

Re: Which security patch NOT to install

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.general/2004-03/5438.html>

From: Steve Nielsen (*steve_nielsen_at__blahX3_lincoln.k12.or.us*)

Date: 03/24/04

Date: Wed, 24 Mar 2004 15:30:15 -0800

Alias wrote:

> *None of the critical updates are unnecessary. None.*

Searching MS site for 824141 (one that she listed and MS does list as a "critical update") has a link to:

<http://www.microsoft.com/technet/security/bulletin/ms03-045.msp>

Where it is stated under Technical Details:

"Microsoft re-issued this bulletin on January 13, 2004 to advise on the availability of an updated Windows NT 4.0 Workstation and Server patch for the Arabic, Hebrew, and Thai languages.

This revised patch corrects an installation issue that some customers experienced with the original patch. This problem is unrelated to the security vulnerability discussed in this bulletin, however the problem has caused some customers difficulty installing the patch. If you have previously applied this security patch, this update does not need to be installed. This issue only affects the language versions of the patch listed (Arabic, Hebrew, and Thai) and only those versions of the patch are being re-released. Other language versions of this patch are not affected and are not being re-released."

Even though the first paragraph states "Windows NT 4.0 Workstation and Server" the update is still listed as a critical update for Windows 2000, Server 2003 and XP.

Unless she has the previous patch for those languages installed why would she need it, and even if she did have the previous patch for those languages installed why would she need a patch to fix a problem with installing the patch if the patch is already installed?

> *If you turn off your AV
> scanner, you should have no problem.*

microsoft.public.win2000.general: Re: Which security patch NOT to install

I follow this practice myself when installing software and updates, however on our staff machines we have had to setup automatic updates for both Windows and a/v because our staff will never manually update anything, and so far have had no problems. We're running CSAV 4.90 (Command Software A/V) with active protection enabled. We also have a Win2K server (that I did not install or configure) with Symantec A/V Corporate Edition that was setup to do auto updates of the OS and A/V and it's been running fine for months. Perhaps it depends which a/v product is being used?

In my mind this also begs another question – if there is a common problem installing MS updates when a/v active protection is enabled why doesn't MS issue instructions on how to install updates successfully? Not all MS's customers are computer literate enough to know best practice is to turn off a/v protection before installing any software. Every piece of professionally written software I've installed has instructions that clearly state to turn off all a/v first. Why doesn't MS?

Steve