


☐

I'm not robot


reCAPTCHA

Continue

Dr.web security space life apkpure

Alex Smith Has become part of the Internet in everyday life, and any company or individual who wants a strong internet presence should create a website. Protecting the web address of a web site is not complicated. Many companies exist to help in this process. Once you've verified a specific web address, you'll either find it available or you won't. If not, you may also be able to ensure that you are the current owner. Visit a domain registration company like GoDaddy, BuyDomains or NameCheap (see Resources). Type the web address you want to obtain in the search box for the front page. Click Search to see if the web address you want is available. Select all suffixes for the address you want to purchase. Some popular choices are: .com - Trading sites .net - Commercial and personal alternative .org - Organization sites .gov - Government sites .edu - Education pages .info - Information pages More suffixes can help generate increased traffic. After selection, continue to the company's cashier page. Enter your personal and credit card information in the appropriate fields to purchase the new web address. Get contact information for the person who registered the desired web address. Some domain companies allow you to access this information directly, while others require you to go through an intermediary. Contact the owner and offer to purchase the web address. Negotiate the price both you and the owner are satisfied with. Don't be afraid to bargain, and he'll leave if the price is too high. If a prefix (example.com) is used, others (example.org, example.net) are also available. Buy the web address from the owner as soon as the price has been agreed. This purchase can be made by credit card, cashier's cheque, wire transfer or any other means agreed between you and the owner. The owner domain company can transfer the address to your name and set up hosting if necessary. A new Google-funded study by browser security firm Accuvant Labs has crowned Chrome a champion of security features, and ranked Firefox under Internet Explorer with respect to the protection available for web threats. Predictably, Microsoft and Mozilla have different opinions on what makes a browser secure, and why Accuvant's results are off base. All this has made us wonder which browser is the safest and whether the security features listed in these studies matter even to others. How was the study performed? Accuvant looked at three browsers in the study: Mozilla Firefox, Google Chrome, and Microsoft Internet Explorer. All three were tested and tested running 32-bit Windows 7, and research wrapped up in July 2011, making the current release versions of all browsers at the time which are included in the report. Accuvant says he missed out browsers like Safari and Opera, you can save time, but you don't plan to update your findings to the big three as more data becomes available, and every development house improves their app. Accuvant's study of browser security is most comprehensively conducted to date, although other browsers and oSes are not included. Researchers are happy to say that they look deeper than the list of bug trackers and vulnerabilities and try to get a little more information about what makes the browser safe or vulnerable to threats - both current and future. Part of that effort led researchers to investigate how each browser performed if an intruder had access to the machine with each browser installed and how much information they could obtain. G/O Media can get commissionedanker Nebula Solar ProjectorWhat was the study find? Accuvant researchers found that Google Chrome had the most new and powerful security features that were designed to protect users from malicious code and scripts embedded in web pages, or were automatically downloaded and implemented as part of the site they visit. Three main areas were examined: sandboxing, or the method by which the browser restricts access to system resources and data beyond the browser boundaries, was a significant difference. The researchers found that Chrome was the most effective of all three browsers in keeping the intruder away from personal information unrelated to the browser. Internet Explorer also has sand boxing features but researchers claimed intruders are given some file-reading capabilities even if they are prevented from installing software. Firefox, on the other hand, is simply not implemented or ineffective. Just-In-Time (JIT) Workout, which keeps the browser from compiling JavaScript that can't be run on the user's computer, was another area where Chrome and IE were on par, but Firefox was far behind. Plug-In Security was another area where Chrome rose above its competition, denying running plug-ins to install additional software and run scripts that don't require user interaction on a site. Chrome peaked in all three areas. The researchers tied Chrome with Internet Explorer in the Sandboxing and JIT Hardening apps, but point out that Chrome was a little better in both areas. Firefox got the lowest score in all three areas. In other areas, however, all three browsers tied, and in at least one area, URL blacklist, all three browsers received the wrong signals, although researchers once again pointed out that Chrome performed better than the other two - only that none of them blacklisted very well. Accuvant researchers put Chrome first, behind Internet Explorer. They pointed out that Google is able to build Chrome from the ground up, from scratch, without having to deal with legacy code or shoehorn with older capabilities on its way way and Mozilla already has Internet Explorer and Firefox. Essentially, according to the research team, Chrome is the safest because Google was able to keep a new perspective and security in mind, without luggage. What does Mozilla and Microsoft say about this? Mozilla's director of Firefox Development, Johnathan Nightingale, responded to the study with an article in Forbes and said: Firefox contains a wide array of technologies to eliminate or reduce security threats, from platform-level features like address space randomization to internal systems like our layout framework poisoning system. Sandboxing is a useful addition to our toolkit that we are exploring, but there is no technology for a silver bullet. During the development process, we invest in security through internal and external code checks, continuous testing and analysis of running code, and rapid response to security issues. We pride ourselves on our reputation for security and remain a central priority of Firefox. Similarly, Microsoft pointed to a study by NSS Labs that showed that Internet Explorer dominates all of its rivals, including Firefox and Chrome, to protect user systems from malware. However, just as the Accuvant study was sponsored and commissioned by Google, NSS Labs' studies often paid for Microsoft, so there's plenty of skepticism to go around. How impartial is the study? Accuvant is a respected security and research firm and has already done its best to provide not only the full text of the study available, but also the tools used and the supporting data behind the study in case other researchers want to examine the findings. Both Google and Accuvant explained that although they commissioned the study, they knew that if the results were in their favor, this fact would cast doubt on the merits of the result. Accuvant explained in an article by Ars Technica that Google gave them more than a wide berth to do their research and insisted that the study be an impartial look at the state of browser security. Accuvant, for its part, has put its reputation on the line, which is a study representative of the company and the quality of work, and they stand behind it. That Google was so open to the study that it was independent because they knew the test methodology and the fact that codebase them would benefit from a different story, but for now, no one is criticizing Accuvant's results or methodology. The real question, however, is, how much do you or I care? Does any of this matter? What do I have to do? In the end, the study is important, but the real lynching-pin of browser security - and always has been - is the user behind the keyboard. Chrome may be at its peak now, but Microsoft and Mozilla are modifying the Accuvant's methodology assumes that the system is corrupted and that there is no other protection besides the browser's own security features to protect you, both of which are probably not true for most users. In the interim, this study will end up being used as cannon fodder for browser wars, with one browser's fans firing to the other without ever having to bother to read it. In most cases, browser security is a matter of user responsibility. Make sure you surf responsibly and use SSL whenever possible. Don't accept, run, or download anything if you're not sure what it is or why you're being asked to download a file, and just keep running the add-ons and add-ons you need on a daily basis. Firefox users can use extensions like HTTPS Everywhere to browse securely when a secure session is available, and on services that allow you to turn on SSL, and with an extension like NoScript to stop malicious JavaScript in its bar. Chrome users can get similar features with add-ons like NoScript or ScriptNo that do very similar things. In the end, browser security features only go so far to protect you, and as long as you take a cautious, skeptical, security focused approach to surfing, it likely won't matter which browser you use. Firefox: Firefox extension HTTPS everywhere, which switches the browser SSL automatically ... Read moreWhat do you think of the findings of the study? More ammo for browser wars, or does it actually set Chrome apart or firefox below? Share your thoughts in the comments below. Following.

