, the greater the attack surface and the more patches required, resulting in more management overhead. With Server Core, there is no graphical interface, no management tools, no Explorer, no Control Panel applets? This is a great feature. The advantages of the reduced overhead are worth a little hardship. You do have a shell, but it’s the command prompt. However, if you think about it, nearly every MMC snap-in you have today can connect to a remote computer, which helps you manage your GUI-less Server Core installation. (Savill, 2008).

Some advantages of a Virtual Server it eliminates the need for numerous dedicated servers. It offers the ability for different domain names, file directories, email administration, IP addresses, logs and analytics. The cost effective because many times server software installation provisioning is available. If one virtual server has a software failure, the other servers will not be affected and reduces energy costs because only one device is running instead of several. It offers a flexible IT infrastructure and can quickly make changes with little downtime. (Touring, 2014).

Some disadvantages of a Virtual Server could be a resource hogging could occur if there are too many virtual servers within a physical machine. As software updates and patches must be compatible with everything running on the virtual machine, administrators may have reduced control over the physical environment. Administration, including backup and recovery,

requires specialized knowledge and if a users experience is impacted, it can be difficult to identify the root cause. Services offered by a dedicated server are more accessible. (Touring, 2014).

A company implicates the VM into their network infrastructure. They eliminate physical hardware now not needed because now they have a VM that can handle multiple machines in one, which is true. I just don’t understand how it can lead to a loss of numerous virtual servers, or services on the network. Well if a company is going to implicate a VM into their network, why would they go ahead and make the necessary changes if it’s not going to do what their network they already have is already capable of doing? Maybe I’m overlooking this statement, but I see one part contradicting the other part of the sentence. This is telling me they would lose everything and have no network if they went to this VM technology.