

Re: How safe is SBS firewall on its own?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2004-05/6455.html>

From: Susan Bradley, CPA aka Ebitz – SBS Rocks [MVP] (*sbradcpa_at_pacbell.net*)

Date: 05/20/04

Date: Thu, 20 May 2004 07:27:18 -0700

Yup one port open is not "nothing open". That's why I run with two, mainly to prevent issues with MY stupidity.

SuperGumby [SBS MVP] wrote:

> cooooooooooooooooooooo, I get to argue security with Susan.

>

> As Bob points out, though his original post suggests 'nothing is open' his
> later post has Shields Up suggesting both port 80 and someother,,, sounds
> like a good reason for an additional firewall to me.

>

> Whether that additional firewall is a true firewall product or a simple NAT
> router matters little to me.

>

> "Susan Bradley, CPA aka Ebitz – SBS Rocks [MVP]" <sbradcpa@pacbell.net>
> wrote in message news:e5l7mQiPEHA.3100@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...

>

>>If you have no open ports... you don't need another firewall on the
>>outside IMHO. Your only threat vectors are your employees stupidity,
>>emails and you employees surfing the web.

>>

>>bob wrote:

>>

>>>SBS standard on static IP, no ports open for anything, ran ICW and

>

> uncheck

>

>>>all choices, exchange using POP and smarthost to send. Any

>

> recommendations

>

>>>for a hardware firewall that won't break the bank? The reason I ask, I
>>>pitched the Linksys, 200 bucks down the drain, it broke and am going to

>

> be

>

>>>forced to run without a hard FW for a few days.

>>>

microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs: Re: How safe is SBS firewall on its own?

>>>

>>

>>--

>><http://www.sbslinks.com/really.htm>

>

>

>

--

<http://www.sbslinks.com/really.htm>