

# Re: Share Permissions vs NTFS Permissions

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.general/2007-06/msg00650.html>

---

- *From:* "Herb Martin" <[news@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 17 Jun 2007 19:57:21 -0500
- 

"Pegasus" <[I.can@xxxxxxx](mailto:I.can@xxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:ONMee0RsHHA.4796@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:ONMee0RsHHA.4796@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

"Herb Martin" <[news@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:exh23TRsHHA.484@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:exh23TRsHHA.484@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

"Pegasus" <[I.can@xxxxxxx](mailto:I.can@xxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:eGVHXKRsHHA.1408@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto: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

## Re: Share Permissions vs NTFS Permissions

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.

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 does if you really care about your security, your business and your resources, as opposed to the mild discomfort or embarrassment that will ensue if your pants are droopy or even fall off.

And notice, it's actually a figure of speech to refer to someone who is serious about getting things right as "a belt and suspenders man".

It seems you do  
(or at least you recommend to the OP that he does).

Also notice that "belt and suspenders" must be added, but we are discussing built-in security and my GENERAL recommendation is to NEVER give MORE privilege than necessary and never give privileges to people (groups) who don't require that access.

People who are serious about security follow this as a general principle:

Lock everything down; grant only the privileges required.

