

SULLIVAN & CROMWELL

NEW YORK TELEPHONE: (212) 558-4000
TELEX: 62694 (INTERNATIONAL) 127816 (DOMESTIC)
CABLE ADDRESS: LADYCOURT, NEW YORK
FACSIMILE: (212) 558-3588

125 Broad Street, New York 10004-2498

1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006-5805
444 SOUTH FLOWER STREET, LOS ANGELES 90071-2901
8, PLACE VENDÔME, 75001 PARIS
ST. OLAVE'S HOUSE, 91 IRONMONGER LANE, LONDON EC2V 8EY
101 COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE 3000
2-1, MARUNOUCHI 1-CHOME, CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100
NINE QUEEN'S ROAD, CENTRAL, HONG KONG
OBERLINDAU 54-56, 60323 FRANKFURT AM MAIN

July 29, 1998

Honorable Joel I. Klein, Esq.,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division,
United States Department of Justice,
10th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20530.

Re: Request for Business Review Letter
Regarding the Licensing of Patents
Essential to DVD-Video and DVD-ROM

Dear Mr. Klein:

On behalf of Koninklijke Philips Electronics, N.V. ("Philips"), Sony Corporation of Japan ("Sony"), and Pioneer Electronic Corporation of Japan ("Pioneer") (and their affiliates which are involved in the patent licensing program described below) we submit this request for a Business Review pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 50.6 regarding the proposed arrangement under which certain patents essential to the manufacture and use of DVD-Video and DVD-ROM will be licensed on reasonable and non-discriminating terms (the "Proposed Licensing Program").

DVD (or Digital Versatile Discs) refers to a high density CD-sized optical disc in which signals are encoded and stored in digital form and are then read and reproduced by players using an optical read out beam. Relying on basic CD technology, the DVD discs and players allow for an increase of approximately six times the storage capacity of a typical CD or CD-ROM. DVD-Video and DVD-ROM are two formats relating to high density optical discs which have been described by Philips, Sony, Pioneer and several other companies in the DVD-Specification for Read Only Disc version 1.0 dated August 1996 and in several updates thereto (a copy of the specification is set forth in Exhibit A hereto).

A single DVD format for video and ROM was defined in an open process by participating companies over the course of several years at the request of various industries — particularly the computer industry — which asserted that multiple DVD formats would delay introduction of this new and beneficial product, increase costs, and much like the incompatible BETA and VHS formats, result in losses to consumers who purchased products based on a format which quickly became obsolete. In defining the DVD-Video and DVD-ROM formats, input was solicited and received from a variety of industries and an even wider variety of companies throughout the world.

As the format was developed and refined, it became clear that numerous independent companies had been granted patents which were relevant to DVD-Video and DVD-ROM. The three companies submitting this request actively sought to join the licensing of their patents with the patents of other companies which also claimed to have patents which are essential to DVD-Video and DVD-ROM. To date, those efforts have not resulted in any other companies joining the Proposed Licensing Program. Philips, Sony and Pioneer, however, remain willing to include others having essential patents in the licensing program described below.

The companies submitting this request firmly believe that, in the near future, DVD products will be widely marketed by a wide variety of companies. We are also convinced that, once these products are manufactured and distributed in volume, there will be great consumer demand for them. We anticipate that the producers and sellers of DVD discs and players will largely be the companies that currently manufacture and sell CDs and the equipment that plays CDs and CD ROMs. Thus, prospective licensees include manufacturers of consumer audio equipment and computer disc drives. Typically, licensees to manufacture DVD discs will be replicators, as is the case with CDs. In sum, the DVD licenses will be offered to the same classes of sophisticated licensees as are CD licenses, and there is every reason to expect that the transfer of this valuable DVD technology will have the same beneficial effects upon the relevant industries that CD licenses had upon the recorded music industry 15 years ago.

In one respect, licensors of DVD technology face risks and uncertainties that were not faced 15 years ago by the creators of CD technology. During the past year, several different formats have been announced that will

compete with various applications of DVD for the favor of consumers. For example, Circuit City and others have developed Digital Video Express (DIVX), a pay-per-play system that allows consumers who have purchased a DIVX-compliant player to purchase a disc at a lower price and to play that disc for a limited period of time without having to return the disc when finished. The disc may later be "re-activated" for additional plays upon payment of additional fees. Various companies have announced that they will offer DIVX discs, including Twentieth Century Fox, the Walt Disney Company, Paramount Pictures, Universal Studios and Dream Works. It is our understanding that DIVX discs will not play on non-DIVX DVD players. In addition, NEC, one of Japan's largest electronics manufacturers, has announced its intention to introduce Multimedia Video File (MMDF), an optical disc format which is expected to compete directly with certain applications of DVD technology. Other new announced products include TeraStor's Near Field Recording (NFR) technology and Advanced Storage Magneto-Optical (ASMO). In short, this is an area in which several well-financed suppliers are prepared to compete aggressively with DVD products. Obviously, there also will be competition among those selling DVD products.

Offering a patent license for all essential patents of the three companies under the Proposed Licensing Program will provide several pro-competitive benefits, including (1) reducing the uncertainty of the availability of patent licenses so that those who require a license to manufacture or use a DVD-Video or DVD-ROM product are aware that a license from the three companies easily can be obtained; (2) reducing the royalties that likely would be payable if the three companies licensed their essential patents on their own; (3) reducing the cost for each prospective licensee of determining on its own the identities of owners of essential patents and the entities from which licenses which must be obtained; (4) reducing other transaction costs of licensees having to negotiate and execute separate licenses; (5) reducing the transaction costs of essential patent holders offering separate licenses thereby allowing for a reduction in the price of the license; and (6) offering the same royalty rate and other conditions to all interested licensees so that no entity manufacturing or selling a DVD-Video or DVD-ROM product will have a price advantage over any other such entity as a result of entering into a license for the essential patents of Philips, Sony and Pioneer.

The Proposed Licensing Program will be structured to avoid any countervailing aspects that may be deemed anticompetitive. For example, each patent holder will retain the right to license its patents outside the Proposed Licensing Program under whatever terms and conditions it reaches with any prospective licensee, and each prospective licensee will be informed in writing of its option to negotiate such an individual license under reasonable terms and conditions. The Philips personnel who are responsible for the Proposed Licensing Program will play no role in the marketing of DVD products. An independent expert in the art has been retained to insure that the portfolio of patents that will be licensed under the Program includes only those patents which are essential to DVD-Video and DVD-ROM products. Although Philips, Sony and Pioneer have not been successful in having other companies join their licensing program, they remain willing to include any others having essential patents who wish to join. There will be no royalty payable by the licensee unless a licensed patent would be infringed but for the license, information which the licensee may be required to disclose to monitor infringement and royalty payments will not be disclosed to any of the licensors, but only to a third party expert retained by the licensors, patents included in the licenses will be specifically identified in appendices to the license, and Philips, Sony and Pioneer will commit to licensing to any licensee any essential patent rights they may acquire subsequent to the date specified in the license.

Set forth below is a fuller description of the proposed licensing terms and the agreements among the licensors.

The Proposed Patent License

Two licenses (Appended hereto as Exhibits B and C) will be offered, both in substantially the same form. One is for DVD players, the other for DVD discs. A three page "Agreement" sets forth a few basic terms of the license and also specifically incorporates the "Conditions" of the license which are appended to the Agreement.

On the first page of the Agreement, it is specifically noted that Philips, Sony and Pioneer are each willing to license their respective patent rights for optical disc or player manufacturing whether within or outside the standard DVD specifications on reasonable terms and conditions. Thus, any prospective licensee who is

dissatisfied with the terms of the Proposed Licensing Program is assured of this alternative.

Article 2 of the Conditions sets forth the terms of the license grant, and provides for a license under Licensed Patents which are defined in Article 1.07 as all patent rights pertinent to DVD discs or players which Philips has acquired the right to license, which have or are entitled to a priority date prior to January 1, 1997, and which are essential to DVD discs or players. Article 1.07 goes on to define as "essential" those patents which are necessary as a practical matter for compliance with the DVD-Video or DVD-ROM specifications. The license, therefore, includes not only all patents technically necessary to manufacture a product to the standard specifications, but also those which a typical licensee is likely to require. For example, it may be theoretically possible to design around a particular patent at significant additional cost (and without additional benefit), but few, if any, licensees who pay the standard royalty rate for other essential patents would want such patent excluded from the license. Indeed, it is fair to say that most, if not all, licensees would want such patents included.

Article 2.07 describes the method by which patents are selected for the portfolio license. The prospective licensee is specifically informed that Philips has appointed an independent patent expert to evaluate the patents of the three licensors for "essentiality" and that the portfolio included in the license may be amended from time to time based on the results of that evaluation.^{1/}

In Article 2.03, each licensor agrees to grant a license to each licensee under any essential patent which Philips, Sony or Pioneer acquire the right to license in the future. Thus, to the extent any of the licensors are issued essential patents in the future or other companies join the

^{1/} Philips has appointed Kenneth Rubenstein, a member of Proskauer Rose LLP of New York, to determine which patents are essential and should be included in the license. Dr. Rubenstein received his Ph.D in plasma physics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1975 and his J.D. cum laude from New York Law School in 1982. Dr. Rubenstein previously performed a similar function for the licensing of patents essential to MPEG-2 technology and he continues this work.

proposed licensing program, all licensees are guaranteed a license under any such essential patent.

Articles 2.05 and 2.06 set forth the terms of the licensees' grant of patent rights. For the identical term of the license granted by Philips, Sony and Pioneer, the licensee agrees to grant to the licensors and other licensees (who also agree to the terms of the grant back) a royalty bearing license on essential patents. Thus, the scope of the grant back is virtually identical to the scope of the license itself. The grant back would not create any disincentive to innovate as it specifically allows the licensee to charge a royalty for its grant of a license and would only prevent a particular patent holder from deciding to use its after-acquired patent position to completely block others from competing in a business in which they already have invested substantial resources.

Article 4 sets forth the royalty payments to be made by licensees. The license provides for a \$10,000 payment upon execution of the license (\$5,000 of which may be credited to royalty payments) and a running royalty of \$.05 per disc or 3.5% of the net selling price of a player, with a minimum player payment of \$7.00 until January 1, 2000 and a minimum of \$5.00 thereafter.^{2/}

Article 4 makes plain that no royalties are due unless "a Licensed Patent is utilized" and, therefore, there are no royalty paying obligations regardless of whether the 10-year license is in effect if the licensee has adopted new or different technology that does not utilize any of the patents in the portfolio.

Articles 4.09 and 4.10 provide that licensees must maintain and furnish certain information relevant to issues of infringement and appropriate royalty payments, but specify that such information shall be provided to independent experts rather than to any licensor itself.

The licenses provide for "most favorable nations" terms under which each licensee is assured of receiving the

^{2/} Widespread public reports have suggested that the typical disc will retail for approximately \$20-25. The per disc royalty thus amounts to approximately .22% of the retail price of discs, although the royalty typically will be payable by the disc replicator.

most favorable royalty rate granted any other portfolio licensee under the conditions specified in Article 5. Thus, no similarly situated licensee is given a competitive advantage by the license over any other such licensee.

Article 10.05 gives each licensor the right to withdraw its own patents from the portfolio license with respect to any licensee which both (1) brings a lawsuit against the licensor for infringement of an essential DVD patent and (2) refuses to license such patents to the licensor on fair and reasonable terms. This provision is necessary to prevent portfolio licensees from taking unreasonable and unfair advantage of the fact that each portfolio licensor already has agreed to license its patent on the open, fair and non-discriminatory terms provided in the portfolio license at royalty rates that are likely considerably lower than what would be payable if patents were licensed individually outside the portfolio license.

Without the provisions of Article 10.05, a portfolio licensee could — while enjoying the considerable benefits of the portfolio license — attempt to extract unreasonable terms for licensing its patents as a result of already being licensed under the portfolio license. Article 10.05 merely “evens the playing field,” returns the parties to the bargaining position each would have been in but for the portfolio license, and creates no competitive issues. This is particularly so in light of each portfolio licensors' undertaking to license its patents outside the portfolio license. Thus, a licensee who subjects itself to the provision of Article 10.05 by filing suit and refusing to grant a license on fair and reasonable terms is not denied the right to a license for essential patents, just to a license for essential patents on the favorable terms of the portfolio license.

Finally, Article 11.04 provides that any disputes involving the license shall be submitted to arbitration in New York and resolved under New York law. This provides for a certain and cost effective method to resolve disputes.

Agreement Among Licensors

The agreements among Philips, Sony and Pioneer relating to the Proposed Licensing Program are set forth in two bilateral Agreements and Amendment No. 1 thereto, one between Sony and Philips and one identical agreement between

Pioneer and Philips. The Agreements and Amendments are appended hereto as Exhibit D.

The Agreements basically set forth the terms under which Philips shall license the three companies' essential patents and set out many of the same terms which are incorporated in the licenses itself and are discussed above. The Agreements make plain that the Proposed Licensing Program does not in any way impede the companies' ability to license their patents on their own under any conditions they may negotiate.

Article 2.01 of the Agreement provides that Philips shall offer the portfolio license to "all interested third parties." Article 5 of Amendment No. 1 further specifies that Philips shall grant licenses "to all interested parties and shall not discriminate against or among potential licensees" although Philips is entitled to seek financial guarantees on royalty payments when required. The Agreements also set out various terms for the collection and distribution of royalties. Although Article 4.03 provides that each party may consult with the others in the event of a good faith belief that an act of infringement has occurred, Article 4.04 provides that each party retains the right to enforce its patents as it sees fit.

Article 7 of Amendment No. 1 sets forth the details of the procedure by which Philips shall retain an independent expert to assure that all patents in the portfolio are essential, and provides the procedure under which patents may be added to the Proposed Licensing Program.

Conclusion

It is anticipated that DVD-Video and DVD-ROM applications will gain widespread acceptance among consumers in the United States and throughout the world. Intellectual property rights granted by the United States and other sovereign nations to numerous unrelated entities could seriously delay if not block the introduction of this new and significant technology. The Proposed Licensing Program described above eliminates one potential impediment to the implementation of DVD-Video and DVD-ROM by allowing all essential patents of Philips, Sony and Pioneer to be offered in a single, non-discriminatory, fair and cost effective licensing program. The Proposed Licensing Program has been carefully crafted in an effort to avoid any competition


Honorable Joel I. Klein, Esq.

-9-

concerns which may arise from the combining of patents belonging to independent entities within a single license. We respectfully submit that the Proposed Licensing Program has successfully addressed any competition concerns, and that the pro-competitive aspects of the program far outweigh any potential competition issues which may remain.

We will be available at your convenience to provide any further information you may require. We very much appreciate the Division's attention to this matter.

Respectfully,



Garrard R. Beeney
for Koninklijke Philips
Electronics, N.V.,
Sony Corporation of Japan and
Pioneer Electronic Corporation
of Japan