

Re: XP's Firewall

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.security.virus/2006-08/msg00298.html>

- *From:* "Kerry Brown" <kerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx*a*m>
 - *Date:* Wed, 23 Aug 2006 18:35:16 -0700
-

Dan wrote:

<snip>

The following is an example of what Zone Alarm Professional blocked recently:

The cheapest NAT router you can buy would have effectively blocked the scans you referenced. Windows Firewall would certainly have blocked them. ZoneAlarm has better reporting and is more configurable than the Windows firewall. It is no better or no worse at stopping unwanted incoming traffic. The fact that it is more configurable is its main advantage and also its main disadvantage. In expert hands you can analyse attacks and try to contact someone who can stop them. This is usually a waste of time but it can be done. It is also easier to configure different levels of protection for different networks, i.e. a laptop. It is also very easy to misconfigure it and have little or no protection. Outbound protection is of very little use to most people. Once something is in your computer it can do what it wants including turning off the firewall. Current versions of ZoneAlarm make this hard to do but the malware programmers are usually only weeks behind in coming up with new hacks. For the average user Windows Firewall is best because it has very few options to configure and is silent for the most part. For the expert user ZoneAlarm may be better because it is more configurable. Personally I use a NAT router and the Windows Firewall. I consider myself an expert user (others may have different opinions). The reason I don't use ZoneAlarm is because it's just one more program running that will eventually be incompatible with something else I'm running. I see no need for any better protection than that provided by the Windows Firewall.

--

Kerry

MS-MVP Windows - Shell/User

<http://www.vistahelp.ca/forum/Forum.htm>

Re: XP's Firewall