

Re: DCOM Access Permissions

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.windows.server.security/2004-12/0119.html>

From: Roger Abell [MVP] (*mvpNoSpam_at_asu.edu*)

Date: 12/10/04

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 2004 16:54:04 -0700

I will acknowledge that the initial MS plans for Com based roles seems to have never come into use, and that many (most) admins have no concept of dcomcnfg.

If your application needs a specific identity to have access as for launch, that is not covered by the defaults for components, then – provided that you know the account or better have defined a group – you should be able to just adjust the component permissions, which if I am not mistaken are just ACLs on the reg keys. If by administration done by the component you mean within Windows rather than application internal, then instead of programmatic override you could configure the identity used by the com package when it is instanced (can be done by the ComAdmin api – if you know the account).

Of course, I am tossing out ideas without knowing all aspects of the system's architecture . . .

--

Roger Abell

Microsoft MVP (Windows Server System: Security)

MCDBA, MCSE W2k3+W2k+Nt4

"Jayme Pechan" <jayme.pechan@whitefeld.com> wrote in message news:eg6o34g3EHA.1524@TK2MSFTNGP09.phx.gbl...

>I would agree with you but Microsoft seems to think it must be done since
> the wizard puts it there for exe's. Also, I wouldn't do this if I
> expected

> an arbitrary client to connect to it but in this case, the installer also
> installs a web application that must connect to it for administration.
> These are 2 components of the same product, it becomes more of a hassle to
> the customer to install a product then have to go in and set the security
> for something that doesn't effect their end users at all. If I was
> required

> to do this, I would probably never get it working and probably just throw
> it

> out and use someone else's product. I believe that is why Microsoft
> expects

> you to call this function.

>

> "Roger Abell" <mvpNOSpam@asu.edu> wrote in message
> news:e8cRbmM3EHA.4008@TK2MSFTNGP15.phx.gbl...

>> That is interesting. I was starting to think it may be on

>> XP SP2 where there was issue, due to changes made to

>> RPC and DCOM authorization.

>>

