1 2 3 4 5	RONALD L. JOHNSTON (State Bar I LAURENCE J. HUTT (State Bar No. SUZANNE V. WILSON (State Bar No. JAMES S. BLACKBURN (State Bar I ARNOLD & PORTER LLP 1900 Avenue of the Stars, 17th Floor Los Angeles, California 90067-4408 Telephone: (310) 552-2500 Facsimile: (310) 552-1191	No. 057418) . 066269) o. 152399) No. 169134)
6 7 8 9	Of Counsel: RICHARD L. ROSEN (Admitted pro ARNOLD & PORTER LLP 555 Twelfth Street NW Washington, D.C. 20004-1206 Telephone: (202) 942-5000 Facsimile: (202) 942-5999	hac vice)
10 11 12 13	BRIAN A. DAVIS (Admitted pro hac VERISIGN, INC. 21355 Ridgetop Circle Dulles, Virginia 20166 Telephone: (703) 948-2300 Facsimile: (703) 450-7326	vice)
14 15	Attorneys for Plaintiff VERISIGN, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
17 18	VERISIGN, INC., a Delaware corporation,	Case No. CV 04-1292 AHM (CTx)
19	Plaintiff,	DECLARATION OF BENJAMIN DESJARDINS IN OPPOSITION TO
20-	<b>,</b> ,	SPECIAL MOTION TO STRIKE OF
4	v.	DEFENDANT INTERNET
21	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR	CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS
21 22	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS, a California corporation:	CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS  Date: May 17, 2004
	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS, a California corporation; DOES 1-50,	CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS  Date: May 17, 2004 Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 14 – Spring Street Bldg.
22	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS, a California corporation:	CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS  Date: May 17, 2004 Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 14 – Spring Street Bldg. Hon. A. Howard Matz
22 23	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS, a California corporation; DOES 1-50,	CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS  Date: May 17, 2004 Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 14 – Spring Street Bldg. Hon. A. Howard Matz  [Memorandum of Points and Authorities:
22 23 24	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS, a California corporation; DOES 1-50,	CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS  Date: May 17, 2004 Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 14 – Spring Street Bldg. Hon. A. Howard Matz
22 23 24 25	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS, a California corporation; DOES 1-50,	CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS  Date: May 17, 2004 Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 14 – Spring Street Bldg. Hon. A. Howard Matz  [Memorandum of Points and Authorities; Evidentiary Objections; Appendix of Exhibits: Declarations; and IProposed Order

6 

- I know all of the following facts of my own personal knowledge and, if called and sworn as a witness, would competently testify thereto.
- 2. I am a Product Marketing Manager with plaintiff VeriSign, Inc. ("VeriSign") and have been continuously employed by VeriSign since approximately June 2000. In general terms, my work consists of promotion and marketing of, and communications concerning, VeriSign's products and services. As part of my duties for VeriSign, I was the businessperson responsible for a marketing program VeriSign conducted in late 2001, to encourage registrars to promote the registration of second-level domain names within the .com and .net top-level domains ("TLDs").
- 3. The individual or organization that creates and registers a specific domain name is a "registrant." Registrants do not have direct access to VeriSign's .com registry. Rather, prospective registrants must register domain names through any one of over 100 accredited "registrars" for the .com TLD. Registrars provide direct services to registrants and prospective registrants, such as processing domain name registrations. The VeriSign .com TLD registry has no contractual or other direct relationship with a registrant. Registrars have a contractual relationship with registrants. Consequently, to boost the volume of domain name registrations within the .com TLD, VeriSign enlisted the participation of registrars for the .com TLD.
- 4. In 2001, several new TLDs that compete with VeriSign, including biz and .info, began registering domain names. Amid this mounting competition from new TLDs, the VeriSign marketing program that I planned and implemented in late 2001 (the "Marketing Program") was designed to enhance the attractiveness and visibility of domain names within the .com and .net TLDs.
- 5. Under the Marketing Program, VeriSign agreed to pay a "placement fee" to registrars who signed up for the program and, among other things, (1) displayed a

. 14

 .com/.net promotional banner on their Internet home pages, and (2) placed .com and .net in the first and second slots in their website's "drop-down menus." As a result, if a potential registrant desired to register the second-level domain name "dogsforsale," for example, a registrar that was participating in the Marketing Program would offer "dogsforsale.com" and "dogsforsale.net" before or above "dogsforsale.biz."

- 6. Essentially, the Marketing Program's placement fees would compensate participating registrars for providing these marketing and promotional services for VeriSign over their websites. As the Marketing Program was designed, VeriSign would compensate a participating registrar in proportion to the effectiveness of its promotional services in generating additional .com/.net name registrations. More specifically, a participating registrar's placement fee was directly tied to its ability to generate greater domain name registrations in the .com and .net TLDs for November and December 2001 than it had generated in the "baseline" months of August and September 2001. We established various compensation "tiers" for registrars that corresponded to specific percentage increases in their .com and .net domain name registrations over the baseline months.
- 7. We launched the marketing program on November 1, 2001. It was my understanding that ICANN had no authority to regulate or prescribe VeriSign's marketing or promotional programs. We did not "pre-clear" the program with ICANN.
- 8. Less than a week after the Marketing Program went into effect, ICANN asserted that the program did not comply with the terms of VeriSign's registry agreements with ICANN and threatened to issue a formal notice declaring VeriSign in breach of those agreements, and potentially to terminate or decline to renew the agreements, unless we agreed to abandon the Marketing Program or to revise it in a manner acceptable to ICANN. ICANN specifically asserted, among other things, that

the placement fees to be paid under the Marketing Program constituted a volume discount supposedly prohibited by the registry agreements.

- 9. To my knowledge, no one at VeriSign considered the placement fees to be volume discounts. Although we disagreed with ICANN's position on this issue, and told ICANN so, under the circumstances we had no choice but to change, midcourse, the way that registrar placement fees would be calculated. Understandably, participating registrars could not be expected to agree to less favorable payment terms than the terms they agreed to accept when they undertook to provide promotional services for the benefit of VeriSign. As a result, in order to satisfy ICANN and still meet our duties to registrars in accordance with the Marketing Program, we were forced to replace the original placement fee formula with one more costly to us and more advantageous to participating registrars. We consequently paid participating registrars substantially more in placement fees than we originally agreed to pay when the program was first offered and sold to registrars.
- 10. After the Marketing Program concluded, I performed an analysis of the program's effectiveness. As part of that analysis, I compared the return that VeriSign actually realized on its investment in the program with the return that it would have realized had it paid placement fees according to the originally agreed formula. Based on this analysis, I concluded that VeriSign realized a 150% return on its investment in the Marketing Program, as compared to a 170% return that we would have realized had ICANN not interfered in the program.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 28th day of April 2004, at Can will Massachusetts.

BENJAMIN DESJARDINS