

From: [REDACTED] </O=ITHAKA/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2011 9:22 AM
To: 'Heymann, Stephen (USAMA)' <Stephen.Heymann@usdoj.gov>
Subject: FW: MIT Update
Attach: MIT Jan IP 18.55.7.240.png

Fyi.

The drop off on Jan. 6 lines up with when MIT implemented a proxy protection.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 8:10 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: MIT Update: It's worse than we know

It looks like another 438,745 PDFs were downloaded in the first 5 days of January (from IP 18.55.7.240). Excessive download activity from MIT was not evident from Jan 6-14 (I only have usage data loaded through Jan 14 at present). Attached is a graph depicting download activity from IP 18.55.7.240 for the first half of Jan. It's a continuation of the December downloading that began on Dec 27th from that same IP address.

The total for December and January is now 3,275,704. I don't have data for Sept or Oct yet - maybe later this week...

From: [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2011 17:01:46 -0500
To: [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>, [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Cc: [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Subject: RE: MIT Update: It's worse than we know

Thanks, [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 4:57 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: MIT Update: It's worse than we know

Here are the totals for each IP during Nov/Dec. All but a few thousand of these are probably attributed to the downloader.
18.55.6.240 – 2,341,267 (periods of activity 11/29 – 12/26)
18.55.7.240 – 306,984 (periods of activity 12/27 - ??)
18.55.5.237 – 188,708 (periods of activity 11/6 – 11/11)

From: [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2011 16:47:44 -0500
To: [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>, [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Cc: [REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Subject: RE: MIT Update: It's worse than we know

[REDACTED], could you provide an approximate breakdown among the three IP addresses in the graph you created and what the excessive downloading is from each – again, just an approximation for now?

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 2:29 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: MIT Update: It's worse than we know

Attached are 2 screen shots depicting PDF download activity from MIT for November and December. One show's all downloads and totals 2,854,824 for the 2 months. The other filters out downloads from the 3 IP's that look to be associated with the download abuse (18.55.6.240, 18.55.7.240, 18.55.5.237) and totals 17,865 for the 2 month period. Recognizing that some legitimate downloads may have occurred from the 3 filtered IP's, it would still be safe to say that about 2.8 million illegal downloads occurred during November and December. We know that some illegal downloading occurred prior to November and into January. I don't have those numbers yet. But looking at the graph you can see that some pretty aggressive downloading was taking place the last week of Dec (over 100k.day). It seems likely this extended into January for some period of time. It wouldn't be much of a stretch to say that as much of a million or more additional downloads may have occurred that are not reflected on this chart. I expect to have January data available for review by Monday. I'll also start loading Oct and Sept numbers as well to complete the picture.

From: [REDACTED]<[REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2011 14:13:57 -0500
To: [REDACTED]<[REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Cc: [REDACTED]<[REDACTED]@ithaka.org>, [REDACTED]<[REDACTED]@lthaka.org>
Subject: RE: MIT Update: It's worse than we know

So, with September and October, what does the number look like? Still looking like the entire corpus?

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 2:10 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: MIT Update: It's worse than we know

Still digging and [REDACTED] is going to pass along a screen shot of what he is seeing for November and December. It appears as though the activity was less impactful in November, but just these two months ballpark ~2 million + PDFs over their normal usage. [REDACTED] is also seeking out data prior and since for review.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 1:53 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: MIT Update: It's worse than we know

I will call in a moment.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 1:43 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: MIT Update: It's worse than we know
Importance: High

Hi [REDACTED]

Speaking with [REDACTED] just now about making sure we have [REDACTED] time as needed for the MIT evaluation currently underway and discovering that the IP addresses associated with these specific incidents have numerous additional days of mass downloading.

It would take some time to normalize against usual MIT usage, but at first glance, it is reasonably safe to assume from what [REDACTED] and I covered that the individual responsible has already acquired the entire JSTOR corpus. Glad to have a call ASAP if you think it useful and I let [REDACTED] know that I thought you might be calling him shortly after receiving this message for clarification. In light of this information, it would seem that we need to try and understand the full picture outside of the identified incidents going forward. Certainly our tack here merits some re-evaluation, both concerning this case and the potential for additional measures of prevention as we move forward. Also copying in [REDACTED] at this juncture.

[REDACTED]

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

JSTOR | Portico

[REDACTED]@ithaka.org
[REDACTED]