

Re: OT: HP's PeeCee customer satisfaction

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2003-07/1137.html>

From: Jack Peacock (peacock_at_simconv.com)

Date: 07/14/03

Date: Mon, 14 Jul 2003 12:55:52 -0700

<VAXman- @SendSpamHere.ORG> wrote in message
news:00A22DA2.DC8D4D1B@SendSpamHere.ORG...

> *A PeeCee is a PeeCee. They all use an intel or AMD chip capable of
> executing BillyBloatWarez. How is any one different than the other?*

>

> *Comparing systems with the same memory, CPU, and drive hardware, what
> is the difference?*

>

I have occasion to install Win2K servers for both Dell and Compaq (customer buys whatever hardware they want). Often this involves migrating from some old machine. The Compaq servers have this nice surprise where IDE drives are not supported in the boot rom. The Dell still retains that feature.

Irrelevant? Well no, because imaging an old drive to migrate to the new machine is far faster than using tape backup. On the Compaqs I have to put in an external SCSI controller and box of SCSI drives. On the Dell I use an 40GB IDE internally. Its also handy to make checkpoint disk images on those cheap and plentiful large IDE drives while upgrading. Given a choice I recomend Dell over Compaq.

Oh yeah, there's also those neat "server agents" from Compaq that cause nightmares when upgrading. Best of all, some of them can't be uninstalled. Others leave open HTTP backdoors on high ports. Our policy now is to **never** install those agents unless customer requests it.

The parts may be commodities but how they bolt together does make a difference. Not that Dell is all that outstanding. Trying to make a phone call into "Dell Hell" tech support is worse than Compaq (but not by much).

Jack Peacock