



Re: SP2 and OWA

|  
+--- ei <waves back>

<whoops>. I fat-fingered that. Now I'm in even more trouble.

Just like Old MacDonald had a farm, e-i, e-i, . . .

Unless, of course, I return to the "old country" where it's "ie".  
Blame my grandfather for that misspelling.

Or the nice fellows at Ellis Island? Although on the tour I took of it a few years back, it was explained that the immigration agents didn't actually rename people by fiat.

but my first  
reaction is that what you ask me to ignore is  
one of the main  
reasons I want SSL!

That's okay, but you said allowing HHTTP into your network was a risk, not that exposing passwords was a risk (which is a given). I'm interested in knowing how HTTP is more of a risk than HTTPS and I want to exclude the obvious from the discussion.

Ah, yes. I fear I am out of my depth here (I'm not much of a web server person), so it's entirely possible I've been living in a fool's paradise, but doesn't forcing SSL encrypt more than just the authentication process to help protect against eavesdropping?

Sure. But that eavesdropping is what makes it possible to detect nefarious behavior. Using HTTPS hides the contents of the channel between the two end points (like SSL and TLS).

Re: SP2 and OWA

Re: SP2 and OWA

I wouldn't know how to eavesdrop on the bad guys, nor the good guys. I guess I rely on my password policies and user training, and hope for the best.

[ snip ]

Do they also have a web site?

Not internally hosted, no...unless it's in a DMZ, and it probably wouldn't even be running IIS then :)

Doesn't matter. HTTP/HTTPS hasn't been appropriated by MS yet. :-P

Oh, no, of course not. I just mean I don't think IIS is widely viewed as the best of all possible webservers.

.