TO: RHASKINS@CNETWORK.COM

letters to the editor

Robert,

I just had the chance to read your response to Nick Christenson's letter to the editor in [the October] ; login:. In your re-sponse you wrote, "I will admit, I haven't set up an MTA for SPF enforcement. But from a quick perusal of instructions for doing so, it does not look like an easy, straightforward task."

You should have written which MTA instructions you were looking at. SPF support is available in Stalker's CommuniGate Pro and is a straightforward

*	SMTP Settings	
Sending	Receiving	Relaying
Log: Low Level ‡	listener	Channels: 50 ‡
Advertise:	AUTH to: everybody 🛟	8BITMIME tO: everybody 🗘
The second secon	Return Paths for: non-clients \$	Force AUTH for: non-clients 💠
	(Reset) (Upo	date
	Limits	
Message Limits:	Size: unlimited ‡	Recipients: unlimited
200000	Limited to: 50 \$\psi\$ recipient Prompt for: 30 seconds \$\psi\$ nnect after: 20 \$\psi\$ errors and	per: 15 seconds \$ Deny Access for: 15 minutes \$
	Retrieving from a Backup Se	rver
☐ Send Wakeups ☐ Use ATRN login	Every: 30 minutes \$ name:	to:
	(Reset) (Upd	ate

task. I am including a screen shot to show that.

In the image you can see an option to specify checking SPF records during SMTP receiving, where the options are: disabled; add header enabled (reject on fail)

I understand that your purpose was to introduce SPF, but I'm writing just to say that I tend to agree with Nick. I'm certain that more MTAs can be made to use SPF quite simply, so there would be no artificial hurdle to

adoption of the technique. Based on my experience so far, the biggest hurdle is changing MTAs so that forwarding doesn't break SPF (but I've found that other techniques, such as external POP polling, can be used to circumvent the problems with forwarding).

Kindest regards,

JASON MADER

jason@ncac.gwu.edu

ROBERT HASKINS REPLIES:

I was talking about integrating SPF with Sendmail. It looks as though it's easy to integrate SPF enforcement into Communigate Pro!

DEAR EDITOR:

In "Wireless Security: A Discussion" in the December ;login:, Marcus Ranum raised a number of valid points, but I was most struck by his complaint, "I was going to be forced to waste time installing security measures." Wow. Isn't this exactly the "luser" attitude many of us fight every day? Hasn't making and selling these "security measures" been a large part of Marcus's professional life? If even he is seriously annoyed at the prospect of actually having to use security measures, we must have a terribly long way to go.

If I may be permitted an analogy: If I don't want people peering at the cargo in the back of my vehicle parked at the conference hotel, I put the cover over it, rather than bitch at the guy who says, "Hey, I can see your laptop in there!" (Nor do I run to "mommy": "He's peeking, he's peeking!").

JOHN HASCALL Iowa State University