

Re: Share Permissions vs NTFS Permissions

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.general/2007-06/msg00679.html>

- *From:* "AllenM" <Bogus@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 18 Jun 2007 08:52:28 -0700
-

Pegasus is correct here simple because SHARE permissions superceed NTFS file permissions with the "least" permissive or as some say "most" restrictive. If you start controlling access at the share level you'll find yourself creating more groups and adding security more than you have to. What happens if you share a top level folder with GroupA=READ and GroupB=Change then you have sub folders where GroupA needs Modify access on one folder yet only Read access on another? What are you going to do? GroupA can now only have Read access within any folder or sub folder. you can't even create another group and add those users to have Modify access because their in a Read only Share group that will take precedent over any other group there in. industry standards and best practices sine the old NT days have "always" been Everyone-FULL at the share level and control folder security using NTFS.

"Pegasus" <I.can@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:ONMee0RsHHA.4796@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

"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

Re: Share Permissions vs NTFS Permissions

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.

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).