

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2010 11:56 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@ithaka.org>
Subject: Re: Restore MIT IP Addresses

As for blocking all of 18. instead of a more specific 18.55.5., was that your idea or [REDACTED]?

Do let me know if you have an opinion regarding 1 vs 2 vs 3.

On 10/12/10 11:47 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

>
> [[http://\[REDACTED\]](http://[REDACTED])
> [REDACTED]

>
> [REDACTED] commented on OPS-1845:
> -----
>
> Given that [REDACTED] is disabled, and the MIT source address group is confining MIT to this disabled VIP,
> I suspect that MIT is receiving no DNS responses for www.jstor.org at all.
>
> Enabling [REDACTED] would put other innocent victims onto the single princeton server as well,
> so that doesn't seem like a very good option.
>
> I could do any of these things:
> 1. put all of MIT back into the main pool with everyone else.
> 2. confine MIT to princeton with a more carefully thought out method that requires a lot more
> configuration.
> 3. change the [REDACTED]-confined source pool to be only the narrow 18.55.5.0/24 instead of the broad 18.0.0.0/8
> (meaning that only this narrow network won't get DNS response, instead of all of MIT getting no
> response).
>
>
>
>
>> Restore MIT IP Addresses
>> -----
>>
>> Key: OPS-1845
>> URL: [http://\[REDACTED\]](http://[REDACTED])
>> Project: Operations
>> Issue Type: Task

>> Reporter: [REDACTED]

>> Assignee: [REDACTED]

>> Priority: Urgent

>>

>> [REDACTED] is asking that the MIT range be restored. [REDACTED] asked that we take a metered approach and ease them back in if we can. I realize the whole Class A range is blocked at the firewall, but if we could enable the IPs not involved in this latest incident (aka, leave the Class C range suspended) that would be ideal in my estimation. Please advise.

>