

Re: Allow ONLY "Administrator" and "System" groups full control to

Re: Allow ONLY "Administrator" and "System" groups full control to

Source:

<http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.windows.server.security/2006-02/msg00085.html>

- *From:* "AllenM" <allen.miyake@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 16 Feb 2006 10:55:40 -0800
-

Couldn't of explained it any better Roger.

"Roger Abell [MVP]" <mvpNoSpam@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:%23dvNNCsMGHA.3896@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

What is wrong with it is that plain (non-admin) user accounts need access to a number of areas in order to function at all, or ever to log in.

This includes account that you might want for services, for IIS app pools or IUSR\IWam user, etc.

All account must be able to access quite a few files in the \Window dir structure and all will want a profile in Documents and Settings.

Depending on what is done once logged in they will attempt to access files in Program Files, either for the specific applications or for shared data, etc.

W2k3 has a fairly reasonable out-of-the-box set of ACLs on the boot drive. There is some room for tightening when done in the light of the specific purpose of the server, but for the most part you are better off leaving the directories under C: that set new permissions inheritance point alone. Changing C: itself without impacting the distinctly ACLed subdirectories is relatively safe, as it mostly just limits creation of new

files and folders at the root level (i.e. Admins full and Users List for example).

"Ed Flecko" <EdFlecko@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:3D71E849-A6A8-413D-B721-9A1013CDB313@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Hi Allen,
Thanks for your input. :-)

Forgive me; I'm not trying to sound flippant. What's wrong with doing this?

When you say "it's not a godd idea"...why not? Do you think I will encounter some form of difficulties?

I'm, of course, just "thinking out loud", but I can't see why anyone

Re: Allow ONLY "Administrator" and "System" groups full control to other than these two groups would need ANY access (even read permissions) to the default directories and their subdirectories.

Ed

"AllenM" wrote:

Well you will accomplish what you're trying to do and that is it will be secured. However no one will be able to use it other than the Administrator.
Not a good idea. Leave the root permissions alone and apply your NTFS permissions at the folder level.

"Ed Flecko" <EdFlecko@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
news:6BA55846-612C-494B-9B6D-95485031FDEC@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Hi folks,
I'm setting up a new Server 2003-R2 server.
I have added the Administrators and System groups full control of the C:\ drive, and removed everyone else. I see, by default, the C:\ drive has a few other directories and subdirectories, i.e., "Windows", "Program Files", etc.

Since I'm setting this server up from scratch, in an effort to be as secure as possible, is there's anything wrong with selecting the little check box "Replace permission entries on all child objects with entries shown here that apply to child objects." I know this will reset all permissions from the root of C:\ down through all directories, I'm just wondering if I can

Re: Allow ONLY "Administrator" and "System" groups full control to

expect
headaches or if this might be smart to do? I
think it sounds like a
smart
idea.

Comments? Suggestions?

Thank you,
Ed