

## Re: Having ASPNET member of Administrators

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.framework.aspnet/2005-02/1030.html>

---

*From:* Matt Berther ([mberther\\_at\\_hotmail.com](mailto:mberther_at_hotmail.com))

*Date:* 01/28/05

Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 14:18:32 -0800

Hello Jeff,

I would tend to agree with Kevin, but will also stand by my point of fixing this problem by moving the logic of creating the EventLog to an installer (as you are thinking). The root cause of this problem can be solved without granting elevated privileges to the ASPNET account.

--

Matt Berther

<http://www.mattberther.com>

```
> Here's the short story: I'm a consultant, and in my current contract
> I've seen a server having ASPNET an Administrator. I felt it was risky
> but not knowing exactly why. Investigation led me learn that the
> reason for this is that some exception handling mechanism has to write
> to the Event Log, and the first time it does, it has to write a key in
> the registry, thus it has to have admin rights (well in fact I think
> the key should be created using a Installation program or by hand, not
> the first time the app crashes). So in our development environment
> here we did not bother removing the ASPNET account from
> Administrators. But in the final production environment I just wanted
> to know what security issues could be involved in being set up this
> way. So basically my question was : "In saying that having the ASPNET
> account member of Administrators might be risky, can someone define
> the word 'risky' in this context ? What evil can happen ?"
```

```
>
> "Kevin Spencer" <kevin@DIESPAMMERSDIETakempis.com> wrote in message
> news:Ox0bUkXBFHA.2076@TK2MSFTNGP15.phx.gbl...
```

```
>
>>> So much for the principle of least privilege...
```

```
>>>
>> The principle of least privilege. Where did you find that?
```

```
>>
>> I believe in principles. In general, where security is the issue, the
>> principle is, use the security that you need. For example, my company
>> owns their own servers and doesn't host. We run ASP.Net under the
>> System account. Now, if you have a problem with that, you might want
>> to rethink whether almost all of your local machine applications
>> should run under the System account (they do).
```

```
>>
>> Microsoft ships all of their software locked down to prevent support
>> calls and complaints from security issues. In other words, if you
>> open it, you're responsible for it. That doesn't mean that on every
>> computer every security setting should be locked down tight. Nothing
>> would run. It means that security should be configured with full
```

microsoft.public.dotnet.framework.aspnet: Re: Having ASPNET member of Administrators

```
>> knowledge of the issues involved.
>>
>> If it were always a bad idea to run ASP.Net under the System account,
>> Microsoft wouldn't have bothered to make that option available.
>> Making the ASP.Net account a Network Admin has much the same effect.
>> I agree, he's painting with a broad brush, but the objective is to
>> prevent spills, not to paint with the smallest brush possible.
>>
>> -- HTH,
>>
>> Kevin Spencer
>> Microsoft MVP
>> .Net Developer
>> Neither a follower nor a lender be.
>> "Matt Berther" <mberther@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> news:7993693632425144622166429@news.microsoft.com...
>>
>>> Hello Kevin,
>>>
>>> So much for the principle of least privilege...
>>>
>>> Jeff: What problems are you encountering that you feel that this is
>>> necessary?
>>>
>>> --
>>> Matt Berther
>>> http://www.mattberther.com
>>>> If you own the server, and you're not running anyone else's ASP.Net
>>>> apps with it, sure, it won't hurt.
>>>>
>>>> Kevin Spencer
>>>> Microsoft MVP
>>>> .Net Developer
>>>> Neither a follower nor a lender be.
>>>> "Jeff Robichaud" <jfrobichaud@gmail.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:OkRtblWBFHA.3120@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl...
>>>>> Are there any security issues having the ASPNET user account
>>>>> member of Administrators ? Is it a good practice ?
>>>>>
```