

ATTACHMENT

Inquiry 3: sought { }¹ but did not actually answer the question asked and, oddly, omitted any mention of when it in fact discovered the existence of a potential breach or a security vulnerability.²

Inquiry 5(a): sought information “in detail” regarding { }, the March 31 LOI Response provided a terse and woefully inadequate response that failed to provide the specifically requested information.³

Inquiry 5(d): sought a { }, Q Link merely asserted that it [] and Q Link’s answer completely failed to address the rest of the question, which asked for { }⁴.

Inquiry 5(e): sought information “in detail” about { }⁵ This response failed to describe { }
 }

Inquiry 5(k): sought detailed information about { }
 } Q Link merely responded that Apple and Google approved the app for distribution on their app stores.⁶

Inquiry 5(l): sought information about { }
 }⁷

Inquiry 5(n): sought “in detail” information about { }
 }
 Q Link responded only that it uses a crash-reporting tool that “does not monitor App security *per se*.”⁸ In response to a sub-question asking for specific information that Q Link { }
 }, Q Link responded only that it was { }
 }

Inquiry 6: sought “in detail” information about { }

¹ Material set off by double brackets { [] } is confidential and is redacted from the public version of this document.

² See March 31 LOI Response at 3-4, Response to Inquiry 3. Documents provided with the LOI Response suggest that consumers may have communicated with Q Link regarding the potential vulnerability prior to publication of the Ars Technica article.

³ See *id.* at 3-4, Response to Inquiry No. 5(a).

⁴ See *id.* at 4, Response to Inquiry No. 5(d).

⁵ *Id.*, Response to Inquiry No. 5(e).

⁶ See *id.* at 7, Response to Inquiry No. 5(k).

⁷ See <https://firebase.google.com/docs/crashlytics/get-started>.

⁸ March 31 LOI Response at 7, Response to Inquiry 5(n).

⁹ *Id.* at 8, Response to Inquiry No. 5(n)(ii).

}} Q Link responded with the brief conclusory statement that they “designed the App to satisfy the standards that Apple and Google impose as prerequisites for distribution.”¹⁰

Inquiry 8: sought an explanation of the basis for {{
}} Q Link’s responses again lacked the requisite level of detail. Q Link answered that {

}}¹¹

This response did not confirm how Q Link {{

asking {
} In response to a sub-question

}¹²

Inquiry 11: asked whether Q Link {

response was incomplete because it failed to identify {{
}}¹³

}} This

Document Request 16: requested {{

}

Document Request 18: requested {{

}¹⁵ {{
}}

Document Request 19: requested documents {

}} It seems unlikely at best that Q Link could have engaged in these activities—and responded to the news report— without {{
}}

¹⁰ *Id.*, Response to Inquiry No. 6.

¹¹ *Id.* at 9, Response to Inquiry No. 8.

¹² *Id.*, Response to Inquiry No. 8(c).

¹³ *See id.* at 10, Response to Inquiry No. 11.

¹⁴ *See id.* at 11, Response to Request for Documents No. 16.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 12, Response to Request for Documents No. 18.