UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Commissioners: Maureen K. Ohlhausen, Acting Chairman

6. VisualDiscovery also operated as a local proxy that stood between the consumer's browser and all the Internet websites the consumer visited, including crypted https:// website.commonly referred to as a "main-the-middle" or a "manin-the-middle" technique.) This manin-the-middle technique allowed VisualDiscovery to see all of a consumer's sensitive personal information that was transmitted on the Internet, such as login credentials, Social Security numbers, financial account information, medical information, and webasedemail communciations VisualDiscovery then collected, transmitted to Superfish servers, and stored a more limited subset of user information, including: the URL visited by the consumer; the text appearing alongside images appearing on shopping websites; the name of the merchant website being browsed; the consumer's IP address; and a unique identifier assigned by Superfish to the user's laptop (collectively, "consumer Internet browsing data" superfish had the ability to collect additional information from Lenovo users through VisualDiscovery at any time.

THE PREINSTALLATION OF VISUALDISCOVERY ON LENOVO LAPTOPS

- 7. VisualDiscovery is a Lenovœustomized version of Superfishast-injecting software, WindowShopper. During the course of discussions with Superfish, Lenovo required a number of modifications to Superfish's WindowShopper program. The most significant modification resulted from Lenovo's requiremethat the softwarenject popup ads on multiple Internet browsers, including browsers that the consumer installed purchase. This condition required WindowShopper to change the way it delivered ads.
- 8. To provideRespondent's required functionali Superfish licensed and corporated a tool from Komodia, Inc.With this tool, VisualDiscovery operated on every Internet browser installed oponsumes' laptops and injected popp adson both http:// and encrypted https:// websites.

- 11. Superfish informed Respondent of its use of the Komtoodiaand warned that might cause antivirus cropanies to flag or block that flag flag are flag and in fact, as discussed in that Paragraph 20-24, the modified Visual Discovers of tware (using the Komodia tool) created two significant security vulnerabilities that put consumers' personal information at risk of unauthorized access. Without requesting viewing any further information, Lenovo approved Superfish's use of the Komodia tool
- 12. After a security researcher reported Respondent that there were problems with VisualDiscovery's interaction with https:// websitein September 2014, Respondent began to preinstall a second version of VisualDiscovery in December 2014 that did not operate on https:// websites or contain the root certificate that cthetedcurity vulnerabilities discussed infra Respondent did not update laptops that had the original version of VisualDiscovery preinstalled or stop the shipment of those laptops. In total, over 750,000 U.S. consumers purchased a Lenovo laptop with VisualDiscovery preinstalled with over half of those consumers purchasing laptop the original version of VisualDiscovery preinstalled.

tntkTw 21.8 eed5(a)-1Vthesnov.he8(e)-1ve-2(4(i)-2;(e)-1()]Te

The popup window also contained samall opt

because attackers could exploit this vulnerabilitipssue fraudulent digital certificates that would be trusted by consumers' browsers. Not onlythreapassword easy to crack – security researchers did so in less than hour – but once attackers had cracked the password on one consumer's laptop, they could target every Lenovo user with VisualDiscovery preinstalled with an-in-the-middle attack that could intercept consumers' electronic communications with any website, including floosieancial institutions and medical providers. Such attacks would provide attackers with unauthorized access to consumers' sensitive personal information, such as Socia

- after Superfish informed Respondematit could cause VisualDiscovery to be flagged by antivirus companies
- d. Respondentailed to require Superfish by contract to adopt and implement reasonable data security measures the ptd enovo users' personal information;
- e. Respondent failed to assess VisualDiscovery's compliance with reasonable data

FTC ACT VIOLATIONS

Count One - Deceptive Failure to Disclose

- 31. As alleged in Paragraphs 113; Respondent represented, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication to consumers that VisualDiscovewas enabled on their browsend would allow consumers to discoverimilar looking products with the best prices
- 32. Respondent representationaled to disclose, or failed to disclose adequatelyt VisualDiscovery woulded as a main-the-middle between consumers all websites with which communicated, including sensitive communications with encrypted https://websites, and collect and the middle between the communications with encrypted https://websites, and collect and the middle between the communications with encrypted https://websites.and.collect.and the middle between the consumer lateral to be a superfixed by the communication with encrypted https://websites.and.collect.and the collect.and t
- 33. Respondent's failure to disclose the material immation described in argraph 32, in light of the representation set forth in Paragraph, was, and is, a deceptive act or practice.
- 34. The acts and practices of Respondent as alleged in this complaint constitute unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce in violation of Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

Count Two - Unfair Preinstallation of Man-in-the-Middle Software

- 35. As alleged in Paragraphs 13, 27and 2930, Responderst preinstallation of injecting software that without adequate notice or informed consent, acted as annual themiddle between consumers and all the websites with which they communicated, including sensitive encrypted http/swebsites, and collected and transmitted consumer Internet browsing data to Superfish, caused or is likely to cause substantial injury to consumer that is not offset by countervailing benefits to consumers or competition, is not reasonably avoidable by consumers. This practice was, and is, an unfair act or practice.
- 36. The acts and practices of Respondent as alleged in this complaint constitute unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce in violation of Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

Count Three – Unfair Security Practices

37. As alleged n Paragraphs 129, Respondent failure to takereasonable measures to assess and address security risks created by that software preinstald on its laptops caused or itikely to cause substantial injury to consument is not offset by countervailing benefits to consumers or competition, is not reasonably avoidable by consumers. This practice was, and is, an unfair act or practice.