

Re: Would you pay more ...

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/securityfocus/security-basics/2004-07/0122.html>

From: Calin Don (*pulse_at_rdslink.ro*)

Date: 07/08/04

Date: Thu, 08 Jul 2004 22:39:07 +0300

To: security-basics@securityfocus.com

Jeff wrote:

- > *Regarding standard consumer broadband connections ...*
- >
- > *Would you pay more to only have the following destination ports open*
- > *to the internet originating from your broadband modem:*
- >
- > *tcp 21 – ftp*
- > *tcp 22 – ssh*
- > *tcp 25 – smtp*
- > *tcp, udp 53 – dns*
- > *tcp 80 – www*
- > *tcp 110 – pop3*
- > *tcp 119 – nntp*
- > *udp 123 – ntp*
- > *tcp 443 – secure www*
- >
- > *(Arguments for/against specific ports solicited. I purposely left*
- > *some out that I don't use. Curious how significant they are to*
- > *others. IMAP4 and icmp protocols come to mind)*
- >
- > *ALTERNATIVELY, would you like it if this was the STANDARD package and*
- > *additional ports were considered optional, and required payment.*
- >
- > *LASTLY, this could start out as the NEW Secure way to go! It simply*
- > *requires that your existing cable modem be upgraded (replaced) at a*
- > *cost of \$50–\$75. All new installations would receive these as part*
- > *of the std pkg.*
- >
- > *(I know some small businesses that would LOVE to have this. I know*
- > *because they've called me to resolve some "weird problems" and look*
- > *at me funny when I tell them that they should have had a firewall all*
- > *along.)*
- >
- > *I would REALLY like to hear from those of you that work in the ISP*
- > *field. I have always been on the receiving end of an ISP -- never*
- > *worked in that trench. But I suspect that this type of firewall could*

SecurityFocus BASICS: Re: Would you pay more ...

- > *be built into every single cable/dsl modem used at little expense.*
- > *Indeed, could save lots of money on bandwidth.*
- >
- > *Consider Grandma now ... she typically isn't a gamer and need other*
- > *ports open. Nor does she work at home and require a vpn. BUT she is*
- > *the MOST likely to get hit by some exploit, and it's her damned box*
- > *(x 1,000,000) uselessly eating up bandwidth because some smart-aleck*
- > **sing script kiddie bas(*#\$*
- >
- > *.... ohm-yelli-mon ... ohm-yelli-mon ... OK, ok, better.*
- >
- >
- > *Jeff*
- >
- >
- >
- >

-
- > *Ethical Hacking at the InfoSec Institute. Mention this ad and get \$545*
 - > *off any course! All of our class sizes are guaranteed to be 10 students*
 - > *or less to facilitate one-on-one interaction with one of our expert*
 - > *instructors. Attend a course taught by an expert instructor with years*
 - > *of in-the-field pen testing experience in our state of the art hacking*
 - > *lab. Master the skills of an Ethical Hacker to better assess the*
 - > *security of your organization. Visit us at:*
 - > *http://www.infosecinstitute.com/courses/ethical_hacking_training.html*
 - >

-
- >
 - >
 - >

No i won't because i think that this kind of option for a home user would be useless. And this because a user could open a http server for instance and leve it unsecured so this protection from ISP useless for him.

-
- application/pgp-signature attachment: OpenPGP digital signature