

## Re: userName="machine" didn't work

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.framework.aspnet/2007-01/msg03629.html>

---

- *From:* Joe Rattz <[JoeRattz@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:JoeRattz@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 29 Jan 2007 14:39:02 -0800
- 

Yes, I understand how decimals work, and that .42 is > .210, but that portion is the revision number and revision 210 comes after revision 42. The way you are interpreting the numbers, .210 is equal to revision .21, and that's not the case. Let me ask you this, what revision would come after .99?

I am quite sure the Microsoft support guy told me correctly.

....A version number is a 128-bit version number that is presented as a set of four decimal pieces: Major.Minor.Build.Revision

<http://msdn2.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms973231.aspx>

Plus: why would the update not update *\*all\** build numbers?  
Remember you had (have?) differing build numbers?

Because only specific assemblies needed to be updated for the security patch? It was an ASP.NET vulnerability, so only the ASP.NET related dlls were rebuilt?

"Juan T. Llibre" wrote:

re:

That's contrary to what Microsoft support told me.  
They said that the .210 is higher than .42, and that indicates a later build.

Basic math review, Joe :

Which number is *\*larger\**: .210 or .42 ?

Either the guy who told you that is redefining math,  
or he was trying to pull a fast one on you.

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

Believe me, \*nobody\* plays around with build numbers.  
Not Microsoft, not Sun, not Apple, and not \*anybody\* in the software business.

Simply put: higher numbers are later builds, not the other way around.

Plus: why would the update not update \*all\* build numbers?  
Remember you had (have?) differing build numbers?

Do you still have them ?

Juan T. Llibre, asp.net MVP  
asp.net faq : <http://asp.net.do/faq/>  
foros de asp.net, en español : <http://asp.net.do/foros/>

=====  
"Joe Rattz" <JoeRattz@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:E1DADF5A-2906-4008-8C74-3AB56A03E1F6@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:E1DADF5A-2906-4008-8C74-3AB56A03E1F6@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

They might have been "newer", although I  
don't know how that could be,  
but they belong to an earlier build than the  
release version.

That's contrary to what Microsoft support told me. They said that the .210  
is higher than .42, and that indicates a later build.

I can't find anything that defines how MS versioning works...that ones tough  
to google on.

Thanks.

"Juan T. Llibre" wrote:

Good to know you were able to find a solution, Joe.

re:

you hinted at it enough that I think you think  
that the .210 dlls are older  
(a previous version) than the .42 dlls. That is  
not the case.  
The .210 dlls I had for ASP.NET are newer  
than the .42 dlls.

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

They might have been "newer", although I don't know how that could be, but they belong to an earlier build than the release version.

Maybe the date on your .210 dll's refers to the \*download\* date, rather than the build date ?

re:

It's a little unclear to me exactly which part of this really resolved the problem

Probably deleting the machinename\ASPNET account.

Running "aspnet\_regiis -i" recreates the account if it doesn't find it, and assigns the needed permissions.

Juan T. Llibre, asp.net MVP

asp.net faq : <http://asp.net.do/faq/>

foros de asp.net, en español : <http://asp.net.do/foros/>

=====

"Joe Rattz" <JoeRattz@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote in message

[news:C096266D-B4DB-40DA-9C9C-5EE7F6FCB753@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:C096266D-B4DB-40DA-9C9C-5EE7F6FCB753@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Juan, thanks for trying to help. You never quite said it, but you hinted at it enough that I think you think that the .210 dlls are older (a previous version) than the .42 dlls. That is not the case. The .210 dlls I had for ASP.NET are newer than the .42 dlls.

Ok, I have a solution that worked for me courtesy of Microsoft support.

The problem had to do with the ASPNET user, and its permissions, and apparently some bug in the ASP.NET install. I had tried all the things in these threads:

<http://forums.microsoft.com/MSDN/ShowPost.aspx?PostID=116989&SiteID=1>  
<http://blog.devstone.com/Aaron/archive/2006/05/08/1586.aspx>

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

But none of them worked for me. Here is what worked for my box:

We followed below steps to resolve the issue

1. Unregistered all the versions of ASP.NET with command  
"C:\WINDOWS\Microsoft.NET\Framework\v2.0.50727\aspnet\_regiis -ua".
2. Deleted the ASPNET account from "Local Users and Group – Users".
3. Then registered ASP.NET 2.0 with IIS using  
"C:\WINDOWS\Microsoft.NET\Framework\v2.0.50727\aspnet\_regiis -i".
4. Gave permissions to the ASPNET account using  
"C:\WINDOWS\Microsoft.NET\Framework\v2.0.50727\aspnet\_regiis -ga machinename\ASPNET".
5. Reset the IIS and that resolved the issue for ASP.NET 2.0.
6. We registered ASP.NET 1.1 with IIS as well using command  
"C:\WINDOWS\Microsoft.NET\Framework\v1.1.4322\aspnet\_regiis -i".
7. Reset the IIS.

After following the above steps we configured virtual directory versions as required and test both ASP.NET 1.1 and ASP.NET 2.0 application.

Everything worked fine as expected.

CAUSE:

=====

This problem occurs because the process model user account (in our case, ASPNET) does not have the correct user

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

rights for the required system files  
and folders to run the ASP.NET worker  
process.

It's a little unclear to me exactly which part  
of this really resolved the  
problem because I had already done lots of  
these steps already without the  
problem being solved.. The problem was not  
resolved until we granted access  
to machine\ASPNET:

```
aspnet_regiis -ga [machinename]\ASPNET
```

But, I believe I had already tried that before  
and it didn't fix the  
problem, but I couldn't swear that I did.

I mention the machine name specifically  
because I had tried to grant access  
to ASPNET (no machine name) and while  
this didn't generate an error message,  
it also didn't work. And that's odd because if  
I try to grant access to a  
made up account name, it does give an error  
message. So somehow, granting  
access to ASPNET doesn't generate an error  
that it is a non-existent account,  
but it fails to grant access to the  
machinename\ASPNET account. Odd. Even  
odder is the number of people in those two  
referenced threads that granting  
access to ASPNET without specifying the  
machine name worked for. It  
apparently works some times without the  
machine name, but it didn't for me.

I bring this up because it may have been  
necessary that we deleted the  
ASPNET user and allowed the ASP.NET  
install to re-create it. If I were  
trying to resolve this problem now, I would  
try to grant access and specify  
the machine name before I uninstalled  
everything just to see if that fixes  
the problem.

There apparently is a problem where if the  
ASPNET user already exists when  
ASP.NET 2.0 is installed, under some  
(unknown) circumstances, the ASPNET user

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

doesn't get its permissions updated properly. Obviously this doesn't happen the majority of the time. There are 3 other .NET developers here all running similar systems (same hardware, same versions of software, and it didn't happen to them. Just my luck!

"Juan T. Llibre" wrote:

Thanks for seeing this through, Joe.

re:

I researched to find out what changed the version of some of my dlls. It is a security patch. You can read about it here:

<http://support.microsoft.com/kb/922770>

—

KB922770

Interesting.

They must not have realized that the patch would run the version number backwards. That's usually a no-no, precisely due to often-appearing compatibility problems.

re:

Since you don't have DLLs with

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

different  
versions,  
you  
might want  
to install  
that security  
update.

I don't think I need to. I'm  
running the W2K3 SP2  
Release Candidate, which  
apparently  
fixes the problem while  
maintaining the same  
version number, since that  
patch doesn't  
appear on my lists of critical  
patches when I go to  
Windows/Microsoft Update.

The release version of SP2  
should not be long in  
appearing.  
I suggest that as soon as it  
comes out you apply it to all  
your W2K3 boxes.

You know, I find it odd that  
you haven't posted the  
operating systems in which  
this problem  
is occurring ( and I haven't  
asked). I should have asked  
you way earlier, since I had  
assumed  
you were running W2K3,  
but now think that you're  
running Windows XP in the  
development  
boxes where the problem is  
occurring.

This might make a  
difference.

re:

This still  
leaves me  
though with

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

the exact  
same  
problem I  
originally  
had.  
Any ideas?

You say that if you leave  
SYSTEM in as the  
process model account,  
everything works, right ?

Well, working with  
SYSTEM as the account  
which runs ASP.NET isn't  
too bad,  
but there \*are\* some  
directories which the  
account which runs  
ASP.NET shouldn't  
have access to, in order to  
stay within strict security  
guidelines.

There's two more things you  
could do to solve the  
problem.

1. Create a custom service  
account to run ASP.NET as.

Please review this article :  
"Configuring ASP.NET  
Process Identity" :  
<http://msdn2.microsoft.com/en-us/library/dwc1xthy.aspx>

....and make sure that the  
account you create/use to  
run ASP.NET as  
has the permissions outlined  
in this article:

"ASP.NET Required Access  
Control Lists (ACLs)"  
<http://msdn2.microsoft.com/en-us/library/kwzs111e.aspx>

Also, review the guidelines  
in this article :  
"How To: Create a Service  
Account for an ASP.NET

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

2.0 Application":

<http://msdn2.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms998297.aspx>

You can ignore the bit about creating an Application Pool if you're not running IIS 6.0 ( if you're not running W2K3 ).

The rest is valid if you're using Windows XP with an NTFS-formatted partition.

2. Impersonate the identity  
ASP.NET runs as for an individual application.

Review this article :

"ASP.NET Impersonation"

<http://msdn2.microsoft.com/en-us/library/xh507fc5.aspx>

The main thrust is configuring an identity in web.config of your application, instead of configuring a process account (which runs all your apps as the configured account).

```
<identity  
impersonate="true"  
userName="Domain\User"  
password="s@omePassword!"  
>
```

That would solve the problem for a single application ( whose web.config you modify to reflect a user identity ).

You could leave SYSTEM as the process model identity, since the impersonation would replace that identity in the specified app.

In this case, you would

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

\*also\* need to assign the necessary permissions, to the directories listed in the "ASP.NET Required Access Control Lists (ACLs)" article, to whichever account you choose to impersonate ASP.NET as.

Those two alternatives are your only choices at this point, until such time as a new patch can be released by Microsoft which will get rid of the different versioning created by the KB922770 patch.

Finally, make sure that the newly-configured application identity, or the newly-configured process model identity are actually running ASP.NET.

Copy this little file I wrote and run it after you've made the identity changes:

identity.aspx:

```
-----  
<% @ Page Language="VB"  
%>  
<% @ Import Namespace =  
System.Security.Principal  
%>  
<script runat="server">  
Sub Page_Load()  
Dim tmp As String =  
WindowsIdentity.GetCurrent.Name()  
Label1.Text = "ASP.NET is  
running as the account : " &  
tmp  
End Sub  
</script>  
<html>  
<head>  
<title>What account is
```

Re: userName="machine" didn't work

```
ASP.NET running as
?</title>
</head>
<body>
<form id="form1"
runat="server">
<div>
<asp:Label ID="Label1"
Runat="server"
Text="Label"></asp:Label>
</div>
</form>
</body>
</html>
```

-----

That will confirm, or not,  
that the identity you  
configured was successfully  
configured.

Please post back what you  
decided to do and how you  
did, OK?  
Either method outlined  
above, in 1. and 2., will  
work.

If you have any doubts or  
further questions, please  
post them.

Good luck!

Juan T. Llibre, asp.net MVP  
asp.net faq :  
<http://asp.net.do/faq/>  
foros de asp.net, en español  
: <http://asp.net.do/foros/>

=====  
"Joe Rattz"

<JoeRattz@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote in message

<news:70A71306-7C44-41D1-A92E-1493187FD59D@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>