

## Re: Basic question from a security newbie

**Source:**

[http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.windowsxp.security\\_admin/2003-09/1300.html](http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/microsoft.public.windowsxp.security_admin/2003-09/1300.html)

---

**From:** Gordon Smith (eMVP) (Gordon.Smith\_at\_avnet.com)

**Date:** 09/05/03

Date: Fri, 5 Sep 2003 09:08:46 -0700

Nevermind, I figured it out.

Gordon Smith (eMVP) wrote:

> Anyone?

>

> Gordon Smith (eMVP) wrote:

>> Don't let the "MVP" fool you here... My MVP role isn't related to  
>> security. :-)

>>

>> I'm trying to lock down a computer for use in an internet cafe. I  
>> assumed the rational way to approach this is to set the default  
>> security level under software restriction policies to "disallow" and  
>> then list the few apps (internet explorer, etc.) as apps that are  
>> allowed to run. Am I on the right track?

>>

>> Here's where I am getting confused. I set enforcement to apply to  
>> all users except administrators (sounds logical). I set the default  
>> security level to disallow. I logged out (even rebooted for good  
>> measure), but my limited user accounts are still able to run  
>> everything. For grins, I went back to the admin account and listed  
>> "sol.exe" using a hash rule as explicitly disallowed. My guest  
>> account can't run sol.exe now, but I had assumed that having a  
>> default rule of disallow would have achieved the same result. Having  
>> the sol.exe show up as blocked tells me that the policies I'm  
>> changing do actually mean something to the system, but the default  
>> rule of disallow seems to be ignored.

>>

>> Do I need to do something to have the default security level of  
>> "Disallow" stick or am I misunderstanding what it means?

--

Gordon Smith (eMVP)  
Gordon.Smith@nospam.avnet.com