

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Paid Whitelisting?](#)

Omniscient - August 7, 2016, 2:07 pm

Would members be interested in paying a small fee to have a single IP whitelisted? It would be a one-time fee maybe like \$10 and yes, the IP could be from a VPN or datacenter.

I'm reconfiguring the firewall and I will now be able to effectively whitelist a single IP even if the datacenter is blocked.

Previously blocks to datacenters were the final step to HF so the block was in place.

Connection to HF should be much faster for anyone whitelisted. You shouldn't get any Cloudflare captchas. We still have levels of protection that the whitelisting would not help such as loading multiple tabs. Any abuse (API usage, sharing, or DOS) would mean the IP would be blacklisted into the firewall.

So does this interest members? I may require Ub3r and the IP would need to be manually whitelisted by me. Should I bother setting something like this up?

SavageAF - August 7, 2016, 2:08 pm

I personally wouldn't (no need) but I'm also interested in if people would want this

V For Vendetta - August 7, 2016, 2:08 pm

I might be interested in this. However, this would work best for static IP users/users on a VPS, which might increase the chance of being a multi.

Reven?nt - August 7, 2016, 2:10 pm

This would make using a VPN much easier. I would definitely pay for this and I am sure others will too.

Update: Like the member said above me though, it would work best for static IP's.

Krave - August 7, 2016, 2:11 pm

I personally wouldn't do/need something like this, but I could see how some members would be interested.

Egregious - August 7, 2016, 2:12 pm

If this is implemented, I think it should be restricted to UB3R members.

Prawnster - August 7, 2016, 2:12 pm

I doubt I would use or need this

Although, there are probs some members that would get good use from this!

Juicy - August 7, 2016, 2:13 pm

The only thing that worries me is if this could be abused by banned members.

Revenge - August 7, 2016, 2:13 pm

I'd be interested in something like this. If I'm understanding this correctly this would make it so that

I'd be able to access it from places like college/hotels using a VPN with no risk? I haven't ever used a private VPN here though. Have members ever had issues with that?

Pittinger - August 7, 2016, 2:13 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:11 PM)Krave Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I personally wouldn't do/need something like this, but I could see how some members would be interested.

Same here - dynamic IP.

However I remember when my country was disabled from accessing. If that happens again I'd happily pay \$10 to be able to access the forum again.

Shoe - August 7, 2016, 2:15 pm

It'd be helpful to people that only have a single VPS and want to route a VPN through it, which would be awesome! However, some people use VPNs like [censored], PIA, and TunnelBear so you'll usually get a different IP each time. As a result, I think some people would get more use out of it than others, but who knows? :)

grady - August 7, 2016, 2:18 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:15 PM)Shoe Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It'd be helpful to people that only have a single VPS and want to route a VPN through it, which would be awesome! However, some people use VPNs like [censored], PIA, and TunnelBear so you'll usually get a different IP each time. As a result, I think some people would get more use out of it than others, but who knows? :)

It's very possible to setup a small VPN server on a VPS through OpenVPN or something similar. It's an extremely quick process.

But yeah, it's a cool feature, but not one that I'd be using.

Restricting it to UB3Rs would also be necessary, as you can see that some multis have managed to make it to UB3R, so imagine the amount that are L33T/lower.

DaisyOdland - August 7, 2016, 2:18 pm

I'm assuming this would have no interest to users with a dynamic ip address and might support multi accounting.

Meaning you'd have a small percentage of static users that might want it and a lot of multi-accounters on vpn's.

The cloudflare only happens once and takes 5 seconds so that's not really an issue as well imo.

Personally I'm not a big supporter of this, although my opinion could change when more posts pop up with good reasoning.

Granny Bacon - August 7, 2016, 2:18 pm

Regardless of my rank, I would be interested in this. I would pay more than \$10 too if this was implemented, saves alot of time for me.

But if you're implementing this for ub3r only then I'm totally fine with it.

Bluffer - August 7, 2016, 2:18 pm

Definitely necessary to have some restrictions if you do implement this. I don't think I'd personally need it but I think a lot of members would find it useful.

Angelus - August 7, 2016, 2:20 pm

I dont have money, otherwise I would do this, could be nice, knowing my internet is already slow. Thanks for the offer Omni

'Suicide - August 7, 2016, 2:21 pm

Honestly yeah, would you be willing to whitelist more than one IP

PrivateDonut - August 7, 2016, 2:21 pm

I wouldn't need it, but I like the idea as it'll be helpful for a lot of members and generate extra income for hackforums

Suspense - August 7, 2016, 2:22 pm

I personally wouldn't have any use for something like this.

John Watson - August 7, 2016, 2:22 pm

I don't think it's going to make much of a difference other than for people who may want to access HF hidden behind a VPN.

Personally, all I have to do is tick a box to pass Captcha verification and certain times just wait 3 seconds for CloudFlare message to disappear and HF page to load.

Omniscient - August 7, 2016, 2:26 pm

Likely would need to be a static and unshared IP because if I see in the logs the same IP I will assume it's shared or a ban evader. So this is not a solution for ban evaders. Would also require Ub3r. Basically this is just going to help some of the ub3r members that experience slow loading times and want to use a VPN for privacy. Would also help members dealing with lots of Captcha from being in a country that's restricted in our firewall.

Quote:However, some people use VPNs like [censored], PIA, and TunnelBear so you'll usually get a different IP each time.

Those VPN's would not work in this situation. I imagine some members might setup private tunnels for reasonable prices for members.

Quote:Honestly yeah, would you be willing to whitelist more than one IP
At \$10 each, yes.

SoulZeh - August 7, 2016, 2:26 pm

I think it could be pretty cool, A lot of members are either on a vpn or have static IP, depending on their provider, so it would be good for them, sadly I've got a dynamic IP.

Granny Bacon - August 7, 2016, 2:29 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:26 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Would also require Ub3r. Basically this is just going to help some of the ub3r members that experience slow loading times and want to use a VPN for privacy. Would also help members dealing with lots of Captcha from being in a country that's restricted in our firewall.

Understandable, alright.

John Watson - August 7, 2016, 2:30 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:26 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Likely would need to be a static and unshared IP because if I see in the logs the same IP I will assume it's shared or a ban evader. So this is not a solution for ban evaders. Would also require Ub3r. Basically this is just going to help some of the ub3r members that experience slow loading times and want to use a VPN for privacy. Would also help members dealing with lots of Captcha from being in a country that's restricted in our firewall.

Those VPN's would not work in this situation. I imagine some members might setup private tunnels for reasonable prices for members.

At \$10 each, yes.

Do you plan to charge for any IP change? Some static IPs may be changed from time to time so if

someone comes to you and asks to change the IP, will they be charged extra \$10?

SoulZeh - August 7, 2016, 2:31 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:26 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) At \$10 each, yes.

(Aug 7, 2016 02:30 PM)John Watson Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Do you plan to charge for any IP change? Some static IPs may be changed from time to time so if someone comes to you and asks to change the IP, will they be charged extra \$10?

He said here.

John Watson - August 7, 2016, 2:32 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:31 PM)SoulZeh Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He said here.

I didn't ask if he would charge for adding extra IPs. I asked if he is willing to replace a current IP with another one for free or for a fee.

SoulZeh - August 7, 2016, 2:33 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:32 PM)John Watson Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I didn't ask if he would charge for adding extra IPs. I asked if he is willing to replace a current IP with another one for free or for a fee.

I'd assume asking to get another IP added or one replaced is the same thing, \$10 each..

minimalist - August 7, 2016, 2:33 pm

I think it'd be sweet if you did a limited trial run while you worked on an automated system to handle the whitelists.

V For Vendetta. - August 7, 2016, 2:34 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:26 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Likely would need to be a static and unshared IP because if I see in the logs the same IP I will assume it's shared or a ban evader. So this is not a solution for ban evaders. Would also require Ub3r. Basically this is just going to help some of the ub3r members that experience slow loading times and want to use a VPN for privacy. Would also help members dealing with lots of Captcha from being in a country that's restricted in our firewall.

Okay so, lets say a user wants to whitelist his VPS (let's take AWS as it's one of the most common ones), and he/she is UB3R on HF. They pay you \$10 to whitelist the IP, and then the UB3R account NEVER logs into HF using his/her account, and instead makes a new account. What would happen then? This is the only abuse I can see so far, and I am unsure how this would be solved.

Ahri????? - August 7, 2016, 2:36 pm

I see no use or purpose for this. At the end of the day some of us have trouble keeping one IP let alone stay in the same state.

Cibor - August 7, 2016, 2:38 pm

I'm sure it would be great to have that

morph - August 7, 2016, 2:53 pm

Yes - it would be great. Could be abused though.

ra1d - August 7, 2016, 3:03 pm

This would be such a nice feature, extremely useful and I would definitely get my hands on it.

Question: Would you also be able to whitelist IPs that are from banned countries? (Not that I am from a banned country, but in case someone is...)

Xerotic - August 7, 2016, 3:09 pm

I probably wouldn't use this feature (I think it would be most useful for those who use a VPN), but I definitely think it is a good idea that others could use.

Potential for abuse? Sure, but banned members will always find their way back regardless.

Seife?r - August 7, 2016, 3:31 pm

Although not that useful to me, what happens if someone is using a shared vpn and someone else on the ip breaks the rules? would it get re-banned?

Regan - August 7, 2016, 3:34 pm

I don't think it would be used that much, and shown by the thread replies I see the same reaction as mine.

or as Minimalist you could trial run it see how many people really are interested.

also very interested to see what you have to say about what V For Vendetta said.

\$lick - August 7, 2016, 5:04 pm

Sign me the fuck up, that's some good shit.

Omniscient - August 7, 2016, 6:26 pm

Quote:Do you plan to charge for any IP change? Some static IPs may be changed from time to time so if someone comes to you and asks to change the IP, will they be charged extra \$10?

A likely setup would be \$10 for the IP addition. Then \$10 for any extra IP's. And only \$5 for an IP change swap (old IP is overwritten).

Quote: I asked if he is willing to replace a current IP with another one for free or for a fee. Probably for \$5 instead of the \$10.

Quote:I think it'd be sweet if you did a limited trial run while you worked on an automated system to handle the whitelists.

Shouldn't be too much to code this. I'd create a system for automatic ordering and then I'd setup a separate system for me to quickly add IPs to whitelist. I'd review each IP and order before adding to whitelist. At least initially. There are still some firewall adjustments I need to make before I can make this 100% work.

Quote:Question: Would you also be able to whitelist IPs that are from banned countries? (Not that I am from a banned country, but in case someone is...)

Probably not because I use GEO IP targeting at multiple layers.

Quote:Although not that useful to me, what happens if someone is using a shared vpn and someone else on the ip breaks the rules? would it get re-banned?

The IP would be blacklisted. Possibly the account(s) would be closed as well.

Quote:Okay so, lets say a user wants to whitelist his VPS (let's take AWS as it's one of the most common ones), and he/she is UB3R on HF. They pay you \$10 to whitelist the IP, and then the UB3R account NEVER logs into HF using his/her account, and instead makes a new account. What would happen then? This is the only abuse I can see so far, and I am unsure how this would be solved

Slightly complex situation. In your scenario the IP was never used by the original buyer of the whitelist. Which means the IP won't be in logs for the user but the IP is still associated to the buyer in purchase logs. Considering this would require Ub3r I suppose there would be enough account

history to review the accounts and make the best assessment I can. Certainly I can't make a line in the sand rule for every situation.

tim - August 7, 2016, 6:32 pm

I would pay you for something like this, yes. It'd help me out TONS as I use VPNs for other sites etc.

\$lick - August 7, 2016, 6:37 pm

Hackforums is the only reason I don't run a VPN 24/7, so I am hyped for this.

Nicholai - August 7, 2016, 6:39 pm

In terms of VPN services, might be a little off-topic here, it's in the end up to the user to be the responsible for their actions. Would it be possible to see a count of possible members that is using the IP-address provided? A feature like this could be useful, in case someone would buy a server to host a VPN on, to make sure that no one else is using that IP-address.

V For Vendetta - August 7, 2016, 6:57 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 06:26 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Slightly complex situation. In your scenario the IP was never used by the original buyer of the whitelist. Which means the IP won't be in logs for the user but the IP is still associated to the buyer in purchase logs. Considering this would require Ub3r I suppose there would be enough account history to review the accounts and make the best assessment I can. Certainly I can't make a line in the sand rule for every situation. Okay so let's assume the following:

For example person A is an uber on HF and whitelists the IP 0.0.0.1 (assuming it is blocked by HF and the IP is on a VPS).

Person B signs up to HF using the IP 0.0.0.1, and decides to scam, scamming for thousands of dollars during his time or gets banned/closed for breaking the rules.

Both person A and person B will get banned/closed correct? Or is it a case by case basis at your discretion?

Note: Person A never logs into the VPS 0.0.0.1 with his HF account.

Egregious Jr. - August 7, 2016, 6:58 pm

Good idea, but only for ub3r members. Or else it will get completely abused by multi-accounters.

webdev77 - August 7, 2016, 7:01 pm

Unfortunately I connect to HF from multiple locations (3 normally). It be nice to have, but I probably wouldn't be willing to pay \$10 per IP considering they would change too often.

\$lick - August 7, 2016, 7:10 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 07:01 PM)webdev77 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Unfortunately I connect to HF from multiple locations (3 normally). It be nice to have, but I probably wouldn't be willing to pay \$10 per IP considering they would change too often.

You would still be able to connect and use HF like normal, I think it's just for VPN ips that are blocked by default.

tim - August 7, 2016, 7:15 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 06:37 PM){Nexus} Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Hackforums is the only reason I don't run a VPN 24/7, so I am hyped for this.

This.

I really can't wait for the implementation for this. Glad it's coming too.. This is what this would save a hassle for:

I usually use a RDP + VPN on the rdp for other needs, but now, I can run the VPN on my pc and still use HF properly.. No need for buying that RDP now.

Omniscient - August 7, 2016, 7:21 pm

Quote:Okay so let's assume the following:

For example person A is an uber on HF and whitelists the IP 0.0.0.1 (assuming it is blocked by HF and the IP is on a VPS).

Person B signs up to HF using the IP 0.0.0.1, and decides to scam, scamming for thousands of dollars during his time or gets banned/closed for breaking the rules.

Both person A and person B will get banned/closed correct? Or is it a case by case basis at your discretion?

Yes, both accounts closed and IP firewalled. What you're describing seems to be that an Ub3r is paying for a whitelisting for another member. That's something I would not allow or sanction and anyone caught doing that for scammers or ban evaders will get a closed account.

Happeh - August 7, 2016, 7:25 pm

Not too interested as I'm just a casual on the site. Would see it being beneficial to many members on site though and limiting as to Ub3rs only would probably be a better idea.

Raddify - August 7, 2016, 7:26 pm

I think it would be cool.

Sucks for dynamic user like myself :(

Backopy - August 7, 2016, 8:31 pm

I'd probably pay for it if we had the ability to (optionally) IP lock the entire account to that one IP, similar to the country lock. It could even be a new TrustScan point with the IP locking.

The more security the merrier.

Omniscient - August 7, 2016, 8:40 pm

I can already do IP locking if I wanted but unsure I want to consider the depths of stupidity members already display with losing 2FA access.

grady - August 7, 2016, 8:40 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 08:40 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I can already do IP locking if I wanted but unsure I want to consider the depths of stupidity members already display with losing 2FA access.

More trouble than it's worth.

2FA should keep an account secure enough.

tim - August 7, 2016, 8:41 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 08:31 PM)Dasace Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I'd probably pay for it if we had the ability to (optionally) IP lock the entire account to that one IP, similar to the country lock. It could even be a new TrustScan point with the IP locking.

The more security the merrier.

That may not be wise.

Lets say your VPN/VPS expires and you lose that iP address. Then you have to go through the

recovery process. As Omni said above, he's unsure about even implementing it as people lose access to 2FA easily which is kinda pathetic on the user's part.

?Opulence - August 7, 2016, 8:42 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 07:01 PM)webdev77 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Unfortunately I connect to HF from multiple locations (3 normally). It be nice to have, but I probably wouldn't be willing to pay \$10 per IP considering they would change too often.

you could buy your main IP whitelist and then setup VPN so you can access it from any location.. Might be a good idea, I'm kinda considering it now.

EDIT: I am down for that! I'm getting pretty sick of the cloudflare blocks.. and if it's faster that's a plus too

? TAQ ? - August 7, 2016, 8:50 pm

Restricted to L33ts/Ub3rs(maybe some other mild sub requirements) wouldn't hurt, I'm sure quite a few members would enjoy this option.

???? - August 7, 2016, 8:51 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:12 PM)Egregious Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If this is implemented, I think it should be restricted to UB3R members.

^, otherwise you'll get lots of multis.

I like this, I'd pay \$15 for it.

Ambien - August 7, 2016, 10:00 pm

I would purchase, so I can use Skype and hf at the same time.

\$lick - August 7, 2016, 10:26 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 08:40 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I can already do IP locking if I wanted but unsure I want to consider the depths of stupidity members already display with losing 2FA access.

If you can lock whitelisted IPs to an account then that would be amazing, if I know for sure that I am the only one using that VPN IP then it would be an instant purchase.

But if I run the risk of getting closed for somebody else using the same whitelisted IP as me then it's really not worth it.

Rubixa - August 7, 2016, 10:39 pm

I personally wouldn't purchase it because I have no problem accessing HF on my home connection and I just route HF to my default gateway so I can still be on my VPN on any other site / application and just use HF on my IP which is okay with me.

Nerdi - August 7, 2016, 10:45 pm

I could see this being worth it.

It would be nice to be able to use a VPN here that's whitelisted.

Rubixa - August 7, 2016, 10:45 pm

Besides, my VPN's dedicated IP changes from time to time. It would be useless for me or anyone else with the same setup to purchase a white list for one IP when it would just change in time anyway.

Lufasu - August 8, 2016, 12:15 am

I might be intrested on it for sure !

Great idea omni,.

StevesTrolls - August 8, 2016, 12:19 am

In theory, it's a good idea for some users on restrictive networks, or who want to access at workplaces. But the suggestion of allowing a VPN (if public) would lead to larger chances of Multi-accounters getting away with it, and maybe negative consequences for accounts associated with that IP address? - or is this something likely to have alternate changes implemented?

Just my opinion on this topic.

Hydra - August 8, 2016, 12:22 am

This is quite the neat feature but should only be done if you can do the whitelisting with ease. Something like integrating it into your ACP and such where you wouldn't have to spend 5-10 minutes logging in each time to add it in. If it takes a lot of your time, don't bother to be honest. You'd be better off putting the time into other features that would be a lot more beneficial to the community.

Wyatt Garcia - August 8, 2016, 12:38 am

This would be interesting feature :) Yes.

StevesTrolls - August 8, 2016, 12:47 am

(Aug 8, 2016 12:22 AM)Hydra Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is quite the neat feature but should only be done if you can do the whitelisting with ease. Something like integrating it into your ACP and such where you wouldn't have to spend 5-10 minutes logging in each time to add it in. If it takes a lot of your time, don't bother to be honest. You'd be better off putting the time into other features that would be a lot more beneficial to the community.

I'm assuming Something like this would be managed somewhat like the UB3R application system - which gives Omni the power to vet all of the IPs before someone can pay to get the whitelist processed automatically.

LayndR - August 8, 2016, 1:24 am

I wouldn't have no use for this, but in text it seems like a good concept that could be added.

BLURRYF?CE - August 8, 2016, 7:36 am

Hell yeah, I'd love some of that whitelisting magic!

Cyam - August 8, 2016, 8:07 am

So who would actually benefit from this? Just curious.

Omniscient - August 8, 2016, 8:09 am

(Aug 8, 2016 08:07 AM)Cyam Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So who would actually benefit from this? Just curious. Members that have difficulty in connecting to HF.

Meow - August 8, 2016, 8:09 am

I think that feature would be easily abused, also I personally wouldn't use it because I have dynamic IP but I could see potential.

Viral Dragon - August 8, 2016, 8:10 am

Nah. I don't need it. I don't spam or what not, and I don't plan on using a VPN.

-Viral.

Stashyy - August 8, 2016, 8:11 am

(Aug 7, 2016 02:11 PM)Krave Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I personally wouldn't do/need something like this, but I could see how some members would be interested.

Same, I wouldn't be interested. Unless NY becomes blacklisted lol.

Prince of all Saiyans - August 8, 2016, 8:12 am

I think I would be interested in this service!

Mons - August 8, 2016, 8:12 am

I think this would be a very welcome feature.

Would we be able to have more IPs whitelisted?

For instance if the IP of my VPN changes...

Desolate Night - August 8, 2016, 8:12 am

This wouldn't be too good because most of the people have dynamic IPs. Even VPNs nowadays have different IPs every time you use them.

This could lead to some possible unforeseen circumstances and could pose a risk. I believe staying with the current state of things would be good.

Lynch - August 8, 2016, 8:12 am

I think this would be a good idea but only for upgraded users.

Lord_Jesus - August 8, 2016, 8:22 am

That would be really nice! I'd love this ahah

Ambien - August 8, 2016, 8:27 am

Just have this available for upgraded users, it'll help me a lot.

?lixir - August 8, 2016, 1:50 pm

I would. I love protecting my privacy.

Aurora - August 8, 2016, 1:53 pm

I like the idea of this. I would restrict it for upgraded members only. Maybe members with UB3R + 3P1C? I don't know, but I definitely recommend UB3R+.

Tommy - August 8, 2016, 3:36 pm

Very interested. How long would it take you to implement this?

Omniscient - August 8, 2016, 3:37 pm

(Aug 8, 2016 03:36 PM)Tommy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Very interested. How long would it take you to implement this?

If I decide to do it then it won't take too long.

Target™ - August 8, 2016, 3:38 pm

This would be quite interesting idea! I like it, i don't have troubles to often but i would pay for it.

Darkwin - August 8, 2016, 3:43 pm

This could be very useful to those who live in other countries or are visiting those countries banned by your firewall.

I don't see myself actually requesting a white-list anytime soon but i'm sure it can be of benefit to others.

Wafflemonger - August 8, 2016, 6:54 pm

I personally would have 0 interest in this as I have one of the most dynamic ISPs in Canada (Bell). My IP changes nearly every time I turn on my PC :/. So a service like this would be completely useless to me. That's not to say that it wouldn't be useful to static IP users, or users that utilize VPNs.

glitchgxd - August 8, 2016, 7:09 pm

\$10 for a whitelist? What about people with dynamic IP addresses or multiple locations? \$10 seems kinda steep to whitelist an IP.

maybe I'm just stingy since I already bought all the upgrades lol

I'm sure people would buy it if you made it an option.

Aura - August 8, 2016, 7:49 pm

I only go on HF when I'm at home and I don't use any VPN or else so personally I wouldn't use it.

B?ker - August 8, 2016, 7:54 pm

(Aug 7, 2016 02:12 PM)Egregious Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If this is implemented, I think it should be restricted to UB3R members.

I agree even Ub3r's with a certain amount of Trust and no active scam reports.

Elegant - August 8, 2016, 8:02 pm

This wouldn't concern me but I'm sure others would benefit from this. Feel free to add this since it will make you money and it would help some members as well.

Description - August 8, 2016, 11:21 pm

I like the idea a lot.

I think people will do it, i know i would.

\$10 isn't too much, fair price.

Doctor Blue - August 8, 2016, 11:42 pm

Getting an IP whitelisted could have been useful some years ago, but I don't feel like I'd do it now. I would probably have been willing to pay for it at that time. \$10 lifetime isn't that bad so if you feel like you have the time to do it, I think it's a sensible idea.

(Aug 7, 2016 06:26 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Slightly complex situation. In your scenario the IP was never used by the original buyer of the whitelist. Which means the IP won't be in logs for the user but the IP is still associated to the buyer in purchase logs. Considering this would require Ub3r I suppose there would be enough account history to review the accounts and make the best assessment I can. Certainly I can't make a line in the sand rule for every situation.

Yeah you could probably factor in whitelisted IPs in whatever system you have for finding multi-accounters.

Josh? - August 9, 2016, 12:23 am

Could the IP be changed once purchased? Say a user moves house, gets a new ISP, a new VPN, etc? EDIT: Just read through the thread, it's \$5 to change the IP, \$10 if you want to add an additional.

Could we whitelist a hostname if we're on a dynamic IP? A bit like no-ip.

Omniscient - August 9, 2016, 9:20 am

Quote:\$10 for a whitelist? What about people with dynamic IP addresses or multiple locations? \$10 seems kinda steep to whitelist an IP.

This is best for people with either static home ISP or those willing to rent a VPS/VPN. You honestly just need a shell account on any dedicated IP system to run a tunnel.

Quote:Could we whitelist a hostname if we're on a dynamic IP?

No, because then I'd have to whitelist the entire ISP making this pointless.

Here, PureVPN seems cheap enough and offers static IP...\$60 for 2 years VPN and \$24 extra for static IP. That's \$84 for 2 years which is \$3.50 per month. They also accept Bitcoin and say NO LOGS in TOS.

<https://www.purevpn.com>

DaFreak - August 9, 2016, 9:26 am

Yes, I'd definitely pay for this kind of service. I actually wanted this implemented but there was no way you'd allow it earlier.

Varane - August 9, 2016, 9:29 am

(Aug 9, 2016 09:26 AM)DaFreak Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yes, I'd definitely pay for this kind of service. I actually wanted this implemented but there was no way you'd allow it earlier.I would as well, the firewall sometimes glitches out and my IP gets blocked for up to 30 minutes.

Mr Whiskey - August 9, 2016, 9:34 am

I know I personally would love this. I enjoy HF a lot and having a faster connection with no captcha would make me very happy, and be very worth it to me for a low (\$20 or less) price.

Omniscient - August 9, 2016, 9:37 am

Quote:I would as well, the firewall sometimes glitches out and my IP gets blocked for up to 30 minutes.

This would not whitelist you past that firewall that temp blocks you. You're blocked because of multiple tabs, userscripts, or because you're spaz that reloads page too fast.

This mainly bypasses the Cloudflare firewall and some server rules (but not all).

Energy Wizard - August 9, 2016, 9:42 am

I would really like this to be implemented.

If this could be used at registration as well, that would be neat.

Meow - August 9, 2016, 9:45 am

(Aug 9, 2016 09:29 AM)Vyrez. Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I would as well, the firewall sometimes glitches out and my IP gets blocked for up to 30 minutes.

Same but since I have dynamic IP I just reset my router and get new IP. If I had static IP I would be interested in this for sure.

Mons - August 9, 2016, 9:48 am

Would it not be possible to make this process automated, Omniscient?

Like an autobuy where you have to fill in the IP address and complete payment and it gets whitelisted automatically?

I believe this would save you from much time-consuming hassle.

hfaccount78894714312 - August 9, 2016, 9:52 am

yea nad next you should whitelist banning any profile for \$600 btc? yea

Also if you allow vpn ip's it would fuck up trustscan's so bad. Espicailly if somenoe paid to ip whitelist a free vpn of some sort

DaFreak - August 9, 2016, 9:55 am

(Aug 9, 2016 09:45 AM)Meow? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Same but since I have dynamic IP I just reset my router and get new IP. If I had static IP I would be interested in this for sure.
just buy a cheap 2\$ vps, set up ssh proxy or something and you're good to go lol

Katarina Du Couteau - August 9, 2016, 9:57 am

What is the point in ub3r only? The registration ip will still be a real one, so its useless to be anon...
Or am I missing something?

hfaccount78894714312 - August 9, 2016, 10:02 am

Whats this for to allow more people use hf or something? Because if wanna whitelist a blacklisted ip then they catn even see this post lol

Armada - August 9, 2016, 10:05 am

I personally have never had a problem access HF due to blacklisting, however I can see how this would be useful for many.

However, Omni.

How would ban evaders be managed if say someone has all of one of our VPN services IP#s white listed?

Would this not simply encourage ban evaders and scammers easier access to continue on with their gibberish?

I think this could be a great idea for many users, however IMO the whitelisted IP# would need to be associated with a specific account for this to be effective without lowered the security already in place.

Mons - August 9, 2016, 10:12 am

(Aug 9, 2016 10:05 AM)Armada Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I personally have never had a problem access HF due to blacklisting, however I can see how this would be useful for many.

However, Omni.

How would ban evaders be managed if say someone has all of one of our VPN services IP#s white listed?

Would this not simply encourage ban evaders and scammers easier access to continue on with their gibberish?

I think this could be a great idea for many users, however IMO the whitelisted IP# would need to be associated with a specific account for this to be effective without lowered the security already in place.

(Aug 7, 2016 02:07 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Any abuse (API usage, sharing, or DOS) would mean the IP would be blacklisted into the firewall.

I may require Ub3r and the IP would need to be manually whitelisted by me.

Armada - August 9, 2016, 10:15 am

(Aug 9, 2016 10:12 AM)Mons Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Code Any abuse (API usage, sharing, or DOS) would

mean the IP would be blacklisted into the firewall.

I may require Ub3r and the IP would need to be manually whitelisted by me.
My point is, Lets say I have Server A of a VPN whitelisted for my uses.

What is preventing someone else on that same VPN service from using the same connection IP#?

I would not be "sharing" so to speak, but it would directly reflect to me as I was the one who had the IP# whitelisted.

Again, I think it would need to be tied to accounts if this were to be feasible.
Maybe I am missing something here as well.

Energy Wizard - August 9, 2016, 10:18 am

(Aug 9, 2016 09:57 AM)Katarina Du Couteau Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) What is the point in ub3r only? The registration ip will still be a real one, so its useless to be anon...

Or am I missing something?Some users browse on the internet with their computer connected to a VPN all the time. It is usually an inconvenience to either disconnect it or add an exception.

For the registration IP, I'm sure it will be safe with staff. Most people are worried about another member getting their IP.

Omniscient - August 9, 2016, 10:38 am

Quote:Would it not be possible to make this process automated, Omniscient?
Yes, and no.

I'd have to ensure that the blocks and whitelisting were correct. Initially I'd want to review everything manually but eventually yes, it could potentially be 100% automated.

Because of my paranoia with HF security, I'd have to write some serious scripts to deal with API access. Nothing touches HF servers except through tunnels so I can 100% control all access with a buffer.

Quote:What is the point in ub3r only?

Almost all new features are Ub3r only if only to ensure it works and is manageable. Also ub3r are all manually approved and have been members for at least 3 months. It's dangerous to whitelist a brand new member who may have just joined. Someone may decide to abuse it even if it costs a few hundred to get a few dozen IPs whitelisted to attack HF. Also it would be super easy for a new member to ban evade that way. Scammers would be super happy.

Quote:What is preventing someone else on that same VPN service from using the same connection IP#?

The IP match would trigger closed accounts. Unsure how much of this thread you're reading. Sharing IP's is an easy way to get closed accounts on HF. Everyone knows this, why don't you? Trust scan would even show the matching.

Quote:Most people are worried about another member getting their IP.

Would it honestly be so hard for me to warn anyone buying this to NOT USE A DYNAMIC IP VPN?

Jesus F'n CHRIST some of you are DENSE!

Black Shadow - August 9, 2016, 10:46 am

I would like to do this, so could you please take me off your ignore list so I can send you a PM.

Armada - August 9, 2016, 10:50 am

(Aug 9, 2016 10:38 AM)Omniscient Wrote: [CITE](#) The IP match would trigger closed accounts. Unsure how much of this thread you're reading. Sharing IP's is an easy way to get closed accounts on HF. Everyone knows this, why don't you? Trust scan would even show the matching. VPNs are inherently shared services though. The end user can not control who else is on the same VPN IP# that they are, nor are they likely to know who else is on that VPN server (Be it another HF member or otherwise).

Again, this issue has never presented myself a problem, but considering the factors I think there would be problems for users who do use this concept.

User A has Server 1 on VPN Service Acme co. whitelisted.
User B,C,D discover Server 1 is whitelisted and utilize the same server.

All 4 users would show as matching IP#'s.

So, with what you stated, would all 4 users be banned/blacklisted?

With what I was stating earlier, I can see this working very effectively, but it would need to be based on the user.

User A has had IP# whitelisted = Okay

User B,C,D have not had the IP# whitelisted = NO ACCESS

I do see this being a benefit for many members, especially in restrictive countries who limit internet access. But I also see potential for abuse as well.

Omniscient - August 9, 2016, 11:09 am

Quote:VPNs are inherently shared services though.

No, they are not.

1. You can setup a tunnel on a VPS or dedicated.
2. You can find a VPN which offers you a private and dedicated IP. I even provided pricing and a link to one (PureVPN).

Quote:User A has Server 1 on VPN Service Acme co. whitelisted.

User B,C,D discover Server 1 is whitelisted and utilize the same server.

All 4 users would show as matching IP#'s.

All 4 users would get a CLOSED account. Which is exactly what would happen now anyways. This changes NOTHING.

Quote:So, with what you stated, would all 4 users be banned/blacklisted?

That's EXACTLY what I do now. WTF. Matching IPs = FUCKED.

Quote: I can see this working very effectively, but it would need to be based on the user.

I've already said that. REPEATEDLY!

Supreme??????? - August 9, 2016, 11:10 am

This is a great implementation. Willing to pay a fee for this. However, it should be only restricted to Uber members.

Omniscient - August 9, 2016, 11:11 am

Going to note one last thing then close this thread.

The service is about whitelisting a single IP for a single user. It is NOT about whitelisting an entire datacenter or dynamic VPN service.

Go back to my first post. Done with the idiocy that is being posted here.