Re: SCO: ISPs are blocking our site Blake Stowell

Source: http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.unix.sco.misc/2004−02/0053.html

---

From: Bill Vermillion (*bv_at_wjv.comREMOVE*)
Date: 02/02/04

Date: Mon, 02 Feb 2004 19:45:06 GMT

In article <3OwTb.209574$xy6.1075105@attbi_s02>,
Joe Dunning <joedunning1234_removethis@hotmail.com> wrote:
>On Mon, 02 Feb 2004 14:05:00 GMT, Bill Vermillion <bv@wjv.comREMOVE> wrote:
>>In article <SDmTb.207681$xy6.1063854@attbi_s02>,
>>Joe Dunning <joedunning1234_removethis@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>On Mon, 02 Feb 2004 06:55:29 GMT, Scott Burns <scott@mirrabooka.com> wrote:
>>>>Daeron wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Feb 01 2004
>>>>>
>>>>>"There are Internet service providers around the world who are
>>>>>blocking access to SCO," company spokesman Blake Stowell said, adding
>>>>>it was because they believe they can limit exposure to the virus that
>>>>>way.
>>>>
>>>>It seems that the way they protected themselves was to remove the DNS
>>>>entry for www.sco.com − it is unresolvable but sco.com is still there.
>>>> I don't think ISPs had anything to do with it.
>>
>>>The one analysis that I read showed the the virus only attempted to
>>>resolve www.sco.com −− it did not do a DDoS. So, removing www.sco.com
>>>will actually result in more load, not less, because the ISPs'
>>>nameservers won't be able to cache the data for www.sco.com
>>
>>There have been many articles on this on the NANOG list in the last
>>day. But when you say that it will give a higher load because the
>>domain is not there, that should not be. What will happen would be
>>like this:

*>>*** ns1.xxxxxx.net can't find www.sco.com: Non−existent host/domain*
>>Server: ns1.xxxxxx.net
>>Address: xx.xxx.xxx.11