Exhibit G

[redacted]

From: Swanson, Daniel G.
Sent: Sunday, November 17, 2013 12:11 AM
To: 'Michael Bromwich'
Cc: Richman, Cynthia; 'Nigro, Barry'; 'Cirincione, Maria'; 'Carroll, Sarah'; 'Matthew J. Reilly'; Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Subject: RE: Apple -- Trip to CA
Attachments: AppleAgenda.docx; ECM Stipulated Protective Order.docx

Michael: Ted is out of pocket today but we wanted to get you a copy of Monday's agenda. Matt Reilly will be in attendance and Ted will dial in as soon as he gets out of a morning court hearing. Also attached is a draft protective order reflecting Apple's changes.

Daniel G. Swanson

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
Tel +1 213.229.7430 • Fax +1 213.229.6430
Avenue Louise 480, Brussels, 1050
Tel +32 2 554 70 00 • Fax +32 2 554 70 33
DSwanson@gibsondunn.com • www.gibsondunn.com

From: Michael Bromwich [mailto:michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com]
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 9:51 AM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Cc: Swanson, Daniel G.; Richman, Cynthia; Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Carroll, Sarah; Matthew J. Reilly
Subject: Apple -- Trip to CA

Dear Ted,

1. The hotel you recommended was sold out. We're staying at the Sheraton in Sunnyvale.

2. Our return flight is late afternoon Tuesday. We remain hopeful that you will identify additional people for us to meet Monday or Tuesday.

3. We think it would be useful for us to meet Deena Said if only briefly during our visit.

4. You had mentioned that Bruce Sewell will be attending the Apple-Samsung trial next week. I would be happy to stop by the courthouse and meet him briefly over a cup of coffee at the courthouse on Monday or Tuesday if that's convenient for him. I think it's important that the two of us meet as soon as possible.

5. We were not planning to have a court reporter attend next week's interviews, unless that is your preference.

6. Please advise who, if anyone, will be attending the interviews along with the witnesses.

7. We still have not received any of the written materials we have been promised since October 22. We would appreciate receiving these as soon as possible.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

MRB

AGENDA

9:00-9:40: Noreen Krall, Apple Vice President Litigation

Confidentiality and Engagement Agreements

10:15-11:15: Tom Moyer, Chief Compliance Officer and Head of Global Security

Compliance Program Overview

11:15-12:15: 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, and Counsel to Risk Management Committee.

Audit Committee Overview

Exhibit H

[redacted]

From: Michael Bromwich <michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 9:51 AM
To: Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.
Cc: Swanson, Daniel G.; Richman, Cynthia; Nigro, Barry; Cirincione, Maria; Carroll, Sarah; Matthew J. Reilly
Subject: Apple -- Trip to CA

Dear Ted,

1. The hotel you recommended was sold out. We're staying at the Sheraton in Sunnyvale.

2. Our return flight is late afternoon Tuesday. We remain hopeful that you will identify additional people for us to meet Monday or Tuesday.

3. We think it would be useful for us to meet Deena Said if only briefly during our visit.

4. You had mentioned that Bruce Sewell will be attending the Apple-Samsung trial next week. I would be happy to stop by the courthouse and meet him briefly over a cup of coffee at the courthouse on Monday or Tuesday if that's convenient for him. I think it's important that the two of us meet as soon as possible.

5. We were not planning to have a court reporter attend next week's interviews, unless that is your preference.

6. Please advise who, if anyone, will be attending the interviews along with the witnesses.

7. We still have not received any of the written materials we have been promised since October 22. We would appreciate receiving these as soon as possible.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

MRB

Exhibit I

SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP
1155 F STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20004
(202) 636-5500

FACSIMILE (202) 636-5502

DIRECT DIAL NUMBER
(202) 636-5566

E-MAIL ADDRESS
mreilly@stblaw.com

BY E-MAIL

November 22, 2013

Re: External Antitrust Compliance Monitoring

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

Dear Michael:

I write in regard to your repeated requests to interview additional Apple executives, board members, and other employees, and to attempt to agree more generally on a schedule moving forward. In the past few weeks, you have sent frequent and repetitive requests to speak with—among many others—at least five different board members and the entire Apple executive team (including Sir Jonathan Ive, whose sole and exclusive responsibility at Apple is to perfect elegant product designs), long before the Court contemplated that your review would begin. As explained below, these requests are inconsistent with Judge Cote's direction and counter-productive to Apple's extensive efforts to develop a comprehensive new antitrust training and monitoring program. Furthermore, cascades of emails and demands for immediate attention are incredibly disruptive.

First and most fundamentally, and as we explained to you previously, Judge Cote stated expressly that she expected your review to begin three months after your appointment, noting from the bench that "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 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***." Transcript of Oral Argument at 20-21, Apple, Inc., No. 1:12-CV-2826 (Sept. 5, 2013) (emphasis added). Similarly, the Court amended the Final Judgment to require you 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 § VI.C (emphasis added). Judge Cote also stated more generally that "I want this injunction to rest as lightly as possible on the way Apple runs its business." Transcript of Oral Argument at 8-9, Apple, Inc., No. 1:12-CV-2826 (Sept. 5, 2013).

Thus, Judge Cote clearly prescribed that your review would begin in substance on or around January 14, 2014, not almost immediately after your appointment. She also directed that you conduct your review in such a way as to disrupt Apple's business operations as little as possible. The reason for this three-month window is of course to provide Apple and its counsel with time to develop new, comprehensive antitrust training and compliance materials in accordance with the Final Judgment, without hampering Apple's business. Apple and its counsel have in fact already dedicated substantial internal

and external resources to developing Apple's new training and compliance program, which we intend to provide to you in draft form in the near future.

Second, ***despite*** the fact that the Court expected your engagement to begin substantively after this three-month window, Apple already has gone far beyond what the Final Judgment and Judge Cote require of it. Apple took the initiative to meet with you and your team on October 22, 2013, immediately after your appointment. We then agreed to schedule interviews of two senior Apple attorneys on November 18, 2013, despite the fact that the Final Judgment does not require Apple to do so. Most recently, we have proposed making several more Apple employees available to you in the first week of December for two-and-a-half full days of additional interviews. We have also provided you with a number of documents pursuant to your requests and will provide additional documents going forward.

Third, your continual requests for additional interviews and other information before January 14, 2014, affirmatively hamper Apple's efforts to develop a new antitrust training and compliance program as efficiently and effectively as possible within the deadline set by Judge Cote. Even after we have met and conferred with you in good faith regarding specific requests, you have regularly repackaged the same demands in different forms, through a variety of emails and telephonic and in-person meet and confers, and on a nearly daily or weekly basis. This constant stream of repetitive requests distracts the Apple in-house and outside counsel responsible for developing the new training program, thereby taking away time that would otherwise be devoted to completing the very antitrust program that is the centerpiece of Judge Cote's Order.

In short, we have gone far above and beyond that required of us by the Final Judgment in order to demonstrate our commitment to working with you in good faith and to complying with Judge Cote's instructions. We remain committed to doing so. In the spirit of cooperation, and to ensure that you obtain the information you need while minimizing any further disruption to the company, we propose the following schedule for additional interviews, generally to be conducted every two months or so beginning with the upcoming interviews in December:

December 4:

9:00 a.m.: Chris Keller, Vice President, Internal Audit

10:00 a.m.: Noreen Krall, Vice President and Chief Litigation Counsel

11:00 a.m.: Doug Vetter, Vice President and Associate General Counsel

1:00 p.m.: Kyle Andeer, Senior Director, Competition Law & Policy

2:00 p.m.: Annie Persampieri, Corporate Counsel, Internet Services & Software

3:00 p.m.: Deena Said, Antitrust Compliance Officer[1]

December 5:

11:00 a.m.: Ronald Sugar, Director and Chair of the Audit and Finance Committee

2:00 p.m.: Rob McDonald, Head, U.S. iBookstore

3:00 p.m.: Tom Moyer, Chief Compliance Officer (by phone, as Mr. Moyer will be traveling)

---

[1] Please let me know what time you plan to begin interviewing each day. If any of the proposed times do not work for you, we will work with you in good faith to move specific interviews later in the afternoon on December 4 or to a mutually convenient time on December 6.

December 6:

9:00 a.m.: Gene Levoff, Associate General Counsel, Corporate Law

11:00 a.m.: Keith Moerer, Director, iBookstore

Please note that Bruce Sewell is unavailable December 4-6 due to prior commitments, but will be available for a telephonic interview the week of December 9. We will follow up with proposed dates and times for that call shortly. We will also provide you with any other logistical information shortly before the interviews.

Furthermore, we propose offering one or a small number of senior executives and content managers in early February. Any meeting between you and an Apple business executive or manager, or between you and Mr. Sugar, will be held in the presence of counsel so that we may appropriately protect Apple's attorney-client privilege.

In advance of the additional interviews set out above, we are happy to continue working with you in good faith to respond to any document requests that are reasonably related to your duties as monitor. To that end, enclosed please find a revised draft confidentiality agreement reflecting our discussions last week. Please let me know if you have any further changes to or comments regarding the agreement.

Feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Matthew J. Reilly

Encl.

Exhibit J

The Bromwich Group

The Bromwich Group LLC
901 New York Avenue, NW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20001

November 22, 2013

Mr. Arthur Levinson
Chairman and former CEO
Genentech, Inc.
One DNA Way
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Mr. Albert Gore, Jr.
The Climate Reality Project
901 E Street, N.W.
Suite 610
Washington, D.C. 20004

Mr. William Campbell
Chairman and former CEO
Intuit Inc.
2700 Coast Avenue
Mountain View, CA 94043

Mr. Robert Iger
President and Chief Executive Officer
The Walt Disney Company
500 South Buena Vista Street
Burbank, CA 91521

Mr. Timothy Cook
CEO
Apple Inc.
One Infinite Loop
Cupertino, CA 95014

Ms. Andrea Jung
Senior Advisor to the Board of Directors
Avon Products, Inc.
777 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Mr. Millard Drexler
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
J. Crew Group, Inc.
770 Broadway
New York, NY 10003

Mr. Ronald Sugar
Former Chairman and CEO
Northrop Grumman Corporation
2980 Fairview Park Drive
Falls Church, VA 22042

Re: Relationship between External Compliance Monitor and Apple

Dear Members of the Apple Inc. Board of Directors:

As you know, on September 5, 2013, the Honorable Denise L. Cote, United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, issued a Final Judgment in *United States of America v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:12-CV-2826 and Order Entering

Permanent Injunction in *The State of Texas, et al., v. Penguin Group (USA), Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:12-CV-3394 (collectively, the "Final Judgment").

Section VI of the Final Judgment established the position of External Compliance Monitor ("monitor") with "the power and authority to review and evaluate Apple's existing internal antitrust compliance policies and procedures," as well as the training program required by the Final Judgment. In addition, the monitor has the power and authority to recommend changes to "address any perceived deficiencies in those policies, procedures, and training." Section VI.B.

More specifically, the Final Judgment requires the monitor to "conduct a review to assess whether Apple's internal antitrust compliance policies and procedures, as they exist 90 days after his or her appointment, are reasonably designed to detect and prevent violations of the antitrust laws" and to "conduct a review to assess whether Apple's training program, required by the [Final Judgment], as it exists 90 days after his or her appointment, is sufficiently comprehensive and effective." Section VI.C. The monitor is required to provide an initial written report summarizing his findings, conclusions, and recommendations no later than April 14, 2014, and additional written reports at six-month intervals for a period of two years. The Court may extend the duration of the monitor's appointment beyond two years, and the monitor, at his discretion or at the request of the Department of Justice, State Attorneys General, or the Court, may file additional reports.

Consistent with a selection process set forth in the Final Judgment, I was selected by the Court, on October 16, 2013, to serve as the monitor. I have assembled a small team to work with me, led by Barry Nigro, the chair of the Antitrust Department at Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP.

I have been doing oversight and monitoring work of various kinds for the past twenty years - first, as the Inspector General for the Department of Justice during the Clinton Administration, and subsequently as a monitor of public agencies and private companies. This is the fourth time in the last eleven years I have been selected to serve as a monitor. I am familiar with the challenges and opportunities presented by serving as a monitor or otherwise engaging in oversight work. I have developed an approach of openness, engagement, and collaboration that has been successful for me and the organizations - both public and private - that I have monitored.

I regret to report that in the month since my appointment, I have experienced a surprising and disappointing lack of cooperation from Apple and its executives that is rare in my oversight experience. Within a week of my appointment, on October 22, Mr. Nigro and I met in New York with a senior lawyer for the company and three of the company's outside lawyers to discuss the monitor's role and my approach to the

responsibilities created by the Court's Final Judgment. I outlined my expectations for the relationship. As reflected in Judge Cote's observations during the trial, and in the post-trial conferences focused on appropriate remedies, senior executives and the Board have an important role to play in the fulfillment of Apple's obligations. At the October 22 meeting, I explained that, in my experience, the monitor and the company benefit from the monitor's direct and regular access to senior management of the company.

In that connection, I advised the company that I felt it was important to conduct a set of initial meetings and interviews with company executives and members of the Board to introduce myself, lay the foundation for our relationship, and learn some basic facts about the company's compliance framework. At the October 22 meeting, I proposed that my first visit to Cupertino for those initial meetings and interviews take place the week of November 18, a full month after my appointment. I expressed my willingness to advance the meetings by a week if that was more convenient for the company and its executives. I should note that the initial meetings for my other monitoring assignments generally occurred within two weeks of my appointment.

Apparently, my requests were inconsistent with the desires, and perhaps the expectations, of the company. Since the October 22 initial meeting until today, the company has not been responsive to our efforts to discharge the obligations the Court assigned to us. The company consistently opposed our requests to conduct interviews during the week of November 18. It originally took the position that we were not to begin our work until 90 days after my appointment, and later opposed the request on grounds that providing senior executive and Board member interviews was overly burdensome, and that *all* of the individuals with whom we had asked to meet were unavailable during the entire week of November 18.

When we made it clear that we intended to travel to California during the week of November 18 and expected to meet with as many of the fifteen individuals we had requested as possible, the company agreed to schedule interviews with only two individuals. We were told that the others were "unavailable," with a specific reason given only for Bruce Sewell. Despite repeated promises, we received not a single document from the company in advance of our trip to California in response to requests we initially made on October 22, and repeated thereafter.[1] Once we arrived in California, the company provided interviews only with the two individuals who had been identified in advance, but with no one else. The company gave no explanation for failing to be more responsive to our requests for other interviews, other than "unavailability."

---

[1] After our November 18 trip to California, counsel for the company provided its first set of documents in response to our requests.

In addition to requests for interviews with relevant executives, we also asked to meet with Board members who work and reside in and around Northern California. We repeated our request upon our arrival on Monday, November 18 but we never received a response. It is unclear to me whether these requests have been communicated to you, although they certainly should have been.

Our requests to meet with key Apple personnel have been largely ignored, and when not ignored the responses have been extremely slow in coming. The company has spent far more time challenging the terms of our compensation and raising other objections related to administrative matters, even though the Court's Order provided no role for Apple in setting the monitor's compensation.[2] Apple has sought for the past month to manage our relationship as though we are its outside counsel or consultant, to whom it can dictate terms and conditions, and whose approval is required before we can undertake our work. Despite Apple's failure to respond adequately to our reasonable requests, we will continue to "proceed with all reasonable diligence" in our duties, as instructed by Judge Cote's November 21, 2013 Order proposing an amendment to her original September 5 Order.

The company's approach to date is antithetical to the type of relationship that is required for the monitor and the company to work together in a constructive and collaborative manner. This approach has the potential to create a relationship fraught with friction and tension rather than the positive, collaborative relationship we can – and should – have.

We understand that Apple is appealing the antitrust verdict the Court rendered against the company. We further understand that the company strongly opposed the appointment of an external antitrust compliance monitor, and that Apple has never had a monitor of any kind. That may explain why, over the past month, Apple has taken an unfortunate and unproductive approach. But understanding the company's perspective does not excuse Apple's continuing failure to cooperate.

We are off to a slow, difficult, and unfortunate start, but I have no doubt that we can get our relationship back on track. It is very early in a long-term relationship. I have several suggestions for you as members of the Board in the exercise of your oversight responsibilities, which I believe could help the Company fulfill its obligations under the Final Judgment:

- Ensure that Apple personnel appointed to serve as liaisons to me and the other members of the monitoring team understand that a relationship

---

[2] The latest of these challenges was in the form of a letter from Noreen Krall on November 21, 2013, demanding documentation and support for compensation.

with a court-appointed monitor is different from a relationship with counsel to the company, an adversary in litigation, or an outside counsel or consultant.

- Promote a positive, direct relationship between the company liaisons and the monitoring team that is unfiltered through outside counsel.

- Encourage senior management of the company to work with us to build a constructive relationship with a shared goal of creating a world-class antitrust compliance program at Apple. That can happen only if the company substitutes a new approach, based on collaboration and engagement, for the confrontational and obstructionist approach it has adopted in the first month of our relationship.

I very much regret that my first encounter with you has been under these circumstances. I look forward to meeting with you in the near future and working with you to ensure that Apple fully complies with the Court's Final Judgment in this matter and builds an antitrust compliance program that can serve as an industry leader.

Very truly yours,

Michael R. Bromwich

Exhibit K

[redacted]

From: Michael Bromwich <michael.bromwich@bromwichgroup.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2013 8:02 PM
To: Reilly, Matt
Cc: Nigro, Barry; Carroll, Sarah; Boutrous Jr., Theodore J.; Cirincione, Maria; Arquit, Kevin; Noreen Krall
Subject: Re: Letter and Confidentiality Agreement

Matt,

Thanks for your letter and the draft confidentiality agreement. We will review the agreement and get back to you promptly.

In response to your letter, we simply disagree with the oft-repeated claim that Judge Cote never meant for us to begin our work before January 14. We have the distinct advantage of having discussed our intentions to get off to a fast start directly with her during the interviewing process. We give that discussion far more weight than snippets of transcript taken out of context.

We appreciate the schedule you have provided. We may have some follow-up, but we appreciate the effort that you have made. I thought we had mentioned that we would not be arriving until the late morning of December 4; I don't arrive back in the US from overseas until late in the day on December 3. I'm hopeful that we can make adjustments to accommodate our later arrival.

Thanks again.

MRB

On Fri, Nov 22, 2013 at 10:31 PM, Reilly, Matt <Matt.Reilly@stblaw.com> wrote:
Michael,

Please see the attached letter and confidentiality agreement pursuant to our discussion at Monday's meeting.

Best,
Matt

Exhibit L

The Bromwich Group

The Bromwich Group LLC
901 New York Avenue, NW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20001

November 5, 2013

BY EMAIL

D. Bruce Sewell, Esq.
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
Apple, Inc.
One Infinite Loop
Cupertino, CA 95014

Dear Bruce:

Thanks very much for your letter of November 4. I am pleased to hear about the work that Apple has been doing with respect to antitrust compliance since the Court entered the Final Judgment on September 5, including the selection of the internal Antitrust Compliance Officer ("ACO"). Based on your letter, it appears that we fully share the objective of establishing and maintaining a professional, constructive, and collaborative relationship.

First, let me briefly respond to your suggestion that our interactions with Apple should not begin in any meaningful way until the expiration of the 90 days provided by the Final Judgment. The Final Judgment makes clear that our initial assessment of the company's antitrust policies, procedures, and training should be as they exist *as of* January 14, 2014, but the Final Judgment in no way precludes us from beginning our work upon appointment. Indeed, in my interviews during the monitor selection process with the Department of Justice and the Plaintiff States, and separately with Judge Cote, I made clear that one of the keys to a successful monitorship was getting off to a fast start and promptly making contact with top executives at the company, including conducting preliminary interviews. These early contacts lay the groundwork

for the type of relationship that benefits both the company and the monitor. There was no suggestion at any time from anyone that these activities needed to be deferred for 90 days after the appointment of the External Compliance Monitor.

I have no doubt, as you suggest, that your newly selected ACO will be quite busy over the next two months, but I also have no doubt that he or she would be available for a brief meeting within the next 2-3 weeks. I am sure the same is true for many of the senior executives in the company, including you and Mr. Cook. That is why from the outset we have been willing to limit each of these initial sessions to one hour. From our perspective, we would benefit from an early window into the work the company has been doing since the Final Judgment. From your perspective, there is a substantial benefit in allowing us to become aware of those efforts as they are taking place rather than having them summarized for the first time when they are complete. It would allow us to comment about such activities in our semi-annual reports and make clear that our information was based on something other than an after-the-fact report.

As I am sure you are aware, monitors often have specific deadlines, some of which can be very demanding. Even so, the existence of such deadlines has never, to my knowledge, been viewed as a reason for the monitor to defer his work until the deadlines have passed. I have been involved in four monitorships over the past eleven years, three as monitor and one as counsel to the monitored entity. In every case, the monitor has met with the top management within 14 days of appointment. Those introductory meetings and interviews have helped create the foundation for the type of relationships that must exist between the monitor and entity being monitored. In none of these cases was the work of the monitor deferred until any of the deadlines, even those that were most demanding, had passed.

As to your concern about a request for "voluminous historical documents," I am afraid you may have been misinformed. Our requests were limited to the company's compliance policies and training materials, organization charts for three specific business divisions, information that describes the company's compliance reporting structure and the roles played by the Audit and Risk Oversight Committees, and any materials referred to in an August 19 letter sent to the Department of Justice, which was provided to us in New York on October 22, that are not duplicative of our other requests. These are very specific and narrowly drawn requests, and we have heard no previous suggestion that the volume was viewed as significant. My impression is that they were viewed as quite modest and reasonable. If that impression is incorrect, we would welcome further discussion on the issue.

I am scheduled to speak with Mr. Boutrous tomorrow to discuss these issues. Our hope is that you will fully authorize him to resolve these issues so that we can move forward without further delay. I ask that you support our efforts to begin our work as promptly as possible, including meeting with me at your earliest convenience.

Please feel free to contact me at any time to discuss these matters directly. I can be reached at 202-682-4268.

Very truly yours,

Michael R. Bromwich

cc: Tim Cook, Chief Executive Officer
Theodore J. Boutrous Jr., Esq.
Bernard A. Nigro Jr., Esq.