

Re: [fw-wiz] Why are developers choosing to...

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Firewall-Wizards/2006-01/msg00057.html>

- *From:* Darren Reed <darrenr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 21 Jan 2006 08:04:07 +1100 (EST)
-

>
> Why are developers choosing to write "web-based" code that runs some
> sort of encryption, typically SSL, across a non-standard port (say
> 10443) and then having those URLs blow up when they try to traverse the
> prudent company's perimeter security... You know... "deny all that is not
> explicitly allowed."
>
> I am seeing more and more "websites" that use a URL such as
> <http://register.at.my.site:10443>. Why not just use the standard secure
> port 443 from the get go? Is there something that makes SSL across
> 10443 innately more secure, or is this just the "security by obscurity"
> smoke-and-mirrors trick?

Well, you don't have to run the web server software as root, if it is running on Unix system, to use port 10443.

Darren

firewall-wizards mailing list
firewall-wizards@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
<http://honor.icsalabs.com/mailman/listinfo/firewall-wizards>

- *References:*
 - ◆ [\[fw-wiz\] Why are developers choosing to...](#)
 ◇ *From:* Behm, Jeffrey L.
- Prev by Date: [**RE: \[fw-wiz\] Why are developers choosing to...**](#)
- Next by Date: [**RE: \[fw-wiz\] Why are developers choosing to...**](#)
- Previous by thread: [**Re: \[fw-wiz\] Why are developers choosing to...**](#)
- Next by thread: [**Re: \[fw-wiz\] Why are developers choosing to...**](#)
- Index(es):
 - ◆ [**Date**](#)
 - ◆ [**Thread**](#)