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hesitant about it.
Q Who is your employer?
A It's a company called Amber Solutions
Incorporated.
Q How long have you been employed by Amber Solutions?

A I have been there since August of last year.
Q How many times have you been retained as an expert in patent litigation or in IPRs?

A Maybe on the order of 30 times.
Q How many of those were for patent litigation?
A Almost all of them.
Q And how many times for IPRs?
A Oh, I'm sorry. I -- I thought of patent litigation and IPR are similar. So...

Q I'll break it down. How many of those were for district court litigation?

A So district court, I would say two-thirds and IPRs, one-third.

Q What is your currently -- current hourly rate, sir?

A 625.
Q How long has that been your rate?
A For maybe three years.
Q What percentage of your professional time in
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the last two years have you spent consulting in connection with patent litigation, in which I include IPRs?

A Between and 10 and 15 percent.
Q And what percentage of your annual income is derived from consulting for patent litigation, including IPRs?

A I don't know for the tax year 2018. For the 2017 tax year, I believe it's about a sixth of my income.

Q By whom have you been retained in these matters?

A By USR.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; vague.
Q And when were you retained?
A I don't recall the exact date. Approximately two years ago.

Q Approximately how much have you billed to date in these matters for USR?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; vague as to "these matters."

Just wait a second also before you answer.
Thanks.
A I don't know really. At least a hundred thousand. But not much more.
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Q And how much have you been paid to date?
A So I think there are two invoices out, and I don't know the exact numbers for those. So I've been paid up until approximately December.

Q Have you been paid more than a hundred thousand dollars to date?

A You mean for the previous work?
Q Correct. By USR.
A Yes.
Q What did you do, sir, to prepare for today's deposition?

A Among other things, I reviewed the -- my declarations.

Q Did you do anything else to prepare?
MR. KAERICHER: Just a caution not to reveal any communications with us or anything we asked you to review at our direction.

THE WITNESS: Of course.
A Yesterday, I met with counsel at these offices to review the -- the declaration.

Q Did you do anything else to prepare for today's deposition?

A Among other things, we also had a couple of phone calls over the last few of days to review, and I have read the declarations in addition to that.
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Q Did anyone participate in those phone calls other than yourself and counsel for USR?

A Not that I'm aware of.
Q Did you do anything else to prepare for today's deposition?

A No.
Q Let me hand you --
A Thank you.
Q -- what I believe to be the declarations that you signed in connection with the IPRs for the '826 and '137 patents.

You should have before you what has been marked as USR Exhibit 210, USR Exhibit 214, USR Exhibit 2003, USR Exhibit 2013, USR Exhibit 2101, and USR Exhibit 2111.

A Yes, I do.
Q Do you recognize those?
A I do.
Q What are they?
A Three of them are declarations in support of patent owner's response, and three of them are declarations in support of motions to amend.

Q And those are declarations that you signed, correct?

A That is correct.
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Q And those are declarations that were submitted in connection with IPRs for USR's patent numbers 9,530,137 and 9,100,826?

A That's correct.
Q Will you understand me today if I refer to U.S. patent number 9,530,137 as the ' 137 patent?

A Yes.
Q And will you understand me today if $I$ refer to U.S. patent number 9100826 as the ' 826 patent?

A I would, yes.
Q Are the six declarations before you that you signed in connection with the '137 and '826 patents complete and accurate in all respects?

A I saw that there was one subtitle that was wrong.

Q Do you want to correct that now?
A Just a moment. So the 813 document section 3A should be titled the "'826 Patent Specification." It says the "'539 Patent Specification."

Q Are your declarations complete and accurate in all other respects?

A To the best of my knowledge, yes.
Q Do your declarations contain all the support for your opinions?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
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A Yes.
Q Who wrote your declarations?
A Some of them -- some of the sentences were not written by me but written by others for me guided by me. And some sentences, such as my understanding of the law, I think, are probably boilerplate. And I have seen them before, and I understand them, but I did not write them, as such. All the arguments, as such, I either wrote or dictated to be written.

Q What percentage or proportion of the declarations did you write?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I would say the majority of the text falls into the category that I described.

Q Let me show you what has been previously marked as Apple Exhibit 1104 in IPR 2018-813. That's also Apple Exhibit 1113 in IPR 2018-809 and Apple Exhibit 1005 in IPR 2018-810.

Do you recognize that?
A $\quad$ I do.
Q And what is it?
A Beg your pardon?
Q What is it?
A It's publication number wo 2004/051585 A2,
which is an application that I'm a coauthor of.

Q Will you understand me today if we refer to this as the '585 reference?

A Yes.
Q You are a named inventor of the
'585 reference, correct?
A That's correct.
Q And there are two other named inventors, correct.

A That's correct.
Q One of them is Dr. Ari Juels, correct?
A Yes.
Q And the other is Dr. Burton Kaliski, correct?
A Yes.
Q Do you know Dr. Kaliski and Dr. Juels?
A I do.
Q How do you know Dr. Juels?
A For one thing, we used to be colleagues at the RSA. Also, I used to mentor him when he started in the field of cryptography.

Q Would you agree that Dr. Juels is a well-known and well-respected expert in the field of cryptography?

A Yes.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
Q And you have a great deal of respect for
Dr. Juels, correct?
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A I do.
Q Would you agree with -- that Dr. Juels is a well-known and well-respected expert in the field of computer security?

A When you say "expert," do you mean in the context of patent litigation?

Q No, in the context of computer security.
A Yes, I agree.
Q And would you agree that he's a well-known and well-respected expert in the field of user authentication?

A Yes, I agree.
Q Would you agree that he's a well-known and well-respected expert in the field of biometrics?

A Slightly less so, but he's knowledgeable.
Q Dr. Jakobsson, I have handed you copies of the '137 patent, which is Apple Exhibit 1101, and the ' 826 patent, which is Apple Exhibit 1001 in IPR 2018-810.

Do you recognize those?
A Yes. This one has not been marked.
Do you want to mark it?
Q Sure. Hand it back to me.
MR. KAERICHER: Thanks.
A Thank you.
Q And for convenience today, I'll refer to these
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by the patent numbers rather than the exhibit numbers. Is that acceptable?

A Understood.
Q You've read both the '137 and '826 patents, correct?

A Yes, I have.
Q When was the first time that you read them? MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.

A I don't remember the exact time, but after I was retained on this case.

Q You first became aware of the '137 and '826 patents after you were retained by USR, correct?

A Or in conjunction with retaining.
Q You were not aware of the ' 137 patent or the '826 patents before you were contacted by counsel?

A That's correct.
Q For USR, correct?
A That is correct.
Q So the first time that you became aware of the existence of the ' 137 and ' 826 patents was in connection with these IPRs, correct?

A No. Because I think I was not aware of the IPRs by the time I was retained.

Q Fair enough. But to be clear, the first time that you ever learned of the existence of the ' 137 and
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' 826 patents was when you were contacted by counsel for USR about the possibility of you being retained.

A In conjunction with that, yes.
Q The ' 826 and '137 patents have never been mentioned in any academic papers, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; calls for speculation.

A I wouldn't know.
Q The ' 137 and ' 826 patents have never been discussed at any industry conferences, to your knowledge, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection. Objection to form.

A To my knowledge, they have not.
Q The '137 and '826 patents have never been the subject of any academic industry or other praise or acclaim, to your knowledge, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objections.
A Yeah. I would not have known about it if they were.

Q You are not aware of the ' 137 or ' 826 patents ever having been licensed, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objections.
A I don't know about the licensing history for these.
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Q You are not aware of anyone requesting a license to the '137 or ' 826 patents, correct?

A My work as an expert witness here has not involved looking into the license histories at all.

Q And, therefore, you're not aware of anyone requesting a license to either the '137 or '826 patents, correct?

A I'm absolutely unaware of the licensing history.

Q You're not aware of any awards being given for the '826 or '137 patents, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A In general, I'm not aware of awards being. Given for patents -- if you mean scientific awards?

Q Awards of any type.
A So do you mean settlements as an award?
Q That would be an example.
A I'm not familiar with any settlements, either, for these patents.

Q Okay. So you're not aware of any praise, acclaim, or awards for the ' 826 or ' 137 patents, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I have not been asked to review that or to -I have not been given information about that either.
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Q And, therefore, you're not aware of any, correct?

A I've only studied these in the context of what I've been asked to do. So I'm not aware of anything beyond what I've been asked to review.

Q And you're not aware of any praise, acclaim, or awards for the ' 826 or ' 137 patents, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I am not aware of such.
Q Had you -- you see the inventor named on the 136 -- strike that.

You see that the --inventor named on the '826 and '137 patents is Kenneth P. Weiss?

A Yes.
Q Had you ever heard of -- of Ken Weiss before you were contacted by counsel for USR?

A Yes.
Q Okay. When have you heard of him?
A He developed technology that was key component of RSA -- by the acquisition of Security Dynamics, I believe, and I used to work for RSA. Much of the work that $I$ did while at RSA was in context of the security token, which was an invention of his.

Q You never discussed the ' 826 or ' 137 patents with Mr. Weiss, correct?

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.
Conducted on March 20, 2019

MR. KAERICHER: Lacks foundation, form.
A I have never met Mr. Weiss.
Q Have you ever talked to Mr. Weiss?
A Not knowing that I did so. If he were ever on a phone call with me, I was not aware of it.

Q Would you recognize Mr. Weiss?
A No.
Q Do you know if Mr. Weiss is an engineer?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form. Calls for speculation.

A I -- I don't know anything about him really other than his achievements.

Q Have you ever spoken to anyone other than counsel about Mr. Weiss?

A Not in any great detail, but when I worked at RSA, of course, much of what we worked on related to the technology that he invented. And so probably, in passing, somebody would say something about Mr. Weiss.

Q Do you remember the specifics of any of those conversations?

A Not whatsoever.
Q Okay. All right. Could you put in front of you USR Exhibit 2014.

A Yes.
Q This is your declaration in support of the
conditional motion to amend the 1137 patent; is that right?

A That's right.
Q And will you turn, please, to paragraph 33.
A Give me a moment to review it, please.
Q Of course.
A Yes.
Q In paragraph 33, you testify that you reviewed the provisional applications, correct?

A That is correct.
Q Did you read all of the provisional
applications?
A Are you saying did $I$ read the entirety of the provisional applications cited in here?

Q Yes.
A I did not.
Q What portions did you read?
A The portions that I deemed to be relevant, and the other portions I skimmed.

Q How did you determine what portions you deemed relevant?

A In the context of the claim amendment, if $I$ saw that a paragraph was not addressing anything that seemed relevant, then $I$ would skim it as opposed to read it carefully.
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Q How many provisional applications are there?
A I don't remember.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A There are at least two, but I know that there are more. I don't recall the exact number.

Q You testify in paragraph 33 of your declaration that, quote, It is my opinion that each limitation of the proposed substitute claims 13
through 21 is disclosed in and fully supported by the provisional applications to which the '137 patent claims priority.

Did I read that correctly?
A Yes.
Q So is it your opinion that each limitation of the proposed substitute claims 13 through 21 is fully supported by the first provisional application filed in February of 2006?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That's not what $I$ said.
Q Is each limitation of the proposed substitute claims 13 through 21 fully supported by the provisional application filed February 2006?

A I wasn't asked to consider that, and I would have to review it more carefully to tell if that is so.

Q Do you know, as you sit here today, whether
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each limitation of the proposed substitute claims 13 through 21 is fully supported by the first provisional application filed in February 2006?

A I don't know it to be the case.
Q Do you know, as you sit here today, whether each limitation of the proposed substitute claims 13 through 21 is fully supported by the second provisional application filed in June of 2006?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A And by that, you mean by itself.
Q Yes.
A Not to my knowledge, but I haven't been asked to review that and consider that.

Q Have you considered the second provisional application filed in June of 2006 at all in determining whether the proposed substitute claims are supported?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I don't refer to the applications by the filing date, and I actually don't remember the filing dates. What application are you asking about?

Q The provisional application filed in June of 2006.

A Right. Does it have a number that we could refer to?

Q Sure. Let me hand you what I've --
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A Thank you.
Q -- what has been marked as USR Exhibit 2009. Do you recognize that?

A Yes, I do.
Q Have you reviewed that?
A Yes, I have.
Q And my question to you is, is each limitation of the proposed substitute claims 13 through 21 fully supported by the second provisional application filed in June of 2006 marked as USR Exhibit 2009?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I'm sorry. I haven't considered that question before, and I don't know. If you would like me to, I could review them, the claims.

Q You have set forth in your declaration marked as USR Exhibit 2014 the full basis for your belief that each limitation of the proposed substitute claims 13 through 21 is fully supported by the provisional applications, correct?

A I have provided evidence for it. There might be additional evidence. You could see for each claim limitation in each claim there's a long list of support. I did not go to great pains to make that exhaustive and complete; just sufficient.

Q Okay. Dr. Jakobsson, devices existed before
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2006 that used codes that varied over time for authentication, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That is correct.
Q Are you familiar with the RSA SecurID token?
A Yes, I am.
Q Can you tell us what that is?
A It's a password replacement technology that has a small screen that displays for each time interval a multidigit code, typically, I believe, six digits long, and the time here, I believe, is set to 30 seconds or 60 seconds based on the exact product. And a user would use this instead of a password when logging in to a resource. So one would enter one's user name as normal in a normal login interface, and then one would enter the code from this device into the password field. And a verifier would compute the same code based on the record associated with your user name and determine if that same -- if that code is indeed the same, and, if so, that would result in a login approval. That would be the same action as if the password were correct.

Q Would you agree that the RSA SecurID token was sold before 2006?

A It was.
Q So the RSA SecurID token is an example of a
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device that existed before 2006 that used codes that varied over time for authentication, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That is correct.
Q The RSA SecurID token was first sold in 2002, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; calls for speculation.

A I don't know actually know.
Q Did you ever use or own a SecurID token yourself?

A I was a user of the security token.
Q And did you do so before 2006?
A I cannot remember exactly when. I believe I did. I believe I did at least while I was working at RSA, which was before 2006 .

Q The RSA SecurID used a time-varying value to authenticate users, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I'm not sure it's a time-varying value as in the limitations here, but it was a value that varied over time, which is this code that we've been speaking about.

Is that the question you are answering?
Q It is. But let me ask it again just to make
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sure we're clear, and I'll try to use your words.
The RSA SecurID token used a value that varied
over time to authenticate users, correct?
A So let me clarify that, actually. So the output would not be the same for each time period; the output being this multidigit code. So that one was different over time.

I understand that, for example, Dr. Shoup argues that the time-varying value is not the code that resulted in the screen, but he argues that it's the value that, in some of these documents, is referred to as $T$, which is a counter corresponding to time. So that's why I mention that in the context of the claim limitations, it -- my answer does not apply to the claim limitations unless we look at each particular claim limitation and consider what the question is.

Q Okay. I'm -- I'm just asking you about the -the SecurID token.

A The SecurID token has an output that varies over time.

Q And the output of the SecurID token varies over time to authenticate a user, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It doesn't vary over time in order to authenticate a user.
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Q You would agree that the SecurID token has a output that varies over time, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And you'd agree that publications existed before 2006 that describe codes that varied over time for the purpose of authentication, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form; speculation.

A They did not vary over time in order to authenticate the user. They authenticated the user, and they varied over time.

Q You'd agree that publications existed before 2006 that described codes that varied over time, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objections.
A Yes.
Q And, in fact, the '585 reference discloses time-varying values, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objections.
A '585 describes a password replacement device that has an output that is different by time intervals.

Q So is the answer to my question yes?
A I believe I understood your question, but would you restate it?

Q Sure. The '585 reference describes
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time-varying values, correct?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes, it does.
Q In fact it uses the expression "time-varying value," correct?

A I believe it does.
Q So the '585 reference is an example of a publication that existed before 2006 that described time-varying values, correct?

A It does describe time-varying values, and I believe it was published in 2004.

Q And the time-varying values disclosed in the '585 reference were used in connection with authenticating users, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It was part of the construction, yes.
Q Would you agree that the '137 patent does not disclose any new ways of generating time-varying codes that didn't exist already in 2006?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I haven't specifically been asked to consider that; so I'd have to take a good look at it to see. I can't remember seeing anything that does, but I also haven't made sure that there's nothing that does.

Q As you sit here, you don't know of any
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disclosure in the '137 patent of a new way of generating time-varying codes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A Give me a moment, please.
The specific generation of the time-varying
codes, I do not believe that I ever -- have seen a new method of generating them in '137.

Q And the provisional patent applications to which the '137 patent claims priority don't discuss any new ways of generating time-varying codes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Again, this is one of those things that $I$ was not asked to verify, and $I$ did not spend any great time looking for this. When I skimmed things, if there were such a disclosure, it's probably one that I would have skipped through rather quickly.

Q You are not aware of anything in the provisional patent applications, to which the '137 patent claims priority, that discloses new ways of generating time-varying codes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A Not that I recall sitting here today.
Q The ' 826 patent also does not discuss any new ways of generating time-varying codes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
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A I believe the specifications are, if not the same, then almost the same for these two. So the answer would be the same.

Q And you are not aware of the provisional patent applications to which the '826 patent claims priority discussing any new ways of generating time-varying codes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A Not as I'm sitting here today.
Q Neither the '137 patent nor the ' 826 patent discuss any inventive time v-a-r-y-i-n-g code, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Any what? I'm sorry.
Q Inventive.
A Inventive.
Q Yes.
A Time-varying code. What do you mean by that?
Q Any new time-varying code.
A They discuss the use of time-varying codes rather than the generation of the time-varying codes.

Q So would you agree with me, sir, that the ' 137 patent and the ' 826 patent don't disclose any time-varying code that did not already exist before 2006?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
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A They don't describe or disclose any that I'm aware of.

Q Time-varying codes are prior art to both the ' 137 and '826 patents, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And as of 2006, time-varying codes were known for use in authenticating one device to another, correct?

A Yes.
Q That's the way the SecurID token used -- was used?

A People sometimes phrase it differently. They would say that the time-varying code is used to authenticate a user to a back end.

Q Encryption techniques existed before 2006, correct?

A That is correct.
Q Encrypting data before transmitting it from one device to another was known before 2006 , correct?

A Yes.
Q And before 2006 -- strike that.
Before 2006, techniques to encrypt messages sent between two devices was known, correct?

A Yes.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
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Q Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include authentication information from the transmitting device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Would you please say the question again.
Q Sure. Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include authentication information from the transmitting device?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A These devices that we're speaking about here, there was no need to necessarily encrypt the outputs.

Are you asking in the context of the SecurID token and the publication.

Q No. I'm asking you about what was known in 2006 .

A Yes.
Q Okay. And my question to you is before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include authentication information from a transmitting device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes, it was.
Q And before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include information from the transmitting device that could be used to verify the identity of an
individual, correct?
A Yes.
Q And prior to 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include an encrypted account number from the transmitting device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I -- I cannot think of particular instances where the device would send an account number. Do you -- is there anything in particular that you are -have in mind?

Q Let me try it this way. Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include an encrypted bank account number or credit card number from the transmitting device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That's possible, yes.
Q And before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could include biometric information from the transmitting device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That's a -- that it was understood that one could communicate biometric information in an encrypted fashion.

Q Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could be used by the receiving device to
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authenticate the transmitting device, correct?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes.
Q Before 2006, it was known that encrypted messages could be used by the receiving device to authenticate the user of the transmitting device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A When you say "message," do you want to be more specific what you mean? I'm sorry.

Q The encrypted information. The encrypted data.

A The input to the encryption function?
Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q So before 2006, it was known that the input to the encrypted function could be used by the receiving device to authenticate the user of the transmitting device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes.
Q Are you familiar with the term "public key"?
A Public key?
Q Public key.
A Yes, I am.
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Q Thought you might be. What is it?
A It's a concept in cryptography where there is a pair of keys. One is referred to as the private key, and one is referred to as the private -- public key. The public key cannot be used to compute the private key. But it can be used to verify a computation performed using the private key. So, for example, one can compute what's called a digital signature using a private key and later verify it, this digital signature, using among other things, the public key. That is one application of this technology. But using the public key, one cannot construct this transcript that was constructed from knowledge of the private key. And when I say "cannot," I mean with a reasonable probability, within a reasonable amount of time.

Q Who is credited with having developed public and private key cryptography?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form, foundation.
A There is some disagreement about that. Some people that often get credited are Diffie and Hellman for describing one genial way of doing it.

Q Encryption techniques that used public keys were known before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q Are you familiar with the term, "key
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encryption key"?
A Yes.
Q Key encryption key is sometimes referred to as KEK; is that right?

A It's not a commonly used term, but it might be.

Q What is a key encryption key?
A So using public key cryptography, one can encrypt inputs of various types. Those can be stored, those ciphertexts, or they can be transmitted. And using the appropriate secret key, one can later decrypt it -- sorry -- using the appropriate private key, one can later decrypt these ciphertexts. That is somewhat computationally involved. For some applications, that is more overhead than the user wishes to see. In such applications, it would have been desirable to use a less computationally involved encryption method, which is what's referred to as a symmetric-key encryption technique. In a symmetric-key encryption technique, the same key is used for encryption and decryption, and, therefore, it doesn't have some of the properties in the public key encryption. But it is much faster. So a key encrypting a key relates to when one uses public key cryptography to encrypt a key that is a symmetric key. And the symmetric key is used to encrypt some other
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message. And one would decrypt that particular message by first decrypting the key, the symmetric key that was used, using the private key that is correspond to the public key.

Q So is a key encryption key an example of a symmetric key?

A Key encryption keys can be symmetric. I gave you an example in which the key encryption key is not symmetric.

Q Key encryption keys were known before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q For a key encryption key known before 2006, a person who wished to send an encrypted message would first encrypt the message with a session key, right?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A There's not necessarily an ordering. One would not have to do this first.

Q For a key encryption key known before 2006, a person wishing to send an encrypt -- encrypted message could first encrypt a message with a session key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Is the session key the symmetric key that $I$ mentioned before?
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Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q Then the session key in my example would be encrypted with a key encryption key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A You mean after that took place?
Q Yes.
A That one possibility.
Q And then both the session key encrypted message and the key encrypted -- key encrypted session key would be sent to the recipient, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Would you please say that again?
Q Sure. Both the session key encrypted message and the key encryption key encrypted session key would be sent to the recipient.

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A I need to parse this carefully. I agree to the first part that the message encrypted using the -what you call the session key would -- could be transmitted, if that's the purpose, of course.

Would you read the other part back to me?
Q Sure. The -- my question is both the session key encrypted message and the key encryption key encrypted session key would need to be sent to the
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recipient, correct?
```

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Did you say key encrypted key?
Q Key encryption key encrypted session key.
A Yes. Could be sent.
Q The recipients would have to know the key encryption key before receiving the session key encrypted message and the key encryption key encrypted session key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form; speculation.

A You have to say that slower. I'm so sorry.
Q No problem. The recipient would have to know the key encryption key before receiving the session key encrypted message and the key encryption key encrypted session key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A Before receiving -- did you say before receiving?

Q Yes.
A One could receive it without knowing.
Q If the recipient didn't know the key encryption key, the recipient would have to find out the key encryption key if the recipient wanted to decrypt the session key, correct?
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MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A In the example I gave before, the key encryption key is a -- is not a symmetric key but a private key. No. I'm sorry. Is a public key in the example I gave you before. The key encryption key is a public key in the example. And that would actually not, per se, have to be known in order to determine what you call a session key.

Q So is it your view that the recipient could decrypt the session key without the key encryption key in my example?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A The key encryption key in the example that you and I constructed together by merging my initial example with your follow-up of the example would be a public key. And one would not, per se, have to know the public key, even though it's knowable, in order to decrypt the message and obtain the session key.

Q How would you define a symmetric encryption key?

A A symmetric -- a symmetric session key?
Q Or a symmetric encryption key.
A Symmetric encryption key is one that is used in order to encrypt messages in a symmetric key algorithm where the same or a related key that can be
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derived from this key can be used to decrypt the same -the associated ciphertext.

Q Would you agree that before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not refer to the key encryption key as a public key?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Would not refer to the session -- the key encryption key?

Q Yes.
A I don't have any opinion about that.
Q Before 2006, would a person of ordinary skill in the art refer to the key encryption key as a private key?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That would not make sense.
Q If the key encryption key was a public key, it could not be used to both encrypt the session key and decrypt the session key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A When in a public key cipher, one uses a different key for encryption and decryption. One uses the private key for decryption.

Q So is the answer to my question correct?
A Would you say the question again?
Q Of course. If the key encryption key was a
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public key, it could -- it could not be used to both encrypt the session key and decrypt the session key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Assuming the session key is what is being encrypted and decrypted, that's correct. One uses a different key for decrypting in a public key cipher. (Deposition Exhibit 1 was marked for identification.)

Q Dr. Jakobsson, I've marked as Exhibit 1
Chapters 3 and 4 from RSA Security's Official Guide to Cryptography.

Do you have that before you?
A I do.
Q Are you familiar with the book "RSA Security's Official Guide to Cryptography"?

A I'm embarrassed to say that I'm not. I might have reviewed contents of it at some point, and I certainly recognize the concepts, but I don't recognize the cover or the authors.

Q Okay. If you could turn, please, to page 54 of Exhibit 1.

MR. KAERICHER: I'm going to raise an objection that the questions about this document are outside the scope of this declaration -- or of this
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deposition and also for foundation.
Can I have a standing objection so I don't
have to make any more?
MR. SELWYN: Sure. And I think they're within
the scope, at least in light of the motion to amend.
Q Do you have page 54 in front of you?
A Yes, I do. Let me take a quick look at it.
Q Of course.
A Yes, I have reviewed this page and portions of the next now.

Q And you see this page describes a key encryption key?

A Yes. I might add that the technique described in here are not commonly seen as secure.

Q Let's walk through, if we might, figure 3 point -- 3-1 together.

A Yes.
Q Figure 3-1 shows that a message is encrypted with a session key, correct?

A Yes.
Q And figure 3-1 also shows that the session -that the session key that the -- strike that.

Figure 3-1 also shows that the session key that encrypted the message is encrypted with a key encryption key, correct?
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A That seems likely to be what the figure says.
Q And in order to decrypt the session key encrypted message, someone who knows the key encryption key would decrypt the session key using the key encryption key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form;
speculation.
A In this case yes.
Q In order to decrypt the session key encrypted message in this case, the message could then be decrypted using the decrypted session key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That is correct.
Q For messages that are encrypted with asymmetric keys, a public key is used to encrypt messages. But a private key is used to decrypt the message, correct?

A That is correct.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
Q Are you familiar with hybrid cryptosystems?
A Yes, I am.
Q What is a hybrid cryptosystem?
A They use the encryption of a symmetric key using a public key. In order to convey a key to be used for an action later which may be the decryption of the
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large ciphertext that was constructed using the symmetric key.

Q Hybrid cryptosystems existed before 2006, correct?

A That is correct.
Q Hybrid cryptosystems existed at least in the 1990s, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; speculation.
A I do not know when they were first introduced.
Q A hybrid cryptosystem was a public key
encryption technique known before 2006, correct?
A That is true.
Q In a hybrid cryptosystem before 2006, a person wishing to send an encrypted message would first encrypt the message with a session key, correct?

A Not necessarily.
Q In a hybrid cryptosystem before 2006, a person wishing to send an encrypted message could first encrypt a message with a session key, correct?

A That's correct.
Q Then the session key would be encrypted with the recipient's public key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Are we speaking about the hybrid?
Q Yes.
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A Yes. So that is true. That is one way of doing it.

Q And both the session key encrypted message and the public key encrypted session key would then be sent to the recipient, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It could be, yes.
Q The recipient could then use his or her private key associated with his or her public key to decrypt the -- the session key, correct?

A Yes.
Q And then the recipient could decrypt the session key encrypted message with the session key to obtain the message, correct?

A That is correct.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
Q And, in that way, the message could be securely sent to a recipient, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes. It would be encrypted.
Q And prior to 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized hybrid encryption systems to be a form of public key encryption, correct?

A They would use public key encryption. I'm not sure they would be considered hybrid -- that they would
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be considered public key encryption.
Q The hybrid cryptosystem encryption technique
that I just walked through with you was known before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
MR. KAERICHER: We've been going for a little over an hour. So if you're about to transition, maybe this is a good --

MR. SELWYN: Sure. This is fine.
(A recess ensued from 10:02 a.m. to
10:11 a.m.)
(Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SELWYN:

Q All right. Dr. Jakobsson, I have handed you what has been marked as Exhibit 2, which is titled "An Introduction to Cryptography." Do you have that in front of you?

A Yes, I do.
Q Do you recognize this book?
A I know the book.
MR. KAERICHER: So I'll object to -- to this line of questioning also as outside the scope. Can I have a standing objection?

MR. SELWYN: Yes.
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Q Is this a book that you have reviewed or referenced before?

A I don't remember doing that.
Q Would you, please, turn to page 16, sir. Do you see in the second line on page 16, it says "PGP is a hybrid cryptosystem"?

A Yes, I do.
Q Do you agree that $P G P$ is a hybrid
cryptosystem?
A Yes, I do.
Q PGP existed before 2006, correct?
A Yes.
Q PGP was introduced in the early 1990s, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection speculation.
A I don't actually remember when it was introduced.

Q What is PGP?
A PGP allows encryption using public keys, and one of the algorithms it uses is the RSA cryptosystem. It doesn't use the now-familiar certification infrastructure but a web of trust in order to determine what public keys to associate with what parties.

Q Do you see on page 16, figure 1-4, which is entitled "How PGP Encryption Works"?
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A Yes.
Q Figure 1-4 shows that plaintext is encrypted with a session key, correct?

A I see that's what it says.
Q And figure $1-4$ shows that the session key that encrypted the plaintext is encrypted with a public key, correct?

A That's also what it says, yes.
Q Do you see the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 16 explains that in $P G P$, the session key encrypted ciphertext and the public key encrypted session key are transmitted to the recipient?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A What sentence did you refer to? I'm sorry.
Q I'm sorry. The last sentence of the third paragraph on page 16.

A So this public key encrypted session key is transmitted along with the ciphertext to the recipient.

Q Yes.
A Yes, I see that sentence.
Q And that sentence explains that in PGP the session key encrypted ciphertext and the public key encrypted session key are transmitted to the recipient, correct?

A Yes.
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Q Do you see agree that before 2006, PGP enabled the session key encrypted ciphertext and the public key encrypted session key to be transmitted to the recipient?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes.
Q Figure 1 -4 shows encrypting information with a first key called a "session key" and encrypting the first key with a second key called a "public key," correct?

A Yes.
Q And the information encrypted with the first key and the first key encrypted with the second key are transmitted to the recipient, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A In this example, yes.
Q And in this example, the first key is a session key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A As you mentioned it, the -- in your statement, it would have been the first key, yes.

Q And in this example, the first key encrypted with the second key is the public key?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A I think --
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Q Strike that. In my example, the second key is the public key, correct?

A Yes, I think so.
Q Let me hand you what's been previously marked as USR Exhibit 2008.

A Thank you.
Q Do you recognize this?
A Yes, I do.
Q What do you recognize it to be?
A This is one of the provisionals, I believe. I don't know which one. I recognize the images. It might be either the application that became '137 or the one that became 86 -- ' 826.

Q Could you please turn to page 49 of USR Exhibit 2008 .

A Yes.
Q And let me focus your attention, please, on lines 24 through 32. Let me know after you've had an opportunity to read that to yourself.

A Okay. Yes.
Q Lines 24 through 32 on page 49 describe a DES key, D-E-S?

A There's mention of a DES key, yes.
Q A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of USR Exhibit 2008 would have understood that the
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DES key described on page 49 would be a symmetric encryption key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes.
Q Page 49, lines 24 through 32 also describes a DES key encrypted biometric data field that is encrypted using the DES key, correct?

A Yes.
Q Page 49, lines 24 through 32 also explains that the DES key can be a PKI encrypted DES key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes.
Q That passage also explains that the key that encrypts a DES key is the public key of the first user, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A Let me just look at it again. That's what it says, yes.

Q A person of ordinary skill in the art reading USR Exhibit 2008 would have understood that the public key of the first user described in this passage would be an asymmetric key, correct?

A Yes.
Q Now, if you would, sir, turn to page 50. And

I'd like to focus your attention on lines 24 through 31. Let me know after you've had an opportunity to read that to yourself.

A Yes.
Q Page 50, lines 24 through 31 of this exhibit describes how to decrypt the PKI encrypted DES key described in page 49, lines 24 through 32, correct?

A That's what it looks like, yes.
Q Page 50, lines 28 through 31 of this exhibit explain that the PKI encrypted DES key is decrypted with the public key of the first user, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It said "The second wireless device uses the first public key to decrypt the PKI encrypted DES key at step 526."

Q So is it fair to say that lines 28 through 31 describe the PKI encrypted DES key being decrypted with the public key of the first user?

A It says that it uses the first public key to decrypt. It doesn't say how.

Q The PKI encrypted DES key is decrypted with the public key of the first user, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A That's what it says.
Q If the public key of the first user is an
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asymmetric key, then decrypting the PKI encrypted DES key with the same public key would not yield the DES key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A That's why I'm saying it's what it says, because $I$ believe that this is a typographical error in here. It should say "the private key of the second party."

Q Can you explain what the typographical error is that you believe?

A One would use a private key to decrypt an asymmetric encryption scheme, not a public key.

Q So, again, directing your attention to lines 28 through 31 on page 50, if the public key of the first user is an asymmetric key, then decrypting the PKI encrypted DES key with the same public key would not yield the DES key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A That's why I'm saying. A person of skill in the art reading this would understand that it's a typo because one does not decrypt using a public key. One decrypts using a private key.

Q So is it fair to say that page 49, lines 24 through 32 and page 50, lines 24 through 31 do not describe how the DES key can be encrypted in a way that
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could then be decrypted?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It's clear that there is a typo here because a person of skill in the art would know that one would decrypt using a private key, not a public key.

Q But based upon the words in page 49 and page 50, would you agree that they do not describe how the DES key can be encrypted in a way that could then be decrypted?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A So let me explain like this. If you were to give these two paragraphs to a person of skill in the art, say an engineer tasked with implementing a system, the engineer would say you must have made a typo here. One doesn't decrypt using the public key. And I understand what you mean, but you wrote the wrong word. And would then go ahead and implement the traditional hybrid encryption and decryption scheme.

Q So a person of ordinary skill in the art reading pages 49 and 50 would say they don't make sense as written, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A They would say there's clearly a typo here. I know what is being conveyed. It's conveyed the -- what we have referred to before as hybrid encryption and
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associated decryption and then would go about and say, if you want to do this, this should use a private key, of course.

Q You'd agree, though, that pages 49 and 50 don't make sense as written, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A They make sense in the regard that they give guidance to a person of skill in the art what was meant to convey. There would be no misunderstanding.

Now, if you take a person of skill in the art, that person has sufficient knowledge to know that one does not decrypt using a public key and would know that one decrypts using the corresponding private key. And so this person of skill in the art would explain that there's a mistake here, would not start attempting to decrypt using a public key.

Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that one known example of a public key encryption was a hybrid cryptosystem, correct?

A One example of what, I'm sorry?
Q Sure. Let me re-ask it. Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that one known example of a public key encryption system was a hybrid cryptosystem, correct?
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A I don't know if they would have called it like that and characterized it like you do. One would have understood -- a person of skill in the art at the time, would have understood that a hybrid cryptosystem has a public key component but would not necessarily qualify the entire system as a public key cryptosystem.

Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that decrypting a value encrypted using a hybrid cryptosystem would involve decrypting a session key with a private key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It doesn't have to be a session key. They would understand that in order to decrypt, the key used -- the symmetric key used in this context, one would need a private key. Or in the case that it's multilevels, it could be that one needs another symmetric key. But one would not use a public key, and a person of ordinary skill in the art reading that would know that.

Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that decrypting a value encrypted using a hybrid cryptosystem would involve decrypting a key with a private key, correct?

A Yes.
Q In 2,000 -- strike that.
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Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that decrypting a value encrypted using a hybrid cryptosystem would involve decrypting the value with a key, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A There would -- no, I wouldn't characterize it as such. You -- the value is the input to the cryptosystem. So you would not do what you said.

Q Could you turn to the '585 reference.
A Yes.
Q And if you would, please, turn to page 23.
A Yes.
Q You see that lines 9 through 11 on page 23 say, "In some embodiments, the verifier 105 decrypts a value encrypted by the user authentication device 120 using symmetric-key encryption or asymmetric encryption techniques such as public key encryption."

A Yes.
Q Those lines describe decrypting a value encrypted using public key encryption, correct?

A Yes.
Q Can you turn back to the ' 137 patents. And if you would, please turn to figure 23. Do you have figure 23 in front of you?

A Yes, I do.

Q Figure 23 shows various fields that can be included within first or second wireless signals, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I don't recall the exact context, but it shows a set of fields that would have been included in a signal.

Q The '137 patent refers to each of the elements 302, 304, 306, 308, 310, 312, and 314 as fields, correct?

A Yes.
Q And the ' 826 patent includes the same figure -- or -- strike that.

The '826 patent includes the same figure 23 as the '137 patent, correct?

A Yes.
Q Figure 23 shows some of these fields next to each other, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes, it does.
Q For example, header field 302 is next to
public ID field 304, correct?
A In this particular field, yes.
Q And in figure 23, public ID field 304 is next
to digital signature field 306 , correct?

## Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.

Conducted on March 20, 2019

A Yes.
Q Figure 23 shows the fields appended to each other, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It doesn't actually describe -- one would understand that that's one way of doing it.

Q Figure 23 shows each field joined to the end of each previous field, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It's not specific about this. They're separate fields.

Q The fields shown in figure 23 are separate, correct?

A These are separable fields.
Q So if the message were to be received in the form shown in figure 23, the receiving device could -could recover, for example, only field 302?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I don't think $I$ understand your question. It could only recover it? Or it could recover only that if it wished to?

Q The latter, if it wanted to just recover one of the fields, it could do so.

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I haven't asked -- been asked to consider that
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question.
Q So you don't know?
A It depends on what you mean. For example, by recovering the field, if the field is the 312 field that's encrypted biometric data, you could recover just that field. But if you mean by "recover" to actually get the biometric data, then one needs, in this example, another field.

Q If a message were to be received in the form shown in figure 23, the receiving device could recover each individual field separately, correct?

A Yes.
MR. KAERICHER: Object to form.
Q I believe you told me a moment ago that the fields shown in figure 23 are separable, correct?

A Yes.
Q What is it about how figure 23 is illustrated that demonstrates to you that the fields are separable?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Figure 23, by itself, may or may not describe that. Reading it with a specification makes it clear that these are values that are not combined, for example, in the sense that one cannot determine what a particular value is. So using the example you used, one could read the data in the header field, and so that
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has -- that is separate or separable from other fields.
Q So one of ordinary skill in the art reading
figure 53 together with the specification would know that the fields can be individually recovered after transmission, correct?

A Just a moment.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Did you say 53?
Q 23 .
A 23. I'm sorry.
Q Do you want the question again?
A Yes, please.
Q One of ordinary skill in the art reading figure 23 together with the specification would know that the fields can be individually recovered after transmission, correct?

A Yes. And by that, I mean that the party who receives it would be able to compute each one of these values and output those. No. Let me clarify that. Would be able to output those. There's no, necessarily, computation going on. But, for example, for the DES key encrypted biometric data, in order to output the biometric data, one would need the DES key.

Q Bear with me one second.
Okay. Can you turn to figure 7 in the
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' 137 patent.
A Let me take a quick look at it.
Q Take your time.
A Yes.
Q Can you also, please, look at column 17, lines 60 through 65 and read that to yourself.

A Yes.
Q According to column 17, line 61 of the '137 patent, figure 7 shows a method of using USR software 18 and USR database 24, correct?

A Yes. This gives one example of one use.
Q And that description also describes a user's electronic ID device, a merchant, and a credit card company, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
Q Let me rephrase it in light of the objection.
The description of figure 7 in the
'137 patent, beginning at column 17, line 61 and going through column 18, line 34 also describes a user's electronic ID device, a merchant, and a credit card company, correct?

A I'd need to review those paragraphs.
Q Go ahead.
A Just a moment, please.
What's your question? I'm sorry.
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Q The description of figure 7 in the '137 patent beginning at column 17, line 61, and extending through column 18, line 34, describes a user's electronic ID device, a merchant, and a credit card company, correct?

A Yes. This is an example that they describe.
Q And in figure 7, each of the user's electronic ID device, the merchant, the USR, and the credit card company is a separate device or operates on a separate device from the others, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It doesn't explicitly say so.
Q But you would understand it that way, correct?
A Yes. I would understand that that's one way of doing it.

Q In figure 7, each of the user's electronic ID device, the merchant, the USR, and the credit card company is a separate element from the other, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It doesn't explicitly say so, but I would understand that that's one possibility.

Q In figure 7 and the accompanying description on columns 17 and 18, the user of the electronic ID device presents a code to the merchant, right?

A That's the code from the SecurID, yes.
Q And to present a code to a different entity as
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described in columns 17 and 18, you would understand that the electronic ID device must be different from the merchant, correct?

A The person -- I'm sorry. Would you say that again.

Q Sure. To present a code to a different entity as described in the text in columns 17 and 18, the electronic ID device must be different from the merchant, correct?

A You mean, this -- the electronic device is not belonging to the merchant?

Q Yes.
A Are you asking about the SecurID now? I'm...
Q Figure 7.
A Figure 7, yes.
Q So let me back up.
A Yes.
Q In figure 7, the user of the electronic ID device presents a code to the merchant, correct?

A Yes.
Q And the user of the electronic ID device is different from the merchant, correct?

A Yes.
Q So if the electronic ID device and the merchant were implemented using the same physical
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device, the electronic ID device wouldn't have to present any code to the merchant, correct?

A It actually doesn't say that it presents it here in the figure. Do you have a place in mind in the text where it does?

Q Looking at figure 7, block 702 shows that the user of the electronic ID device presents a code to the merchant, correct?

A No. It says the user enters the secret code in SecurID.

Q Let me direct your attention, then, to column 17, lines 66, through column 18, line 4. Why don't you read that to yourself.

A Yes.
Q We can agree, can we not, that that text makes clear that the user of the electronic ID device presents a code to the merchant?

A It ends with saying "or otherwise presents the code to the merchant."

Q Right. So in figure 7, the user of the electronic ID device presents a code to the merchant, correct?

A But -MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.

A -- you referred to 702 for that.

Q No. Let me start over. Column 17, lines 66, through column 18, line 4 indicate that in figure 7, the user of the electronic ID device presents a code to the merchant, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And the user of the electronic ID device is different from the merchant, correct?

A In this particular example, I believe they are.

Q Turning back to figure 7. In step 704, a merchant transmits three things, a code from SecurID, a store number, and an amount of purchase to a credit card company, correct?

A Yes.
Q And then in step 706, the credit card company sends the code received from the SecurID to the USR, correct?

A It doesn't specifically say in this figure that it's the same code.

Q But that's the way you understand it to work, correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. If the code is valid in step 706, seven -- step 708 shows that the USR transmits a credit card number to the credit card company, correct?
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MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I don't understand what you say that in -it's -- it's valid in 706. I don't think that there is a verification of the validity in 706.

Q Step 708 shows that the USR transmits a credit card number to the credit card company, correct?

A Yes.
Q And it would only do that if a determination has been made that the code is valid, correct?

A Yes.
Q The specification at column 18, lines 13
through 34, also describes an embodiment where the USR sends a multidigit public ID code to the credit card company to map to the credit card number, correct?

A Yes.
Q And figure 8 shows another method of using USR software 18 and USR database 24, correct?

A Let me review that for a moment.
Q Have you reviewed figure 8?
A Yes.
Q Figure 8 shows another method of using USR software 18 and USR database 24, correct?

A Yes.
Q And in reaching your opinions for this matter, did you consider any differences between figures 7 and
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8?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Are you asking was I specifically asked to compare these figures?

Q Well, let's start with that.
A I was not asked to specifically compare figure 7 and figure 8.

Q And in reaching the opinions expressed in the declarations that you have signed for these -- the '137 and '826 IPRs, did you consider any differences between figures 7 and 8?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I did not go about it like that. I considered lots of material, and we can go to the list of material I did consider. As I'm sitting here, I do not recall specifically comparing these two. Instead, I was looking for -- to understand in general the disclosures.

Q Would you agree that figure 8 differs from figure 7, at least in that the merchant transmits the code from SecurID, store number, and amount of purchase to the USR in step 804 instead of to the credit card company?

A I agree with that.
Q And in step 806, the USR determines if the code is valid, correct?
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A That's what it says.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; vague. Sorry.
Form.
And just wait a second before you answer.
THE WITNESS: My apologies.
Q And in step 808, the USR transmits the credit card number, store number, and amount of purchase to the credit card company, correct?

A Yes, that's what it says.
Q If the embodiment of figure 8 were instead to use a multidigit public ID code as in figure 7, the USR would send that code to the credit card company, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A It doesn't say so. I haven't considered that question.

Q In the embodiments of figures 7 and 8, the USR performs the validation of the code in steps 708 and 808 respectively, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I don't think so. I think it's 708 and 806.
Q In the embodiments of figure 7 and 8, the USR performs the validation of the code in steps 708 and 806 respectively, correct?

A I think that's correct.
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Q In the embodiments of figures 7 and 8, the credit card company does not perform the validation of the code, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Now, when you're saying "the code," is that the code from the security?

Q Yes.
A And your question is whether the merchant validates the secure -- the SecurID code?

Q My question is in the embodiments of figures 7 and 8, the credit card company does not perform the validation of the code, correct?

A Can we take these one by one?
Q Sure.
A So it doesn't say that the merchant does anything to the code from the SecurID except sends it to the USR in 7 -- figure 7. And, of course, it receives it in some way.

Q So taking these one at a time, nothing in figure 7 suggests that the credit card company performs the validation of the code, correct?

A The code from the SecurID.
Q Right.
A It doesn't say so.
Q And nothing in figure 8 suggests that the
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credit card company performs the validation of the code, correct?

A Again, speaking of the SecurID code, it doesn't say so.

Q And to the best of your memory, nothing in the specification suggests that the credit card company performs the validation of the code, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I -- I really can't say that, sitting here today. I -- there may or may not be embodiments such.

Q Well, focusing your attention on column 17 beginning at line 60 through column 18, line 35, nothing in that text suggests that the credit card company performs the validation of the code, correct?

A Give me a moment, please.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A It doesn't say one way or the other.
Q A person of ordinary skill in the art looking at figure 7 and 8 in the accompanying text would understand that the device that performs the validation of the code in steps 708 and 806 must be different from the device that maps the multidigit public ID code to the credit card company, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Where's the mapping that you address? The
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figure doesn't mention the mapping here, I think. I -I don't see mapping performed in the figures.

Q Let me follow up on your answer. Can you turn to figure 23. Do you see in figure 23, the public ID field 304?

A Yes, I do.
Q The '137 patent nowhere describes the public ID field 304 being used to map to a credit card number of a user, correct?

A I haven't been asked to consider that.
Q You're not aware of any place that the
'137 patent describes the public ID field 304 being used to map to a credit card number of a user, correct?

A Sitting here --
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A -- right now, I do not, but I can look for it.
Q You're not aware of the provisional applications to which the ' 137 patent claims priority describing the public ID field 304 being used to map to a credit card number of a user, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I read the provisionals several weeks ago, and my goal was not to look for this. I wasn't asked particularly to look for that. I might have read something about it, but I would not remember that today.
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I'm sorry.
Q Would you agree that the public ID field 304 shown in figure 23 does not function in a similar way to the multidigit public ID code referenced at column 18, line 16 through 22?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I need to refresh my recollection about the public ID field. Do you know where to find information related to that?

Q You can look at whatever you'd like, but if it will help, you can look at column 3 -- 32 which describes figure 23.

A This only gives information on things it might comprise. It says, "Any of name information, a badge number, an employee number, an e-mail address, social security number, and the like of the first user."

So these are identifiers associated with a user.

Q Okay. Would you agree that the public ID field 304 shown in figure 23 does not function in a similar way to the multidigit public ID code referenced at column 18 in line 16 through 22?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I'm a little bit confounded by your question, because I'm not sure what you mean by "functions in the
same way." Do you, for example, mean to identify something?

Q The public ID field 304 functions differently than the public -- strike that.

The public ID field 304 in figure 23 functions differently than the multidigit public ID code referenced at column 18, lines 16 through 22, correct?

A I think that depends on how you frame it. Both are used to, for example, select a record. That's one possible way of doing it. Now, there might be differences as well as similarities. So unless you're being more specific, it's very difficult to respond.

Q What are the differences?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A So it doesn't speak of the differences here. I'm saying there could be differences.

Q What are the similarities?
MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A For example, it could be used to identify a record.

Q Anything else?
A Well, in -- in the example of figure 7, I believe, it's used to identify a credit card associated with a person; although it doesn't say so.

Q It nowhere says so, correct?
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A I beg your pardon?
Q It nowhere says so, correct?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I'm looking for it. Do you have a particular paragraph to...

Q I don't.
A It says that the -- this may be avoided by instant transmitting on approval a multidigit public ID code for the credit card holder, which the credit card company can map to the correct credit card number. So if you're asking, can one perform a similar action using the field public ID in 304, one could also perform a mapping with those. So it depends on -- your question is very general.

Q Okay. We -- I asked you a minute ago whether the '137 patent describes anywhere the public ID field 304 being used to map to a credit card number and user.

And your answer was?
A I'm say -- you're asking if it could be? That...

Q No. My question is, does the ' 137 patent describe -- does it say -- does it disclose the public ID field 304 being used to map to a credit card number by user?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
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A I don't know where, if it does.
Q Could you turn back to figure 23. Do you see figure 23 includes a digital signature 306 ?

A Yes.
Q Are you familiar with the digital signature 306 described in the ' 137 patent?

A In general, yes.
Q The '826 patent describes a similar digital signature of 306 as the ' 137 patent, correct?

A Yes, it does.
Q A person of ordinary skill in the art before 2006 would have known what a digital signature is, correct?

A Yes.
Q Digital signatures have existed since at least the 1990s, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Speculation.
A I don't know exactly the date, but yes.
Q X. 509 digital signatures have existed since at least the 1990s, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A Again, I -- I don't know the exact date, but yes, they are fairly old.

Q Certainly before 2006, correct?
A Yes, I believe so.
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Q You, yourself, wrote about digital signatures in your own articles before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q You wrote about digital signatures in your own patents before 2006, correct?

A I believe so, yes.
Q A person of ordinary skill in the art before 2006 would have known that digital signatures could be used to authenticate the generator of the digital signature, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Normally a digital signature is used to associate a public key in a potentially associated certificate with a message that is being sent.

Q Okay. Is it fair to say that before 2006, any person of ordinary skill in the art would have known that you could use a digital signature to authenticate the entity that generated the digital signature?

A That would be one potential use of it, yes.
Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that one purpose of generating a digital signature is to verify the device that generated it, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A What do you mean by verify the device?
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Q To confirm the authenticity of.
A That's -- would -- I would need more information to understand that question.

Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that one purpose of a digital signature is to verify that a device is what it purports to be, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A There are many aspects of being what you purport to be. What you would be able to verify is that a particular private key was used in association with an input by applying the associated public key. But the private key might reside in more one -- than one place, for example.

Q Do you know why digital signatures are called digital signatures?

A I could imagine that it is because it conveys the same or similar notion to a layman as a handwritten signature, that it associates an entity with, say, a contract; like, public key and private key become associated with an input to a digital signature algorithm.

Q In what way is a digital signature similar to a handwritten signature?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
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A That's very vague. So one way would be that it allows an association of some kind. In the case of the digital signature, it's all the public key and associated private key and potentially associated certificates to a message; whereas in the handwritten signature, of course, one could have a handwritten signature that associates the signer, the person, with the message that is being signed. It's a bit different, of course.

MR. KAERICHER: We've been going for an hour, so whenever you get to a good point.

MR. SELWYN: Yeah, this is good. Let's take a break.
(A recess ensued from 11:14 a.m. to
11:21 a.m.)
BY MR. SELWYN:
Q Dr. Jakobsson, before the break, we were talking about digital signatures. Do you remember that?

A Yes, I do.
Q Okay. Before 2006, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have understood that forming a digital signature would require information to be encrypted and a private or secret key, correct?

A No.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
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Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that the digital signature is formed by encrypting the data with the private or secret key, correct?

A No.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
Just wait a second.
THE WITNESS: My apologies.
Q When one device sends a digital signature to another device, a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that this digital signature is sent for verification purposes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I'd say that a person of skill in the art would understand that one could verify certain things, given the digital signature having access to the appropriate information. Whether that's the purpose, I don't want to speculate on.

Q A digital signature serves no purpose if it is never sent to another device for verification, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I disagree with that.
Q A digital signature can be verified because only those having the signer's private key can create an encrypted message content for the expected data,
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correct?
A I disagree.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection.
Q Okay. Let me hand you what has been -previously been marked as Exhibit 1115. Do you recognize this?

A Yes.
Q What do you recognize it to be?
A This is a patent application that $I$ have referred to as the Schutzer application and at least one of my declarations.

Q And we'll understand each other today if I refer to this as the Schutzer -- as the Schutzer reference?

A Yes, I do.
Q Could you turn, please, to page 5, column 7 of the Schutzer reference?

A Yes.
Q And if I could direct your attention to lines 18 through 36.

A Just a moment, please.
Yes.
Q Lines 18 through 36 describe sending a card number and a secret PIN or password or hash of a PIN or password from the user's computing device 10 to an
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issuing bank 8, correct?
A Yes, it does.
Q The issuing bank 8 issued the bank or credit card, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I would presume that's one of the ways to use this.

Q This passage also discloses sending additional information such as digital signatures to the issuing bank, correct?

A Yes.
Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that upon receipt of a digital signature, the issuing bank 8 would then verify that digital signature, correct?

A Rather, it could verify it.
Q That would be the purpose of the issuing bank having been sent the digital signature, correct?

A Not necessarily.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It could be another party that would verify the digital signature under some context. I would have to review more material in Schutzer in order to determine whether this digital signature would be verified by the issuing bank.
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Q But we can agree that before 2006 , a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that upon receipt of a digital signature, the issuing bank 8 could then verify that digital signature, correct?

A Yes.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That said, this paragraph doesn't say so.
Q Could you put back in front of you the
'137 patent.
A Yes.
Q If I could direct your attention, please, to column 30 of the '137 patent beginning at line 51.

A Just a moment please.
Q More particularly, I'm going to ask you questions about lines 51 through 62.

A Okay. Thank you. Yes.
Q The passage on column 30 from lines 51 through line 62 describe part of a periodic communication process between a first device and a secure database, correct?

A Yes, it does.
Q And in that communication process, the first device periodically communicates with the secure database after the first user authenticates his or herself to the second device, correct?
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A Let me take a look at that again.
Q Yep.
A That's one example they give up.
Q If the first device successfully communicates with the secure database after expiration of the periodic interval, the data remains on the first device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Would you read that question back to me, please?

Q Sure. If the first device successfully communicates with the secure database after expiration of the periodic interval, the data remains on the first device in this description, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A It doesn't say so.
Q Would you agree that one of ordinary skill in the art reading this passage in column 30 from lines 51 through 62 would understand if the first device successfully communicates with the secure database after expiration of the periodic interval, the data remains on the first device?

A What it actually says is, "If the first device does not communicate with a secure database at such periodic intervals at step 208, then the first device
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can be configured to delete any or a portion of this data storage in memory at step 206."

So it speaks of deleting something as a -- as
a result of not communicating.
Q If the first device does not check in with the secure database after expiration of the periodic interval, the first device deletes data on the first device, correct?

A That's what it says here.
Q And that deletion of the data on the first device occurs automatically, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A What do you mean by "automatically"?
Q Well, if the communication does not occur in the periodic interval, the deletion of data on the first device happens regardless of the first user's input, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That would be my understanding, yes.
Q If a user doesn't want to delete the data, the user should simply authenticate him or herself to the first device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That would not be sufficient. You would also have to have the communication.
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Q If the user successfully authenticated him or herself to the first device, the data would not be deleted, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I don't think it speaks of that. It says that "If the first device does not communicate with the security database at such periodic intervals at step 208, then the first device can be configured to delete any or a portion of the data stored in the memory at step 206."

Q Well, would you agree that if the user wanted to delete the data, the first user could simply skip the authentication step, and the first device would automatically delete the data at the expiration of the periodic interval?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A It's a peculiar question to me because I don't think necessarily the user is aware of the data that is being deleted or not. So I don't know if the intent of the user is a meaningful part of the question here.

Would you rephrase it without the user in mind so that I understand what you're really asking.

Q Well, look at -- look at column 30, lines 51 through 53.

A Yes.
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Q You see the reference there to automatic deletion?

A Yes.
Q And that's automatic deletion of data, correct?

A Yes.
Q Would you agree that this passage discloses that the deletion of data on the first device occurs automatically?

A Under some conditions, yes.
Q And because this deletion is automatic under some conditions, the first device would have no way of stopping this deletion without authenticating the first user and communicating with a secure database, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A That's not what it says.
Q If the user wants to intentionally delete the data, there's nothing in the patent that explains what the first device or the secure database can do to stop it, correct?

A See, the reason I don't understand your question is that I'm not sure that the user is aware of the data being deleted or not. So when you're speaking about the wishes of the user, for example, the user might not know the time interval and when it expires and
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would not understand how the technology works. So the user's wishes might be rather irrelevant in this context.

Can we -- would I -- could I please ask you to ask the question without the user's intent in mind so I understand what you're asking?

Q If it's desired to intentionally delete the data of the first user, there's nothing in the patent that explains what the first device or the second -- or the secure database can do to stop it, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That's not what this paragraph speaks of. It doesn't give an answer to your question. For example, if it's desired not to delete the data, maybe the data is stored in another way and not in this way. For example, say that there's data that should not be deleted. The software would be configured so to exclude the -- this from deletion. The deletion is a desired aspect.

Q Let me ask you this. The concept of deletion of data doesn't appear anywhere in the ' 137 patent other than from column 30, line 51 through column 31, line 18 and associated figure 22A, correct?

A I really don't know that, but I could review it with that in mind and see if $I$ could find instances
of deletion elsewhere.
Q Well, as you sit here today, based upon all the work that you've done in this case, can you tell me whether the concept of deletion of data appears anywhere in the '137 patent other than from column 30, line 51 through column 31, line 18 in figure 22A?

A I cannot. But I also would not have been able to pinpoint a location that it did speak about it. I just know that it's in the disclosure, and I don't know the locations. So I appreciate you pointing me to it, but I don't know whether it's also in other places.

Q There's nothing in the 137 patent that explains how the first device or the second device would discern intentional or unintentional deletion of data from the first device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I do not know of such a description. But then again, this is not what $I$ was asked to look for and to understand. So if there is one, I would be embarrassed to say that I might very well have overlooked it and not -- not understood its significance.

Q Let me ask you some questions about what's claimed in the '137 patent. The '137 patent claims generally relate to verifying an account holder's identity, correct?
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A To --
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I'm sorry. To do what?
Q The '137 patent claims generally relate to
verifying an account holder's identity, correct?
MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A I don't think they use those exact words. One aspect is to authenticate a user.

Q The verification that's described in the '137 patent is used to enable a transaction, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A The goal, of course, is to enable or not enable a transaction. But, of course, there's much more to it than just that.

Q And the patent describes verifying an account holder's identity based on codes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Would you draw me to the patent and the limitation -- the patent claim and the limitation that says this because I just want to make sure that $I$ use the right words.

Q Well, is it correct or not that the '137 patent describes verifying an account holder's identity based on codes?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
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A So maybe it's my shortcomings here, because I don't remember exact phrases very well. And -- and I don't know if that particular phrase is here in the -in the claim language. If you have a particular portion of the claim that you want to point me to, it's much easier for me to accurately describe.

Q Okay. Let me ask you to keep in mind the claimed invention of the '137 patent. Are you familiar with that?

A Yes.
Q Okay. The claimed invention of the
'137 patent involves verifying an account holder's identity based on codes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A But you're asking me about the claim language, right?

Q Let me ask you a new question. Okay?
A Yes.
Q The '137 patent describes verifying an account holder's identity based on codes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Yes.
Q The ' 137 patent describes verifying an account holder's identity based on information related to an account holder, correct?

# Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D. 

Conducted on March 20, 2019

A Yes.
Q The '137 patent relates to verifying an
account holder's identity, correct?
A Do you mean to verify that there's an authentic transaction?

Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q The '137 patent is generally directed to the idea of verifying an account holder's identity to enable a transaction based on codes, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A When you say a transaction based on codes, what do you mean?

Q Let me rephrase the question. The '137 patent is generally directed to the idea of verifying an account holder's identity to enable a transaction based on codes or information related to an account holder, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes.
Q And the verification that's described in the '137 patent is used to enable a transaction, correct?

A That's one of the things.
Q Okay. Can you put back in front of you the
'585 reference?
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A Yes.
Q Let me direct your attention, please, to paragraph 3.

A Just a moment, please.
Yes.
Q In paragraph 3, the 585 reference states that, existing, quote, security systems can use one or more of several factors alone or in combination to authenticate identities. Correct?

A Yes.
Q And the last sentence of paragraph 3 lists three examples of factors, including something that the entity knows, something that the entity -- something the entity is, or something that entity has, correct?

A Yes.
Q And these factors are used to authenticate entities, correct?

A Yes.
Q An entity can be a user, correct?
A Yes.
Q Paragraph 4 of the '585 reference provides examples of, quote, something than an entity knows that can be used to authenticate a user. Correct?

A Let me take a look.
Q Yep.
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A Yes.
Q The first sentence of paragraph 4 describes a, quote, code word, password, personal identification number, PIN, as examples of something an entity knows. Correct?

A Yes.
Q Paragraph 4 also explains that a code word, password, and personal identification number PIN are used to authenticate the identity of the entity, correct?

A Yes.
Q Paragraph 4 also explains that these values are kept secret, correct?

A Where does it say that?
Q Second sentence, third sentence.
A Oh, of a secret, yes. It -- it's referred to as a secret. It doesn't say that it's kept secret. There are -- there are many secrets that aren't kept secret.

Q One of ordinary skill in the art reading paragraph 4 would understand that these values are kept secret, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A That's the best way of doing it.
Q The '585 reference discloses authenticating a
user based on a secret PIN, correct?

A Yes.
Q And PIN-based authentication was known before 2006, correct?

A That's correct.
Q PIN-based authentication has existed since at least the '60s or '70s, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Speculation.
A I would not know. I'm sorry.
Q PIN-based authentication has existed at least

```
since the 1980s?
```

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A I -- I believe you're right.
Q Let's turn to paragraph 5.
A Just a moment please.
Q Why don't you take a moment to read that to yourself.

A Yes.
Q Paragraph 5 describes, quote, examples of something the entity is. Correct?

A Yes.
Q And paragraph 5 lists examples such as physical, biological, and physiological characteristics, correct?

A Yes.
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Q Paragraph 5 lists fingerprints, handwriting, eye retina patterns as examples, correct?

A Those are three examples, yes.
Q Fingerprints, handwriting, eye retina patterns are examples of biometric information, correct?

A Yes.
Q The second-to-last sentence in paragraph 5 reads, quote, The verifier typically can observe the characteristic and compare the characteristic to records that associate the characteristic with the entity.

Did I read that right?
A Yes, you did.
Q That sentence is describing a biometric authentication, correct?

A Yes.
Q Biometric authentication was known before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q Turning back to paragraph 3.
A Of '585?
Q We're still at the '585 reference.
A Okay.
Q In paragraph 3, the 585 reference states that existing, quote, Security systems can use one or more of several factors alone or in combination to authenticate
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entities.
Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q When the '585 reference says that secure
systems can use one or more factors in combination,
those factors include personal identification numbers,
PINs, correct?

A Yes.
Q When the '585 reference says that secure systems can use one or more factors in combination, those factors include biometric information, correct?

A Yes.
Q It was known before 2006 that authentication could be based on the use of a PIN and biometric information, correct?

A You mean in conjunction?
Q Yes.
A I think so.
Q The '585 reference discloses combining the use of a PIN with biometric information, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes.
Q The '585 reference discloses combining the use of a PIN with biometric information to authenticate a user, correct?
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MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A That's somewhat simplified, but the -- what you're saying are parts of the components.

Q So is the answer correct?
A Would you re- --
Q Sure.
A -- restate the question?
Q The '585 reference discloses combining the use of a PIN with biometric information to authenticate a user, correct?

A Yes.
Q It was known before 2006 that PINs and biometric information could be combined to authenticate a user, correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Could you turn, please, to
paragraph 59.
A 59 ?
Q 59.
A Just a moment, please.
Yes.
Q The first sentence of paragraph 59 says "a first authentication of user 110 is performed by the user authentication device 120." And it continues, correct?
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A Yes.
Q This sentence describes local authentication, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It doesn't actually specify that it's local, but one way of doing it would be local authentication.

Q One of ordinary skill in the art reading that sentence would understand that it's disclosing local authentication, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A A person of skill in the art would have recognized that that's certainly an option.

Q And the '585 reference discloses local authentication, correct?

A Yes, it does.
Q Local authentication was known before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q Later in the same paragraph, paragraph 59, it says, quote, If the first authentication is successfully verified by the authentication device 130, the device 120 generates an identity authentication code which is verified by the verifier 105.

A I think it says something slightly similar but not quite. I see the paragraph I think you have in

## Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.

Conducted on March 20, 2019
mind.
Q Did I misread it?
A I -- I think you said 130, and I don't see that being mentioned here. Do I have another paragraph that I'm looking it?

Q Oh, I misread it.
A Okay.
Q Let me try it again because that was not my intent.

Do you see the sentence in paragraph 59 that reads "If the first authentication is successfully verified by the authentication device 120, the device 120 generates an authentication code which is verified by the verifier 105"?

A I see the sentence.
Q That sentence is describing remote authentication, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A It describes a part of what could be used for remote authentication.

Q The '585 reference discloses remote authentication, correct?

A That's correct.
Q Remote authentication was known before 2006, correct?
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A Yes.
Q And combining local and remote authentication was known before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q Combining local and remote authentication is prior art to the '137 patent, correct?

A Yes.
Q Credit cards are used for financial transactions, correct?

A Yes.
Q Is a credit card transaction an example of a financial service?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I -- I have not thought of it in that sense. Financial service seems like it's a slightly different thing for me, to service related to the financial transaction.

Q A credit card transaction is a service related to a financial transaction, correct?

A A credit card transaction is related to
financial service.
Q Credit card -- I'm sorry.
Can you turn -- strike that.
The '585 reference discloses an authentication
system, correct?
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A That is correct.
Q Can you turn, please, to paragraph 37 of the
'585 reference?
A Did you say 37?
Q I did.
A Just a moment, please.
Yes.
Q The first sentence of paragraph 37 indicates that figure 1 shows authentication system 100 , correct?

A Yes. Let me just look at figure 1 for a moment, please.

Yes. I remember this.
Q Authentication system 100 is used to help securely authenticate the identity of exemplary user 110 according to paragraph 37, correct?

A I think 100 refers to the entire architecture here, including the user. Did I misunderstand your question?

Q I think we're saying the same thing, but let me ask the question again.

Authentication system 100 is, quote, used to help securely authenticate the identity of exemplary user 110, correct?

A Yes.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
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Q Can you turn, please, to paragraph 39.
A Yes.
Q Paragraph 39 indicates that authentication can result in, quote, providing access or privileges, taking action, or enabling some combination of the two, correct?

A Yes.
Q And it also discloses that "Access includes access to such services as financial services," correct?

A Now, you have to remember in this context, Jakobsson or '585 describes what we might call a "password substitute." So just like you could log in to your bank with a password -- user name and password, '585 describes that you could log in with a user name and this type of code. So it is not performing the transaction, financial transaction. It's pretty much a gatekeeper mechanism. It allows people to be verified for whatever purpose. The purpose could be to enter a building. It could be to log in to your online bank.

Q I guess that's -- that wasn't my question. So for the record, I will move to strike.

I'm focusing your attention on the second sentence of paragraph 39. Okay?

A Yes.
Q And that sentence begins "access includes,"

## Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.

Conducted on March 20, 2019
correct?
A Yes.
Q And then it identifies various forms of access, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And one of the forms of access that's included is access to such services as financial services, correct?

A So the reason I clarified before was to distinguish it from other financial services we might talk about. Here, it's described as a gatekeeping instead of a password. '585 is a password replacement system. So when it says that access to such services, financial services, you should imagine what a password would do and then think that this has additional features that are beneficial; namely, that if the code that is exposed -- if a code is exposed, it can't be used later on like a password would.

Q I'm just asking you right now what the words say. It says, "Access includes access to such services as financial services and records," correct?

A In the sense of logging in to services, such as an online bank, for example, it would allow the user to be verified with a user name and a code instead of a user name and a password.
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 Conducted on March 20, 2019Q So, then, can we agree that the authentication system described in the '585 patent can be applied to a financial transaction?

A That's a little bit vague. It can be applied for you to gain access to any kind of service. It's instead of a password that you would use this; so for example, in combination with a user name and a code. In this case, instead of a user name and a password, you can gain access to any online service or offline, for that matter, one of which might be, say, your bill payment. It's for the case of '585, it doesn't matter what the service is.

Q So one service could be a credit card, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A What does it mean with the service being a credit card?

Q A credit card transaction, correct?
A Still, it's a little bit unclear to me what you mean as a credit card transaction is not something that you have a gatekeeping of this kind to. I don't understand your question, maybe.

The example that we had in mind when we wrote this would be that you would log in into your bank, and at your bank, of course, once you logged in, you know
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that you could perform various actions. You could look at your accounts. You could look at transaction history. But that is orthogonal to what is described in '585.

Q Okay. You -- if I understand you right, the authentication system described in the '585 reference can be used to gain access to any service online or offline, for that matter, correct?

A So let me qualify that. The services we're speaking of is -- that it gains access to is in -- in the same way that a password would gain you access to it. So if you think about a service that would have a user name and a password being verified, '585 describes that instead of that, you could use a user name and a code as described in here, the authentication code.

Q Okay. Let's see if we can -- let me just ask you whether you agree or disagree with some things.

A credit card transaction is a type of financial service, correct?

A It's not the kind of financial service that we had in mind here. You don't log in to a credit card transaction. So this is for logging in.

Q You have never logged in to perform a credit card transaction?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
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A Are you asking me if $I$ log in to a site and at that site, I perform a credit card transaction?

Q That would be an example.
A But that would be -- the logging in would be an independent step. It would not be part of the performing the transaction there. It's just like you wouldn't say you've never used a password to perform a transaction. You -- you give the password in order to be verified, and, later, whatever functionality is given, you might use.

Q Is it your opinion that a person of ordinary skill in the art in 2000 -- let me ask it this way.

In 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a financial service could include a financial transaction, correct?

A Not in this context. So, here, it speaks of logging in to a financial service, such as your bank.

Q But my question is not directed to the reference --

A Okay.
Q -- the '585 reference. I'm just asking you right now about what a person of ordinary skill in the art would know in 2006. Do you have that in mind?

A Please ask your question again, and I'll think about it generally and not in context of '585.
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Q A person of ordinary skill in the art in 2006 would understand that a financial service could include a financial transaction, correct?

A Some financial services would involve financial transactions. But the same person would also recognize that those were not the ones that were described in the context of paragraph 39.

Q A person of ordinary skill in the art in 2006 would understand that an ATM transaction is a kind of financial service, correct?

A Likewise, they would understand that whereas it is a financial service, it's not the kind of financial service that we're describing here.

Q A person of ordinary skill in the art in 2006 would understand that a credit card transaction is a kind of financial service, correct?

A They would understand that a credit card transaction is part of a financial service, but they would not understand that in the context given in paragraph 39.

Q Before 2006, there were financial institutions, like banks, whose websites allowed a user to access the user's account information, correct?

A I believe that to be true.
Q The website of a financial institution before
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2006 -- strike that.
There were financial institutions before 2006 whose websites allowed users to perform financial transactions, correct?

A Yes.
Q A person of ordinary skill in the art reading the '585 reference in 2006 would understand how you could apply the disclosed authentication system to a credit card transaction, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I haven't thought about that. The reason is that this speaks of access rather than the action of performing a credit card transaction.

Q So you haven't thought one way or the other about whether a person of ordinary skill in the art reading the '585 reference in 2006 would understand how to apply the disclosed authentication system to a credit card transaction, correct?

A I -- of course, I know some ways in which a person of skill in the art would interpret this. It would -- the person of skill in the art would understand that the -- the authentication here is in place of a user name and password. That's the context of the application. So the person of skill in the art would recognize that wherever you normally log in by giving a
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user name and password, this would be relevant. And it's relevant in the sense that it replaces the use of a password. Instead, a user would input this code that is given on the device.

Q Okay. So can we agree that a person of ordinary skill in the art in 2006 reading the '585 reference would understand how the authentication system that's described in the reference could be applied to a credit card transaction?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A This does not describe credit card transactions. It describes access. So the access is, for example, like logging into your bank. If they had in mind that you would go in and look at a credit card transaction at your bank, is that what you're asking?

Q I don't think so. My question is a little bit different. My question is a person of ordinary skill in the art in 2006, reading and understanding the '585 reference, would understand how the authentication system that's described in the reference could be applied to a credit card transaction, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Maybe I misunderstand your question, because I'm thinking that a credit card transaction, as a person of skill in the art would understand it in the time
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frame, would be that you present a merchant with your credit card.

But this is different. This is, instead, presenting a user name and some information instead of a password to a website, for example, in order for that entity to verify that it likely corresponds to you.

Q So is it your view that a person of ordinary skill in the art reading the '585 reference in 2006 would have no understanding of how to apply the disclosed authentication system to a credit card transaction?

A I haven't given this any thought before. It's an interesting question. I -- I think that the person of skill in the art would primarily think of a credit card transaction in the traditional sense. And the traditional sense of thinking about a credit card transaction would be to perform the transaction whereas this is to gain access.

So if you were to ask could I log in and look at my bank statement, that would be a natural thing. But the application here in front of us describes the logging in part, not the looking at the statement.

Q Let me direct your attention back to paragraph 39. Do you see in the second sentence it says "access includes without limitation"?
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A Yes, I do.
Q Can you explain your understanding of the words "without limitation"?

A So it means that the access one is granted or not granted here could be to a physical location or -and there's an -- a list of examples here. The examples here correspond to things that you either would or not would get access to in a system that were to use a user name and password, for example.

Q You use the words "without limitation" in paragraph 39 to indicate to one of ordinary skill in the art that the examples that are listed are not intended to be limiting, correct?

A In the context of the application, of course.
MR. SELWYN: Why don't we take our lunch break.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
(A recess ensued from 12:11 p.m. to
12:51 p.m.)
(Mr. Guledjian is not present.)
BY MR. SELWYN:
Q Good afternoon, Dr. Jakobsson.
A Good afternoon.
Q Dr. Jakobsson, systems existed before 2006 to protect against fraudulent transactions using a stolen
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device, correct?
A Are you saying that the fraudulent
transactions used stolen device?
Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q Systems existed before 2006 that used
time-varying codes to protect against fraudulent transactions, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection.
A In general, yes.
Q Systems existed before 2006 that enabled a
local device to authenticate using both biometric information and secret information from the user, correct?

A When you say "local device," what do you mean?
Q The device that a user has.
A Okay. Yes.
Q Systems existed before 2006 that involved handheld devices that wirelessly communicated with a second device, correct?

A In general?
Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q Systems existed before 2006 that authenticated users using just a handheld device, correct?
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MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A What's the question again?
Q Systems existed before 2006 that authenticated users using just a handheld device, correct?

A When you say using just a handheld device, what do you mean? Nothing else?

Q Yes.
A No, I wouldn't agree with that characterization.

Q Systems existed before 2006 that authenticated users using just the handheld device and secret information of the user, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A There would be much more things needed than just a handheld device and a secret of the user.

Q Systems existed before 2006 that authenticated users using a handheld device and a second device, correct?

A When you say "and a second device," what's the role of the second device?

Q Could be just a second device.
A So the user has both a first and a second device? Or --

Q No. Somebody else has a second device.
A Okay. And where is the -- where are the
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various actions taking place in your question?
Q Remote from the user.
A Okay. So there is an authentication. Would you ask the question again.

Q Sure. Sure. Systems existed before 2006 that authenticated users using a handheld device and a second device, correct?

A Yes.
Q And systems existed before 2006 that authenticated users on a second device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A When you say "authenticated users on a second device," do you mean that the user somehow used the second device or that the verification took place on the second device?

Q The latter.
A Would you ask -- I'm sorry. Would you ask the question again to make sure --

Q Yes. Systems existed before 2006 that authenticated users on a second device, correct?

A The reason I am hesitant with this question is that it's easy to misunderstand. Would you paraphrase it so that there's no risk for misunderstanding.

Q I'll try. Systems existed before 2006 that authenticated users who were using a local device on a
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second device?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A What I have a hard time with is on a second device, what does that relate to? I mean there are many portions of your sentence that it could potentially relate to.

Q Can you turn to what's been previously been marked as USR Exhibit 210 [sic].

A I don't think I have that. I'm sorry.
Q It should be in your --
MR. KAERICHER: It's in there somewhere.
A Is it 2010? No.
Q 2010. Yes.
A Then I have it. Yes. Yes.
Q Okay. You have Exhibit USR 2010 in front of you?

A I do.
Q Can you turn, please, to paragraph 89.
A Just a moment, please.
Yes.
Q Exhibit 2010 is your declaration submitted in connection with an IPR for the '137 patent, correct?

A Yes.
Q And then paragraph 89 of your declaration, you testify, quote, In my opinion, the commercial success of

## Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.

Conducted on March 20, 2019
the claimed inventions was directly tied to the -- was directly tied to the benefits of the claimed inventions, parentheses, e.g., increased security and ease of deployment. Correct?

A Yes.
Q Your declaration, Exhibit 2010, does not cite any technical documents that show how Apple Pay works, correct?

A That's correct.
Q None of your declarations cite any technical documents that show how Apple Pay works, correct?

A Are you speaking of the documents in front of me today?

Q Yes.
A None of them describe how Apple works.
Q Your declaration, Exhibit 2010, does not cite any statement by Apple about how Apple Pay works, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And none of the declarations that you have prepared in connection with the ' 137 or ' 826 patents cite any statement by Apple about how Apple Pay works, correct?

A By Apple?
Q Yes.
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A I'm not -- would you break down the question. I'm sorry.

Q You have in front of you --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- six declarations that you submitted in connection with the '137 and '826 IPRs, correct?

A Yes.
Q None of those declarations cite any statement of Apple about how Apple Pay works, correct?

A That's my understanding.
Q Your declaration that we've marked as Exhibit -- strike that.

Your declaration marked as Exhibit 2010 does not explain how Apple Pay works, correct?

A Right.
Q None of the declarations that you have submitted for the '137 or '826 patents explain how Apple Pay works, correct?

A Right.
Q Your declaration, Exhibit 2010, does not compare any claims of the ' 137 or $' 826$ patents to any Apple product or service, correct?

A That is correct.
Q None of the declarations that you have submitted in connection with the ' 826 or '137 IPRs
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compare any claims of the ' 137 or ' 826 patents to any Apple product or service, correct?

A That is correct.
Q Exhibit 2010, your declaration does not map any claim terms from the '137 or '826 patent to any Apple Pay features, correct?

A Correct.
Q None of the declarations that you have submitted in connection with the '137 or '826 IPRs maps any claim terms to Apple Pay features, correct?

A I was not asked to do that.
Q Exhibit 210, your declaration does not compare any claims of the '137 or ' 826 patents to any Visa product or service, correct?

A Again, I wasn't asked to do that.
Q You have submitted no declarations in connection with the IPRs for the '137 or '826 patents that compare claims of the ' 137 or $' 826$ patents to any Visa product or service, correct?

A The IPRs probably do not need to do that, right?

Q Is the answer, correct?
A I have not, yes.
Q Your declaration marked as Exhibit 2010 does not cite any technical documents that show how Visa
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Checkout works, correct?
A That is correct.
Q None of the declarations that you have submitted in connection with the ' 826 or '137 IPRs cites any technical documents that show how Visa Checkout works, correct?

A I was not asked to do that.
Q Your declaration marked as Exhibit 2010 does not explain how Visa Checkout works, correct?

A Again, I was not asked to do that.
Q And your declaration does not explain how Visa Checkout works, correct?

A Again, $I$ was not asked to do that either.
Q And therefore your declaration doesn't explain it?

A I was not asked to do it, so I didn't do it.
Q None of the declarations that you have submitted in connection with the ' 826 or ' 137 IPRs explains how Visa Checkout works, correct?

A Again, I was not asked to do that; so there was absolutely no reason to do it.

Q Your declaration, Exhibit 2010, does not compare any claims of the ' 137 or $' 826$ patents to any Visa product or service, correct?

A Since I wasn't asked to do it, correct, I was
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not doing it.
Q And you have submitted no declaration in connection with any IPR for the ' 137 or ' 826 patents that compares any claims of the ' 137 or ' 826 patents to any Visa product or service, correct?

A There was no request to do that.
Q And therefore the declarations do not?
A I did not write about things that I was not asked to write about.

Q Okay. Your declaration, Exhibit 2010, does not identify any USR products or services that practice the '137 or '826 patents, correct?

A Again. I wasn't asked to do that.
Q So is the answer, correct?
A That is correct.
Q And your declaration, Exhibit 2010, doesn't identify any USR products or services, correct?

A I do not believe I do for the simple reason that I was not asked to do that.

Q None of the declarations that you have prepared in connection with the ' 137 or ' 826 patents identify any USR products or services, correct?

A For the simple reason that $I$ was not asked to do that.

Q And the answer to my question is correct?
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A It -- what you're saying is correct. I did not do that because $I$ was not asked to.

Q None of the declarations that you summitted in connection with the '826 or '137 IPRs identify any evidence that $U S R$ has ever made any money from the '137 or '826 patents, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I have not been asked to look into this and haven't considered it. Therefore, it's not in the declaration.

Q None of the declarations that you submitted in connection with the '826 or '137 IPRs identifies any evidence that USR has ever licensed the '137 or '826 patents, correct?

A I do not know whether they have or not, and I was not asked to consider that.

Q None of the declarations that you submitted in connection with the '826 or '137 IPRs evaluate or analyze the features or functionality of Apple Pay or Visa Checkout, correct?

A They did not, as I was not asked to do that.
Q Would you put in front of you the
'585 reference.
A '585. Yes. I got it.
Q Did you ever ask to speak with Ken Weiss in
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connection with your engagement on the IPRs for the '826 or '137 patents?

MR. KAERICHER: Caution you not to reveal any communications with counsel. But $I$ think you can answer this one 'cause $I$ know the answer.

A So I -- I have not.
Q So you never asked Mr. Weiss whether USR has ever made any money in connection with the '137 or '826 patents?

A I've never met or spoken with Kenneth Weiss, as far as $I$ know.

Q You've never asked Mr. Weiss whether USR ever practiced the '137 or ' 826 patents in any product or service, correct?

A Could not have done that, because I have not spoken with him.

Q And you don't know whether USR ever practiced the ' 137 or ' 826 patents in any product or service, correct?

A I --

MR. KAERICHER: Same caution.
A -- I haven't seen any information about this, and I haven't been asked to consider it or try to find it.

Q Okay. You have in front of you the
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'585 reference?
A Yes, I do.
Q Would you agree that the '585 reference discloses authentication codes?

A Yes, it does, one particular kind of authentication codes.

Q The '585 reference discloses that the combination function 230 is used to generate authentication codes, correct?

A Let me ask you what paragraph you have in mind here?

Q Paragraph 60 would be one example.
A Let me take a moment just to review that.
Please remind me of your question.
Q The '585 reference discloses that the combination function 230 is used to generate authentication codes, correct?

A Yes.
Q The '585 reference discloses that the combination function can be implemented using more than one different combining algorithm, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A To report on things that there's a one-way function associated with it.

Q Is the answer to my question correct?
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A Your answer -- the answer is that is correct, but not any kind of function.

Q Well, let's look at paragraph 77.
A Just a moment, please.
Yes.
Q Paragraph 77 tells us that the combination function can combine values, quote, in various ways and in any order. Correct?

A That is correct.
Q And when it says "various ways," it means there's more than one way to combine the values, correct?

A One could implement this in various ways, and, of course, different ways may have different benefits. But there are many ways in which to do this. And it's not specific to the order, although, again, there might be some orderings that are less beneficial.

Q One way to combine the inputs would be to just concatenate all of them, right?

A No, that's a misunderstanding. That would not be what the combination function would do. The combination function implicitly would involve something that is not invertible.

Q Paragraph 77 of the 585 reference indicates that, quote, Before being combined by the combination
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function 230, these values can be processed by one or more other functions.

Correct?
A That is correct.
Q Would you agree that the '585 reference teaches that you can process the input values before combining them?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A The disclosures here describe ways of combining things before you apply the combination function, rather than what you're saying. I'm sorry. They're -- in the combination function, there is a one-way function step. And the processing using the one-way function step would not -- I'm sorry. I don't think I'm answering your question particularly.

Q I don't think you are.
A No.
Q Let me try it again.
Would you agree that the '585 reference teaches that you can process the input values before combining them?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A What is said here that you can process them before you combine them, but, of course, also you'd have to process them after you combine them. So there might
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be multiple steps of processing involved.
Q The '585 reference teaches that you can process the input values before combining them or after combining them, correct?

A No. That's a misunderstanding.
Q Okay. The '585 patent -- strike that.
The '585 reference teaches that you can process the input values before combining them, correct?

A As long as you also process them after. So let me give you an example of processing before. You may have an input such as a biometric reading, which is not going to -- necessarily all of the bits of information are going to be sent or used. And so what you might do is to process them and keeping some of these bits and then input that to a combination function along with other information and then apply one other function. That would be one way of doing it. The one-way function is a critical aspect of this, and that's part of the processing, and that would not be performed solely before the combining.

Q Would it have been within the technical ability of a person of skill in the art reading the '585 reference in 2006 to concatenate the input values?

A To concatenate them, but that would not be it. You would have to concatenate and then perform, for
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example, the one-way function.
Q Okay. My -- my question is, simply, would it have been within the technical ability of a person of skill in the art reading a '585 reference in 2006 to concatenate the input values?

A You know, I haven't given this much thought, because it's not necessarily making sense in the context of the application here. The -- this -- this patent publication describes how to process it. And there are various ways of doing that. Concatenation is not a critical aspect.

Q So is it your opinion that it would not have been within the technical ability of a person of ordinary skill in the art, reading the '585 reference in 2006, to concatenate the input values?

A What I'm saying -MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.

A What I'm saying is that it would not have been necessarily something a person of skill in the art would have considered when reading this, whether they would concatenate or not. The -- the authentication function here uses a one-way function for combining purposes. The inputs to that, it doesn't matter whether they're concatenated or not.

Q Let me ask a different question then. Would
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it have been within the technical ability of a person of skill in the art in 2006 to concatenate the input values?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A In what context would they concatenate?
Q In the context of trying to develop an authentication system.

A So what I'm explaining is that it -- the concatenation is -- does not have a meaning in that context. The one-way function that is used for the combination function takes inputs, and it doesn't matter whether those inputs have been concatenated or not. So it's -- it's not something that a person of skill in the art would consider, because it's not something, I'd say, useful in the context.

Q Let me ask you to look at paragraph 73.
A Just a moment.
Yes.
Q Paragraph 73 says that a PIN (P) can be combined with A (K, T, E), quote, by prepending or appending the $P$-- PIN (P), correct?

A Let me see. Where did you read from? I think -- I think I see it. Yes.

Q This sentence indicates that prepending or appending is a function performed by the combination
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function 230, correct?
A In this particular context, it doesn't actually call out that it's the combination function that does it, but it clarifies that the PIN, which is the value $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{can}$ be combined by prepending or appending. In many instances here, the combination function corresponds to the function $A$.

Q So is the answer to my question correct?
A I have a hard time understanding your question; so I'm trying to answer as best as I can.

Q A person of ordinary skill in the art reading that sentence would understand the reference to be disclosing that prepending or appending is a function performed by the combination function 230, correct? MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.

A The combination function here is the function A. That -- it doesn't describe anything about prepending or appending by that function. You take -you prepend or append a PIN to the output of that function.

Q Paragraph 73 says, quote, The combination function 230 then combines the generated authentication code 291 with a PIN (P) to generate an authentication code 292 that is a function of (K, T, E, P). Correct?

A Yes. And I apologize. I was being unclear
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about the previous use of the word "authentication code."

Q The combination function 230 combines the code 291 with the PIN (P), correct?

A Yes.
Q And then the next sentence says, quote, The PIN (P) can be combined with A (K, T, E) by prepending or appending the PIN (P) to A (K, T, E) by arithmetically adding the PIN (P) to A (K, T, E) or using a block cipher or other one-way function or other algorithm or a combination of these and other techniques that combine two or more input values together. Correct?

A Yes.
Q So would you agree that the act of combining performed by the combination function 230 to combine PIN (P) includes prepending or appending?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A So it -- it prepends or appends the PIN (P) to A (K, T, E), which is a value that has been computed from (K, T, E).

Q The combination function 230 can prepend or append, correct?

A The PIN to that value. So I just want to make sure that $I$ understand what you're saying it's

## Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.

Conducted on March 20, 2019
prepending or appending to. It's the function result of the function A taking input (K, T, E).

Q Okay. My first question, though, is the combination function 230 is capable of prepending or appending, correct?

A It's not the authentication function that is doing that.

Q The combination function?
A Combination function, yes. The combination function -- one way it could do is to combine the PIN (P) with A (K, T, E) by prepending or appending the PIN to A (K, T, E) where A (K, T, E) is a value.

Q The '585 reference doesn't limit what the combination function can be, correct?

A There are many things it could be, and there are examples given here to describe a -- a few ways of doing it.

Q Okay. So the '585 reference doesn't limit what the combination function can be, correct?

A It does in a sense that it outlines the expected functionality. So --

Q Please finish.
A So -- so if you did something that would counteract the goals stated here, of course that would not be desirable.
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Q So you're saying that there is something that you disclosed in the '585 reference that limits what the combination function can be?

A No. What I'm saying is that there are examples given here in the spirit of the goals that the '585 publication aims to achieve, and there may be other ways of applying other functions that simply would not reach these goals.

Q Are there any words in the '585 reference that limit what the combination function can be?

A It would be limited --
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A -- by the understanding of a person of skill in the art of the goals and the functionality of the components used in here.

Q Are there any words in the '585 reference that I can look at that limit what the combination function can be?

A I have not considered that question. But I know that it can't just be anything.

Q The '585 reference doesn't require that the combination function be a one-way function, correct?

A It says that it -- the only examples it gives of the authentication function and the combination function in unison would involve a one-way function.
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Q That's not my question. There is nothing in the '585 reference that requires the combination function be a one-way function, correct?

A Whether it's stated? The -- all the examples given and the motivation of this requires that it's a one-way function. Remember, one of these things is -for example, the value $K$, that's a secret key. If you were not to apply a one-way function to that and you were to, as a result, expose that to an eavesdropper, that would not be beneficial.

So the spirit of the '585 application
described -- corresponds to a set of techniques that one would use in order to achieve these goals.

Q Is there -- is there anything that says in the '585 reference that the combination function must be a one-way function, yes or no?

A I have not considered that question. I'm sorry.

Q Is there anything in the '585 reference that says the combination function is limited in some way?

A The -MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.

A -- '585 application describes both the combination function and the authentication function $A$ and describes what the goals are. And it's -- would be
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a -- clear to a person of skill in the art reading this that there has to be a one-way function. There are examples given of one-way functions, and a person of skill in the art knowing from the description what the goals of the application was would have understood that not applying a one-way function would have been contrary to the goals of the inventors.

Q Is there any statement, are there any words in the '585 reference that says the combination function is limited?

A I have not considered that question. We can go through it in more detail if you have something in particular in mind.

Q The '585 reference says in paragraph 73 in the fourth sentence that the PIN can be combined using a one-way function, quote, or other algorithm. Do you see that?

A So --
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A -- if the -- you have to remember that $A(K$, T, E), which is also combining things, is a one-way function. And so that's why I'm collectively describing the combination function in A because together they have a purpose. The purpose is shared by these two. It is to take the inputs and create the value from all of them
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in a way that secures the communication and which doesn't expose, for example, the key $K$.

Q Do you see the words "or other algorithm"?
A Yes.
Q And it says other one-way function or other algorithm, correct?

A Yes, it does.
Q Which is disclosing that you could be using an algorithm that is not a one-way function, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A So for one thing, there are functions that you don't know to be one-way function but you believe to be one-way function. Many of the algorithms that people call one-way functions may not be one-way functions. They're just believed to be one-way function. There are even studies whether they exist, one-way functions.

So as a shortcut here, when you use a one-way function or a function with suitable functionality -which would be very hard to invert. But in addition, you have to remember that the authentication function, which is part of the combining function -- it's part of the combining of the inputs, is a one-way function.

Q Prepending or appending is not a one-way function, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
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A There are parts of the processing that do not need to be a one-way function.

Q Can you answer my question. Prepending or appending is not a one-way function, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.
A Neither prepending nor appending is a one-way function, but that is not what is important. Because what you prepend or append to is A (K, T, E), which has a one-way function.

Q If we prepended or appended an input value such as PIN (P) to an authentication code, it would be the same as concatenation, correct?

A Concatenation is the same as prepending or appending based on where you put it.

Q If we prepended or appended an input value to form an authentication code, the input values would form separable fields, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A But only those that you do that to.
Q But the answer to my question is correct, right?

A It's correct for those that you would do it to, but it's very clear from the description here that you would not do that to some of the fields. And a person of skill in the art reading this would understand
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that.
Q Okay. But if we prepended or appended an input value to form an authentication code, the input values would form separable fields, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Only the portion that we prepend or append would be a separable field.

Q The -- the '585 reference refers to reporting the occurrence of certain events, correct?

A That is true.
Q And those events are called event states?
A Yes.
Q The event state is represented by the E value, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And E can be an input into the combination function, correct?

A Yes, it can.
Q Can you turn to paragraph 15, please, of the '585 reference.

A Give me a moment, please.
Yes.
Q Paragraph 15 indicates that one or more bits of the authentication code are dedicated to the event state, correct?
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A Yes.
Q So, for example, the last two bits of the authentication code could be dedicated to the event state, correct?

A Only for explicitly and separable portions of the event state. For example, your battery level, that's not considered sensitive in most situations. That could be communicated in a separable field whereas another thing like the device has been popped open or the user has conveyed an alert in some way, an emergency, that of course would not be communicated explicitly.

Q Okay. But you agree that the last two bits of the authentication code could be dedicated to the event state, correct?

A I don't think it says so.
Q Do you see where it says "One or more bits included in the authentication code can be dedicated to reporting the occurrence of an event"?

A Yes.
Q And that is -- that example -- strike that.
That sentence is consistent with the example of the last two bits of the authentication code being dedicated to the event state, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
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A And if you understood my example of the event codes being either sensitive or not, you would see that one could communicate in such a way the -- an event that is not sensitive; so, for example, the battery is dead.

Q Okay. But the last two bits of the authentication code could be dedicated to the event state, correct?

A It doesn't say that it's the last two bits. But it does -- also does not say that it wouldn't be the last two bits.

Q If the two bits are used to represent the event state, then one or more bits included in the authentication would be dedicated to the reporting of the occurrence of an event, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I'm so sorry. Would you say that again.
Q Sure. If two bits are used to represent the event state, then one or more bits included in the authentication would be dedicated to the reporting the occurrence of an event, correct?

A No, it's not that easy. You are assuming that the event is communicated explicitly in a separable way.

Q Let me ask -- go ahead.
A And in the main embodiment which corresponds to not conveying event state, which is the goal of
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Jakobsson, the event would be part of the input to A, and one could not identify any one bit that is used to convey the event state.

Q The '585 reference discloses using a separable field to represent the event state in an authentication code, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Only in context where the event state is -it's not -- where it's not undesirable for the event state to be learned by an eavesdropper. And the goal of the publication is to hide, to communicate covertly an event state.

Q The event state is an in-click to the combination function disclosed in the '585 reference, correct?

A Yes, it is.
Q And the combination function in the '585 reference is used to generate the authentication code, correct?

A Yes, it is.
Q The '585 reference indicates to one of ordinary skill in the art the use of a separable field to represent inputs into the combination function, correct?

A But only some of those inputs.
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Q But that is correct, right?
A A person of skill in the art would have understood that it would be absolutely against the principles of the invention to do so in a careless manner. There would be event states such as the battery state that could be conveyed, but the focus of the invention is to convey in a way that isn't separable events of critical importance covertly.

Q Does the '585 reference disclose the occurrence of an event communicated explicitly in authentication code?

A It says that an occurrence to an event, it -communicated explicitly in the authentication code in one embodiment. And a person reading this would understand that that is only for some event codes, and there would be events that would not be communicated in this way. And it's critical that those are not separable and that they are part of the input to the authentication function because they need to be communicated covertly.

Q Can we agree that the '585 reference discloses using a separable field to represent inputs to the combination function, yes or no?

A Some of the inputs could be communicated in a separable field.
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Q And the '585 reference discloses using a separable field to represent at least one input to the combination function, correct?

A There are instances where one instance could be conveyed in a separable field.

Q And the '585 reference discloses instances in which separable fields are in the authentication code, correct?

A Yes. However, a person of skill in the art reading this would know that it's critical for the functionality described in here that there are event states that are not conveyed explicitly and which have to be input into the authentication code production.

Q Can you tell me, Dr. Jakobsson, whether systems existed before 2006 that authenticated users using a handheld device and a second device that provides the verification for authenticating a user?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Yes, there were.
Q Does the '585 reference disclose credit card devices?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I don't recall that.
Q Does it disclose credit cards?
A I -- I don't recall this. Do you have a
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particular segment of it in mind?
Q Does the '585 reference disclose a user authentication device that is a credit card?

A That is a credit card?
Q Yeah.
A I don't remember.
Q Would it surprise you if the '585 reference includes a user authentication device that is a credit card?

A I would have to see the portion that you're describing. I know that many of these devices are credit card shaped, which is a general description of the form factor. But $I$ don't know what you have in mind. Do you have a particular segment in mind?

Q Do you agree that the '585 reference discloses a credit card that includes a magnetic strip?

A Maybe in the background it would do that. That would make sense. I don't see it as being relevant to the technical disclosure in the patent application. It does not quite have anything to do with payments.

Q Doesn't the '585 reference disclose the use of credit cards for financial transactions?

A You'd have to remind me where it says. The '585 publication describes and discloses authentication techniques. It's not at all centered on financial
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transactions. It mentions in one paragraph that the use of this could be to log in to any kind of service.

Q As part of your preparation of your declarations for the ' 137 and '826 IPRs, did you investigate or analyze whether the '585 reference discloses a credit card?

A I understand what it does disclose, because I understand as a co-inventor of this, the goal.

Q Can you answer my question, sir. Part of your preparation for your declaration, did you investigate whether the '585 reference discloses the credit cards? Yes or no?

A Let me refresh my recollection by reading the background of the invention, because that's where I could see that it could have been mentioned.

You know, I'd have to ask you to either direct me to a paragraph in one of my declarations or a particular paragraph in '585, because as much as I'm co-inventor of this, this was written in 2004, and I don't remember by heart the descriptions in there. What I could say, though, is that this is not about financial transactions or credit card purchases.

Q As you sit here, you do not recall a disclosure of credit card in the '585 reference, correct?
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A You'd have to give me more context. There are devices that are credit card shaped. Of course, that makes them -- doesn't make them credit cards. And there are disclosures that just describes, you know, one could use the credit card to buy this thing. But that's not what the invention is.

Q I'm not asking you about a credit card shaped. I'm asking you, as you sit here, whether you recall a description of a credit card in the '585 reference? Yes or no?

A I do not recall a description of a credit card, because the '585 application is not about credit cards. It's about generation of what you might think of as password substitutes.

Q Can we agree that credit cards are used to conduct financial transactions?

A That is for sure. There are some financial transactions that involve credit cards. Those are not the ones that would be the focus of this. The focus of this would be not financial transactions at all, but access to resources.

Q Would you turn to paragraph 59 of the '585 reference.

A Just a moment.
Yes.
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Q So can we walk through paragraph 59 together?
A Sure.
Q The first sentence of paragraph 59 tells us that a first authentication is performed based on information supplied by the user 110, correct?

A Yes.
Q Then the next sentence says that this information supplied by the user can be a, quote, PIN, password, or biometric information. Correct?

A Yes.
Q The '585 reference discloses a first authentication based on a PIN, correct?

A You mean in general or in this sentence?
Q Well, in this sentence.
A It just says that the information supplied by -- may include a PIN.

Q So the '585 reference in paragraph 59 discloses a first authentication based on a PIN, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Again, this sentence does not say so. Do you want to speak about '585 in general or here?

Q So I'm directing you to paragraph 59.
A Yes.
Q Paragraph 59 of the '585 reference discloses a
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first authentication, correct?

A Of the user.
Q And it discloses a first authentication based on a PIN, correct?

A As far as we read together, it does not. It says that there's a first authentication of the user that is performed, and then it speaks about what information is supplied by the user, but it doesn't say -- up till here -- that there's any processing at all of this.

Q Do you agree that the '585 reference discloses a first authentication based on a PIN?

A Yes.
Q Do you agree that the '585 reference discloses a first authentication based on a password?

A Yes.
Q Do you agree that the '585 reference discloses a first authentication based on biometric information?

A Wait a minute. Let me back up here and correct. When you're saying a first authentication, do you refer to the one performed by the user authentication device?

Q I'm referring to a first authentication of user 110.

A So then you mean it in the context of
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paragraph 59? This only says -- this speaks of what is performed by the authentication device 120.

Q Okay. Let me not limit it to paragraph 59 then, okay?

A Okay.
Q The '585 reference discloses a first authentication based on a PIN, correct?

A Can we drop the word "first," because I have it here, and I want to make sure that we don't mess -mix it up with this sentence. So is it okay if we say discloses authentication?

Q Well, let's -- first to my question.
A Sure.
Q The '585 reference discloses a first authentication based on a PIN. Correct or not correct?

A I would have to look for that.
Q Okay. The '585 reference discloses authentication based on a PIN, correct?

A Again, in this sentence it does not, but, of course, I know the '585, that the PIN is of relevance for the verification.

Q The '585 reference discloses authentication based on a password, correct?

A In general, yes.
Q The '585 reference discloses authentication
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based on biometric information, correct?
A That is also correct.
Q And paragraph 59 says that the device may perform the authentication alone, correct?

A It says that it could perform alone or in combination with another device. So let me give you an example. It could be that your PIN is input and the device determines if it's correct.

Q Would you --
A It could also be that the PIN is determined to -- to be correct by another device or in conjunction with another device and the -- the present -- the publication is actually silent on how it's done.

Q Would you agree that a person of ordinary skill in the art reading paragraph 59 would understand it to disclose a first authentication based on a PIN?

A No, because the first authentication is performed by the user authentication device 120, and it doesn't say that, that is -- can be performed by the user authentication device alone.

Q So --
A It says, "Perform the first authentication alone or in combination with another device."

Q So your opinion is that a person of ordinary skill in the art reading paragraph 59 would not think
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that the first authentication could be based on a PIN? MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.

A It would know that the first authentication is performed by the user authentication device. And it also would know that the first authentication could be done alone or in combination with another device. So this person of skill in the art would not come to the conclusion that you're describing based on this sentence alone.

Q Okay. Does the '585 reference disclose a first authentication performed by the user authentication device based on a PIN?

A You'll have to point me to the place where it does; I'm not keenly aware of any such.

Q Does the '585 reference disclose a first authentication of a user performed by the user authentication device based upon biometric information?

A So what we know is that the first authentication of a user is performed by the user device 120. But we also know that it's alone or in combination with another device. '585 doesn't specify where this is done. Let me give you an example. There's one field of research that is distributed, password verification. That is when you take a password and there's not one entity that verifies it, but multiple entities. There
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MR. SELWYN: I move to strike as
nonresponsive.
Q Would you agree with me that one way to perform the first authentication, described in paragraph 59, is to compare a received value with a stored value?

A Again, it doesn't say so, but that would be one way of doing it. Now, there are other ways of doing it, as well, as I clarified before.

Q In the system that's described in paragraph 59, if the user enters a PIN, a password, or a biometric, then the device could compare the entered value with a stored value, correct?

A What it says, that the -- the device may perform this first authentication alone or in combination with another device. So it's silent on whether it could do it alone.

Q Well, sir, you know that a person of skill in the art has some background and education in computer security, right?

A Right.
Q So would you agree with me that it would have
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been within the technical skill of a person of skill in the art reading the '585 reference, to design a system for comparing a stored value and a received value?

A What I'm saying is that this is not what the paragraph is speaking of.

Q Can you answer my question, please?
A I -- I think I need to think about it for a while. Whether a person of skill in the art would have -- that's not a question I have been asked to consider before. And as simple as it might seem to you, that would require some thinking for me.

Q Okay. So let me just make sure that the record is clear. You do not know whether it would be within the technical ability of a person of ordinary skill in the art, reading a '585 reference in 2006 , to design a system for comparing a stored value and a received value. Correct?

A Are you saying --
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A -- any stored value and any received value?
Q Yes.
A The application here does not speak of any values. You're asking about a particular value, I think. And there are very clear pros and cons of different approaches. So, as I mentioned to you before,
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in a distributive password verification setting, there are great benefits associated with that. For example, if there's a data compromise, that would not affect adversely a system based on such -- such a technique. So it really comes down to weighing the pros and the cons, and a person of skill in the art would have to do that.

MR. SELWYN: I move to strike as nonresponsive.

Q In 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood how to store a biometric value in memory, correct?

A By biometric value, what do you mean? Is it a template, you mean?

Q A value indicative of a biometric.
A So it's not the input necessarily.
Q Not necessarily.
A So a person of skill in the art would not have stored the biometric value in memory but would have stored a template in memory.

Q In 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood how to store a template for a biometric in memory, correct?

A Yes.
Q In 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art
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would have understood how to compare a stored biometric with another biometric value, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A This other biometric value, is that also a template?

Q Yes.
A That person would not be motivated to do so.
Q Would a person of ordinary skill in the art have understood how to do -- design a system that compared a template for a biometric with another template for a biometric?

A That's a nonsensical question. I don't see the person ever being motivated to do so.

Q In 2006, would a person of ordinary skill in the art have understood how to compare a stored biometric value with another biometric value?

A So is a stored biometric value a template?
Q Yes.
A And is the biometric value a template?
Q Yes.
A That person would not understand why to do that. There's no meaning to compare on such sets of values.

Q In 2006, would a person of ordinary skill in the art have known how to program a computer to compare
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a template for a biometric with a stored biometric?
A Is the stored biometric a template?
Q Yes.
A That person would not know why that should be done. So you could write a program for it, but what would the program do? It's very unclear what this would achieve.

Q And are you as confident in that opinion as all the other opinions you've given today? MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.

A I have not rated my confidence, but based on my understanding of your question, I think I understand that it would not make sense to compare two templates.

Q Okay. Let's go back to paragraph 59.
MR. KAERICHER: We've been going for about an hour. Whenever we get to a good spot --

MR. SELWYN: Sure. Let me just finish this.
Q Do you see towards the bottom of paragraph 59 reads, "In one embodiment, the strength of the first authentication is communicated as event state in the authentication code that is verified by the verifier 105. For example, the event state can reflect the degree of the match of a biometric element."

A That's the example I gave you before, I think, where I said there are certain events that you would not
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convey explicitly but which would by necessity and according to the spirit of this publication be conveyed as part of the computation of the authentication code.

Q All I asked is whether you saw those two sentences.

A Yes, I did.
Q That passage says that there is a match of a biometric element, correct?

A It says speaks of the degree of the match.
Q Of a biometric element, correct?
A Yes.
Q And this match could be performed by the device, correct?

A It doesn't say so. It, in fact, speaks about performing the authentication alone or in combination with another device. So it's silent on what device performs it.

Q Okay. If the match is performed by the device alone, then there must be a stored value, correct?

A The stored value would be the template.
Q The first sentence of paragraph 5 describes biological characteristics such as fingerprints, right?

A Yes.
Q And the second-to-last sentence in paragraph 5 says that, quote, A verifier typically can observe the
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characteristic and compare the characteristic to records that associate the characteristic with the entity. Correct?

A Those are the templates we've been speaking of.

Q So that sentence, the second-to-last sentence in paragraph 5 is describing a comparison of biometric information to a stored record, correct?

A What it's doing is comparing the biometric input to a template that's been stored.

Q And that comparison is being used to verify the biometric, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A The biometric input, yes.
Q And in paragraph 5, the '585 reference is disclosing a comparison of a biometric value to a stored value, correct?

A With a stored value would be something like a biometric template, of course. This now -- let me point out, this is the background of the invention; so this does not describe the invention as such but the background only.

Q I'm just asking you what paragraph 5 discloses. Paragraph 5 discloses comparing a biometric value to a stored value, correct?
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A Yes. And one would understand that the stored value would be the biometric template.

Q And going back to paragraph 59, would you agree that it's not possible to perform the first authentication described in that paragraph on one device without some stored value?

A I haven't been given that much thought.
Q Would you agree that it's not possible to perform the first authentication described in the first sentence of paragraph 59 on one device without a comparison?

A So this doesn't speak about doing it on the device. It says that it's one or more devices. Now, something has to be stored somewhere. I agree with that. But it doesn't have to be stored on the device.

Q Has to be stored somewhere.
A Somewhere. It could be another device. That's why it says that the device -- 120 may perform this first authentication alone or in combination with another device.

Q So you'd agree that it's not possible to perform the first authentication described in paragraph 59 on one device without a comparison to a stored value somewhere, correct?

A But this -- we said about -- the first
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authentication would be done alone or in combination with another device. You're speaking of a combination -- of a -- of a comparison where?

Q I'll re-ask the question.
A Okay.
Q It's not possible to perform the first authentication described in paragraph 59 on one device without a comparison to a stored value, correct?

A Where that stored value could be elsewhere and the comparison likewise.

Q So the answer is correct?
A There has to be stored value somewhere, but it doesn't have to be on the first device.

MR. SELWYN: Let's take our break.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
(A recess ensued from 1:59 p.m. to 2:06 p.m.) BY MR. SELWYN:

Q Dr. Jakobsson, can you put back in front of you the ' 137 patent.

A Yes. Yes.
Q And could you please turn to column 46, claim 6.

A If I could just take a moment to look up my corresponding opinion, since $I$ know that it's probably going to be relevant.
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I'm sorry. I have lost one document, the one I brought that had the index. Has either of you seen that? Oh. This is it. Sorry.

Yes.
Q Okay. Do you have claim 6 in front of you of the '137 patent?

A I do.
Q Claim 6 is a dependent claim, correct?
A That's correct.
Q Claim 6 in the '137 patent says "the system of claim 1 wherein the first processor is configured to encrypt the first authentication information," correct?

A Yes.
Q Claim 6 doesn't require any specific kind of encryption, correct?

A It doesn't specify.
Q Any known algorithms would meet that limitation, correct?

A I believe so.
Q The '137 and '826 patents don't propose any new encryption algorithm, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That is correct.
Q The '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any new computer or computer components to perform
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encryption, correct?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That's also true.
Q The '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any new software to perform encryption, correct?

A That is correct.
MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Sorry. That's correct.
Q The '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any new arrangement of components to perform encryption, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That is correct.
Q Encrypting communications transmitted over the Internet was known before the '137 and '826 patents, correct?

A In general, yes.
Q Encrypting communications transmitted over an insecure channel was known before the '137 and '826 patents, correct?

```
            MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
```

A That's correct.
Q In 2006, a person -- strike that. Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to program a computer to
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perform an encryption or a decryption, correct?
A Yes.
Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to configure a processor to encrypt or decrypt information, correct?

A By that, do you mean providing input software?
Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to configure an electronic device to encrypt or decrypt information, correct?

A Yes.
Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that encrypted communications are more secure than unencrypted communications, correct?

A Yes. Now, there are, of course, instances where encryption is not meaningful. I'm thinking of the '585, which the authentication code there, as it's being transmitted, there's no point to encrypting it because its encryption is to hide contents, and one does not need to hide the contents of the authentication code as it already has made it unseparable.

Q I move to strike everything after the answer, yes.
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In -- strike that.
Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood what symmetric-key encryption was, correct?

A Yes.
Q Before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood what asymmetric encryption was, correct?

A Yes.
Q And before 2006, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood what public key encryption was, correct?

A Yes.
Q Would you turn, please, in the '137 patent to column 4, line 11?

A Just a moment, please.
Yes.
Q Okay. So directing your attention to column 13, lines 4 through 11, do you see it reads, quote, To enhance security, especially where communication takes place over a publicly accessible network such as the Internet, communications facilitating or relating to transmission of data from/to the USR database 24 or the computer system 10 may be encrypted using an encryption algorithm such as PGP,
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DES, or conventional symmetric or -- or asymmetric algorithms?

A Yes. But I apologize. I thought you were asking me to look up another paragraph before. Give me a moment to just read this again.

Q Okay.
A Yes.
Q And when it refers to "conventional," you understand that to mean that there were known encryption algorithms, correct?

A In fact, people mostly want to use the known encryption algorithms, because they have some assurance that they would work as promised.

Q And the '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any new encryption algorithms, correct?

A To their credit, I would say --
Q And --
A -- they use what is known to be working.
Q And the '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any new arrangement of components to perform conventional symmetric or asymmetric encryption algorithms, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A This is true. Most use of cryptography in this -- of this type is done as building blocks.
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Q The '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any new arrangement of components to perform any encryption algorithms, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A That's correct.
Q Are you familiar with the term "ciphertext"?
A Yes, I am.
Q Ciphertext can be used to refer to encrypted information, correct?

A Yes.
Q And would you agree that the '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any new types of hardware to perform encryption or cryptography?

A Yes.
Q And the '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any new type of software to perform encryption or cryptography, correct?

A They describe new uses of the encryption, which would probably be in software -- at least, in part of software.

Q The '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any software, correct?

A They describe --
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Sorry.
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MR. KAERICHER: Go ahead.
A They describe the method, of course. That would guide the development of the software.

Q But they don't purport to disclose any new software, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A They describe the new method, whether they're going to be implemented in software or hardware or a combination thereof. They don't give particular descriptions of this hardware or software.

Q And, in fact, they say that conventional uses of software can be applied, correct?

A So what $I$ think they mean is that the conventional hardware and conventional types of programming -- languages, for example, could be used. The software itself, of course, implements the functionality. And to implement the functionality, they would implement what is described here and claimed, for example, which would be novel and which would be different from just the plain encryption.

Q The '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any examples of software for performing any of the methods claimed in the patents, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A If by "software," you mean the code for doing
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it, they do not.
Q Okay. Plaintext can be used to refer to unencrypted information, correct?

A Yes.
Q And if I wanted to encrypt plaintext, one way is to use a key, right?

A Among other things.
Q If I XOR plaintext with a key, the results would be ciphertext, correct?

A That's not how you would do it. One would have an -- an algorithm for encryption, and, for example, in the case of DES, the key would not be encrypted -- the key would not be XOR'd. Now, there are particular instances -- and you may think of stream ciphers where there is an XOR involved, but... I don't see that that's what you're asking me.

Q Well, let me break it down. The XOR function is a type of encryption function, correct?

A Definitely not.
Q If I were to XOR the same key with the encrypted ciphertext, I would effectively decrypt the ciphertext, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I'm sorry. Would you say that again?
Q Sure. If I were to XOR the same key with the
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encrypted ciphertext, I would, effectively, decipher the ciphertext, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A So I think what you're describing is a stream cipher, and one would not refer to the stream as a key. The key, for example, would be the input -- one of the inputs to DES, as described in these applications. And there you do not XOR. And the decryption would not involve XORing, either, except that the DES function may have XORs, but it's not an XOR with the plaintext or the ciphertext.

Q Is XORing a form of encryption?
A No, it's not seen as such. XOR is useful in some encryption schemes, but it's, by itself, is not an encryption scheme. Now --

Q Now can XORing be used as a form of decryption?

A So the only context for this makes sense is the stream cipher context where the -- the XOR is not with a key, but it's with a stream. The -- using an XOR with a key in a ciphertext, that would not be thought of as decryption or encryption for that matter.

Q Can you turn, please, to the '585 reference.
A Yes.
Q Can you turn, please, to paragraph 58.
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A Yes. Let me just refresh my recollection of this paragraph.

Q Okay.
A Yes.
Q The fourth sentence of paragraph 58 reads, quote, Verifier 105 reverses the combination function -I'm sorry -- reverses the combination operation, e.g., by subtracting and/or XOR the user's PIN from the received authentication code. Correct?

A That's correct.
Q That sentence discloses a decryption operation that's performed on the system's authentication code, correct?

A Not in the --
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A -- traditional sense.
Q Wasn't -- that sentence discloses a decryption operation, correct?

A The -- the reason it uses the term "reverses" is that this would not be seen as decryption. The publication uses encrypting and decrypting in other places, but this is -- the reason that it uses reversing here is that it's hard to call this encryption and decryption.

Q Okay. I want to make sure that the record is
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clear about what you're saying. That sentence, the fourth sentence of paragraph 1 -- paragraph 58 in your view, does not disclose a decryption operation, correct?

A It -- it calls it for reversing it by subtracting or XORing, so it extracts the -- the PIN from the received code. Now, it's not a traditional decryption as such. But I did bring up the stream cipher before. It has similarities to stream cipher technology, but for a stream cipher, you have a suit of random code, and here, it's not the same. So I -- the -- the reason it uses the reverses is that it's not quite the same.

Q Okay. So, in your opinion, the fourth sentence of paragraph 58 does not disclose a decryption operation, correct?

A It -- the reason it uses reverses is to specify that it does obtain information from it. But we're not talking about traditional encryption decryption here. Some people might flinch if you call this decryption. It is extracting information by reversing.

Q You understand what a decryption operation is, correct?

A Yes, I do.
Q Does the fourth sentence of paragraph 58
disclose a decryption operation? Yes or no.
A It describes the reversing. It's very similar to what you'd call a decryption, but it's not a traditional decryption. It's not, for example, a stream cipher. It's certainly not DES. There are other places where encryption and decryption is disclosed. The reason it uses reverses is that it is not the same. It -- it has hidden the information, the PIN in the information that is being sent and it's being extracted.

Q The reversing that's described in the fourth sentence of paragraph 58 is being performed on the system's authentication code, correct?

A Yes.
Q And that sentence discloses that the verifier is configured to decrypt an authentication code, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That's -- if you're referring to the "in some embodiments, the verifier 105 decrypts a value." Is that it?

Q Yes.
A That is not necessarily describing the same thing.

Q Does the fourth sentence -- strike that.
Do you see the sentence in paragraph 58 that
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says that the verifier 105 reverses the combination operation?

A Yes.
Q That sentence is referring to a combination operation performed by the user authentication device, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It doesn't explicitly say so, but I -- I would imagine that's likely.

Q Paragraph 58 also reads, quote, In a simplistic example, the user authentication device 120 generates an authentication code by arithmetically combining a secret stored by the user authentication device 120 and a user-supplied PIN.

Did I read that right?
A Yes. I think why it's called an simplistic -simplistic example is to convey that this is, of course, not exactly what you would do, but here's some of the intuition.

Q The arithmetic combination disclosed in paragraph 58 is the combination operation that's later reversed in the fourth sentence of paragraph 58, correct?

A I cannot be sure from this description, because it says that it's combines a secret stored by
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the user or authentication device and the user-supplied PIN, and I don't know the received authentication code to be stored by the user device.

Q And XOR could be the arithmetic combination, correct?

A XOR is an arithmetic combination.
Q In the embodiment disclosed in paragraph 58, an authentication code is not generated at the verifier, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I don't understand why you would say that.
How else would the verifier know the identification code?

Q So you think in the embodiment disclosed paragraph 58, an authentication code is generated at the verifier, correct?

A That's what all these -- that's the principle of -- of 858.

Q Okay.
A So the -- the basic structure of 858 is that an authentication code is generated on the first device. And then it's also generated -- another one is generated on a second device. And the second device receives the first one and compares it to the second one. So -- and you could not perform this reversing without having --
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well, I'm sorry. So if you're reversing it and you get -- from the received authentication code and reversing out the PIN, then you're getting something else, which would match what you have computed.

I think I'm not answering your question. I'm sorry.

Q I don't think you are.
The embodiment described in paragraph 58
doesn't involve a hash function, correct?
A It doesn't say so. But hash functions are used in the authentication codes, or at, least, a hash function is one of the functions that being -- one-way functions could be used to generate the authentication code.

Q The system disclosed in paragraph 58 does not require a hash function, correct?

A You could have any authentication code described in 858, and this would still work.

Q So is the answer to my question correct?
A So a hash function is not necessary in order to perform the function here. One could, for example, use another one-way function.

Q The '585 reference does not require the use of a hash function, correct?

A That is true.
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Q The '137 and '826 patents do not disclose any new form of biometric sensor, correct?

A Not that $I$ know of.
Q And the '137 and '826 patents don't disclose any new form of user interface, correct?

A I don't think they do it that either.
Q Turning back to the '585 reference, the authentication codes disclosed in the '585 reference can have a number of inputs, correct?

A Yes.
Q And one of those inputs is an E value, correct?

A Yes.
Q The E value represents an event state, correct?

A Yes.
Q And that event state is communicated to the verifier as part of the authentication code, right?

A That's not the right way of putting it. It's an input to the generation of the authentication code.

Q Can you turn, please, to paragraph 59.
A Yes, let me take a look at it first.
Yes.
Q This paragraph says that, quote, if the first authentication is successfully verified by the
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authentication device 120, the device 120 generates an identity authentication code, correct?

A Yes.
Q This sentence indicates that the device generates an authentication code if the first authentication is successful, correct?

A Yes.
Q And if the first authentication fails, then the device does not generate an identity authentication code, correct?

A It doesn't say that.
Q Well, that's true, isn't it?
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I don't know.
Q If no authentication code is generated by the device, then no authentication code is sent, correct?

A So, actually, let me back up with your question before. There are, actually, good examples of instances where you would have an identity authentication code that is generated, in spite of a first authentication not being successfully verified, because the goal of the publication is to not convey the situation that has been detected to potentially malicious user.

So let me give you an example. Say that you
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have one of these 858 authentication devices, and it can determine when you have correctly biometrically authenticated to it. And then it sends or generates -it generates an authentication code which you can input somewhere. Assume that somebody were to attack you or force you to use it and you used this with the wrong finger because you don't want to convey something to the back end that allows this user to get full access to your information or account. If the device were not to generate the authentication code in response to this, the attacker, of course, would know that something is up. So there are very good examples where in order to hide the state -- we refer to it sometimes as event state -- the device would continue operating in a way that is indistinguishable to this malicious user from normal operation in which nothing is detected.

Q Have you described just now an example that appears in the ' 585 reference?

A This particular example? Or the principle of the example?

Q No. This particular example that you just described, is that anywhere in the '585 reference, sir?

A Word by word, it's not. I explained this in order to convey to you why it's important.

Now, the '585 patent application speaks a lot
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about the importance of this. And a person of skill in the art would recognize that there are obvious things that you wouldn't do, such as alerting an attacker to the fact that they've been noticed.

Q I move to strike. The answer is nonresponsive.

Sir, did you speak with your counsel, attorney at the break about the substance of any of your testimony?

A No. I'm not allowed to, right?
Q Would you agree with me that, according to the '585 reference, if no authentication code is generated by the device, then no authentication is sent? Yes or no.

A It's not possible to send what is not generated because the authentication codes aren't stored there.

Q And if no authentication code is sent, then no event state is sent, correct?

A That is also true.
Q Can you turn to paragraph 52, please. Still on the '585 reference.

A Let me take a quick look at this.
Q Sure.
MR. SELWYN: How long have we been going since
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the last break?
MR. KAERICHER: Half an hour.
MR. SELWYN: Oh. Seems like longer.
A Yes.
Q Do you see in the middle of paragraph 52 where it reads "other examples of reportable events can include" and then it continues?

A Yes.
Q That sentence describes event states that can be sent in an authentication code, correct?

A They're not sent in authentication codes. They're inputs to the generation of the authentication code.

Q One of the examples listed there is, quote, authentication quality, e.g., a number of PIN errors prior to a successful authentication. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And a PIN error is a kind of failed authentication attempt, correct?

A Yes.
Q So that sentence indicates that the event state can store information about the failed authentication, correct?

A That could be an event state.
Q An event state wouldn't need to be reported
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for every authentication attempt, correct?
A Would you say that question again?
Q Sure. An event state wouldn't need to be reported for every authentication attempt, correct?

A No. That's a misunderstanding. Event states are also -- always reported, but the event might be everything is fine.

Q Turn to paragraph 59, please.
A This is actually what we spoke of before, which you asked me if $I$ knew whether it was -- I understood it.

Q I haven't asked you a question yet.
Do you see the sentence that reads "In some embodiments, the device operates differently upon occurrence of an event such that the occurrence of the event is communicated in identity authentication codes output by the device subsequent to the occurrence of the reportable event"?

A Yes.
Q Paragraph 15 discloses that the occurrence of an event can be communicated in an authentication code sometime after the occurrence of the event, correct?

A Yes.
Q Paragraph 15 discloses that a reportable event need not be reported right away, correct?
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A Why do you say that?
Q Is that correct or not?
A What this means is that one could report events multiple times. So -- for example, say that a device is being physically opened and there's a sensor or circuit that detects that it's being popped open. Now, the first time that the device -- the device is generating an authentication code, this, of course, would be an event that is valuable to convey and, of course, in a way that is not extractible by a potential attacker.

But if it were only the first time an authentication code were generated that it were conveyed, then an attacker who breaks open the device would simply throw away the first authentication code and then wait for the next one. So there are some events that maintain -- for example, if you have ever had your device popped open, then the event could always indicate that the device has popped open, even though it was a long time ago.

Q Move to strike as nonresponsive.
A failed authentication is a reportable event, correct?

A That is one example.
Q And the '585 reference discloses that a failed
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authentication need not be immediately reported, correct?

A That's not what it says.
Q Okay. Could you turn, please, to paragraph 3 of the '585 reference.

A Give me a moment, please.
Q Sure.
A Yes.
Q Paragraph 3 describes access as including electronic access to a computer system or data, correct?

A Yes.
Q And it discloses that, quote, one goal of such security systems is to accurately determine identity so that an unauthorized party cannot gain access, correct?

A Yes.
Q And one way to determine identity is to perform a user authentication, correct?

A Yes.
Q When paragraph 3 says, quote, so that an unauthorized party cannot gain access, it's referring to a denial of access, correct?

A Well, if you take the example of a person accessing an e-mail account, for example, and you don't have a user name and a password but instead you have a user name and the -- the code generated here, the goal
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here is to convey to the back end -- in this case, the mail server or mail system -- that an attack has taken place. So, first of all, the device wishes to know whether it was you who properly used the device, and, if so, you will gain access to your e-mail.

Now, if an attacker were to use your device or force you to use the device and an event will be conveyed in the form of being an input to the authentication code and it detected therefore on the back end, then it would be foolish of the system to have a big alert saying you cannot gain access. But, instead, in this particular example, one might give access to something that looks like your mailbox but is not. This, of course, is just a simplistic example to explain the subtleties of this.

Q And the simplistic example that you just gave me is not in the '585 reference, correct?

A So this is to clarify since, you're asking me, the '585 publication relates to covertly conveying event information by including it in the generation of the authentication code.

Q Let's go back to paragraph 3.
A Yes.
Q Paragraph 3 describes denying access based on a failed user authentication, correct?
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MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A So this is the background of the invention.
Q I'm just asking you, sir, whether paragraph 3 describes denying access based on a failed user authentication.

A Yes. Now, in this case, of course, this describes the prior art relative to the 858. So that is not necessarily a desirable thing to do this, but that is something that has been done in the prior art.

Q If an unauthorized party cannot gain access the unauthorized party is being denied access, correct?

A So in the context of the 858 patent, you wish for this not to be knowable of the unauthorized party. You wish for the information to be conveyed in such a way and the responses to be made in such a way that this unauthorized person is not necessarily aware of it. There could be cases where it is desirable. But the main goal is to convey things covertly.

Q I don't think you answered my question. I'm going to ask it again.

A Yes, please.
Q If an unauthorized party cannot gain access, the unauthorized party is being denied access, correct?

A Well, if you cannot gain access but you didn't try, it wasn't because you're denied access. So in
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general I think that statement doesn't hold.
Q Okay. Let's look at paragraph 3. Paragraph 3 discloses what was known, correct?

A Yes.
Q Paragraph 3 tells one of ordinary skill in the art that if an unauthorized party cannot gain access, the unauthorized party is being denied access, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It speaks of the allowed access, but it doesn't speak of the denying of access.

Q Do you know what a one-way hash function is?
A Yes, I do.
Q If you were to input value through a one-way hash function, the output can't be used to derive the input, correct?

A That depends on the size of input. But in general, for -- if used properly, then that is true.

Q If you only had the output from a one-way hash, you can't derive the input, correct?

A Provided that the distribution of inputs is not marginal.

Let me give you an example of how one would not use such a system or such a function. Say that there are only two things that you might want to say, yes or no, and you could input either one of them but
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nothing else into the hash function, then of course $I$ can determine what you said, even if $I$ don't see your message, just looking at the hash function for the simple reason that $I$ could try both yes and no as the inputs to the hash function. So that's a simplistic case that doesn't correspond to how the hash function would be used.

Q You understand, sir, don't you, that one of ordinary skill in the art in 2006 would understand that the purpose of a one-way hash function is to ensure that an input value sent through a one-way hash can't be -strike that.

You understand that one of ordinary skill in the art in 2006 would use a one-way hash function in order to ensure that the output can't be used to derive the input, correct?

A One does -- would not have to do that. One could use a one-way function in general in order to make the input not derivable from the output.

Q One of ordinary skill in the art in 2006 would understand that one function of a one-way hash is to ensure that the output can't be used to derive the input, correct?

A Provided that the distribution is large enough. Then that is one common use. There are other
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common uses. For example, a cryptographic hash function, which was what we were speaking of, has the benefit of providing an output of uniform size. No matter what the size of the input is.

Q If the input value to a one-way hash function were biometric information, the hashed output value would not reveal the original biometric information, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A That is also not necessarily true. It depends on the input value and its size. Now, if you were to apply a one-way hash function to a substantially long biometric value such as a fingerprint, that is not a meaningful thing to do in the context of this patent. And the reason is that one would never be able to verify in any sense what it was.

Q Did my question ask you about the '585 patent? MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.

A I'm sorry. I misunderstood. I thought you were still on the '585.

Q Listen to my question. If the input value to a one-way hash function were a biometric information such as a fingerprint, the hashed output value would not reveal the original biometric information, correct?

A In fact, it would be meaningless because it
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would not be able to be matched on the other side.
Q If the input value to a one-way hashed
function were biometric information such as a fingerprint, an attacker could not derive the original biometric information from the hashed biometric information, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection.
A But nobody would ever do this because it's a pointless thing to apply this and transmit it, which I presume is what you're saying.

Q Can you answer my question, correct or incorrect?

A Would you say it again, please.
Q If the input value to a one-way hash function were biometric information such as a fingerprint, an attacker could not derive the original biometric information from the hashed biometric information, correct?

A Nor would anybody else, and it would be a pointless thing to do. So it would -- it's a question that I'm having a little bit of a hard time with because it's very hypothetical.

Q Are you able to answer my question, correct or incorrect?

A It -- I think I'm doing that. I'm just trying
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to qualify it so that it's not misunderstood.
Q If the input value to a one-way hash function
were biometric information such as a fingerprint, an attacker could not identify the user just using the hashed biometric information, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Nobody could do that.
Q Okay. Turn now to the '585 reference, paragraph 72.

A And give me a moment, please.
Q Take your time.
A Yes.
Q Have you had an opportunity to read paragraph 72?

A Yes, I did.
Q Do you see towards the middle of paragraph 72 where it says "The user data $P$ can be mapped to another value with a one-way function such as a hash function or a key derivation function," and then it continues?

A Yes.
Q That sentence tells us that you can protect user data $P$ with a one-way function, correct?

A Sometimes, yes.
Q User data $P$ can be a biometric, correct?
A Not in this context.
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Q You're sure of that?
A So the user data $P$, if it's a fingerprint, for example -- well, it could be protected, but it's useless when it's done, because the problem is -- let me explain the problem with the biometrics.

Q Before you do that, let me direct you, please, to the third sentence of the paragraph.

A Yes.
Q Pardon me. The fourth sentence. You see, it says "The user data $P$ can also be obtained by biometric measurement or observation"?

A Yes, I see that.
Q So that tells us that user data $P$ can be a biometric, correct?

A But then it says in one embodiment, it continues from there and on, and then it describes something that applies a one-way function. Now --

Q Sir, does the sentence that reads "The user data $P$ can also be obtained by biometric measurement or observation" tell one of ordinary skill in the art that user data $P$ can be a biometric?

A It -- it says that it can be obtained by biometric measurement observation. Maybe I'm not understanding your question.

Q User data $P$ can be a biometric, according to
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the fourth sentence --

A It can be obtained by biometric measurement observation. It doesn't say that it's a biometric.

Q One of ordinary skill in the art reading the fourth sentence of paragraph 72 would know user data $P$ can be a biometric, correct or incorrect?

A So if we were to consider what's saying -said afterwards to apply one-way function to it, that would not make sense. It would make sense if the user data P that is obtained by biometric measurement or observation is a statement about the biometric input. So, for example, it could be the count or the failure or something like that because that, you can apply a hash function or another one-way function to.

Q Let me make sure that the record is very clear here so that when the judges read this --

A Yes.
Q -- it's clear what you're saying. You're saying that one of ordinary skill in the art reading the sentence "The user data $P$ can also be obtained by a biometric measurement or observation" would not understand that user data $P$ could be a biometric?

A So let me qualify this. If you later were to apply a one-way function to it in order to perform a comparison, that cannot happen. It's not meaningful.
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You cannot compare if the, say, fingerprint is input to a one-way function. However, if the biometric is processed in some way, it could be the failure count, something like that. That could be the value P. That is a meaningful thing to apply the one-way function to.

So all I'm saying is in the context of the next portion of this paragraph, $P$ cannot be a biometric reading such as a fingerprint if you're considering applying a one-way function to it.

Q I'm just asking you about the sentence that reads "The user data P can also be obtained by a biometric measurement or observation." Do you have that in mind?

A Yes.
Q And my question is would one of ordinary skill in the art reading that sentence understand that user data $P$ can be a biometric?

A Not in the context of applying a one-way function to it because that would not be helpful. So if it's another measurement related to this, it could be helpful.

Q Now, when you wrote in paragraph 72 that the user data P can also be obtained by a biometric measurement, you were referring to a measurement of a biometric, correct?
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A I do not recall what $I$ had in mind. But looking at the rest here, $I$ know that it cannot be biometric fingerprint, for example, or it would make no sense to apply a one-way function to it.

Q In the fourth sentence when you use the term "biometric measurement," you're referring to measuring a biometric, correct?

A This is -- it says the user data can be obtained by biometric measurement or observation. It doesn't say what the user -- what the data $P$ is. I gave you an example of something that would make sense in the context of applying the one-way function, which is some kind of error or count or something like that.

The reason why that's a problem is the fingerprint, if you think about you could turn your finger in so many ways and slide it in so ways, applying a hash function would make it impossible to match it to anything later.

Q Okay. Let me ask you this. Would one of ordinary skill in the art reading paragraph 72 understand that user data $P$ can be biometric data, yes or no?

A By "biometric data," what do you mean?
Q Can you answer my question?
A Not without a little bit better understanding
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what you mean by biometric data.
Q Okay. Let's look, sir, at the sentence in paragraph 72 that says "The user data $P$ can be the actual PIN password, biometric data, et cetera." Do you see that?

A Yes, I do.
Q Now, my question to you is would one of ordinary skill in the art reading that sentence understand that the user data $P$ can be biometric data?

A So if you finish reading the sentence, it would say "Or the user data value $P$ can be the result of processing the user data by one or more functions."

Coming back to my example of the count, it would not make sense to apply one-way function to a fingerprint if you wish to match it later. If you want to perform any kind of match later, you do not want to apply a one-way function to it. And the reason is simple. It just simply will never match.

Q Okay. So I want to make sure we're very clear here for the judges who read this transcript. Your view is that one of ordinary skill in the art reading paragraph 72 would not interpret user data $P$ to include biometric data, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A What do you mean by biometric data?
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Q Is that the best answer to your -- to my question?

A It's not an answer to your question. It's a wish for clarification. I know you want me to -- to answer in a way that is helpful; so I need to know what the question is.

Q Well, you used the term "biometric data" in paragraph 72. Did you not?

A Yes, I did. And I'm asking you what do you mean by biometric data? For example, biometric data is data about biometric use, and it's also the biometric fingerprint. But in this context, it cannot be the latter because one would not apply a one-way function to that.

Q And you're as confident in that answer as you are in all the other answers you've given today?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A So what $I$ can tell you is that it's a long-studied research problem to take a biometric or another value that varies over time and extract from it a string that doesn't vary over time. That would be a very helpful thing. I have studied it. I have made partial progress on this. But there is no perfect solution developed so far.

Q Do you know what a fingerprint sensor is?
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A Yes.
Q Fingerprint sensors existed before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q The '137 and '826 patents don't describe any new form of fingerprint sensors, correct?

A Not that $I$ know of.
Q And the '137 and '826 patents don't describe any new form of processor, correct?

A That's correct.
Q The '137 and '826 patents don't describe any new form of communication interface, correct?

A Not that $I$ know of.
Q Fingerprint sensors are electronic devices, correct?

A Well, they are hardware, and they're -- do I understand your questions, correctly? As opposed to what? I would qualify them as electronic components.

Q Okay. Fingerprint sensors are electronic components, correct?

A Yes.
Q They typically read fingerprints?
A That's what they're built to do.
Q Fingerprint sensors capture some biometric observation, correct?
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A They do.
Q Fingerprint sensors that captured a biometric observation existed before 2006, correct?

A Yes.
Q And in the case of a fingerprint sensor, the biometric observation is a fingerprint, correct?

A In the case of what?
Q In the case of fingerprint sensors, the biometric observation is a fingerprint, correct?

A Well, it could be. There could be other things too, of course. For example, it's commonly undesirable to transmit the full fingerprint, say, from a secure area to elsewhere. And so a fingerprint sensor might have a processor that makes a determination and processes what it gets. It might have a template or more than one template stored and transmit biometric information that related to this. So the output of this component might not be a fingerprint as such but an assessment related to it.

Q My question wasn't about the output. My question is in the case of fingerprint sensors, the biometric observation is of a fingerprint, correct?

A So to be very precise, you'd have to look at how the -- this component works. It would be of, for example, electric charges or something like that. That
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is, of course, if you apply a fingerprint to it, that would -- the meaning would be a fingerprint. But if you apply something else, it would be -- the output would be something else.

Q A fingerprint sensor makes a biometric observation, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And the observation it is making is of a fingerprint, correct?

A Yes.
Q Computers or processors use the information from a fingerprint sensor in order to authenticate the user, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A The fingerprint sensor sometimes has a processor. Are you considering that? Or you're saying in general?

Q The processor could be in the fingerprint sensor.

A Okay. And that processor -- would you ask your question again about it.

Q Computers or processors use the information from a fingerprint sensor to authenticate the user, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
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A That would be one of the goals.
Q And in order for a computer or a processor to use the information from a fingerprint sensor, the information must be in the form of bits, correct?

A Yes.
Q And the bits are a data representation from the fingerprint, correct?

A Right.
Q Fingerprint sensors don't collect an actual physical sample, correct?

A That's correct.
Q Fingerprint sensors collect a data representation of the fingerprint, correct?

A Correct.
Q And to perform an authentication based on a fingerprint sensor, a processor must use data that is derived from the biometric observation, correct?

A That's what it would do.
MR. SELWYN: Why don't we take a break.
(A recess ensued from 3:06 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.)
BY MR. SELWYN:
Q Welcome back, Dr. Jakobsson. Let me hand you what has been previously marked as Apple Exhibit 1105.

A Thank you.
Q Do you recognize that exhibit?
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A Yes, I do.
Q What do you recognize it to be?
A Beg your pardon?
Q What do you recognize it to be?
A Oh, it's a patent that I referred to as Maritzen in my declaration -- or my declarations.

Q And you'll understand me if I refer this afternoon to Exhibit 1105 as the Maritzen reference?

A Yes, I will.
Q Maritzen -- strike that.
The Maritzen reference discloses a biometric key and a transaction key, correct?

A Let me familiarize myself with the section you have in mind here to get -- make sure that I get the terminology right. Would you point me to one section where it uses this?

Q Well, I don't have a particular section in mind yet. Would you please tell me whether the Maritzen reference discloses a biometric key and a transaction key?

A I remember the biometric key. I don't remember the other one called the transaction key. Let me just take a look at it.

Yes, I see the transaction key too.
Q Okay. So we can agree that the Maritzen
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reference discloses both a biometric key and a transaction key, correct?

A Yes.
Q And Maritzen discloses that the transaction key can be the biometric key, correct?

A Yes, I believe that. Or at the very at least comprise it. I don't remember the exact sentence that said that they would be the same.

Do you have a particular paragraph in mind?
Q Sure. Let's look at paragraph 45.
A Okay.
Q You've read paragraph 45 before today, correct?

A Definitely.
Q And paragraph 45 discloses that the transaction key can be the biometric key, correct?

A Well, it says the transaction key may include the biometric key and the PTD identifier. So I'm familiar with that setting. I thought you asked if it could be the same, and I don't remember that.

Q You don't. Do you see the sentence that says "In an alternate embodiment, the transaction key includes only the biometric key"?

A Yes, I see that.
Q And it tells us that the transaction key can
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be the biometric key, correct?
A You bet.
Q The transaction key is used as part of the authentication in the Maritzen reference, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Need to ask you to turn me to a particular paragraph where it speaks of this.

Q That's not something you remember?
A I know that the biometric key likely is what some people refer to as a database key. It's a way of finding a record. And I don't remember to what extent that is the transaction key is used for authentication.

Q In the Maritzen reference, the transaction key is used as a form of authentication information, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Again, it -- it's getting late in the day, and I just wanted to either -- if you have a particular line in my -- in one of my declarations or a particular paragraph here for me to review first, that would be great.

Q So let's turn to paragraph 48.
Are you at 48?
A Yes. Just give me a moment. I just want to review it.
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Yes, I see this paragraph.
Q Do you see the paragraph says
"Clearinghouse 130 compares the transaction key against a list of keys." Then it goes on, "If a match is found, then the transaction key is valid."

A Yes.
Q And then if you look at paragraph 49, do you see that the Maritzen reference indicates, quote, Once clearinghouse 130 determines that the transaction type and transaction key are valid, clearinghouse 130 selects a preexisting account from a number of user accounts associated with the PTD100 and the user to process the financial transaction.

Did I read that right?
A Yes, I think so.
Q So can we agree that the transaction key is used as part of the authentication?

A I don't see authentication being described here.

Q One of ordinary skill in the art would understand paragraphs 48 and 49 to indicate that the transaction key is used as part of the authentication, correct?

A It seems like it's used --
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
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A -- to -- for lookup. So if you have other context in mind, I'd be very happy to look at that. Here, I don't see it being used for authentication.

Q The transaction key is used as a form of authentication information, is it not?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I need to ask to -- if you mean in the context of 48 and the portion of 49 that you read, that's not what it says.

Q Okay. The biometric key is used in the Maritzen reference as part of the authentication, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A So, again, I would really appreciate it if you drew my attention either to a particular paragraph here or in one of my declarations, because it is getting late in the day.

Q Well, let's look at what you just reviewed, paragraph 48?

A Yes.
Q Paragraph 48 says "Clearinghouse 130 also verifies that the biometric key is valid by comparison of the biometric key transmitted to clearinghouse 130 with a known biometric key contained within clearinghouse 130."
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Did I read that right?
A Yes.
Q The biometric key is used in Maritzen as part of authentication, correct?

A Again, that's not what it says.
Q Okay.
A Valid key is one which has a corresponding stored element in the database that is described here. So there's a lookup.

But this does not describe authentication.
Q So you do not think that one of ordinary skill in the art would read paragraph 48 to suggest a form of authentication; is that right?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A No. This is not authentication. They determine validity based on whether it is in the record, and then they know what account to select.

Q In paragraph 48, it indicates -- strike that.
In paragraph 45, it indicates that the
biometric key is encrypted, correct?
A Let me take a look at this.
Yes, it does.
Q The Maritzen reference discloses encrypting a biometric key, correct?

A Yes.
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Q And at the bottom of paragraph 45, the last sentence indicates that the transaction key is encrypted prior to transmission, correct?

A Yes.
Q So Maritzen discloses encrypting a transaction key, correct?

A Yes.
Q It discloses encryption, correct?
A Yes.
Q And it discloses encrypting authentication information, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Where do you see that?
Q Do you agree or disagree?
A I -- I -- just from what you read, I don't see what you mean.

Q Are you familiar with the device disclosed in Maritzen referred to as the PTD?

A Yes.
Q What is the PTD?
A Let me look up what it's short for. It's the personal transaction device. So it's a device that a user would have in his or her car or other vehicle.

Q Let's look at paragraph 69. Paragraph 69 discloses something called a privacy card 110, right?
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A Just -- just a moment, please.
Yes. I'm done. What did you say?
Q Paragraph 69 discloses something called a privacy card 110, correct?

A Yes.
Q And it tells us that the privacy card is the size of a credit card, correct?

A In one embodiment, yes.
Q Well, the Maritzen reference doesn't suggest that the privacy card is of any size other than that of a credit card, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Don't remember that, but I see what you mean that it could be a credit-card-sized device -- credit card. I'm sorry.

Q And you'd agree with me that credit cards are handheld, right?

A Not as a person of skill in the art would use the term "handheld."

Q You don't regard a credit card as something that is handheld, correct?

A Handheld relates to, for example, a phone as a handheld device. Nobody would say, "What kind of handheld devices do you have?"
"Oh, I have a credit card."
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Q That's not what $I$ asked, sir. I didn't call a credit card a handheld device, did I?

A I'm not sure.
Q My question to you is credit cards are handheld, correct?

A Are you saying they could be held in one's hand?

Q Let's start with that.
A Yes, a credit card could be held in your hand.
Q Okay. Would you ever hold a credit card anywhere other than in your hand?

A I could hold it in my wallet.
Q Would you ever hold a credit card anyplace on your body other than your hand?

A I cannot think of any instance where $I$ would.
Q Okay. The privacy card can be integrated into the PTD in the Maritzen reference, correct?

A Yes.
Q And would you turn, please, to paragraph 16.
A To what? I'm sorry.
Q Paragraph 16.
A 60 ?
Q $16,1-6$.
A Oh, thank you.
Yes.
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Q Paragraph 16 tells us that figure 6A and 6B are examples of a personal transaction device with integrated privacy card. Do you see that?

A Yes, I do.
Q And if you would, please, now turn to figure 6A.

A Ooh, I wish you had a better copy than this.
This is the copy I've seen too.
Q Are you at figure 6A?
A Yes.
Q Figure 6A, the patent tells us, is the PTD with an integrated privacy card 110, correct?

A Yes.
Q Element 620 is a display, correct?
A Yes.
Q Element 630 is a biometric sensor, correct?
A Yes.
Q Element 630 is designed for a finger, correct?
A Where does it say, by the way? I don't
remember that part.
Q I'm just asking, sir, is figure -- is element 630 designed for a finger?

A Please jog my memory. Where is -- can I look this up? This is such a difficult figure. That's why I'm looking for the guidance on what it means. Would
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you happen to know the paragraph?
Q I -- I don't. And you can look at whatever you'd like, but my question to you, sir, is would one of ordinary skill in the art understand that the biometric sensor that is element 630 is designed for a finger?

A I cannot tell either from the description here. It says "illustrates biometric input 630." And this is such a poor image. It could be a fingerprint sensor. But, you know, it really could be something else too.

Q So you think one of ordinary skill in the art, looking at figure 6A and knowing that element 630 is a biometric sensor, that that person of ordinary skill in the art would think that something other than a person's finger should be placed on that element?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A For example, it could potentially be a microphone, right?

Q A biometric sensor has a microphone?
A A microphone could be used for biometric purposes. I don't know for sure, but we could go along with the assumption that it's a biometric sensor.

Q Well, it's not an assumption, sir. The patent tells us that, doesn't it?

A It says that it has biometric input 630. It
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doesn't quite describe what kind of biometric input. Are you referring to another paragraph?

Q Can a person hold the device in figure 6A in his or her hand?

A Given the context here, I don't think this is a handheld device.

Q You don't think that the device in figure 6A is a cell phone?

A No, I don't. I think this is dash mounted because that would in the context of this application makes sense. If you're going to do this without having to be distracted from driving, you probably would not want to pull out your phone.

Q Well, would you agree with me that figure 6A is in the shape of cell phones that existed as of 2001?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It's in the general shape that matches some cell phones, but I don't believe that it would be a cell phone.

Q Could a person hold a cell phone in his or her hand in 2001?

A Yes.
Q Does the Maritzen reference anywhere disclose a mounting bracket for the PTD?

A It does not, but that would make sense if you
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don't want to be distracted when you're driving.
Q Sir, yes or no, does the Maritzen reference disclose a mounting bracket for the PTD?

A I would have to look for that. I'm not aware of it.

Q Does Maritzen disclose an adhesive for mounting the PTD?

A I'm not aware of that, but I haven't been looking for that.

Q None of the figures in the Maritzen reference show that the PTD can be mounted to anything, correct?

A Are you referring to the figures 6A and 6B?
Q Any of the figures anywhere in the Maritzen reference.

A I cannot tell what 6A and 6B refers to. This could be mounts as far as -- or include mounts, as far as I'm concerned. They're very poor images.

But irrespective of whether they're mounted or not in this figure, I wouldn't believe Maritzen would disclose a cell phone without saying that it's a cell phone.

Q Do you see anywhere in the Maritzen reference a figure that shows the PTD mounted to anything?

A So if you're looking at figure 6A, it's unfortunately of such a poor quality that it's hard to
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know what it is. We're speculating on what it is. We can't even know whether it's floating in the air or mounted on the dashboard.

Q Well, you know that that figure 6A shows a PTD, correct?

A That's what it says, yes.
Q And nothing in figure 6A shows the PTD mounted on anything, correct?

A That is where I'm stating that the figure is so weak in itself, you cannot tell whether this -- you know, I don't see a hand there. That's for sure. I cannot tell whether it's mounted or not.

Q Okay. Can you tell from any other figure whether the PTD is mounted? Is there anything that shows it being mounted?

A I can neither say that it's handheld nor mounted. These are awful pictures when it comes to describing things like that.

Q Is there anything in the text of the Maritzen reference that indicates that the PTD is mounted to something?

A It does not say, as far as I know.
Q Had you heard of a personal transaction device before you read the Maritzen reference?

A I don't think this is a term that is common in
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the art. I was not aware of, at the very least. I cannot remember having seen it. If $I$ saw it in a context where it would make sense, I would not recall that at this point.

Q Have you read the Maritzen reference from cover to cover?

A Yes, I have.
Q How many times?
A I would not know. I have read it several times.

Q As part of the preparation of your declarations, did you do any research into how the term "personal transaction device" is understood in the art?

A I did not. I was not asked to do that.
Q Personal devices are typically tied to a person, correct?

A But you're asking about personal transaction device now.

Q Sir, my question is personal devices are typically tied to a person, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Like a personal computer?
Q For example.
A Okay. So, for example, what is commonly referred to as a PC, say, a desktop computer, it's a
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personal device by naming. Of course one could share it.

Q The phrase "personal" refers to a relationship with a person, correct?

A Not necessarily. I share my PC with my son and my wife.

Q And you are all people, correct?
A We're all people.
Q Okay. Good.
Turn to paragraph 30, please.
A Sorry. I misunderstood your question. It does not have a relationship with one person. That's not what you asked, right? Could I just ask for clarification what you're asking?

Q I'm happy to, but what question do you want me to clarify?

A The last one. I'm just --
Q My last question was, And you are all people, correct?

A No, no, no. The previous one. Sorry.
Q The phrase "personal" refers to a relationship with a person.

A With one or more. Is that what you asked or with only one?

Q Either way.
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A So if it's with only one, then I'm not so sure that's true in many cases. And if it's one or more, I -- it at least works for my PC example.

Nevertheless, did I answer you in a way that
made sense?
Q You own a smartphone, correct?
A Yes, I do.
Q Do you regard that as a personal device?
A Unfortunately not. I -- I often lend it to my
son. So I use it much of the time, but it's not only used by me.

Q All right. Can you turn, please, to paragraph 30.

A Yes.
Q You've read paragraph 30 before today?
A Yes.
Q That paragraph describes a pre-funded cash account that is loaded onto the PTD, correct?

A Yes.
Q And a cash account would be one way to identify a specific user, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A When you say "identify user," what do you mean?

Q What's confusing to you about that?
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A The goal of a cash account is not to identify a user but, rather, to perform financial transactions. So I'm trying to understand your question.

Q The user of the PTD would be associated with the pre-funded cash account, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A So one or more users would be associated with it.

Q And if I wanted to fund my pre-funded account, I would need to identify my account before $I$ funded it, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A You're not referring to the paragraph you drew my attention to now, right?

Q I am.
A Okay. So is it the loading of the pre-funded -- the loading of it?

Q One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that if you wanted to fund the pre-funded account, you need to identify the account prior to funding it, correct?

A No. For example, if you are taking subway rides in the New York Metro and you have a stored value card, you just stick it in the machine, you don't have to identify an account. You could transfer money. You
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could, for example, put a bill in, and that would add to the balance associated with the account.

Q Okay. Well, paragraph 30 is talking about a pre-funded cash account, right?

A That's what I used in the example. When I pay money in order to build up my MTA card, that's a cash account.

Q Your -- your MTA card is a cash account?
A It's a stored value.
Q Is your MTA card a cash account?
A It's not a credit account. It's a stored value. That's how I read the cash here, that it's a noncredit, but it's a stored value.

Q Would you agree that a pre-funded cash account needs to have a account identifier that identifies the account?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A So the biometric key here, as we discussed, is used to locate the record associated with the device. And to that extent, that key could -- is a record locator -- is that what you're asking about?

Q You've read paragraph 30 in its entirety, correct?

A Yes, I did.
Q And you know, then, that paragraph 30
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describes an embodiment in which the funds are uniquely identified with the owner of the PTD, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A So I read the owner of the PTD as the user of the PTD. I know it says the owner of it, but I understand it to mean the user of it.

Q And you understand that this indicates that the PTD is associated with a single owner, correct?

A Here, it doesn't clarify. For example, the owner could be an organization. And that's not a single user.

Q You think that paragraph 30, when it says the owner of the PTD, that one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret that as an organization; is that right?

A No, I'm not saying one way or the other. I'm saying it says here that it's identified the owner. For example, say that you have a bus company, and every bus driver would be able to pay the tolls using the PTD here. Now, of course the bus driver is not going to have to pay for the toll. But it goes to the bus company. Here, the owner of the device is not the user of the device. The user of the device is the bus driver, and the account owner is the device owner.

So I'm -- all I'm saying is that it's not very clear on this account at all.
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Q You read the owner of the PTD to mean that the PTD could have multiple owners; is that right?

A No. I'm saying I'm not reading it as it's a single user.

Q When it says the owner of the PTD, it means a single owner, correct?

A But if the single owner is a corporate entity, that corresponds to multiple people.

Q Can you answer my question. When it says the owner of the PTD, it means a single owner, correct?

A It means a single entity, as I read it here.
Q So you think that the owner in paragraph 30 is not a person but an entity?

A I am just -- since it doesn't specify, I am being as clear as I can without overgeneralizing.

Q So when it says personal transaction device, you are interpreting "personal" to mean "entity"?

A No. Personal transaction device as such is not a term that I'm familiar with in the prior art. We spoke about personal devices like a PC, which, as I gave the example, could be associated with multiple people.

Q Okay. Let's go to paragraph 45.
A Just give me one moment, please.
Yes.
Q In paragraph 35, the third sentence says that
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the transaction key can include a PTD identifier, correct?

A Yes.
Q And then the next sentence says that the -the next -- strike that. The next sentence says that the identifier identifies the particular PTD being used, correct?

A Yes.
Q The transaction key is sent to the clearinghouse as part of the authentication, correct?

A It doesn't actually say authentication. If we call it the operation, I agree.

Q If the transaction key includes the PTD identifier, that means that the PTD identifier is also sent to the clearinghouse, correct?

A Yes, that's how I understand it.
Q And paragraph 48 tells us that the clearinghouse 130 compares the transaction key against a list of keys associated with a particular user, correct?

A Let me just read this again. It says it validates it against preexisting user keys. Is that the sentence you have in mind?

Q Yes.
A Yes. So the clearinghouse may validate the transaction key against preexisting user keys.
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Q The clearinghouse could use the PTD identifier to identify the user, correct?

A Where does it say that?
Q You don't think one of ordinary skill in the art would understand from paragraph 48 that the clearinghouse could use the PTD identifier to identify the user?

A The PTD identifier identifies the PTD, which is a device. Now, the device, if it's used by multiple people, the identifier is going to remain the same.

Q If the PTD has a single owner, the clearinghouse could use the PTD identifier to identify the user, correct?

A But how would the clearinghouse know whether it has one or many?

Q Sir, if the PTD has a single owner, then the clearinghouse could use the PTD identifier to identify the user, correct?

A Again, we're back at the owner. The owner might be multiple users. So in -- and it's important here to say that the clearinghouse would have to know that there's only one user associated with it.

Q Do you understand I'm asking you to assume that the PTD has a single owner? Can you do that?

A Single owner. Can you use another word than
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"owner"?
Q No.
A Okay. So the owner might be an entity such as a bus company.

Q If the PTD has a single personal owner, a human being, the clearinghouse could use the PTD identifier to identify the user, correct?

A No, it didn't. That's the device. It doesn't know whether the wrong person uses it from seeing the PTD identifier. In other words, the PTD identifier doesn't convey your identity or parts thereof. In fact, this patent is very clear on that user information is not transmitted. So if you were to identify user, you would have to transmit user information.

Q Just tracking down exhibit numbers.
A There's a bunch to select from.
Q What's that?
A There's a bunch to select from.
Q That's true.
All right.
A Thank you.
Q Dr. Jakobsson, I'm handing you what had been previously been marked as Exhibit 1117 from the '809 IPR. Do you recognize that as a U.S. patent to Niwa?

A Yes, I do.
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Q And will you understand me if $I$ refer to Exhibit 1117 as the Niwa reference?

A Yes, I will.
Q Could you turn, please, to column 4, line 27.
A Just a moment.
Yes.
Q Do you see the sentence that reads the fingerprint identification device 50 includes a microprocessor memory and fingerprint sensor 51 which are interconnected and programmed in order to compare a fingerprint of the customer 52 with a stored fingerprint of that customer 52?

A Yes.
Q The microprocessor mentioned here is a processor within the fingerprint identification device, correct?

A I would understand that to be so.
Q This microprocessor is a first processor, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I'm not sure what you mean by that. Do you mean in the context of the claim language in the Niwa patent?

Q Let me ask you this. The fingerprint of the customer is authentication information, correct?

## Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.

Conducted on March 20, 2019

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A I'm sorry. Would you say that again.
Q The fingerprint of the customer is authentication information, correct?

A So do you mean authentication information in the context of the patents at stake here? Then I'm not so sure. We have to look at that.

Q Well, I'm using authentication information in the same way that it's used in the '137 and '826 patents.

A So there, it depends on other claim limitations to interpret what it means. Authentication information has a relationship to other limitations.

Q Well, do you understand the way the term "authentication information" is used in the '137 and ' 826 patents?

A Yes. But I have a hard time applying it to Niwa. Would you -- can we switch to the '137 and look at authentication information?

Q No, not yet.
A Okay.
Q Would you agree with me that the fingerprint of the customer as described in column 4 of the Niwa reference is authentication information as the term "authentication information" is used in the '137 and

# Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D. <br> Conducted on March 20, 2019 

' 826 patents?
A I would have to look at either my declarations or the patent to determine that. I cannot recall the exact description related to this.

Q Your declarations do not say whether the fingerprint of the customer in the Niwa reference is authentication information, correct?

A I would have to look this up.
Q Go ahead.
A Let me...
So I know that Niwa produces an authentication code, and I'm reading from the abstract.

Q Do you recall my question?
A Yes, I think I do.
So Niwa produces an authentication code when the fingerprint of a customer matches a stored fingerprint.

Now, in the context of '8 -- the ' 826 patent, claim 21, the first authentication information is transmitted, and it's received by the second device. Now, I don't think Niwa transmits this, so I don't see how it could be first authentication information.

Q Okay. The question that I asked you is the following. Your declarations do not say whether the fingerprint of the customer in the Niwa reference is
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authentication information, correct?
A I -- in the context of the patent owner's response, I'm the rebuttal expert. So for -- for that purpose, I've only commented on things that Dr. Shoup has described. He probably did not make an assertion earlier to this, and, therefore, I -- I would not include anything in my declaration.

Q When Niwa says that the microprocessor memory and fingerprint sensor 51 are interconnected and programmed in order to compare a fingerprint, you understand that to mean the microprocessor is performing the comparison, correct?

A Let me take a look at this sentence again. I forgot where we were.

Q We were at column 4 beginning at line 27.
A So it says that the fingerprint sensor in 51 are interconnected and programmed -- I'm sorry -includes a microprocessor memory and fingerprint sensor which are interconnected and programmed in order to compare fingerprint of the customer 52 with a stored fingerprint of that customer 52. So are you -- would you -- in light of that, would you ask your question again?

Q One of ordinary skill in the art would understand the sentence that you just read to mean that
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the microprocessor is performing the comparison, correct?

A Yes.
Q The comparison here is done by the fingerprint identification device 50, correct?

A That is one way to do it. As we talked about before, there are lots of cases where one would want a determination to be made elsewhere, but what you're describing is one possibility.

Q And it's the possibility that Niwa discloses, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection; form.
A Well, they're programmed in order to compare the fingerprint of the customer. That might be to send something elsewhere and receive something. That would be in order to do it. It doesn't specifically say where it's done. One good place would be to do it on this device.

Q Niwa discloses a processor that's configured to compare stored biometric information with the biometric information of the user, correct?

A You know, let me backtrack to my previous answer and -- and clarify. I think you're right that this microprocessor would do the comparison. Give me a moment and figure this out. It's getting late in the
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day, and I want to make sure $I$ don't mix these up.
I can't find any evidence one way or another, and I'm not sure. I'm sorry. I don't remember anything about whether it would be done there or elsewhere. Either is possible.

Q Would you agree with me that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that the system described in the Maritzen reference could be -- could be combined with the system described in the Niwa reference?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Do you mean in general?
Q That the two systems could be combined? MR. KAERICHER: Same objection.

A Just a moment. I know I've addressed this, and I want to make sure that I'm not making a misstatement.

So I know I have addressed the motivation to combine and described why a person of skill in the art would not have combined the Maritzen and Jakobsson.

Q My question, sir, is about combining Maritzen and Niwa?

A I understand. I do not recall where I addressed this in my declaration.

Do you know the place where that has been discussed.

Q I -- I don't. You're welcome to look at anything you want in your declarations, but my question to you, simply, sir, is that would you agree that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that the system described in the Maritzen reference could be combined with the Niwa reference?

A So --
MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A -- I'm looking for what I've already written, because I want -- don't want to wing this. If I haven't made an assertion about it in any of the declarations, I have not expressed an opinion about it, and I would need some time to consider that.

Q Have you considered, at all, whether the Maritzen reference incorporates the Niwa reference?

A I know that it incorporates it for certain purposes. So I -- I know that the Maritzen reference relies on aspects of Niwa by incorporating by reference. But I need to understand your question. I'm sorry.

Q Does the Maritzen reference incorporate by reference the Niwa reference?

A Yes, it does.
Q And do you have any understanding of what the legal significance is of one reference incorporated by reference in another?
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A Yes. Unless they state otherwise, then they use all of the portions of the incorporated. So I need to go back and look where they incorporate the reference to see whether it was all or not.

Q Okay. Can you put the Schutzer reference back in front of you.

Is it buried in there, someplace?
A Yeah, I'm not sure where. That's it. Yes.
Q Okay. Do you have the Schutzer reference now in front of you?

A I do.
Q Could you turn, please, to figure 5. I'd like to ask some questions about that.

A Can we look at where this is cited? Do you know the paragraph where it's referenced offhand?

Q Paragraph 35.
A Okay.
Yes.
Q In figure 5 of the Schutzer reference, the user enters information into the device 34, correct?

A Yes.
Q And paragraph 35 of Schutzer discloses that for this input, quote, the user 2 enters a password onto the input device 34 , such as the keypad, or, alternatively, the user 2 enters a biometric, such as a
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fingerprint. Onto the input device 34 , such as a biometric input device. Correct?

A Yes.
Q And then after receiving the correct information, the input device 34 provides an anonymous card number to the merchant point-of-sale card device 42, correct?

A I -- I'll read it. Upon entering the correct password or biometric on to the input device 34, the anonymous card number is displayed on the LCD 36 as the card number, and when the card 32 is dipped in the card device 42, the magnetic strip 38 outputs the anonymous card number.

Q So do you agree with me that after receiving the correct information, the input device 34 provides an anonymous card number to the merchant point-of-sale card device 42?

A It doesn't say so. It just says that the magnetic strip outputs the anonymous card number. Seems plausible that this would be read by the card device 42, even though it's not explicitly stated.

Q One of ordinary skill in the art reading paragraph 35, would understand that after receiving the correct information, the input device 34 provides an anonymous card number to the merchant point-of-sale
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device 42, correct?
A It allows it to be provided. So the magnetic
strip is being written with the anonymous card number and the user swipes or dips, and then, as a result of that, this information is being read.

Q And then in paragraph 37, the anonymous card number could be a one-time-use anonymous card number, correct?

A Did you say 37?
Q I did.
A I haven't read that paragraph. I apologize.
Sorry. Paragraph 37 or line 37.
Q Paragraph 37?
A Paragraph. Thank you.
Would you state your question again, please.
Q In paragraph 37, the anonymous card number can be a one-time-use anonymous card number, correct?

A Yes.
Q This anonymous card number is eventually provided to the issuing bank 8, correct?

A Yes.
Q Could you look at paragraph 32, please.
A Give me a moment, please.
Yes, I've read that.
Q In paragraph 32, Schutzer explains that the
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issuing bank server receives the anonymous card number and sends the card holder's actual card number to the card issuer's authorization processor 26 before authorizing the transaction, right?

A So the alternate -- the issuer's alternate card number generator receives the request and transmits the actual card number. But that is not the entity that sends the authorization, I believe. That's the card issuer's authorization processor 26. So it's the receiving party.

Q In paragraph 32, Schutzer explains that the issuing bank server receives the anonymous card number, correct?

A Yes.
Q And in paragraph 32, Schutzer explains that the issuing bank server sends the card holder's actual card number to the card issuer's authorization processor 26 , correct?

A That is correct.
Q And that happens before authorizing the transaction, correct?

A That happens before the transaction is authorized.

Q The issuing bank server identifies the actual card number based on the anonymous card number, correct?
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A So it doesn't use exactly those terms. But I would understand there to be a lookup of some form.

Q One of ordinary skill in the art, reading paragraph 32 would understand that the issuing bank's server identifies the actual card number based on the anonymous card number. Correct?

A Because it has stored it before. We know that it generates the next number in the sequence. So I would presume that it stores that number.

Q So is the answer correct?
A I -- so I understand that if you used the pre-stored number and look that up and use it.

Q So would you agree with me that a person of ordinary skill in the art reading paragraph 32 would understand that the issuing bank server identifies the actual card number based on the anonymous card number?

A Yes.
Q The issuing bank server maps the anonymous card number to the actual card number, correct?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A I'm not sure there's a mapping. It doesn't say one way or the other.

Q One --
A It says that it links the other card number to the card holder, actual number. So it could just be a
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lookup, as it suggests here.
Q One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that paragraph 32 indicates that the issuing bank server compares the anonymous card number to the actual card number, correct?

A Would you say that again? It compares to what?

Q One of ordinary skill in the art would understand paragraph 32 to indicate that the issuing bank server compares the anonymous card number to the actual card number.

A I don't understand that at all. They would not be the same, I think, and there would be no meaning to compare them.

Q What would one of ordinary skill in the art understand paragraph 32 to indicate that the issuing bank server does with the anonymous card number?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A It doesn't say, but it says before that it has linked the alternate card number to the card holder's actual number. So I don't think there's -- there's a comparison to the anonymous card number and the actual card number. That would make very little sense. You know, I haven't studied this reference with this question in mind. I can be pretty sure that it doesn't
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perform the comparison that you perform, but $I$ don't know what it does do, because I haven't been asked to figure that out in this context.

Q Can you look back at the '585 reference, please?

MR. KAERICHER: We've been going over an hour.
MR. SELWYN: Okay. Just give me about five minutes. Might be less. Could be a little bit more.

A Yes. I'm at the '585.
Q Okay. And if you'd turn, please, to paragraph 41 of the '585 reference?

A Yes. Give me a moment to read this.
Yes.
Q Did you draft paragraph 41?
A I cannot remember that.
Q Among you, Dr. Juels, and Dr. Kaliski, whose idea was paragraph 41?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A There's no way for me to know.
Q You don't know, as you sit here, whether it was your idea?

A I -- you know, I need to read this patent application carefully. It was filed, as I said, in 2004. I don't remember the details of it right now. By studying records, I might be able to find the answer to
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your question, although $I$ doubt it since $I$ don't believe I kept any such records.

Q Okay. So you don't know, correct?
A Sitting here right now, I cannot remember.
Q Do you see on page 14 beginning at line 9 of paragraph 41 the sentence that reads, quote, In still other embodiments, a credit-card-sized device 120 is a card such as a credit card including a magnetic strip or other data store" --

A I'm sorry. I don't see that. You said
line 9?
Q So I'm -- I'm on page 14.
A Yes.
MR. KAERICHER: And it's line 8.
A I'm sorry?
Q Line 8.
A Line 8? I'm sorry. Line 8. Yes. Now I see it.

Q It reads, "In still other embodiments, a credit card-sized device 120 is a card such as a credit card including a magnetic strip or other data store on one of its sides."

A Yes.
Q Did you author that sentence?
A I cannot recall.
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Q Do you recall if that was your idea or Dr. Juels' or Dr. Kaliski's?

A I have no idea at this point.
Q Do you remember seeing that sentence before today?

A I'm sure I saw it when we submitted this publication. Now, this actually speaks about the question you asked me before --

Q Sir, I haven't asked a question yet.
A I'm sorry?
Q I haven't asked a new question yet.
A Okay.
Q Do you have a memory of reading that sentence before today?

A You know, I know I read the whole publication multiple times when $I$ was first starting to study this reference. But I don't have a specific memory of specifically reading this line.

Q Okay. Let me just ask you about this line. I'm going to focus your attention just on this line that begins "In still other embodiments," okay?

A Yes.
Q It says in this sentence that the user authentication device 120 is a card such as a credit card, correct?
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A No. I'm sorry. It says it's a
credit-card-sized device. "In still other embodiments, a credit-card-sized device, 120, is a card such as a credit card." So it describes the form factor. It has the form factor of a credit card. That's what it means. So it is -- it is not saying that it's a credit card. It's a credit-card-sized device.

Q And then it goes on and says, "Including a magnetic strip or other data store on one of its sides." Do you see those words?

A Right.
Q And a magnetic strip is something physical, correct?

A Yes.
Q And "other data store on one of its sides" is also describing something physical, correct?

A Yes.

Q Do you agree that the credit-card-sized device disclosed in this sentence can be the user authentication device 120?

A It says that the credit-card-sized device 120, so it describes 120, and it says that it can have the form factor of a credit card, and in addition to the form factor, it could have the storage. That is correct.
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Q Do you agree that the credit-card-sized device disclosed in the sentence can be the user authentication device 120?

A I'm a little bit puzzled by your question, because I'm just reading back to make sure I get it right. It says it's a credit-card-sized device 120. So we know that it speaks of 120, and it now describes the form factor of it, that it's credit card sized.

Q Well, it says a credit-card-sized device is a card such as a credit card, does it not?

A What it means here, it's a card -- let me give the perspective here. It doesn't say that it has an account number and -- that you use for purchases. It's a credit-card-sized device. What -- a user seeing it in my wallet would recognize it as being similar to a credit card. For example, you might have more credit-card-sized devices than actual credit cards. You might have a credit-card-sized device with a mag stripe that allows you into the building.

So it describes a general device with this form factor, but it does not describe something that is used in order to make a purchase.

Q So your -- you don't believe that that sentence discloses an actual credit card, correct?

A It describes something that is such as a
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credit card in its form factor.
Q Does that sentence describe an actual credit card?

A It describes it -- it's saying that the credit-card-sized device 120 is as such as a credit card. It doesn't say that it is a credit card. It describes the form factor and the fact that it has a magnetic strip and/or other data store on its side. It would not be used for purchases. This is an authentication device.

Q Are you as confident in that testimony as you are in all the other testimony you've given today?

MR. KAERICHER: Objection to form.
A Like I said before, I -- I don't rate my confidence, but I feel confident in that this describes the form factor of the device.

Q So your testimony is that one of ordinary skill in the art reading the '585 reference would not interpret a credit-card-sized device 120 is a card such as a credit card to mean a credit card that could perform a credit card transaction?

A A person who reads this of course would read it in the context of the patent application. And it would know that this is not a credit-card-related application. This is about authentication devices, and
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it speaks here about it's a credit-card-sized device. And it describes further that it has the -- such as a credit card including a magnetic strip or other data store on the side. But is not a credit card. And a person of skill in the art would not be mistaken reading this reference as such to think that this sentence describes a credit card.

Q So your testimony under oath today is that one of ordinary skill in the art reading that sentence would not view the credit card reference there to be a credit card that could perform a credit card transaction, correct or incorrect?

A The person of skill in the art that you're asking about would probably not only be asked to read this sentence but would read it in the context of the patent.

Q Can you answer my question?
A I need to qualify it. I don't believe you're asking about this sentence alone. I believe you're asking about the sentence --

Q No, sir. I'm asking about the sentence alone.
A This sentence alone has no meaning. It has meaning in the context of the patent application.

Q This sentence has no meaning?
A By itself. It needs to be construed in the
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context here. In the context here, we know this is not about credit card transactions. This is about authentication.

Q Now, tell us, please, like when you said in that sentence, "in still other embodiments," what do you understand "still other embodiments" to mean?

A So, before, it has described an embodiment where there's a keypad or button for PIN entry. So that is one embodiment. There are several embodiments given here.

Q What is a key fob?
A A key fob is a small device that you typically can carry on a key chain.

Q So is a key fob a credit-card-sized device?
A It doesn't have the form factor of a credit card normally, but people would understand a key fob -it's possible that a key fob has that functionality, but many of them do not.

MR. KAERICHER: We've been going for way over an hour now.

MR. SELWYN: Yeah, let's take our break.
(A recess ensued from 4:30 p.m. to 4:37 p.m.)
MR. SELWYN: I don't have any further
questions at this time.
MR. KAERICHER: Okay. Can I have just a
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minute? I'll be right back. But I'm probably done too. (A recess ensued from 4:38 p.m. to 4:39 p.m.) MR. KAERICHER: No questions.
(The deposition concluded at 4:39 p.m.)
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```87:13, 94:25, 143:17 authenticity 78:1 author 239:24 authorization 235:3, 235:8, 235:9, 235:17 authorized 235:23 authorizing 235:4, 235:20 authors 41:20 automatic 87:1, 87:4, 87:11 automatically 85:11, 85:13, 86:14, 87:9 avoided 75:7 award 16:16 awards 16:10, 16:13, 16:14, 16:15, 16:21, 17:7 aware 9:3, 14:11, 14:14, 14:19, 14:22, 15:21, 16:1, 16:5, 16:10, 16:13, 16:20, 17:1, 17:4, 17:6, 17:9, 18:5, 28:17, 29:4, 30:2, 72:11, 72:17, 86:18, 87:22, 151:14, 185:16, 213:4, 213:8, 215:1 away 181:25, 182:15 awful 214:17``` |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | 121:18, 136:12, <br> 161:19, 202:6, <br> 212:18, 213:19, <br> 235:8, 239:1, <br> 242:23, 244:18, <br> 244:19 <br> believed <br> 136:15 <br> belonging <br> 64:11 <br> beneficial <br> 104:16, 125:17, 134:10 <br> benefit $188: 3$ <br> benefits 117:2, 125:14, $152: 1,154: 2$ <br> best <br> 5:15, 10:22, <br> 71:5, 94:24, <br> 130:10, 196:1 <br> bet <br> 203:2 <br> better <br> 194:25, 210:7 <br> between <br> 7:4, 30:23, <br> 67:25, 68:10, <br> 83:19 <br> beyond <br> 17:5 <br> big <br> 184:11 <br> bill <br> 105:10, 219:1 <br> billed <br> 7:18 <br> biological <br> 95:23, 157:22 <br> biometrically <br> 178:2 <br> biometrics <br> 13:14, 191:5 <br> bit <br> 5:25, 73:24, <br> 79:8, 105:4, <br> 105:19, 110:16, | ```141:2, 189:21, 194:25, 238:8, 242:4 bits 127:12, 127:15, 138:23, 139:2, 139:13, 139:17, 139:23, 140:5, 140:8, 140:10, 140:11, 140:12, 140:17, 140:18, 200:4, 200:6 bjorn 1:14, 2:1, 4:3, 5:2, 5:11, 247:6, 247:17 block 65:6, 131:10 blocks 165:25 blood 247:25 board 1:3 body 209:14 boilerplate 11:6 book 41:15, 46:20, 46:21, 47:1 both 14:4, 30:3, 37:9, 37:14, 37:23, 40:17, 41:1, 45:3, 74:9, 113:12, 114:22, 134:23, 187:4, 202:1 bottom 156:18, 207:1 bracket 212:24, 213:3 break 6:16, 79:13, 79:17, 112:16, 118:1, 160:14, 168:17, 179:8,``` | $180: 1, \quad 200: 19$, <br> $245: 21$ <br> breaks <br> $182: 14$ <br> bring <br> $171: 7$ <br> brought <br> $161: 2$ <br> build <br> $219: 6$ <br> building <br> $103: 19, \quad 165: 25$, <br> $242: 19$ <br> built <br> $197: 23$ <br> bunch <br> $224: 16, \quad 224: 18$ <br> buried <br> $232: 7$ <br> burton <br> $12: 12$ <br> bus <br> $220: 17, \quad 220: 19$, <br> $220: 20, \quad 220: 22$, <br> $224: 4$ <br> button <br> $245: 8$ <br> buy <br> $146: 5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 208:3 | 37:18, 238:23 | certified | 166:6, 166:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| calls | careless | 2:8, 247:3 | 168:9, 168:21, |
| 8:24, 9:1, | 142:4 | certify | 168:22, 169:1, |
| 15:6, 18:9, | carry | 247:4, 247:13, | 169:2, 169:11, |
| 24:7, 171:4 | 245:13 | 247:17, 247:24 | 169:21 |
| can't | case | cetera | ciphertexts |
| 27:23, 71:9, | 1:11, 14:10, | 195:4 | 35:10, 35:13 |
| 104:17, 133:20, | 21:4, 43:8, | chain | circuit |
| 186:14, 186:19, | 43:10, 56:15, | 245:13 | 182:6 |
| 187:11, 187:15, | 79:2, 89:3, | channel | cite |
| 187:22, 214:2, | 105:8, 105:11, | 162:19 | 117:6, 117:10, |
| 230:2 | 168:12, 184:1, | chapters | 117:16, 117:22, |
| cannot | 185:6, 187:6, | 4:10, 41:11 | 118:8, 119:25 |
| 5:15, 24:14, | 198:5, 198:7, | characteristic | cited |
| 32:7, 34:5, | 198:8, 198:21 | 96:9, 96:10, | 19:14, 232:14 |
| 34:12, 34:14, | cases | $158: 1, \quad 158: 2$ | cites |
| 60:23, 89:7, | 185:17, 217:2, | characteristics | 120:4 |
| 173:24, 183:14, | 229:7 | 95:23, 157:22 | claim |
| 183:20, 184:11, | cash | characterization | 19:22, 22:21, |
| 185:10, 185:22, | 217:17, 217:20, | 114:9 | 22:22, 25:13, |
| 185:24, 186:6, | 218:1, 218:5, | characterize | 25:14, 25:15, |
| 192:25, 193:1, | 219:4, 219:6, | 57:6 | 90:19, 91:4, |
| 193:7, 194:2, | 219:8, 219:10, | characterized | 91:5, 91:15, |
| 196:12, 209:15, | 219:12, 219:14 | 56:2 | 119:5, 119:10, |
| 211:6, 213:15, | category | charges | 160:22, 161:5, |
| 214:10, 214:12, | 11:14 | $198: 25$ | 161:8, 161:10, |
| 215:2, 227:3, | cause | charlotte | 161:11, 161:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 238: 15, \\ & 239: \end{aligned}$ | 123:5 | $1: 25,2: 7$ | $225: 22,226: 11,$ |
| $239: 25$ | caution | $247: 3, \quad 248: 11$ | $227: 19$ |
| capable | $8: 15,123: 3,$ | check | claimed |
| $132: 4$ | $123: 21$ | $85: 5$ | $89: 23,91: 8,$ |
| capture | cell | checkout | $91: 11, \quad 117: 1,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 197: 24 \\ & \text { cantured } \end{aligned}$ | 212:8, 212:15, | $120: 1, \quad 120: 5,$ | $117: 2, \quad 167: 18,$ |
| captured $198: 2$ | $212: 18,212: 20,$ | $120: 9,120: 12,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 167: 23 \\ & \text { 1 aime } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 198: 2 \\ & \text { car } \end{aligned}$ | $213: 20$ | $120: 19, \quad 122: 20$ | claims <br> 20:8, 20:10 |
| $207: 23$ | centered | chief | 20:8, 20:10, |
| card-sized | certain | 5:23, 5:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 15, ~ 20: 21, \\ & 21: 1,21: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| 239:20 | 80:15, 138:9, | cipher 40:20, | 21:16, 22:8, |
| cards | $156: 25,231: 16$ | $131: 10,169: 5 \text {, }$ | 22:14, 22:17, |
| 101:8, 143:24, | certainly | 169:19, 171:8, | $\left[\begin{array}{ll} 28: 9, & 28: 19, \\ 29: 5, & 72: 18 \end{array}\right.$ |
| $144: 22,145: 11,$ | 41:19, 76:24, | 171:9, 172:5 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 29: 5, \quad 72: 18, \\ & 89: 23, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| $146: 3,146: 13$, $146: 15,146: 18$, | 99:12, 172:5 certificate | ciphers | $\begin{array}{\|ll} 89: 23, & 90: 4, \\ 118: 21, & 119: 1, \end{array}$ |
| 208:16, 209:4, | 77:14, 247:1 | ciphertext | 119:13, 119:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 242: 17 \\ & \text { carefully } \end{aligned}$ | certificates $79: 5$ | $40: 2, \quad 44: 1,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:23, 121:4 } \\ & \text { clarification } \end{aligned}$ |
| 19:25, 20:24, | certification | $48: 22,49: 2$ | 196:4, 216:14 |
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|  | $\begin{array}{ll} 161: 25, & 162: 10, \\ 165: 20, & 166: 2, \\ 197: 18, & 197: 20 \end{array}$ <br> comprise <br> 73:14, 202:7 <br> compromise <br> 154:3 <br> computation <br> 34:6, 61:21, <br> 157:3 <br> computationally <br> 35:14, 35:17 <br> compute <br> 23:17, 34:5, <br> 34:8, 61:18 <br> computed <br> 131:20, 175:4 computer $13: 4,13: 7,$ $152: 22,155: 25$ $161: 25,162: 25$ $164: 24, \quad 183: 10,$ $200: 2,215: 22,$ $215: 25$ <br> computers <br> 199:11, 199:22 <br> computing <br> 81:25 <br> concatenate <br> 125:19, 127:23, <br> 127:24, 127:25, <br> 128:5, 128:15, <br> 128:21, 129:2, <br> 129:5 <br> concatenated <br> 128:24, 129:12 <br> concatenation 128:10, 129:9, <br> 137:12, 137:13 <br> concept $34: 2, \quad 88: 20$ $89: 4$ <br> concepts <br> 41:19 <br> concerned <br> 213:17 <br> concluded <br> 246:4 | ```conclusion 151:8 conditional 19:1 conditions 87:10, 87:12 conduct 146:16 conferences 15:10 confidence 156:11, 243:15 confident 156:8, 196:15, 243:11, 243:15 configure 163:4, 163:10 configured 85:1, 86:8, 88:17, 161:11, 172:15, 229:19 confirm 78:1 confounded 73:24 confusing 217:25 conjunction 14:13, 15:3, 97:16, 150:11 connection 7:2, 9:10, 10:2, 10:12, 14:20, 27:13, 116:22, 117:21, 118:6, 118:25, 119:9, 119:17, 120:4, 120:18, 121:3, 121:21, 122:4, 122:12, 122:18, 123:1, 123:8 cons 153:24, 154:6 consider 20:23, 21:13, 25:16, 27:21, 59:25, 67:25,``` | ```68:10, 68:15, 72:10, 122:16, 123:23, 129:14, 153:10, 192:7, 231:13 considered 21:14, 22:12, 45:25, 46:1, 68:13, 69:15, 122:9, 128:20, 133:19, 134:17, 135:11, 139:7, 231:14 considering 193:8, 199:16 consistent 139:22 construct 34:12 constructed 34:13, 39:14, 44:1 construction 27:16 construed 244:25 consulting 7:1, 7:6 contacted 14:15, 15:1, 17:16 contain 10:23 contained 205:24 content 80:25 contents 41:18, 163:21, 163:22 context 13:6, 13:7, 17:3, 17:22, 19:22, 25:13, 31:12, 56:14, 58:5, 82:22, 88:3, 103:10, 107:16, 107:25,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | ```182:14, 184:8, 185:14 conveying 140:25, 184:19 conveys 78:17 copies 13:16 copy 210:7, 210:8 corporate 221:7 correctly 20:12, 178:2, 197:17 correspond 36:3, 112:7, 187:6 corresponding 25:12, 55:13, 160:24, 206:7 corresponds 111:6, 130:7, 134:12, 140:24, 221:8 counsel 8:19, 9:2, 14:15, 15:1, 17:16, 18:14, 123:4, 179:7, 247:15 count 192:12, 193:3, 194:13, 195:13 counter 25:12 counteract 132:24 couple 8:23 course 8:18, 18:16, 19:6, 37:21, 40:25, 42:8, 55:3, 70:17, 79:6, 79:9, 90:12, 90:13, 105:25, 109:19,``` |  | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 12,41: 16, \\ & 46: 17,165: 24, \\ & 166: 13,166: 17 \\ & \text { cryptosystem } \\ & 43: 22,44: 10, \\ & 44: 13,44: 17, \\ & 46: 2,47: 6, \\ & 47: 9,47: 20, \\ & 55: 19,55: 25, \\ & 56: 4,56: 6, \\ & 56: 9,56: 22, \\ & 57: 3,57: 8 \\ & \text { cryptosystems } \\ & 43: 20,44: 3, \\ & 44: 6 \\ & \text { csr } \\ & 1: 25,248: 11 \\ & \text { current } \\ & 5: 22,6: 20 \\ & \text { currently } \\ & 6: 20 \\ & \text { customer } \\ & 225: 11,225: 12, \\ & 225: 25,226: 3, \\ & 226: 23,227: 6, \\ & 227: 16,227: 25, \\ & 228: 20,228: 21, \\ & 229: 14 \end{aligned}$ <br> D d-e-s $50: 22$ dash $212: 9$ <br> dashboard $214: 3$ <br> data $\begin{aligned} & 5: 24, \quad 30: 18, \\ & 33: 12, \quad 51: 6, \\ & 60: 5, \quad 60: 7, \\ & 60: 25, \quad 61: 22, \\ & 61: 23, \quad 80: 3, \\ & 80: 25, \quad 84: 6, \\ & 84: 13, \quad 84: 21, \\ & 85: 2, \quad 85: 7, \\ & 85: 10, \quad 85: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  |  | ```describing 34:21, 72:19, 96:13, 100:16, 108:13, 135:22, 144:11, 151:8, 158:7, 169:4, 172:22, 214:18, 229:9, 241:16 description 4:8, 62:12, 62:17, 63:1, 63:21, 84:14, 89:17, 135:4, 137:23, 144:12, 146:9, 146:11, 173:24, 211:6, 227:4 descriptions 145:20, 167:10 design 153:2, 153:16, 155:9 designed 210:18, 210:22, 211:5 desirable 35:16, 132:25, 185:8, 185:17 desired 88:7, 88:14, 88:18 desktop 215:25 detail 18:15, 135:12 details 238:24 detected 177:23, 178:16, 184:9 detects 182:6 determination 67:8, 198:14, 229:8 determine 19:20, 23:18, 39:7, 47:22,``` | ```60:23, 82:24, 178:2, 183:13, 183:16, 187:2, 206:16, 227:3 determined 150:10 determines 68:24, 150:8, 204:9 determining 21:15 develop 129:6 developed 17:19, 34:16, 196:24 development 167:3 devices 22:25, 30:23, 31:10, 113:19, 143:21, 144:11, 146:2, 159:13, 178:1, 197:14, 208:24, 215:15, 215:19, 221:20, 242:17, 243:25 dictated 11:9 did 8:10, 8:14, 8:21, 9:1, 9:4, 11:7, 11:11, 17:22, 18:4, 19:11, 19:13, 19:16, 19:17, 19:20, 20:12, 22:23, 24:10, 24:13, 24:15, 26:9, 28:13, 29:23, 38:3, 38:18, 48:14, 61:8, 67:25, 68:10, 68:13, 68:15, 89:8, 96:11, 96:12, 100:2, 102:4, 102:5, 102:17,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 19, \quad 77: 1, \\ & 77: 4,77: 8, \\ & 77: 9, \quad 77: 12, \\ & 77: 17, \quad 77: 18, \\ & 77: 22, \quad 78: 5, \\ & 78: 15, \quad 78: 16, \\ & 78: 21, \quad 78: 23, \\ & 79: 3, \quad 79: 18, \\ & 79: 22, \quad 80: 2, \\ & 80: 9, \quad 80: 11, \\ & 80: 16, \quad 80: 19, \\ & 80: 23, \quad 82: 9, \\ & 82: 13, \quad 82: 15, \\ & 82: 18, \quad 82: 22, \\ & 82: 24, \quad 83: 3, \\ & 83: 4 \\ & \text { digits } \\ & 23: 10 \\ & \text { dipped } \\ & 233: 11 \\ & \text { dips } \\ & 234: 4 \\ & \text { direct } \\ & 65: 11, \quad 81: 19, \\ & 83: 11, \quad 93: 2, \\ & 111: 23, \quad 145: 16, \\ & 191: 6 \\ & \text { directed } \\ & 92: 8, \quad 92: 15, \\ & 107: 18 \\ & \text { directing } \\ & 53: 13, \quad 147: 23, \\ & 164: 18 \\ & \text { direction } \\ & 8: 17 \\ & \text { directly } \\ & 117: 1, \quad 117: 2 \\ & \text { disagree } \\ & 80: 22, \quad 81: 2, \\ & 106: 17, \quad 207: 14 \\ & \text { disagreement } \\ & 34: 19 \\ & \text { discern } \\ & 89: 14 \\ & \text { disclose } \\ & 27: 18, \quad 29: 22, \\ & 30: 1, \quad 75: 22, \\ & 142: 9, \quad 143: 20, \\ & \text { 71 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 202:1, 202:4, $202: 15, \quad 206: 23$, $207: 5, \quad 207: 8$, $207: 10, \quad 207: 25$, $208: 3, \quad 229: 10$, $229: 19, \quad 232: 22$, $242: 24$ disclosing $99: 8, \quad 130: 13$, $136: 8, \quad 158: 16$ disclosure $28: 1, \quad 28: 15$, $89: 9, \quad 144: 19$, $145: 24$ disclosures $68: 17, \quad 126: 9$, $146: 4$ discuss $28: 9, \quad 28: 23$, $29: 11, \quad 29: 19$ discussed $15: 10, \quad 17: 24$, $219: 18, \quad 230: 25$ discussing $29: 6$ display $210: 14$ displayed $233: 10$ displays $23: 9$ distinguish $104: 10$ distracted $212: 12, \quad 213: 1$ distributed $151: 23$ distribution $186: 20, \quad 187: 24$ distributive $154: 1$ district $6: 17, \quad 6: 18$ document $10: 17, \quad 41: 24$, $161: 1$ documents $25: 11, \quad 117: 7$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 117:11, 117:12, 119:25, 120:5 <br> does <br> 21:23, 25:14, <br> 27:3, 27:6, <br> 27:10, 27:17, <br> 27:23, 27:24, <br> 28:23, 53:21, <br> 55:12, 58:20, <br> 65:5, 70:2, <br> $70: 11,70: 15$, <br> 73:3, 73:20, <br> $75: 21,75: 22$, <br> 76:1, 76:10, <br> 82:2, 83:21, <br> 84:24, 85:5, <br> 85:14, 86:6, <br> 94:14, 99:15, <br> 105:16, 110:11, <br> 116:4, 117:6, <br> 117:16, 118:13, <br> 118:20, 119:4, <br> 119:12, 119:24, <br> 120:8, 120:11, <br> 120:22, 121:10, <br> 124:5, 129:9, <br> 130:4, 132:20, <br> 136:7, 140:9, <br> 142:9, 143:20, <br> 143:24, 144:2, <br> 144:20, 145:7, <br> 147:21, 148:5, <br> 149:19, 151:10, <br> 151:14, 151:15, <br> 153:22, 158:21, <br> 163:21, 171:3, <br> 171:14, 171:17, <br> 171:25, 172:24, <br> 175:15, 175:23, <br> 177:9, 187:17, <br> 191:18, 206:10, <br> 206:22, 210:19, <br> 212:23, 212:25, <br> 213:2, 213:6, <br> 214:22, 216:12, <br> 223:3, 231:20, <br> 231:22, 237:17, <br> 238:2, 242:10, |  |  | 220:23 <br> driving <br> $212: 12, \quad 213: 1$ <br> drop <br> $149: 8$ <br> duly <br> $5: 3, \quad 247: 8$ <br> dynamics <br> $17: 20$ <br> $\quad$ E <br> e <br> $129: 20, \quad 131: 7$, <br> $131: 8, \quad 131: 9$, <br> $131: 20, \quad 131: 21$, <br> $132: 2, \quad 132: 11$, <br> $132: 12, \quad 135: 21$, <br> $137: 8$ <br> e-mail <br> $73: 15, \quad 183: 23$, <br> $184: 5$ <br> each <br> $20: 7, \quad 20: 14$, <br> $20: 20, \quad 21: 1$, <br> $21: 6, \quad 22: 7$, <br> $22: 17, \quad 22: 21$, <br> $22: 22, \quad 23: 9$, <br> $25: 5, \quad 25: 15$, <br> $58: 8$, <br> $58: 18$, <br> $59: 2$, <br> $59: 7$, <br> $59: 8$, <br> $61: 18$, <br> $63: 11$, <br> $63: 15, \quad 81: 12$ <br> earlier <br> $228: 6$ <br> early <br> $47: 13$ <br> ease <br> $117: 3$ <br> easier <br> $91: 6$ <br> easy <br> $115: 22, \quad 140: 21$ <br> eavesdropper <br> $134: 9, \quad 141: 10$ <br> education <br> $152: 22$ <br> effectively <br> $168: 21, \quad 169: 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { either } \\ & 11: 8,16: 6, \\ & 16: 18,16: 25, \\ & 50: 12,112: 7, \\ & 120: 13,140: 2, \\ & 145: 16,161: 2, \\ & 169: 9,176: 6, \\ & 186: 25,203: 18, \\ & 205: 15,211: 6, \\ & 216: 25,227: 2, \\ & 230: 5 \\ & \text { electric } \\ & 198: 25 \\ & \text { electronic } \\ & 62: 13,62: 20, \\ & 63: 3,63: 6, \\ & 63: 15,63: 22, \\ & 64: 2,64: 8, \\ & 64: 10,64: 18, \\ & 64: 21,64: 24, \\ & 65: 1,65: 7, \\ & 65: 16,65: 21, \\ & 66: 3,66: 6, \\ & 163: 10,183: 10, \\ & 197: 14,197: 18, \\ & 197: 19 \\ & \text { element } \\ & 63: 17,156: 23, \\ & 157: 8,157: 10, \\ & 206: 8,210: 14, \\ & 210: 16,210: 18, \\ & 210: 22,211: 5, \\ & 211: 12,211: 15 \\ & \text { elements } \\ & 58: 8 \\ & \text { else } \\ & 8: 14,8: 21, \\ & 9: 4,74: 21, \\ & 114: 6,114: 24, \\ & 174: 12,175: 4, \\ & 187: 1,189: 19, \\ & 199: 3,199: 4, \\ & 211: 10 \\ & \text { elsewhere } \\ & 89: 1,160: 9, \\ & 198: 13,229: 8, \\ & 229: 15,230: 4 \\ & \text { emanuel } \\ & 2: 2,3: 14, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $247: 19$ embarrassed $41: 17, \quad 89: 19$ embodiment $67: 12, \quad 69: 10$, $140: 24, \quad 142: 14$, $156: 19, \quad 174: 7$, $174: 14, \quad 175: 8$, $191: 15, \quad 202: 22$, $208: 8, \quad 220: 1$, $245: 7, \quad 245: 9$ embodiments $57: 14, \quad 69: 17$, $69: 22, \quad 70: 1$, $70: 10, \quad 71: 10$, $172: 19, \quad 181: 14$, $239: 7, \quad 239: 19$, $240: 21, \quad 241: 2$, $245: 5, \quad 245: 6$, $245: 9$ emergency $139: 11$ employed $6: 5, \quad 248: 1$ employee $73: 15$ employer $6: 2$ enable $90: 10, \quad 90: 12$, $90: 13, \quad 92: 9$, $92: 16, \quad 92: 22$ enabled $49: 1, \quad 113: 11$ enabling $103: 5$ encrypt $30: 22, \quad 31: 11$, $35: 9, \quad 35: 24$, $35: 25, \quad 36: 15$, $36: 20, \quad 36: 21$, $39: 24, \quad 40: 17$, $41: 2, \quad 43: 15$, $44: 14, \quad 44: 18$, $161: 12, \quad 163: 5$, $163: 11, \quad 168: 5$ encrypted $31: 1, \quad 31: 7$, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```136:16 existed 22:25, 24:1, 26:4, 26:12, 27:8, 30:15, 44:3, 44:6, 47:11, 76:15, 76:19, 95:6, 95:10, 112:24, 113:6, 113:11, 113:18, 113:24, 114:3, 114:10, 114:16, 115:5, 115:9, 115:19, 115:24, 143:15, 197:2, 198:3, 212:15 existence 14:20, 14:25 existing 93:7, 96:24 expected 80:25, 132:21 expert 6:9, 12:21, 13:3, 13:5, 13:10, 13:14, 16:3, 228:3 expiration 84:5, 84:12, 84:21, 85:6, 86:14 expires 87:25 explain 52:10, 53:9, 54:11, 55:14, 112:2, 118:14, 118:17, 120:9, 120:11, 120:14, 184:15, 191:4 explained 178:23 explaining 129:8 explains 48:10, 48:21, 51:9, 51:14,``` | ```87:18, 88:9, 89:13, 94:7, 94:12, 120:19, 234:25, 235:11, 235:15 explicitly 63:11, 63:19, 139:5, 139:12, 140:22, 142:10, 142:13, 143:12, 157:1, 173:8, 233:21 expose 134:9, 136:2 exposed 104:17 expressed 68:8, 231:12 expression 27:4 extending 63:2 extent 203:11, 219:20 extract 196:20 extracted 172:9 extractible 182:10 extracting 171:20 extracts 171:5 eye 96:2, 96:4 facilitating 164:23 fact 26:17, 27:4, 157:14, 165:11, 167:11, 179:4, 188:25, 224:11, 243:7 factor 144:13, 241:4,``` |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 59:12, 59:16, | financial | 198:13, 198:18, | following |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $60: 10,60: 15$, | 101:8, 101:12, | 198:21, 198:22, | 227:24 |
| 60:17, 60:20, | 101:15, 101:16, | 199:1, 199:2, | follows |
| 61:3, 61:14, | 101:19, 101:21, | 199:5, 199:9, | 5:4 |
| 61:25, 62:9, | 103:9, 103:16, | 199:12, 199:15, | foolish |
| 62:17, 63:1, | 104:7, 104:10, | 199:18, 199:23, | 184:10 |
| 63:6, 63:15, | 104:14, 104:21, | 200:3, 200:7, | force |
| 63:21, 64:14, | 105:3, 106:19, | 200:9, 200:12, | 178:6, 184:7 |
| 64:15, 64:18, | 106:20, 107:14, | 200:13, 200:16, | forgot |
| 65:4, 65:6, | 107:15, 107:17, | 211:8, 225:8, | 228:14 |
| 65:20, 66:2, | 108:2, 108:3, | 225:9, 225:11, | formed |
| 66:10, 66:18, | 108:4, 108:5, | 225:15, 225:24, | 80:3 |
| 67:16, 67:19, | 108:10, 108:12, | 226:3, 226:22, | forming |
| 67:21, 68:7, | 108:13, 108:16, | 227:6, 227:16, | 79:21 |
| 68:18, 68:19, | 108:18, 108:21, | 227:17, 227:25, | forms |
| 69:10, 69:11, | 108:25, 109:2, | 228:9, 228:10, | 104:3, 104:6 |
| 69:22, 70:17, | 109:3, 144:22, | 228:16, 228:18, | forth |
| $70: 20,70: 25$, | 144:25, 145:21, | 228:20, 228:21, | $22: 15,247: 7$ |
| 71:19, 72:1, | 146:16, 146:17, | 229:4, 229:14, | found |
| 72:4, 73:3, | 146:20, 204:13, | 233:1 | $204: 4$ |
| 73:12, 73:20, | 218:2 | fingerprints | foundation |
| $74: 5,74: 22$, | financially | 96:1, 96:4, | $18: 1,34: 18,$ |
| 76:2, 76:3, | 248:3 | 157:22, 197:22 | $42: 1$ |
| 88:23, 89:6, | find | finish | fourth |
| 102:9, 102:10, | 38:23, 73:8, | $132: 22,156: 17,$ | $135: 15, \quad 170: 5$ |
| 210:1, 210:6, | 88:25, 123:23, | $195: 10$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 135: 15,170: 5, \\ & 171: 2,171: 13, \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| 210:9, $210: 11$, | 230:2, 238:25 | five | $171: 25,172: 10,$ |
| 210:21, 210:24, | finding | 238:7 | $172: 24,173: 22 \text {, }$ |
| 211:12, 212:3, | 203:11 | flinch | $191: 9,192: 1,$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}212: 7, & 212: 14, \\ 213: 19, & 213: 23,\end{array}$ | fine | $171: 19$ | $192: 5,194: 5$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 213: 19, ~ 213: 23, \\ & 213: 24, ~ 214: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 46:9, 181:7 | floating | frame |
| 213:24, $214: 4$, $214: 7,214: 9$, | finger | 214:2 | 74:8, 111:1 |
|  | $178: 7,194: 16$, 210:18, $210: 22$, | floor | fraudulent |
| $232: 12,232: 19,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 210: 18, ~ 210: 22, \\ & 211: 5, \quad 211: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 2:3, 3:15, $247: 20$ | 112:25, 113:2, |
| 238:3 | fingerprint | fob | 113:7 <br> from |
| figures | 188:13, 188:23, |  | $7: 6,23: 16,$ |
| 67:25, 68:4, | 189:4, 189:15, | $245: 14, \quad 245: 16,$ | $30: 18,31: 2,$ |
| 68:11, 69:17, | 190:3, 191:2, | $245: 17$ | $31: 8, \quad 31: 19,$ |
| 70:1, 70:10, | 193:1, 193:8, | focus | $31: 24, \quad 32: 4,$ |
| 12:2, 213:10, 213:12, 213:13 | 194:3, 194:15, | 50:17, 52:1, | $32: 13,32: 18,$ |
| 213:12, 213:13 <br> filed | 195:15, 196:12, | 142:6, 146:19, | 34:13, 40:1, |
| 20:16, 20 | 196:25, 197:2, | 240:20 | 41:11, 46:10, |
| $20: 16, ~ 20: 8$ $21: 3, ~ 21: 8$ | 197:6, 197:14, | focusing | 61:1, 63:9, |
| $21: 3,21: 8$, $21: 15, ~ 21: 21$, | 197:19, 197:24, | 71:11, 103:22 | 63:17, 63:24, |
| 22:9, 238:23 | 198:2, 198:5, | follow | 64:2, 64:8, |
| filing | 198:6, 198:8, | 72:3 | 64:22, 66:7, |
| $21: 19$ | 198:9, 198:12, | follow-up | 66:11, 66:16, |
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|  | functionality 107:9, 122:19, <br> 132:21, 133:14, <br> 136:18, 143:11, <br> 167:17, 245:17 <br> functions <br> 73:25, 74:3, <br> 74:5, 126:2, <br> 133:7, 135:3, <br> 136:11, 136:14, <br> 136:16, 175:10, <br> 175:12, 175:13, <br> 195:12 <br> fund <br> 218:9, 218:19 <br> funded <br> 218:10 <br> funding <br> 218:21 <br> funds <br> 220:1 <br> further $\begin{aligned} & 244: 2, \quad 245: 23, \\ & 247: 13,247: 17, \\ & 247: 24 \end{aligned}$ G <br> gain 105:5, 105:9, $106: 7,106: 11,$ $111: 18,183: 14$ $183: 20, \quad 184: 5,$ <br> 184:11, 185:10, <br> 185:22, 185:24, <br> 186:6 <br> gains <br> 106:10 <br> gatekeeper <br> 103:17 <br> gatekeeping <br> 104:11, 105:21 <br> gave $\begin{aligned} & 36: 7, \quad 39: 2, \\ & 39: 5,156: 24, \\ & 184: 16,194: 10, \\ & 221: 20 \\ & \text { general } \\ & 16: 13,68: 17, \end{aligned}$ | ```75:14, 76:7, 113:10, 113:21, 144:12, 147:13, 147:22, 149:24, 162:17, 186:1, 186:17, 187:18, 199:17, 212:17, 230:11, 242:20 generally 89:24, 90:4, 92:8, 92:15, 107:25 generate 124:8, 124:16, 130:23, 141:18, 175:13, 177:9, 178:10 generated 77:18, 77:23, 130:22, 174:8, 174:15, 174:21, 174:22, 177:15, 177:20, 179:12, 179:16, 182:13, 183:25 generates 99:22, 100:13, 173:12, 177:1, 177:5, 178:3, 178:4, 236:8 generating 27:18, 28:1, 28:7, 28:10, 28:20, 28:24, 29:6, 77:21, 182:8 generation 28:5, 29:20, generator 77:9, 235:6 genial 34:21 get 34:20, 60:7, 79:11, 112:8, 156:16, 175:2,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  |  | ```happen 192:25, 211:1 happens 85:16, 235:20, 235:22 happy 205:2, 216:15 hard 116:3, 130:9, 136:19, 170:23, 189:21, 213:25, 226:17 hardware 166:12, 167:8, 167:10, 167:14, 197:16 has 6:23, 9:12, 11:15, 13:20, 16:3, 22:2, 23:9, 25:19, 26:1, 26:21, 46:16, 55:11, 56:4, 61:1, 67:9, 81:4, 93:14, 95:6, 95:10, 104:15, 113:16, 114:22, 114:24, 122:5, 122:13, 123:7, 131:20, 135:2, 137:8, 139:9, 139:10, 152:22, 159:14, 159:16, 160:12, 161:2, 163:23, 171:8, 172:8, 177:23, 182:19, 184:2, 185:9, 188:2, 199:15, 200:23, 206:7, 211:19, 211:25, 223:11, 223:15, 223:16, 223:24, 224:5, 226:13, 228:5, 230:24, 236:7, 237:19, 241:4, 242:12, 243:7,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 214:23 | 148:19, 149:9, | 212:4, 212:20 | 150:13, 154:11, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| heart | 153:22, 167:18, | histories | 154:22, 155:1, |
| 145:20 | 170:23, 171:10, | 16:4 | 155:9, 155:15, |
| held | 171:19, 175:21, | history | 155:25, 162:25, |
| 2:1, 209:6, | 183:25, 184:1, | 15:24, 16:9, | 163:4, 163:10, |
| 209:9 | 192:16, 194:2, | 106:3 | 168:10, 174:12, |
| hellman | 195:20, 201:14, | hold | 179:25, 186:22, |
| 34:20 | 203:20, 204:19, | 186:1, 209:10, | 187:6, 198:24, |
| help | 205:3, 205:15, | 209:12, 209:13, | 215:8, 215:12, |
| 73:11, 102:13, | 206:8, 211:7, | 212:3, 212:20 | 219:12, 222:16, |
| 102:22 | 212:5, 219:12, | holder | 223:14, 227:22 |
| helpful | 219:18, 220:9, | 75:9, 91:25, | however |
| 193:19, 193:21, | 220:16, 220:19, | 92:17, 236:25 | 143:9, 193:2 |
| 196:5, 196:22 | 220:21, 221:11, | holder's | human |
| her | 223:21, 225:14, | 89:24, 90:5, | 224:6 |
| 45:8, 45:9, | 226:6, 229:4, | 90:16, 90:23, | hundred |
| 207:23, 212:4, | 237:1, 238:20, | 91:12, 91:20, | 7:24, 8:5 |
| 212:20 | 239:4, 242:11, | 91:24, 92:3, | hybrid |
| here | 242:12, 244:1, | 92:9, 92:16, | $43: 20,43: 22,$ |
| 5:16, 16:3, | $245: 1, \quad 245: 10$ | 235:2, 235:16, | 44:3, 44:6, |
| 19:14, 20:25, | here's | $237: 20$ | $44: 10,44: 13$ |
| 21:5, 23:11, | 173:18 | hour | 44:17, 44:24, |
| 24:21, 27:25, | hereby | 46:7, 79:10, | 45:22, 45:25, |
| 28:22, 29:9, | 247:4 | 156:16, 180:2, | 46:2, 47:6, |
| 31:10, 42:14, | herein | 238:6, 245:20 | 47:8, 54:18, |
| 53:7, 54:3, | 5:3 | hourly | 54:25, 55:19, |
| 54:14, 54:23, | hereinbefore | 6:20 | $55: 25,56: 4$, |
| 55:15, 65:4, | 247:7 | how | 56:9, 56:22, |
| 68:15, 71:9, | hereunto | 5:20, 6:5, 6:8, | 57:3 |
| 72:1, 72:14, | 248:6 | 6:11, 6:13, | hypothetical |
| 74:15, 85:9, | herself | 6:16, 6:23, | 189:22 |
| 86:20, 89:2, | 83:25, 85:21, | $7: 18,8: 1$, | I |
| 91:1, 91:3, | 86:2 | 12:16, 19:20, | i'11 |
| 100:4, 102:17, | hesitant | 20:1, 39:19, | 6:16, 13:25, |
| 104:11, 106:15, | 6:1, 115:21 | 47:25, 52:6, | 25:1, 46:22, |
| 106:21, 107:16, | hidden | 52:20, 53:25, | 107:24, 115:24, |
| 108:13, 109:22, | 172:8 | 54:7, 60:17, | 160:4, 233:8, |
| 111:21, 112:5, | hide | 74:8, 88:1, | $246: 1$ |
| 112:6, 112:7, | 141:11, 163:21, | 89:13, 109:7, | i've |
| 124:11, 126:9, | 163:22, 178:13 | 109:16, 110:7, | $8: 3, \quad 17: 3,$ |
| 126:23, 128:8, | him | 110:19, 111:9, | $17: 4, \quad 17: 5,$ |
| 128:22, 130:6, | 12:18, 17:18, | $117: 7, \quad 117: 11$ | $21: 25,41: 10,$ |
| 130:16, 132:16, | $18: 11,85: 21,$ | 117:15, 117:17, | $123: 10,210: 8,$ |
| $132: 24,133: 5$ | $86: 1, \quad 123: 16$ | $117: 22,118: 9$ | $228: 4,230: 14,$ |
| 133:15, 136:17, | his | $118: 14,118: 17,$ | $231: 9, \quad 234: 24$ |
| 137:23, 143:11, | $17: 23,18: 12,$ | $119: 25, \quad 120: 5$ | id |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 145: 23, & 146: 8, \\ 147: 22, & 148: 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 8, \quad 45: 9, \\ & 83: 24 . \end{aligned} \quad 207: 23,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120: 9, \quad 120: 11, \\ & 120: 19, \quad 128: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 58:22, 58:24, |
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|  | ```121:17, 121:22, 122:4, 141:2, 190:4, 217:21, 217:23, 218:1, 218:10, 218:20, 218:25, 223:2, 223:6, 223:12, 223:17, 224:7, 224:13 identities 93:9 identity 31:25, 89:25, 90:5, 90:16, 90:24, 91:13, 91:20, 91:24, 92:3, 92:9, 92:16, 94:9, 99:22, 102:14, 102:22, 177:2, 177:9, 177:19, 181:16, 183:13, 183:16, 224:11 illustrated 60:17 illustrates 211:7 image 211:8 images 50:11, 213:17 imagine 78:17, 104:14, 173:9 immediately 183:1 implement 54:17, 125:13, 167:17, 167:18 implemented 64:25, 124:20, 167:8 implementing 54:13 implements 167:16 implicitly 125:22``` | ```importance 142:8, 179:1 important 137:7, 178:24, 223:20 impossible 194:17 in-click 141:13 inc 1:5, 3:2 include 7:2, 31:2, 31:7, 31:18, 31:24, 32:4, 32:12, 32:18, 97:6, 97:11, 107:14, 108:2, 147:16, 180:7, 195:22, 202:17, 213:16, 222:1, 228:7 included 58:2, 58:6, 104:6, 139:18, 140:12, 140:18 includes 58:12, 58:14, 76:3, 103:8, 103:25, 104:20, 111:25, 131:17, 144:8, 144:16, 202:23, 222:13, 225:8, 228:18 including 7:6, 93:12, 102:17, 183:9, 184:20, 239:8, 239:21, 241:8, 244:3 income 7:5, 7:10 incorporate 231:20, 232:3 incorporated 6:4, 231:24, 232:2 incorporates 231:15, 231:16``` | ```incorporating 231:18 incorrect 189:12, 189:24, 192:6, 244:12 increased 117:3 indeed 23:19 independent 107:5 index 161:2 indicate 66:2, 112:11, 182:19, 204:21, 237:9, 237:16 indicates 102:8, 103:3, 125:24, 129:24, 138:23, 141:21, 177:4, 180:21, 204:8, 206:18, 206:19, 207:2, 214:20, 220:7, 237:3 indicative 154:15 indistinguishable 178:15 individual 32:1, 60:11 individually 61:4, 61:15 industry 15:10, 15:16 information 16:25, 31:2, 31:8, 31:19, 31:24, 32:18, 32:22, 33:11, 49:7, 49:12, 73:8, 73:13, 73:14, 78:3, 79:22, 80:17, 82:9, 91:24, 92:17, 96:5, 97:11, 97:15,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.
Conducted on March 20, 2019

|  |  | ```instead 23:13, 68:16, 68:21, 69:10, 104:12, 104:24, 105:6, 105:8, 106:14, 110:3, 111:3, 111:4, 183:24, 184:12 institution 108:25 institutions 108:22, 109:2 integrated 209:16, 210:3, 210:12 intended 112:12 intent 86:19, 88:5, 100:9 intentional 89:14 intentionally 87:17, 88:7 interconnected 225:10, 228:9, 228:17, 228:19 interested 248:3 interesting 111:13 interface 23:15, 176:5, 197:12 internet 162:15, 164:22 interpret 109:20, 195:22, 220:14, 226:12, 243:19 interpreting 221:17 interval 23:9, 84:6, 84:13, 84:21, 85:7, 85:15, 86:15, 87:25 intervals 26:21, 84:25,``` | 86:7 into $11: 14, \quad 16: 4$, $23: 16, \quad 105: 24$, $110: 13, \quad 122: 8$, $138: 16, \quad 141: 23$, $143: 13, \quad 187: 1$, $209: 16, \quad 215: 12$, $232: 20, \quad 242: 19$ introduced $44: 9, \quad 47: 13$, $47: 17$ introduction $4: 11, \quad 46: 17$ intuition $173: 19$ invented $18: 17$ invention $17: 23, \quad 91: 8$, $91: 11, \quad 142: 4$, $142: 7, \quad 145: 14$, $146: 6, \quad 158: 20$, $158: 21, \quad 185: 2$ inventions $117: 1, \quad 117: 2$ inventive $29: 11, \quad 29: 14$, $29: 15$ inventor $12: 4,17: 10$ inventors $12: 7,135: 7$ invert $136: 19$ invertible $125: 23$ investigate $145: 5,145: 10$ invoices $8: 2$ involve $56: 9, ~ 56: 22$, $57: 3,108: 4$, $125: 22, \quad 133: 25$, $146: 18, ~ 169: 9$, $175: 9$ involved $16: 4, \quad 35: 14$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  |  |  | keep <br> 91:7 <br> keeping <br> 127:14 <br> kek <br> 35: 4 <br> ken <br> 17:15, 122:25 <br> kenneth <br> 17:13, 123:10 <br> kept <br> 94:13, 94:17, <br> 94:18, 94:21, <br> 239:2 <br> keypad <br> 232:24, 245:8 <br> keys <br> 34:3, 34:22, <br> 36:7, 36:10, <br> 43:15, 47:19, <br> 47:23, 204:4, <br> 222:19, 222:21, <br> 222:25 <br> kind <br> 79:2, 105:5, <br> 105:21, 106:20, <br> 108:9, 108:12, <br> 108:16, 124:5, <br> 125:2, 145:2, <br> 161:14, 180:18, <br> 194:13, 195:16, <br> 208:23, 212:1 <br> knew <br> 181:10 <br> knowable <br> 39:17, 185:13 <br> knowing <br> 18:4, 38:21, <br> 135:4, 211:12 <br> knowledge <br> 10:22, 15:11, <br> 15:14, 15:17, <br> 21:12, 34:13, <br> 55:11 <br> knowledgeable <br> 13:15 <br> known <br> 15:19, 30:6, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  |  | ```127:14, 146:13, 153:10, 171:19, 181:6, 184:12, 186:24, 198:14, 198:15, 198:18, 223:20, 224:3, 229:14, 238:8, 238:25, 242:16, 242:18 mill 3:6 mind 32:10, 65:4, 86:21, 88:5, 88:25, 91:7, 100:1, 105:23, 106:21, 107:23, 110:14, 124:10, 135:13, 144:1, 144:14, 193:13, 194:1, 201:14, 201:18, 202:9, 205:2, 222:22, 237:25 minute 75:15, 148:19, 246:1 minutes 238:8 misread 100:2, 100:6 misstatement 230:16 mistake 55:15 mistaken 244:5 misunderstand 102:17, 110:23, 115:22 misunderstanding 55:9, 115:23, 125:20, 127:5, 181:5 misunderstood 188:19, 190:1, 216:11 mix 149:10, 230:1``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```165:24 mostly 165:11 motion 19:1, 42:5 motions 9:22 motivated 155:7, 155:13 motivation 134:5, 230:17 mounted 212:9, 213:11, 213:18, 213:23, 214:3, 214:7, 214:12, 214:14, 214:15, 214:17, 214:20 mounting 212:24, 213:3, 213:7 mounts 213:16 move 103:21, 152:4, 154:8, 163:24, 179:5, 182:21 mta 219:6, 219:8, 219:10 much 7:18, 7:25, 8:1, 17:21, 18:16, 35:22, 90:13, 91:5, 103:16, 114:14, 128:6, 145:18, 159:7, 217:10 multidigit 23:10, 25:6, 67:13, 69:11, 71:22, 73:4, 73:21, 74:6, 75:8 multilevels 56:16 multiple 127:1, 151:25,``` | $\begin{aligned} & 182: 4, \quad 221: 2, \\ & 221: 8, \quad 221: 21, \\ & 223: 9, \quad 223: 20, \\ & 240: 16 \\ & \text { must } \\ & 54: 14, \quad 64: 2, \\ & 64: 8, \quad 71: 21, \\ & 134: 15, \quad 157: 19, \\ & 200: 4, \quad 200: 16 \\ & \text { myself } \\ & 201: 13 \end{aligned}$  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```88:8, 89:12, 114:6, 134:1, 178:16, 187:1, 214:7 notice 2:7 noticed 179:4 notion 78:18 novel 167:19 now 10:16, 42:10, 51:25, 55:10, 64:13, 70:5, \(72: 16,74: 10\), 103:10, 104:19, 107:22, 152:1, 152:11, 158:19, 159:13, 163:17, 168:13, 169:15, 169:16, 171:6, 178:17, 178:25, 182:7, 184:6, 185:6, 188:11, 190:8, 191:17, 193:22, 195:7, 210:5, 215:18, 218:14, 220:19, 223:9, 227:18, 227:21, 232:9, 238:24, 239:4, 239:17, 240:7, 242:7, 245:4, 245:20 now-familiar 47:21 nowhere 72:7, 74:25, 75:2 number 10:6, 10:9, 11:24, 20:5, 21:23, 32:4, \(32: 8,32: 13\), 66:12, 66:25, 67:6, 67:14,``` |  | 199:8, 200:17 observe <br> 96:8, 157:25 obtain $39: 18,45: 14,$ $171: 17$ <br> obtained $\begin{aligned} & 191: 10, \\ & 191: 19, \\ & 191: 22, \\ & 192: 2, \\ & 192: 102: 192, \\ & 193: 11, \\ & 194: 93 \\ & \text { obvious } \end{aligned}$ <br> 179:2 <br> occupation $5: 22$ <br> occur <br> 85:14 <br> occurred <br> 247:18 <br> occurrence $\begin{aligned} & 138: 9, \\ & 140: 149: 19,140: 20, \\ & 142: 10, \\ & 142: 12, \\ & 181: 15, \\ & 181: 20, \\ & 181: 17, \end{aligned}$ <br> occurs <br> 85:11, 87:8 <br> offhand <br> 232:15 <br> office <br> 1:1 <br> offices <br> 2:2, 8:19, 247:18 <br> official <br> 4:9, 41:11, 41:16 <br> offline <br> 105:9, 106:8 <br> often <br> 34:20, 217:9 <br> oh <br> 6:14, 94:16, 100:6, 161:3, <br> 180:3, 201:5, <br> 208:25, 209:24 <br> okay <br> 16:20, 17:18, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| periodic | physical | 52:17, 52:21, | 185:21, 189:13, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 83:18, 84:6, | 64:25, 95:23, | 53:1, 53:15 | 190:10, 191:6, |
| 84:13, 84:21, | 112:5, 200:10, | place | 201:18, 208:1, |
| 84:25, 85:6, | 241:12, 241:16 | 37:6, 65:4, | 209:19, 210:5, |
| 85:15, 86:7, | physically | 72:11, 78:13, | 210:23, 216:10, |
| 86:15 | 182:5 | 109:22, 115:1, | 217:12, 221:23, |
| periodically | physiological | 115:14, 151:13, | 225:4, 232:12, |
| 83:23 | 95:23 | 164:21, 184:3, | 234:15, 234:22, |
| person's | pickering | 229:17, 230:24 | 234:23, 238:5, |
| 211:14 | 3:5 | placed | 238:10, 245:4 |
| personal | pictures | 211:15 | point |
| 94:3, 94:8, | 214:17 | places | 41:18, 42:16, |
| 97:6, 207:22, | pin | 89:11, 170:22, | 79:11, 91:5, |
| 210:2, 214:23, | 81:24, 94:4, | 172:5 | 151:13, 158:19, |
| 215:13, 215:15, | 94:8, 95:1, | plain | 163:20, 201:15, |
| 215:17, 215:19, | 97:14, 97:20, | 167:20 | 215:4, 240:3 |
| 215:22, 216:1, | 97:24, 98:9, | plaintext | point-of-sale |
| 216:3, 216:21, | 129:19, 129:21, | 48:2, 48:6, | 233:6, 233:16, |
| 217:8, 221:16, | 130:4, 130:19, | 168:2, 168:5, | 233:25 |
| 221:17, 221:18, | 130:23, 131:4, | 168:8, 169:10 | pointing |
| 221:20, 224:5 | 131:7, 131:8, | plausible | 89:10 |
| perspective | 131:9, 131:17, | 233:20 | pointless |
| 242:12 | 131:19, 131:24, | please | 189:9, 189:20 |
| petitioner | 132:11, 132:12, | 5:9, 19:4, | poor |
| 1:6, 3:2 | 135:15, 137:11, | 19:5, 28:4, | 211:8, 213:17, |
| pgp | 147:8, 147:12, | 31:5, 37:13, | 213:25 |
| 47:5, 47:8, | 147:16, 147:18, | 41:21, 47:4, | popped |
| 47:11, 47:13, | 148:4, 148:12, | 50:14, 50:17, | $139: 9,182: 6,$ |
| 47:18, 47:19, | 149:7, 149:15, | 57:11, 57:23, | 182:18, 182:19 |
| 47:25, 48:10, | 149:18, 149:20, | 61:12, 62:5, | portion |
| 48:21, 49:1, | 150:7, 150:10, | 62:24, 71:15, | 85:1, 86:9, |
| 164:25 | 150:16, 151:1, | 81:16, 81:21, | 91:4, 138:6, |
| ph | 151:12, 152:14, | 83:11, 83:13, | 144:10, 193:7, |
| 1:14, 2:1, 4:3, | 170:8, 171:5, | 84:10, 88:4, | 205:8 |
| 5:2, 247:6, | 172:8, 173:14, | 93:2, 93:4, | portions |
| 247:18 | 174:2, 175:3, | 95:15, 98:16, | 19:17, 19:18, |
| phone | 180:15, 180:18, | 98:20, 102:2, | 19:19, 19:20, |
| 8:24, 9:1, | 195:4, 245:8 | 102:6, 102:11, | 42:9, 116:5, |
| 18:5, 208:22, | pin-based | 103:1, 107:24, | 139:5, 232:2 |
| 212:8, 212:13, | 95:3, 95:6, | 116:18, 116:19, | possibility |
| 212:19, 212:20, | 95:10 | 124:14, 125:4, | 15:2, 37:8, |
| 213:20, 213:21 | pinpoint | 132:22, 138:19, | 63:20, 229:9, |
| phones | 89:8 | 138:21, 153:6, | 229:10 |
| 212:15, 212:18 | pins | 160:21, 164:14, | possible |
| phrase | 97:7, 98:12 | $164: 16,169: 23,$ | $32: 16,74: 10,$ |
| 30:12, 91:3, | pki | $169: 25,176: 21,$ | 159:4, 159:8, |
| $216: 3, \quad 216: 21$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 51: 10, & 52: 6, \\ 52: 10, & 52: 14, \end{array}$ | 179:21, 181:8, | $\begin{array}{ll} 159: 21, & 160: 6, \\ 179: 15, & 230: 5, \end{array}$ |
| phrases | $52: 10,52: 14,$ | 183:4, 183:6, | 179:15, 230:5, |
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| random | 54:20, 56:18, | rebuttal | 48:23, 49:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 171:10 | 60:21, 61:2, | 228:3 | 49:14 |
| rate | 61:13, 84:18, | recall | recipient's |
| 6:20, 6:23, | 94:20, 99:7, | 7:16, 20:5, | 44:22 |
| 243:14 | 109:6, 109:16, | 28:22, 58:5, | recipients |
| rated | 110:6, 110:18, | 68:15, 143:23, | 38:6 |
| 156:11 | 111:8, 127:11, | 143:25, 145:23, | recognize |
| rather | 127:22, 128:4, | 146:8, 146:11, | 9:17, 11:19, |
| 14:1, 28:16, | 128:14, 128:20, | 194:1, 215:3, | 13:19, 18:6, |
| 29:20, 82:16, | 130:11, 135:1, | 227:3, 227:13, | 22:3, 41:19, |
| 88:2, 109:12, | 137:25, 142:14, | 230:22, 239:25, | 46:20, 50:7, |
| 126:11, 218:2 | 143:10, 145:13, | 240:1 | 50:9, 50:11, |
| re-ask | 150:15, 150:25, | receipt | 81:6, 81:8, |
| 55:22, 160:4 | 153:2, 153:15, | 82:13, 83:3 | 108:6, 109:25, |
| reach | 192:4, 192:19, | receive | 179:2, 200:25, |
| 133:8 | 193:8, 193:16, | 38:21, 229:15 | 201:2, 201:4, |
| reaching | 194:20, 195:8, | received | 224:24, 242:15 |
| $67: 24, \quad 68: 8$ | $195: 10, ~ 195: 21$, $221: 3,227: 12$, | 59:15, 60:9, | recognized |
| read | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 221: 3, ~ 227: 12, \\ & 233: 22, ~ 236: 3, \end{aligned}\right.$ | 66:16, 152:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 22, ~ 99: 12 \\ & \text { recollection } \end{aligned}$ |
| 8:25, 14:4, | 236:14, 240:13, | 153:3, 153:17, | recollection |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 7, \quad 19: 11, \\ & 19: 13, \quad 19: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $240: 18, \quad 242: 5,$ | $171: 6, \quad 174: 2,$ | $170: 1$ |
| 19:24, 20:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 243: 18, \quad 244: 5 \\ & 244: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 175:2, 227:20 | record |
| 37:22, 50:19, | 244:9 <br> reads | receives | 5:10, 23:18, |
| 52:2, 60:25, | $96: 8, \quad 100: 11,$ | 61:18, 70:17, | $74: 9, ~ 74: 20$, $103 \cdot 21.153 .13$, |
| 62:6, 65:13, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 96: 8,100: 11, \\ & 156: 19, \quad 164: 19, \end{aligned}\right.$ | 174:23, 235:1, | 103:21, 153:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 72: 22, \quad 72: 24, \\ & 84: 9,95: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 156: 19, \quad 164: 19, \\ & 170: 5, \quad 173: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $235: 6, \quad 235: 12$ <br> receiving | $\begin{aligned} & 158: 8, \quad 170: 25, \\ & 192: 15, \quad 203: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| 84:9, $95: 16$, $96: 11, ~ 129: 22, ~$ | 180:6, 181:13, | 32:25, 33:5, | 206:16, 219:19, |
| 148:5, 165:5, | 191:18, 193:11, | $33: 17,38: 7$, | 219:20, 247:10 |
| 173:15, 190:13, | 225:7, 239:6, | 38:14, 38:18, | records |
| 192:16, 195:20, | 239:19, 243:22 | 38:19, 59:16, | 96:9, 104:21, |
| 197:22, 202:12, | really | 60:10, 233:4, | 158:1, 238:25, |
| 204:14, 205:8, | 7:24, 18:11, | 233:14, 233:23, | 239:2 |
| 206:1, 206:12, | 71:9, 86:22, | 235:10 | recover |
| 207:15, 214:24, | 88:24, 154:5, | recess | 59:17, 59:20, |
| 215:5, 215:9, | 205:14, 211:9 | 46:10, 79:14, | 59:22, 60:5, |
| 217:15, 219:12, | reason | 112:18, 160:16, | 60:6, 60:10 |
| 219:22, 220:4, | 5:15, 87:21, | 200:20, 245:22, | recovered |
| 221:1, 221:11, | 104:9, 109:11, | 246:2 | 61:4, 61:15 |
| 222:20, 228:25, | 115:21, 120:21, | recipient | recovering |
| 233:8, 233:20, | 121:18, 121:23, | $37: 11, \quad 37: 16$ | $60: 4$ |
| 234:5, 234:11, | 170:19, 170:22, | $38: 1, \quad 38: 13,$ | redwood |
| 234:24, 238:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 171: 11, \quad 171: 16, \\ & 172: 7, \quad 187: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $38: 22,38: 23$, | 1:15, 2:4, |
| 238:22, 240:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 172: 7, \quad 187: 4, \\ & 188: 15 . \end{aligned}$ | 38:24, 39:9, | 247:20 |
| 243:22, 244:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 188: 15, \quad 194: 14, \\ & 195: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 45:5, 45:8, | refer |
| $244: 15$ | 195:17 <br> reasonable | $45: 12, \quad 45: 18,$ | $10: 5, \quad 10: 8,$ |
| reading $51: 20,53: 20,$ | 34:14, 34:15 | 48:12, 48:18, | 12:1, 13:25, |
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| ```21:18, 21:24, 40:4, 40:7, 40:12, 48:14, 81:13, 148:21, 166:8, 168:2, 169:5, 178:13, 201:7, 203:10, 225:1 referenced 47:2, 73:4, 73:21, 74:7, 232:15 referred 25:11, 34:3, 34:4, 35:3, 35:18, 54:25, 65:25, 81:10, 94:16, 201:5, 207:18, 215:25 referring 148:23, 172:18, 173:4, 183:20, 193:24, 194:6, 212:2, 213:12, 218:13 refers 58:8, 102:16, 138:8, 165:8, 213:15, 216:3, 216:21 reflect 156:22 refresh 73:7, 145:13, 170:1 regard 55:7, 208:20, 217:8 regardless 85:16 registry 1:8, 3:11, 247:14 relate 89:24, 90:4, 116:4, 116:6 related 18:16, 39:25,``` | ```73:9, 91:24, 92:17, 101:16, 101:18, 101:20, 193:20, 198:17, 198:19, 227:4, 247:24 relates 35:23, 92:2, 184:19, 208:22 relating 164:23 relationship 216:3, 216:12, 216:21, 226:13 relative 185:7 relevance 149:20 relevant 19:18, 19:21, 19:24, 110:1, 110:2, 144:18, 160:25 relies 231:18 remain 223:10 remains 84:6, 84:13, 84:21 remember 14:9, 18:19, 20:2, 21:19, 24:14, 27:23, 47:3, 47:16, 72:25, 79:18, 91:2, 102:12, 103:10, 134:6, 135:20, 136:20, 144:6, 145:20, 201:21, 201:22, 202:7, 202:20, 203:8, 203:11, 208:13, 210:20, 215:2, 230:3, 238:15, 238:24, 239:4, 240:4 remind 124:14, 144:23``` |  | ```research 151:23, 196:19, 215:12 reside 78:13 resource 23:14 resources 146:21 respect 12:24 respectively 69:19, 69:24 respects 10:13, 10:21 respond 74:12 response 9:21, 178:10, 228:3 responses 185:15 rest 194:2 restate 26:24, 98:7 result 23:20, 85:4, 103:4, 132:1, 134:9, 195:11, 234:4 resulted 25:10 results 168:8 retained 6:8, 7:11, 7:15, 14:10, 14:12, 14:23, 15:2 retaining 14:13 retina 96:2, 96:4 reveal 8:15, 123:3, 188:7, 188:24 reversed 173:22``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

PLANET DEPOS

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.
Conducted on March 20, 2019

| scheme | secret | 70:6, 73:16, | seemed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 53:12, 54:18, | 35:11, 65:9, | 86:7, 93:7, | 19:24 |
| 169:15 | 79:23, 80:3, | 96:24, 117:3, | seems |
| schemes | 81:24, 94:13, | 152:23, 164:20, | 43:1, 101:15, |
| 169:14 | 94:16, 94:17, | 183:13 | 180:3, 204:24, |
| schutzer | 94:19, 94:22, | security's | 233:19 |
| 81:10, 81:13, | 95:1, 113:13, | 4:9, 41:11, | seen |
| 81:17, 82:23, | 114:11, 114:15, | 41:15 | 11:6, 28:6, |
| 232:5, 232:9, | 134:7, 173:13, | see | 42:14, 123:22, |
| 232:19, 232:22, | 173:25 | 17:10, 17:12, | 161:2, 169:13, |
| 234:25, 235:11, | secrets | 22:21, 27:22, | 170:20, 210:8, |
| 235:15 | 94:18 | 35:15, 42:11, | 215:2 |
| science | section | 47:5, 47:24, | segment |
| 5:23 | 10:17, 201:13, | 48:4, 48:9, | 144:1, 144:14 |
| scientific | 201:15, 201:17 | 48:20, 49:1, | select |
| 16:14 | secure | 57:13, 72:2, | 74:9, 206:17, |
| scope | 1:8, 3:10, | 72:4, 76:2, | 224:16, 224:18 |
| 41:25, 42:5, | 42:14, 70:9, | 87:1, 87:21, | selects |
| 46:23 | 83:19, 83:23, | 88:25, 97:2, | 204:10 |
| screen | 84:5, 84:12, | 99:25, 100:3, | selwyn |
| 23:9, 25:10 | 84:20, 84:24, | 100:10, 100:15, | $3: 3,4: 4,5: 6$, |
| se | 85:6, 87:14, | 106:16, 111:24, | 42:4, 46:9, |
| 39:7, 39:16 | 87:19, 88:10, | 129:22, 129:23, | 46:14, 46:25, |
| second | 97:4, 97:9, | 135:16, 136:3, | 79:12, 79:16, |
| 7:22, 21:7, | 163:15, 198:13, | 139:17, 140:2, | 112:15, 112:21, |
| 21:14, 22:9, | 247:14 | 144:10, 144:18, | 152:4, 154:8, |
| 47:5, 49:9, | securely | 145:15, 155:12, | 156:17, 160:14, |
| 49:13, 49:23, | 45:18, 102:14, | 156:18, 164:19, | 160:17, 179:25, |
| 50:1, 52:13, | 102:22 | 168:16, 172:25, | 180:3, 200:19, |
| 53:7, 58:2, | secures | 180:5, 180:16, | 200:21, 238:7, |
| 61:24, 69:4, | 136:1 | 181:13, 187:2, | 245:21, 245:23 |
| 80:7, 83:25, | securid | 190:16, 191:9, | send |
| 88:9, 89:13, | 23:5, 23:22, | 191:12, 195:5, | 32:8, 36:14, |
| 94:15, 103:22, | 23:25, 24:5, | 201:24, 202:21, | 36:20, 44:14, |
| 111:24, 113:20, | 24:10, 24:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 202: 24, \quad 204: 1, \\ & 204: 2, \quad 204: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 44:18, 69:12, |
| 114:17, 114:19, | $25: 2, ~ 25: 18, ~$ $25: 19, ~ 25: 21$, | $\begin{aligned} & 204: 2, \quad 204: 8, \\ & 204: 18, \quad 205: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 179:15, 229:14 |
| 114:20, 114:21, | 25:19, 25:21, | 207:13, 207:15, | sending |
| $114: 22,114: 24$, $115: 6,115: 10$, | $26: 1, ~ 30: 10, ~$ $31.12, ~ 63: 24$, | $208: 13, \quad 210: 3$ | 81:23, 82:8 |
| $115: 6, ~ 115: 10$, $115: 12, ~ 115: 14$, | $31: 12, ~ 63: 24$, $64: 13,65: 10$, | $213: 22, \quad 214: 11$ | sends |
| $115: 12, ~ 115: 14$, $115: 15, ~ 115: 20$, | 64:13, 65:10, | $225: 7,227: 21$ | 66:16, 67:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 115: 15, \quad 115: 20, \\ & 116: 1, \quad 116: 3 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 66: 11, & 66: 16, \\ 68: 20, & 70: 9, \end{array}$ | $232: 4,239: 5$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 70: 16, & 80: 9, \\ 178: 3, & 235: 2 \end{array}$ |
| 143:16, 174:23, | 70:16, $70: 22$, | 239:10, 239:17, | $235: 8, \quad 235: 16$ |
| 174:24, 227:20 | 71:3 | 241:10 | sense |
| second-to-last | security | seeing | $40: 15,54: 20,$ |
| 96:7, 157:24, | 5:24, 13:4, | $\begin{array}{ll} 27: 23, & 224: 9, \\ 240: 4, & 242: 14 \end{array}$ | $55: 5,55: 7,$ |
| 158:6 | $13: 7,17: 20,$ | 240:4, 242:14 seem | 60:23, 101:14, |
| seconds | 17:22, 24:12, | 153:10 | 104:22, 110:2, |


|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```shaped 144:12, 146:2, 146:7 share 216:1, 216:5 shared 135:24 shores 1:15, 2:4, 247:20 short 207:21 shortcomings 91:1 shortcut 136:17 shorthand 2:8, 247:1 should 9:12, 10:18, 53:7, 55:2, 85:21, 88:16, 104:14, 116:10, 156:4, 211:15 shoup 25:8, 228:4 show 11:15, 117:7, 117:11, 119:25, 120:5, 213:11 shown 59:12, 59:16, 60:10, 60:15, 73:3, 73:20 shows 42:18, 42:21, 42:23, 48:2, 48:5, 49:7, 58:1, 58:5, 58:17, 59:2, 59:7, 62:9, 65:6, 66:24, 67:5, 67:16, 67:21, 102:9, 213:23, 214:4, 214:7, 214:15 sic 116:8``` | ```side 189:1, 243:8, 244:4 sides 239:22, 241:9, 241:15 signal 58:7 signals 58:2 signature 34:8, 34:9, 58:25, 76:3, 76:5, 76:9, \(76: 12,77: 10\), \(77: 12,77: 17\), \(77: 18,77: 22\), 78:6, 78:19, \(78: 21,78: 23\), 78:24, 79:3, 79:6, 79:7, 79:22, 80:2, 80:9, 80:11, 80:16, 80:19, 80:23, 82:14, 82:15, 82:18, 82:22, 82:24, 83:3, 83:4 signature-mu6r9 248:8 signatures 76:15, 76:19, 77:1, 77:4, 77:8, 78:15, \(78: 16,79: 18\), 82:9 signed 9:10, 9:23, 10:12, 68:9, 79:8 signer 79:7 signer's 80:24 significance 89:21, 231:24 silent 150:13, 152:19,``` | ```157:16 similar 6:15, 73:3, 73:21, 75:11, 76:8, 78:18, 78:23, 99:24, 172:2, 242:15 similarities 74:11, 74:17, 171:8 simple 121:18, 121:23, 153:10, 187:4, 195:18 simplified 98:2 simplistic 173:11, 173:16, 173:17, 184:14, 184:16, 187:5 simply 85:21, 86:12, 128:2, 133:7, 182:15, 195:18, 231:3 since 6:7, 76:15, 76:19, 95:6, 95:11, 120:25, 160:24, 179:25, 184:18, 221:14, 239:1 single 220:8, 220:10, 221:4, 221:6, 221:7, 221:10, 221:11, 223:11, 223:16, 223:24, 223:25, 224:5 sir 5:7, 5:14, 6:21, 8:10, 29:21, 47:4, 51:25, 145:9, 152:21, 178:22, 179:7, 185:3, 187:8, 191:18, 195:2, 209:1,``` | ```210:21, 211:3, 211:23, 213:2, 215:19, 223:16, 230:20, 231:3, 240:9, 244:21 sit 20:25, 21:5, 27:25, 89:2, 145:23, 146:8, 238:20 site 107:1, 107:2 sitting 28:22, 29:9, 68:15, 71:9, 72:14, 239:4 situation 177:23 situations 139:7 six 10:11, 23:10, 118:5 sixth 7:9 size 186:16, 188:3, 188:4, 188:11, 208:7, 208:10 sized 242:8 skim 19:24 skimmed 19:19, 28:14 skip 86:12 skipped 28:16 slide 194:16 slightly 13:15, 99:24, 101:15 slower 38:12 small 23:9, 245:12``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  |  |  | specific <br> 28:5, 33:10, <br> 59:10, 74:12, <br> 125:16, 161:14, <br> 217:21, 240:17 <br> specifically <br> 27:21, 66:18, <br> 68:3, 68:6, <br> 68:16, 229:16, <br> 240:18 <br> specification <br> 10:18, 10:19, <br> 60:21, 61:3, <br> 61:14, 67:11, 71:6 <br> specifications 29:1 <br> specifics <br> 18:19 <br> specify <br> 99:5, 151:21, <br> 161:16, 171:17, <br> 221:14 <br> speculate <br> 80:18 <br> speculating <br> 214:1 <br> speculation <br> 15:7, 18:10, <br> 24:8, 26:8, <br> 38:11, 43:7, <br> 44:8, 47:15, <br> $76: 17,95: 8$ <br> spend <br> 28:13 <br> spent <br> 7:1 <br> spirit <br> 133:5, 134:11, <br> 157:2 <br> spite <br> 177:20 <br> spoke <br> 181:9, 221:20 <br> spoken <br> 18:13, 123:10, <br> 123:16 <br> spot <br> 156:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| stake | 68:21, 68:24, | 160:8, 160:9, | 237:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 226:6 | 69:6, 84:25, | 160:12, 173:13, | studies |
| standing | 85:2, 86:8, | 173:25, 174:3, | 136:16 |
| 42:2, 46:24 | 86:10, 86:13, | 179:16, 198:16, | study |
| start | 107:5, 126:13, | 206:8, 218:23, | 240:16 |
| 55:15, 66:1, | 126:14 | 219:9, 219:11, | studying |
| 68:5, 209:8 | steps | 219:13, 225:11, | 238:25 |
| started | 69:18, 69:23, | 227:16, 228:20, | subject |
| 12:18 | 71:21, 127:1 | 229:20, 236:7 | 15:16 |
| starting | stick | stores | submitted |
| 240:16 | 218:24 | 236:9 | 10:1, 116:21, |
| state | still | stream | 118:5, 118:17, |
| 2:8, 138:13, | 96:21, 105:19, | 168:14, 169:4, | 118:25, 119:9, |
| 138:25, 139:4, | 175:18, 179:21, | 169:5, 169:19, | 119:16, 120:4, |
| 139:6, 139:15, | 188:20, 239:6, | 169:20, 171:7, | 120:18, 121:2, |
| 139:24, 140:7, | 239:19, 240:21, | 171:8, 171:9, | 122:3, 122:11, |
| 140:12, 140:18, | 241:2, 245:5, | 172:4 | 122:17, 240:6 |
| 140:25, 141:3, | 245:6 | street | subsequent |
| 141:5, 141:8, | stolen | 3:15 | 181:17 |
| 141:10, 141:12, | 112:25, 113:3 | strength | substance |
| 141:13, 142:6, | stop | 156:19 | 179:8 |
| 156:20, 156:22, | 87:19, 88:10 | strike | substantially |
| 176:14, 176:17, | stopping | 17:11, 30:21, | 188:12 |
| 178:13, 178:14, | 87:13 | 42:22, 50:1, | substitute |
| 179:19, 180:22, | storage | 56:25, 58:13, | 20:8, 20:15, |
| 180:24, 180:25, | 85:2, 241:24 | 74:4, 101:23, | $20: 20,21: 1,$ |
| 181:3, 232:1, | store | 103:21, 109:1, | $21: 6,21: 16,$ |
| 234:15, 247:4 | 66:12, 68:20, | 118:12, 127:6, | $22: 8,22: 17,$ |
| stated | 69:7, 154:11, | 139:21, 152:4, | $103: 12$ |
| 132:24, 134:4, | 154:22, 180:22, | 154:8, 162:23, | substitutes |
| 233:21 | 239:9, 239:21, | 163:24, 164:1, | $146: 14$ |
| statement | 241:9, 241:15, | 172:24, 179:5, | subtitle |
| 49:20, 111:20, | 243:8, 244:4 | 182:21, 187:12, | $10: 14$ |
| 111:22, 117:17, | stored | $\begin{aligned} & 201: 10, ~ 206: 18, ~ \\ & 20: 5 \end{aligned}$ | subtleties |
| 117:22, 118:8, | 35:9, 86:9, | \|222:5 | $184: 15$ |
| 135:8, 186:1, | 88:15, 152:9, | string | subtracting |
| 192:11 | 152:16, 153:3, | 196:21 | $170: 8, \quad 171: 5$ |
| states | 153:16, 153:20, | strip | subway |
| 1:1, 93:6, | 154:19, 154:20, | 144:16, 233:12, | $218: 22$ |
| 96:23, 138:11, | 155:1, 155:15, | 233:19, 234:3, | success |
| 142:5, 143:12, | 155:17, 156:1, | 239:8, 239:21, | $116: 25$ |
| 180:9, 181:5 | 156:2, 157:19, | 241:9, 241:12, | successful |
| stating | $157: 20,158: 8 \text {, }$ | $243: 8,244: 3$ | 177:6, 180:16 |
| $214: 9$ | 158:10, 158:16, | stripe | successfully |
| step | 158:18, 158:25, | 242:18 | 84:4, 84:11, |
| 52:15, 66:10, | 159:1, 159:6, | structure | 84:20, 86:1, |
| $66: 15,66: 23$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 159: 14, & 159: 15, \\ 159: 16, & 159: 24 \end{array}$ | $174: 20$ | 99:20, 100:11, |
| 66:24, 67:5, | 159:16, 159:24, | studied $17: 3,196: 22 \text {, }$ | 176:25, 177:21 |
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| such | sullivan | switch | T |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:5, 11:8, | 2:3, 3:14, | 226:18 | take |
| 17:9, 28:15, | 247:19 | sworn | 27:22, 42:7, |
| 35:15, 57:7, | supplied | 5:3, 247:8 | 55:10, 62:2, |
| 57:17, 71:10, | 147:5, 147:8, | symmetric | 62:3, 70:13, |
| 82:9, 84:24, | 147:15, 148:8 | 35:24, 35:25, | 79:12, 84:1, |
| 86:7, 89:17, | support | 36:2, 36:6, | 93:24, 95:16, |
| 95:22, 103:9, | 9:20, 9:22, | 36:7, 36:9, | 112:15, 124:13, |
| 104:7, 104:13, | 10:23, 18:25, | 36:24, 39:3, | 130:18, 135:25, |
| 104:20, 104:22, | 22:22 | 39:19, 39:21, | 151:24, 160:14, |
| 107:17, 127:11, | supported | 39:22, 39:23, | 160:23, 176:22, |
| 137:11, 140:3, | 20:9, 20:16, | $39: 24,43: 23$, | 179:23, 183:22, |
| 142:5, 151:14, | 20:21, 21:2, | 44:2, 51:1, | 190:11, 196:19, |
| 154:4, 155:22, | 21:7, 21:16, | 56:14, 56:17, | 200:19, 201:23, |
| 157:22, 158:21, | 22:9, 22:18 | 165:1, 165:21 | 206:21, 228:13, |
| 164:22, 164:25, | sure | symmetric-key | 245:21 |
| 169:13, 171:7, | 13:22, 21:25, | 35:18, 35:19, | taken |
| 179:3, 181:15, | 24:20, 25:1, | 57:16, 164:3 | 5:13, 184:2, |
| 183:12, 185:14, | 26:25, 27:24, | system | 247:9 |
| 185:15, 186:23, | 31:6, 37:14, | 54:13, 55:25, | takes |
| 188:13, 188:23, | 37:23, 42:4, | 56:6, 101:25, | 129:11, 164:21 |
| 189:3, 189:15, | 45:25, 46:9, | 102:9, 102:13, | taking |
| 190:3, 190:18, | 55:22, 64:6, | 102:21, 104:13, | 70:19, 103:4, |
| 193:8, 198:18, | 70:14, 73:25, | 105:2, 106:6, | 115:1, 132:2, |
| 210:24, 211:8, | 84:11, 87:22, | 109:8, 109:17, | $115: 1$, $218: 22$ |
| 213:25, 221:18, | 90:20, 98:6, | 110:8, 110:20, | talk |
| 224:3, 232:24, | 115:5, 115:18, | 111:10, 112:8, | 104:11 |
| 232:25, 233:1, | 131:25, 140:17, | 129:7, 152:13, | talked |
| 239:2, 239:8, | 146:17, 147:2, | 153:2, 153:16, | $18: 3,229: 6$ |
| 239:20, 240:24, | 149:9, 149:13, | 154:4, 155:9, | talking |
| 241:3, 242:10, | 153:12, 156:17, | 161:10, 164:24, | $79: 18,171: 18,$ |
| 242:25, 243:5, | 168:25, 170:25, | 175:15, 183:10, | $219: 3$ |
| 243:19, 244:2, | 173:24, 179:24, | 184:2, 184:10, | tasked |
| 244:6, 247:8, | 181:3, 183:7, | 186:23, 230:7, | $54: 13$ |
| 247:9, $247: 10$ sufficient | 191:1, 192:15, | 230:9, 231:4 | tax |
| 22:24, 55:11, | 195:19, 201:14, | system's | 7:8, 7:9 |
| $85: 24$ | 202:10, 209:3, | 170:12, 172:12 | teaches |
| suggest | 211:21, 214:11, 217:1, 225:21, | systems $45: 23$ | 126:6, 126:20, |
| 206:12, 208:9 | 226:7, 230:1, | 45:23, $93: 7$, $96: 24, ~ 97: 5$, | 127:2, 127:7 |
| suggests | 230:3, 230:15, | 97:10, 112:24, | technical <br> 117•7.117•10 |
| 70:20, 70:25, | 232:8, 236:21, | 113:6, 113:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 117: 7, \quad 117: 10, \\ & 119: 25, \quad 120: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| 71:6, 71:13, | $237: 25, \quad 240: 6,$ | 113:18, 113:24, | $\begin{array}{ll} 119: 25, & 120: 5, \\ 127: 21, & 128: 3, \end{array}$ |
| 237:1 | $242: 5$ | $114: 3,114: 10,$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 127: 21, & 128: 3, \\ 128: 13, & 129: 1, \end{array}\right.$ |
| suit | surprise | $114: 16,115: 5,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 128: 13, & 129: 1, \\ 144: 19 . & 153: 1 \end{array}$ |
| 171:9 | 144:7 | 115:9, 115:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 144: 19, \quad 153: 1, \\ & 153: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| suitable | swipes | 115:24, 143:15, | technique |
| 136:18 | 234:4 | 183:13, 230:12 | $35: 19,42: 13,$ |
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| ```44:11, 46:2, 154:4 techniques 30:15, 30:22, 34:22, 57:17, 131:11, 134:12, 144:25 technology 17:19, 18:17, 23:8, 34:11, 88:1, 171:9 tell 5:9, 5:13, 20:24, 23:7, 89:3, 143:14, 191:20, 196:18, 201:18, 211:6, 213:15, 214:10, 214:12, 214:13, 245:4 tells 125:6, 147:3, 186:5, 190:21, 191:13, 202:25, 208:6, 210:1, 210:11, 211:24, 222:17 template 154:14, 154:20, 154:22, 155:5, 155:10, 155:11, 155:17, 155:19, 156:1, 156:2, 157:20, 158:10, 158:19, 159:2, 198:15, 198:16 templates 156:13, 158:4 term 33:22, 34:25, 35:5, 166:6, 170:19, 194:5, 196:7, 208:19, 214:25, 215:12, 221:19, 226:14, 226:24 terminology 201:15``` |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 198:10, 214:11, | 134:13, 135:24, | 102:19, 111:20, | 209:15, 211:11, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 214:14, 214:19, | 144:11, 169:7, | 136:11, 139:9, | 211:14, 212:5, |
| 226:11, 229:7, | 174:17, 178:1, | 146:5, 172:23, | 212:7, 212:9, |
| 230:4, 232:7, | 214:17, 230:1 | 185:8, 188:14, | 214:25, 220:12, |
| 236:2, 237:13, | they | 189:9, 189:20, | 221:12, 223:4, |
| 244:10, 245:9 | 9:19, 15:14, | 193:5, 196:22 | 227:14, 227:21, |
| there's | 15:19, 26:9, | things | 229:23, 237:13, |
| 22:22, 27:24, | 26:10, 26:11, | 8:12, 8:23, | 237:21, 244:6 |
| 36:17, 50:23, | 29:19, 30:1, | 28:12, 28:14, | thinking |
| 54:23, 55:15, | 30:12, 35:10, | 34:10, 66:11, | 110:24, 111:16, |
| 61:20, 87:18, | 43:23, 44:9, | 73:13, 80:15, | 153:11, 163:18 |
| 88:8, 88:16, | 45:24, 45:25, | 92:23, 106:17, | third |
| 89:12, 90:13, | 54:7, 54:20, | 112:7, 114:14, | 48:9, 48:15, |
| 92:4, 112:6, | 54:23, 55:7, | 121:8, 124:23, | 94:15, 191:7, |
| 115:23, 124:23, | 56:1, 56:12, | 126:10, 132:15, | 221:25 |
| 125:11, 148:6, | 63:5, 66:8, | 134:6, 135:21, | those |
| 148:9, 151:22, | 76:23, 84:3, | 168:7, 179:2, | 6:11, 6:16, |
| 151:24, 154:3, | 90:7, 108:11, | 185:18, 186:24, | 8:3, 9:1, 9:17, |
| 155:22, 163:20, | 108:17, 108:18, | 198:11, 214:18, | 9:23, 10:1, |
| 182:5, 206:9, | 110:13, 122:15, | 228:4 | 13:19, 18:19, |
| 223:22, 224:16, | 122:21, 128:20, | think | 28:12, 35:9, |
| 224:18, 236:21, | 129:5, 135:23, | 8:2, 11:6, | 35:10, 57:19, |
| 237:21, 238:19, | 136:16, 142:18, | 14:22, 32:7, | 61:19, 61:20, |
| 245:8 | 142:19, 165:12, | 42:4, 49:25, | 62:22, 75:13, |
| therefore | 165:13, 165:18, | 50:3, 59:19, | 80:24, 90:7, |
| 16:5, 17:1, | 166:18, 166:23, | 67:3, 69:21, | 96:3, 97:6, |
| 35:21, 120:14, | 167:2, 167:4, | 69:25, 72:1, | 97:11, 108:6, |
| 121:7, 122:9, | 167:7, 167:9, | 74:8, 86:5, | 118:8, 129:12, |
| 184:9, 228:6 | 167:11, 167:13, | 86:18, 90:7, | 137:19, 137:22, |
| thereof | 167:17, 168:1, | 97:18, 99:24, | 138:11, 141:25, |
| 167:9, 224:11 | 176:6, 197:16, | 99:25, 100:3, | 142:17, 146:18, |
| these | 197:22, 198:1, | $102: 16, \quad 102: 19,$ | 157:4, 158:4, |
| 7:11, 7:19, | 202:8, 206:15, | 104:15, 106:12, | 176:11, 236:1, |
| 7:20, 8:19, | 206:17, 209:6, | 107:24, 110:16, | 241:10 |
| 13:25, 14:21, | 232:1, 232:3, | 111:13, 111:14, | though |
| 15:25, 16:19, | 237:12 | 116:9, 123:4, | 39:17, 55:4, |
| 17:3, 25:11, | they're | 126:15, 126:16, | 132:3, 145:21, |
| 29:2, 31:10, | 42:4, 59:10, | 129:23, 139:16, | 182:19, 233:21 |
| 35:13, 54:12, | 126:12, 128:23, | 146:13, 150:25, | thought |
| 58:17, 59:14, | 136:15, 167:7, | 153:7, 153:24, | 6:14, 34:1, |
| 60:22, 61:18, | 180:11, 180:12, | 156:12, 156:24, | 101:14, 109:11, |
| 68:4, 68:9, | 197:16, 197:23, | 167:13, 168:14, | 109:14, 111:12, |
| 68:16, 70:13, | 213:17, 213:18, | 169:4, 173:16, | 128:6, 159:7, |
| 70:19, 73:17, | 229:13 | 174:14, 175:5, | 165:3, 169:21, |
| 93:16, 94:12, | they've | 175:7, 176:6, | 188:19, 202:19 |
| 94:21, 126:1, | 179:4 | 185:19, 186:1, | thousand |
| $127: 15,131: 11,$ | thing | 189:25, 194:15, |  |
| 133:8, 134:6, | 12:17, 101:16, | 204:15, 206:11, | three |
|  |  |  | 6:24, 9:20, |
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| ```198:16, 224:14 transmits 66:11, 66:24, 67:5, 68:19, 69:6, 227:21, 235:6 transmitted 35:10, 37:21, 48:12, 48:18, 48:23, 49:3, 49:14, 162:14, 162:18, 163:20, 205:23, 224:13, 227:20 transmitting 30:18, 31:3, 31:8, 31:19, 31:24, 32:5, 32:14, 32:19, 33:1, 33:6, 33:18, 75:8 trial 1:3 true 44:12, 45:1, 108:24, 138:10, 162:3, 165:24, 175:25, 177:12, 179:20, 186:17, 188:10, 217:2, 224:19, 247:10 trust 47:22 truth 5:13 try 25:1, 32:11, 100:8, 115:24, 123:23, 126:18, 185:25, 187:4 trying 129:6, 130:10, 189:25, 218:3 turn 19:4, 41:21, 47:4, 50:14, 51:25, 57:9, 57:11, 57:22,``` |  | 215:15, 215:20, 245:12 <br> typo <br> 53:20, 54:3, <br> 54:14, 54:23 <br> typographical <br> 53:6, 53:9 <br> uh-huh <br> 118: 4 <br> unauthorized <br> 183:14, 183:20, <br> 185:10, 185:11, <br> 185:13, 185:16, <br> 185:22, 185:23, <br> 186:6, 186:7 <br> unaware <br> 16:8 <br> unclear <br> 105:19, 130:25, <br> 156:6 <br> under <br> 82:22, 87:10, <br> 87:11, 244:8 <br> understand <br> 5:12, 10:5, <br> $10: 8,11: 7$, <br> 12:1, 25:8, <br> 53:20, 54:16, <br> 56:13, 59:6, <br> 59:19, 63:12, <br> 63:13, 63:20, <br> 64:1, 66:20, <br> 67:2, 68:17, <br> 71:20, 78:3, <br> 80:11, 80:15, <br> 81:12, 84:19, <br> 86:22, 87:21, <br> 88:1, 88:6, <br> 89:19, 94:21, <br> 99:8, 105:22, <br> 106:5, 107:14, <br> 108:2, 108:9, <br> 108:11, 108:15, <br> 108:17, 108:19, <br> 109:7, 109:16, <br> 109:21, 110:7, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.
Conducted on March 20, 2019


Transcript of Bjorn Markus Jakobsson, Ph.D.
Conducted on March 20, 2019

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 142:7, 142:17, | weighing | 44:9, 54:11, | 128:20, 136:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152:6, 152:11, | 154:5 | 59:15, 60:9, | 148:20, 151:24, |
| 168:5, 176:19, | weiss | 64:25, 69:10, | 165:8, 178:2, |
| 178:14, 182:10, | 17:13, 17:15, | 79:17, 108:6, | 183:19, 191:4, |
| 183:16, 185:15, | 17:25, 18:2, | 108:21, 109:2, | 192:16, 193:22, |
| 193:3, 196:5, | 18:3, 18:6, | 111:19, 112:8, | 194:5, 213:1, |
| 203:10, 210:19, | 18:8, 18:14, | 115:25, 134:8, | 214:17, 217:23, |
| 216:25, 217:4, | 18:18, 122:25, | 134:9, 143:19, | 219:5, 220:12, |
| 217:20, 220:15, | 123:7, 123:10, | 165:3, 165:9, | 221:5, 221:9, |
| 226:9, 226:14, | 123:12 | 168:20, 168:25, | 221:16, 227:15, |
| 229:6, 230:2, | welcome | 178:5, 178:9, | 228:8, 233:11, |
| 236:22, 238:19, | 200:22, 231:1 | 182:12, 182:13, | 240:6, 240:16, |
| 245:19, 248:2 | well | 184:6, 186:13, | 245:4 |
| ways | 68:5, 71:11, | 188:2, 188:6, | whenever |
| 27:18, 28:10, | 74:11, 74:22, | 188:11, 188:20, | 79:11, 156:16 |
| 28:19, 28:24, | 85:14, 86:11, | 188:22, 189:3, | where |
| 29:6, 82:6, | 86:23, 89:2, | 189:15, 190:3, | 32:8, 34:2, |
| 109:19, 125:7, | 89:20, 90:22, | 192:7, 192:23, | 39:25, 65:5, |
| 125:10, 125:13, | 91:2, 125:3, | 193:24, 224:13, | 67:12, 73:8, |
| 125:14, 125:15, | 147:14, 149:12, | 228:14, 228:15 | $76: 1,94: 14$, |
| 126:9, 128:10, | 152:12, 152:21, | what's | 114:25, 129:22, |
| 132:16, 133:7, | 168:17, 175:1, | 34:8, 35:18, | 132:12, 137:14, |
| 152:11, 194:16 | 177:12, 183:22, | 50:4, 62:25, | 139:17, 141:8, |
| we'll | 185:24, 191:3, | 89:22, 114:2, | 141:9, 143:4, |
| 81:12 | 196:7, 197:16, | 114:19, 116:7, | 144:23, 145:14, |
| we're | 198:10, 201:17, | 192:7, 217:25, | 151:13, 151:21, |
| 25:1, 31:10, | 202:17, 205:18, | 224:17 | 156:25, 160:3, |
| 96:21, 102:19, | 208:9, 211:23, | whatever | 160:9, 163:18, |
| 106:9, 108:13, | 212:14, 214:4, | 73:10, 103:18, | 164:20, 168:15, |
| 152:3, 171:18, | 219:3, 226:8, | 107:9, 211:2 | 169:19, 172:6, |
| 195:19, 214:1, | 226:14, 229:13, | whatsoever | 177:19, 178:12, |
| 216:8, 223:19 | 242:9 | 18:21 | 180:5, 185:17, |
| we 've | well-known | when | 190:17, 201:16, |
| 24:22, 46:6, | 12:20, 13:3, | 7:15, 12:18, | 203:7, 207:13, |
| 79:10, 118:11, | 13:9, 13:13 | 13:5, 14:7, | 209:15, 210:19, |
| 156:15, 158:4, | well-respected | 15:1, 17:18, | 210:23, 214:9, |
| 238:6, 245:19 | 12:21, 13:3, | 18:15, 23:13, | 215:3, 223:3, |
| weak | 13:10, 13:14 | 24:14, 28:14, | 228:14, 229:7, |
| 214:10 | were | 33:9, 34:13, | 229:16, 230:22, |
| web | 6:11, 6:16, | 35:23, 40:20, | 230:24, 232:3, |
| 47:22 | 7:15, 10:1, | 44:9, 47:16, | 232:8, 232:14, |
| website | 11:3, 14:12, | $70: 5, \quad 80: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 232: 15, \quad 245: 8 \\ & \text { where's } \end{aligned}$ |
| $108: 25,111: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 14, \quad 14: 15, \\ & 15: 1, \quad 15: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87: 23, \quad 87: 25, \\ & 92: 12, \quad 97: 4, \end{aligned}$ | where's $71: 25$ |
| websites | 15:1, 15:20, | 97:9, 104:13, | whereas |
| 108:22, 109:3 <br> wednesday | $\begin{array}{ll} 17: 16, & 18: 4, \\ 23: 21, & 27: 13 \end{array}$ | $105: 23,113: 15,$ | whereas $79: 5,108: 11$, |
| 1:16, 247:21 | $28: 14, \quad 30: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 114: 5, \quad 114: 19, \\ & 115: 12, \quad 125: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 111:17, 139:8 <br> wherein |
| weeks $72: 22$ | 34:23, 36:10, | 115.12, 125:10, | 161:11 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 54: 16, \quad 77: 1, \\ & 77: 4, \quad 105: 23, \\ & 193: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 208: 16, & 211: 3, \\ 238: 10 & \\ \text { you'l1 } & \\ 151: 13, & 201: 7 \\ \text { you're } & \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .509 \\ & 76: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 148: 24, \quad 207: 25, \\ & 208: 4, \quad 210: 12 \\ & 1101 \\ & 13: 17 \\ & 1104 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X |  | $00$$1: 17,247: 21$ |  |
| xor |  |  |  |
| 168:8, 168:15, | 16:5, 16:10, | 00809 | 11:16 |
| 168:17, 168:20, | 16:20, 17:1, | 1:11 | 1105 |
| 168:25, 169:8, | 17:6, 46:7, | 02 | 200:23, 201:8 |
| 169:10, 169:13, | $70: 5,72: 11$, | 46:10 | 1113 |
| 169:19, 169:20, | 72:17, 74:11, | 051585 | 11:17 |
| 170:8, 174:4, | 75:11, 75:19, | 11:24 | 1115 |
| 174:6 | 86:22, 87:23, | $11: 24$ 06 | 81:5 |
| xor'd | 88:6, 91:15, | 160:16, 200:20 | 1117 |
| 168:13 | 95:13, 98:3, | $\frac{160.16,200.20}{1}$ | 224:23, 225:2 |
| xoring | 110:15, 122:1, | $\xrightarrow{1}$ | 12 |
| 169:9, 169:12, | 126:11, 131:25, |  | 112:18, 112:19 |
| 169:16, 171:5 | 133:1, 144:10, | 160:16 | 120 |
| xors | 148:20, 151:8, | 1-4 | 57:15, 98:24, |
| 169:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 153: 23, ~ \\ & 160: 2, \\ & 168: 16, \\ & 171: 1, \\ & 172: 18, \\ & 175: 1, \\ & 175: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 24, \quad 48: 2, \\ & 48: 5,49: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 99:22, 100:12, |
| Y |  |  | 100:13, 149:2, |
| yeah |  | 209:23 | $\begin{array}{lll} 150: 18, & 151: 20, \\ 159: 18, & 173: 11, \end{array}$ |
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