



US009231968B2

(12) **United States Patent**
Fang et al.

(10) **Patent No.:** **US 9,231,968 B2**
(45) **Date of Patent:** ***Jan. 5, 2016**

(54) **SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR UPDATING
CONTENT DETECTION DEVICES AND
SYSTEMS**

63/0227 (2013.01); **H04L 63/1408** (2013.01);
H04L 63/1416 (2013.01); **H04L 63/1441**
(2013.01)

(71) Applicant: **Fortinet, Inc.**, Sunnyvale, CA (US)

(58) **Field of Classification Search**

CPC **H04L 63/0227**; **H04L 63/1441**; **H04L**
63/1408; **H04L 63/1416**; **H04L 63/1425**
See application file for complete search history.

(72) Inventors: **Yu Fang**, Burnaby (CA); **Michael Xie**,
Menlo Park, CA (US)

(56) **References Cited**

(73) Assignee: **Fortinet, Inc.**, Sunnyvale, CA (US)

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this
patent is extended or adjusted under 35
U.S.C. 154(b) by 0 days.

This patent is subject to a terminal dis-
claimer.

5,910,179	A	6/1999	Mohseni
6,035,423	A	3/2000	Hodges et al.
6,044,367	A	3/2000	Wolff
6,052,531	A	4/2000	Waldin, Jr. et al.
6,088,804	A	7/2000	Hill et al.
6,157,932	A	12/2000	Klein et al.
6,233,618	B1	5/2001	Shannon

(Continued)

(21) Appl. No.: **14/072,184**

(22) Filed: **Nov. 5, 2013**

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

(65) **Prior Publication Data**

US 2014/0068749 A1 Mar. 6, 2014

WO	WO-9737454	A1	10/1997
WO	WO-01/55905	A1	8/2001

Related U.S. Application Data

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

(63) Continuation of application No. 13/795,407, filed on
Mar. 12, 2013, which is a continuation of application
No. 13/546,915, filed on Jul. 11, 2012, which is a
continuation of application No. 13/240,661, filed on
Sep. 22, 2011, now Pat. No. 8,276,205, which is a
continuation of application No. 11/000,703, filed on
Nov. 30, 2004, now Pat. No. 8,051,483.

“U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Advisory Action mailed Jul. 14, 2008”,
3 pgs.

(Continued)

(60) Provisional application No. 60/552,457, filed on Mar.
12, 2004.

Primary Examiner — Zachary A Davis

Assistant Examiner — Devin Almeida

(74) *Attorney, Agent, or Firm* — Schwegman Lundberg &
Woessner, P.A.

(51) **Int. Cl.**

H04L 29/06 (2006.01)

G06F 21/56 (2013.01)


(57) **ABSTRACT**

Systems, methods, and software for processing received net-
work traffic content in view of content detection data and
configuration data to either block, permit, or to further evalu-
ate network traffic content when entering a network.

(52) **U.S. Cl.**

CPC **H04L 63/1425** (2013.01); **G06F 21/567**
(2013.01); **H04L 63/02** (2013.01); **H04L**

9 Claims, 2 Drawing Sheets



(56)

References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

6,269,456	B1	7/2001	Hodges et al.	
6,314,565	B1	11/2001	Kenner et al.	
6,324,654	B1	11/2001	Wahl et al.	
6,484,315	B1	11/2002	Ziese	
6,651,099	B1	11/2003	Dietz et al.	
6,651,249	B2	11/2003	Waldin et al.	
6,725,377	B1	4/2004	Kouznetsov	
6,782,527	B1	8/2004	Kouznetsov et al.	
6,804,778	B1	10/2004	Levi et al.	
6,880,086	B2	4/2005	Kidder et al.	
7,080,000	B1	7/2006	Cambridge	
7,159,036	B2	1/2007	Hinchliffe et al.	
7,162,538	B1	1/2007	Cordova	
7,181,765	B2 *	2/2007	Patel et al.	726/12
7,185,332	B1	2/2007	Waldin et al.	
7,210,168	B2	4/2007	Hursey et al.	
7,292,531	B1	11/2007	Hill	
7,320,020	B2	1/2008	Chadwick et al.	
7,379,993	B2	5/2008	Valdes et al.	
7,389,539	B1	6/2008	Kouznetsov	
7,398,553	B1	7/2008	Li	
7,401,359	B2	7/2008	Gartside et al.	
7,424,706	B2	9/2008	Ivanov et al.	
7,478,381	B2	1/2009	Roberts et al.	
7,480,297	B2	1/2009	Ramanna et al.	
7,577,721	B1	8/2009	Chen	
7,600,257	B2	10/2009	Dubrovsky et al.	
7,639,613	B1	12/2009	Ghannadian et al.	
7,664,048	B1	2/2010	Yung et al.	
7,672,275	B2	3/2010	Yajnik et al.	
7,681,032	B2	3/2010	Peled et al.	
7,725,544	B2	5/2010	Alspector et al.	
7,760,722	B1	7/2010	Tripathi et al.	
7,761,503	B2	7/2010	Dhawan et al.	
7,769,815	B2	8/2010	Wang et al.	
7,774,839	B2	8/2010	Nazzal	
7,814,089	B1	10/2010	Skrenta et al.	
7,844,708	B2	11/2010	Willehadson et al.	
7,937,697	B2	5/2011	Alberti et al.	
7,992,142	B2	8/2011	Hartshorne et al.	
8,046,832	B2	10/2011	Goodman et al.	
8,051,483	B2	11/2011	Fang et al.	
8,056,135	B2	11/2011	Fang et al.	
8,108,429	B2	1/2012	Sim-Tang et al.	
8,276,205	B2	9/2012	Xie et al.	
2002/0009070	A1	1/2002	Lindsay et al.	
2002/0009079	A1	1/2002	Jungck et al.	
2002/0013832	A1	1/2002	Hubbard	
2002/0083175	A1	6/2002	Afek et al.	
2002/0083195	A1	6/2002	Beshai et al.	
2002/0100036	A1	7/2002	Moshir et al.	
2002/0124181	A1	9/2002	Nambu	
2002/0178262	A1	11/2002	Bonnell et al.	
2003/0079145	A1	4/2003	Kouznetsov et al.	
2003/0110280	A1	6/2003	Hinchliffe et al.	
2003/0123465	A1 *	7/2003	Donahue	370/401
2003/0177485	A1	9/2003	Waldin et al.	
2004/0003266	A1	1/2004	Moshir et al.	
2004/0030913	A1	2/2004	Liang et al.	
2004/0146006	A1	7/2004	Jackson	
2004/0153666	A1	8/2004	Sobel	
2005/0044165	A1	2/2005	O'Farrell et al.	
2005/0091653	A1	4/2005	Willehadson et al.	
2005/0120229	A1	6/2005	Lahti	
2005/0144616	A1	6/2005	Hammond et al.	
2005/0204151	A1	9/2005	Fang et al.	
2010/0154064	A1	6/2010	Fang et al.	
2012/0017277	A1	1/2012	Fang et al.	
2012/0278896	A1	11/2012	Fang et al.	
2013/0263246	A1	10/2013	Fang et al.	
2014/0059689	A1	2/2014	Fang et al.	

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

"U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Final Office Action mailed Apr. 3, 2009", 13 pgs.

"U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Final Office Action mailed Apr. 7, 2008", 18 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Final Office Action mailed Jun. 29, 2010", 8 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Non Final Office Action mailed Nov. 14, 2007", 16 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Non Final Office Action mailed May 9, 2008", 3 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Non Final Office Action mailed Oct. 14, 2010", 8 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Non Final Office Action mailed Dec. 15, 2009", 16 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Notice of Allowance mailed Jun. 27, 2011", 12 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Notice of Allowance mailed Aug. 8, 2011", 5 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Response filed Jan. 15, 2008 to Non Final Office Action mailed Nov. 14, 2007", 13 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Response filed Apr. 8, 2011 to Non-Final Office Action mailed Oct. 14, 2010", 8 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Response filed Apr. 15, 2010 to Non Final Office Action mailed Dec. 15, 2009", 10 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Response filed Jul. 7, 2008 to Final Office Action mailed Apr. 7, 2008", 10 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Response filed Sep. 29, 2010 to Final Office Action mailed Jun. 29, 2010", 7 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Response filed Oct. 2, 2009 to Final Office Action mailed Apr. 3, 2009", 9 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 11/000,703, Response filed Dec. 19, 2008 to Non Final Office Action mailed Sep. 19, 2008", 9 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 12/639,800, Non Final Office Action mailed May 9, 2011", 11 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 12/639,800, Notice of Allowance mailed Aug. 22, 2011", 5 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 12/639,800, Response filed Jun.28, 2011 to Non-Final Office Action Received May 9, 2011", 7 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/240,661, Response filed Jun. 1, 2012 to Non Final Office Action mailed May 3, 2012", 8 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/546,915, Non Final Office Action mailed Feb. 27, 2015", 26 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/240,661, 312 Amendment filed Aug. 17, 2012", 3 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/240,661, Non Final Office Action mailed May 3, 2012", 10 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/240,661, Notice of Allowance mailed Jun. 13, 2012", 5 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/546,915, Preliminary Amendment filed Aug. 17, 2012", 3 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/795,407, Response filed Feb. 27, 2014 to Non Final Office Action mailed Nov. 27, 2013", 6 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/795,407, Non Final Office Action mailed Nov. 27, 2013", 10 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/795,407, Final Office Action mailed Jun. 6, 2014", 10 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/795,407, Notice of Allowance mailed Sep. 24, 2014", 7 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 13/795,407, Supplemental Notice of Allowability mailed Nov. 28, 2014", 4 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 14/072,292, Final Office Action mailed 08-29-14", 14 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 14/072,292, Non Final Office Action mailed Aug. 8, 2014", 11 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 14/072,292, Notice of Allowance mailed Oct. 7, 2014", 7 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 14/072,292, Response filed Aug. 19, 2014 to Non Final Office Action mailed Aug. 18, 2014", 9 pgs.
 "U.S. Appl. No. 14/072,292, Response filed Sep. 3, 2014 to Final Office Action mailed Aug. 29, 2014", 7 pgs.
 "Accurate Attack Protection", Juniper Networks, (2005), 6 pgs.
 "Anti-Virus Software Distribution: Managing the Distribution of Anti-Virus Upgrades and Updates Across the Enterprise", Network Associates, (1997), 7 pgs.

(56)

References Cited**OTHER PUBLICATIONS**

U.S. Appl. No. 13/546,915, filed May 27, 2015 to Non Final Office Action mailed Feb. 27, 2015, 11 pgs.

"avast! Distributed Network Manager", [Online]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: http://web.archive.org/web/20040612065805/http://www.avast.com/i_idt_I68.html, (Jun. 12, 2004), 5 pgs.

"Barracuda Web Filter Administrator's Guide Version 3.0", Barracuda Networks, (2004-2007), 86 pgs.

"Blended Threats: Case Study and Countermeasures. White Paper.", Symantec Enterprise Security, (2001), 16 pgs.

"Centrax Version 3.0 User's Guide", Cybersafe Corporation, (Feb. 2001), 180 pgs.

"Check Point SmartUpdate", [Online]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20030205084611/http://www.checkpoint.com/products/manage/smartupdate.html>, (Accessed Mar. 20, 2015), 9 pgs.

"Comparison chart of Symantec Virus Protection and Content Filtering Products", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 2 pgs.

"Comprehensive Intrusion Protection Solutions from Symantec: Secure enterprise assets and applications with advanced intrusion protection", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 8 pgs.

"Concepts & Examples Guide Netscreen-IDP Fundamentals", Version 2.1. Chapters 1-4, (2003), 1-126.

"Concepts & Examples Guide NetScreen-IDP Fundamentals—Version 2.1", NetScreen Technologies. Chapter 1-5, (2003), 1-126.

"Concepts & Examples Guide NetScreen-IDP Fundamentals—Version 3.0", Juniper Networks. Chapters 1-7, (2004), 1-164.

"Content Filtering Service-Standard Administrator's Guide", SonicWALL Inc., (2008), 30 pgs.

"Content Filtering, Blocking and Network Management", K12USA.com Service Demos, [Online]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20030510195438/http://k12usa.com/sademo6.asp>>, (May 10, 2003), 1 pg.

"Enhanced Dynamic Threat Protection via Automated Correlation and Analysis (an ISS White Paper)", Internet Security Systems, (2002), 1-14.

"Enterasys Dragon-EALTM Intrusion Defense System Security Target Version 11", Enterasys Networks, (Aug. 31, 2004), 79 pgs.

"ePolicy Orchestrator version 3.0—Installation Guide Revision 1.0", McAfee, (2003), 108 pgs.

"ePolicy Orchestrator Small Business Edition version 3.0—Getting Started Guide", McAfee, (2003), 52 pgs.

Exhibit A-1, U.S. Pat. No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,484,315 to Ziese, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-27.

Exhibit A-10, U.S. Pat. No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,992,142 to Hartshorne et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-9.

Exhibit A-2, U.S. Pat. No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,782,527 to Kouznetsov, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-26.

Exhibit A-3, U.S. Pat. No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,577,721 to Chen, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-21.

Exhibit A-4, U.S. Pat. No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on Jun Li et al., Resilient Self-Organizing Overlay Networks for Security Update Delivery, 22 IEEE Journal on Selected Areas Communications 189 (Jan. 2004), (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-32.

Exhibit A-5, U.S. Pat. No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on Fortinet Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-65.

Exhibit A-6, U.S. Pat. No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on Symantec Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-53.

Exhibit A-7, U.S. Patent No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the McAfee Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2012), 1-67.

Exhibit A-8, U.S. Pat. No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on Trend Micro Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-38.

Exhibit A-9, U.S. Pat. No. 8,056,135, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 8,108,429 to Sim-tang et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-37.

Exhibit B-1, U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,484,315 to Ziese, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-43.

Exhibit B-2, U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,782,527 to Kouznetsov, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-40.

Exhibit B-3, U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,577,721 to Chen, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-35.

Exhibit B-4, U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, Invalidity Claim Chart based on Jun Li et al., Resilient Self-Organizing Overlay Networks for Security Update Delivery, 22 IEEE Journal on Selected Areas Communications 189 (Jan. 2004), (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-43.

Exhibit B-5, Part 1, U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the Fortinet Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-44.

Exhibit B-6, U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, Invalidity Claim Chart based on Symantec Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-61.

Exhibit B-7, U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the McAfee Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-62.

Exhibit B-8, U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, Invalidity Claim Chart based on Trend Micro Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-45.

Exhibit B-9, U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 8,108,429 to Sim-tang et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-50.

Exhibit C-1, U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,484,315 to Ziese, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-43.

Exhibit C-2, U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,782,527 to Kouznetsov, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-41.

Exhibit C-3, U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,577,721 to Chen, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-37.

Exhibit C-4, U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, Invalidity Claim Chart based on Jun Li et al., Resilient Self-Organizing Overlay Networks for Security Update Delivery, 22 IEEE Journal on Selected Areas Communications 189 (Jan. 2004), (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-39.

Exhibit C-5, U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the Fortinet Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-64.

Exhibit C-6, U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the Symantec Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-33.

Exhibit C-7, U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the McAfee Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-37.

Exhibit C-8, U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the Trend Micro Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-39.

Exhibit C-9, U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 8,108,429 to Sim-tang et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-45.

Exhibit D-1, U.S. Pat. No. 7,580,974, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,651,099 to Dietz et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-21.

Exhibit D-2, U.S. Pat. No. 7,580,974, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,600,257 to Dubrovsky et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-18.

Exhibit D-3, U.S. Pat. No. 7,580,974, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,292,531 to Hill, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-20.

Exhibit D-4, U.S. Pat. No. 7,580,974, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,664,048 to Yung, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-25.

Exhibit D-5, U.S. Pat. No. 7,580,974, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0009079 to Jungck et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-21.

Exhibit D-6, U.S. Pat. No. 7,580,974, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,681,032 to Peled et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-28.

Exhibit D-7, U.S. Pat. No. 7,580,974, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,760,722 to Tripathi et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-18.

Exhibit D-8, U.S. Pat. No. 7,580,974, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,639,613 to Ghannadian et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-23.

Exhibit E-1, U.S. Pat. No. 8,204,933, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,651,099 to Dietz et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-37.

Exhibit E-2, U.S. Pat. No. 8,204,933, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,600,257 to Dubrovsky et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-24.

Exhibit E-3, U.S. Pat. No. 8,204,933, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,292,531 to Hill, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-26.

Exhibit E-4, U.S. Pat. No. 8,204,933, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,664,048 to Yung, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-32.

Exhibit E-5, U.S. Pat. No. 8,204,933, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0009079 to Jungck et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-26.

Exhibit E-6, U.S. Pat. No. 8,204,933, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,681,032 to Peled et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-32.

Exhibit E-7, U.S. Pat. No. 8,204,933, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,760,722 to Tripathi et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-27.

Exhibit E-8, U.S. Pat. No. 8,204,933, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,639,613 to Ghannadian et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-26.

Exhibit F-1, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the MINDS Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-26.

Exhibit F-10, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,161,130 to Horvitz, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-27.

(56)

References Cited

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Exhibit F-11, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,774,839 to Nazzari, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-27.

Exhibit F-12, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,379,993 to Valdes, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-24.

Exhibit F-13, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on Brin, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-20.

Exhibit F-14, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on WO 01/55905 to Kessinger et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-20.

Exhibit F-15, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,814,089 to Skrenta et al., (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-18.

Exhibit F-2, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the Arbor Networks System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-31.

Exhibit F-3, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the McAfee Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-40.

Exhibit F-4, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on NetScreen Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-47.

Exhibit F-5, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on the Symantec Prior Art System, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-31.

Exhibit F-6, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,725,544 to Alspector, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-29.

Exhibit F-7, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,320,020 to Chadwick, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-23.

Exhibit F-8, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 8,046,832 to Goodman, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-29.

Exhibit F-9, U.S. Pat. No. 7,979,543, Invalidity Claim Chart based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,804 to Hill, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-27.

Exhibit G, Prior Art References Relevant to the '135 Patent, '205 Patent, and the '483 Patent, (Mar. 2, 2015), 1-27.

"F-Secure Anti-Virus 5 Win 95/98/ME/NT4.0/2000/XP DOS Administrator's Guide", F-Secure Corporation, (1996), 113 pgs.

"FireEye's Disclosure of Invalidity Contentions", *Fortinet, Inc. v. FireEye, Inc.*, US District Court of Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case No. 5:13-cv-02496-HSG-PSG, (Mar. 2, 2015), 38 pgs.

"FortiGate—3600 User Manual Part 1", Fortinet, (2003), 1-168.

"FortiResponse Update Infrastructure", Fortinet, (2002), 10 pgs.

"Hardware Guide NetScreen-IDP V/N 2.1", NetScreen Technologies, (2003), 114 pgs.

"High Availability QuickStart Guide IDP 100 & 500", NetScreen Technologies Inc., (2003), 32 pgs.

"How to determine whether virus definitions on a NetWare server are up to date without using Symantec System Center. Article ID:TECH99403", Symantec Corporation, (2007), 2 pgs.

"Implementation Guide—Version 2.0", NetScreen Technologies, (2002), 106 pgs.

"Implementing Trend Micro antivirus solutions in the Enterprise", SANS Institute, (2003), 18 pgs.

"Intelligent Network Management with Peakflow Traffic", Arbor Networks, Inc., (2003), 14 pgs.

"Intruder Alert 3.6: Host-Based Intrusion Detection and Security Policy Management", Symantec Corporation, (2001), 2 pgs.

"Intrushield IPS Quick Reference Card", McAfee, (2008), 2 pgs.

"Intrusion Detection Systems: Symantec ManHunt—Reducing the Risk of Compromise", Symantec corporation, (2003), 16 pgs.

"LiveUpdate Administrator's Guide. Documentoin Version 1.8", Symantec Corporation, (2002), 65 pgs.

"Managed Virus Defense ASaP", Network Associates, (2003), 1 pg.

"Managing Security Incidents in the Enterprise. White paper", Symantec Corporation, (2002), 12 pgs.

"ManHunt: FAQ", Recourse Technologies, [Online]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20010430012831/http://www.recourse.com/products/manhunt...>>, (Apr/30, 2001), 2 pgs.

"McAfee AutoUpdate Architect version 1.1.1—Product Guide Revision 1.0", McAfee, (2003), 80 pgs.

"McAfee AVERT Launches Webimmune to Deliver Real-Time Cures for New Viruses Via the Internet; McAfee AVERT Webim-

une Offers E-businesses Immediate Cures for the Newest Internet Viruses and Malicious Code Attacks", LexisNexis, (Sep. 20, 2000), 3 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield IPS—Intrushield Security Manager (ISM) version 4.1—Alerts & System Health monitoring Guide revision 5.0", McAfee, (2008), 116 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield IPS—Intrushield Security Manager (ISM) version 4.1—Policies Configuration guide revision 4.0", McAfee, (2007), 96 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield IPS—McAfee Intrushield Security Manager (ISM) version 4.1—Manager Server configuration Guide revision 5.0", McAfee, (2008), 88 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield IPS—McAfee Intrushield Security Manager (ISM) version 4.1—Intrushield Quick Tour revision 4.0", McAfee, (2007), 36 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield IPS Attack Description version 4.1—Intrushield Attack Description Guide revision 1.0", McAfee, (2007), 14 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield IPS Intrushield Security Manager (ISM) version 4.1—Intrushield Getting Started Guide revision 7.0", McAfee, (2009), 85 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield IPS Intrushield Sensor 4000 version 4.1—Intrushield Sensor 4000 Product Guide revision 7.0", McAfee, (2008), 35 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield Network IDS Sensor—Data Sheet", McAfee, (2003), 6 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield Network IPS Sensor—Industry-Leading, Next Generation Network Intrusion Prevention Solution (Data Sheet)", McAfee, (2004), 8 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield Security Management", McAfee, (2004), 7 pgs.

"McAfee Intrushield Security Management—Data Sheet", McAfee, (2003), 6 pgs.

"McAfee VirusScan Home Edition Version 7.0—Product Guide", McAfee, (2002), 48 pgs.

"McAfee WebShield c500 Appliance", McAfee, (2001), 2 pgs.

"NETASQ IPS-Firewalls Version 6.0", NETASQ Secure Internet Connectivity, (2004), 16 pgs.

"NetScreen IDP Concepts Guide—Version 2.0", NetScreen Technologies, (2002), 170 pgs.

"NetScreen IDP Hardware Information Guide—Version 2.0", NetScreen Technologies, (2002), 52 pgs.

"NetScreen—Global PRO Security Management Systems", NetScreen Technologies Inc., (2003), 8 pgs.

"NetScreen—5000 Series", NetScreen Technologies, (2003), 4 pgs.

"NetScreen—IDP Release Notes", NetScreen Technologies, (Mar. 25, 2004), 16 pgs.

"NetSpective Solutions White Paper", Verso Technologies, (Jul. 2003), 1-12.

"Network Appliance, now from Symantec", Recourse Technologies, (2002), 2 pgs.

"Norton AntiVirus for use with ePolicy Orchestrator version 3.0, version 7.50, 7.51, 7.6, 8.0 and 8.01—Configuration Guide Revision 1.0", McAfee, (2003), 48 pgs.

"Packeteer's PacketShaper", Packeteer, Inc., (2004), 4 pgs.

"Peakflow X: Internal Network Security for Mission-Critical Networks", Arbor Networks, Inc., (2004), 4 pgs.

"Peakflow X: Over the past few years, large enterprises have significantly improved the security of the network perimeter. However, despite those investments, most networks remain vulnerable at their core.", Arbor Networks, Inc., (2003), 4 pgs.

"Product Deployment Comparison", McAfee Security, (2003), 2 pgs.

"Quickstart Guide IDP 10, 100, 500 & Bypass Unit Version 2.1", NetScreen Technologies Inc., (2003), 28 pgs.

"Quickstart Guide IDP 100, Version 2.0", NetScreen Technologies Inc., (2002), 24 pgs.

"Real Time Network Protection for Educational Institutions", Fortinet, (Feb. 2003), 14 pgs.

"Release Notes for McAfee ePolicy Orchestrator (TM) Version3.0.0", McAfee, (2003), 43 pgs.

"Service Provider Infrastructure Security: Detecting, Tracing, and Mitigating Network-Wide Anomalies with Peakflow DoS", Arbor Networks, Inc., (2003), 14 pgs.

(56)

References Cited

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

- "SmartCOP Anti-Virus Corporate Edition", [Online]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20040401193806/http://www.s-cop.com/LAN-scop-features.html>, (Accessed Mar. 20, 2015), 4 pgs.
- "SonicWALL Intrusion Prevention Service 2.0, Administrator's Guide", SonicWALL, (2005), 1-38.
- "SonicWALL Intrusion Prevention Service Administrator's Guide", SonicWALL, Inc., (2004), 81 pgs.
- "Symantec AntiVirus™ Corporate Edition Administrator's Guide and Reference Guide. Documentation version 9.0", Symantec Corporation, (2004), 258 pgs.
- "Symantec AntiVirus™ Corporate Edition Administrator's Guide. Document version 9.0", Symantec Corporation, (2004), 216 pgs.
- "Symantec AntiVirus™ Corporate Edition Reference Guide. Documentation version 8.1", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 42 pgs.
- "Symantec Central Quarantine Administrator's Guide", Symantec Corporation, (2001), 81 pgs.
- "Symantec Client Security with Event Manager: Integrated antivirus, firewall, and intrusion detection for the client with centralized logging, alerting, and reporting", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 4 pgs.
- "Symantec Corporation: Feature and Usage Comparison of the Symantec Gateway Security Appliance: Test report prepared under contract from Symantec Corporation", Symantec Corporation, (Dec. 2002), 1-33.
- "Symantec Decoy Server 3.1", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 2 pgs.
- "Symantec Enterprise Product Catalog", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 16 pgs.
- "Symantec Enterprise Security Manager: Comprehensive Policy and Compliance Management", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 2 pgs.
- "Symantec Event Manager for Intrusion Protection: Centralized monitoring, alerting, and reporting for Symantec and select third-party intrusion detection and intrusion prevention solutions", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 2 pgs.
- "Symantec Event Manager for Security Gateways: Centralized logging, alerting, and reporting across Symantec's security gateway protection solutions and select third-party products", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 2 pgs.
- "Symantec Gateway Security 5400 Series: Full-inspection firewall appliance with integrated security technologies", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 4 pgs.
- "Symantec Gateway Security: Symantec introduces the answer to attacks like Nimda, Code Red and other blended threats Blended security.", Symantec Corporation, (2002), 7 pgs.
- "Symantec Host IDS: Automated intrusion detection and response for systems, applications, and data", Symantec Corporation, (2002), 2 pgs.
- "Symantec Incident Manager: Real-time security incident management for enterprise network environments", Symantec Corporation, (2003), 4 pgs.
- "Technical Brief—Cisco Secure Intrusion Detection System Technical Overview", Cisco Systems, Inc., [Online]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20001018195620/http://www.cisco.com/warp/public/cc/pd/sq...>, (Oct. 18, 2000), 8 pgs.
- "The Digital Immune System: Enterprise-Grade Anti-Virus Automation in the 21st Century", Symantec Corporation, (2001), 16 pgs.
- "Trend Micro ServerProtect 5.31 for EMC Celerra Evaluation Guide", Trend Micro Inc., (Sep. 2001), 36 pgs.
- "Updating with VirusScan Enterprise Version 7.0 Document Revision 1.0—Implementation Guide", McAfee Security, (2003), 44 pgs.
- "Updating with VirusScan Enterprise. Version 7.0—Implementation Guide", McAfee Security, (Mar. 2003), 44 pgs.
- "Using Management Center for Cisco Security Agents 4.0", Chapters 1-4. Cisco Systems, Inc., (2003), 1-190.
- "VirusScan® Enterprise. Version 7.1.0—Product Guide, Revision 1.0", Chapters 6-8, plus Appendices, Glossary and Index. McAfee Security, (Sep. 2003), 149-290.
- "VirusScan ASaP Desktop AntiVirus without the management headache", Network Associates, (2003), 2 pgs.
- "VirusScan ASaP FAQ", Network Associates, (2003), 1 pg.
- "VirusScan ASaP Features and Benefits", Network Associates, (2003), 2 pgs.
- "VirusScan Enterprise version 7.1.0—Product Guide Revision 1.0", Chapters 1-5. McAfee, (2003), 1-148.
- "WatchGuard LiveSecurity System User Guide", Chapters 1-14. WatchGuard Technologies, Inc., LiveSecurity System 4.1, (1998-2000), 1-178.
- "WebShield e500 Appliance Product Guide Version 2.0", McAfee, (2001), 52 pgs.
- Andersen, David, et al., "Resilient Overlay Networks", Proceedings of the eighteenth ACM symposium on Operating systems principles, (Oct. 21, 2001), 15 pgs.
- Bace, Rebecca, et al., "NIST Special Publication on Intrusion Detection Systems", Booz-Allen and Hamilton Inc., (2001), 53 pgs.
- Barry, R L, et al., "Multifractal Characterization for Classification of Network Traffic", Proceedings ICCECE—CCGEL, vol. IV, (2004), 1453-1457.
- Bhattacharyya, Manasi, et al., "MET: An Experimental System for Malicious Email Tracking", New Security Paradigms Workshop, (2002), 3-10.
- Bhola, Sumeer, et al., "Exactly-once Delivery in a Content-based Publish-Subscribe System", Dependable Systems and Networks, 2002. DSN 2002. Proceedings. International Conference, (2002), 10 pgs.
- Boniforti, Christian, "Securing a University's Bandwidth with PacketShaper. Version 1.4b, Option B", SANS Institute. Global Information Assurance Certification Paper, (Mar. 2003), 31 pgs.
- Brin, Sergey, et al., "The Anatomy of a Large- Scale Hypertextual Web Search Engine", Elsevier Science Publisher, (1998), 24 pgs.
- Chalak, Ashok, et al., "Effective Data Mining Techniques for Intrusion Detection and Prevention System", UACEE International Journal of Advances in Computer Networks and its Security, (2011), 286-290.
- Chandola, Varun, et al., "Data Mining for Cyber Security", Data Warehousing and Data Mining Techniques for Computer Security, (2006), 20 pgs.
- Chen, Yao-Min, et al., "Policy management for network-based intrusion detection and prevention", Network Operations and Management Symposium, 2004. NOMS 2004. IEEE/FIP vol. 2, (Apr. 23, 2004), 218-232.
- Choi, TS, et al., "Content-Aware Internet Application Traffic Measurement and Analysis", Network Operations and Management Symposium, 2004. NOMS 2004. IEEE/IFIP. vol. 1, (2004), 511-524.
- Cohn, David, et al., "Semi-supervised Clustering with User Feedback", Cornell University, (2003), 9 pgs.
- Cooley, Al, "Using Integrated Security Platforms to Improve Network Security and Reduce Total Cost of Ownership", Astaro Internet Security, (Oct. 24, 2003), 14 pgs.
- Davison, Brian D., "Topical Locality in the Web", Department of Computer Science Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, (2000), 272-279.
- De Rijk, Mark, "Use offense to inform defense. Find flaws before the bad guys do. Case study: Implementing Trend Micro antivirus solutions in the enterprise.", SANS Penetration Testing, (Nov. 2002), 18 pgs.
- Debar, Herve, et al., "Aggregation and Correlation of Intrusion-Detection Alerts", IBM Research, Zurich Research Laboratory, (2001), 87-105.
- Dokas, Paul, et al., "Data Mining for Network Intrusion Detection", Proc. NSF Workshop on Next Generation Data Mining, (2002), 21-30.
- Dumais, Susan, et al., "Hierarchical Classification of Web Content", Proceedings of the 23rd annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval, (2000), 256-263.
- Ertoz, L., et al., "Detection and Summarization of Novel Network Attacks Using Data Mining", AHPARC Technical Report, (2003), 23 pgs.
- Ertoz, Levent, et al., "Detection of Novel Network Attacks Using Data Mining", Computer Science Department, University of Minnesota, (Jan. 26, 2015), 10 pgs.

(56)

References Cited

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

- Ertoz, Levent, et al., "MINDS—Minnesota Intrusion Detection System", Chapter 3, (2003), 21 pgs.
- Ester, Martin, et al., "Web Site Mining: A new way to spot Competitors, Customers and Suppliers in the World Wide Web", SIGKDD, (2002), 249-258.
- Eugster, Patrick T., "The Many Faces of Publish/Subscribe", ACM Computing Surveys, 35(2), (Jun. 2003), 114-131.
- Fisk, Mike, et al., "Fast Content-Based Packet Handling for Intrusion Detection", UCSD Technical Report CS2001-0670, (May 2001), 1-14.
- Freed, Les, "Corporate Antivirus: Germ Warfare at Work", PC Magazine, (May 9, 2000), 7 pgs.
- Gong, Dr. Fendmim, "Next Generation Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS)", McAfee Security, (Mar. 2002), 16 pgs.
- Gong, Fengmin, "Next Generation Intrusion Detection systems (IDS)", Network Associates, (Mar. 2002), 16 pgs.
- Gupta, Manish, et al., "Intrusion Countermeasures Security Model Based on Prioritization Scheme for Intranet Access Security (Emerging Concepts Category)", Proceedings of the 2003 IEEE Workshop on Information Assurance, (2003), 174-181.
- Gupta, P., et al., "Packet Classification on Multiple Fields", Proceedings of the Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication (ACM SIGCOMM '99), (1999), pp. 147-160.
- Gupta, Pankaj, et al., "Algorithms for Packet Classification", IEEE Network, (Mar. 2001), 29 pgs.
- Haas, Norman, et al., "Personalized News Through Content Augmentation and Profiling", IEEE, Paper 238, (2002), 5 pgs.
- Hauswirth, Manfred, et al., "A Component and Communication Model for Push Systems", Proceedings of the 7th European software engineering conference held jointly with the 7th ACM SIGSOFT International symposium on Foundations of software engineering, (1999), 38 pgs.
- Hoffmeyr, Steven, "An Immunological Model of Distributed Detection and its Application to Computer Security", University of Witwatersrand, (May 199), 135 pgs.
- Jackson, Kathleen, "Intrusion Detection System (IDS) Product Survey. Version 2.1", Distributed Knowledge Systems Team Computer Research and Applications Group Computing, Information, and Communications Division Los Alamos National Laboratory Los Alamos, New Mexico, (Jun. 25, 1999), 106 pgs.
- Jungck, Peder, et al., "Computing Practices: Issues in High-Speed Internet Security", Published by the IEEE Computer Society, (Jul. 2004), 36-42.
- Karagiannis, Thomas, et al., "Transport Layer Identification of P2P Traffic", IMC, (2004), 14 pgs.
- Kephart, Jeffrey, et al., "Automatic Extraction of Computer Virus Signatures", In Proceedings of the 4th Virus Bulletin International Conference, R. Ford, ed., Virus Bulletin Ltd., (1994), 179-194.
- Kreibich, Christian, et al., "Honeycomb—Creating Intrusion Detection Signatures Using Honeypots", ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communications Review, vol. 34, No. 1, (Jan. 2004), 51-56.
- Lakshminarayanan, Karthik, et al., "Algorithms for Advanced Packet Classification with Ternary CAMS", SIGCOMM, (2005), 193-204.
- Lee, Wenke, et al., "A Framework for Constructing Features and Models for Intrusion Detection Systems", ACM Transactions on Information and System Security, vol. 3, No. 4, (Nov. 2000), 227-261.
- Li, Jun, et al., "Resilient Self-Organizing Overlay Networks for Security Update Delivery", IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications (vol. 22, No. 1), (Jan. 1, 2004), 14 pgs.
- Lockwood, John, et al., "An Extensible, System-On-Programmable-Chip, Content-Aware Internet Firewall", 13th International Conference, FPL, Lecture Notes in Computer Science vol. 2778, (2003), 859-868.
- Lonvick, C., "Network Working Group Request for Comments: 3164 Category: Informational: The BSD syslog Protocol", Cisco Systems, (Aug. 2001), 30 pgs.
- Lynxwiler, Rodney, "Implementing a Norton AntiVirus Managed Infrastructure", Symantec Corporate, (2002), 13 pgs.
- Ma, Pingchuan, "Log Analysis-Based Intrusion Detection via Unsupervised Learning", School of Informatics University of Edinburgh, (2003), 1-70.
- Malan, G. Robert, et al., "Salamander: A Push-based Distribution Substrate for Internet Applications", USENIX Symposium on Internet Technologies and Systems, (Dec. 1997), 12 pgs.
- Malkin, Gary, "RIP Version 2", Network Working Group. Request for Comments: 2453, (Nov. 1998), 1-39.
- Maselli, Gaia, et al., "Design and Implementation of an Anomaly Detection System: an Empirical Approach", TERENA Networking Conference, (2003), 1-20.
- Merrick, David, "Hardware Flow Classification's Potential Impact on Security-in-Depth Design. GSEC Practical Version 1.3", SANS Institute. Global Information Assurance Certification Paper, (Apr. 15, 2002), 12 pgs.
- Moore, Andrew, et al., "Toward the Accurate Identification of Network Applications", Passive and Active Network Measurement. 6th International Workshop, PAM, (2005), 15 pgs.
- Nachenberg, Carey, "Computer Virus-Coevolution", Communications of the ACM vol. 40 No. 1, (Jan. 1997), 46-51.
- Nakayama, Takehiro, "Content-Oriented Categorization of Document Images", COLING '96 Proceedings of the 16th conference on Computational linguistics, vol. 2, (1996), 818-823.
- Neubauer, Bruce J, et al., "Protection of computer systems from computer viruses: ethical and practical issues", Journal of Computing Sciences in Colleges, vol. 18, No. 1, (Oct. 2002), 270-279.
- Noel, Steven, et al., "Modern Intrusion Detection, Data Mining, and Degrees of Attack Guilt", Applications of Data Mining in Computer Security, vol. 6., Kluwer Academic Publishers, (2002), 1-31.
- Noel, Steven, et al., "Optimal IDS Sensor Placement and Alert Prioritization Using Attack Graphs", JNSM, vol. 16, Issue 3, (2008), 1-15.
- Northcutt, Stephen, et al., "Chapter 3: Stateful Firewalls", Inside Network Perimeter Security, 2nd Edition, Pearson, (2005), 55-86.
- Oveissian, A, et al., "Fast Flow Classification over Internet", Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference on Communication Networks and Services Research, (2004), 8 pgs.
- Pietzuch, Peter R., et al., "Hermes: A Distributed Event-Based Middleware Architecture", Distributed Computing Systems Workshops, 2002. Proceedings. 22nd International Conference, (2002), 8 pgs.
- Rabek, Jesse, et al., "Detecting Privilege-Escalating Executable Exploits", In ICDM Workshop on Data Mining for Computer Security, (2003), 1-7.
- Radcliff, Deborah, "The Evolution of IDS", Network World, (Nov. 8, 2004), 4 pgs.
- Rigney, Steve, "Network Antivirus: Defend Your Network", PC Magazine, (May 4, 1999), 4 pgs.
- Roeckl, Chris, "Stateful Inspection Firewalls: An Overview of Firewall Technology and How Juniper Networks Implements it. White Paper", (2004), 1-14.
- Roughan, Matthew, et al., "Class-of-Service Mapping for QoS: A Statistical Signature-based Approach to IP Traffic Classification", IMC, (2004), 135-148.
- Salvatore, J, et al., "Combining Behavior Models to Secure Email Systems", CU Tech Report, (May 16, 2003), 1-14.
- Salvatore, J, et al., "Detecting Viral Propagations Using Email Behavior Profiles", ACM Transactions on Internet Technology, (2006), 47 pgs.
- Schultz, Matthew, et al., "Data Mining Methods for Detection of New Malicious Executables", Proceedings of the 2001 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, (2001), 38-49.
- Schultz, Matthew, "Data Mining Methods for Detection of New Malicious Executables", Proceedings of the 2001 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, (2001), 1-14.
- Srinivasan, V., et al., "Packet Classification Using Tuple Space Search", Proceedings of the Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols (ACM SIGCOMM '99), (1999), pp. 135-146.

(56)

References Cited

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Subramanya, S. R., et al., "Computer Viruses", Potentials, IEEE vol. 2, No. 4, (Oct./Nov. 2001), 16-19.

Wenjie, Hu, "Robust Anomaly Detection Using Support Vector Machines", ICML, (2003), 1-8.

Wespi, Andreas, "Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2516—Part 1 Recent Advances in Intrusion Detection", 5th International Symposium, RAID 2002, (Oct. 2002), 1-157.

Wu, Yu-Sung, et al., "SCIDIVE: A Stateful and Cross Protocol Intrusion Detection Architecture for Voice-over-IP Environments", Proceedings of the 2004 International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN'04) Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, (2004), 10 pgs.

Zander, Sebastian, et al., "Automated Traffic Classification and Application Identification using Machine Learning", Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Local Computer Networks 30th Anniversary, (2005), 8 pgs.

* cited by examiner




Fig. 1




Fig. 2

1

SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR UPDATING CONTENT DETECTION DEVICES AND SYSTEMS

RELATED APPLICATION DATA

This application is a Continuation of U.S. application Ser. No. 13/795,407, filed on Mar. 12, 2012, which is a Continuation of U.S. application Ser. No. 13/546,915, filed on Jul. 11, 2012, which is a Continuation of U.S. application Ser. No. 13/240,661, filed Sep. 22, 2011 and issued on Sep. 25, 2012 as U.S. Pat. No. 8,276,205, which is a Continuation of U.S. application Ser. No. 11/000,703, filed Nov. 30, 2004 and issued on Nov. 1, 2011 as U.S. Pat. No. 8,051,483, which claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/552,457, filed on Mar. 12, 2004, to each of which priority is claimed and the entire disclosures of which are expressly incorporated herein by reference.

BACKGROUND

1. Field of the Invention

The field of the invention relates to computer network and computer systems, and more particularly, to systems and methods for updating content detection modules.

2. Background

The generation and spreading of computer viruses are major problems in computer systems and computer networks. A computer virus is a program that is capable of attaching to other programs or sets of computer instructions, replicating itself, and/or performing unsolicited or malicious actions on a computer system. Viruses may be embedded in email attachments, files downloaded from Internet, and macros in MS Office files. The damage that can be done by a computer virus may range from mild interference with a program, such as a display of unsolicited messages or graphics, to complete destruction of data on a user's hard drive or server.

To provide protection from viruses, most organizations have installed virus scanning software on computers in their network. However, these organizations may still be vulnerable to a virus attack until every host in their network has received updated anti-virus software. With new attacks reported almost weekly, organizations are constantly exposed to virus attacks, and spend significant resources ensuring that all hosts are constantly updated with new antivirus information. For example, with existing content detection software, a user may have to request for a download of a new virus signature in order to enable the content detection software to detect new virus that has been created since the last update. If a user delays in downloading the new virus signature, the content detection software would be unable to detect the new virus. Also, with existing content detection systems, new virus signatures are generally not made available shortly after they are discovered. As such, a computer may be subjected to attack by the new virus until the new virus signature is available and is downloaded by a user.

Besides virus attacks, many organizations also face the challenge of dealing with inappropriate content, such as email spam, misuse of networks in the form of browsing or downloading inappropriate content, and use of the network for non-productive tasks. Many organizations are struggling to control access to appropriate content without unduly restricting access to legitimate material and services. Currently, the most popular solution for blocking unwanted web activity is to block access to a list of banned or blacklisted web sites and pages based on their URLs. However, as with virus scanning, the list of blocked URL requires constant updating. If a user

2

delays in downloading the list of URL, or if the list of URL is not made available soon enough, the content detection software would be unable to detect undesirable content, such as web pages.

Many email spam elimination systems also use blacklists (spammer lists) to eliminate unwanted email messages. These systems match incoming email messages against a list of mail servers that have been pre-identified to be spam hosts, and prevent user access of messages from these servers. However, as with virus scanning, the spammer list also requires constant updating. If a user delays in downloading the spammer list, or if the spammer list is not made available soon enough, the content detection software would be unable to detect undesirable content.

SUMMARY

In accordance with some embodiments, a method of updating a content detection module includes obtaining content detection data, and transmitting the content detection data to a content detection module, wherein the transmitting is performed not in response to a request from the content detection module.

In accordance with other embodiments, a system for updating a content detection module includes means for obtaining content detection data, and means for transmitting the content detection data to a content detection module, wherein the means for transmitting is configured to perform the transmitting not in response to a request from the content detection module.

In accordance with other embodiments, a computer-program product having a medium, the medium having a set of instructions readable by a processor, an execution of the instructions by the processor causes a process to be performed, the process includes obtaining content detection data, and transmitting the content detection data to a content detection module, wherein the transmitting is performed not in response to a request from the content detection module.

In accordance with other embodiments, a content detection system includes a station having a computer-readable medium for storing content detection data, the content detection data usable by a content detection module to detect content, wherein the station is configured to transmit the content detection data not in response to a request by the content detection module.

In accordance with other embodiments, a method of sending content detection data includes determining whether a first update station received the content detection data, and sending the content detection data to the first update station if the first update station did not receive the content detection data.

In accordance with other embodiments, a system for sending content detection data includes means for determining whether a first update station received the content detection data, and means for sending the content detection data to the first update station if the first update station did not receive the content detection data.

In accordance with other embodiments, a computer-program product having a medium, the medium having a set of instructions readable by a processor, an execution of the instructions by the processor causes a process to be performed, the process includes determining whether a first update station received the content detection data, and sending the content detection data to the first update station if the first update station did not receive the content detection data.

In accordance with other embodiments, a method of sending content detection data includes obtaining content detec-

3

tion data, selecting an update station from a plurality of update stations, and sending the content detection data to the selected update station.

In accordance with other embodiments, a system for sending content detection data includes means for obtaining content detection data, means for selecting an update station from a plurality of update stations, and means for sending the content detection data to the selected update station.

In accordance with other embodiments, a computer-program product having a medium, the medium having a set of instructions readable by a processor, an execution of the instructions by the processor causes a process to be performed, the process includes obtaining content detection data, selecting an update station from a plurality of update stations, and sending the content detection data to the selected update station.

In accordance with other embodiments, a method of building a content detection system includes establishing a first communication link between a central station and an update station, the central station configured to transmit content detection data to the update station, and establishing a second communication link between the update station and a content detection module.

In accordance with other embodiments, a system for building a content detection system includes means for establishing a first communication link between a central station and an update station, the central station configured to transmit content detection data to the update station, and means for establishing a second communication link between the update station and a content detection module.

In accordance with other embodiments, a computer-program product having a medium, the medium having a set of instructions readable by a processor, an execution of the instructions by the processor causes a process to be performed, the process includes establishing a first communication link between a central station and an update station, the central station configured to transmit content detection data to the update station, and establishing a second communication link between the update station and a content detection module.

Other aspects and features of the invention will be evident from reading the following detailed description of the preferred embodiments, which are intended to illustrate, not limit, the invention.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

The drawings illustrate the design and utility of preferred embodiments of the application, in which similar elements are referred to by common reference numerals. In order to better appreciate how advantages and objects of various embodiments are obtained, a more particular description of the embodiments are illustrated in the accompanying drawings. Understanding that these drawings depict only typical embodiments of the application and are not therefore to be considered limiting its scope, the embodiments will be described and explained with additional specificity and detail through the use of the accompanying drawings.

FIG. 1 illustrates a block diagram of a content detection system in accordance with some embodiments; and

FIG. 2 is a diagram of a computer hardware system.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

Various embodiments are described hereinafter with reference to the figures. It should be noted that the figures are not drawn to scale and that elements of similar structures or

4

functions are represented by like reference numerals throughout the figures. It should also be noted that the figures are only intended to facilitate the description of specific embodiments. They are not intended as an exhaustive description of the invention or as a limitation on the scope of the invention. In addition, an illustrated embodiment may not show all aspects or advantages. An aspect or an advantage described in conjunction with a particular embodiment is not necessarily limited to that embodiment and can be practiced in any other embodiments, even if not so illustrated or described.

FIG. 1 illustrates a block diagram of a content detection system 100 in accordance with some embodiments. The content detection system 100 includes a central station 102, a processing station 104 for providing content detection data to the central station 102, a plurality of base stations 106 in communication with the central station 102, and a plurality of content detection modules 108 in communication with the base stations 106.

In the illustrated embodiments, processing station 104 is a computer. Alternatively, processing station 104 can be a server, a module, a device, a computer program, and the like, e.g., any one of a variety of devices that can receive and transmit information. Processing station 104 is configured to determine content detection data, such as a virus signature, a spammer identification, a URL, and the like, and transmit the content detection data to central station 102. For example, processing station 104 can be configured (e.g., programmed) to determine the content detection data using any of the techniques known in the art. Alternatively, the content detection data can be input into processing station 104 by a user of processing station 104. Although one processing station 104 is shown, in other embodiments, content detection system 100 can include more than one processing station 104 in communication with central station 102.

Central station 102 is configured to receive the content detection data from processing station 104, and send the content detection data to update stations 106 (e.g., through the Internet). In some embodiments, central station 102 also receives subscriber data, such as a user identification of a content detection module 108, level of protection desired by the user, etc., from processing station 104 or from update station(s) 106 for processing. In the illustrated embodiments, central station 102 is a computer, but alternatively, can be a server, a module, a device, a computer program, and the like, e.g., any one of a variety of devices that can receive and transmit information. Although one processing station 102 is shown, in other embodiments, content detection system 100 can include more than one central station 102, each of which in communication with at least one update station 106. In other embodiments, central station 102 and processing station 104 are combined and implemented as a single unit (e.g., a processor, a computer, or the like).

Update stations 106 receive the content detection data from central station 102, and send the content detection data to content detection modules 108 (e.g., through the Internet). Each of the update stations 106 is located at a geographical location that is different from others. For example, update station 106a may be located at a different building, a different street, a different city, or a different country, from update station 106b. In some embodiments, the update stations 106 also receives subscriber data, such as a user identification of a content detection module 108, level of protection desired by the user, etc., from content detection module(s) 108, and forward the subscriber data to central station 102 for processing. In other embodiments, update station 106 may be configured to handle requests (such as a subscriber's contract information, the latest update data, etc.) from content detec-

5

tion module(s) **108**, collect information (such as the version information, IP address, geographical location of the detection module, etc.) from content detection module(s) **108**, and forward collected information to central station **102**. In the illustrated embodiments, each update station **106** is a computer, but alternatively, can be a server, a module, a device, a computer program, and the like, e.g., any one of a variety of devices that can receive and transmit information. In FIG. 1, three update stations **106a-106c** and five content detection modules **108a-108e** are shown. However, in alternative embodiments, the system **100** can have different numbers of update station(s) **106** and different numbers of content detection module(s) **108**.

In the illustrated embodiments, each content detection module **108** is configured to receive electronic content (content data), and determines whether the electronic content contains undesirable content based on the content detection data it receives from update station **106**. For example, content detection module **108** can be configured to detect virus based on a virus signature received from update station **106**. In the illustrated embodiments, module **10** is implemented as a component of a gateway (or gateway product), which is configured to perform policy enforcement. As used in this specification, the term "policy enforcement" refers to a process or procedure, an execution of which creates a result that can be used to determine whether to pass data to user, and includes (but is not limited to) one or a combination of: source verification, destination verification, user authentication, virus scanning, content scanning (e.g., scanning for undesirable content), and intrusion detection (e.g., detecting undesirable content, such as worms, porno website, etc.). In other embodiments, instead of being a component of gateway, content detection module **108** can be a separate component that is coupled to gateway. In other embodiments, content detection module **108** can be a gateway product by itself.

In some embodiments, content detection module **108** can be implemented using software that is loaded onto a computer, a server, or other types of memory, such as a disk or a CD-ROM. Alternatively, content detection module **108** can be implemented as web applications. In alternative embodiments, content detection module **108** can be implemented using hardware. For example, in some embodiments, content detection module **108** includes an application-specific integrated circuit (ASIC), such as a semi-custom ASIC processor or a programmable ASIC processor. ASICs, such as those described in Application-Specific Integrated Circuits by Michael J. S. Smith, Addison-Wesley Pub Co. (1st Edition, June 1997), are well known in the art of circuit design, and therefore will not be described in further detail herein. In still other embodiments, content detection module **108** can be any of a variety of circuits or devices capable of performing the functions described herein. For example, in alternative embodiments, content detection module **108** can include a general purpose processor, such as a Pentium processor. In other embodiments, content detection module **108** can be implemented using a combination of software and hardware. In some embodiments, content detection module **108** may be implemented as a firewall, a component of a firewall, or a component that is configured to be coupled to a firewall.

Having described the components of the content detection system **100**, methods of using content detection system **100** in accordance with some embodiments will now be described. First, processing station **104** receives an electronic content. By means of non-limiting examples, such electronic content can be a web page, an email, an email attachment, a word file, a program, etc., and the like, e.g., a file that may contain undesirable content. In other examples, electronic content

6

can be a virus, a spam, a worm, or any of other undesirable content. Processing station **104** can receive the electronic content from one or more sources. For example, a content detection module **108** may detect a content that is suspicious (or that requires further processing), in which case, content detection module **108** then sends the electronic content to processing station **104** for processing. Alternatively, processing station **104** can receive electronic content from a person, who sends the content to processing station **104** via email. In other embodiments, electronic content can be input into processing station **104** by a user of processing station **104**.

After processing station **104** received the electronic content, processing station **104** then analyzes such information to determine whether the content contains/is a threat (e.g., a virus, a worm, a spam, etc.) that is desired to be detected. If processing station **104** determines that the electronic content contains a threat that is desired to be detected, processing station **104** then generates content detection data for the electronic content. For example, after processing station **104** received a set of content data, processing station **104** then performs an analysis using conventional or known technique(s) to determine whether it is a virus (an example of content that is desired to be detected). In some embodiments, processing station **104** is programmed to perform such analysis. Alternatively, the set of content data can be analyzed by an administrator, a separate device, or a separate software, and the result of the analysis is then input to processing station **104**. If processing station **104** determines that the set of content data includes content that is undesirable (e.g., desired to be detected by content detection modules **108**), processing station then generates content detection data, which can be used by content detection modules **108** to detect the undesirable content. By means of non-limiting examples, content detection data can be a virus signature, a virus definition, a spammer identification, a URL, a NIDS signature, a time at which content detection data is created, a level of threat, etc., and the like, e.g., any information that can be used in a content detection or screening process. In other embodiments, processing station **104** does not generate the content detection data. In such cases, content detection data can be provided by a separate source, and is input into processing station **104**.

As soon as, or shortly after, processing station **104** obtains the content detection data, processing station **104** then transmits the content detection data to central station **102**. If processing station **104** and central station **102** are implemented as a single unit, then the step of transmitting content detection data to central station **102** is omitted. In response to obtaining the content detection data, central station **102** initiates a transmission process for transmitting the content detection data to update stations **106**. In the illustrated embodiments, central station **102** maintains a list of prescribed geographical areas, a list of content detection modules **108** in each prescribed geographical area, and a list of update stations **106** for serving (e.g., sending content detection data to and/or from) each prescribed geographical area. Based on the lists, central station **102** assigns update stations **106** to provide the content detection data to content detection modules **108** within the prescribed geographical areas. In some embodiments, one update station **106** is used to serve content detection modules **108** within a prescribed geographical area. Alternatively, more than one update station **106** can be used to serve content detection modules **108** within a prescribed geographical area.

In some cases, an update station **106** can be configured to check another update station **106** to determine whether it has received content detection data. For example, if update station **106a** determines that update station **106b** did not receive content detection data, update station **106a** then sends content

7

detection data to update station 106b. Various techniques can be used to determine whether update station 106b received content detection data. For example, in some embodiments, update station 106a is configured to send an inquiry to update station 106b. If update station 106b did not receive content detection data, update station 106b then transmits a signal or a reply to update station 106a, indicating that update station 106b did not receive content detection data. Alternatively, update station 106a is configured to initiate a timer after it has received content detection data. The timer continues to run until update station 106a receives a signal from update station 106b indicating that update station 106b received content detection data. If update station 106a does not receive such signal from update station 106b within a prescribed time period, update station 106a then determines that update station 106b did not receive the content detection data. Other techniques known in the art can also be used to check whether update station 106b received content detection data. If it is determined that update station 106b did not receive content detection data, update station 106a then sends content detection data to update station 106b. It should be noted that in other embodiments, instead of having one update station check another update station, one update station can check a plurality of other update stations. Also, in other embodiments, more than one update station 106 can check another update station 106.

In the illustrated embodiments, each of the update stations 106 are configured (e.g., pre-assigned) to serve one or more content detection module 108. For example, update station 106a can be configured to serve content detection modules 108a, 108b, update station 106b can be configured to serve content detection module 108c, and update station 106c can be configured to serve content detection modules 108d, 108e.

In other embodiments, instead of pre-assigning update stations 106 to serve certain content detection modules 108, central station 102 determines which update station 106 to use for sending content detection data based on a condition during use, e.g., based on load demands and/or capacities of update stations 106. As used in this specification, "capacity" refers to a variable that represents or associates with a level of ability for an update station 104 to handle content transmitted thereto. For example, capacity of an update station 104 can be an amount of memory space available, etc. Using the example of FIG. 1, central station 102 receives information regarding capacities of update stations 106a-106c, and selects one or more update stations 106 for transmitting content detection data based on their load and/or capacities. For example, if update station 106a has a high load demand (e.g., above a prescribed load demand) and/or if its remaining capacity to handle additional traffic is low (e.g., below a prescribed capacity threshold), central station 102 then uses update stations 106b and 106c to transmit content detection data to content detection modules 108a-108e. Load on the update stations 106b and 106c can be approximately shared in equal portion. For example, if central station 102 determines that update stations 106b and 106c are available, central station 102 can assign update station 106b to transmit content detection data to modules 108a and 108b, and update station 106c to transmit content detection data to modules 108a-108c. Alternatively, load among the available update stations 106 can be distributed based on the respective load demand and/or capacities of the available update stations 106. For example, if update stations 106b, 106c have capacities to serve twenty (20) and eighty (80) content detection modules 108, respectively, central station 102 then assign update stations 106b, 106c to transmit content detection data such that the ratio of the assigned loads approximately corresponds with the ratio

8

of the capacities of the available update stations 106b, 106c. Following the above example, central station 102 will assign update station 106b to serve content detection module 108a, and update station 106c to serve content detection modules 108b-108e.

In other embodiments, central station 102 maintains an order list of update station 106, which prescribes an order (e.g., in a round-robin configuration) in which load is to be assigned to update stations 106. For example, the order list may have update stations 106a-106c as primary, secondary, and tertiary stations, respectively, for serving content detection modules 108a-108e. In such cases, central station 102 will initially attempt to use update station 106a (the primary station) for transmitting content detection data to content detection modules 108a-108e. However, if update station 106a is unavailable (e.g., due to heavy load demand), central station 102 will then attempt to use update station 106b (the secondary station) for transmitting content detection data to content detection modules 108a-108e. If update station 106b is unavailable (e.g., due to heavy load demand), central station 102 will then attempt to use update station 106c (the third station on the order list) for transmitting content detection data to content detection modules 108a-108e.

It should be noted that the technique for transmitting content detection data from central station 102 and/or update station(s) 106 to content detection module(s) 108 should not be limited to the examples discussed previously, and that other techniques can also be used in other embodiments. For example, one or more of the techniques described previously can be combined with another technique. Also, in other embodiments, central station 102 does not maintain the list of content detection modules 108 and the list of geographical areas. In such cases, after central station 102 receives content detection data, it transmits the content detection data to all update stations 106. The update stations 106 are configured to coordinate among themselves to ensure that all content detection modules 108 are provided with the content detection data. For example, in the example of FIG. 1, update station 106a can be configured (e.g., programmed) to communicate with update station 106b for various purposes, such as, to check a load demand on update station 106b, to check a capacity of update station 106b, to check an availability of update station 106b, and/or to verify that update station 106b has received content detection data. In some embodiments, based on the load demand and/or the capacities on the update stations 106, update stations 106 share the load among themselves (e.g., by dividing the load in equal parts, or by distributing the load based on respective ratios of the demand and/or capacities on the update stations 106) to pass the content detection data to content detection modules 108. In some embodiments, one update station 106 can be configured to communicate with one or more other update station 106. In such cases, the update station 106 can check one or more other update station 106 to make sure that content detection data have been received, and/or to serve as backup for the one or more other update station 106. In other embodiments, more than one update stations 106 can check an update station 106, and serve as backup for the update station 106.

After content detection modules 108 received the content detection data (e.g., a virus signature), content detection modules 108 can then utilize the content detection data to detect content. In some embodiments, the content detection data is a virus signature, in which case, content detection modules 108 utilizes the virus signature to detect the virus that corresponds with the virus signature. Alternatively, the content detection data is a spammer identification, in which case, content detection modules 108 utilizes the spammer identification to detect

9

and screen undesirable spam that corresponds with the spammer identification. In other embodiments; the content detection data can be other information, such as, a time at which content detection data is created, that content detection modules 108 can use in a content detection or screening process.

Using the above method, content detection data can be provided to content detection modules 108 within a short period, such as, several minutes, and in some cases, within seconds, after the content detection data has been obtained (determined) by processing station 104 and/or central station 102. This allows content detection modules 108 to be updated in substantially real time. This is advantageous because some content detection data such as virus definitions are very time-sensitive, and should be distributed to all content detection modules 108 as soon as the content detection data are available. Also, with system 100, the responsibility to keep up with the latest security update (e.g., content detection data) is shifted from users of content detection modules 108 to processing station 104 and/or central station 102. In addition, unlike typical update method, which requires a content detection module to regularly "poll" an update station to check if there is a new update, central station 102 and/or update stations 106 "push" the latest security update data within minutes (or even seconds) after they are available to all content detection modules 108. This method has the advantage of faster response time during an outbreak and less resource consumption on content detection modules 108.

Further, using a network of update stations 106 for transmitting content detection data is reliable because if update station(s) 106 is not available or fail to work properly, a nearby update station 106 in the same prescribed geographical area or update station(s) 106 located in other prescribed geographical area can provide the content detection data to content detection modules 108. Also, with content detection system 100, an update station 106 can be added, removed from the content detection system 100 at run-time without causing service interruption. If the update stations 106 for a certain geographical areas cannot keep up with the ever-increasing load, more update station(s) can be added to the content detection system 100. As such, content detection system 100 provides high scalability.

In some embodiments, an update station can be customized to serve the need of certain organization(s). Some organizations have some special policies that restrict their network device's access to the Internet. For example, their network connection from Intranet to Internet is only limited to certain host(s). Therefore, it may not be possible for their content detection modules 108 inside the Intranet to access update station(s) 106. In such cases, a customized update station can be provided outside the Intranet of the organization (customer). For example, the customer can configure [] an update station to serve its own content detection module(s) 108. In some embodiments, a user interface can be provided for allowing a user to select which content detection module(s) 108 within the organization to use a customized update station and which content detection module(s) 108 to use a regular update station. As with update stations 106, more than one customized update station can be provided, and these customized update stations can back up each other and distribute their load.

Computer Architecture

As described previously, any of central station 102, processing station 104, update station 106, and content detection module 108 can be implemented using a computer. For example, one or more instructions can be imported into a computer to enable the computer to perform any of the functions described herein.

10

FIG. 2 is a block diagram that illustrates an embodiment of a computer system 200 upon which embodiments of the invention may be implemented. Computer system 200 includes a bus 202 or other communication mechanism for communicating information, and a processor 204 coupled with bus 202 for processing information. Computer system 200 also includes a main memory 206, such as a random access memory (RAM) or other dynamic storage device, coupled to bus 202 for storing information and instructions to be executed by processor 204. Main memory 206 also may be used for storing temporary variables or other intermediate information during execution of instructions to be executed by processor 204. Computer system 200 may further include a read only memory (ROM) 208 or other static storage device(s) coupled to bus 202 for storing static information and instructions for processor 204. A data storage device 210, such as a magnetic disk or optical disk, is provided and coupled to bus 202 for storing information and instructions.

Computer system 200 may be coupled via bus 202 to a display 212, such as a cathode ray tube (CRT), for displaying information to a user. An input device 214, including alphanumeric and other keys, is coupled to bus 202 for communicating information and command selections to processor 204. Another type of user input device is cursor control 216, such as a mouse, a trackball, cursor direction keys, or the like, for communicating direction information and command selections to processor 204 and for controlling cursor movement on display 212. This input device typically has two degrees of freedom in two axes, a first axis (e.g., x) and a second axis (e.g., y), that allows the device to specify positions in a plane.

Embodiments of the invention are related to the use of computer system 200 for transmitting content data. According to some embodiments of the invention, such use may be provided by computer system 200 in response to processor 204 executing one or more sequences of one or more instructions contained in the main memory 206. Such instructions may be read into main memory 206 from another computer-readable medium, such as storage device 210. Execution of the sequences of instructions contained in main memory 206 causes processor 204 to perform the process steps described herein. One or more processors in a multi-processing arrangement may also be employed to execute the sequences of instructions contained in main memory 206. In alternative embodiments, hard-wired circuitry may be used in place of or in combination with software instructions to implement the invention. Thus, embodiments of the invention are not limited to any specific combination of hardware circuitry and software.

The term "computer-readable medium" as used herein refers to any medium that participates in providing instructions to processor 204 for execution. Such a medium may take many forms, including but not limited to, non-volatile media, volatile media, and transmission media. Non-volatile media includes, for example, optical or magnetic disks, such as storage device 210. Volatile media includes dynamic memory, such as main memory 206. Transmission media includes coaxial cables, copper wire and fiber optics, including the wires that comprise bus 202. Transmission media can also take the form of acoustic or light waves, such as those generated during radio wave and infrared data communications.

Common forms of computer-readable media include, for example, a floppy disk, a flexible disk, hard disk, magnetic tape, or any other magnetic medium, a CD-ROM, any other optical medium, punch cards, paper tape, any other physical medium with patterns of holes, a RAM, a PROM, and EPROM, a FLASH-EPROM, any other memory chip or car-

Although particular embodiments have been shown and described, it will be understood that it is not intended to limit the present inventions to the preferred embodiments, and it will be obvious to those skilled in the art that various changes and modifications may be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the present inventions. The specification and drawings are, accordingly, to be regarded in an illustrative rather than restrictive sense. The present inventions are intended to cover alternatives, modifications, and equivalents, which may be included within the spirit and scope of the present inventions as defined by the claims.

when network traffic is determined to violate the at least one policy defining suspicious network traffic, forward-

13

ing the network traffic to an analysis process that will perform analysis on network traffic to determine whether the network traffic contains a threat desired to be detected and, when the network traffic is determined to contain a threat desired to be detected, the analysis process generates additional content detection data to detect the threat in subsequently received network traffic;

receiving, via the at least one network interface device, the additional content detection data indirectly from the analysis process via an update station;

storing the additional content detection data on the at least one memory device;

processing subsequently received network traffic in view of the additional content detection data;

blocking network traffic determined to violate at least one policy; and

allowing network traffic to pass on the data network that does not violate a policy.

5. The method of claim 4, wherein the analysis process, to which the network traffic content is forwarded, executes on a computing device distinct from the data network device.

6. The method of claim 5, wherein the analysis process facilitates an analysis that includes receiving administrator input.

7. A non-transitory computer-readable medium with instructions stored thereon which when executed by at least one processor of a data network device, causes the data network device to:

receive network traffic via at least one network interface device;

process the received network traffic in view of content detection and configuration data stored on at least one memory device to enforce policies defined at least in part by the content detection and configuration data and

14

including at least one policy that defines a suspicious category of network traffic, the policy enforcement performed to determine whether to allow the received network traffic to pass on a data network, the policy enforcement including user identification, content identification, and at least one of source verification and destination verification;

when network traffic is determined to violate the at least one policy defining suspicious network traffic, forward the network traffic to an analysis process that will perform analysis on network traffic to determine whether the network traffic contains a threat desired to be detected and, when the network traffic is determined to contain a threat desired to be detected, the analysis process generates additional content detection data to detect the threat in subsequently received network traffic;

receive, via the at least one network interface device, the additional content detection data indirectly from the analysis process via an update station;

store the additional content detection data on the at least one memory device;

process subsequently received network traffic in view of the additional content detection data;

block network traffic determined to violate at least one policy; and

allowing network traffic to pass on the data network that does not violate a policy.

8. The non-transitory computer-readable medium of claim 7, wherein the analysis process, to which the network traffic content is forwarded, executes on a computing device distinct from the data network device.

9. The non-transitory computer-readable medium of claim 8, wherein the analysis process facilitates an analysis that includes receiving administrator input.

* * * * *