

**From:** [REDACTED] </O=ITHAKA/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 9, 2010 9:59 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@ithaka.org>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@ithaka.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@ithaka.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@jstor.org>  
**Subject:** Re: Please block 18.0.0.0/8 in the firewalls

---

If the session limit in literatum was actually on then it didn't do a thing. I bet it's on a "per server" basis and not for an entire datacenter. We might need to bring that up with Atypon.

Given the size of pdfs, I am serious about setting an all out bandwidth limit for that net on the firewall if it's possible technically.



They were using about 50mb of bandwidth for a good part of Saturday. So, if we limit the whole thing to 1-5mb that should keep the problem on their side rather than ours. They'll run out of bits before we start to have site problems. Though, that abuse appliance [REDACTED] was talking about after last time sounds much effective than thi\$ idea ;).

On Oct 9, 2010, at 9:05 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Sorry to be so late to the party. I'll be in touch with MIT directly. Note that they reported a visiting scholar responsible for the first incident. Once we get a report on this incident from them, if it happens again, we should do a deeper think about them and what is really going on here.

Also, after the last incident, we implemented the Literatum Abuse Tools to block when 5000 sessions are created from the same IP in a 60 minute period. Once we're settled, can we see if that did or did not work as expected?

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 09, 2010 6:50 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Please block 18.0.0.0/8 in the firewalls

████ has completed the ip block and I'm now seeing it deny the abusive traffic. Also, there is a new GSS rule to lock 18.0.0.0/8 to █████ -- so, we can use them for whatever testing we want -- their punishment is to be sent to guinea-pigdom.

I'm rolling restarting the servers in █████ that got locked up in █████ access log synchronization nonsense.

On Oct 9, 2010, at 6:14 PM, █████ wrote:

About half the servers in █████ are now broken. I'm rolling restarting them but not unlocking them so that we can turn them on only after the scraper is gone -- otherwise, they might all lock up again immediately.

Also, a new idea might be to just rate limit 18.0.0.0/8 to like 56kb :).

On Oct 9, 2010, at 5:45 PM, █████ wrote:

████,

The MIT scraper is back -- he's been at it all day from 18.55.5.100. Please deny their entire ip range, 18.0.0.0/8.

Thanks much!