

## Dead update?

Once again a new virus has proved that Norton's LiveUpdate feature is a waste of space and should immediately be renamed WeeklyUpdate so that consumers (and resellers) are not misled.

As with Blaster and Swen, the Beagle and Novarg viruses/worms have slipped under Symantec's guard because LiveUpdate does not do what its name suggests.

I have emailed Symantec on each of the first three occasions above without success. I did have an email conversation with a tech support person in the US

but he repeatedly advised me how to use the Intelligent Updater rather than get involved with a discussion as to why LiveUpdate is generally ineffective against new viruses.



For example: I run NAV 2004 and have all the automatic features enabled. This morning I received about eight emails in two minutes, which all had suspicious attachments but were passed by NAV. So I had a look on Symantec's website — sure enough the Novarg worm was discovered yesterday and the vendor is working on it. I checked my NAV status screen and it showed my definitions were only to January 21. So I forced a manual LiveUpdate and found there were new definitions available.

I have a permanent ADSL connection so why did my LiveUpdate feature not automatically get the latest definitions for me? I did not use the intelligent updater feature on this occasion (I thought I might need to though) so why did LiveUpdate wait and not immediately get the latest definitions?

Symantec's website states that

the latest definitions are always in the intelligent updater, which can of course be downloaded manually at any time. It also states that LiveUpdate is only updated weekly (usually on Wednesdays, what an opportunity for weekend virus writers) in non-alert situations. However, we have an alert situation with Novarg yet LiveUpdate still did not protect me.

We like to keep our customers fully informed and their computers fully protected, which is why we sell Symantec products. The way LiveUpdate works (not) is not helping us at all. We would be better off telling our customers to download the intelligent updater twice a week to improve their level of protection

**Greg Williams, Lincoln Computer Centre, Port Lincoln, SA**

## A question of SCO's rights or wrongs

I have been following the IBM/Novell/SCO litigation debate in ARN with interest but cannot understand why SCO thinks it has any right to start infringement litigation against any

body when their own claim to the code has not yet been established by the court.

Why are users afraid when at this point the simple argument against SCO is that it has no real proof of ownership and no basis for infringement litigation when nothing has yet been infringed upon.

I feel badly for those who have run like rabbits to buy these licences. If SCO loses its fight with IBM, these licensees will have shelled out good money to a company that had no right to it.

Does SCO have any legal right to sell licences to use the code in question while the intellectual property right to the code is still in dispute in the court? Nobody else seems to have asked this question, so what bit of information have I missed? Maybe I haven't — maybe SCO is simply trading on the fear of litigation and the threat of price hikes if they do win their suit, which is very dirty pool, indeed.

**Louise Kelly, ALTE Networks, Armidale, NSW**