

Exhibit A

October 31, 2013

VIA E-MAIL

Michael R. Bromwich
The Bromwich Group LLC
901 New York Avenue, NW 5th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001

Re: External Antitrust Compliance Monitoring

Dear Michael:

It was a pleasure meeting you last week, and Apple looks forward to working with you to achieve our shared objective of developing a comprehensive and effective antitrust training program consistent with Judge Cote's Final Judgment. Apple is fully committed to ensuring that its antitrust training program, and its policies and procedures related thereto, are both robust and effective.

I am writing to follow up on three issues arising from our discussion last week and your recent correspondence (letter of October 23, 2013¹ and e-mails on October 26 and 29, 2013). First, Apple believes that the timing and scope of your requests are inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the Final Judgment. Judge Cote was very clear that the injunction should be narrowly tailored to address the antitrust violation she found in this case and sought to avoid unnecessarily burdening Apple or limiting its ability to innovate and do business in this dynamic industry. *See* Hearing Transcript, *United States v. Apple Inc., et al.*, No. 1:12-CV-2826, at 8-9 (Aug. 27, 2013) ("I want this injunction to rest as lightly as possible on the way Apple runs its business.") (hereinafter "Aug. 27, 2013 Hearing Tr.")² Notably in this regard, the Final Judgment provides that the External Compliance Monitor's review of Apple's internal antitrust compliance policies and procedures and antitrust training program is not to commence until "90 days after his or her appointment." Final Judgment at § VI.C. Second, Apple also has concerns over the financial terms of your engagement, which the Final Judgment requires be "reasonable and customary" and approved by the

¹ As you are aware, Apple received a letter from you, in draft form, on October 23, 2013, which was not finalized until October 26, 2013.

² *See also* Aug. 27, 2013 Hearing Tr. at 27 ("I'm trying to think about, as I've indicated, where the real risks are and to minimize the burdens on Apple.")

October 31, 2013

Page 2

Department of Justice (“DOJ”). Third, we also need to ensure that the confidentiality of any information Apple may share with you during the course of your activities as monitor is appropriately protected.

Apple is hopeful that these issues can be resolved quickly so that we can move forward together to achieve the objectives of the Final Judgment. Each of these issues is discussed in more detail below.

1. Timing and Scope of Monitor’s Responsibilities

As you mentioned at the outset of our introductory meeting, the Final Judgment defines the scope of your responsibilities in a manner that is clear and straightforward. The monitor’s primary responsibility is to “conduct a review . . . [of] Apple’s internal antitrust compliance policies and procedures, *as they exist 90 days after his or her appointment*” and to “also conduct a review to assess whether Apple’s training program, required by Section V.C of this Final Judgment, *as it exists 90 days after his or her appointment*, is sufficiently comprehensive and effective.” Final Judgment at § VI.C (emphasis added).

During the August 27 hearing Judge Cote explained, “I don’t think that the [Monitor] should conduct a review or assessment of the current policies. I would expect that Apple would revise its current policy substantially and procedures and create an effective training program. That will require some time. So I think this should be revised to have the [Monitor] doing an assessment in three months from appointment and *beginning to engage Apple in a discussion at that point.*” Aug. 27, 2013 Hearing Tr. at 20-21 (emphasis added).

Apple is in the process of revising and enhancing its compliance training programs to ensure that they are robust, comprehensive, effective, and compliant with the terms of the Final Judgment. In this regard, Apple will soon be bringing on board its new Antitrust Compliance Officer, as directed by the Final Judgment, and adding new lawyers with antitrust compliance expertise in the legal department. In light of the express language of the Final Judgment, as well as Judge Cote’s elaboration at the August 27 hearing, the time period for your review of Apple’s antitrust policies and procedures and training program does not commence until January 14, 2013 (90 days from the date of appointment).

Accordingly, your request to begin interviewing Apple’s entire board and its executive team, as well as additional senior executives on November 18 is premature, not authorized by the Final Judgment, and would not only be disruptive to Apple’s business operations but also directly contrary to Judge Cote’s intent. We fully understand and expect that there will be a need to conduct interviews with certain personnel at some point once Apple’s new training programs are up and running. And you have Apple’s assurance that it will be a most willing partner in facilitating those meetings. Furthermore, there will be ample opportunity over the course of your engagement to determine whether Apple’s new training program is consistent with the Judge’s Order and is effective in its impact.

October 31, 2013

Page 3

However, it makes no sense, and would be extremely disruptive, to schedule those interviews before Apple has completed its internal assessment and developed its new antitrust training program.

2. Financial Terms and Fiduciary Responsibilities

The Final Judgment requires the monitor to operate on “reasonable and customary terms” that are “consistent with reasonable expense guidelines.” Final Judgment at § VI.I. Apple has already raised concerns regarding your hourly fees, the administrative fee you seek to impose in addition to those fees, the need for additional personnel, and finally, adherence to a defined expense policy. Apple does not believe your proposed fee structure is reasonable and customary, whether for a monitor or a lawyer, and respectfully objects to it. Moreover, your dictate that we simply accept these fees and costs at face value without any support or explanation is inconsistent with the company’s fiduciary responsibilities to its shareholders, and to the customary practices of Apple and other companies in conducting business or legal activities. And, while the Final Judgment requires DOJ and Plaintiff States to approve your fee and expense structure (*see* Final Judgment at § VI.I), it appears from your correspondence you have not secured such approval but instead have simply submitted your proposed approach to DOJ and it has not acted upon it.

3. Confidentiality

To protect the confidentiality of any information Apple may share with you during the monitorship, we have attached a non-disclosure agreement for your signature that is consistent with Apple’s standard confidentiality agreements and the Stipulated Protective Order in this matter. Apple also reserves its right to assert attorney-client privilege and work product protections as appropriate throughout this process. Finally, Apple again requests that, consistent with its policies, you, the Bromwich Group, Goodwin Procter, and Fried Frank refrain from using Apple’s name in any marketing materials or media communications like the press release Goodwin Procter issued announcing your appointment and containing a direct quote from you.

* * * * *

Concurrent with this response, Apple has submitted to DOJ and Plaintiff States a notice of its objections. Please direct any future communications on these issues to me. As we work to resolve these issues, Apple will continue to focus its efforts on its internal assessment and enhancement of its antitrust policies and procedures and the training program mandated by the Final Judgment. As you know, Apple has retained seasoned antitrust practitioners and former government officials at the law firm of Simpson Thacher to aid it in this process. We appreciate an honest and open dialogue on these issues, and look forward to

October 31, 2013

Page 4

working with you to establish antitrust compliance policies and training programs that are comprehensive and effective in satisfaction of the Final Judgment.

Very truly yours,

s/ Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr.

Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr.

Enclosure

CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

This Confidentiality Agreement (the “Agreement”) is entered into and is effective as of _____ (the “Effective Date”) by and between Michael Bromwich, on behalf of the Bromwich Group, and Bernard Nigro (hereinafter “ECM”) and Apple Inc. (“Apple” and, collectively, the “Parties”) in connection with Section VI.I of the September 5, 2013 Final Judgment (the “Final Judgment”) entered in *United States of America v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 1:12-CV-2826 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 5, 2013) (the “Action”), and consistent with the May 7, 2012 Stipulated Protective Order entered in the Action (the “Protective Order”).

Whereas, the Final Judgment contemplates that the Parties will execute customary confidentiality agreements in connection with ECM’s monitoring responsibilities pursuant to the Final Judgment; and

Whereas, Apple contemplates that certain highly sensitive information and materials may be disclosed in connection with ECM’s performance of his responsibilities pursuant to the Final Judgment; and

Whereas, the Parties agree that such materials should be kept confidential subject to the terms and conditions set forth below,

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties do hereby agree and stipulate as follows:

1. DEFINITION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. ECM agrees that all information disclosed by Apple to ECM in any manner in connection with ECM’s monitoring responsibilities pursuant to the Final Judgment will be considered and referred to collectively in this Agreement as “Confidential Information.” Confidential Information, however, does not include information that: (a) is now or subsequently becomes generally available to the public through no fault or breach on the part of ECM; (b) ECM can demonstrate to have had rightfully in his possession prior to disclosure to ECM by Apple; (c) is independently developed by ECM without the use of any Confidential Information; or (d) ECM rightfully obtains from a third-party who has the right to transfer or disclose it to ECM without limitation.

2. NONDISCLOSURE AND NONUSE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. ECM agrees to protect Apple’s Confidential Information, using at least the same degree of care that he uses to protect his own confidential and proprietary information of similar importance, but no less than a reasonable degree of care. ECM agrees to use Apple’s Confidential Information for the sole purpose of performing his monitoring responsibilities in connection with the Final Judgment. ECM will not disclose, publish, or disseminate Confidential Information to anyone, and will not use Confidential Information in any manner, except as set forth in this Agreement.

3. INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE BY APPLE OF PRIVILEGED OR PROTECTED INFORMATION. If Apple inadvertently discloses to ECM material subject to the attorney-client privilege, work-product protection, or any other applicable privilege or protection that ECM is not authorized to receive pursuant to the Final Judgment, the applicable privilege and/or protection will not be waived if Apple makes a request for return of such inadvertently produced material promptly after learning of its inadvertent production. Upon such notice, ECM will promptly return or destroy the materials subject to privilege and/or protection.

4. INADVERTENT DISCLOSURE BY ECM OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.

In the event of disclosure by ECM of any Confidential Information to any person or persons not authorized to receive such disclosure pursuant to this Agreement, ECM will promptly notify Apple of the disclosure and provide to Apple all known relevant information concerning the nature and circumstances of the disclosure. ECM will promptly thereafter take all reasonable measures to retrieve the improperly disclosed material and to ensure that no further or greater unauthorized disclosure and/or use thereof is made. Unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure will not change the confidential status of any Confidential Information.

5. AUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BY ECM.

Information and materials designated as Confidential Information pursuant to this Agreement may only be disclosed by ECM to the persons and in the manner set forth below:

- (a) To the extent necessary to discharge ECM's monitoring responsibilities pursuant to the Final Judgment, attorneys, employees, and associates of ECM, including attorneys and employees of The Bromwich Group LLC, and attorneys and employees of Fried, Frank, Harris, Schriver & Jacobson.
- (b) United States Department of Justice attorneys and employees, in connection with their enforcement or monitoring of compliance with the Final Judgment;
- (c) Attorneys and employees of the Attorney General's Office of any Representative Plaintiff State (as defined in the Final Judgment), in connection with their enforcement or monitoring of compliance with the Final Judgment; and
- (d) The Court and all persons assisting the Court in the Action, in connection with enforcement or monitoring of the Final Judgment, including law clerks, court reporters, and stenographic or clerical personnel.

In addition, before any information designated as Confidential Information may be disclosed to any person described in subparagraphs 5(a)-(c) above, he or she must first read this Agreement or must have otherwise been instructed on his or her obligations pursuant to this Agreement, and must execute the Agreement included as Appendix A hereto prior to receiving Confidential Information. Each individual described in subparagraphs 5(a)-(c) above and to whom Confidential Information is disclosed must not disclose that information to any other individual, except as set forth in this Agreement.

Nothing in this Agreement prevents disclosure by ECM of Confidential Information to any current employee of Apple, and nothing in this Agreement prevents the United States or any Representative Plaintiff State (as defined in the Final Judgment), subject to taking appropriate steps to preserve the confidentiality of such information, from using or disclosing Confidential Information as permitted or required by the Final Judgment, for law enforcement purposes, or as may otherwise be required by law or binding court order.

6. NOTICE OF DISCLOSURE AND USE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION IN COURT PROCEEDINGS. Before disclosure of Confidential Information is made to any person or persons not authorized to receive the information pursuant to paragraph 5 above, ECM must give Apple at least ten (10) calendar days' advance notice in writing, including the name(s), address(es), and employer(s) of the person(s) to whom the disclosure will be made and the reason for the disclosure. If, within that ten-day period, Apple objects to the disclosure, ECM must make a written request to the United States and Representative Plaintiff States (as defined in the Final Judgment) within ten (10) calendar days' receipt of Apple's objection. In addition, in connection with any disclosure or use of Confidential Information in any court proceeding, ECM must take reasonable steps to maintain the confidentiality of those materials, including but not limited to filing documents under seal and satisfying the other requirements of paragraph 20 of the Protective Order.

7. PROCEDURES UPON COMPLETION OF ECM'S MONITORING RESPONSIBILITIES. The obligations imposed by this Agreement survive the termination of ECM's monitoring responsibilities as set forth in the Final Judgment. Within ninety (90) days after termination of ECM's monitoring responsibilities in connection with the Final Judgment, ECM must certify to Apple in writing that it has destroyed or returned to Apple all Confidential Information and that it has endeavored in good faith to ensure that any Confidential Information disclosed pursuant to paragraph 5 above has been destroyed or returned to Apple. However, nothing in this paragraph prevents the United States or the Representative Plaintiff States (as defined in the Final Judgment) from retaining or using Confidential Information, subject to taking appropriate steps to preserve the confidentiality of such information, as permitted or required by the Final Judgment, for law enforcement purposes, or as may otherwise be required by law or binding court order.

8. EQUITABLE RELIEF. ECM hereby acknowledges that unauthorized disclosure or use of Confidential Information could cause irreparable harm and significant injury to Apple that may be difficult to ascertain. Accordingly, ECM agrees that Apple will have the right to seek and obtain immediate injunctive relief to enforce obligations under this Agreement in addition to any other rights and remedies it may have.

9. NO IMPLIED WAIVER. Apple's failure or delay in exercising any of its rights will not constitute a waiver of such rights unless expressly waived in writing.

10. ENTIRE AGREEMENT AND GOVERNING LAW. This Agreement, in conjunction with the terms set forth in the Final Judgment, constitutes the entire Agreement with respect to the Confidential Information disclosed pursuant to this Agreement and supersedes all prior or contemporaneous oral or written Agreements concerning such Confidential Information. This Agreement may not be amended except by written Agreement signed by authorized representatives of both Parties. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California, excluding that body of California law concerning conflicts of law. The Parties further submit to and waive any objections to the exclusive jurisdiction of and venue in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York for any litigation arising out of this Agreement.

Understood and agreed to by the parties:

MICHAEL BROMWICH:

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

BERNARD NIGRO:

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

On behalf of APPLE INC.:

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Appendix A

I am employed as _____ by _____. I hereby certify that:

1. I have read the Confidentiality Agreement between Michael Bromwich and Apple Inc. (the "Agreement") and understand its terms.
2. I agree to be bound by the terms of the Agreement, including the terms relating to disclosure of Confidential Information (as defined in the Agreement) in paragraph 5 and the terms relating to the destruction or return of Confidential Information in paragraph 7 of the Agreement.
3. I agree to use the information provided to me in connection with the Agreement only for the purpose of enforcement and monitoring of the Final Judgment (as defined in the Agreement).
4. I understand that my failure to abide by the terms of the Agreement will subject me, without limitation, to liability for breach of the Agreement and this Appendix A.
5. I submit to the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York solely for the purpose of enforcing the terms of the Agreement and this Appendix A and freely and knowingly waive any right I may otherwise have to object to the jurisdiction of said court.

I make this certificate on this _____ day of _____, _____.

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

ATTACHMENT 2

Subject:

Monitoring Letter

On Oct 26, 2013, at 8:47 AM, Michael Bromwich <michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com> wrote:

Dear Kyle,

Thanks very much for your response to my cover note and our draft letter. Unfortunately, I think you may have misconceived its purpose. It was not to begin a negotiation about fees, rates, and expenses, nor was it meant to provide you with an opportunity to provide us with guidelines that are applicable to providers of legal services where Apple is the client -- but that are inapplicable to firms providing independent monitoring services. It was to give you an opportunity to modify or revise the confidentiality provision. In light of your response, it probably makes sense to execute any enhancements to the confidentiality agreement separately. I have attached a signed copy of the monitoring letter. The only change is the date.

Without responding to each item in your note, I wanted to clarify the following:

1. Administrative fees are completely standard for consulting firms. The Bromwich Group is not a law firm and does not practice law. The normal range for the administrative/management fees for consulting firms is between 10% and 25%. Therefore, the 15% is at the low end of the range.
2. We will add additional personnel, whether from Fried Frank or elsewhere, only as necessary and appropriate. We will keep you informed if we add personnel performing significant substantive responsibilities but not if we use a lawyer to do a discrete research project or a legal assistant to provide support. We will do this as a courtesy and we do not intend to provide a rationale. It will be because we need additional assistance.
3. On expenses, please advise whether your lawyers from Gibson Dunn working on this matter, your Wilmer lawyers working on the Samsung matter in the ND of California, and other lawyers working on high-end litigation and corporate matters follow these expense guidelines without exception. If they do, we will seriously consider doing so. We are happy to receive from you a list of Apple's preferred hotels.
4. We are serving as an independent compliance monitor pursuant to a Court order, not as counsel to Apple subject to its direction and control. Accordingly, we will not be providing a budget. You are incorrect in stating that this is standard practice in monitorships. We will do everything we reasonably can to keep fees and expenses to a minimum. We plan to provide you each month with a statement of the number of hours spent by each timekeeper on this matter but not to provide descriptions of the amount of time spent on specific tasks. We will maintain such records and will share them with the Department of Justice, the Plaintiff States, and the Court if requested to do so.
5. We will submit our invoices directly to you, or to someone you designate. We will be happy to execute W-9s.

6. My consulting firm did not issue a press release. Goodwin Procter posted an item on its web site without my advance knowledge or consent to clarify that the firm itself would not be involved in the monitorship.

We very much look forward to your responses to the various substantive matters we discussed on Tuesday and to your confirming the particulars of our initial visit to Cupertino the week of November 18.

Best regards.

MRB

On Fri, Oct 25, 2013 at 10:45 PM, Kyle Andeer <kandeer@apple.com> wrote:

Dear Michael,

Thank you for sharing your draft letter. It is very helpful in that it tees up a number of different issues that make sense to address at the outset of our relationship. As you noted, the treatment of confidential information is one of several issues that will require additional research and thought. Although the disclosure of such information is highly unlikely given the narrow scope of the External Compliance Monitor's responsibilities, we agree that this is an issue we should seek to address at the outset. It likely makes sense for us to execute one of our "customary confidentiality agreements" as contemplated in the Final Judgment. Final Judgment at § VI.I, U.S. v. Apple, Inc., No. 1:12-CV-2826 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 5, 2013). We will provide a full response on these and other issues in the next week, as well as a retention obligations agreement and confidentiality agreements to address this point.

I do want to raise concerns with the compensation and expense terms outlined in your letter which are in tension with the terms of the Final Judgment which require the External Monitor to operate on "reasonable and customary terms" that are "consistent with reasonable expense guidelines." Final Judgment at § VI.I, U.S. v. Apple, Inc., No. 1:12-CV-2826 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 5, 2013). From our perspective they do not reflect the competitive realities of the marketplace. We expect that your firm – like all of Apple's legal service providers – will comply with Apple's Outside Service Provider Policy ("OSP") (attached) and its standard expense policy (also attached).

1. Administrative Fee. You request that the Bromwich Group be paid a "management/ administrative fee" of 15% of all billable hours. As you will note in the attached policies, Apple does not pay any of its legal vendors a "management/administrative fee."
2. Hourly Rates. You have requested that Apple pay you \$1,100 per hour and Mr. Nigro \$1,025 per hour. These rates are very high, particularly when compared to the average rate Apple pays a law firm partner (\$565 per hour). Even if one looks at the top 25%, the average rate per partner is \$801 per hour. Apple is prepared to compensate you at \$800 per hour and Mr. Nigro at a rate of \$700 per hour. With the foregoing principles in mind, we also ask that you provide the hourly rate for Maria Cirincione.
3. Additional Personnel. Pursuant to Apple's Outside Service Provider Policy, the Bromwich Group (and Fried Frank) should notify Apple before adding new timekeepers to its team and provide a rationale for the additional resources. As you appreciate, this is a standard requirement that ensures costs do not spiral out of control.

4. Expense policy. Apple expects that you will adhere to its standard expense policy (attached) Apple will pay for coach airfare, lodging at Apple preferred hotels, and per diems of \$15 for breakfast, \$25 for lunch and \$30 for dinner. The policy also outlines our guidelines on telephone and copying charges. Apple will not reimburse for data storage and information technology services. This is consistent with these policies is in keeping with the “reasonable expense guidelines” language in Section VI.I of the Final Judgment.

5. Budget and Invoicing. The Bromwich Group should submit an expected budget for its services for the coming year. As you know this is standard practice in any engagement, including in monitorships. In addition, Apple expects that your invoices will describe time spent on tasks and a description of those tasks. Apple reserves the right to challenge fees that are excessive, outside the scope your responsibilities, and/or unjustified pursuant to Sections VI.I. and VI.J. of the Final Judgment.

6. Billing. Apple requires firms to submit invoices - within 30 days of service - via an electronic portal. We can set up a meeting with our eBilling team as soon as you are ready. Apple will also require a signed W9 in order to pay invoices for your firm.

7. Marketing. Apple does not allow the firms it works with to market their representation of Apple (see OSP at 6). We noted that your firm, Goodwin Proctor, your consulting practice, The Bromwich Group, and Mr. Nigro's firm, Fried Frank all issued press releases announcing your appointments. We ask that you please refrain from using Apple's name in any marketing materials or media communications.

The requests in your letter do not reflect market realities. That raises significant concerns on our part. We sincerely hope that you will reflect on these points and that we can work out these issues without going to the Department of Justice and the courts. Please let me know if you would like to discuss.

Best regards,

Kyle

On Oct 23, 2013, at 3:58 PM, Michael Bromwich <michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com> wrote:

Dear Kyle,

I have attached a draft letter that sets forth our duties and responsibilities as the external antitrust compliance monitor under the Final Judgment, and touches on other matters relevant to our monitoring work, including information about fees, expenses, and confidentiality. This letter is specifically tailored to the provision of monitoring services under the Final Judgment. Accordingly, it is different in various ways from the engagement letter that would be appropriate if Apple were a client of a law firm or my consulting firm.

Before I provided a signed version of the letter, I wanted to make sure it should be addressed to you rather than someone else at Apple, and give you the opportunity to suggest any revisions to Section 10 of the letter dealing with confidentiality. I realize this may be a sensitive issue and I wanted to make sure the language I have crafted is acceptable. I am willing to consider reasonable modifications.

Please confirm that you should be the recipient of this letter (or provide an alternative addressee) and suggest any reasonable changes to the confidentiality language as promptly as you can.

Thanks very much.

MRB

<Apple Monitoring Letter -- 10-23.doc>

<Apple -- 10-26 Letter.pdf>

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this e-mail and any attachments may be legally privileged and confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the e-mail and any attachments immediately. You should not retain, copy or use this e-mail or any attachment for any purpose, nor disclose all or any part of the contents to any other person. Thank you.

Exhibit B

From: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2013 7:48 AM
To: Michael Bromwich
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Swanson, Daniel G.; Richman, Cynthia
Subject: RE: Apple -- Expense Guidelines

Dear Michael:

I am very surprised and disappointed in your email below. I thought that we had set things on a productive and collaborative path in our call last week and with my follow up list of potential interviewees (which was much broader and longer than the one I had suggested during the cordial November 6 call). During our call, I specifically noted that the week of November 18 might not be feasible or convenient and suggested that the week of December 2 (the week after the intervening Thanksgiving holiday week) might work well. When I then followed up and proposed December 2, you responded in your November 7 email that you would be in Europe the week of December 2 and had some other scheduling conflicts that week and the week of December 9. I then simply wrote back and asked if you could reshuffle your schedule so that we could make the December 9 timeframe work.

Your response below was not in the spirit of our efforts and offer to host you at Apple headquarters for a full slate of interviews and provide other information well in advance of the date on which your review of the new compliance and training programs is to commence under the Final Judgment (January 14). As set forth in my October 31 letter, Judge Cote and the Final Judgment could not have been clearer regarding the timing and scope of your review and the need to avoid unduly intruding on Apple's business operations. The Final Judgment is also clear that any "interview [is] to be subject to the reasonable convenience of such personnel..." Final Judgment at VI.G.1. Contrary to your suggestions below, and as Apple's General Counsel Bruce Sewell made clear in his letter to you and I emphasized when we spoke and in my letter to you and in my conversations with the Justice Department and States on these issues, Apple takes its obligations and responsibilities under the Final Judgment very seriously. To that end, and among the other things it is doing on this front, Apple has made a reasonable proposal regarding the requested interviews and for working collaboratively and productively with you. Under the circumstances, your demands and approach are unreasonable, unnecessary and unwarranted, and go well beyond the scope of the Final Judgment and Judge Cote's guidance.

Ted

Theodore J. Boutrous Jr.

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
Tel +1 213.229.7804 • Fax +1 213.229.6804
TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com • www.gibsondunn.com

From: Michael Bromwich [mailto:michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 2:48 PM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Swanson, Daniel G.; Richman, Cynthia; scarroll@robbinsrussell.com
Subject: Re: Apple -- Expense Guidelines

Ted,

This is a very disappointing response, and very much at odds with what my understanding was during and after our call last Wednesday. The company was put on notice on October 22 that we intended to make our initial visit the week of November 18. Your response suggests that our request was not -- and is not -- taken seriously by the company. Apple is a can-do company, and I am confident that they can pull this together. If they maintain that they cannot, that suggests to me that they do not take its obligations and my responsibilities under the Final Judgment very seriously. The questions below need only be answered if the company maintains that that it unable to comply with our request for a series of interviews and meetings the week of November 18.

Please advise which of the 15 people (Sewell, Moyer, Levoff, Vetter, Andeer, Said, Persamperi, Moerer, McDonald, Cook, Schiller, Cue) identified in your e-mail and my response are unavailable for as little as an hour any day the week of November 18 (Monday through Friday). Be prepared to support any representations concerning their unavailability with detailed copies of their schedules for that entire week.

Please confirm that contact has been made with the 2-3 Board members identified in my e-mail who appear to work in the vicinity of Apple's headquarters, and that they are also unavailable for a meeting/interview of similar length.

Please advise which of the subjects identified in my recent e-mail cannot be addressed in a presentation/discussion (with almost two weeks notice) and why that is the case.

I remain willing to upend my schedule and make the trip this coming week rather than the week of November 18 if that will mean the company is better able to comply with our quite reasonable requests. I am not prepared to drag things out any longer than that.

Thanks.

MRB

On Sat, Nov 9, 2013 at 4:01 PM, Boutrous Jr., Theodore J. <TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com> wrote:

Michael:

I have now heard back and, unfortunately, that week is very bad in terms of scheduling. I know you will be out of the country the week of December 2, but we would very much appreciate it if you could work on your scheduling conflicts the week of December 9 and make the trip that week. Apple will be able to have a full slate of interviewees for you to meet with that week along the lines of my prior email and the new ACO will have had time to get acclimated and up and running. This will get things off to a strong start and would be much better from the standpoints of efficiency and effectiveness. It doesn't make sense to have you fly all the way to California only to

meet with a few people the week of November 18. In the meantime, we can start getting you some of the information you have requested. We are also working on a new confidentiality arrangement based on the protective order. Can we make this work?

Theodore J. Boutrous Jr.

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
Tel [+1 213.229.7804](tel:+12132297804) • Fax [+1 213.229.6804](tel:+12132296804)
TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com • www.gibsondunn.com

From: Michael R. Bromwich [mailto:michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 11:30 AM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Swanson, Daniel G.; Richman, Cynthia; scarroll@robbinsrussell.com
Subject: Re: Apple -- Expense Guidelines

Thanks, Ted. We appreciate it. We will plan to fly in late Sunday and be ready to go first thing Monday morning unless a Tuesday start would be significantly better for the company.

Also, we would be grateful for any of the materials we originally requested October 22.

Best.

MRB

On Nov 9, 2013, at 2:13 PM, "Boutrous Jr., Theodore J." <TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com> wrote:

Checking to see what can be pulled together for that week Will report back

Theodore J. Boutrous Jr.

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
Tel [+1 213.229.7804](tel:+12132297804) • Fax [+1 213.229.6804](tel:+12132296804)
TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com • www.gibsondunn.com

From: Michael Bromwich [<mailto:michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com>]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:58 PM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Swanson, Daniel G.
Subject: Re: Apple -- Expense Guidelines

Thanks, Ted. Let's keep trying for the week of November 18. The following two weeks are bad for me -- I'm out of the country and otherwise committed the week of December 2 and have some real scheduling difficulties the following week as well. And then we're into the holidays when we can expect people to be traveling everywhere.

We have always understood that we would not be able to grab everyone we would like to meet or interview the week of the 18th, but let's resolve to do the best we can. The list you have generated is an excellent start.

In addition to the people on this list, all of whom we want to meet/interview either the week of the 18th or at some point soon thereafter, we would like to interview/meet Tim Cook, Phil Schiller, and Eddie Cue. If there are other Senior VPs who touch antitrust-related issues in a meaningful way, we would like to add them to the list as well.

In addition, we would be very interested in gathering information while we are out there on the following.

1. A discussion of the overall compliance structure at Apple -- spheres of responsibility, reporting structure, and personnel involved in compliance.
2. Overview of the compliance activities that were commenced after the Final Judgment, as referred to in Bruce Sewell's November 4 letter.
3. Overview of the structure and operation of the Risk Management Committee.
4. Overview of the role of the Audit Committee in compliance
5. Overview of the evaluative tools -- e.g., outside audits and reviews -- currently used to review and monitor the compliance program.
6. Discussion of the tools and methods currently used within the company to promote compliance.
7. Structure for reporting and investigating suspected compliance violations (antitrust and other issues).
8. Existing system for imposing discipline on company personnel who violate compliance policies.
9. Mechanisms for reporting compliance violations and preventing retaliation.

These are just a few ideas about topics that I have found very worthwhile to explore at the outset of monitoring. I will leave to Apple which of these it wants to take up the week of 11/18 and which it would prefer to defer until our next trip -- realistically,

probably in early January. I am open to interviewing people who are the most knowledgeable on these subjects, or receiving presentations, which can then be later followed up on with interviews. I want to be as flexible as possible about this, but I have no doubt we will be able to usefully fill 2-3 days the week of 11/18.

We would also very much ask for the company's assistance in arranging interviews with its Board members. In addition to Mr. Cook, I note that Mr. Levenson and Mr. Campbell, both of whom are members of the Audit Committee, are based in Mountain View (Campbell) and South San Francisco (Levenson). My understanding is that Mr. Gore either lives or frequently visits Northern California. If one or more of these outside directors are available the week of the 18th, we would very much like to meet with them.

Thanks very much for your continued assistance and cooperation on this.

Best.

MRB

On Thu, Nov 7, 2013 at 3:16 PM, Boutrous Jr., Theodore J. <TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com> wrote:

Thank you Michael. I look forward to reviewing this and very much appreciated our call yesterday. The week of November 18 is looking bad from a scheduling standpoint (including because the new Antitrust Compliance Officer will be officially starting work that week and a number of other folks will be traveling), so we would like to propose the week of December 2. I am still working to confirm, but interviewees could potentially include:

Bruce Sewell, Senior Vice President, General Counsel, and Secretary Member of Management Risk Oversight Committee

Tom Moyer, Chief Compliance Officer and Head of Global Security

Gene Levoff, Senior Director, Associate General Counsel - Corporate Law and Assistant Secretary, Legal Counsel to Audit and Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee, Liaison to Board of Directors, Counsel Risk Management Committee

Doug Vetter, Vice President, Associate General Counsel Product Law and Assistant Secretary. Assumed responsibility in July 2013 for legal groups supporting hardware, software, and iTunes (including App Store and iBooks Store).

Kyle Andeer, Senior Director, Competition Law & Policy

Deena Said, Antitrust Compliance Officer

Annie Persamperi, Legal Counsel, iBooks Store

Keith Moerer, Director, iTunes content
Rob McDonald, Head of iBooks Store for the United States

I hope we can work together to make this a productive first trip for you to Apple and sets us on a joint path to achieving the objectives of this effort.

Ted

Sent from my iPad

On Nov 7, 2013, at 1:00 PM, "Michael Bromwich" <michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com> wrote:

Dear Ted,

As promised during our call yesterday afternoon, attached please find a letter that sets forth the items included in Apple's expense policies that we feel comfortable signing on to. As you will see, we have no objection to agreeing to follow those polices that don't raise independence concerns or otherwise seem inappropriate. Please let us know if you have any questions or need to discuss any of the specific items.

Again, I want to thank you for the very productive discussion we had yesterday. We look forward to receiving the list of people and groups the company is proposing we meet and/or interview the week of November 18 so we can reach closure on the issue as soon as possible and schedule the trip.

Best regards.

MRB

<Apple -- Letter to Boutrous -- 11-7.PDF>

This message may contain confidential and privileged information. If it has been sent to you in error, please reply to advise the sender of the error and then immediately delete this message.

Exhibit C

From: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:17 PM
To: Michael Bromwich
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Swanson, Daniel G.
Subject: Re: Apple -- Expense Guidelines

Thank you Michael. I look forward to reviewing this and very much appreciated our call yesterday. The week of November 18 is looking bad from a scheduling standpoint (including because the new Antitrust Compliance Officer will be officially starting work that week and a number of other folks will be traveling), so we would like to propose the week of December 2. I am still working to confirm, but interviewees could potentially include:

Bruce Sewell, Senior Vice President, General Counsel, and Secretary Member of Management Risk Oversight Committee

Tom Moyer, Chief Compliance Officer and Head of Global Security

Gene Levoff, Senior Director, Associate General Counsel - Corporate Law and Assistant Secretary, Legal Counsel to Audit and Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee, Liaison to Board of Directors, Counsel Risk Management Committee

Doug Vetter, Vice President, Associate General Counsel Product Law and Assistant Secretary. Assumed responsibility in July 2013 for legal groups supporting hardware, software, and iTunes (including App Store and iBooks Store).

Kyle Andeer, Senior Director, Competition Law & Policy

Deena Said, Antitrust Compliance Officer

Annie Persamperi, Legal Counsel, iBooks Store

Keith Moerer, Director, iTunes content

Rob McDonald, Head of iBooks Store for the United States

I hope we can work together to make this a productive first trip for you to Apple and sets us on a joint path to achieving the objectives of this effort.

Ted

Sent from my iPad

On Nov 7, 2013, at 1:00 PM, "Michael Bromwich" <michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com> wrote:

Dear Ted,

As promised during our call yesterday afternoon, attached please find a letter that sets forth the items included in Apple's expense policies that we feel comfortable signing on to. As you will see, we have no objection to agreeing to follow those policies that don't raise independence concerns or otherwise seem inappropriate. Please let us know if you have any questions or need to discuss any of the specific items.

Again, I want to thank you for the very productive discussion we had yesterday. We look forward to receiving the list of people and groups the company is proposing we meet

and/or interview the week of November 18 so we can reach closure on the issue as soon as possible and schedule the trip.

Best regards.

MRB

<Apple -- Letter to Boutrous -- 11-7.PDF>

Exhibit D

From: Kyle Andeer [mailto:kandeer@apple.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 12:08 AM
To: Bromwich, Michael; barry.nigro@friedfrank.com
Subject: Introduction

Hi Michael & Barry,

I wanted to drop you a quick note of introduction in light of today's news. I am responsible for Apple's in-house antitrust/competition legal team; I have spent three years here after a decade at the DOJ and the FTC.

I don't believe I have met either of you before but I am looking forward to it. The circumstances (at least from my perspective) could be better but I am committed to working with both of you and developing a best of class antitrust compliance program for iTunes. We are already hard at work developing such a program working with our internal compliance team here at Apple and Kevin Arquit and Matt Reilly at Simpson Thacher. We are hopeful that the program that we will present to you in 90 days will meet our lofty goals. That said, we recognize and expect that you will have thoughts and comments. I really do hope this can be a collaborative effort.

I thought it might be helpful to at least introduce myself at the outset. I am more than willing to get on a call (or a plane) at any time if that would be of interest. And Michael, I apologize for using your Goodwin address . . . I did not have one for your consulting practice. Let me know if there is a better contact.

Kyle

Kyle Andeer | Apple Legal | Senior Director, Competition Law & Policy/Commercial & Retail Law
1 Infinite Loop, Cupertino, California 95014 | T (408) 862-9307 | C (408) 464-2006 | kandeer@apple.com

The information in this e-mail and any attachment(s) is intended solely for the personal and confidential use of the designated recipients. This message may be an attorney-client communication protected by privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not review, use, copy, forward, or otherwise disseminate this message. Please notify us of the transmission error by reply e-mail and delete all copies of the message and any attachment(s) from your systems.

Exhibit E

From: Michael Bromwich <michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2013 8:34 AM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.; Carroll, Sarah
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Swanson, Daniel G.; Richman, Cynthia
Subject: Re: Apple -- Expense Guidelines

Ted, let's see if we can make some progress on a phone call this afternoon rather than exchanging additional e-mails. We don't think a slate of interviews and meetings next week, almost a full month after we identified it as the time we would like to begin our on site work, is at all unreasonable, especially because we have made clear that we will understand if some of the people we want to meet are unavailable next week. I'm hopeful that we can work something out that isn't overly burdensome to the company but that doesn't cause us further delay. I think we can.

Please let us know what times this afternoon would work for you. Thanks.

MRB

On Mon, Nov 11, 2013 at 10:48 AM, Boutrous Jr., Theodore J. <TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com> wrote:

Dear Michael:

I am very surprised and disappointed in your email below. I thought that we had set things on a productive and collaborative path in our call last week and with my follow up list of potential interviewees (which was much broader and longer than the one I had suggested during the cordial November 6 call). During our call, I specifically noted that the week of November 18 might not be feasible or convenient and suggested that the week of December 2 (the week after the intervening Thanksgiving holiday week) might work well. When I then followed up and proposed December 2, you responded in your November 7 email that you would be in Europe the week of December 2 and had some other scheduling conflicts that week and the week of December 9. I then simply wrote back and asked if you could reshuffle your schedule so that we could make the December 9 timeframe work.

Your response below was not in the spirit of our efforts and offer to host you at Apple headquarters for a full slate of interviews and provide other information well in advance of the date on which your review of the new compliance and training programs is to commence under the Final Judgment (January 14). As set forth in my October 31 letter, Judge Cote and the Final Judgment could not have been clearer regarding the timing and scope of your review and the need to avoid unduly intruding on Apple's business operations. The Final Judgment is also clear that any "interview [is] to be subject to the reasonable convenience of such personnel..." Final Judgment at VI.G.1. Contrary to your suggestions below, and as Apple's General Counsel Bruce Sewell made clear in his letter to you and I emphasized when we spoke and in my letter to you and in my conversations with the Justice

Department and States on these issues, Apple takes its obligations and responsibilities under the Final Judgment very seriously. To that end, and among the other things it is doing on this front, Apple has made a reasonable proposal regarding the requested interviews and for working collaboratively and productively with you. Under the circumstances, your demands and approach are unreasonable, unnecessary and unwarranted, and go well beyond the scope of the Final Judgment and Judge Cote's guidance.

Ted

Theodore J. Boutrous Jr.

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
Tel [+1 213.229.7804](tel:+12132297804) • Fax [+1 213.229.6804](tel:+12132296804)
TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com • www.gibsondunn.com

From: Michael Bromwich [mailto:michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 2:48 PM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Swanson, Daniel G.; Richman, Cynthia; scarroll@robbinsrussell.com
Subject: Re: Apple -- Expense Guidelines

Ted,

This is a very disappointing response, and very much at odds with what my understanding was during and after our call last Wednesday. The company was put on notice on October 22 that we intended to make our initial visit the week of November 18. Your response suggests that our request was not -- and is not -- taken seriously by the company. Apple is a can-do company, and I am confident that they can pull this together. If they maintain that they cannot, that suggests to me that they do not take its obligations and my responsibilities under the Final Judgment very seriously. The questions below need only be answered if the company maintains that that it unable to comply with our request for a series of interviews and meetings the week of November 18.

Please advise which of the 15 people (Sewell, Moyer, Levoff, Vetter, Andeer, Said, Persamperi, Moerer, McDonald, Cook, Schiller, Cue) identified in your e-mail and my response are unavailable for as little as an hour any day the week of November 18 (Monday through Friday). Be prepared to support any

representations concerning their unavailability with detailed copies of their schedules for that entire week.

Please confirm that contact has been made with the 2-3 Board members identified in my e-mail who appear to work in the vicinity of Apple's headquarters, and that they are also unavailable for a meeting/interview of similar length.

Please advise which of the subjects identified in my recent e-mail cannot be addressed in a presentation/discussion (with almost two weeks notice) and why that is the case.

I remain willing to upend my schedule and make the trip this coming week rather than the week of November 18 if that will mean the company is better able to comply with our quite reasonable requests. I am not prepared to drag things out any longer than that.

Thanks.

MRB

On Sat, Nov 9, 2013 at 4:01 PM, Boutrous Jr., Theodore J. <TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com> wrote:

Michael:

I have now heard back and, unfortunately, that week is very bad in terms of scheduling. I know you will be out of the country the week of December 2, but we would very much appreciate it if you could work on your scheduling conflicts the week of December 9 and make the trip that week. Apple will be able to have a full slate of interviewees for you to meet with that week along the lines of my prior email and the new ACO will have had time to get acclimated and up and running. This will get things off to a strong start and would be much better from the standpoints of efficiency and effectiveness. It doesn't make sense to have you fly all the way to California only to meet with a few people the week of November 18. In the meantime, we can start getting you some of the information you have requested. We are also working on a new confidentiality arrangement based on the protective order. Can we make this work?

Theodore J. Boutrous Jr.

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
Tel [+1 213.229.7804](tel:+1213.229.7804) • Fax [+1 213.229.6804](tel:+1213.229.6804)
TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com • www.gibsondunn.com

From: Michael R. Bromwich [<mailto:michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com>]
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 11:30 AM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Swanson, Daniel G.; Richman, Cynthia; scarroll@robbinsrussell.com
Subject: Re: Apple -- Expense Guidelines

Thanks, Ted. We appreciate it. We will plan to fly in late Sunday and be ready to go first thing Monday morning unless a Tuesday start would be significantly better for the company.

Also, we would be grateful for any of the materials we originally requested October 22.

Best.

MRB

On Nov 9, 2013, at 2:13 PM, "Boutrous Jr., Theodore J." <TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com> wrote:

Checking to see what can be pulled together for that week Will report back

Theodore J. Boutrous Jr.

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
Tel [+1 213.229.7804](tel:+1213.229.7804) • Fax [+1 213.229.6804](tel:+1213.229.6804)
TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com • www.gibsondunn.com

From: Michael Bromwich [<mailto:michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com>]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 12:58 PM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Swanson, Daniel G.
Subject: Re: Apple -- Expense Guidelines

Thanks, Ted. Let's keep trying for the week of November 18. The following two weeks are bad for me -- I'm out of the country and otherwise committed the week of December 2 and have some real scheduling difficulties the following week as well. And then we're into the holidays when we can expect people to be traveling everywhere.

We have always understood that we would not be able to grab everyone we would like to meet or interview the week of the 18th, but let's resolve to do the best we can. The list you have generated is an excellent start.

In addition to the people on this list, all of whom we want to meet/interview either the week of the 18th or at some point soon thereafter, we would like to interview/meet Tim Cook, Phil Schiller, and Eddie Cue. If there are other Senior VPs who touch antitrust-related issues in a meaningful way, we would like to add them to the list as well.

In addition, we would be very interested in gathering information while we are out there on the following.

1. A discussion of the overall compliance structure at Apple -- spheres of responsibility, reporting structure, and personnel involved in compliance.
2. Overview of the compliance activities that were commenced after the Final Judgment, as referred to in Bruce Sewell's November 4 letter.
3. Overview of the structure and operation of the Risk Management Committee.
4. Overview of the role of the Audit Committee in compliance
5. Overview of the evaluative tools -- e.g., outside audits and reviews -- currently used to review and monitor the compliance program.
6. Discussion of the tools and methods currently used within the company to promote compliance.
7. Structure for reporting and investigating suspected compliance violations (antitrust and other issues).
8. Existing system for imposing discipline on company personnel who violate compliance policies.
9. Mechanisms for reporting compliance violations and preventing retaliation.

These are just a few ideas about topics that I have found very worthwhile to explore at the outset of monitoring. I will leave to Apple which of these it wants to take up the week of 11/18 and which it would prefer to defer until our next trip -- realistically, probably in early January. I am open to interviewing people who are the most knowledgeable on these subjects, or receiving presentations, which can then be later followed up on with interviews. I want to be as flexible as possible about this, but I have no doubt we will be able to usefully fill 2-3 days the week of 11/18.

We would also very much ask for the company's assistance in arranging interviews with its Board members. In addition to Mr. Cook, I note that Mr. Levenson and Mr.

Campbell, both of whom are members of the Audit Committee, are based in Mountain View (Campbell) and South San Francisco (Levenson). My understanding is that Mr. Gore either lives or frequently visits Northern California. If one or more of these outside directors are available the week of the 18th, we would very much like to meet with them.

Thanks very much for your continued assistance and cooperation on this.

Best.

MRB

On Thu, Nov 7, 2013 at 3:16 PM, Boutrous Jr., Theodore J. <TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com> wrote:

Thank you Michael. I look forward to reviewing this and very much appreciated our call yesterday. The week of November 18 is looking bad from a scheduling standpoint (including because the new Antitrust Compliance Officer will be officially starting work that week and a number of other folks will be traveling), so we would like to propose the week of December 2. I am still working to confirm, but interviewees could potentially include:

Bruce Sewell, Senior Vice President, General Counsel, and Secretary Member of Management Risk Oversight Committee

Tom Moyer, Chief Compliance Officer and Head of Global Security

Gene Levoff, Senior Director, Associate General Counsel - Corporate Law and Assistant Secretary, Legal Counsel to Audit and Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee, Liaison to Board of Directors, Counsel Risk Management Committee

Doug Vetter, Vice President, Associate General Counsel Product Law and Assistant Secretary. Assumed responsibility in July 2013 for legal groups supporting hardware, software, and iTunes (including App Store and iBooks Store).

Kyle Andeer, Senior Director, Competition Law & Policy

Deena Said, Antitrust Compliance Officer

Annie Persamperi, Legal Counsel, iBooks Store

Keith Moerer, Director, iTunes content

Rob McDonald, Head of iBooks Store for the United States

I hope we can work together to make this a productive first trip for you to Apple and sets us on a joint path to achieving the objectives of this effort.

Ted

Sent from my iPad

On Nov 7, 2013, at 1:00 PM, "Michael Bromwich" <michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com> wrote:

Dear Ted,

As promised during our call yesterday afternoon, attached please find a letter that sets forth the items included in Apple's expense policies that we feel comfortable signing on to. As you will see, we have no objection to agreeing to follow those policies that don't raise independence concerns or otherwise seem inappropriate. Please let us know if you have any questions or need to discuss any of the specific items.

Again, I want to thank you for the very productive discussion we had yesterday. We look forward to receiving the list of people and groups the company is proposing we meet and/or interview the week of November 18 so we can reach closure on the issue as soon as possible and schedule the trip.

Best regards.

MRB

<Apple -- Letter to Boutrous -- 11-7.PDF>

This message may contain confidential and privileged information. If it has been sent to you in error, please reply to advise the sender of the error and then immediately delete this message.

Exhibit F

From: Michael Bromwich <michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 3:10 PM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Cc: Nigro, Barry (Barry.Nigro@friedfrank.com); Cirincione, Maria (Maria.Cirincione@friedfrank.com); Richman, Cynthia; Swanson, Daniel G.
Subject: Re: Apple

Ted,

Thanks very much for your timely response and the offer of interviews with Mr. Moyer and Mr. Levoff next Monday, November 18. We accept. We are hopeful that once you advise the company that we will be conducting these interviews on Monday, other people whom we have identified, or whom you have suggested, will become available on Monday, Tuesday, or even Wednesday. I think it is very much in the company's interests for us to meet, if only briefly, those people with whom we will be having the most contact over the next two years.

Please let us know whether we should be prepared to conduct the interviews Monday morning or Monday afternoon. Also, we would very much appreciate obtaining the materials we originally requested on October 22, especially those most relevant to Mr. Moyer's and Mr. Levoff's responsibilities, as soon as possible.

Please let us know if the company has any suggestions on hotels where we should try to make reservations.

Again, thanks very much for your cooperation in this matter.

Best regards.

MRB

On Tue, Nov 12, 2013 at 4:55 PM, Boutrous Jr., Theodore J. <TBoutrous@gibsondunn.com> wrote:

Dear Michael:

It was good speaking with you yesterday. I have confirmed that Apple would be able to make available for 1-hour interviews on Monday November 18 Tom Moyer, who is Chief Compliance Officer and Head of Global Security, and Gene Levoff, who serves as Senior Director, Associate General Counsel - Corporate Law - and Assistant Secretary, Legal Counsel to Audit and Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee, Liaison to Board of Directors, and Counsel to Risk Management Committee. While

they would be able to cover many of the topics you have expressed interest in discussing at the outset of your work, we strongly encourage you to hold off and make the trip the week of December 2 or December 9, when Apple can make a fuller slate of folks available to you, including Bruce Sewell, who will be attending the Samsung trial next week, and Deena Said, the new Antitrust Compliance Officer, who will be starting her job at the company and attending new employee orientation next week, along with other relevant members of the legal and business teams mentioned in my prior correspondence. Apple respectfully submits that this will be more efficient and effective in getting you the information you seek and in working together to ensure that the company has comprehensive and effective antitrust compliance and training programs. Regards,

Ted

This message may contain confidential and privileged information. If it has been sent to you in error, please reply to advise the sender of the error and then immediately delete this message.
