

Re: Norton Personal Firewall 2003

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.security.firewalls/2002-12/1052.html>

From: David (davidwnh@adelphia.net)

Date: 12/10/02

From: "David" <davidwnh@adelphia.net>

Date: Tue, 10 Dec 2002 08:19:33 GMT

This is not true. Most applications do not get rid of all the registry entries when you do an uninstall from the control panel applet. This is particularly true with Symantec. For example with Norton Antivirus your registration and subscription information is left there so you can't simply reinstall it to "renew" your subscription. You have to seek out these entries and manually delete them. All kinds of entries and files are left behind. Many firewalls leave logs etc. behind because they don't keep track of every file they create and destroy during the entire time you are using an application. And they leave settings in files and the registry so that you don't have to reconfigure something if you upgrade. Not to mention symantec leaves shared registry entries because several of their products use live update.

>

> *Regarding the uninstall's and reinstall i – offcourse – used the control
> panels add/remove function, used the tool from Symantec to remove it
> entirely and then removed all entries in regedit with words: "Symantec"
and
> "Norton". So my system was totally free from symantec products and
registry
> entries.*

All in all I agree with you. NPF is trying to make their firewall less interactive so that it is more suitable for an "average" home user who panics when they see an alert. And if it doesn't allow you to configure the alerting level to suit your preference you shouldn't hesitate to go back to the old version or try something else. I'm in your boat with the "port scan" alerts. Seeing them can lead to additional filtering if someone is being quite persistent. In particular when you are running services on the internet. I get a kick out of how many people slam one firewall compared with another when sometimes that are very similar underneath the covers. Sometimes it is simply the level of alerting which makes a certain user more assured that their firewall is doing what it should be doing. (There are however a few firewalls that are buggy and unstable on many systems).

>

> *I don't think that NPF2003 is lesser of a firewall than NPF2002, it just*

comp.security.firewalls: Re: Norton Personal Firewall 2003

- > *doesn't fit to my kind of use.*
- > *Before i felt safe nowing it would block scan attempts and that it would*
- > *also filter out traffic to the other computers on the network. That is not*
- > *the case now, and i guess i will have to find a different solution.*
- > *I'm not interested in having both NPF and NAV on all my machines because*
it
- > *tends to slow them down. So i'm using nav on all machines, but i'm only*
- > *interested in having one machine act as a firewall.*
- >
- > *Most firewalls do not have port scan detection – and i don't know if it is*
- > *necessary, but i feel more safe with that feature. I guess i have a lot of*
- > *confidence in grc.com's advice about that being the most often used reason*
- > *for an intruder/hacker to select your machine as a target!*
- >