

DECLARATION OF SANDY GINOZA FOR IETF

RFC 793: Transmission Control Protocol

RFC 1001: Protocol Standard for a NetBIOS Service on a TCP/UDP Transport: Concepts and Methods

RFC 1122: Requirements for Internet Hosts – Communication Layers

RFC 1630: Universal Resource Identifiers WWW
A Unifying Syntax for the Expression of Names and Addresses of Objects
on the Network as used in the World-Wide Web

RFC 1738: Uniform Resource Locators (URL)

RFC 2187: Application of Internet Cache Protocol (ICP), version 2

RFC 2616: Hypertext Transfer Protocol – HTTP/1.1

RFC 2960: Stream Control Transmission Protocol

RFC 6520: Transport Layer Security (TLS) and Datagram
Transport Layer Security (DTLS) Heartbeat Extension

I, Sandy Ginoza, hereby declare that all statements made herein are of my own knowledge and are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code:

1. I am an employee of Association Management Solutions, LLC (AMS), which acts under contract to the IETF Administration LLC (IETF) as the operator of the RFC Production Center. The RFC Production Center is part of the "RFC Editor" function, which prepares documents for publication and places files in an online repository for the authoritative Request for Comments (RFC) series of documents (RFC Series), and preserves records relating to these documents. The RFC Series includes, among other things, the series of Internet standards developed by the IETF. I hold the position of Director of the RFC Production Center. I began employment with AMS in this capacity on 6 January 2010.

2. Among my responsibilities as Director of the RFC Production Center, I act as the custodian of records relating to the RFC Series, and I am familiar with the record keeping practices relating to the RFC Series, including the creation and maintenance of such records.

3. From June 1999 to 5 January 2010, I was an employee of the Information Sciences Institute at University of Southern California (ISI). I held various position titles with the RFC Editor project at ISI, ending with Senior Editor.

4. The RFC Editor function was conducted by ISI under contract to the United States government prior to 1998. In 1998, ISOC, in furtherance of its IETF activity, entered into the first in a series of contracts with ISI providing for ISI's performance of the RFC Editor function. Beginning in 2010, certain aspects of the RFC Editor function were assumed by the RFC Production Center operation of AMS under contract to ISOC (acting through its IETF function and, in particular, the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (now the IETF Administration LLC (IETF)). The business records of the RFC Editor function, as it was conducted by ISI, are currently housed on the computer systems of AMS, as contractor to the IETF.

5. I make this declaration based on my personal knowledge and information contained in the business records of the RFC Editor as they are currently housed at AMS, or confirmation with other responsible RFC Editor personnel with such knowledge.

6. Prior to 1998, the RFC Editor's regular practice was to publish RFCs, making them available from a repository via FTP. When a new RFC was published, an announcement of its publication, with information on how to access the RFC, would be typically sent out within 24 hours of the publication.

7. Since 1998, the RFC Editor's regular practice was to publish RFCs, making them available on the RFC Editor website or via FTP. When a new RFC was published, an announcement of its publication, with information on how to access the RFC, would be typically sent out within 24 hours of the publication. The announcement would go out to all subscribers and a contemporaneous electronic record of the announcement is kept in the IETF mail archive that is available online.

8. Beginning in 1998, any RFC published on the RFC Editor website or via FTP was reasonably accessible to the public and was disseminated or otherwise available to the extent that persons interested and ordinarily skilled in the subject matter or art exercising reasonable diligence could have located it. In particular, the RFCs were indexed and placed in a public repository.

9. The RFCs are kept in an online repository in the course of the RFC Editor's regularly conducted activity and ordinary course of business. The records are made pursuant to established procedures and are relied upon by the RFC Editor in the performance of its functions.

10. It is the regular practice of the RFC Editor to make and keep the RFC records.

11. Based on the business records for the RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's course of conduct in publishing RFCs, I have determined that the publication date of RFC 793 was no later than October 1992, at which time it was reasonably accessible to the public either on the RFC Editor website or via FTP from a repository. An announcement of its publication also would have been sent out to subscribers within 24 hours of its publication. A copy of that RFC is attached to this declaration as Exhibit 1.

12. Based on the business records for the RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's course of conduct in publishing RFCs, I have determined that the publication date of RFC 1001 was no

later than October 1992, at which time it was reasonably accessible to the public either on the RFC Editor website or via FTP from a repository. An announcement of its publication also would have been sent out to subscribers within 24 hours of its publication. A copy of that RFC is attached to this declaration as Exhibit 2.

13. Based on the business records for the RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's course of conduct in publishing RFCs, I have determined that the publication date of RFC 1122 was no later than October 1989, at which time it was reasonably accessible to the public either on the RFC Editor website or via FTP from a repository. An announcement of its publication also would have been sent out to subscribers within 24 hours of its publication. A copy of that RFC is attached to this declaration as Exhibit 3.

14. Based on the business records for the RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's course of conduct in publishing RFCs, I have determined that the publication date of RFC 1630 was no later than June 1994, at which time it was reasonably accessible to the public either on the RFC Editor website or via FTP from a repository. An announcement of its publication also would have been sent out to subscribers within 24 hours of its publication. A copy of that RFC is attached to this declaration as Exhibit 4.

15. Based on the business records for the RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's course of conduct in publishing RFCs, I have determined that the publication date of RFC 1738 was no later than December 1994, at which time it was reasonably accessible to the public either on the RFC Editor website or via FTP from a repository. An announcement of its publication also would have been sent out to subscribers within 24 hours of its publication. A copy of that RFC is attached to this declaration as Exhibit 5.

16. Based on the business records for the RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's course of conduct in publishing RFCs, I have determined that the publication date of RFC 2187 was no later than September 1997, at which time it was reasonably accessible to the public either on the RFC Editor website or via FTP from a repository. An announcement of its publication also would have been sent out to subscribers within 24 hours of its publication. A copy of that RFC is attached to this declaration as Exhibit 6.

17. Based on the business records for the RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's course of conduct in publishing RFCs, I have determined that the publication date of RFC 2616 was no later than June 1999, at which time it was reasonably accessible to the public either on the RFC Editor website or via FTP from a repository. An announcement of its publication also would have been sent out to subscribers within 24 hours of its publication. A copy of that RFC is attached to this declaration as Exhibit 7.

18. Based on the business records for the RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's course of conduct in publishing RFCs, I have determined that the publication date of RFC 2960 was no later than October 2000, at which time it was reasonably accessible to the public either on the RFC Editor website or via FTP from a repository. An announcement of its publication also would have been sent out to subscribers within 24 hours of its publication. A copy of that RFC is attached to this declaration as Exhibit 8.

19. Based on the business records for the RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's course of conduct in publishing RFCs, I have determined that the publication date of RFC 6520 was no later than February 2012, at which time it was reasonably accessible to the public either on the RFC Editor website or via FTP from a repository. An announcement of its publication also

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.