

Re: Will 839645 disable this?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.general/2004-10/0375.html>

From: George Hester (hesterloli_at_hotmail.com)

Date: 10/03/04

Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2004 14:14:32 -0400

Now that's a funny one. Risk Analysis an arcane art. OK! I don't think Wall Street holds that opinion or the major Insurance Cos in the USA or NASA or...me.

<http://www.actuarialcareers.com/main-page.asp?whatpage=showjobs&jobtype=pi>

Check out the salary for Risk Analysis professionals.

--

George Hester

"Lanwench [MVP - Exchange]" <lanwench@heybuddy.donotsendme.unsolicitedmail.atyahoo.com> wrote in
> George Hester wrote:
> > Lanwench I appreciate your feedback. One thing you may not know.
> > Although articles are relevant to Windows NT 4 and Windows 95 the
> > technology that is in those systems, still apply to Windows 2000.
>
> Well, not Win9x.
>
> > Windows 2000 is after all Windows NT 5.
>
> Yep.
>
> > No it is not in my benefit
> > to install a security update in the offchance and likely remote
> > chance that I will be effected by it.
>
> I don't agree, but your server isn't my server. :-)
> >
> > Let me explain by an example. Many security updates are NOT remote
> > exploits. Exploits that are there by a user who logs on locally to
> > the system and not as anonymous. Since that never happens on my
> > servers those exploits I am pretty much immune to. And the risk of
> > installing the security fix is more than the risk of someone with
> > sufficient credentials is going to log on locally to my servers.
> > Might happen yes but not likely.
>
> Really depends on the patch. And for a lot of patches that protect against
> exploits, if you don't keep *all* your machines on the network patched, one
> unprotected workstation can take down your network. It's your call. I prefer
> to be fairly zealous about patching. If you have the luxury of a lab
> environment, test things out there first...that's always a good idea.
> >
> > We need to consider our security fixes as what is called Risk
> > Assessment. There is a whole school of thought devoted to that.

microsoft.public.win2000.general: Re: Will 839645 disable this?

> > It's a science in its own right.
>
> I'd argue that it's more of an arcane art. ;-)
>
> > My application of it is probably
> > not as it should be done but I am not going to ignore it. Again
> > thanks for your feedback.
>
> No problem - hope it was helpful.
> >
> >> George Hester wrote:
> >>> Here is KB839645:
> >>>
> >>> <http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;839645>
> >>>
> >>> This fixes a security issue with the Windows Shell. There is no
> >>> workaround for it and so that means if I remove this security
> >>> vulnerability it is permanent. I don't really like doing that unless
> >>> I know the repercussions.
> >>>
> >>> On this page:
> >>>
> >>> <http://www.microsoft.com/technet/security/bulletin/ms04-024.msp>
> >>>
> >>> we are directed to 839645 for a discussion of the known issues that
> >>> can result from installing this security fix. All the issues seem
> >>> to be specific to Windows XP and 2003. That's good for Windows
> >>> 2000. But let's investigate further.
> >>>
> >>> Since 839645 says the it applies to Windows 2000 and there is no
> >>> mention of Windows 2000 in the body of the article, we again are
> >>> left in a quandry as to exactly how this fix can effect Windows
> >>> 2000. To that end we must return to ms04-024.msp link above and
> >>> check out:
> >> Affected software:
> >>
> >> ...
> >>
> >> Microsoft Windows 2000 Service Pack 2, Microsoft Windows 2000
> >> Service Pack 3, Microsoft Windows 2000 Service Pack 4"
> >>
> >> and....
> >>
> >> Known issues
> >> 871242 After you install security update 839645, you may again
> >> experience symptoms that were fixed by hotfix 830411 for Windows XP
> >> Service Pack 1
> >>
> >> 871262 Shortcuts on the desktop do not work after you install
> >> security update 839645 in Windows NT 4.0
> >>
> >> So they don't mention any *known* issues installing this on W2k.
> >>>
> >>> FAQ for Windows Shell Vulnerability. In this it says:
> >>>
> >>> What does the update do?
> >>> The update removes the ability to use a CLSID as a file type within
> >>> Windows Shell
> >>>
> >>> So I am assuming this is what this update does to Windows 2000.
> >>
> >> Yes, it's what it does for all the OSes you install it on.

microsoft.public.win2000.general: Re: Will 839645 disable this?

> >>
> >>> That's all well and good but exactly what does that mean? Well
> >>> googling we find this:
> >>>
> >>> <http://www.microsoft.com/msj/archive/S332.aspx>
> >>
> >> What did you google for? That's an old article about WinNT4 and
> >> Win95. Dated from 1996. How is it relevant? Are you using NT4, and
> >> if so, did you make the listed registry & .ini changes in it?
> >>
> >>
> >>> an old article. I am assuming that if we install this Shell
> >>> security fix then that article becomes null and void. In other
> >>> words the Shell security fix will result in that article no longer
> >>> working.
> >>
> >> Sometimes it takes a while for MS to update KBs - and sometimes they
> >> seem to forget to. And this wasn't a KB article....but again, is it
> >> even relevant to your server(s)?
> >>
> >>> And if so that seems not such a bright idea.
> >>> The fact that this is a remote exploit makes this issue more
> >>> disturbing but again I need to consider the likelihood of running
> >>> into such a remote exploit versus the implications of installing the
> >>> security update.
> >>>
> >>> What's the opinion of the experts here? Thanks.
> >>
> >> Install it. Take backups first. You need to keep on top of your
> >> updates.
>
>