Page 1

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

VIACOM INTERNATIONAL INC., COMEDY )
PARTNERS, COUNTRY MUSIC )
TELEVISION, INC., PARAMOUNT )
PICTURES CORPORATION, and BLACK )
ENTERTAINMENT TELEVISION LLC, )

Plaintiffs,

VS.

) NO. 07-CV-2103

YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and GOOGLE INC.,

Defendants.

THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION PREMIER )
LEAGUE LIMITED, BOURNE CO., et al.,)
on behalf of themselves and all )
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

) NO. 07-CV-3582

YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and GOOGLE, INC.,

Defendants.

30(b)(6) VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF STORM DUNCAN SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2008

BY: ANDREA M. IGNACIO HOWARD, CSR, RPR, CLR CSR LICENSE NO. 9830 JOB NO. 15373

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

	Page 2
1	
2	
3	
4	JULY 16, 2008
5	9:14 a.m.
6	
7	30(b)(6) VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF STORM DUNCAN,
8	held at the offices of SHEARMAN & STERLING,
9	525 Market Street, San Francisco, California,
10	pursuant to notice, before ANDREA M. IGNACIO
11	HOWARD, CLR, RPR, CSR License No. 9830.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS VIACOM INTERNATIONAL INC.:
4	JENNER & BLOCK, LLP
5	By: BILL HOHENGARTEN, Esq.
6	SCOTT B. WILKENS, Esq.
7	1099 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 900
8	Washington, D.C. 20001
9	(202) 639-6000 swilkens@jenner.com
10	
11	FOR THE LEAD PLAINTIFFS AND PROSPECTIVE CLASS:
12	BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN, LLP
13	By: JOHN C. BROWNE, Esq.
14	1285 Avenue Of The Americas
15	New York, New York 10019
16	(212) 554-1533 johnb@blbglaw.com
17	
18	FOR THE DEFENDANTS YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC and
19	GOOGLE, INC.:
20	WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI, LLP
21	By: BART E. VOLKMER, Esq.
22	650 Page Mill Road
23	Palo Alto, California 94304-1050
24	(650) 493-9300 bvolkmer@wsgr.com
25	

```
Page 4
       APPEARANCES: (Continued.)
 2
          FOR THE DEPONENT:
                DUVAL & STACHENFELD, LLP
 5
                By: ALLAN N. TAFFET, Esq.
 6
                300 East 42nd Street
 7
               New York, New York 10017
                (212) 692-5523 ataffet@dsllp.com
 8
 9
10
          ALSO PRESENT: Ken Reeser, Videographer.
11
12
                               ---000---
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.
450 Seventh Avenue - Ste 2803, New York, NY 10123 (212)705-8585

			Page 10
09:18:46	1	A	No.
09:18:46	2	Q	Is there any reason why you cannot give
09:18:49	3	complet	e and accurate testimony today?
09:18:52	4	А	No.
09:18:52	5	Q	What is the highest degree you've obtained
09:18:59	6	educati	onally?
09:19:00	7	А	A masters degree.
09:19:02	8	Q	Is that an MBA or
09:19:05	9	А	Yes, MBA from University of Michigan.
09:19:08	10	Q	And when was that awarded?
09:19:10	11	А	1994.
09:19:15	12	Q	And who is your current employer?
09:19:17	13	А	Credit Suisse.
09:19:17	14	Q	And what is your job title?
09:19:19	15	А	Managing director.
09:19:20	16	Q	And is there a particular group or group
09:19:29	17	at Cred	it Suisse that you work in?
09:19:31	18	А	I'm in the mergers and acquisitions group.
09:19:34	19	Q	And within that group, is there any
09:19:38	20	subdivi	sion technology or anything like that that
09:19:42	21	you're	primarily located in?
09:19:45	22	А	Yeah. I'd say most of my time is spent in
09:19:47	23	the tec	hnology arena.
09:19:48	24	Q	And how long have you held that position?
09:19:52	25	А	Of managing director?

		Page 11
09:19:54	1	Q Yes.
09:19:54	2	A I think it's been about four or five years
09:19:57	3	now.
09:19:57	4	Q And were you working for Credit Suisse before
09:20:04	5	that, before you became a managing director?
09:20:06	6	A Yes.
09:20:06	7	Q For how long?
09:20:08	8	A I've been with Credit Suisse since about the
09:20:10	9	end of 1999.
09:20:15	10	Q And what was your position before you became
09:20:17	11	a managing director?
09:20:19	12	A Director.
09:20:21	13	Q And did you focus on the same types of
09:20:24	14	matters that you focus on now, mergers and
09:20:27	15	acquisitions in the technology area?
09:20:30	16	A Yes.
09:20:30	17	Q And between receiving your MBA in 1994 and
09:20:39	18	moving to Credit Suisse in 1999, were you employed
09:20:43	19	somewhere else or other places?
09:20:45	20	A Yes.
09:20:45	21	Q Where?
09:20:48	22	A What is now UBS. It was a start of my
09:20:52	23	career. I was at Merrill Lynch and Lehman Brothers.
09:20:56	24	Q And were those all investment-banker-type
09:21:01	25	positions?

		Page 24
09:39:48	1	Q And can you tell me what this document is?
09:39:55	2	A It's a set of discussion materials
09:39:57	3	surrounding Project Yellow, I think, which is our code
09:40:02	4	name for YouTube that addresses a profile of Yellow
09:40:07	5	and sector overview, as well as some preliminary
09:40:09	6	financial analyses, and then there's some exhibits in
09:40:12	7	the back, but I think that's the primary gist of what
09:40:15	8	it's trying to accomplish.
09:40:16	9	Q Okay. And you said in your answer that
09:40:18	10	Yellow is the code name for YouTube?
09:40:23	11	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
09:40:24	12	question.
09:40:25	13	THE WITNESS: Yes.
09:40:27	14	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And is Green also used
09:40:31	15	in this documentation as a code name or alternative
09:40:35	16	name for Google?
09:40:38	17	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
09:40:39	18	question.
09:40:42	19	THE WITNESS: Yes, it appears that's the case
09:40:56	20	as well.
09:40:58	21	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And you stated that
09:41:12	22	this document begins with a profile of YouTube; is
09:41:17	23	that what is that correct?
09:41:19	24	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
09:41:20	25	question.

Γ		
		Page 25
09:41:21	1	THE WITNESS: The first table in the table
09:41:22	2	of contents, the first section is a profile of Yellow
09:41:25	3	and sector overview.
09:41:27	4	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And which which
09:41:35	5	pages that follow constitute that part of the
09:41:38	6	document?
09:41:40	7	A The divider pages, page two, and then I think
09:41:43	8	the section ends on page 12.
09:41:57	9	Q And you're referring to Bates page 2231?
09:42:01	10	A So Bates
09:42:02	11	Q The Bates numbers are those numbers on the
09:42:06	12	lower right.
09:42:07	13	A So the divider page is Bates 2221 as a
09:42:12	14	starter one for the divider page. The section begins
09:42:14	15	on 2222 and ends on 2231.
09:42:18	16	Q And then starting on Bates page 2232, is that
09:42:46	17	the beginning of a financial analysis, a preliminary
09:42:53	18	financial analysis?
09:42:55	19	A Yeah, the title page of 2232 is "Preliminary
09:42:57	20	Financial Analysis," and the subsection is
09:43:00	21	"Illustrative" sorry " Illustrative Model."
09:43:02	22	Q And what is an "Illustrative Model" or what
09:43:06	23	is this "Illustrative Model"?
09:43:08	24	A The an "Illustrative Model" in the context
09:43:11	25	of how I'm viewing it here is that we didn't have any
ĺ		· ·

		Page 60
11:03:27	1	Suisse that the purchase price they are paying is fair
11:03:29	2	to their shareholders from a financial point of view,
11:03:32	3	and actually I don't have the fairness opinion in
11:03:34	4	front of me, so it could be to the Board of Directors
11:03:37	5	or some other constituency, but to some constituency,
11:03:43	6	the transaction is fair from a financial perspective.
11:03:45	7	Q But it would be for an opinion provided to
11:03:48	8	Google or its Board of Directors, and you're doing
11:03:50	9	this for Google; correct?
11:03:51	10	A Yes, that's correct.
11:03:52	11	Q So is it fair to Google or for Google?
11:03:54	12	A Or Google's shareholders, and I'm sure we'll
11:03:57	13	get there at some point. I can answer that more
11:03:59	14	specifically who we addressed it to, but
11:04:02	15	Q And had Credit Suisse been asked to begin its
11:04:16	16	analyses to provide a fairness opinion before the time
11:04:18	17	of this e-mail?
11:04:28	18	A It's not inherently obvious to me from this
11:04:32	19	e-mail that that's the case, but I would think it
11:04:34	20	would be odd to just get an e-mail with this snip of
11:04:38	21	information only, so I would assume there was a
11:04:41	22	conversation before this e-mail.
11:04:42	23	Q And as the corporate representative of Credit
11:04:46	24	Suisse, can you say when Credit Suisse's engagement
11:04:50	25	began on the project to provide a fairness opinion?
1		

		Page 61
11:04:56	1	A So we had been engaged on engaged being a
11:05:00	2	very nonlegal term so actively involved on this
11:05:04	3	project for a number of months. I think even prior to
11:05:07	4	August we had conversations with Sequoia and with
11:05:10	5	Google trying to put the two companies together.
11:05:13	6	We had the August set of conversations which
11:05:15	7	we talked about, and then and your question might
11:05:19	8	be specifically referring to this. It appears as
11:05:22	9	though they came to some purchase price on this term
11:05:25	10	sheet on October 5th that was attached to the e-mail
11:05:28	11	on October 5th.
11:05:29	12	So I would assume somewhere very close to the
11:05:31	13	vicinity of October 5th they called us up and said,
11:05:34	14	"Hey, can you provide a fairness opinion?"
11:05:36	15	Q Okay. And you mentioned Sequoia in your
11:05:40	16	answer. What is that?
11:05:42	17	A Sure. Is there a date on this, too? It
11:05:46	18	might help clarify it.
11:05:48	19	The and just for the benefit, the date on
11:05:52	20	the term sheet has a draft of October 3rd. So if it's
11:05:55	21	a draft of October 3rd, you could probably interpolate
11:05:59	22	something between the 3rd and the 5th as being when
11:06:02	23	they would have called us to do the fairness opinion.
11:06:06	24	Sequoia is a venture capital firm, and I'm
11:06:09	25	going a little bit off of memory here, that's if my

		Page 62
11:06:14	1	memory is correct, it is one of the significant
11:06:16	2	investors in YouTube.
11:06:18	3	Q And from your prior answer, your prior answer
11:06:25	4	indicated that Credit Suisse had also talked to
11:06:29	5	Sequoia in connection with a possible purchase of
11:06:32	6	YouTube; is that right?
11:06:42	7	A I'm pretty sure that we had conversations
11:06:44	8	with Sequoia around YouTube that were beyond just or
11:06:49	9	specifically just an acquisition that were certainly
11:06:54	10	in advance of this, and I think actually when you
11:06:57	11	showed me a previous exhibit, we actually had been
11:07:00	12	asked to hold off on continuing those conversations,
11:07:06	13	Exhibit 6, to preserve the delicacy of Google's
11:07:13	14	approach.
11:07:18	15	Q And keep that exhibit handy, but we'll mark
11:07:49	16	also Exhibit 9.
11:07:53	17	(Document marked Duncan Exhibit 9
11:08:07	18	for identification.)
11:08:07	19	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Sorry.
11:08:08	20	Q Which is Bates Nos. CSSU 2908 through 2913.
11:09:16	21	A Okay.
11:09:16	22	Q And Exhibit 9 is a cover e-mail followed by a
11:09:27	23	letter and a term sheet; correct?
11:09:31	24	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
11:09:34	25	question.

		Page 63
11:09:35	1	THE WITNESS: Exhibit 9 has three components
11:09:41	2	to it. It has an e-mail track record as page 2908.
11:09:46	3	As page 2909, it has a letter from David Drummond at
11:09:51	4	Google to Chad and Steve at YouTube, and then the
11:09:54	5	remaining pages appear to be a term sheet.
11:09:57	6	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And as the corporate
11:10:03	7	representative of Credit Suisse, is it your
11:10:05	8	understanding that this term sheet is the final term
11:10:07	9	sheet for Google's acquisition of YouTube?
11:10:12	10	A On the first page there's a line from Matt
11:10:16	11	Sucherman to Salman Ullah and Sean Dempsey saying that
11:10:20	12	this is not the countersigned. It doesn't say what
11:10:24	13	this says. "It's not countersigned by target but it
11:10:27	14	is the final."
11:10:28	<b>1</b> 5	Q And as a recipient of this, you understood it
11:10:32	16	to be the final term sheet; correct?
11:10:35	17	A That's correct. I had I assumed that was
11:10:36	18	the truth.
11:10:37	19	Q And sitting here today, you have no reason to
11:10:39	20	doubt that; correct?
11:10:45	21	A That's right.
11:10:45	22	Q Is the term sheet provided to Credit Suisse
11:10:55	23	in connection is it being provided in connection
11:10:58	24	with the request for a fairness opinion about the
11:11:00	25	transaction?
I		

		Page 64
11:11:07	1	A I think that's a fair assumption. The
11:11:10	2	again, the next sentence on here says the
11:11:13	3	countersigned copies are in my office, and he asked
11:11:15	4	Salman if things are in motion for a fairness opinion.
11:11:19	5	So, you know, as I think that's fair to
11:11:22	6	assume that at this point that we're fully starting to
11:11:26	7	have a conversation with Google around doing a
11:11:28	8	fairness opinion, and that's starting to get supported
11:11:32	9	by some of these documents you've provided me.
11:11:34	10	Q Is the term sheet something that is typically
11:11:36	11	provided to Credit Suisse when it's asked to give a
11:11:38	12	fairness opinion?
11:11:41	13	A You know, the fairness opinion is dependent
11:11:46	14	upon knowing what the economics of the transaction
11:11:49	15	are, so we could get that from a definitive agreement
11:11:51	16	or a term sheet.
11:11:52	17	So to get the balls rolling, we'd probably
11:11:57	18	depend upon a term sheet at the end of the day that
11:11:59	19	the definitive agreement is going to have the final
11:12:03	20	term, which is what we would really rely upon.
11:12:10	21	Q When you say "the definitive agreement," do
11:12:12	22	you mean the final merger agreement or acquisition
11:12:16	23	agreement?
11:12:18	24	A That's right.
11:12:34	25	Q And under this term sheet, was the proposed

		Page 65
11:12:46	1	price, the agreed-to price at which Google would
11:12:52	2	purchase YouTube \$1.65 billion?
11:12:55	3	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
11:12:57	4	question.
11:13:02	5	THE WITNESS: The face value of that offer on
11:13:05	6	the term sheet is \$1.65 billion.
11:13:10	7	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And is there some other
11:13:13	8	way of measuring the offer other than the face value?
11:13:18	9	A Sure.
11:13:18	10	So on Bates 2910, under "Acquisition
11:13:23	11	Consideration," there's a sentence in there that says
11:13:27	12	that that Google is going to issue a number of shares
11:13:30	13	of Google Class A Common Stock, the "Shares," in
11:13:34	14	quotes, equal to \$1,650,000,000 based on the average
11:13:41	15	daily closing price of the shares for 30 days
11:13:44	16	immediately preceding the closing of the acquisition.
11:13:49	17	So what that means is is that 1.65 billion is
11:13:53	18	an optical number. The value that they're actually
11:13:56	19	going to get is a number of shares equal to
11:13:58	20	\$1.65 billion divided, you know, a share price of \$30
11:14:03	21	on average divided into that 1.65 billion. So that
11:14:06	22	will be a number of shares they'll get, and that will
11:14:07	23	have a value that will be different than \$1.65 billion
11:14:12	24	by definition.
11:14:12	25	Q Based on variation of price per shares?

Page 66 11:14:15 That's right. Α 11:14:15 And again, Credit Suisse was retained in order to provide an opinion that the purchase price 11:14:18 11:14:20 was fair; correct? 11:14:27 Gosh, I'd have to see the fairness opinion to 11:14:30 see if that's the exact phraseology, because I 11:14:33 don't -- I'm not trying to parse your words. That's 11:14:36 not fair of me to do, but I think it's that the 11:14:38 acquisition consideration was fair, which would be the 11:14:42 10 shares that they issued, not the \$1.65 billion. 11:14:42 11 Okay. Thank you. 11:14:43 12 And what I want to know is whether -- do you 11:14:46 13 know what that consideration was in dollar value in 11:14:49 the end? 14 11:14:50 15 The fairness opinion is given at the time of 11:14:53 16 execution of the definitive agreement. And as such, 11:14:56 17 we would have made an assumption as to the number of 11:14:58 18 shares that were issued that, in reality -- so to 11:15:01 answer your question specifically, I think the number 19 11:15:02 20 of shares declined substantially from signing to 11:15:05 21 closing, because I think Google's stock price went up, 11:15:08 22 so they were issued fewer shares. 11:15:10 23 I don't recall without going into some of the 11:15:12 24 books that you might provide to me what our fairness 11:15:15 25 opinion -- what shares our fairness opinion exactly

		Page 67
11:15:18	1	were based upon and what it actually ended up being at
11:15:20	2	the end of the day.
11:15:42	3	Q We'll come back to that.
11:15:44	4	A Okay. Sounds good. Thanks.
11:16:04	5	Q We'll mark Exhibit 10.
11:16:06	6	A Should I put these away?
11:16:08	7	Q Yes.
11:16:09	8	(Document marked Duncan Exhibit 10
11:16:10	9	for identification.)
11:16:10	10	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Which is Bates Nos.
11:16:24	11	CSSU 28545 to 2852. Sorry. Let me it's CSSU 2845
11:16:37	12	to 2852.
11:16:47	13	A Thank you. Okay.
11:17:36	14	Q Can you describe what Exhibit 10 is?
11:17:39	15	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
11:17:41	16	question.
11:17:42	17	THE WITNESS: Exhibit 10 has a number of
11:17:45	18	pages. The first page of which is an e-mail chain.
11:17:48	19	Actually, the first two pages of which are an e-mail
11:17:52	20	chain, Bates 2845 and 2846; and then Bates 2847 to
11:18:00	21	Bates 2852 are an engagement letter between Credit
11:18:04	22	Suisse and Google.
11:18:05	23	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And as the corporate
11:18:12	24	representative of Credit Suisse, can you tell me
11:18:14	25	whether this is the final engagement letter between

<u> </u>		
		Page 68
11:18:18	1	Credit Suisse and Google related to this fairness
11:18:20	2	opinion?
11:18:21	3	A It appears to be, yeah, the final executed
11:18:24	4	copy, yes.
11:18:25	5	Q In looking at Bates page 2847 of Exhibit 10,
11:18:35	6	under "Compensation," it provides that the company
11:18:40	7	agrees to pay Credit Suisse a fee of 2,000 sorry.
11:18:46	8	\$2,500,000 payable upon rendering of our opinion;
11:18:50	9	correct?
11:18:50	10	A That's correct.
11:18:50	11	Q And the company he's referring to is Google;
11:18:54	12	right?
11:18:56	13	A That's correct.
11:19:02	14	Q And Google was obligated to make that payment
11:19:07	15	upon the rendering of Credit Suisse's opinion
11:19:09	16	regardless of whether whether Credit Suisse said
11:19:12	17	the consideration for the transaction was fair or not
11:19:17	18	fair; correct?
11:19:18	19	A That's correct.
11:19:18	20	Q And at the bottom of that same page, 2847, it
11:19:32	21	says "In connection with Credit Suisse's engagement,
11:19:34	22	the Company will furnish, or cause to be furnished to
11:19:38	23	Credit Suisse all information concerning the Company
11:19:39	24	and, to the extent available to the Company, Target
11:19:43	25	that Credit Suisse reasonably deems necessary or

		Page 83
11:49:48	1	Q And having reviewed this e-mail as a
11:49:51	2	corporate representative of Credit Suisse, you
11:49:53	3	testified that Zach Maurus also went to Wilson Sonsini
11:49:58	4	for due diligence?
11:50:00	5	A He did. It helped refresh an additional
11:50:02	6	name. Thank you.
11:50:02	7	Q And having now been refreshed in that way, do
11:50:05	8	you recall anybody else who was there from Credit
11:50:06	9	Suisse?
11:50:09	10	A I don't think Chris Scarborough was there,
11:50:14	11	which is who sent the e-mail, so I think it was just
11:50:17	12	Zach and I and Jim Kim. Amrit Rao might have attended
11:50:23	13	at some point. I'm not sure, so that's another a
11:50:25	14	fourth possibility.
11:50:26	15	Q And can you spell that name?
11:50:28	16	A R-A-O.
11:50:28	17	Q And how is the first name spelled?
11:50:31	18	A A-M-R-I-T.
11:50:33	19	Q Thank you.
11:50:48	20	We'll mark Exhibit 13 which is CSSU 2686.
11:50:59	21	(Document marked Duncan Exhibit 13
11:51:18	22	for identification.)
11:51:18	23	THE WITNESS: Thank you. Okay.
11:52:01	24	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Exhibit 13 is an e-mail
11:52:03	25	chain. The latest e-mail, top e-mail in the chain, is
		· ·

		Page 84
11:52:07	1	from Sean Dempsey of Google to Zach Maurus, Storm
11:52:13	2	Duncan, and James Kim; correct?
11:52:15	3	A That's correct.
11:52:15	4	Q Dated October 6th, 2006; correct?
11:52:18	5	A That's correct.
11:52:18	6	Q And it's forwarding a Snowmass video
11:52:21	7	analysis; correct?
11:52:22	8	A That's correct.
11:52:23	9	Q And you testified earlier that Snowmass
11:52:28	10	referred to the transaction of Google acquiring
11:52:31	11	YouTube; correct?
11:52:32	12	A That's correct.
11:52:35	13	Q And the e-mail from Sean Dempsey is
11:52:38	14	forwarding an e-mail from Salman Ullah, also dated
11:52:43	15	October 6th; correct?
11:52:45	16	A Correct.
11:52:47	17	Q And it shows a breakdown of types of videos
11:52:52	18	on YouTube or some analysis of that; is that right?
11:52:57	19	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
11:52:59	20	question.
11:52:59	21	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Actually, let me rephrase
11:53:00	22	that question.
11:53:01	23	Q Can you describe what this Snowmass video
11:53:05	24	analysis is?
11:53:06	25	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the

		Page 85
11 52 00	4	
11:53:08	1	question.
11:53:08	2	THE WITNESS: The title of the e-mail is
11:53:12	3	"Snowmass video analysis" that was sent from Salman to
11:53:16	4	Salman, and within it there's a detail of videos, I
11:53:26	5	guess, which is includes 424, I guess 123 which
11:53:31	6	aren't valid URLs. I'm not sure what that means in
11:53:34	7	terms of the total quantity.
11:53:37	8	And then it says a subdivision of that 424
11:53:48	9	sorry. That 424 less the 123 describing them by two
11:53:53	10	three categories, a premium category, a removed
11:53:58	11	category, and a no category, which is no copyright but
11:54:02	12	includes commercials, trailers, public service promos
11:54:06	13	and true UGC.
11:54:09	14	Q That's the no category, what you were just
11:54:10	15	describing?
11:54:11	16	A That's right.
11:54:12	17	Q And the premium category, do you understand
11:54:15	18	what that is?
11:54:18	19	A Yeah. It says it's content that is
11:54:20	20	copyrighted either in whole or in substantial part,
11:54:23	21	and it also included, removed where links were that
11:54:28	22	were taken down.
11:54:31	23	Q Do you understand what removed where were
11:54:34	24	links that were taken down means?
11:54:36	25	A Probably not from a technical perspective,

		Page 87
11:55:36	1	MR. VOLKMER: And renew that objection.
11:55:39	2	THE WITNESS: No. The way I read it, it's
11:55:40	3	63 percent of the net total, not the gross total. So
11:55:43	4	the percentage of the total would be 189 over 424
11:55:47	5	which would be a smaller percentage than the 63.
11:55:50	6	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Okay. Let me step back.
11:56:02	7	Q As the corporate representative of Credit
11:56:04	8	Suisse, what is your understanding of the purpose of
11:56:07	9	providing this information to Credit Suisse?
11:56:09	10	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
11:56:11	11	question.
11:56:11	12	THE WITNESS: This is more information
11:56:18	13	that that is being provided to us coincident with,
11:56:22	14	I think, with what we just discussed in Exhibit 11 to
11:56:29	15	help us facilitate doing some modeling around the
11:56:33	16	valuation or the financial performance first, and then
11:56:36	17	the valuation second of YouTube.
11:56:39	18	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And it's a one way
11:56:41	19	of breaking down video content on YouTube into
11:56:45	20	categories; correct?
11:56:47	21	A Yes.
11:56:48	22	Q And it's relevant to the valuation insofar as
11:56:53	23	the ability to monetize these different categories may
11:56:58	24	be different; correct?
11:57:00	25	A That is one way they could be differentiated,

		Page 89
11:58:01	1	according to the ability to monetize them?
11:58:06	2	MR. VOLKMER: I'm going to renew the
11:58:08	3	objection.
11:58:12	4	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
11:58:13	5	Let's wait until we get to those, and then
11:58:15	6	I'll give you a better answer.
11:58:16	7	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Let's walk through the
11:58:17	8	breakdown here though
11:58:19	9	A Sure.
11:58:19	10	Q still.
11:58:19	11	We started to talk about it but I want to try
11:58:22	12	to go through it a little more methodically to make
11:58:25	13	sure that I understand the information that's being
11:58:27	14	supplied here.
11:58:28	15	A Okay.
11:58:29	16	Q There is the first line gives a gross
11:58:30	17	total and it says "424"; correct?
11:58:36	18	A That's correct.
11:58:36	19	Q In parenthesis, and you mentioned this in a
11:58:40	20	prior answer, it says "Includes 123 that aren't valid
11:58:45	21	URLs"; correct?
11:58:47	22	A That's correct also.
11:58:47	23	Q Do you understand what the 424 refers to?
11:58:55	24	A My recollection of the 424 is that it's a
11:58:59	25	it says at the top of the e-mail, "Some manual
1		<b>!</b>

		Page 90
11:59:02	1	analysis we did," was that it was a study that the
11:59:07	2	Google folks had performed studying, you know, a
11:59:10	3	number of randomly generated or chosen videos, and
11:59:16	4	that 424 is the number that they had randomly chosen
11:59:19	5	and and were able to categorize with these
11:59:25	6	subcategorizations.
11:59:27	7	Q Okay. And the "includes 123 that aren't
11:59:30	8	valid URLs," do you understand what the meaning of
11:59:36	9	that is?
11:59:38	10	A I would assume I don't know YouTube's
11:59:42	11	technology underpinnings well enough, but I would
11:59:46	12	assume that meant at one point there was a video that
11:59:49	13	had been put up and it kind of looks as though you can
11:59:52	14	click on it, but when you click on it, that video is
11:59:55	15	no longer there, so it's no longer valid. That would
11:59:58	16	be my understanding.
11:59:59	17	Q And that number is subtracted from the 123
12:00:03	18	that aren't valid URLs are are subtracted from the
12:00:07	19	gross total to provide a net total of videos of 301;
12:00:13	20	is that correct?
12:00:13	21	A That's correct.
12:00:14	22	Q And then that net total of 301 videos that's
12:00:18	23	regard that treated as 100 percent for purposes of
12:00:20	24	the analysis; right?
12:00:21	25	A That's correct, yes.

		Page 91
12:00:22	1	Q And then that's divided into two categories.
12:00:26	2	The first category is called "No," and the second
12:00:29	3	category is called "Pram/Rem," which I believe means
12:00:37	4	<pre>premium/removed; correct?</pre>
12:00:40	5	A Yes.
12:00:40	6	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
12:00:41	7	question.
12:00:43	8	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. The first category is
12:00:44	9	"No"; correct?
12:00:46	10	A Yes.
12:00:46	11	Q And the second category is labeled here
12:00:48	12	"Prem/rem"; correct?
12:00:53	13	A There's actually just two labelings. So the
12:00:55	14	definition down below expands upon that to say that it
12:00:58	15	means premium/removed.
12:01:03	16	Q Okay. And that category of premium/removed
12:01:08	17	under this analysis is 63 percent of the net total of
12:01:12	18	videos sampled; correct?
12:01:15	19	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
12:01:17	20	question.
12:01:37	21	(Whereupon, record read by the Reporter as
12:01:37	22	follows:
12:01:04	23	"Question: Okay. And that category of
12:01:05	24	premium/removed under this analysis is
12:01:11	25	63 percent of the net total of videos

		Page 92
12:01:14	1	sampled; correct?")
12:01:37	2	THE WITNESS: So the the premium/removed
12:01:40	3	category is 189 of the 424, and 189 of the 301. So
12:01:46	4	the percentage 63 percent is 63 percent of the net
12:01:49	5	total, so hopefully that answers your question, I
12:01:52	6	think.
12:01:52	7	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. It's 63 percent of the
12:01:54	8	net total which excludes the URLs that aren't valid?
12:01:58	9	A That's correct, which is, I think, the
12:02:00	10	definition of net total for purposes of this, which I
12:02:03	11	think you established as well, so sure.
12:02:08	12	Q And the "No" category is 37 percent of that
12:02:11	13	net total; correct?
12:02:14	14	A That's correct, yes.
12:02:15	15	Q So setting aside the URLs that aren't valid,
12:02:21	16	the remaining sample of videos, the net total, breaks
12:02:25	17	down into 63 percent that are premium removed and
12:02:28	18	37 percent that are no; correct?
12:02:30	19	A That's correct.
12:02:31	20	Q And the premium/removed category includes
12:02:37	21	content that is copyrighted in whole or substantial
12:02:42	22	part, plus removed, which are links that were taken
12:02:44	23	down; right?
12:02:48	24	A Yeah, that's how it's categorized here
12:02:51	25	from from the Google folks.

		Page 93
12:02:56	1	Q And the no category is categorized here by
12:03:07	2	the people from Google as no copyright but includes
12:03:12	3	commercials, trailers, public service, promos, and
12:03:16	4	true UGC; right?
12:03:18	5	A That's correct.
12:03:18	6	Q What is what is your understanding of the
12:03:21	7	phrase "true UGC"?
12:03:23	8	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
12:03:25	9	question.
12:03:26	10	THE WITNESS: I think that the initials UGC
12:03:30	11	probably stand for user-generated content.
12:03:33	12	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And true UGC?
12:03:45	13	A I'm not sure. I mean, true UGC is just
12:03:50	14	honest UGC. Honestly, you know, user generated. I
12:03:55	15	would assume it's implying the users had generated
12:03:58	16	that content through their cell phones, or through a
12:04:01	17	video camera, or something along those lines.
12:04:03	18	Q Okay. And that true UGC is encompassed in
12:04:06	19	the no category; right?
12:04:07	20	A That's correct.
12:04:07	21	Q Now, the no category also includes
12:04:10	22	commercials, trailers, public service announcements,
12:04:13	23	and promotions; right?
12:04:15	24	A That's correct.
12:04:16	25	Q And together the true UGC, plus those other
I		

		Page 94
12:04:19	1	categories, are 37 percent of the net total sample;
12:04:24	2	right?
12:04:24	3	A That's correct.
12:04:25	4	Q And the other 63 percent is either premium,
12:04:29	5	which is defined as copyrighted content or removed,
12:04:34	6	which is links taken down?
12:04:35	7	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
12:04:37	8	question.
12:04:49	9	(Whereupon, record read by the Reporter as
12:04:49	10	follows:
12:04:26	11	"Question: And the other 63 percent is
12:04:28	12	either premium, which is defined as
12:04:31	13	copyrighted content or removed, which is
12:04:35	14	links taken down?")
12:04:49	15	MR. TAFFET: I'll join in that objection.
12:04:51	16	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think that I think
12:04:53	17	we actually clarified what premium and removed was
12:04:56	18	earlier, and I think it's written explicitly on
12:04:59	19	Exhibit 13. So I just read it for your clarification,
12:05:02	20	not for your clarification, but for the clarification
12:05:03	21	of the answer.
12:05:04	22	The premium/removed means the content is
12:05:09	23	copyright either in whole or in substantial part, and
12:05:13	24	then also the second part is "and removed were links
12:05:16	25	that were taken down."

		Page 95
12:05:17	1	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Okay.
12:05:23	2	Q Did Credit Suisse itself review any YouTube
12:05:27	3	videos or sample of videos in connection with
12:05:30	4	providing a fairness opinion?
12:05:32	5	A No.
12:05:34	6	Q Do you know, as the corporate representative
12:05:38	7	of Credit Suisse, did you receive any other
12:05:42	8	information about a breakdown of video categories from
12:05:45	9	Google other than this e-mail, Exhibit 13, that we've
12:05:50	10	just been talking about?
12:05:52	11	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
12:05:54	12	question.
12:06:48	13	THE WITNESS: We might have received other
12:06:49	14	categorization. I guess when we go through more
12:06:53	15	documents, that might help refresh my memory. Sitting
12:06:55	16	here right now, I can't remember which documents might
12:06:58	17	have given us additional information.
12:06:59	18	Certainly there's some additional kind of
12:07:01	19	characterization of the videos in Exhibit 8 that you
12:07:04	20	showed me previously, but it wasn't re-categorizing it
12:07:12	21	any differently than had been shown here.
12:08:02	22	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Mark exhibit what was
12:08:04	23	that one?
12:08:05	24	THE WITNESS: 13 was the last one.
12:08:06	25	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Exhibit 14, which is CSSU

10.00 11	-	Page 96
12:08:11	1	
12:08:22	2	(Document marked Duncan Exhibit 14
12:08:34	3	for identification.)
12:08:34	4	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Sorry.
12:10:29	5	THE WITNESS: Okay.
12:10:30	6	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Exhibit 14 is an e-mail
12:10:39	7	chain with an attachment; correct?
12:10:48	8	A There were two attachments, it looks like,
12:10:50	9	but yes, at least on the attached line up top it says
12:10:54	10	there's two.
12:10:55	11	Q Yes, you're right.
12:10:57	12	The attachments at the top says "agua
12:11:00	13	model.xls" and "agua model.xls," the same names;
12:11:05	14	correct?
12:11:05	15	A They do say the same name.
12:11:09	16	Q Either with attachment or attachments.
12:11:18	17	A Sure. Absolutely. That's a little confusing
12:11:21	18	as well but yes, it looks like there are either one or
12:11:24	19	two attachments. There are definitely two
12:11:26	20	attachments. I'm not sure if they're different and
12:11:28	21	named the same or named the same and the same.
12:11:30	22	Q And the the e-mail is being sent by James
12:11:34	23	Kim of Credit Suisse to Salman Ullah of Google and
12:11:39	24	Storm Duncan and James Kim of of Credit Suisse;
12:11:43	25	right?

		Page 97
12:11:45	1	A And David Drummond.
12:11:46	2	Q Thank you, and David Drummond.
12:11:48	3	A And a whole bunch of people cced as well.
12:11:51	4	Q And the e-mail says "Attached please find the
12:11:54	5	latest version of the model"; correct?
12:11:57	6	A It does.
12:11:58	7	Q And do you know what's meant by "the
12:12:02	8	model" there?
12:12:05	9	A It appears to be the the beginning of a
12:12:12	10	model or more than the beginning. A substantial a
12:12:16	11	substantially further enhanced draft of a model
12:12:21	12	incorporating some monetization around YouTube.
12:12:30	13	Q And what kind of a model is this? Is it a
12:12:34	14	cash flow model?
12:12:47	15	A This has a what is the Bates numbers? Is
12:12:52	16	that the name again?
12:12:53	17	Q Yes, that's what those numbers at the bottom
12:12:56	18	are.
12:12:56	19	A Bates Nos. 4071 and 4072 seem to be a
12:13:01	20	projection model. 4073 has a valuation. Hard to tell
12:13:06	21	if that's a discounted cash flow model or not, but it
12:13:08	22	appears that it could be, and then 4074 is a further
12:13:17	23	projection model with again some valuation at the
12:13:23	24	bottom that hard to tell if it's a DCF or not.
12:13:27	25	Q When you say "DCF," you mean discounted cash

		Page 98
12:13:29	1	flow?
12:13:40	2	A Yes.
12:13:40	3	Q And looking at Bates page 4071
12:13:52	4	A Okay.
12:13:53	5	Q this is the first of the first two
12:13:55	6	pages of the two pages which you said were a
12:14:07	7	projection model; right?
12:14:10	8	A Yes.
12:14:10	9	Q And what's being projected here?
12:14:27	10	A The project of the financial performance of
12:14:35	11	YouTube, and I'm not sure if it's as part of Google or
12:14:41	12	not. It doesn't specifically say.
12:14:47	13	Q Okay. And so to do that projection, is it
12:14:52	14	looking at projecting revenue that YouTube would be
12:14:56	15	able to bring in in the future?
12:14:59	16	A Yes.
12:15:00	17	Q And then is it also looking at the cost of
12:15:03	18	that revenue or expenses to get net revenue measured
12:15:08	19	in a variety of ways?
12:15:12	20	A It does come to net revenues well, and then
12:15:15	21	also further costing that down to the EBIDTA level and
12:15:19	22	the EBIT level, and the net operating profit after tax
12:15:24	23	level free cash flow, which is NOPAT and then FCF at
12:15:28	24	the very bottom.
12:15:32	25	Q And for a layperson, are those different ways

		Page 113
13:17:29	1	for identification.)
13:17:29	2	THE WITNESS: Okay.
13:17:29	3	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And Exhibit 17. First
13:17:39	4	page of Exhibit 17 is a cover e-mail with an
13:17:42	5	attachment; is that correct?
13:17:44	6	A Yes.
13:17:44	7	Q And it's being sent by Amrit Rao to Storm
13:17:53	8	Duncan, yourself, cc Chris Scarborough and James Kim;
13:17:57	9	right?
13:18:00	10	A Yes, that's correct.
13:18:01	11	Q On October 9th, 2006; correct?
13:18:07	12	A Yes.
13:18:07	13	Q And it subject is "Green Board Materials";
13:18:15	14	right?
13:18:16	15	A Correct.
13:18:16	16	Q And then there's an attachment which is
13:18:23	17	indicated that its file name is "Materials for Green
13:18:26	18	Board.pdf; correct?
13:18:30	19	A That's correct as well.
13:18:31	20	Q And the remainder of Exhibit 16 after the
13:18:35	21	e-mail, after the first page, is that attachment;
13:18:38	22	correct?
13:18:40	23	A Exhibit 17
13:18:42	24	Q I'm sorry.
13:18:42	25	A and yes.

		Page 114
13:18:48	1	Q Thank you for correctly identifying the
13:18:50	2	exhibit number as 17.
13:18:51	3	A Absolutely.
13:18:58	4	Q And is this presentation this is a
13:19:01	5	presentation to the Google board about the YouTube
13:19:07	6	acquisition; is that right?
13:19:09	7	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
13:19:10	8	question.
13:19:11	9	THE WITNESS: This is a presentation to the
13:19:15	10	Google board, and I think it is our fairness
13:19:20	11	presentation.
13:19:22	12	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Your fairness
13:19:24	13	presentation?
13:19:25	14	A Yes.
13:19:25	15	Q And what is a fairness presentation?
13:19:30	16	A It's a as you recall from the earlier
13:19:34	17	topics that we discussed, we were asked to provide a
13:19:37	18	fairness opinion, and this is the book that allows
13:19:41	19	them to understand how we came to our fairness
13:19:43	20	opinion.
13:19:49	21	Q In was this book or presentation actually
13:19:53	22	presented to the Google board?
13:19:55	23	A It was.
13:19:55	24	Q Were you present for that presentation?
13:20:10	25	A I was.
1		

		Page 115
13:20:10	1	Q Was this book or presentation presented to
13:20:13	2	other Google personnel at any other time?
13:20:18	3	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
13:20:19	4	question.
13:20:24	5	(Whereupon, record read by the Reporter as
13:20:24	6	follows:
13:20:11	7	"Question: Was this book or presentation
13:20:12	8	presented to other Google personnel at any
13:20:16	9	other time?")
13:20:28	10	THE WITNESS: I don't recall. It wouldn't
13:20:36	11	surprise me if we also shared it with the operating
13:20:39	12	team of Salman Ullah, Sean Dempsey, but I don't recall
13:20:48	13	specifically if we did or didn't.
13:20:55	14	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. We'll also come back to
13:20:56	15	this
13:20:57	16	A Okay.
13:20:57	17	Q but let's just get a couple more exhibits.
13:21:02	18	We'll mark Exhibit 18, which is CSSU 2882
13:21:10	19	through 2885.
13:21:24	20	(Document marked Duncan Exhibit 18
13:21:25	21	for identification.)
13:21:25	22	THE WITNESS: Thank you. Okay.
13:21:47	23	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Exhibit 18 is a cover
13:21:49	24	e-mail from James Kim to Salman Ullah and Matthew
13:21:57	25	matthew@google.com and Sean Dempsey; correct?

		Page 116
13:22:02	1	A Yes.
13:22:02	2	Q Do you know who matthew@google.com is?
13:22:09	3	A I don't recall off the top of my head. I
13:22:11	4	thought I saw him on the previous exhibit, but I don't
13:22:14	5	know if you want me to use your time looking for that
13:22:17	6	or not.
13:22:24	7	Q And the attachment to this e-mail is Credit
13:22:29	8	Suisse's final fairness opinion in connection with
13:22:32	9	Google's acquisition of YouTube; is that right?
13:22:35	10	A That's correct. It's the executed version.
13:22:38	11	Q And the opinion provides that let me start
13:23:12	12	that question over.
13:23:13	13	It's according to this opinion, it's
13:23:19	14	Credit Suisse's opinion that the aggregate
13:23:21	15	consideration to be paid by Google in the merger is
13:23:23	16	fair to Google from a financial point of view;
13:23:25	17	correct?
13:23:50	18	A Yes, and this opinion also outlines an answer
13:23:58	19	to an earlier question you had as to how the
13:24:02	20	consideration is defined.
13:24:03	21	Q I was just about to ask that, and what is
13:24:05	22	the how is the aggregate consideration defined
13:24:16	23	here?
13:24:16	24	A An aggregate number of shares of Class A
13:24:20	25	Common Stock of Google equal to the quotient of
1		

		Page 117
13:24:24	1	1.65 billion divided by the average daily closing
13:24:29	2	price of a Google Class A Common Stock for the 30
13:24:32	3	consecutive trading day period ending two trading days
13:24:36	4	prior to the closing date of the merger.
13:24:40	5	Q So it's a certain number of shares of stock
13:24:43	6	determined by a formula set out there; is that right?
13:24:46	7	A That's correct.
13:24:46	8	Q And when providing this opinion, were you
13:24:52	9	able to estimate the the value of that stock
13:24:57	10	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
13:24:58	11	question.
13:24:58	12	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q and the date of the
13:25:00	13	transaction?
13:25:00	14	MR. VOLKMER: Sorry about that.
13:25:07	15	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. On the date of the
13:25:10	16	transaction?
13:25:13	17	A Can you define "date of the transaction"? Is
13:25:18	18	that
13:25:21	19	Q The date that they would hand over the
13:25:23	20	shares.
13:25:23	21	A No, no.
13:25:24	22	Q You didn't you didn't make an attempt to
13:25:27	23	estimate what the value would be or projection to
13:25:30	24	provide this opinion?
13:25:31	25	A No.
I		

		Page 118
13:25:31	1	Q In order to provide an opinion, do you assume
13:25:37	2	a value of \$1.65 billion of the stock on the date that
13:25:43	3	the aggregate consideration is paid?
13:25:46	4	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form.
13:25:49	5	THE WITNESS: We would never project what
13:25:52	6	Google's stock any company's stock price would be
13:25:56	7	in the future, in addition to Google's.
13:25:57	8	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. How how are you able
13:26:13	9	to determine that a number of shares of stock let
13:26:21	10	me rephrase that.
13:26:22	11	What are you measuring the fairness of here?
13:26:26	12	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
13:26:28	13	question.
13:26:30	14	THE WITNESS: We're measuring the fairness
13:26:31	15	of from a financial it's the first sentence,
13:26:31	16	actually.
13:26:36	17	The fairness from a financial point of view
13:26:37	18	of Google, Inc., of the aggregate consideration
13:26:40	19	provided for the agreement and plan of merger to be
13:26:42	20	entered into by Google and YouTube and certain
13:26:46	21	stockholders of YouTube.
13:26:48	22	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And for an aggregate
13:26:49	23	consideration defined as a certain number of shares of
13:26:54	24	stock?
13:26:54	25	A That's correct, yeah. For the purposes of

		Page 119
13:26:55	1	how we do that, derive that analysis, we come up with
13:26:58	2	a certain number of or sorry it's based upon a
13:27:02	3	certain number of shares that is derived from that
13:27:05	4	formula that we gave.
13:27:34	5	Q And if you look back at Exhibit 17
13:27:44	6	A Sure.
13:27:45	7	Q which is the board presentation, Bates
13:27:53	8	page 3563, page two also, it's labeled as
13:28:01	9	A Okay.
13:28:01	10	Q it shows the as a summary of financial
13:28:06	11	analyses of Yellow, it shows the aggregate
13:28:09	12	consideration as 1 \$1.65 billion; correct?
13:28:16	13	A Correct.
13:28:16	14	Q So I'm wondering if you that's the number
13:28:20	15	you used in performing your fairness evaluation?
13:28:23	16	A Yes. So it is, to answer your question
13:28:27	17	directly, and I think to clarify the distinction
13:28:29	18	between what you had been asking and what you're
13:28:31	19	getting at now, that is a proxy for what the
13:28:36	20	shareholders I shouldn't say a proxy that is the
13:28:40	21	value, if that transaction had closed right then, of
13:28:42	22	the consideration that they would receive in essence.
13:28:46	23	We can't predict what that will be in the
13:28:48	24	future, so we don't attempt to do that, and as it
13:28:51	25	correlates to the fairness opinion, our fairness

		Page 120
13:28:54	1	opinion is as of the date we give it.
13:28:56	2	So so we use the value on that date even
13:28:58	3	though we know full well that in the future that value
13:29:01	4	could change. It's no different than any other
13:29:03	5	transaction, I guess, to be fair. If we you know,
13:29:05	6	if you know Viacom bought Time Warner and issued
13:29:09	7	stock, the day of the announcement of that
13:29:11	8	transaction, we would do the analysis and say it's
13:29:14	9	fair knowing fully well that as soon as the
13:29:18	10	transaction is announced the Viacom stock would change
13:29:22	11	in value substantially.
13:29:23	12	Q Okay.
13:29:23	13	A And therefore the consideration is received
13:29:25	14	by, you know, the target company.
13:29:27	15	Q Then you say as a proxy you use the the
13:29:30	16	value on the date of the opinion, and that value was
13:29:37	17	\$1.65 billion?
13:29:39	18	A Yeah.
13:29:39	19	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
13:29:41	20	question.
13:29:41	21	THE WITNESS: Let me slow down.
13:29:42	22	I'd like to take back the word "proxy,"
13:29:44	23	because that's not a very good term here, because it's
13:29:47	24	not a proxy for what the value will be in the future.
13:29:49	25	The fairness opinion we're giving is opining
1		

		Page 121
13:29:52	1	to the value on that day, and we use the 1.65 billion
13:29:55	2	as the value on that day knowing fully well it will
13:29:59	3	fluctuate up or down, as the case may be.
13:30:02	4	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Okay.
13:30:10	5	Q And returning to Exhibit 18, which is the
13:30:19	6	fairness opinion.
13:30:19	7	A Okay.
13:30:20	8	Q On page at the bottom of page 2883, going
13:30:25	9	on to 2884, the last paragraph, the second sentence,
13:30:31	10	let me read, "With respect to the financial forecasts
13:30:35	11	for YouTube that we have reviewed (including potential
13:30:38	12	synergies and strategic benefits anticipated by the
13:30:42	13	management of Google to result from the merger), the
13:30:44	14	management of Google has advised us, and we have
13:30:47	15	assumed, that such forecasts have been reasonably
13:30:50	16	prepared on bases reflecting the best currently
13:30:51	17	available estimates and judgments of the management of
13:30:54	18	Google as to the future financial performance of
13:30:56	19	YouTube after giving effect to the merger and that the
13:31:02	20	financial forecast reflected in the forecasts utilized
13:31:05	21	in our analyses will be utilized in the amounts and at
13:31:05	22	the times indicated thereby."
13:31:10	23	Did I read that correctly?
13:31:11	24	A I thought you had transcribed a few words on
13:31:13	25	the second half of that where it says "after giving

		Page 122
13:31:19	1	effect to the merger and that the financial results
13:31:21	2	reflect in the forecast utilized in our analyses will
13:31:25	3	be realized in the amounts and at the times indicated
13:31:27	4	thereby."
13:31:28	5	Q And that's correct.
13:31:29	6	Is that a correct statement?
13:31:42	7	A You might need to define that question. Is
13:31:44	8	it a correct statement that what you said is correct
13:31:47	9	or
13:31:47	10	Q No.
13:31:48	11	A is it a correct statement that
13:31:50	12	Q Is that sentence in that letter a correct
13:31:52	13	statement?
13:32:01	14	A Gosh, that's a very unusual question, because
13:32:04	15	the sentence says we're assuming that what you gave us
13:32:06	16	is accurate, and you're asking me if that's a correct
13:32:09	17	statement.
13:32:09	18	I think that's a question for Google, not for
13:32:13	19	us; right?
13:32:14	20	Q Well, let me focus on a couple of words in
13:32:17	21	this sentence where it says "The management of Google
13:32:21	22	has advised us, and we have assumed, that such
13:32:23	23	forecasts have been reasonably prepared," and it goes
13:32:26	24	on.
13:32:27	25	I want to know whether the management of
1		

		Page 123
13:32:30	1	Google actually advised you to that effect.
13:32:32	2	A Great. Thank you for clarifying that. That
13:32:35	3	was the source of my confusion.
13:32:38	4	Yes, so they did advise us to use the set of
13:32:40	5	projections that we've identified in a previous
13:32:42	6	exhibit.
13:32:46	7	Q And they also advised you that those
13:32:54	8	forecasts reflected the best current estimates and
13:32:58	9	judgements of the management of Google as to the
13:33:00	10	future financial performance of YouTube after giving
13:33:03	11	effect to the merger?
13:33:05	12	MR. VOLKMER. Object to the form of the
13:33:06	13	question.
13:33:08	14	THE WITNESS: Yes, at the time of this
13:33:12	15	letter.
13:33:29	16	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And you can set that
13:33:30	17	aside.
13:33:31	18	A Okay. Thanks.
13:33:35	19	Q We'll mark Exhibit 19, which is CSSU 2065
13:33:55	20	through 2093.
13:33:57	21	(Document marked Duncan Exhibit 19
13:33:59	22	for identification.)
13:34:17	23	THE WITNESS: Can I ask my counsel a question
13:34:19	24	or no off the record?
13:34:22	25	MR. TAFFET: Yeah.
1		<b>!</b>

		Page 124
13:34:23	1	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record?
13:34:25	2	MR. HOHENGARTEN: We'll go off the record.
13:34:27	3	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:34 p.m.
13:34:34	4	We are off the record.
13:34:35	5	(Recess taken.)
13:35:34	6	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:35 p.m.
13:35:42	7	We are back on the record.
13:35:43	8	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Okay.
13:35:44	9	Q Mr. Duncan, just before we took a break for
13:35:46	10	you to confer with your counsel, we handed you
13:35:49	11	Exhibit 19 which had been identified.
13:35:51	12	A Yes.
13:35:51	13	Q Have you had an opportunity to look at it?
13:36:07	14	A Okay.
13:36:09	15	Q And Exhibit 19 is a cover e-mail from
13:36:13	16	Amrit Rao attaching a number of materials; correct?
13:36:21	17	A Yes.
13:36:21	18	Q And the date of the e-mail is Sunday,
13:36:25	19	October 8th, 2007; correct?
13:36:27	20	A Yeah, 2006.
13:36:29	21	Q Thank you.
13:36:29	22	The date of the e-mail is Sunday,
13:36:32	23	October 8th, 2006; correct?
13:36:35	24	A Correct, yes.
13:36:35	25	Q Thank you.

		Page 125
13:36:36	1	A Absolutely.
13:36:38	2	Q The cover e-mail, could you could you read
13:36:46	3	the first three lines of the cover e-mail, the content
13:36:49	4	of it?
13:36:50	5	A Sure. Down.
13:36:51	6	Q Yeah.
13:36:51	7	A "Dear IBC Members: Attached please find
13:36:55	8	materials pertaining to project Snowmass in advance of
13:37:00	9	the Monday 9:00 a.m. Eastern, 6:00 a.m. Pacific call
13:37:05	10	October 9th."
13:37:07	11	Q Thank you.
13:37:08	12	And who are IBC members?
13:37:11	13	MR. TAFFET: You know, at this point, why
13:37:14	14	don't we go off the record a moment and see if we
13:37:16	15	can
13:37:17	16	MR. HOHENGARTEN: We can go off the record.
13:37:18	17	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Should we change tapes?
13:37:20	18	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Sure.
13:37:20	19	MR. TAFFET: Yeah.
13:37:22	20	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Still have to get us off.
13:37:25	21	This is the end of videotape number two in
13:37:27	22	the continuing deposition of Storm Duncan on
13:37:31	23	July 16th, 2008. The time is 1:37 p.m.
13:37:35	24	We're off the record.
13:37:37	25	(Recess taken.)
l		

		Page 158
14:32:13	1	A Correct.
14:32:15	2	Q The definition of "premium content" in
14:32:17	3	Exhibit 19 does not appear in the final version in
14:32:21	4	Exhibit 17; correct?
14:32:24	5	A Correct.
14:32:24	6	Q Do you have any reason to believe that the
14:32:26	7	definition changed between exhibit the draft in
14:32:31	8	Exhibit 19 and the final version in Exhibit 17?
14:32:34	9	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
14:32:35	10	question.
14:32:36	11	THE WITNESS: I guess a couple of things.
14:32:39	12	One is I'm not sure why it wasn't carried over so that
14:32:43	13	in and of itself might mean the definition changed. I
14:32:47	14	don't know the answer to that, and the second
14:32:48	15	supporting, I guess, statements or what I just said is
14:32:51	16	that this as an example on on Exhibit 19 says
14:32:57	17	"Copyrighted content such as movie/TV trailers, music
14:33:01	18	videos, etc.," my recollection is that in the early
14:33:03	19	document nonpremium content included trailers, if I
14:33:07	20	remember right, although we might want to go back
14:33:09	21	there and cross-reference, because I'm getting
14:33:11	22	definitioned out a little bit or definition confused a
14:33:15	23	little bit.
14:33:15	24	So that might be another reason it might have
14:33:18	25	changed between the two. I think, you know, it's
İ		

		Page 159
14:33:20	1	on Exhibit 17, the premium video was stuff that
14:33:27	2	required providers to allow Yellow to monetize their
14:33:34	3	content. So I think that's how I would view the
14:33:36	4	definition on page nine in the absence of having
14:33:40	5	something specifically defining.
14:33:50	6	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And now still sticking
14:33:51	7	with Exhibit 17, the final board model, you can set
14:33:54	8	Exhibit 19 aside.
14:33:56	9	A Okay.
14:33:57	10	Q Sticking with Exhibit 17, the final board
14:34:00	11	model on page 3570, just to confirm, the assumption of
14:34:08	12	the projection model there is that in 2007, 10 percent
14:34:12	13	of the premium content providers have given that
14:34:15	14	permission that's required for Yellow to monetize the
14:34:19	15	content; correct?
14:34:21	16	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form.
14:34:41	17	(Whereupon, record read by the Reporter as
14:34:41	18	follows:
14:33:57	19	"Question: Sticking with Exhibit 17, the
14:33:59	20	final board model on page 3570, just to
14:34:07	21	confirm, the assumption of the projection
14:34:09	22	model there is that in 2007, 10 percent of
14:34:12	23	the premium content providers have given
14:34:15	24	that permission that's required for Yellow
14:34:17	25	to monetize the content; correct?")

		Page 192
15:43:55	1	my memory.
15:43:57	2	O Let's turn to Exhibit 21.
15:43:59	3	A Okay.
15:44:05	4	Q Exhibit 21 consists of handwritten notes also
15:44:08	5	~
		interspersed with some other pages. Just focusing on
15:44:12	6	that handwritten notes at the moment, are those your
15:44:16	7	notes?
15:44:17	8	A Looks like my handwriting, for lack of a
15:44:23	9	better way of putting it.
15:44:25	10	Q And this set of documents that we've labeled
15:44:35	11	Exhibit 21 was produced to us all as one set, I
15:44:39	12	believe. Would this be maintained as a single file by
15:44:49	13	you? Do you recall?
15:44:52	14	A No, I don't recall. My guess is it was
15:44:54	15	probably just a stack of stuff and somehow I think you
15:44:56	16	guys interpret it as one document. I think it's a
15:45:00	17	lot
15:45:00	18	Q Okay.
15:45:00	19	A of documents that were probably sitting
15:45:02	20	together.
15:45:10	21	Q Looking at the first page of Exhibit 21
15:45:16	22	A Okay.
15:45:17	23	Q actually, do you know what these are notes
15:45:22	24	of on the first page notes from?
15:45:38	25	A It looks like notes on diligence, like asking

		Page 193
15:45:42	1	questions of them of what they're doing and how it's
15:45:44	2	going.
15:45:45	3	Q Would they be notes of the due diligence
15:45:49	4	meetings with YouTube personnel at Wilson Sonsini's
15:45:52	5	offices?
15:45:52	6	A That's highly possible, yeah. I don't know
15:45:54	7	the answer, but it seems like that's definitely a
15:45:57	8	possibility here.
15:45:58	9	Q When you take notes in a due diligence
15:46:01	10	setting, do you make every effort to accurately record
15:46:06	11	what's going on?
15:46:08	12	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form.
15:46:10	13	THE WITNESS: If this was done in the
15:46:13	14	context context of me doing due diligence, I try to
15:46:17	15	write as much as I can down.
15:46:20	16	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. And as accurately as
15:46:22	17	possible?
15:46:22	18	A Yeah. I wouldn't make up stuff. Yeah,
15:46:26	19	absolutely. Some of it might not be what I heard. It
15:46:29	20	might be my interpretation or might be other people's
15:46:32	21	interpretation that I don't agree with. So that
15:46:32	22	doesn't mean there's not much truth in here either
15:46:39	23	communicated to me or
15:46:39	24	Q Okay.
15:46:39	25	A that's how it was, but
		,

		Page 194
15:46:42	1	Q Several lines just a few lines down from
15:46:44	2	the top there's a reads "Brent/Gideon"; correct?
15:46:49	3	A Uh-huh.
15:46:50	4	Q Does that indicate that you met with Brent
15:46:53	5	Hurley and Gideon Yu during due diligence?
15:46:57	6	A It could. Typically that's not what I would
15:47:00	7	put in my notes, but maybe because this was a while
15:47:03	8	ago, I had a different style back then. So it could
15:47:06	9	either mean that those were the two folks that were
15:47:08	10	giving me the information or could mean follow-up with
15:47:13	11	Brad and Gideon or something.
15:47:13	12	So I don't want to give you 100 percent
15:47:15	13	comfort on that, but it seems logical that it could
15:47:18	14	have been the two folks that were there.
15:47:20	15	Q And you say it's not what that's not what
15:47:21	16	you would normally write who you met with in your
15:47:25	17	notes. Where would you normally write?
15:47:26	18	A I probably normally have like you know,
15:47:27	19	although this is up at the top, but I probably have
15:47:30	20	like a category of like Credit Suisse people, you
15:47:32	21	know, lawyers, client people, et cetera, in different
15:47:35	22	columns, and I don't have it, but this was a while
15:47:38	23	ago. Maybe my style has changed since then. Maybe I
15:47:44	24	should go back to my old style.
15:47:52	25	Q If you could flip back a couple of pages

		Page 195
15:47:55	1	A Okay.
15:47:56	2	Q to page 1865
15:47:59	3	A All righty.
15:48:01	4	Q in Exhibit 21. At the top of that page,
15:48:10	5	could you read the first two lines at the top of that
15:48:12	6	page, since it's your handwriting.
15:48:14	7	A Sure.
15:48:15	8	That doesn't mean it will be correct when I
15:48:18	9	read it either. "No copyright issues; DMCA (no
15:48:24	10	issues). Don't target because we can't profit from
15:48:29	11	these pages."
15:48:35	12	Q And do you know what "DMCA" is referring to
15:48:38	13	there?
15:48:40	14	MR. TAFFET: Just for point of clarity, if
15:48:43	15	it's there seems to be a 1, 2, and 3, if you go to
15:48:48	16	the prior page. This is a continuation of number two.
15:48:50	17	I don't know if that
15:48:51	18	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Okay.
15:48:51	19	MR. TAFFET: changes the witness's answer,
15:48:53	20	but it's
15:48:54	21	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Thank you, Mr. Taffet.
15:48:55	22	Q Why don't we, so we have the full context,
15:48:57	23	that's helpful, have you look at page 1864. The last
15:49:02	24	two lines have a number two circled.
15:49:09	25	Could you read those two lines?

		Page 196
15:49:12	1	A You mean the "Search Deal" and the
15:49:15	2	"Partnerships"?
15:49:16	3	Q I believe
15:49:17	4	A The first two lines of two you're saying?
15:49:19	5	Yeah.
15:49:19	6	Q Look at the bottom two lines of the page.
15:49:21	7	A Okay. Yeah. Got it. My bad. I
15:49:23	8	misunderstood you.
15:49:23	9	So it says "Partnerships (Studio\Labels) most
15:49:31	10	aggressively monetized."
15:49:33	11	Q Is it your understanding that the next two
15:49:36	12	lines on that page are a part of the same set of notes
15:49:40	13	about point two?
15:49:40	14	A Yeah, it looks to be a carryover. That's
15:49:42	15	right. I think that's fair.
15:49:47	16	Q And in that context, what does "No copyright
15:49:54	17	issues DMCA refer to"?
15:49:56	18	MR. VOLKMER: Objection to the form of the
15:49:57	19	question.
15:49:58	20	THE WITNESS: I would assume it's under the
15:50:04	21	subcategory of "Partnerships (Studio/Labels)."
15:50:18	22	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Do you recall whether
15:50:19	23	this was something that is notes of something you were
15:50:21	24	told?
15:50:23	25	A Yeah, I think that's what all of this is, is

		Page 197
15:50:25	1	the note. Oh, you're referring specifically to my
15:50:28	2	comment where I might put down my own opinion?
15:50:30	3	Q Yes. You asked exactly
15:50:31	4	A Oh, sorry.
15:50:32	5	Q where you said a number, so
15:50:34	6	A I would not have expressed my own opinion on
15:50:37	7	that statement, so it was definitely told to me by
15:50:39	8	someone else.
15:50:40	9	Q And do you recall who that person was?
15:50:45	10	A I don't.
15:50:45	11	Q And
15:50:50	12	A Someone from YouTube.
15:50:51	13	Q And do you recall the significance of the
15:50:55	14	last line that we've been discussing, don't which
15:50:58	15	is on page 1865 that says "Don't target because we
15:51:03	16	can't profit from these pages"?
15:51:04	17	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
15:51:06	18	question.
15:51:15	19	(Whereupon, record read by the Reporter as
15:51:15	20	follows:
15:50:52	21	"Question: And do you recall the
15:50:54	22	significance of the last line that we've
15:50:56	23	been discussing, don't which is on page
15:51:00	24	1865 that says 'Don't target because we
15:51:03	25	can't profit from these pages'?")

		Page 198
15:51:16	1	THE WITNESS: You good with that question?
15:51:20	2	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. If you understood it.
15:51:22	3	I'll rephrase it if you didn't.
15:51:24	4	A Yeah, if you could rephrase it. I think
15:51:25	5	Q Okay. Looking at page 1865
15:51:27	6	A Yeah.
15:51:27	7	Q we've been discussing a number of lines.
15:51:30	8	The last one reads "Don't target because we can't
15:51:33	9	profit from these pages"; correct?
15:51:35	10	A Uh-huh.
15:51:35	11	Q Do you recall the significance of that
15:51:38	12	statement?
15:51:39	13	A I think by "significance" you mean the
15:51:41	14	importance of it?
15:51:42	15	Q What does it mean?
15:51:43	16	A Okay. The meaning of it. Sorry. Got it.
15:51:45	17	Thank you.
15:51:45	18	It my gut tells me that there's something
15:52:04	19	that I missed between the "No copyright issues DMCA
15:52:08	20	line," and "Don't target because we can't profit from
15:52:10	21	these messages" I'm sorry " from these pages,"
15:52:13	22	because it seems as though what they're saying here is
15:52:15	23	that some of this stuff was monetized or there weren't
15:52:21	24	copyright issues, and then other stuff wasn't targeted
15:52:23	25	for revenue monetization, because they can't profit
		!

		Dago 100
15 50 05	-	Page 199
15:52:25	1	from those pages.
15:52:27	2	Q And to the best of your recollection,
15:52:30	3	somebody from YouTube would have explained that to
15:52:32	4	you?
15:52:32	5	A Yes.
15:52:32	6	Q But you don't recall who specifically?
15:52:34	7	A No.
15:52:37	8	MR. HOHENGARTEN: I think we need to change
15:52:38	9	video tapes.
15:52:42	10	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the end of video
15:52:44	11	tape number three in the continuing deposition of
15:52:47	12	Storm Duncan on July 16th, 2008. The time is
15:52:55	13	3:52 p.m.
15:52:56	14	We are off the record.
15:52:57	15	(Recess taken.)
16:04:54	16	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the beginning of
16:04:57	17	video tape number four in the continuing deposition of
16:05:01	18	Storm Duncan on July 16th, 2008. The time is
16:05:06	19	4:05 p.m. We're off the record we're back on the
16:05:10	20	record.
16:05:11	21	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Okay.
16:05:12	22	Q Continuing with Exhibit 21, if you would turn
16:05:18	23	to Bates page 1957, and do you see roughly in the
16:05:32	24	middle of the page there's a line that begins with
16:05:35	25	"60 percent"?

		Page 200
16:05:35	1	A Uh-huh.
16:05:35	2	Q Can you read that line and the next line
16:05:38	3	-
		please?
16:05:38	4	A Sure. "60 percent is 'Premium.'
16:05:42	5	Professionally produced. Legitimate and
16:05:49	6	illegitimate."
16:05:50	7	Q And do you recall what the significance or
16:05:52	8	meaning of those notes are?
16:05:57	9	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
16:05:58	10	question.
16:06:01	11	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Did you understand my
16:06:02	12	question?
16:06:02	13	A The meaning of those notes are? So are you
16:06:05	14	asking what do I mean by "legitimate and
16:06:09	15	illegitimate," or
16:06:09	16	Q That would be part of my question certainly.
16:06:11	17	A You want to break it down into parts then?
16:06:14	18	Q What do you mean by "legitimate,
16:06:17	19	illegitimate"?
16:06:18	20	A Okay. I think.
16:06:19	21	MR. VOLKMER: I'm going to object to the form
16:06:20	22	of that question.
16:06:22	23	You can proceed.
16:06:23	24	THE WITNESS: Can you read it back?
16:06:24	25	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Actually. I'll just
I		

Page 201 16:06:26 Α Okay. 16:06:28 What is meant in these notes by "legitimate" 16:06:31 and "illegitimate"? 16:06:34 Okay. Okay. My recollection is that there's 16:06:39 5 professionally produced content which is by, you know, 16:06:42 a studio or someone professional that would own that 16:06:46 content, and legitimate and illegitimate is whether it 16:06:51 was put up in agreement with YouTube and that producer 16:06:53 or put up by someone else without the agreement of 16:06:57 10 that producer. 16:06:58 11 Okay. And does -- does -- do those notes 16:07:02 12 reflect something that somebody told you as opposed to 16:07:04 13 your own thoughts? 16:07:09 Definitely something that someone told me as 14 Α 16:07:12 15 opposed to my own thoughts to your question. 16:07:16 16 And do you recall who? 16:07:32 17 Α I don't. 16:07:34 18 Do you recall whether it was somebody from Q 16:07:36 YouTube? 19 16:08:07 20 Α I don't. 16:08:07 21 Do you recall whether it was somebody from Q 16:08:10 22 Google? 16:08:10 23 Α I don't. 16:08:10 24 And do you recall roughly when this 16:08:14 25 information was imparted to you?

## DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

		Page 202
16:08:20	1	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
16:08:21	2	question.
16:08:22	3	THE WITNESS: Somewhere between Thursday and
16:08:24	4	Monday of that weekend.
16:08:26	5	MR. HOHENGARTEN: Q. Some time during the
16:08:28	6	during the due diligence process for your fairness
16:08:30	7	evaluation?
16:08:31	8	A That's correct.
16:08:31	9	Q Mr. Browne is now going to ask a few
16:08:37	10	questions.
16:08:38	11	A Okay.
16:08:38	12	Q He represents the class.
16:08:40	13	MR. BROWNE: Okay. Can we go off the record
16:08:43	14	for a few minutes? Thanks.
16:08:45	15	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:08 p.m.
16:08:47	16	We are off the record.
16:08:48	17	(Recess taken.)
16:10:41	18	(Document marked Duncan Exhibit 22
16:11:01	19	for identification.)
16:11:01	20	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:11 p.m.
16:11:04	21	We're back on the record.
16:11:06	22	EXAMINATION BY MR. BROWNE
16:11:06	23	MR. BROWNE: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Duncan.
16:11:08	24	My name is John Browne. I represent the English
16:11:11	25	Premier League and the Class in this case, and I just

		Page 207
16:16:24	1	MR. BROWNE: Q. And then earlier when we
16:16:25	2	were talking about the meaning of IP issues in that
16:16:27	3	sentence, you you sort of had a definition in your
16:16:31	4	mind as what you thought of as IP issues, stealing
16:16:34	5	source code, something else you may have said.
16:16:36	6	Were you do you exclude from that phrase
16:16:38	7	IP issues, copyright issues?
16:16:41	8	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
16:16:42	9	question.
16:16:44	10	THE WITNESS: Yeah, when I when I think of
16:16:48	11	IP issues just, you know, when this e-mail crossed me
16:16:52	12	in a technology deal, my immediate reaction is
16:16:55	13	intellectual property issues, not copyright issues.
16:16:58	14	MR. BROWNE: Okay.
16:16:59	15	Q Do you know whether whether, in fact, you
16:17:02	16	guys decided to dive deeper into the IP issues in
16:17:09	17	connection with your due diligence?
16:17:12	18	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
16:17:13	19	question.
16:17:14	20	THE WITNESS: Zach attended the diligence
16:17:21	21	with me, so I would assume that if he had an issue
16:17:25	22	with it, and we had a chance to deal with it, which we
16:17:28	23	did that day but, you know, we would have vetted all
16:17:31	24	of our questions.
16:17:32	25	MR. BROWNE: Q. Other than the types of IP
İ		

		Page 208
16:17:36	1	issues that you that you described to me, were
16:17:39	2	aware in the time frame that you received this e-mail
16:17:41	3	of of copyright issues that were facing YouTube?
16:17:44	4	A Yeah, yes.
16:17:45	5	Q And what were those?
16:17:47	6	MR. VOLKMER: Object.
16:17:48	7	THE WITNESS: Sorry.
16:17:48	8	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
16:17:49	9	question.
16:17:50	10	THE WITNESS: I think we had just talked
16:17:52	11	about the primary copyright issue which is whether
16:17:56	12	something is put up on the site by a publisher. We
16:17:59	13	have an agreement with that publisher or that it was
16:18:02	14	put up by someone else that didn't have the permission
16:18:04	15	from that publisher to put it up.
16:18:07	16	MR. BROWNE: Q. Is that something that you
16:18:09	17	guys looked into, that Credit Suisse looked into in
16:18:12	18	connection with due diligence?
16:18:13	19	A I think I think that's what we spent a lot
16:18:16	20	of time earlier today on when we were going through
16:18:19	21	the model which is the percentage. You know, Google's
16:18:23	22	goal was to to you know, let's go back to
16:18:28	23	Exhibit 16 if that's that's what I remember.
16:18:32	24	You know, Google's goal on this premium video
16:18:35	25	content was to have the permission content which was
ĺ		

		Page 209
16:18:37	1	that 10 percent, 50 percent we spent so much time on
16:18:41	2	earlier to get the permission to have that content on
16:18:44	3	that legitimate side, the permission side, and that's
16:18:48	4	what I think the whole purpose of that entire
16:18:50	5	conversation was earlier today was how do you how
16:18:53	6	do they anticipate monetizing that.
16:18:55	7	MR. BROWNE: Right.
16:18:56	8	Q Other than that correct me if I'm wrong
16:18:57	9	other than YouTube or, I'm sorry, Google giving you
16:18:59	10	some information about what was premium content and
16:19:02	11	how much was not premium content on the site, and then
16:19:06	12	Credit Suisse using that information to create the
16:19:09	13	model, what, if anything else, did Credit Suisse do to
16:19:16	14	diligence copyright issues?
16:19:17	15	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
16:19:18	16	question.
16:19:21	17	THE WITNESS: So we had a lot of
16:19:22	18	conversations. You know, we we aren't copyright
16:19:26	19	attorneys, so we didn't do copyright diligence, if
16:19:29	20	that's the specific answer to your question.
16:19:30	21	You know, we obviously spent a lot of time
16:19:32	22	that day with YouTube and with Google talking about
16:19:35	23	the monetization plan which is, I think, the source of
16:19:37	24	how this model came about.
16:19:39	25	MR. BROWNE: Okay.
1		

		Page 210
16:19:40	1	Q Did you spend a lot of time that day or any
16:19:42	2	other day talking with anyone at Google or YouTube
16:19:46	3	about specific copyright issues aside from the
16:19:50	4	monetization point?
16:19:56	5	A So is there a copyright issue where they're
16:20:00	6	not monetizing it you're saying?
16:20:02	7	Q Let me let me just start asking a
16:20:04	8	different way.
16:20:04	9	A Okay.
16:20:05	10	Q You you dealt with the monetization of the
16:20:07	11	copyright copyrighted material, is that correct, in
16:20:12	12	your valuation model?
16:20:13	13	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the
16:20:14	14	MR. TAFFET: Objection to the form.
16:20:15	15	MR. VOLKMER: Object to the form of the
16:20:16	16	question.
16:20:18	17	MR. BROWNE: Q. Did you?
16:20:20	18	A No.
16:20:21	19	Q Okay. When you guys when when Credit
16:20:27	20	Suisse was conducting its due diligence, I'm just
16:20:32	21	going to try it in a very broad way
16:20:34	22	A Sure.
16:20:35	23	Q what did you do? Tell me everything you
16:20:37	24	did with respect to copyright issues that were facing
16:20:40	25	YouTube.
I		<b>!</b>