

# Re: Share Permissions vs NTFS Permissions

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.general/2007-06/msg00648.html>

---

- *From:* "Pegasus" <I.can@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sun, 17 Jun 2007 22:21:41 +0200
- 

"Herb Martin" <news@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
<news:exh23TRsHHA.484@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

"Pegasus" <I.can@xxxxxxx> wrote in message  
<news:eGVHXKRsHHA.1408@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

NTFS permissions are sufficiently powerful to keep out unauthorised users. I'd be interested to hear why you are so strongly in favour of a belt-and-braces approach.

I already gave you the why — re-read the message.

I was hoping for a little more substance. When I apply permissions then I check them, same as I check all my other work. If I detect a mistake then I prefer to correct it instead of adding a second security layer which offers far less flexibility or granularity than ACLs.

Security principle: Never grant more security privileges than necessary, even with the INTENT to restrict them later.

Always grant the minimum privileges at each opportunity.

Always grant privileges to ONLY those who specifically need them.

## Re: Share Permissions vs NTFS Permissions

You may in fact get the NTFS perfect -- but the fact that you have to check them (and you should) implies you **COULD** be wrong. Don't take such chances unnecessarily and don't recommend that others (who may not be as careful as you) do so as a **GENERAL** rule.

Recommend the tightest possible (practical) settings, with privileges being granted as **EXCEPTIONS** whenever possible.

This is the way good security works more reliably.

--

Herb Martin, MCSE, MVP  
<http://www.LearnQuick.Com>  
(phone on web site)

Just because I **\*\*\*might\*\*\*** forget to do up my belt does not necessarily mean that I wear braces. It seems you do (or at least you recommend to the OP that he does).