EXHIBIT 22

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document487-24 Filed09/23/09 Page2 of 10

SAFRA CATZ March 27, 2009 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE CORPORATION, a
Delaware corporation, ORACLE
USA, INC., a Colorado
corporation, and ORACLE
INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, a
California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

) No. 07-CV-1658 (PJH)

SAP AG, a German corporation, SAP AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation, TOMORROWNOW, INC., a Texas corporation, and DOES 1-50, inclusive,

Defendants.

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF

SAFRA CATZ

FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 2009

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

REPORTED BY: HOLLY THUMAN, CSR No. 6834, RMR, CRR

(1-416874)

Merrill Legal Solutions (800) 869-9132

				Page	19
08:23:08	1	-			
08:23:13	2			•	
08:23:16	3				
08:23:20	4		•		
08:23:22	5				
08:23:27	6				
08:23:28	7				
08:23:31	8				
08:23:33	9				
08:23:41	10	Q.	Does SAP compete with Oracle in any		. •
08:23:46	11	markets?			
08:23:46	12	Α.	Yes.		
08:23:47	13	Q.	Which markets?		
08:23:49	14	Α.	ERP.		
08:23:49	15	Q.	Any others?		
08:23:51	16	А.	CRM.		
08:23:52	17	Q.	Any others?		
08:23:56	18	Α.	Like what?		
08:23:57	19	Q.	Any other markets that you can think of	in	
08:23:59	20	which Ora	acle participates, does SAP compete?		
08:24:06	21	Α.	Maybe a little in retail, and utilities.		
08:24:11	22	But I can	n that's almost ERP.		
08:24:15	23	Q.	In the ERP market, does Oracle have any		
08:24:17	24	more sign	nificant competitor than SAP?		
08:24:20	25	Α.	No.		

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document487-24 Filed09/23/09 Page4 of 10

Г				-,
			Page 77	
	09:45:02	1		
	09:45:04	2		
	09:45:05	3		
	09:45:08	4		
	09:45:11	5		
	09:45:12	6		
	09:45:12	7		
	09:45:15	8		
	09:45:21	9		100
	09:45:23	10		1000
	09:45:28	11		
	09:45:30	12		2000
	09:45:32	13		
	09:45:32	14		s g
	09:45:35	15		
	09:45:40	16		
	09:45:44	17		100
	09:45:44	18		
	09:45:45	19		ł
	09:45:46	20	Q. Did Oracle have things in mind it wanted to	
	09:45:49	21	accomplish by acquiring PeopleSoft?	10 Vin
	09:45:51	22	A. Sure.	i i
	09:45:52	23	Q. What were those things?	
	09:45:54	24	A. Oh, wow. They were really to have within	
	09:46:09	25	Oracle a much larger customer base and a much larger	
				1

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document487-24 Filed09/23/09 Page5 of 10

		Page 78
09:46:15	1	maintenance base so we could spend more on R&D and
09:46:21	2	so that we could sell more to this larger customer
09:46:25	3	base of our other products.
09:46:29	4	And so that we could take advantage of the
09:46:32	5 .	fact that scale in our business improves the
09:46:36	6	operating performance of the company.
09:46:39	7	Q. And how would acquiring PeopleSoft or
09:46:43	8	how do you expect that acquiring PeopleSoft would
09:46:46	9	help you spend more on R&D?
09:46:48	10	A. Well, first of all, that was not a
09:46:51	11	definitive a complete list
09:46:53	12	Q. Oh, I'm sorry.
09:46:54	13	A. Because just so that we're clear.
09:46:56	14	Just being larger, having more customers,
09:46:58	15	would also make us much more competitive against
09:47:01	16	SAP.
09:47:02	17	How would it allow us to spend more on R&D?
09:47:06	18	Well, you have more customers, you sell them more,
09:47:10	19	you have an installed base of customers who are
09:47:13	20	paying you maintenance, and thus you have a lot more
09:47:16	21	money you can direct towards R&D.
09:47:22	22	And I mean, as you saw in the previous
09:47:24	23	document, we were planning on retaining a lot of the
09:47:28	24	R&D people. And together, them and the E-Business
09:47:35	25	suite teams could have a lot more resources to build

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document487-24 Filed09/23/09 Page6 of 10

,				
			Page	79
09:47:41	1	Fusion applications, which we on our own wouldn'	t be	
09:47:44	2	able to spend nearly as much to do.		
09:47:47	3		:	
09:47:49	4			
09:47:51	5			
09:47:53	6	,s		
09:47:56	7			
09:48:00	8			
09:48:01	9			
09:48:03	10			
09:48:06	11			
09:48:09	12			
09:48:13	13		:	
09:48:17	14			
09:48:21	15			
09:48:24	16			
09:48:28	17			
09:48:33	18			
09:48:35	19		•	
09:48:39	20			
09:48:44	21			
09:48:47	22			
09:48:49	23			
09:48:54	24			
09:48:57	25			

		Page 83
09:52:14	1	
09:52:16	2	
09:52:18	3	
09:52:19	4	
09:52:21	5	
09:52:25	6	
09:52:26	7	
09:52:28	8	
09:52:30	9	
09:52:32	10	
09:52:33	11	
09:52:43	12	
09:52:45	13	
09:52:47	14	
09:52:52	15	
09:52:56	16	
09:52:58	17	
09:53:02	18	Q. Did Oracle have goals in mind for the
09:53:04	19	Siebel acquisition?
09:53:09	20	A. Yes.
09:53:09	21	Q. What were those goals as you recall them?
09:53:12	22	A. Well, we obviously, in that case, they
09:53:17	23	had the leading CRM product line, and we wanted to
09:53:23	24	both have their customer base and be able to sell
09:53:26	25	them other products that we already have as well

Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document487-24 Filed09/23/09 Page8 of 10

```
Page 84
              including database and all those things, including
09:53:30
          1
              also have those products to sell to all of our
          2
09:53:34
              Oracle, PeopleSoft, J.D. Edwards, Retek customers.
09:53:38
           3
09:53:43
09:53:45
09:53:49
09:53:54
           7
09:53:55
09:53:57
09:54:01 10
09:54:02 11
09:54:05 12
09:54:11 13
09:54:13 14
09:54:19 15
09:54:22 16
09:54:24 17
09:54:26 18
09:54:28 19
09:54:31 20
09:54:34 21
09:54:37 22
09:54:41 23
09:54:48 24
09:54:52 25
```

SAFRA CATZ March 27, 2009 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

13:40:35	1	(Time noted, 1:38 p.m.)
13:40:39	2	000
13:40:39	. 3	I declare under penalty of perjury that
13:40:39	4	the foregoing is true and correct. Subscribed at
13:40:39	5	Redwood City , California, this 6th day of
13:40:39	6	May, 2009.
13:40:39	7	
13:40:39	8	
13:40:39	9	SAFRA CATZ
	10	
	11	·
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
.	18	
•	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

206

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	I, HOLLY THUMAN, a Certified Shorthand
3	Reporter, hereby certify that the witness in the
4	foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to tell the
5	truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the
6	within-entitled cause; that said deposition was taken
7	down in shorthand by me, a disinterested person, at the
8	time and place therein stated, and that the testimony of
9	the said witness was thereafter reduced to typewriting,
10	by computer, under my direction and supervision;
11	That before completion of the deposition,
12	review of the transcript $[X]$ was [] was not requested.
13	If requested, any changes made by the deponent (and
14	provided to the reporter) during the period allowed are
15	appended hereto.
16	I further certify that I am not of counsel or
17	attorney for either or any of the parties to the said
18	deposition, nor in any way interested in the event of
19	this cause, and that I am not related to any of the
20	parties thereto.
21	
22	DATED April 6, 2009.
23	
24	John Thum
25	HOLLY THUMAN, CSR No. 6834