

Re: schannel.dll, secur32.dll, and DSCLIENT.EXE redistribution

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.platformsdk.security/2004-01/0374.html>

From: Drew Cooper [MSFT] (dcoop_at_online.microsoft.com)

Date: 01/28/04

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 2004 17:34:34 -0800

I didn't find any external docs about this, so I sent mail to the dev who used to own that API. Here's what he said:

they can use the lsadll.lib from the DDK -- we used to tell customers that in the old days, so that is fine. If they need to run on all platforms, they should think about dynamically selecting secur32.dll, vs. the static code from lsadll.lib. (ie: just implement a MyLsaLogonUser() wrapper which calls either straight through to secur32.dll, or calls the LsaLogonUser from lsadll.lib).

Unfortunately it looks like you have to be a subscriber to download the NT4 DDK.

I'll contact our SDK tech writers and file a bug to update the LsaLogonUser content.

--

Drew Cooper [MSFT]

This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no rights.

"Gary S. Terhune" <grystnews@mvps.org> wrote in message

news:%231KL3LR5DHA.1936@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl...

> Sounds to me like you simply have to make dsclient.exe available for download or

> include it in the distribution package. Either way, your intent is to permit

> interface with a Win2K-based server, and that fits the intent I read from that

> article.

>

> I would probably have a detection routine that would prompt the installation

> when not present in a client attempting to access server. But this, of course,

> might be likely to run into issues involving inappropriate security settings in

> the client system, so perhaps a CD redistribution is called for, along with

> advisory page(s) on required security settings. I don't see how the *method* of

> distribution matters.

>

microsoft.public.platformsdk.security: Re: schannel.dll, secur32.dll, and DSCLIENT.EXE redistribution

```
> --
> Gary S. Terhune
> MS MVP for Windows 9x
>
>
> "Matthew S" <mls@bitstream.net> wrote in message
> news:Xns947D900C88DA8mlsignorethisbitstre@207.46.248.16...
> > "Gary S. Terhune" <grystnews@mvps.org> wrote in
> > news:ONBMjaQ5DHA.488@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl:
> >
> > > Sorry, I focused on one aspect of your post and failed to consider the
> > > larger picture. Let's see if I can remedy that.
> >
> > No problem, I appreciate your effort.
> >
> > > Am I right in assuming, from the way you couch this, that your program
> > > and its functions do not involve a Win 2000 generation server in any
> > > way?
> >
> > In this particular situation, my company is acting as a service
> provider.
> > We host portions of the application via IIS on a Windows 2000 server.
> >
> > The end user of the software, utilizes the software on their machines,
> on
> > their network. For various functions, the software communicates via SSL
> to
> > our Windows server on our network. I am concerned with the legality of
> > distributing these DLLs to them, for running on their machines.
> >
> > > Are the two DLLs in your Subject line the only ones
> > > involved? If so, which versions? Only the ones available in
> > > dsclient.exe?
> >
> > I believe so. Only the ones available in dsclient, which are secur32.dll
> > version 4.10.0.2226, and the schannel.dll version that I believe comes
> with
> > IE 5.01 which should be 4.86.x (I need to verify this).
> >
> > > Suggest you see
> > > http://support.microsoft.com/servicedesks/fileversion/dllinfo.asp and
> > > research the versions available for each, and their distribution. Note
> > > that schannel.dll has an Export version, which I take to mean that
> > > certain versions are probably *not* for export outside the US.
> >
> > Ahh, this is already proving to be a help. If nothing else, it is
> providing
> > me with alternate packages to install from. I need to test to see if
> > 1.10.0.2222 of secur32.dll will work.
> >
> > > From what I infer from the article, the expected method of
> > > distribution for dsclient.exe is for the server administrator to make
> > > dsclient.exe available for network installation, download to the
> > > client, or even pushed.
> >
> > Undetermined at this time.
> >
> > > If the functionality of the program involves Win2K-based server(s) and
> > > all you wish to do is make the client available in a more convenient
> > > manner, then I see no problem in redistributing the EXE--which you
> > > would get from a WinServer CD.
> >
```

microsoft.public.platformsdk.security: Re: schannel.dll, secur32.dll, and DSCLIENT.EXE redistribution

> > It does as described above, but would I get in trouble from MS legal for
> > doing so?
> >
> > > However, in all other cases, I suspect that MDAC updates, VBRUN
> > > service packs, or any number of other redistributables would be the
> > > more kosher method, and probably more appropriate, considering the
> > > "packaged" nature of these runtime libraries. If you can provide me
> > > with the DLL names and versions required, I can fairly easily see
> > > which packages and which versions would satisfy your needs (I have
> > > most of them on my HD, and the rest of them somewhere in this mess.)
> >
> > I concur, I'll let you know the versions once I do some more testing.
> >
> > > At least, that's the way I see it. I can't comment on alternative
> > > code. Not my thing.
> >
> > Thanks for your help so far, it has opened up some other possibilities.
> >
> > - Matthew
>