

Re: Bringing new NT4 installation up to snuff

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.ms-windows.nt.admin.security/2003-01/0211.html>

From: John Brock (jbrock@panix.com)

Date: 01/30/03

From: jbrock@panix.com (John Brock)

Date: 30 Jan 2003 11:42:34 -0500

In article <OW0BPiAyCHA.2604@TK2MSFTNGP12>,

Curtis Anderson <nedfla@hotmail.com> wrote:

>John Brock <jbrock@panix.com> uttered:

>> Are there one or two files which

>> will bring each up to date, or am I going to have to spend time

>> searching out a zillion unrelated fixes?

>You're going to have to search out a zillion unrelated fixes. There is hope

>though, in the form of <http://hfnetchk.shavlik.com>, which will tell you

>what they are. Hint: Use the `-vv` option to make it tell you the URLs as

>well.

Thank you for a very helpful post. There are several products on the page you pointed me to (which, BTW, is mostly unreadable from the version of Netscape I am using on Solaris), and I am a bit unclear about them. It sounds though that HFNetChk is a *Microsoft* command line utility that you can download from this company's site, while HFNetChkLT is an expanded version with a GUI and automatic application of patches (rather than just letting you know what is missing). Is that right? Is HFNetChk also available from Microsoft's site? And can you tell me how this functionality differs from what seems to be available from the Windows Update page at <http://windowsupdate.microsoft.com>? Is there any reason to avoid Windows Update?

>> Applying SP6A installed Internet Explorer 5.00.

>No it didn't. IE was updated by someone, on purpose. Applying SP6a to a

>fresh NT install results in IE v2.0, which is what ships on the CDROM. I

>should know, I just rebuilt the machine beside me this morning ;-)

I checked my SP6A CD, which I bought direct from MS, and IE 5.00 is definitely on it. It's a separate install though -- I applied it after applying SP6A. Now I'm wondering if I should try to uninstall it before installing something higher.

>> All of the security

comp.os.ms-windows.nt.admin.security: Re: Bringing new NT4 installation up to snuff

>> *updates I see are for IE 5.01 or higher, so I am assuming that I
>> have to download a complete new copy of IE, rather than just patching
>> IE 5.00. Right?*

*>Right. If you have a copy of the IE5SETUP.EXE from IE 5.5. SP2 you can
>still use the web install to update it, or bite the bullet and go with IE 6
>SP1. FWIW for minor web browsing, patch downloads, etc. I really haven't
>noticed a major performance diff on my aging 486/66/32MB. I do try not to
>launch Ie on it unless I really need to though ; -)*

OK, you are recommending IE 6 over IE 5.5, and telling me that both are usable on a machine even slower than mine. Good! BTW I'm encouraged by your attitude problems with WMP, since I don't really trust Microsoft, and I wanted to hear from someone with a critical attitude.

*>> This particular file, q324929.exe, appears in several different
>> places in the search, and it appears that it is a cumulative update
>> for *all* versions of IE. Is this correct? Is this a property of
>> all cumulative IE patches?*

*>No, read the MS Q-article carefully. When you go to download it you will be
>asked which IE you are updating.*

Yep, I noticed later that different downloads named q324929.exe seemed to have different file sizes. This seems strange though; I thought the general industry practice was that every driver or update file should have a unique name.

*>> Is there anything else I should be downloading? For example, while
>> this is emphatically not a multi-media machine maybe I should get
>> the latest version of Windows Media Player anyway. (The latest
>> version for NT4 seems to be 6.4, and it says a Pentium 166 is
>> required. That won't stop the install will it?).*

*>WMP 6.4 installs and runs just fine on a 486/66 with 32 MB. Playback of
>>true-colour video files *sucks*, but it does work. If you take my
>suggestion of the HFNetChk download, you'll also find out that there's a
>security patch for it. I have an attitude problem with WMP versions higher
>than 6.4 so can't tell you if they would install/work or not.*

Sounds good enough. I've got the space, so I'll install it.

Since you were so helpful with these questions I wonder if you wouldn't mind another. I still haven't connected this computer to the Internet under NT, because I am afraid the moment I do some autohack script will break into it. I have looked for NT security measures on the Web, and what I have found seems to be much more complicated than those recommended for 95/98 (long lists of services to be turned off, renaming admin accounts, dealing with things like disk shares, and so on). Can you give me any simple NT security

Re: Bringing new NT4 installation up to snuff

comp.os.ms-windows.nt.admin.security: Re: Bringing new NT4 installation up to snuff

recommendations, or point me to a Web page with such recommendations?
Or is it really that complicated, and I'm just going to have to
bite the bullet? What security measures have you taken on your
own machine?

I did download the free version of ZoneAlarm, but I haven't installed
it yet, and it's not clear to me whether this is something I should
do in addition to other security measures or if ZoneAlarm will take
care those other measures once I install it. Do you know anything
about this? Thanks again for your help!

--

John Brock
jbrock@panix.com