

From: [REDACTED]=ITHAKA/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, October 10, 2010 9:33 AM
To: [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>; [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Subject: Re: MIT is currently denied JSTOR Access

Thanks, [REDACTED] Very troubling.

Also, this is the first I've heard of this. [REDACTED] needs to be involved earlier in these types of matters to ensure we adhere to contract terms and pursue appropriate remedies. This is part of the protocol we established. The activity noted is outright theft and may merit a call with university counsel, and even the local police, to ensure not only that the activity has stopped but that -- e.g. the visiting scholar who left -- isn't leaving with a hard drive containing our database.

[REDACTED] please clarify the history of this activity. What happened 3 weeks ago? How did we respond? What has happened in the intervening time?

And what is the "last time" incident with the visiting scholar? Is this the one from three weeks ago? Again, this is the first I've heard of this. Going forward, we need to make sure [REDACTED] is aware of these cases as they are emerging. The [REDACTED] component is critical here, but there are other avenues that often need to be pursued concurrently.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 09, 2010 11:18 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: MIT is currently denied JSTOR Access

Just want to be sure [REDACTED] is aware of the situation.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 09, 2010 10:30 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: MIT is currently denied JSTOR Access

Good Evening,

I want to make you aware that the MIT abuse case that showed up 3 weeks ago came back today, forcing [REDACTED] to deny 18.0.0.0/8 at the firewall. Half of Manchester needed restarting this afternoon to address servers that got jammed up due to this activity. I have emailed our contacts at MIT and informed them of the situation.

Just for clarity, that's the whole range, the largest we have ever denied. Last time they reported that a visiting scholar was responsible and that it should not recur as the scholar had left.

I am in conversation with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is reporting that this scraping is very intensive and threatening the website when unblocked. The block of their range has brought the incident under control and they are currently getting deny pages and not threatening the website.

The pattern is simple... they start a session, download 1 pdf, start a new session, download 1 pdf on and on. [REDACTED] can comment on the specific volume and duration.

Also, after the last incident at MIT, we implemented Literatum's # of sessions per hour IP blocking rule to 5000 sessions in 60 minutes. It did not fire. We are digging deeper, but the earliest speculation is that this rule is applied 'per server', which we did not anticipate, meaning we'll need to adjust the number down based on data gathered from this incident and elsewhere.

I don't know if this will cause any negative reaction in the public and haven't heard anything through our feedback channels as yet, but wanted to make sure we were all on the same page and that there are no surprises here. This is an extreme block to combat an extreme attack.

More as the situation gets resolved.

Best,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

JSTOR | Portico

[REDACTED]@ithaka.org

[REDACTED]