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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.