

Re: [fw-wiz] RE: In defense of non standard ports

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Firewall-Wizards/2006-01/msg00096.html>

- *From:* "Paul D. Robertson" <paul@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 24 Jan 2006 19:35:55 -0500 (EST)
-

On Tue, 24 Jan 2006, Arkanoid wrote:

> Allowing uncontrolled HTTP CONNECT to any port seems quite suicidal for
> any reasonable security policy, am i wrong?

As suicidal as allowing all TCP outbound. Which is happening *way* too much, and is the reason we see things like botnets rampant on hospital networks.

I think you shouldn't be allowed to install I{D,P}S until your firewall ruleset is this | high.

Paul

Paul D. Robertson "My statements in this message are personal opinions paul@xxxxxxxxxxxxx which may have no basis whatsoever in fact."
<http://fora.compuwar.net> Infosec discussion boards

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

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ **[Re: \[fw-wiz\] RE: In defense of non standard ports](#)**
◇ *From:* Tim Shea
- *References:*
 - ◆ **[Re: \[fw-wiz\] RE: In defense of non standard ports](#)**
◇ *From:* Arkanoid
- Prev by Date: **[Re: \[fw-wiz\] X server in a Firewall](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: \[fw-wiz\] RE: IDS \(was: FW appliance comparison\)](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: \[fw-wiz\] RE: In defense of non standard ports](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: \[fw-wiz\] RE: In defense of non standard ports](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**

Re: [fw-wiz] RE: In defense of non standard ports

◆ *Thread*