

Re: Limited Users / No AV software --How Safe

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.security/2005-12/msg00559.html>

- *From:* "Tom [Pepper] Willett" <tompepper@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 29 Dec 2005 17:30:30 -0600
-

Without AV protection, you will not be protected against viruses.

Tom

"shawn modersohn" <smodersohn@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:OdFUW9MDGHA.4080@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

| I don't feel like using reg hacks and special permissions to enable
| virus defs to be automatically downloaded and installed by limited user
| accounts. I haven't seen any AV software that installs to the home
| directory, I believe they all essentially insist on something in the
| 'Program Files' directory. Obviously, I am unwilling to create
| administrator accounts for all users just for virus defs and thereby
| creating a giant catch 22. The way I see it, if I can't install virus
| defs in a limited user account, I couldn't install *most* viruses
| either. I am about to eliminate this licensing and subscription
| headache altogether and opt for mandatory limited user accounts and XP
| upgrades. Any opinions? How would a sasser or other exploit
| potentially deal with limited user accounts? Thanks.

-
- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ ***Re: Limited Users / No AV software --How Safe***
◇ *From:* shawn modersohn
 - *References:*
 - ◆ ***Limited Users / No AV software --How Safe***
◇ *From:* shawn modersohn
 - Prev by Date: ***Re: Service running as Local system account Unable to map drive on ano***
 - Next by Date: ***Limited Users / No AV software --How Safe***
 - Previous by thread: ***Limited Users / No AV software --How Safe***
 - Next by thread: ***Re: Limited Users / No AV software --How Safe***
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***