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> PROCEEDINGS
(Call to order of the court.)
COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Civil Action 20-3010, United States of America, et al., versus Google LLC.

Kenneth Dintzer for the DOJ; William Cavanaugh on behalf of Plaintiff States; John Schmidtlein on behalf of Google.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everyone. I hope everybody is well.

All right. Before we get started, why don't I just inquire of Ms. Waszmer in terms of the one witness, Mr. Vallez, and whether or not you have all been able to resolve the question.

MS. WASZMER: Good morning, Your Honor. With the help of Microsoft counsel, we resolved that late last night. So we anticipate doing everything in open session.

THE COURT: Okay. Terrific.
So with that, I think Ms. Nylen, I believe it is, wished to be heard. But hopefully, that resolves the issue.

MS. NYLEN: That does.
THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate that.
Are we ready to proceed this morning?
MR. CAVANAUGH: We are, Your Honor. Plaintiff States call Jeff Hurst.

JEFFREY HURST, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN
THE COURT: Mr. Hurst, welcome.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Hurst. Could you just please provide your name, and where do you live?
A. Jeffrey Alan Hurst, Austin, Texas.
Q. All right. Mr. Hurst, did we meet last night over Zoom?
A. We did.
Q. Okay. For approximately how long?
A. 40 minutes.
Q. Okay. Are you currently employed?
A. I am not.
Q. What was your last place of employment?
A. Expedia Group.
Q. Okay. What is Expedia Group?
A. Expedia Group is a online travel agent, sells flights and hotels and vacation rentals and cars and other parts of a trip experience.
Q. Does it have various brands?
A. It does.
Q. What are those brands?
A. The primary three brands are expedia.com, Hotels.com, and Vrbo. They operate probably on the order of a dozen other brands around the world such as Travelocity, Orbitz, Hotwire, several smaller ones.
Q. Okay. Could you briefly provide the Court with your educational background, and then we will talk about your work history?
A. I have my undergraduate degree from the University of Texas and my master's from Stanford, master's in business.
Q. Why don't you walk us through your professional experience.
A. Coming out of undergraduate, $I$ was at McKenzie in

San Francisco. Then I was at Levi Strauss in the strategy group. I went to Stanford. After Stanford, I went back to McKenzie for almost three years. From there, I joined HomeAway in 2010 as a director of strategy.
Q. What was HomeAway?
A. HomeAway is a vacation rental marketplace that consisted of, I think, 15 or 20 consumer-facing brands, largest among them at the time VRBO, which subsequently became Vrbo.

And then I was at HomeAway until 2015 as the chief strategy officer, when it was bought by Expedia Group, and I stayed at Expedia Group as the chief commercial officer of HomeAway, then the president of HomeAway, then the co-lead of marketing for Expedia Group, and then the chief operating officer for Expedia Group.
Q. Okay. When did you become the chief operating officer?
A. I think it would have been around June or July of ' 21.
Q. And I think you said prior to that, you were co-lead of marketing --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for Expedia Group? Roughly what time period was that?
A. March of ' 20 would have been when I started, and then transitioned from that role to the COO role.
Q. And at Vrbo, you were the president. When did you become president?
A. I think it was November of '19.
Q. And then prior to that, you were in various positions with Vrbo?
A. Yeah. I was the chief commercial officer for quite some time, which managed our supply acquisition teams and what we called retail, which was a general management function.
Q. Okay. Does Expedia Group have what's known as inventory partners?
A. We do, providers who provide us hotel content or airline content or cars or vacation rentals.
Q. Okay. When a user searches on one of Expedia Group's websites or apps., where do those query results come from? A. All of the results are via contracts we've signed with those inventory providers. So it could be an individual homeowner, all the way through a company like American Airlines or Marriott.
Q. And I should have asked you, what does Vrbo do?
A. Vrbo is a online travel agent that specializes in vacation rentals. And so it's where you would book a whole home for your
family as opposed to potentially a flight or a hotel.
THE COURT: I'm sorry. Did I hear you say Vrbo is a member of the Expedia Group? In other words, it's one of the subs?

THE WITNESS: It is. It was acquired in December of 2015.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. How does Expedia Group generate revenue?
A. Primary source of revenue is commission by providing bookings to their inventory partners.
Q. Okay. Does Expedia generate revenue from noncommission sources, such as advertising?
A. Yes, I think a small portion.
Q. Okay. How small a portion?
A. Single-digit percentage.
Q. Single digits in terms of overall revenue?
A. In terms of overall Expedia's revenue, it would be a single-digit percentage.
Q. What group would handle the advertising that would appear on an Expedia website?
A. The internal team responsible for selling. It is called media solutions.
Q. Okay. Were you responsible for that group?
A. I was not.
Q. Within Expedia Group, are you familiar with the travel leadership team?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you explain to the judge what that is?
A. Travel leadership team is the top executive team at Expedia Group. It consists of Barry Diller, the executive chairman, Peter Kern, the CEO, and then direct reports of Peter Kern.
Q. Were you a member of TLT?
A. Starting in November of '19.
Q. Okay. Did TLT meet regularly?
A. Typically, weekly.
Q. And what were the purpose of those meetings?
A. Discuss weekly -- weekly results and upcoming priorities, anything we needed to collaborate on.
Q. And when did you start attending those weekly meetings?
A. November of '20 -- sorry, November of '19.
Q. That's when you became president of --
A. President of Vrbo was the first time I was a standing member of travel leadership team. I would have attended sporadically prior to that, kind of at invitation.
Q. When you attended TLT meetings, including various roles you had at Vrbo, would you learn information about the other Expedia Group brands?
A. Yes.
Q. How so?
A. How so?
Q. Yes.
A. A large portion of that meeting and the offshoots of it, which we'd call quarterly business reviews or our strategy and planning process, are -- you know, in particular in advance of 2020 was to exchange pattern across the brands to see if there was something happening at Hotels.com that could inform what we did at Vrbo, or potentially something we had learned at Vrbo that could inform what we did at Expedia Group.
Q. I'm going to turn to a different topic.

Are you familiar with -- strike that.
Does Expedia Group engage in digital advertising?
A. Yes, we do.
Q. Okay. What types of digital advertising?
A. We organized our -- I would say at this point most of the advertising is probably digital in some form. The channels we would have looked at, search engine marketing, which is basically the text ads at the top of Google, and then we would have called it meta providers. So that would be Trip Advisor or Kayak or Google's meta product. We would have then had social spend, mainly through meta but also -- meta brands but also TikTok, that would have largely been -- all been digital.

We would have then had display advertising and affiliate spend. Some of our branded media, so think like a traditional commercial, would be digital in nature in that it might be
running on a streaming service, but we think of that a little bit differently from the prior channels.
Q. All right. Let's focus initially on search engine advertising.

Would those be general search engines?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the United States, what would that encompass?
A. It would have been Google. Technically, I think it would have been Google and Bing, but the only thing we ever would have talked about was Google.
Q. Okay. So can you give me a sense of proportionality between Google and Bing digital advertising?
A. Something like 10 to 1, I think, yeah, something like 10 to 1 in favor of Google.
Q. I think you mentioned this already. Did Expedia buy text ads on Google?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. In terms of the various channels you've mentioned, how much did Expedia invest in search engine marketing compared to the other marketing channels?
A. Search engine marketing was the largest source of spend.
Q. Okay. Why did Expedia Group do most of its spend on search engine marketing?
A. It's where the most travelers are, and so there isn't a great substitute for the volume of high-intent customers you can
find on Google. And so when we think about it, you know, someone is in Google and has actively typed a query which gives you reason to believe they might be booking travel. And so it's more valuable to us than a lot of the other opportunities.
Q. Is that what you mean by "high intent"?
A. Yes. So if you think of the ingredients for Expedia's site to work, you basically need to know where they're going, how many people are going, and the dates, and that query would generally tell us where they're trying to go, either conceptually, like a beach, or specifically, you know, Washington, D.C.
Q. Now, you also mentioned meta providers. Can you explain to us what you mean by that?
A. Yes. When we talk about meta, it's basically a price comparison engine. Google hotels or Google travel, Google flights, Trip Advisor, Skyscanner, Trivago, Kayak, you know.

There's -- Google is the largest among them, and then there are several others that compete in the space. We would work with probably all of them.
Q. And would Expedia brands buy ads on those --
A. Yes.
Q. In those channels? Focusing on --

THE COURT: I'm sorry to interrupt. Just to be clear, on those platforms, when you say you purchased ads, do you mean digital ads, or does that also include paying to participate in
the price comparison process?
THE WITNESS: In the meta channels, it is primarily an auction. And so you're paying to participate in the process. I'm sure some of the meta products have a, call it, version of ads that might feel like a display ad or something. But overwhelmingly, the spend is to basically bid to have your price show up for a specific hotel.

So in general, it would be something like the Hilton in Washington, D.C., and then there might be five or six price points below it, and different providers had bid to show up as one of those price points.

THE COURT: All right. So if I -- I've used Kayak, for example, and go to Kayak and Washington, D.C. hotels, and results, and in order to appear on that results page, there's an auction, and you participate in the auction, and if you are displayed, you pay whatever auction price that you pay?

THE WITNESS: If you are clicked instead of displayed, but yes.

BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. So let me just clarify. For the meta ads we were just talking about, for Google, does that appear on the SERP?
A. So it would -- I would say overwhelmingly for a travel query, you would expect to see a Google meta product. It wouldn't be unanimously, but overwhelmingly.
Q. But to get to the ad, does the ad appear on a SERP?
A. I think you would see, you know, a map with a bunch of dots, maybe prices on the dots, and then you would see a handful of properties. You wouldn't know it was an ad until you clicked it and then you were in the Google travel experience, where you would see more, you know -- essentially, more provider names.
Q. Are you familiar with the term "SEM"?

THE COURT: Just to make sure I understand, on Google specifically, what you're talking about, what we've called verticals, in other words, there's sort of a vertical for travel, and there are text ads that can appear and hotels in D.C. there can be a text ad that appears at the top. But you're talking about the verticals that would actually have specific hotels and perhaps a map that accompanies the search? Is that what you're referring to?

THE WITNESS: Yes. You would -- as a consumer, you would mainly experience it as a map. That's how you would know it was something different. Most travel queries will have like four, it could be less, text ads. And then you will see a map. The map will have a couple of hotels or products on the left, dots. Clicking anything in the map takes you to the Google Travel product.

Whereas, clicking the four links above it would take you to usually a nonGoogle product. It could be Expedia or Booking or Vrbo or anyone else that won that auction.

Then below the map, you would see what we call organic
results, which are the unpaid placements in Google.
THE COURT: I see. And your payment for a click would come where in that --

THE WITNESS: The largest source of spend would be those top four ads, where we're paying for a text link that takes you into one of our brand properties.

And then not that far behind would be what we call that map treatment or meta providers, where we would be paying, once you clicked off the search engine results page on Google into the Google product and then if you clicked one of the price points that said Expedia or Hotels.com, that's when we would be monetized.

THE COURT: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. Are you familiar with the term "SEM"?
A. Yes.
Q. What does that stand for?
A. Search engine marketing, which are typically the top four text ads I referenced.
Q. And are you familiar with the term "SEO"?
A. Yes.
Q. What does that reference?
A. Search engine optimization, which is the term used for getting more out of the organic, or free, results that were
below the map in the description I provided.
Q. And if we see those terms in Expedia documents, that's what those would be referring to?
A. Yes. It's very common shorthand for us.
Q. Can a consumer go directly to Expedia's website and enter the same information they enter on Google?
A. Could you elaborate?
Q. Are there differences -- I saw a reference in your deposition where you refer to Google saw things that OTAs hadn't.
A. So Google can respond to any query that you type into its text box. I'm not aware of it ever saying sorry, we don't have an idea what that is. And so you can put in, you know, "top beach hotel in Miami" or "best place with a view in the Caribbean" or a "family of five trying to go somewhere with a Labradoodle." Any of those will return a result.

Expedia only works with structured queries. And so you have to basically say where you're going, what dates you're going, and how many people are going in order for it to return results from its inventory of supply partners.

Whereas, Google's returning results from anything it has scraped on the Internet. And so it has a much wider aperture for what a valid query is than Expedia would or Vrbo.
Q. Okay. Let me just go back to the ads for the meta product in the immersives.

In your view, is there a difference between Google text ads and those ads with respect to users' intent?
A. Typically, I would say the meta or map product has more intent, and at a very coarse level, it's because they gave us more ingredients to fulfill one of our queries.

So for the Google meta product to be accurate, it also needs location, dates, and ideally number of people in the party.

Once you have those three things, they can pass it to us to where we're providing a more accurate result, and it's typically a signal someone's closer to a booking occasion.
Q. And so the user has provided that information?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your view, is that reflecting the user's intent?
A. Yes.
Q. Does Expedia Group -- on what does Expedia Group spend more money on, Google text ads or these ads in the immersives?
A. Text ads.
Q. By what proportion?
A. It's probably on the order of, if you combined them, two-thirds text/one-third meta, but that's an obviously dated estimate.
Q. You also mentioned purchase of ads on social media platforms.

What kind of ads?
A. On a social media platform, Facebook or Instagram, we're more buying an audience. So we're trying to typically short firm video in front of an audience that the social media provider or platform has qualified as maybe being interested in a type of travel.

So we basically pick a set of characteristics, and then we run video ads in front of them, usually with the goal of getting them to download our app. and engage with our product.

On the flip side, when we think about Google, we're more buying a query. So someone has expressed intent, and we're trying to buy them at that moment of intent to get them interested in our product.

So the ads look a lot different, but even the theory behind them is pretty different.
Q. And what is that difference based on?
A. It's based -- it's really based on intent and where someone is in a purchase decision. We don't know in a social channel -we would rarely know in a social channel if someone is trying to book travel right now. We would know they have an affinity for it. Maybe they're interacting with different groups or different ads. But we wouldn't be as likely to know I'm trying to go to Miami October 20th through 22nd, which is kind of the most information you would know in Google and a pretty frequent use case in Google.
Q. Let me ask you about direct traffic to Expedia.

How does Expedia define direct traffic?
A. It's basically anyone who goes directly to our URL, so types it in or opens the app. from their mobile device.
Q. So when a user navigates directly to expedia.com, is that considered direct traffic?
A. It is.
Q. Okay. What about if they just put in "Expedia"?
A. You know, it kind of depends on the browser. Someone could start typing "Expedia" into most browsers, and depending on whether they're on a phone or a desktop, so say Chrome on a desktop probably gives you a dropdown list. One of them might take you directly to expedia.com. One of them might be "search Google for Exped," because you haven't finished it, and then there would be other options. If you click on something other than direct to expedia.com, it will put you frequently in the Google search results page, which could have a link directly to Expedia that's free or could have a paid link, because our competitors or we may be bidding on that term on Google.
Q. When a -- when a user clicks on one of the organic links, is that considered direct traffic?
A. No. We would characterize that as SEO traffic for our internal tracking.
Q. When you were at Expedia, was Expedia able to grow its direct channel?
A. Yes, it grew in absolute terms. I don't think it grew a
lot in relative terms. It would have varied a little bit by brand property.
Q. Okay. How would that vary?
A. We had, I think, towards the end of my tenure more luck getting people direct into Vrbo than we had on expedia.com or Hotels.com, but none of them were, I'd say, really meaningful shifts. Like, it wasn't as though the mix shifted five or ten points. I think single digits was considered a very big success, and I think on Vrbo, especially moving to ad, we might have achieved single digits.
Q. Did any increases that you observed in direct traffic impact what Expedia had to spend on search engine marketing?
A. No, I don't think so. The use case maybe. If people are searching for our brand more often, it's a little cheaper to buy it on Google, but in general, I think the amount we were paying Google rose pretty consistently with how the business was performing.

I don't recall meetings where we were so enthusiastic about our direct traffic that we were, oh, we can spend less on Google now. That wasn't really the trade-off.
Q. Did you consider advertising on Google as essential?
A. Yes.
Q. Why?
A. It's where all the intent is. There's not a -- there's not an opportunity to go buy that many high-intent consumers to
introduce them to your product anywhere else.
MR. CAVANAUGH: Your Honor, may I approach? We have a few documents.

BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. Mr. Hurst, did there come a time when Google introduced a vacation rental unit to appear on its SERP?
A. Did there come a time when Google introduced a vacation rental unit on SERP? Yes.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you to turn to PSXD07, a demonstrative. This is a search one of my colleagues conducted on "vacation rental Saratoga Springs, New York."

And we see at the top, is that a Vrbo text ad?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. Would Vrbo have paid more for that top spot?
A. Yes. Google's generally a second-price auction. So each spot higher in the order is more expensive.
Q. And if we can scroll down, so you have, I think, four -Peter, if you could go back up a little bit.

You have three text ads, and then what appears below that?
A. Below the three text ads is the -- what we would call the vacation rentals meta product.
Q. Okay. And then if we could just go below that, are these the organic links?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And is Vrbo the top --
A. Yes, we are.
Q. Okay. Now, if you had anticipated -- would you anticipate that for something like this type of search, that Vrbo would come near the top in the organic links?
A. I would.
Q. Why?
A. We -- in particular -- I haven't been to Saratoga Springs, New York, but in general for leisure destinations, Vrbo typically has a high SEO rank because we have a lot of inventory and have a long-established business.

Now, it would have been more the case that we were at the top earlier in my tenure, you know. We are -- Vrbo is less frequently there today than they were years ago.
Q. And why is that?
A. I don't exactly know.
Q. Okay. Was there more competition?
A. I think there's -- there's certainly more competition from Airbnb than there would have been a decade ago. I think there are, you know, maybe more people trying to optimize for those results, but I'm not sure. I just know that what used to be a larger portion of our traffic became smaller.
Q. If you anticipated that you were going to be at or near the top of the organic links, why then buy a text ad?
A. So if the organic links were on top, you wouldn't. You have to basically -- think of like the Google universe as
finite. A certain number of people are going to enter this search term or any other. And you're basically doing two part science/one part art of how often are they going to make it all the way down the page to your organic results. And depending on your calculus there, you decide what position you want to be buying on top to increase the likelihood that people come to your property.

And so you're thinking about the return on the dollar spent and the incrementality of that dollar spent as to whether you're going to buy position 1, 2, or 3, and that's over and over.

The same would go for the meta product.
Q. So let's go to the -- if we could scroll back up to the vacation rental unit.

Did Vrbo -- at one time, did Vrbo appear in the vacation rental unit?
A. Early in the product's development, we would have been most of the inventory in the unit.
Q. Did there come a time when Vrbo withdrew from the vacation rental unit?
A. Yes. That was in 2020.
Q. And why did it withdraw?
A. So we were -- we had collaborated, we had partnered with Google quite a bit on the development of it with the premise, you know, from our account team at Google that this was going to be a new highly invested placement, it was going to be a big
opportunity for us to capture, you know, more Google share, and it was going to be free at the beginning. And so we were working with them to build this.

As we build it, we're not getting quite the results we were hoping for out of it, and at the same time, they started talking about how they were going to introduce paid features within it.

We, based a little bit on the other brands' experience with the hotels product and the flights product, came to the conclusion that it was not going to be in our best interest to help build a product that was essentially going to cannibalize what was below the page.

And so if every time Google introduces something paid, fewer people end up getting to the organic results, it's not always obvious that helping them to build that out is in your best interest, because you've got to think about the alternative for a user's click.
Q. You mentioned other experiences in Hotel. Can you explain to the Court what you are referencing?
A. Both the Google Hotel product, which looks similar to this in a search experience, but separately the Google Flight product, which is kind of all of the flight results.
Q. If you could turn to in your binder PSXD08.

My colleague did a search for "where to stay in Buffalo," to which I would probably say New York City, but the -- if we look at this, Vrbo again has a text ad at the top?
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, would a search like this, would this embrace hotels as well?
A. Yes. This is a more generic search term, so kind of -- I would think of it as all lodging is relevant. And you can bid -- vacation rentals could bid on hotels or vice versa, but you're typically trying to match the intent that someone typed into the search browser.
Q. And if we can scroll down to "where to stay/Buffalo, New York," is this the hotel unit? Is this Google's hotel unit?
A. Yes, it is. On the prior one, it said "properties" at the bottom, and on this one, it says "hotels." That's kind of the distinction you would use to tell which one you're in.
Q. You were referring back to the prior, PSX07?
A. 07 says "properties" at the bottom of it, and this one says "hotels."
Q. Can Expedia appear in the hotel unit?
A. We wouldn't appear on the first page, but if you clicked into it, the second page could have us as price points.
Q. Okay. And why couldn't you appear on the first page?
A. I don't think we're eligible to.
Q. Okay. Would the same thing be true with respect to Vrbo in the hotels unit?
A. In the hotels unit, yes. And so we're kind of like -we're a price point behind the lodging provider, you know, one
of these three options. We're a price point behind it. We're not on the first page.
Q. Let's turn to a related topic. Are you familiar with the term "customer acquisition cost"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What does that mean in your business?
A. Customer acquisition cost is the amount of money you're spending to acquire a new customer. So there's a return on spend in incrementality. It's talking more about your incrementality.
Q. If you could turn to PSX0113, and if you could identify this document for us.
A. This is an e-mail I sent to our executive chairman shortly after I became president of Vrbo in December of 2019.

MR. CAVANAUGH: Your Honor, we would move 113 into evidence.

```
MS. MAIER: No objection.
THE COURT: It will be admitted.
(Exhibit PSX0113 received into evidence.)
BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
```

Q. There's a chart on the second page of this. If you could explain to the Court -- did you prepare this chart?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What was the purpose of it, and what is it showing?
A. Well, the purpose of it, it wasn't actually for Barry. I
prepared this chart for Google, shared it with Google, and then subsequently shared it with Barry.

The purpose of it in the context of, I guess, both the original conversation and with Barry was to describe whether or not our partnership with Google was actually serving our interests.

And so this is a Vrbo-specific set of data that is describing how many visits we got from the combination of text ads or SEM at the top of Google results and SEO or free placements near the bottom of Google results.

What we found in going through this was we had basically seen a flat amount of volume from Google over a greater than four-year period. While over that four-year period, we went to spending about ten times as much to get the same thing as we did originally in 2015.

We made a very large and -- very large investment, people wise and money wise, with Google. And I don't think we actually ended up getting anything incremental in return.

This was basically a preamble to the decision not to partner going forward on the map product, because we thought it had the potential to exacerbate this trend.
Q. And so if we look at this in 2016, Vrbo was spending $\$ 43$ million and getting 507 million visits? Is that the right way to read this?
A. That is the right way to read it.
Q. All right. And then four years later, you have fewer visits and a spend of $\$ 272$ million?
A. I think the bullet points in the e-mail are probably the more accurate apples to apples.
Q. Okay. Why don't we go back to that.
A. 2019, the bar chart is year to date. The estimate for the full year at the time we prepared this was that we were going to spend 290 million for a little bit less than 500 million.

And these data points also include an estimate for 2015.
We did not have as robust a data set there. We know we spent 21 million, but we didn't have an exact visits number.

So I think of the most -- kind of the beginning and ending of the story from this standpoint is 21 million for 500 million visits versus $\$ 290$ million for less than 500 million visits.
Q. Now, with respect to the other brands --

THE COURT: So to what do you attribute the trend? THE WITNESS: So think about the -- over this time horizon, there's a couple of dynamics. One is, the Google search results page itself is changing. And so more and more inventory and real estate are going to those text ads at the top. Maybe there used to be -- I don't remember exactly in 2015. At some point, they were on the right, not the top. So the stuff on the right shifts to the top. Maybe it's one ad or two ads become four ads.

Then as you introduce the map, you're now in a place to
where, in particular on a mobile device, you may scroll three times before you get to what we called SEO opportunity, an SEO link. And so as the composition of the page changes, there's less traffic going to SEO.

Separately, as auction participants increase, then you have both more links and a higher cost within the SEM structure above.

In this time horizon, the meta product's not really included as a source of spend or traffic, but it would have been potentially starting to capture why there's fewer SEO visits below it.

THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. To follow up on a point you just made, the numbers we're looking at for 2019, did that include clicks from the vacation rental -- your ads on a vacation rental meta products?
A. No. We would have characterized that as meta channel as opposed to as SEO.
Q. Now, if we had included that, would it materially change these numbers?
A. No. It was de minimis. It would have been no incremental spend and marginal incremental visits.
Q. Okay. What conclusions did you draw from this analysis?
A. That we had spent a heck of a lot of money on Google for no incremental business value.
Q. Okay. Did you discuss this with Google?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. In what context?
A. We had a meeting at Phocuswright a month or two prior to this e-mail -- I think Phocuswright is in November, so it's probably November -- about kind of -- we had meetings with Google all the time. So we had a partnership meeting. This one had a standard agenda of how are things going and then also what our plans were for participation in their vacation rental map product or meta product.

I led the meeting by basically describing to them, in my new role as president, I was concerned that our robust partnership with Google had produced these results. We hadn't really looked at this way. All of the Google dialogue centers around your paid conversation. There's not really a mechanism to talk about unpaid or pay changes. There's a mechanism to talk about how you spend more in text ads and how you spend more on meta or how you spend more in YouTube or how you spend more in any other Google product.

And I brought it up with the group, you know. Kind of looks of awkward who is going to say something next. And it was hey, let's take this separately under consideration and move on to the agenda, which was frustrating.

And then separately, the meeting notes they published made no reference to the first ten minutes of my conversation with
the group on this topic, which was exceedingly frustrating.
And coming out of that, reached out to the account manager, why is this not a topic? Oh, they're in my detailed notes, we're going to get back to you.

I just felt like I was stuck in the Google attorney crack and was unlikely to come out, and that's where I, you know, kind of decided -- that's when I, which was different than we, thought we were no longer going to participate in that product, but we needed to find a different way to partner with Google.
Q. In your chart, this is just Vrbo spend on Google; correct?
A. This is.
Q. If we were to look at the spend for Expedia brands as a whole, would it be --
A. Much larger.
Q. Okay. Based on your work at Expedia brands when you were co-lead of marketing and COO, were the other brands continuing to invest heavily in Google Ads?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Were they experiencing the same things you were experiencing?
A. I think the same overall dynamic, although they were further along in the evolution in that the hotel meta product was very well-established. You would expect it to always be on the page. Whereas, the vacation rental product in this time was more in trial. And so I think we were earlier in the curve of
seeing the search results page change to four links and a map. Whereas, they were already past that point in the curve. It was kind of always four links and a map.
Q. If you could look at PSX00112.

And could you identify this document?
A. This is the follow-on e-mail thread from the meeting at Phocuswright with the Google account team.
Q. Let me just go back to what we were just discussing. We were talking about the other Expedia brands. After 2019 and after you did this analysis, did Vrbo keep spending on text ads? A. Yes.
Q. Why?
A. It was the -- there's not a replacement for the volume and intent of consumers.
Q. So let's go back to 112. I think before I interrupted you you were describing this.

THE COURT: Can I interrupt and ask another question.
Hypothesize with me, if you would, a world in which there was a search engine that was as equally -- equal competitor to Google. What's that world look like for online travel companies like Expedia?

THE WITNESS: If there were another, say, equal-sized general search engine?

THE COURT: Right.
THE WITNESS: I think you would -- so what it would
mean for us internally is that we wouldn't spend all of our time in general search focused on what Google says we should focus on, you know, their definition of a consumer journey, their definition of new data products, their definition. We have to be very present there and, in many cases, kind of following cue of what they think the next thing is.

In a world where there were two equals, we would have more opportunity to, say, partner with the alternative on a different way to approach text ads or a different treatment or, you know, more likely highlighting different parts of a value proposition.

So I think the -- my understanding of what really makes Google thrive is they commoditize a category. They turn it into a price point. And if you can turn something into a price point, it's very easy to create an auction, because the auction is just rewarding the next commodity that pays more.

In a world where there's two doing different things, you might have an opportunity in our case to highlight a loyalty program or to highlight customer service or to make more of the experience about the thing that you sell that is unique beyond having a low price.

And I think you -- it's a reasonable but not perfect analogy to think of, you know -- not too far ago, you said you were a Kayak user -- that Kayak and Trip Advisor and Trivago and Skyscanner were kind of known for different things in the meta space, even though they had a functionally similar problem they
were solving. And you could have seen that same type of evolution with other general search engines, where maybe one is more focused on reviews and trust, as Trip Advisor would have been, and one may be more focused on price, like a Google or a Trivago in that case.

So it's hard to know exactly how it would have played out, but I think you would have had more consumer differentiation and more innovation at the OTA and provider level to compete within those search results.

THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. Just to follow up on the judge's question, you've testified about concerns you had regarding the vacation rental unit and the hotel unit created by Google.

In the hypothetical world the judge was just describing, does an alternative give you options?
A. Yes.
Q. How so?
A. It -- you don't end up -- it gives you options in that there's a different type of partnership that could exist with two, three, or four equal players in terms of them having an incentive to build something with you and you having an incentive to try something different.

And that collaboration is rare with a kind of one-sided partnership as I experienced with Google, where you're more
frequently listening to what they say you need to do as opposed to having an open audience around what you could do together. Q. Let's go back to 112. Could you just describe what this is.
A. So you probably need to read from the back forward. The second-to-last page is an e-mail from one of the participants on the Google account management team that is summarizing the meeting where $I$ led by providing the data set referenced in the e-mail we just looked at for Barry Diller.
Q. Let me just stop you so we can get this into evidence.

Are these e-mails that you sent to Google and Google responded to you?
A. Google sent the first e-mail as a summary of the meeting we had at Phocuswright, and then I think I forward it to our account lead, which is page 4 in this e-mail chain. No, sorry, it's page 3 in the e-mail chain.

So we had an e-mail summarizing the meeting from Tony.
Then we had an e-mail that is adding additional context from our account manager, Shaun, who I don't think was personally in the meeting, and then we had my reply expressing frustration with why the Google notes did not reference what I thought was the most important part of the meeting.

MR. CAVANAUGH: Your Honor, we would move 112 into evidence.

MS. MAIER: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.
(Exhibit PSX112 received into evidence.)
BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. Let's turn to Bates page 1407. It's in the bottom right-hand corner, the number, the second page of the document. This is your response to Shaun.

You say, "The summary notes miss the main point of emphasis on my end from the discussion. Basically, since 2015, Vrbo is spending 10X as much with Google (entire entity) and receiving fewer visits than in 2015 (including SEO). During the same time frame, our marketplace (and revenue) is up about 3X."

Could you explain to the Court what the source of your dissatisfaction was?
A. So in a time horizon where our business -- you know, think about revenue grew three times, our spend with Google grew ten times. And given that the volume of traffic we were getting from Google had basically been flat, then our 3 X growth is not actually aided that much by Google, even though we're spending ten times as much money with them.

And so, you know, in particular in the context of them asking to support a paid product that was another means to monetize our relationship, it felt quite unyielding that this was my experience and the next ask was may I have another. Q. Did Shaun respond to you?
A. Yes. That's the lower right, ending in 7. "All captured
in more detailed notes I received."
Q. If we look at the e-mail above, he states, "At a high level, agree on the cost per visit increases, but we've also substantially increased revenue per visit during that same time frame, which obfuscates a bit of how unprofitable, I believe, the program was in 2015."

What was your reaction to this statement?
A. This was frustrating.
Q. Why?
A. So the use of we, as in Google and Vrbo, had substantially increased revenue per visit was a falsehood to me.

We, Vrbo, had changed our business model, largely
influenced by the need to be more competitive on Google. So we had changed our business model in order to charge a traveler service fee and become a commission site. Previously, we were a subscription site. So kind of a flat all you can use, paid by the homeowner.

And so us having grown 3 X during this time horizon, you know, would have happened with or without Google's partnership. It was influenced by our need to spend more on Google, but it would have happened regardless.

And so the point that we got more profitable, so they deserved more, was meritless to me. They don't just empirically deserve to make more money when we make more money and, in particular, not ten times as much money when we make three times
as much money.
And so it was a -- this was a challenge. I think it was within a few months after this Shaun was, not at request, removed from the account. We kind of did not work with him again.
Q. Could Expedia brands forego advertising on Google?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. It wouldn't be consistent with the way we create value for our marketplace and shareholders by growing our business. Growing without Google from where we start is not -- I don't think it's mathematically possible.
Q. Could Expedia brands reasonably shift ad spend from Google to Bing?
A. We could, you know -- at a 10-to-1 ratio, and let's assume maybe we've got a similar share in each, I don't think there is a way to shift enough spend to Bing to make up for that gap. I'm actually very confident there is not a way to spend that much money in Bing and find all the travelers you had in Google by using one instead of the other.

MR. CAVANAUGH: Nothing further, Your Honor. I pass the witness.

THE COURT: All right. I take it that DOJ has no questions of this witness? MS. BELLSHAW: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

MS. MAIER: Good morning, Your Honor. Gloria Maier for Google.

THE COURT: Ms. Maier.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. MAIER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Hurst.
A. Good morning. We've met before.
Q. Yes. It's good to meet you in person. We met previously at your deposition. I guess that was a year and a half ago now. A. That seems right.
Q. Yes. So, Expedia Group we've talked about a bit today. Expedia Group is a publicly traded company; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you mentioned Expedia Group has had 3X growth?
A. No. Vrbo, in the time horizon described in that e-mail, had experienced 3X growth.
Q. Okay. Expedia Group also has experienced growth over the past -- let's say from 2014 to the present?
A. Yes.
Q. And we -- so I think is it fair to say that from 2014 to 2018, Expedia Group's revenues doubled?
A. Not knowing specifically, it is certainly fair to say it grew.
Q. Okay. And, you know, we looked at an exhibit previously together. I'm going to show that one to you again today.
A. Great.

MS. MAIER: May I approach?
THE COURT: Of course.
BY MS. MAIER:
Q. All right. So Mr. Hurst, if you could turn to DX0273 in that binder.
A. Yes.
Q. This is an Expedia Group presentation from February of 2019 .

This has been admitted into evidence, Your Honor.
So Mr. Hurst, Expedia posts information like this on its investors website; correct?
A. Yes.

THE COURT: Is this something we can put up on the screen?

MS. MAIER: Yes. We can put up DX0273.
BY MS. MAIER:
Q. So Mr. Hurst, to go back to my question, Expedia posts this kind of information on their investors website?
A. Yes.
Q. So Expedia, as a publicly traded company, has a page that has all of their SEC filings, their earnings statements, financial presentations like this?
A. Yeah. It would typically be updated quarterly or ad hoc for specific events.
Q. Okay. So this is one of those presentations. And if you look at slide 9 of this presentation, this shows certain metrics for the Expedia Group as a whole, including revenue and gross bookings.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And so for revenue, Expedia Group's revenue doubled from 2014 to 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. And so did Expedia Group's gross bookings?
A. Yes. It's a little bit win dated. So from '15 to '16, we would have added Vrbo to the group. So that's why it kind of pops more in that year, because there's an acquisition. But yes.
Q. And so these charts cover most of the time period that's reflected in the e-mail that you were discussing with Mr. Cavanaugh; correct?
A. One year earlier in these charts, but most of the time period, yes.
Q. And the e-mail that you were discussing goes through 2019; correct?
A. I think through the third quarter of 2019 .
Q. And it's true that Expedia's revenues were also higher in 2019 than they were in 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. So notwithstanding the information that you set forth in that e-mail that went to Google, 2014 to 2019 was a period of growth for the Expedia Group?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think we've discussed today that Vrbo is the vacation rental brand of the Expedia Group; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you mentioned that during this period of time, Vrbo in particular faced increasing competition from Airbnb?
A. Yes.
Q. And when it comes to getting traffic through search engines, Vrbo prefers to get free clicks from the organic results; correct?
A. We prefer SEO to SEM, yes.
Q. And so by SEO, you mean --
A. Free below, you know, below the paid ads, yes.
Q. And those are more valuable because it's a higher-profit click to Vrbo?
A. Yeah, the -- it's not necessarily a more valuable shopper so much as it is that we didn't pay to bring them in.
Q. And the basic -- am I right that the basic concern expressed in your e-mail was that Vrbo was getting less free traffic from Google's organic results from that period of time, and more traffic from Google was coming through the ads?
A. There would have been two dynamics. So that dynamic would
have been true. But the other dynamic would have been what it cost to get the ads out of the paid environment. So there's shift from unpaid to paid, and then there's increase in cost within paid.
Q. So Vrbo was buying a lot more ads in 2019 than it was in 2015?
A. We were definitely spending more. Now, I think the cost per click would have gone up. So there wouldn't have been a linear relationship. So buying more ads and spending even more.
Q. But part of the dynamic was buying more ads?
A. Yes.
Q. And so when it comes -- I think with Mr. Cavanaugh you discussed how Vrbo may appear on the Google search results page and where Vrbo may appear in the organic listings.

Is it fair to say that when it comes to those organic results, Vrbo does not necessarily show up first?
A. Yes, it's fair to say we don't always show up first.
Q. And there are a lot of other websites that may appear above Vrbo in those organic results?
A. Yes.
Q. And Google has ranking systems that determine order of those organic search results?
A. I presume so. I would never have been given access to them.
Q. Bu do you know generally that things like relevance to the
query matters to where you would show up in those results?
A. Yes.
Q. And also quality factors, like site speed and landing page quality?
A. Yes.
Q. And so Vrbo essentially has to compete to show up at a higher position in those organic results?
A. Yes.
Q. And I want to pull up a demonstrative now, it's been marked for identification DXD18, at page 2. I believe we have copies that we can hand out, but we will also put that on the screen. Your Honor, may I approach? THE COURT: You may. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. MAIER:
Q. So Mr. Cavanaugh showed you some example search results page. This is another such example.

You will agree that the search results page is dynamic? It doesn't necessarily look the same, depending upon where you're searching, but it's dynamic?
A. I think it's dynamic on dimensions other than just the term. I think it also takes into account the user's behavior, but I'm not sure.
Q. And so in this particular example, this is a search for "vacation rentals, Boulder, Colorado." And in this particular
example, you see that Google's vacation rental module appears on the top; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. This particular sample does not include ads above it; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then below it, you see that there are a number of organic results; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so in this example, it includes -- I see six here. So there are five results that appear above the Vrbo result in this example?
A. Yes.
Q. And so this one includes Kayak, HomeToGo, FlipKey, Trip Advisor, and Airbnb; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so when it comes from Vrbo's perspective, Vrbo is competing for user attention with everything on this page; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that includes the vacation rentals unit at the top of the page?
A. It does.
Q. And then if we can go to the next page of the demonstrative, marked as page 3, Mr. Hurst, this is another
example SERP. This one is for "places to stay in Asheville, North Carolina."

Do you see that?
A. It is.
Q. And so for this one, there are two ads at the top. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. The top one is for Trip Advisor; the one below it is for Vrbo?
A. Yes.
Q. And in this instance, Vrbo has chosen to bid for that ad on Google's SERP?
A. Yes.
Q. And Vrbo will pay for that if a user clicks on it?
A. Yes.
Q. But Vrbo is still competing with Trip Advisor to gain that click up at the top of the page?
A. Correct.
Q. And Vrbo is also competing with, below it, the places to stay unit that shows information about potential places to stay? A. I do not think we're in that "places to stay" unit. It looks like it says "hotels" there.
Q. But Vrbo is competing for user attention with the information being displayed there?
A. Yes.
Q. And there are also -- just looking at sort of above the fold on this search results page on this example, we only see two organic results; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And Vrbo does not appear among those organic results?
A. They do not.
Q. So in order to receive the preferred prominent placement on the page, Vrbo has chosen to bid for an ad?
A. Yes.
Q. And we've mentioned competition with Airbnb, but in general, is it fair to say that Expedia's brands, including Vrbo, compete in intensely competitive markets?
A. Yes.
Q. And so we saw that Expedia Group was growing during this time period; correct? But Airbnb was also growing during this time period; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Airbnb was growing at an even higher growth rate than the Expedia Group brands were?
A. I don't know for sure. They went public later. But it is my opinion they were probably growing faster than us.
Q. And you do -- you are aware of sort of trends in the way -trends in click data and brand interest on search engines; correct?
A. I'm aware of the terms.
Q. You are aware that there's information available about trends --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in who is searching for what brand?
A. Yes. They would have had faster interest than we would over this time horizon.
Q. I'm going to put up demonstrative DXD18 at page 4.

Do you see that? So this is a visual representation of that interest that you're describing; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so Google makes available publicly trends data where you can compare how frequently users are searching for one search term versus another; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so this graph shows that sort of in the early days, users were more frequently searching for the term Vrbo compared to Airbnb; correct?
A. Yes, it does show that.
Q. And then there's a point at which the lines cross and Airbnb becomes a much more frequently searched term than Vrbo? A. Yes.
Q. If you go to the next page of the demonstrative, it zooms in on the dates, and so this shows that comparison for the period of time 2015 to 2019; right?
A. Yes, it shows that.
Q. And so in addition to increasing competition from Airbnb, Vrbo also faced competition from other brands; correct?
A. Yes, we do.
Q. And that includes from Trip Advisor; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Booking.com?
A. Yes.
Q. And the other travel brands like Kayak and FlipKey?
A. Slightly separate, in that Trip Advisor is potentially a partner. FlipKey, I think, might have gone away over this time horizon. Kayak was also a partner.
Q. FlipKey was a vacation rentals brand introduced by Trip Advisor at some point during this period?
A. I think that they were purchased by Trip Advisor, you know, probably before I joined HomeAway, so pre-2010.
Q. But there were a number of players in this space --
A. There are.
Q. -- competing?
A. Including the property managers, the actual supply partners.
Q. Right. And so those supply partners being hotels; correct? A. Hotels would be an example.
Q. And then there are other property managers that manage vacation rental properties?
A. Correct.
Q. And also during this period of time -- you can take that one down -- Vrbo faced increasing competition from the units being introduced in Google search results page; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So then in -- we've talked about the period of time up through 2019. In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic hit; right? And that had a -- correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That had a major impact on Expedia's financial results in the '20-'21 time period?
A. Extending into '22, but most felt in '20 and '21.
Q. But then in 2022, Expedia's business did substantially rebound; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And so it's true that -- so Expedia's revenues in 2022 were above the level that they were in the 2018-2019 time period; correct?
A. Yes, our revenue would have surpassed.
Q. Okay. And Expedia delivered its most profitable year in 2022?
A. Probably in absolute terms. I'm not sure if it would have been in percentage terms, but yes, in absolute terms.
Q. Okay. And let's put up an exhibit that has been admitted into evidence, DX0590. This is also in your binder.

Is this an example of the kind of press release that

Expedia Group releases quarterly or annually?
A. Yes. For this time horizon, this would be the annual.
Q. Okay. And so this release is for Expedia's full year 2022 results; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And under the "key highlights" section on the second page, it notes that Expedia had "record full year and fourth quarter lodging bookings and lodging revenue"; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then below that, it notes, "We were pleased that we were able to deliver our most profitable year in 2022"?
A. Yes, it says that.
Q. And that's quoting Peter Kern, Expedia Group's CEO; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And when Peter Kern provides financial results like this publicly, he's providing accurate information about them?
A. He is.
Q. And then he also notes, "We begin 2023 with record app. usage and member counts."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And that was true that Expedia Group did begin the year with more people using its app. and more members?
A. This specific number is about members, so how many people
create a loyalty count, which could be different from people.
So we had a big drive to take people who may not have used loyalty and make them loyalty. So that would have driven some shift here.
Q. Right. And it does say "record app. usage"; correct?
A. Yes, that would have been true.
Q. And so that refers to people using Expedia's app.?
A. Yes.
Q. And thinking about how an Expedia user can get to Expedia, you do agree that there are a number of different ways that such a person can find their way to Expedia; correct?
A. There are.
Q. So one is they can open the Expedia app.; correct?
A. I don't think you would find your way to Expedia by opening the app. You've already found it. But that is a way to enter the product, is directly through the app.
Q. To enter the product. So people can enter the Expedia product in a number of different ways?
A. Yes.
Q. One of those being by opening up the app.; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. They can also directly navigate to Expedia by going to wWW. expedia.com?
A. Yes.

THE COURT: Just a clarification. When you say the

Expedia app., is that just for the brand Expedia, or is there a universal Expedia Group app. that would allow you to search among the different companies?

THE WITNESS: Each brand has a different app. So there would be an Expedia app., a Vrbo app., a Hotels.com app. would be the three largest.

BY MS. MAIER:
Q. And so to go back to some of the ways that a person can enter the Expedia Group product, one is the app. One is direct navigation to the website; correct?

Expedia also engages in e-mail and push notification marketing; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So people could click on a link in an e-mail that Expedia sent them; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Or could click on a push notification on their phone that Expedia sent them?
A. Only if they had the app. installed, but yes.
Q. And then that would launch the app.?
A. Yes.
Q. And you mentioned before social media. Expedia does have a presence in social media; correct?
A. We do.
Q. Including through social media marketing?
A. Yes.
Q. And so a person could navigate to Expedia by clicking on a link within a social media experience?
A. Yeah, you would either navigate to the app. store to get the app., to the app., or to Expedia in a web form.
Q. And you mentioned that Expedia does video advertising; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is displayed on a variety of online platforms?
A. Online and traditional broadcast.
Q. And on the online platforms, those ads allow a user that wants to engage with Expedia to click on a link to be taken to Expedia?
A. You wouldn't always be taken to Expedia, because you would frequently go to the app. store in that environment. But it would always be a link we provided to get you more familiar with an Expedia Group brand.
Q. And then a person could also navigate, as we discussed earlier, to Expedia through a search engine?
A. Yes.
Q. And within a search engine, there are multiple ways that a user could navigate to Expedia; correct?
A. The ways we've discussed, like text ads, meta, and organic? Yes.
Q. And some of those ways Expedia does not pay for; correct?
A. We pay for all text ads, most meta, although there are free links in the Google meta product now, and then we don't pay for the organic results.
Q. And when it comes to the free links and the Google meta product, to just explain that for a moment, what that means is when a Google user launches the Google hotels unit and then clicks on the information about a particular property -correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Within that information, Google displays booking links for that property; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And some of those booking links are sponsored listings for which a supplier or OTA has paid an advertising fee; correct? A. Yes.
Q. But then others are not? Others are simply unpaid booking links; correct?
A. Right. I think that product was introduced in ' 20 or ' 21.

I think the unpaid part happened during my tenure and across Expedia.
Q. And Expedia is eligible to participate in those unpaid booking links?
A. We are.
Q. And then you mentioned earlier today that other companies -- there are a variety of online meta search companies
for travel; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And so those include Trip Advisor, Trivago, and Kayak; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In addition to the Google meta search product we were just discussing?
A. Yes.
Q. And those are also platforms on which Expedia can purchase advertising?
A. They are.
Q. And that is intent-based advertising?
A. It is. The same ingredients of location, dates, people.
Q. And so -- let's see here. And so when it comes to social media marketing, Expedia does use targeting techniques to best target populations within social media?
A. We do.
Q. And overall, Expedia seeks to maximize its incremental return on paid advertising across its advertising types?
A. Yes.
Q. And Expedia measures and seeks to optimize return on ad spend for a variety of formats of digital search -- digital advertising?
A. Yes.
Q. And so it tries to optimize those returns for the paid
search on search engines; correct?
A. It does.
Q. But it also tries to optimize those results for other forms of digital advertising, like paid social?
A. Yes, and we would look at them relative to one another.
Q. And the Expedia Group tries to optimize the mix of advertising channels; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So in one quarter, it might choose to spend more money on the paid social advertising as compared to the search engine marketing?
A. On a relative basis, $I$ don't think we would have ever spent more on social than search engine marketing.
Q. Not more overall.
A. Okay.
Q. But might shift some spend to the other advertising channels?
A. Yes.
Q. But direct traffic generates the majority of Expedia's bookings; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think we've talked about this, but direct traffic is primarily someone opening the Expedia app. or typing
"expedia.com" into a browser?
A. Correct.
Q. And in recent quarters beginning in, let's say, mid-2022, Expedia's direct business has been growing; correct?
A. Yes, it would have been growing.
Q. And almost two-thirds of Expedia's gross bookings have come from traffic that came to them directly?
A. Yes.
Q. And thinking about -- so the remaining --
A. That last point, just for clarity, whether it's Expedia Group or Expedia brand, there's a lot of different dynamics happening within them.
Q. Okay. Maybe we can look at a document that will be helpful here.
A. Okay.
Q. So we have marked for identification, it's in the binder, DX2026.

```
    So this -- so looking at this exhibit, Mr. Hurst --
```

A. Okay.
Q. -- does this look to be one of Expedia Group's earning calls transcripts?
A. It does.
Q. And this is the type of information that Expedia Group posts on its investor website?
A. Yes.
Q. And in these earnings calls, Expedia Group's CEO speaks to the investor community about the Expedia Group's financial
results?
A. Yes.
Q. And he provides true information during those updates?
A. He does.

MS. MAIER: Okay. We move to admit DX2026 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Cavanaugh?
MR. CAVANAUGH: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: That will be admitted.
(Exhibit DX2026 received into evidence.)
MS. MAIER: And then we have two other earnings call transcripts that are the same sort of thing in your binder, DX2027 and 2028. For the sake of efficiency, I move to admit those into evidence.

THE COURT: Mr. Cavanaugh?
MR. CAVANAUGH: No objection.
THE COURT: All right. So 2027 and 2028 will also be admitted.
(Exhibits DX2027 and DX2028 received into evidence.)
BY MS. MAIER:
Q. Mr. Hurst, so looking at the August 4th, 2022 earnings call transcript that is marked as DX2026, Peter Kern noted that, on page 4, marked 004 at the bottom, in the second paragraph, "not surprisingly, therefore, our direct business continues to grow, with almost two-thirds of our business to consumer gross
bookings in Q2 generated from traffic that came to us directly."
Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And so that is -- do you understand that to be traffic for the Expedia Group?
A. That would be Expedia global traffic, Expedia Group global traffic.

And the distinction $I$ was making was that as travel becomes more U.S.-centric, our metrics on topics like this actually look better on a ratio basis, because we have a stronger U.S. business than we do an international business.

And so a shift to something like two-thirds may not just be that we were doing a better job driving direct traffic. It could be that the mix of our business shifted to the place where there was more direct traffic. So there are two factors at play.
Q. But Peter Kern has been telling the investing community that Expedia Group is being successful in deriving the majority of its bookings from direct traffic?
A. This is a globally true statement.
Q. And thinking about sort of the remaining one-third of the pie, that includes all of the other forms of traffic that we've been talking about today; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So that includes the meta search traffic from meta websites
other than Google; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That includes the social traffic; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That includes the free search engine optimization organic traffic from Google?
A. Yes.
Q. It includes traffic from Bing?
A. Yes.
Q. And so the fraction of traffic that's coming from paid Google marketing is a fraction of the one-third?
A. Correct.
Q. And -- so thinking about this statement from Mr. Kern to the investing public, Expedia has been publicly stating that it is evolving its strategy to increasingly focus on building direct relationships with its customers; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so earlier today, we talked a little bit about whether Expedia is able to try something different; right?
A. Yes.
Q. It is correct that Expedia is trying to do something different at present; correct?
A. We are trying to get a different outcome, yes.
Q. And part of that process includes promoting loyalty programs within Expedia; correct?
A. Yes. One Key is the name of it.
Q. And it includes promoting Expedia's app.; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And encouraging consumers to come directly to Expedia's app. --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as much as possible; correct? And it also includes rolling out innovations in Expedia's app.; correct?
A. Yes, it would include features.
Q. And overall improving Expedia's product offerings?
A. Yes.
Q. So I think another exhibit that you have in front of you in your binder is DX0308. This is Expedia Group's most recent annual filing with the SEC for the year 2022. It has been admitted into evidence.

On page 2 of this document, one of the -- I'm sorry. It's page 005 at the bottom. The fourth paragraph that begins "in 2021," this is a statement describing some of the changes in strategy that Expedia Group has been making recently; correct? Is that right, Mr. Hurst?
A. I'm just reading it.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. And it says, "In 2021, we began evolving our consumer retail strategy from being largely transactionally focused where
we were primarily focused on acquiring customers through performance marketing channels to building direct, longer-lasting relationships with our customers."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And so that's an accurate statement of changing strategy at Expedia Group?
A. Probably emphasis on evolving as opposed to like change on a dime.
Q. And so this -- but this evolution began in or around 2021? A. Yes.
Q. And as a part of it, the second sentence notes, "We focused towards increasing customer loyalty and app. adoption as loyalty members and app. users typically experience higher repeat rates, gross profits, and bookings relative to nonloyalty members and non-app. users"; right?
A. Right.
Q. There's just one other statement in this, later in the document at page .035. This notes that -- the third paragraph. Mr. Hurst, do you see that paragraph beginning "in 2022"?
A. I do.
Q. The first sentence is similar to what we just saw, but it also notes here that in 2022, Expedia Group is "allocating more marketing spend towards our loyalty programs, paid app. downloads, and brand awareness."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah. It doesn't mean allocating more than the other channels. It means more in those places than we used to, which would have been equally true for the other channels.
Q. Okay. So an increasing amount in those channels --
A. Yes.
Q. -- relatively speaking?
A. Yes.
Q. And those -- so paid app. downloads -- I don't know if we've covered this, but in app. stores, Expedia is able to purchase advertising there as well; correct?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. And so it can -- if a user is searching for travel apps. in an app. store, Expedia is able to purchase an ad for one of its apps.; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that gives more prominent placement to Expedia's apps. and increases the likelihood that a user might choose and download that app.?
A. Yes.
Q. And then brand awareness, do those ads include advertising on paid social?
A. Brand awareness would mainly be TV and streaming platform. And so it would include, you know, YouTube-TV or college football, whatever those formats would be.

MS. MAIER: And, Your Honor, I don't know if we want to take our morning break. I probably have -- I am about halfway through.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's do that. It's a little bit after 11:00. We will resume at 11:20.

Mr. Hurst, I will ask you not to discuss your testimony with anyone during the break.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
(Recess taken from 11:03 a.m. to 11:21 a.m.)
(Call to order of the court.)
THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone.
BY MS. MAIER:
Q. Hello again, Mr. Hurst.
A. Hello.
Q. So, I want to go back for a moment.

Could you bring up slide 3 of the demonstrative.
We were speaking a bit earlier about how Vrbo was facing increasing competition in the organic results during the period of time we were talking about.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Vrbo was also facing increasing competition in the paid ads as well on the search results page?
A. Yes.
Q. You can take that one down.

So moving back to what we were discussing just before the break --
A. So maybe one clarification. On the organic side, it's hard to know what's competitive versus algorithmic versus something else. So it would be empirically true, we were getting less traffic from SEO. As to whether it had become more competitive or not would be a Google question more than a Expedia Group question.
Q. But there were a lot of other companies who were --
A. Someone was getting clicks, and we were getting fewer of them.
Q. Got it. So turning back to the period of time in 2022 that the -- we were looking at some of the financial reports from that period of time. So let's bring back up -- and you can turn in your binder, to DX2026.

As a part of the results during this time period, so this is the second quarter 2022 earnings call results, some of the facts that Peter Kern provided to investors at this time was that -- let's go on page 3, .003, towards the bottom of the page.
"Over the last 18 months on our Expedia and Hotels.com brands, loyalty members drove approximately three times the gross bookings per customer."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And they had over twice the gross profit per customer and twice the repeat business as compared to nonmembers; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. And also, app. users drove 2.5 times the gross bookings per customer; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And app. downloads were also on the -- have been on the rise; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in this time period, one of the facts that he shared on the next page is that new app. downloads grew 58 percent in Q2 '22 versus Q2 2019; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's correct that over this period of years, the app. downloads were growing; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And app. usage was growing?
A. Yes.
Q. And he noted "and really, this is just the beginning." So he says, "With improving product features, including our price tracking product for flights, which has been a huge engagement-driver in the app., and with the rollout of loyalty to all our customers next year, we will be able to drive much
more direct engagements with our customers."
That summarizes the strategy that Expedia Group has been engaged in; right?
A. Yes.
Q. We have marked in the binder for identification one more document, an investor presentation from June 1st, 2022, so right around this same time. That's been marked by identification as DX2030. It's in your binder.

This is another one of the investor presentations from the Expedia Group investor website. And do you recognize it to be such?
A. I do.

MS. MAIER: Your Honor, we move to admit DX2030.
MR. CAVANAUGH: No objection.
THE COURT: It will be admitted.
(Exhibit DX2030 received into evidence.)
BY MS. MAIER:
Q. Will you put up on the screen that exhibit and then going to page . 003 of that exhibit.

So this is -- kind of at the introduction of this presentation, it notes "Expedia has grown big over time," and that graph there reflects Expedia Group's gross bookings; correct?
A. It does.
Q. But it also includes some of the criticisms of Expedia

Group's strategy and structure during that time period reflected; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And one of those criticisms in the investor presentation reflects "slow product innovation."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And was that an issue within the company?
A. Combined with the complexity. And so the issue was, we had to build things more than one time. So you would build a feature for Expedia that was functionally similar to Hotels.com, and then you would build it for Hotels.com. So it was actually slower because you were building it twice.
Q. And Expedia Group was working to improve that product innovation and streamline those products?
A. Yes.
Q. And it also noted here, one of the criticisms was that over this period of time, Expedia Group had an "over-reliance on performance marketing"; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And -- you can take that one down.

And I think you were asked some questions earlier this morning about, you know, what if Expedia stopped advertising on Google.

Is it fair to say that Expedia Group would end up spending
that money in other venues or would have more profit in a smaller business?
A. Or -- I think those are the two extreme ends of the pole. There's shades in between. And so if we weren't spending on Expedia, we could try and spend on more people. If we weren't spending on Google, the money could go into more product development, more personnel, which would be kind of a flavor in the middle.

On one extreme, put it all into profit. On another, you're reinvesting into something. We wouldn't be able to spend it all in substitute channels, but we could potentially spend more in other places.
Q. But there are other channels that are available to the Expedia Group, including the meta search channels that we discussed; correct?
A. Meta search would be the closest comparable for Google's meta product. The only real comparable for the text ads would be Bing, and you wouldn't be able to redeploy all that money in a similar intent environment.
Q. But Bing -- Expedia Group does buy advertising on Bing; correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. And get traffic from Bing's organic results; correct?
A. Both organic and paid, yes.
Q. And Expedia Group does participate in Bing's hotels unit,
which they may call The Answer; correct?
A. I've never talked about Bing's hotels unit. So if you've seen it in their -- if you've seen it online, they do.

The amount of time $I$ spent talking to Bing in my career was zero. Whereas, with Google, it would have been every month and every quarter.
Q. But there were people on your team that were handling advertising relationships on Bing?
A. Yes.
Q. So thinking about innovation and Expedia's app., we talked a bit about how Expedia has been rolling out new features in its app.; correct?

And so we have a demonstrative, DX.006. So the judge asked about the different Expedia apps.

So this is the app. for the Expedia brand; correct?
A. It appears so.
Q. And if you go to the next page, this is a demonstrative that reflects the price tracking feature in Expedia's app.

That's a new feature that Expedia released over the past couple of years?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's helpful to consumers? It can show them if the price of the flight that they want to buy is a good price or if it is expected to go up or down?
A. Yes.
Q. And then on the next page, you mentioned One Key. This is the new loyalty program that Expedia Group has recently rolled out; correct?
A. Yes. After my tenure concluded, but yes.
Q. And Expedia has released some other improvements in its app., including one involving ChatGPT; correct?
A. I am aware of a press release. I have not used it.
Q. And -- but during your tenure at Expedia Group, Sam Altman, the CEO of OpenAI, was on Expedia's board of directors; correct? A. He was.
Q. And Expedia had a partnership with OpenAI to develop new tools and features?
A. During my tenure, it was probably more of a sparkle in an eye than a deep partnership I participated in.
Q. But you are aware that this year -- and you can go to the next page -- Expedia did introduce in its app. an additional feature with ChatGPT?

And you can play that.
And so this is a demonstrative taken from Expedia's YouTube page that shows how now in Expedia's app. a user can interact with a ChatGPT feature and ask open-ended questions like "can you recommend a couple romantic resorts on Maui?"

And the ChatGPT will provide, you know, a list of answers and suggestions. And users can ask additional open-ended questions like "what are some fun activities on Maui?"

And this way, a user's able to ask more open-ended queries than they used to be able to on just the Expedia interface.
A. Is that a question?
Q. Yes.

And so you can go to the next page, Andrew.
So yes, that is a question, that now in the Expedia app., users are able to ask open-ended questions and get travel planning information?
A. I have not used the product. I am familiar that that's how ChatGPT works.
Q. Okay. But -- so you are familiar with how ChatGPT works, and that is how ChatGPT does generate open-ended answers?
A. I have used ChatGPT, the product. I have not used ChatGPT within Expedia.
Q. Okay. But your testimony earlier today that Expedia -when you search on Expedia, you're limited to searching structured information, do you agree that that testimony that you provided might be a little bit outdated now, given the release of the ChatGPT functionality in the Expedia app.?
A. I don't believe -- my personal use, which includes booking my hotel for the past several nights, there is not an option to use the search bar on Expedia that provides a general search or ChatGPT experience. It is still very much, I start typing "Washington, D.C.," it starts to autofill whether I want Washville or Washington, D.C. or the greater metro. And that's
the limitation of the Expedia or Vrbo or Hotels.com search bar. Q. The search bar on the Web site?
A. Or to my knowledge -- I booked it on the app. -- the app. search bar. So I expect it's a different product treatment somewhere within the app. as opposed to a general search bar treatment in the search that most -- me and, I think, most customers would use when they interact with the Expedia or Hotels or Vrbo product.
Q. But with this new ChatGPT feature that Expedia has released, users are now able to start their search journey in a different way using the ChatGPT?

MR. CAVANAUGH: Objection, Your Honor; no foundation. THE COURT: Yeah, I think he said he's not familiar with it. So it will be sustained. BY MS. MAIER:
Q. But so you have been away from the company for a number of months at this point; right?
A. Since January of '23.
Q. January of '23. But you said that you are aware of a press release about this feature?
A. Yes.
Q. And that press release, I think, is admitted into evidence and is in your binder at DX0592.

In the press release, the announcement does explain that Expedia members can now start an open-ended conversation in the

Expedia app. and get recommendations on places to go, where to stay, how to get around, and what to see and do based on the chat.

Do you see that?
A. I do see that.
Q. And that's a part of the information that Expedia released in their press release?
A. It is in the press release, yes.
Q. And the press release also does say that "the new trip planning experience brings in intelligent shopping by automatically saving hotels discussed in the conversation to a trip in the app."
A. It does say that.
Q. So Mr. Hurst, when it comes to a person who wants to plan travel, a person could start their search for a hotel in a particular location on Expedia; correct?
A. Yes. Well -- yes.
Q. And a person could also do that on Google?
A. Yes.
Q. And a person could start their search for things to do in a particular area on Expedia; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And a person could also do that on Google?
A. Yes.
Q. And a person could search for a flight on Expedia?
A. Yes.
Q. And a person could also do that on Google?
A. Yes.
Q. And when it comes to Google's hotels unit, I think we were discussing earlier this morning in my questions the way in which the vacation rentals unit or the places to stay unit or the hotels unit competes with Vrbo; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that also competes with the other Expedia brands as well?
A. Yes.
Q. And Expedia does regularly state in their SEC filings that it competes with search engines, including Google?
A. We do.
Q. And it also states in its SEC filings that its brands compete for advertising revenue with those search engines?
A. I would take your word for it.
Q. I can point you -- I'm sorry. What was that?
A. I do not know our SEC filings verbatim.
Q. Sure. You have one of them in front of you in your binder, DX0308.
A. Okay.
Q. At page 13.013. Sorry. This might be the wrong page. Okay. Sorry.

It says here, under the bolded header, "We operate in an
intensely competitive global environment." You see that there's a section below that that begins with "search engines and large online portal websites" down below.

Sorry. I'm talking about the paragraph -- three paragraphs down, with that italicized language "search engines and large online portal websites" and the top paragraph on the next page.

And so here it says, "In addition, our brands or brands in which we hold a significant ownership position, including Trivago, compete for advertising revenue with these search engines."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is true?
A. Yes.
Q. So we briefly -- you were asked a few questions earlier this morning about the ads that Expedia Group sells on its platforms.

Do you recall those questions?
A. I do.
Q. One of those forms of ads is called Expedia travel ads?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you can bring up the demonstrative at page 12.

So travel ads on Expedia's platform are a form of pay-per-click hotel advertising?
A. They are.
Q. And these travel ads allow hotel advertisements to appear at the top of the Expedia search results?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. Okay. And Expedia promotes its travel ads as a way to maximize your hotel's visibility?
A. Yes.
Q. And that it provides its advertisers an added boost they need to engage travelers?
A. Yes, it says that.
Q. And Expedia markets the travel ad's precise targeting abilities?
A. Yes.
Q. And so if you go to the next page of the demonstrative, so this is a sample search results page from expedia.com, and it reflects that this just shows the top three hotel results here that are marked "ad" in that little white box.

These are the Expedia travel ads; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And so these are the ones that an advertiser has to pay more for if they wish to appear high on Expedia's search results page?
A. So it is -- you have to pay more to be in these ads. It's not always true that you have to pay more to be at the top of search results.
Q. Okay. But the search results are usually at the top of the
page -- or, I'm sorry, the travel ads are usually at the top of the page and have a more prominent placement?
A. Similar to the dynamics described earlier with Google, the number and frequency with which we show all these ads would vary. But I do think when they show, it would frequently be at the top.
Q. And these ads are served in response to the user's query; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So in this sample, a user says that they're going to Boulder, Colorado, for particular dates, and these three travel ads are all ads for hotels in Boulder for those particular dates?
A. Correct.
Q. And a hotel who chooses to buy Expedia's travel ads could also consider buying similar types of ads sold by Google; correct?
A. The purchase mechanism is different, but the -- the purchase mechanism here is a commission and pay per click. So everything on our page has a commission dynamic. And then incrementally, you can basically pay to boost it with a pay-per-click dynamic.

And so whether it's a -- it's got more of a comparable to the Google meta product where you might choose to pay more in Google meta and then maybe pay less here.

I don't think of it as being a substitute for the Google text product, you know. At some level, all dollars are fungible. But I think the use case would be more between Google meta and this.
Q. And with Google's hotel ads, I think what you were just describing is, as we discussed earlier today, within those results, a hotel's booking information could simply appear in unpaid results, or they could pay to purchase a pay-per-click ad to appear higher in those results?
A. Right. In the Google example, you would go to the hotel or other OTA, and in our example, you would stay on our site, "our" being Expedia's.
Q. And you were asked briefly about Expedia's revenues from its advertising business.

Is it fair to say that in 2022 Expedia earned nearly \$1 billion in advertising revenue?
A. It would be fairer for me to say it if $I$ saw the exhibit.
Q. So in your binder, the $10-\mathrm{K}$ that we've been looking at, Exhibit DX0308, on page . 042 , in that top chart, there is the revenue by business, and there's a row for advertising media and other, and it's \$911 million?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. So that's nearly a billion dollars of the $\$ 11$ billion and change that Expedia earned that year?
A. Yes.

THE COURT: Can $I$ just ask you to move your mic closer? Thank you.

MS. MAIER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: This number is not exclusively that ad placement we discussed, although it is included in this number. BY MS. MAIER:
Q. Expedia offers some other forms of advertising as well? A. Yes.

MS. MAIER: All right. If you could give me one moment, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Great. Thank you.
Any redirect, Mr. Cavanaugh?
MR. CAVANAUGH: Yes. Thank you. Just a few questions.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. Mr. Hurst, when a user clicks on an Expedia link on the Google search engine result page and is automatically taken to a previously downloaded Expedia app. -- are you following me?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that considered direct traffic?
A. No. We would have paid to get them back into the app.
Q. So it's not considered direct traffic?
A. No.
Q. Okay. In your view, what is the difference between Google text ads and ads in the Google meta product?
A. It's higher intent in the meta product, in particular because you get dates and/or people, which could be quite different than something like "place with a view in Miami."
Q. And would that also be true for a user that goes directly to the Expedia app.?
A. Directly to the app. from Google or just in general?
Q. Let's start with from Google.
A. There wouldn't be a use case where we got that type of qualified into the app. from Google. We would put you on a web-landing page from their meta product.
Q. What about for a -- someone who goes directly to the Expedia app., they downloaded the app.?
A. You would -- you wouldn't really know the same type of intent, because you wouldn't have a actual text signal when they opened the app., of this is what they're doing, until they got into the app.

And then you would have a better feel, are they servicing an existing trip, are they trying to book something new, in which they might give you exactly the same information.

Those would be the different dynamics.
Q. And that information you got would inform you as to the user's intent?
A. Yes.

THE COURT: I didn't hear you clearly when you were asked the comparison of which product has the higher intent, text ads or the meta product.

THE WITNESS: Higher intent is in the meta product, because they're providing more signal.

THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. If you could turn to the demonstratives that counsel for Google provided you, and if you would go to 002 -- actually, the second page.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see in the upper right-hand corner on the first page, there's a red dot?
A. I do.
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Does that indicate whether someone has signed in?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. And when you sign in --

THE COURT: Signed into Google?
MR. CAVANAUGH: Yes.
BY MR. CAVANAUGH:
Q. Could the user have saved user preferences in there?
A. Yes. I mean, and it would also just know your history of what you look at.
Q. And might that impact whether text ads appear or do not appear?
A. It might. And in this use case, I suspect the larger impact -- I actually think vacation rentals are illegal in Boulder, and so they've got ordinances against it, and sometimes when there are ordinances against a vacation rental property, we don't bid on it, and we would typically expect competitors to not bid on it.

It's a, frankly, confusing and often-changing dynamic. So I don't know the current space. But I know both Boulder Denver at one point had been working to regulate away vacation rentals. Q. Okay. If you could turn to 003 .
A. Yes.
Q. We don't see the red dot, do we?
A. We do not.
Q. Would that indicate someone had not signed in?
A. I don't know every Google use case, but that's my personal experience.
Q. Okay. And there are text ads that appear on 003 ; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And do any appear on 002?
A. No.
Q. Did Expedia spend more on Google SEM, the text ads, in 2022 than it did in 2019?
A. Yes.
Q. You were asked some questions about competition.

Does Expedia compete with Google's meta products?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you view Expedia as competing with Google's general search product?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. You can't generally search for most of the things I search Google for on Expedia. There's no mechanism for who won the playoff baseball game or who's got the best price on something I'm buying for my kids or any number of things you could search for.

There's just -- Expedia product literally does not work for what I assume is the overwhelming majority of Google general search.
Q. If I was going to take a trip when this trial is over someday and I wanted to buy a book about where I was going, could I do that on Expedia?
A. No.

MR. CAVANAUGH: Nothing further. Thank you,
Mr. Hurst.
Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Hurst, thank you very much for your
time and your testimony, sir. Safe travels home.
THE WITNESS: Thank you. I presume I can leave
everything?
THE COURT: You can leave that, and someone will grab
it. Thank you.
All right. Are the States ready with the next witness?
MR. SCHWARTZ: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael
Schwartz from New York State on behalf of the Plaintiff States.

Our next witness is Mr. Paul Vallez.
PAUL VALLEZ, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Vallez, welcome.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. SCHWARTZ: May I proceed?
THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say your name one more time.
MR. SCHWARTZ: Michael Schwartz.

THE COURT: Thanks.
DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. Good morning, sir.
A. Good morning.
Q. Can you please state and spell your name for the record.
A. My name is Paul Vallez. Last name is spelled V-a-l-l-e-z.
Q. Are you currently employed?
A. Yes.
Q. And where do you work?
A. I work at a technology company called skai.
Q. And Skai is spelled $S-k-a-i ?$
A. Correct.
Q. Can you briefly describe Skai's business?
A. Skai is a technology company that builds an omnichannel platform that enables advertisers to manage, to optimize, to effectively manage their overall marketing programs.
Q. And what types of entities are Skai's customers?
A. Usually enterprise-type brands, brands that have a big online presence that are looking to promote their products and services online.
Q. Are ad agencies also Skai customers?
A. Yes, ad agencies as well.
Q. Was Skai previously called Kenshoo?
A. It was.
Q. When did Skai -- when did the company change its name from Kenshoo to Skai?
A. I believe it was in 2022, I believe. We went ahead and repositioned the company and pivoted, and the name change came along with that.
Q. And is it okay if for today's purposes I refer to the company as Skai, whether it was before or after the name change? A. Yes.
Q. How long have you worked at Skai?
A. In December, it will be ten years.
Q. So around 2013 is when you joined the company?
A. The end of 2013, yes.
Q. And what is your current position?
A. I'm the executive vice president for our business development and partnerships at Skai.
Q. And what are your responsibilities in that role?
A. My roles have shifted throughout the years, but today, I focus on really working closely with all of our strategic partners, whether it be Google, Microsoft, Snapchat, TikTok. I lead the overall negotiation of net new deals, as well as manage the existing partnerships that we have today.
Q. Does Skai assist advertisers in purchasing ads in different digital marketing channels?
A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?
Q. Sure. Does Skai work with advertisers to purchase ads in different digital channels?
A. Yes.
Q. And what are those different digital channels?
A. I would say the channels that we typically work on are search, social, apps., retail media, and display advertising.

THE COURT: When you say your "partners," do you mean the platforms that your customers can place advertisements on? Is that who you consider your partners?

THE WITNESS: Correct; correct. We build to their marketplace, and we coordinate, collaborate. So we use the term "partner" because we engage on a regular basis. THE COURT: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. What generally is the search channel?
A. Can you be more specific?
Q. Sure. So what are some examples of different partners in the search channel?
A. Okay. I would say today it's Google. It's Bing, Microsoft Bing. We also work with Yahoo! Japan and to a certain extent, not significant, but some of the more regional players like Baidu and Yandex.
Q. And what is Baidu?
A. Baidu is another -- it's a competing search engine. They operate mostly in China.
Q. What are some examples of major partners in the social channel?
A. Meta is probably our largest. I would say our second one is TikTok, Snapchat, Pinterest.
Q. What are some examples of major partners in the retail channel?
A. The largest is Amazon. We also work with Walmart, Target.
Q. And can you explain generally what is meant by the -- the app. marketing channel?
A. So we work with -- there's two types of classifications of advertisers that usually will focus on apps. Those are app. mobile first companies, let's say like Airbnb where their primary business model is an app. And then we also work with
companies where the app. is an extension of their business, let's say like Target also promotes their app. as a way to keep reengaging with their customers.
Q. And in your current position, do you have oversight responsibilities for the different channels you just described?
A. Yes.
Q. I would like to show you a document that we've marked PSX1200.

MR. SCHWARTZ: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Is it okay if I familiarize myself with this?

THE COURT: Sure.
BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. And I can represent to you, this is an image we took a few days ago of the paid search website -- page on skai's website.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Do you recognize this page?
A. Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Your Honor, I move to admit PSX1200.

MS. WASZMER: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It will be admitted.
(Exhibit PX1200 received into evidence.)
BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. The first sentence reads, "There's no paid media channel
that better captures the intent of users."
Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And do you agree with that statement?

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm not following the statement.

MR. SCHWARTZ: This again is the paid search tab within the Skai, website. And there's a paragraph of text near the bottom of the first page.

THE COURT: I understand. Paid search, gotcha.
THE WITNESS: I assume that we're referring to search, based on all the logos up there.

BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. And just to clarify, because it's maybe not clear, there are five tabs running, sort of going down the page, and this specific one is the middle one, the "paid search" one.
A. Yes, I would agree with that statement.
Q. And can you explain why it is that paid search is better than all other channels at capturing the intent of users?
A. If you think about the experience of a consumer, an individual who is going out there and consuming content, browsing the web, when you think about where they are in their process of exploring or looking at products or maybe exploring purchase, search is more often than not the last step, one of the last steps in that journey.

So when it comes to the moment right when they're about to make a decision, make a purchase, search again is more often than not that channel where they make their decision.
Q. How, if at all, does advertising on the paid social channel differ from advertising in the paid search channel?
A. The way we think about all the different channels and advertising, we try to align a lot of the different ad types, whether it be social or search, with the customer journey, the journey that the customer goes through on their path towards a purchase. And we try to align some of these ad formats with that journey.

And so we've already talked about search being close to that bottom of that funnel, that last step before they make a decision. We think about social as being more upper funnel, for earlier in that stage, where we're trying to influence and engage when they're not necessarily in the context of purchasing.
Q. Have you heard the terms "push ads" and "pull ads" used in the context of digital marketing?
A. Yes.
Q. And what do those terms mean?
A. A push ad will generally mean that -- actually, let me start with pull ads. We think about search as pull in the sense that the consumer is specifically going out and asking for information. They're looking for a very specific topic.

They're searching it. They're actually pulling information. It's more intentional.

Whereas, push is where -- you may be in what we call
lean-back experience. You're consuming content. You're being entertained. And as a result, you're being pushed ads to you that may or may not be relevant to your experience.

Yeah, that's how we think about them.
Q. But I think you just testified that you associate pull ads more with the search channel; is that right?
A. Pull ads definitely more with search channels.
Q. And are there certain channels that you associate more so with push ads?
A. We generally think about search as pull. Yeah. I don't off the top of my head think of any other ad formats as pull as the way we do with search.
Q. Understood. Are there other channels, though, as to push -- what other channels are push ads?
A. Oh, push ads? Okay. Push ads are generally more what we call upper funnel. They're more video, display, that type of media, social media.
Q. So is it fair to say that they're more -- the social media channel is more characterized with push ads?
A. They are, because the consumer is not intentionally trying to pull information. They're being -- they're usually getting a feed that's being presented to them, different options, again
which may or may not be relevant to the context which they're in.

THE COURT: Mr. Schwartz, can I just ask you to keep your voice up as well? Thank you.

BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. Focusing on the social channel still, are you aware of any ads that are sold in the social channel in response to user queries?
A. I am.
Q. And have you heard those referred to sometimes as social search ads?
A. Yes.
Q. And can advertisers manage social search ads on the skai tool?
A. Not today, no. We've engaged with some of the publishers, we call them, like a meta. A lot of these are still in their infancy and fairly nascent, but we've talked to a lot of different publishers about these opportunities.

But it's really not a priority for advertisers at this point. So we haven't really built out support or engaged on that front too deeply yet.
Q. And can you explain why, in your experience, those types of ads are not a priority for advertisers?
A. Because they're not performing at the same level as traditional search. Advertisers who focus on search are used to
a certain level of performance. They're used to a certain level of controls they have to drive good performance. But what they're finding, at least from the advertisers that we engage with, is that it's not the same level of control, it's not keyword-driven. And so as a result, it's not performing at the same level, and so they haven't really pushed too much budget in that direction.
Q. You've alluded to this, but in the course of your job, do you speak with advertisers?
A. Yes.
Q. And at times, do you discuss specific features with advertisers?
A. Yes.
Q. And does Skai make business decisions based in part on the feedback it receives from its customers?
A. Yes.
Q. And why is that?
A. We position our advertisers as investors in Skai. They are -- they're the ones who are -- they're the ones that we're trying to solve problems for. So they have allowed us voice when it comes to the feedback and the priorities in which we set for our business.
Q. Do the large advertisers that you work with generally have a single team or multiple teams managing advertising in the different channels that we discussed?
A. Multiple teams.
Q. Does Skai allow advertisers to set distinct budgets by the different channels?
A. They do set very specific -- an advertiser will definitely set a specific budget per channel, yes.
Q. Have you heard the term "SEM tool" used to refer to a tool that helps manage search ad campaigns across multiple search engines?
A. Yes.
Q. And is one of the functions that Skai provides an SEM tool?
A. We provide SEM tools, features, functions, services, but that's not all that we provide, yes.
Q. And do you know the other major companies in the U.S. that provide SEM capabilities?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you list them?
A. The primary one that we come up against a lot and hear a lot about is Search Ads 360.
Q. And are there other major --
A. There are some other ones, but we don't really come across them as much. They're much smaller. We have heard about Marin and Adobe.
Q. And SA360 is owned by Google?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you consider SA360 to be a competitor to Skai?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know the relative size of the four major SEM tools you just listed?
A. Size in terms of?
Q. So in terms of, let's say, ad spend managed.
A. I mean, we've done some internal estimations, but they're not scientific necessarily.
Q. Can you give just a general order of magnitude based on your internal estimates?
A. We would expect that Search Ads 360 is probably ten times the size of Skai in terms of our search footprint. And I would say that Adobe and Marin are probably -- Adobe is maybe a third of where we're at in terms of our search spend, and Marin is probably maybe 10 percent, 10 to 20 percent of the size of Skai. Q. Okay.
A. Again, relative to our search spend that we manage.
Q. Do you know the extent to which Search Ads 360 or SA360 is used by ad agencies?
A. Yes.
Q. And what's your understanding of the extent to which SA360 is used by ad agencies?
A. We estimate it to be at or above 90 percent of the market.
Q. Have you heard the term "native tool" used to refer to a tool used to place ads on a specific search engine?
A. Yes.
Q. And both Google and Microsoft have native tools?
A. Yes.
Q. What, if anything, is the value for an advertiser in using an SEM tool like Skai as opposed to one of the native tools? A. Incremental value. We try to look at the marketplace and provide value on top of that marketplace.

So whether it be efficiencies, helping them to drive their performance by adding optimization on top of what the native applications do, and sometimes, efficiencies across not channels but, let's say, search engines, yes.
Q. And can you explain what you mean by efficiencies across search engines?
A. So one example would be a solution that we launched called mirroring. We found that oftentimes advertisers are spending a lot of their time in the native tool for Google's ads marketplace, and when they wanted to bring a lot of those campaigns over to Microsoft, it was a lot of work trying to reconcile them. They would do quarterly audits to understand what do I have on Google versus what do I have on Microsoft.

And so we provided a solution for them to be able to just mirror everything over so they didn't have to do all that work manually, and they were able to just with a few clicks mirror all of their activity from Google over to Microsoft. Q. So using an SEM tool like Skai, an advertiser could use one interface to manage their ad campaigns on multiple search
engines?
A. Correct.
Q. And that wouldn't be possible using a particular native tool?
A. Correct.
Q. And then $I$ think you said as well using an SEM tool like Skai, an advertiser could compare the performance of its ad campaigns on multiple search engines?
A. I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you.
Q. Is it correct that using an SEM tool like Skai, an advertiser can compare how its ad campaigns on multiple search engines are performing in one single interface?
A. Yes.
Q. In your experience, is it common for large advertisers to run ad campaigns on multiple search engines?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you estimate the relative ad spend on Skai in the U.S. between the different search engines?
A. What is the ad spend we have running on the different search engines?
Q. Correct.
A. Yes. We have about 5 billion annually running on Google AdWords, Google Ads today, and about 600 million globally on Microsoft.
Q. And the number is even lower for the other search engines
you mentioned earlier?
A. Yes, much smaller.

THE COURT: So those are global numbers?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. Do you know as to the U.S. specifically if -- how that would impact the numbers, at least the relative size of the numbers?
A. I would say if you put -- if you took all the search engines outside of Google and Microsoft, they together would represent less than 1 percent of our global spend.
Q. In your experience, why does the majority, the vast majority of the ad spend by advertisers go to Google?
A. Volume. They have the highest amount of volume or inventory available.
Q. And can you explain what you mean by that?
A. Sure. If you think about a day in the life of an advertiser, they're trying to be as efficient and effective as they can be in terms of driving revenue for their business.

So where they're going to start first is, where can I get the most volume so that I'm not having to spend all my time across many, many channels, but $I$ can get most of my work done where the volume sits. And because Google has the majority of the search volume, they start and spend most of their time with Google.
Q. And by "volume," do you mean user queries?
A. Correct; correct.
Q. Of your customers that buy paid search ads, are there any that exclusively buy on Google?
A. It's a small percent. I would say it's less than

10 percent, yes. But the majority, obviously, spend across both.
Q. Are there any that buy exclusively on Bing?
A. Through our -- I mean, all we know is what we know. So in terms of, we do have a number of advertisers that also focus just on Bing. It doesn't mean they don't advertise on Google, but we know that they focus their campaigns with us on Bing, yes.
Q. And do advertisers sometimes shift their spend between Google and Bing?
A. They do.
Q. And why might an advertiser shift spend between Google and Bing?
A. An advertiser is looking at where can $I$ invest my dollars that's going to drive the most efficiency and performance. That's one of the reasons. Sometimes, if it's too difficult to be able to bring budget back and forth more fluidly versus having to do it manually, that can be a barrier for them. Q. I'm going to show you another document.

Your Honor, this document is PSX1119. This document is in
evidence. May I approach?
THE COURT: You may.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. If you turn past the empty first page to the second page, the title of this document is "total search intelligence, June 2020."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you recognize this document?
A. I do.
Q. And what generally is it?
A. I'm sorry. What's the question?
Q. What is this document?
A. This is a presentation that we provide to prospective advertisers that we want to win their business.
Q. And this document would have been prepared in or around June 2020?
A. Yes.
Q. If you could turn in the bottom right to page 11 in the document, do you see there are some green boxes along the bottom of the page?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. The first one says "2000-plus brands and agencies." What does that mean?
A. That is the number of entities that we work with as customers. So we have in terms of customers about 2,000 entities, which are a combination of brands and agencies.
Q. And the second box says "about $\$ 7$ billion spend under management."

What does that mean?
A. Across all the channels and publishers, which are all the logos you see at the top of the page, when you aggregate all the spend that we are managing through our platform, that's the number, about 7 billion at that point in time.
Q. And if you would turn to the next page of the document, page 12.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. So in the middle of the page, it says "for the world's most successful brands."

Are those some examples there of skai customers at this time?
A. Yes.

THE COURT: If you could just flip back to the prior page, I'm just curious. What's the check represent?

THE WITNESS: That was -- it's Verizon, I believe. THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: I believe it is. I'm just surprised that we would put a Verizon there. It might have been when Verizon was -- I think Verizon and Yahoo! were one company, one
entity. But we have Yahoo! separately. So I'm sorry. I'm not sure.

THE COURT: That's okay. I was just curious. BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. And just by the way, the logo to the right of that, the paw with the "DU," is that Baidu?
A. It is.
Q. If you turn back to page 4 of the document.
A. Okay.
Q. There are four categories, four columns here,
"native/free," "full publisher stack," "build in-house," and then it says "Kenshoo search independent platform."

What is generally meant by the four different categories on this slide?
A. If you're an advertiser and you're looking for a solution to be able to manage your advertising, these are generally the four different buckets that are different paths an advertiser would fall into.

They would either go and just work free on the native platforms. They would build their own technology because they wanted to build that internal muscle. I'm sorry. That's the build in-house.

The full publisher stack is where you might, instead of using the native tool, you would use the whole ecosystem of tools that are available for that publisher, like reporting or
optimization, different ad types and formats.
Or you would go with the independent platform like Kenshoo or Skai.
Q. And when it says "native/free," that's referring to the native tools we discussed earlier?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you briefly explain what the -- what the points about native tool are being conveyed here?
A. Oftentimes -- the first point is around value on top. So if you take optimization, for example, both Google and Microsoft offer their own automated bidding technology. But the bidding often focuses on -- I'm sorry. It focuses on the bid and the budget. But there's a lot more ways to optimize and provide value for the advertiser beyond just bidding and budgets.

And so we, for example, put value on -- we add value on top of that, more ways to optimize on top of what the publishers do. So that's an example of value on top.

Or we might add features that make their optimization even perform better. So we use them as a foundation and build value on top of those features.

Second one, "All of your competitors have access to the same basic tool set." So if you're an advertiser and you are working in a very competitive landscape, then that means all your competitors have access to the same exact tools and functions. So there's not really a big differentiator for them
to advance their performance ahead of their peers or competitors.
Q. And when you say that Kenshoo or Skai is an independent platform, what does it mean that it's independent?
A. It means that we are working on behalf of the advertiser to make sure we're helping them achieve their goals and objectives. So we're neutral. We don't take sides between one publisher versus the other.

A lot of our advertisers try to think about Skai as an advertiser for them, a neutral third party who is giving them advice that is not again biased towards one publisher versus the other.
Q. And in your experience, do advertisers value the fact that Skai is an independent platform?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I think you testified earlier that SA360 is owned by Google.
A. Yes.
Q. And obviously, Google is the main search engine that -- I think you said is the predominant search engine to advertise on? A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any concerns about the fact that Google owns the predominant SEM tool as well as the predominant search engine?
A. We have concerns, yes.
Q. And can you explain?
A. Let me start by saying that we value competition. We think competition is a good thing. So if there are other players out there, whether it be a neutral third party or a publisher, competition is good.

But it's only in cases where there are disadvantages, and we have identified some disadvantages that we have as a neutral third party versus -- Search Ads 360 is a part of Google that has maybe access to more benefits and advantages than we do. Q. And the third category here says "build in-house."

So first of all, what does build in-house mean?
A. It means that they would actually build -- they would actually take the APIs available from the different marketplaces, whether it be Google or Microsoft, and they would build features and functions to help them manage their advertising programs on a day-to-day basis.
Q. And when you say "they," you're referring to a specific advertiser?
A. Yes. We often find that the larger, more sophisticated advertisers, they're always evaluating what do we build versus what do we buy. Because a lot of it is around how they compete online. If they're going to be successful online, they have to build that muscle. They can't always farm it off to an agency or a third party. They want to be a part of the process and have some of their own technology to manage it.
Q. In your experience, do advertisers sometimes switch from using one SEM tool to a different SEM tool?
A. It happens, yes.
Q. And would you say it happens frequently or infrequently?
A. I would say it depends on the size of the advertiser. The more complex your advertising program is, the more difficult it is to switch. And so there's some barriers out there for switching based on the size, complexity, and scale of your program.
Q. If I could just return for a moment to the prior issues we were discussing, I think you testified that there were some disadvantages for Kenshoo as an independent platform as compared to Google; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you just explain what -- the disadvantages you were referring to?
A. I think one example is around their technology stack. So it's -- there is a tool that is -- that is widely used by the market. The original name was Doubleclick. I think the most recent name is Google Ad Manager at this point.

But what often happens is, our understanding is up to 80 percent of the market uses this tool for measurement, for trying to deduplicate all their conversions. And so they use it as what we call in the industry their true north, what they define as what is the single source of truth where we can define
our measurement, our conversions for our business.
One of the challenges that we've had is if you're an advertiser using Search Ads 360, you generally get to use that Google Ad Manager for free, but if you're using a third party like Skai, then there is fees associated with it. And those fees are often much more than our fees for our platform by itself. So it becomes cost prohibitive for the advertiser to use a third party, because it's hard to compete with free.
Q. So switching back to the topic of switching SEM tools, for the large advertisers you work with, do they typically have to implement additional employee training when they would switch from one SEM tool to another?
A. Yes.
Q. And do they typically, these large advertisers, have to redo the conversion tracking and integration they have when they switch SEM tools?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your experience, how long would it generally take a large advertiser to switch from one SEM tool to another?
A. I mean, every advertiser is unique based on their complexity, but we've seen it takes months.
Q. Changing topics a little bit, do the Google and Microsoft native tools offer certain features within them that help buy advertisements?

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you, Counselor. It
sounds like you're switching topics and areas. So it may be a good time to break for lunch. So we will return at 1:30.

Mr. Vallez, we will ask you not to discuss your testimony with anyone during the lunch break. Thank you, sir.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Your Honor, I think we are on track to be done for today probably around 3:00 -- by the 3:00 afternoon break. So $I$ just wanted to give you that --

MR. CAVANAUGH: I had predicted 3:30 yesterday. Maybe it is 3:00. Mr. Hurst went a little faster than $I$ anticipated.

THE COURT: Okay. We can reach out to --
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: I wasn't sure, in light of last night's filing, if you were still thinking about having some additional argument or discussion, but $I$ just wanted to let you know.

THE COURT: I appreciate it. We will reach out and have some -- at least invite counsel for the times here to go through this. If they can arrive by -- if he can arrive by 3:00, all the better.

Thank you.
(Recess taken at 12:27 p.m.)
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| 003 [4]-6561:19, | $2010[1]-6501: 11$ | $333_{[1]}-6497: 9$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6563:19, 6579:12, } \\ & \text { 6579:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $2013[2]-6582: 24,$ 6582:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 360[5]-6591: 18, \\ & 6592: 10,6592: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { a.m [3]-6496:6, } \\ & 6560: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 004[1] - 6554:23 | $\begin{gathered} 6582: 25 \\ 2014[4]-6534: 18, \end{gathered}$ | 6602:8, 6604:3 | abilities [1] - 6573:11 |  |
| 005[1]-6557:17 | 6534:20, 6536:8 | 3:00 [4] - 6605:7, | able [17] -6499:12, |  |
| 035[1] - 6558:19 | 6537:2 | 6605:10, 6605:19 | 6514:23, 6546:11, |  |
| $042\left[{ }_{[1]}-6575: 19\right.$ | $2015[10]-6501: 16,$ | 3:30 [1] - 6605:9 | 6556:19, 6559:10, |  |
| 07[1] - 6520:15 | 6503:6, 6522:15, | $3 \mathrm{X}[5]-6531: 11,$ | 6559:14, 6562:25, 6565:10, 6565:18, |  |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 6523: 9,6523: 22, \\ & 6531: 8,6531: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 6534:14, 6534:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 6568: 1,6568: 2, \\ & 6568: 7,6569: 10 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1[5]-6506: 13, \\ & 6506: 14,6518: 10, \\ & 6575: 16,6595: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6532:6, 6538:6, } \\ & \text { 6543:24 } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6593:20, 6593:22, } \\ & 6596: 22,6599: 16 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 2018[3]-6534: 21, \\ 6536: 8,6536: 24 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4[4]-6530: 15, \\ & 6543: 7,6554: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { above-entitled }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 6606:5 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10 \text { [5] - 6506:13, } \\ & 6592: 14,6596: 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6543: 7,6554: 23, \\ & 6599: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 10-K [1] - 6575:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2018-2019 [1] - } \\ & 6545: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 6599:8 | 6545:22 |  |
| 10-to-1 [1] - 6533:15 | 2019[14]-6521:14, | 40th [1] - 6497:6 |  |  |
| 10005 [1] - 6496:22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4704-B [1] - 6497:10 } \\ & \text { 4th [1] - 6554:21 } \end{aligned}$ | ```access [4]-6538:23, 6600:21, 6600:24, 6602:9 accompanies [1] - 6509:13 account [8] - 6518:24, 6526:2, 6527:7, 6530:7, 6530:15, 6530:19, 6533:4,``` |  |
| 10019[1] - 6497:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6523:6, 6524:15, } \\ & \text { 6527:9, 6535:9, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 10036[1] - 6496:19 | 6527:9, 6535:9, <br> 6536:20, 6536:22, | 5 |  |  |
| $10 X_{[1]}-6531: 9$ $11[1]-6597: 20$ | 6536:24, 6537:2, |  |  |  |
| 1100 [1] - 6496:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 6538: 5,6543: 24, \\ & 6545: 6,6562: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 5 [1] - 6594:22 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 112[3]-6527: 15, \\ 6530: 3,6530: 23 \end{gathered}$ | 6579:24 | 500 [3]-6523:8, |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 202-354-3284[1] - } \\ & 6497: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 6523:13, 6523:14 |  |  |
| $113{ }^{[1]}$-6521:15 |  | 507 [1] - 6522:23 |  |  |



| 6602:13 | beginning [5] - | 6563:5, 6563:8, | 6537:6, 6542:23, | 6602:20, 6602:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Avenue }[4] \text { - 6496:18 } \\ 6497: 3,6497: 6, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6519: 2,6523: 12, \\ & 6553: 1,6558: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6569: 23,6571: 20, \\ & 6575: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6543: 4,6544: 12, \\ & 6548: 1,6548: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { building }[3]-6556: 15, \\ & 6558: 2,6564: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6497:9 | 562:21 | Bing [18] - 6506:9 | 49:17, 6553: | ds [1] - 6582:3 |
| aware [8]-6511:12, | begins [2] - 6557:17, | 506:12, 6533:1 | 6558:25, 6559:21, | built [1] - 6589:20 |
| 6542:22, 6542:25, | 6572:2 | 6533:17, 6533:1 | 6559:23, 6566:15 | bullet [1] - 6523:3 |
| 6543:1, 6567:7, | behalf [4] - 6499:6, | 6556:8, 6565:18 | branded [1] - 6505:24 | bunch [1] - 6509:1 |
| 6567:15, 6569:19, | 6499:7, 6581:6, | 6565:20, 6566:4 | brands [30]-6500:19, | business [30] - |
| 6589:6 | 6601:5 | 6566:8, 6584:6 | 6500:21, 6500:22, | 6501:5, 6505:4, |
| awareness [3] 6558:25, 6559:21 | behavior [1] - 6539:22 <br> behind [4] - 6510:7 | 6584:7, 6596:8, 6596:11, 6596:12, | 6500:24, 6501:14, 6504:23, 6505:6, | 6515:16, 6517:10, |
| 6559:23 | $6513: 13,6520: 25$ | 6596:15, 6596:18 | 6505:21, 6507:20, | $6531: 14,6532: 12,$ |
| awkward [1] - 6525:21 | $6521: 1$ <br> Belknap | Bing's [3] - 6565:23, 6565:25, 6566:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 6523: 15,6526: 12, \\ & 6526: 15,6526: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6532:14, 6533:10, } \\ & \text { 6545:12, 6553:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BELLSHAW } \\ & \text { [1] } \\ & \hline 533: 25 \end{aligned}$ | bit $[15]-6506: 2$, 6515:1, 6516: | $\begin{aligned} & 6527: 9,6533: 6, \\ & 6533: 13,6542: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6554: 24,6554: 25, \\ & 6555: 11,6555: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| background ${ }_{[1]}$ 6501:2 | below [16] - 6508:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 6518: 23,6519: 7 \\ & 6523: 8,6532: 5, \end{aligned}$ | 542:19, 6544:2, | 6562:2, 6565:2, |
| Baidu [4] - 6584:9, | 516:19, 6516:20, | 6534:11, 6536:11, | 6571:9, 6571:15, | 6582:2, 6583:2, |
| 6584:10, 6584:11, | 6516:22, 6519:11, | 6556:18, 6560:5, | 6572:7, 6582:7, | $6584: 25,6585: 1,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6599:6 } \\ & \text { bar [6] - 6523:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 6524:11, 6537:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6560:17, 6566:11, } \\ & \text { 6568:18, 6604:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6597:24, 6598:3, } \\ & \text { 6598:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6590: 14,6590: 22, \\ & 6595: 19,6597: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| 6568:22, 6569:1, | 6541:19, 6546:10, | board [1] - 6567:9 | brands' [1] - 6519:7 | 660 |
| 6569:2, 6569:4, | 6572:2, 6572:3 | bolded [1] - 6571:25 | break [6] - 6560:2, | buy [16] - 6506:15, |
| barrier [1] - 6596:23 | BENCH [1] - 6496:9 | bo | 05:2, 6605:4 | 20, 6513:11, <br> 14, 6515:25, |
| barriers [1] - 6603:7 | best [5] - 6511:14, | $80:$ | 6605:8 | 6517:23, 6518:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Barry [5] - } 6504: 6, \\ & 6521: 25,6522: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6519:9, 6519:15, } \\ & 6551: 15,6580: 10 \end{aligned}$ | booked [1] - 6569:3 <br> booking [8] - 6507:3, | $\begin{gathered} \text { briefly }[5]-6501: 1, \\ 6572: 15,6575: 13, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6565: 20,6566: 23, \\ & 6574: 15,6580: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| 6522:4, 6530:9 | better [7] - 6555:10 | 50:1 | 6582:2, 6600:7 | 96:3, 6596:4 |
| baseball [1] - 6580:10 | 555:13, 6577:19 | 6550:13, 6550:16 | bring [6] - 6537:20 | 6596:8, 6602:21, |
| based [12] - 6513:15, | 6586:1, 6586:18, | 6550:22, 6568:20, | 6560:16, 6561:1 | 6604:23 |
| 6513:16, 6519:7, | 6600:19, 6605:19 | 6575:7 | 6572:22, 6593:16, | buying [8] - 6513:2, |
| $6526: 15,6551: 12,$ | between [9]-6506:12, | Booking [1] - 6509:23 | 6596:22 <br> brings [1] - 6570:10 | 6513:10, 6518:6, 6538:5, 6538:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6570: 2,6586: 12, \\ & 6590: 14,6592: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6512:1, 6565:4, } \\ & \text { 6575:3, 6577:1, } \end{aligned}$ | Booking.com [1] - 6544:6 | brings [1] - 6570:10 broadcast [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6538:5, 6538:9, } \\ & \text { 6538:10, 6574:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 6603:8, 6604:20 | $94: 18,6596: 14$ | bo | 49:10 | 580:11 |
| basic [3] - 6537:21, | 6596:17, 6601:7 | 6503:11, 6536:4 | brought [1] - 6525:20 | BY [31] - 6500:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6600:22 } \\ & \text { basis [4] - 6552:12, } \end{aligned}$ | beyond [2] - 6528:19, 6600:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 6536: 10,6546: 8 \\ & 6552: 20,6553: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { browser [3] - 6514:8, } \\ 6520: 8,6552: 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6503: 8,6508: 19, \\ & 6510: 15,6516: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
| 6555:10, 6583:24, | $\text { biased }[1]-660$ | $6555: 1,6555: 19$ | browsers [1] - 6514:9 | 521:20, 6524:13, |
| 6602:16 | bid [9] - 6508:6 | 58:15, 6561:23 | browsing [1] - | 529:11, 6531:3, |
| Bates [1] - 6531:4 | 6508:10, 6520:6, | 6562:6, 6563:22 | 6586:22 | 6534:5, 6535:4, 6535:17, 6539:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { beach }[2]-6507: 10, \\ & 6511: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6541:11, 6542:8, } \\ & \text { 6579:7, 6579:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { boost [2] - 6573:7, } \\ & 6574: 21 \end{aligned}$ | bu [1] - 6538:25 buckets [1] - 6599:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6535:17, 6539:15, } \\ & \text { 6548:7, 6554:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| became $[4]$ - 6501:15, | 6600:12 | bottom [11]-6520:12, | budget [4]-6590:6, | 6560:12, 6563:17, |
| 6504:17, 6517:21, | bidding [4] - 6514:18, | 6520:15, 6522:10, | 6591:5, 6596:22, | 6569:15, 6576:6, 6576:17, 6578:7, |
| become [5] - 650 |  | 6557:17, 6561:1 | budgets [2] - 6591 | 6578:22, 6581:16, |
| 6502:5, 6523:24, 6532.15, $6561 \cdot 6$ | $6518: 25,6547: 2,$ | 6586:9, 6587:13, <br> 6597:20, 6597.21 | $6600: 14$ | 6584:1, 6585:14, 6585:24, 6586:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6532:15, 6561:6 } \\ & \text { becomes [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6563: 21,6582: 7, \\ & 6600: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 6597:20, 6597:21 } \\ \text { bought }[1]-6501: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buffalo [1] - 6519:23 } \\ & \text { build [20] - } 6519: 3 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6585:24, 6586:13, } \\ & \text { 6589:5, 6595:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6543:20, 6555:8, } \\ & 6604: 7 \end{aligned}$ | billion [6] - 6575:16, 6575:23, 6575:24, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Boulder [5] - 6539:25, } \\ 6574: 11,6574: 12, \end{gathered}$ | 6519:4, 6519:10, 6519:14, 6529:22, | 6597:4, 6599:4 |
| BEFORE [2] - 6496:1, | 6594:22, 6598:4 | 6579:5, 6579:10 | 6564:10, 6564:12, | C |
| 6496:10 | 6598:10 | box [3]-6511:12, | 6583:22, 6599:11, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { began }[2]-6557: 24, \\ & 6558: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { binder [12] - 6519:22, } \\ 6535: 6,6545: 24, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6573: 16,6598: 4 \\ \text { boxes }[1]-6597: 21 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6599: 20,6599: 21, \\ & 6599: 22,6600: 19, \end{aligned}$ | campaigns [7] - |
| begin [2] - 6546:19, | 6553:14, 6554:12, | brand [15]-6510:6, | 6602:10, 6602:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6591:7, 6593:17, } \\ & 6593: 25,6594: 8, \end{aligned}$ |



| ```conducted [1] - 6516:10 confident [1] - 6533:18 confusing [1] - 6579:9 Connolly [1] - 6497:3 consider [4] - 6515:21, 6574:16, 6583:21, 6591:25 consideration [1] - 6525:22 considered [5] - 6514:5, 6514:20, 6515:8, 6576:22, 6576:24 consisted [1] - 6501:13 consistent [1] - 6533:9 consistently [1] - 6515:16 consists [1] - 6504:6 Constitution [1] - 6497:9 consumer [10] - 6501:14, 6509:15, 6511:5, 6528:3, 6529:7, 6554:25, 6557:24, 6586:20, 6587:24, 6588:23 consumer-facing [1] - 6501:14 consumers [4] - 6515:25, 6527:14, 6557:4, 6566:22 consuming [2] - 6586:21, 6588:4 content [4] - 6502:15, 6502:16, 6586:21, 6588:4 context [7]-6522:3, 6525:3, 6530:18, 6531:20, 6587:16, 6587:19, 6589:1 continued [1] - 6496:24 CONTINUED \({ }_{[1]}\) - 6497:1 continues [1] - 6554:24 continuing [1] - 6526:16 contracts [1] - 6502:19 control [1] - 6590:4 controls [1] - 6590:2 conversation [5] - 6522:4, 6525:15, 6525:25, 6569:25, 6570:11``` |  |  | ```COVID-19 [1] - 6545:6 \\ crack [1] - 6526:5 \\ create [3]-6528:14, \\ 6533:9, 6547:1 \\ created [1] - 6529:14 \\ criticisms [3] - \\ 6563:25, 6564:4, \\ 6564:17 \\ Cross [1] - 6498:4 \\ cross [1] - 6543:19 \\ CROSS [1] - 6534:4 \\ CROSS- \\ EXAMINATION \({ }_{[1]}\) - \\ 6534:4 \\ Cross-Examination.. \\ ............ [1] - 6498:4 \\ CRR \({ }_{[1]}\) - 6497:9 \\ cue [1] - 6528:5 \\ curious [2]-6598:20, 6599:3 \\ current [3] - 6579:10, 6583:1, 6585:4None```$\mathbf{D}$ <br> D.C $[10]-6496: 5$, <br> 6496:14, 6497:4, <br> 6497:10, 6507:11, <br> 6508:9, $6508: 13$, <br> 6509:11, 6568:24, <br> 6568:25 <br> data $[7]-6522: 7$, <br> 6523:9, $6523: 10$, <br> 6528:4, 6530:8, <br> 6542:23, 6543:11 <br> DATE $[1]-6606: 9$ <br> date $[1]-6523: 6$ <br> dated $[2]-6512: 21$, <br> $6536: 11$ <br> dates $[8]-6507: 8$, <br> $6511: 18,6512: 7$, <br> $6543: 23,6551: 13$, <br> 6574:11, $6574: 13$, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6543:9, 6557:18, } \\ & 6575: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6603:6 } \\ & \text { digit }[2]-6503: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6561:1, } 6571: 5, \\ & 6603: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { dozen }[1]-6500: 23$ | E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| description [1] - | 6503:19 | discussion [2] | drive [5] - 6547:2, | e-mail [19] - 6521:13, |
| 6511: | digital [14] - 650 | $\text { 6531:8, } 6605$ | 6562:25, 6590 | 6523:3, 6525:5, |
| deserved [1] - | 6505:22, 6505:25 | $6508: 5,6583: 18$ | driven [2] - 6547:3, | 30:9, 6530:1 |
| 6532:23 | 06:12, 6507:25 | 6588:19 | dive | 6530:15, 6530:16, |
| desktop [2] - 6514:10, | 6551:22, 6552:4, | displayed [4] | driver [1] - 6562:24 | 6530:17, 6530:18, |
| 6514:11 | 6583:11, 6583:14 | 6508:16, 6508:1 | driving [2] - 6555:13, | 2:2, 6534:15 |
| destinations [1] | 6583:16, 6587:1 | 6541:24, 6549:9 | 6595:19 | 536:16, 6536:20, |
| 6517:8 | digits [3] - 6503:17 | displays [1] - 6550:10 | dropdow | 7:2, 6537:22 |
| detailed [2] - 6526:3, | 6515:8, 6515:10 | dissatisfaction ${ }_{[1]}$ | 51 | 6548:11, 6548:14 |
| 6532:1 | Diller [2] - 6504:6 | 6531:1 | drove [2] - 6561:22, | e-mails [1] - 6530:11 |
| determine | 530 | distinct [1] - 6591:2 | 562: | early [2] - 6518:16, |
| 6538:21 | dime [1] - 6558:9 | distinction [2] | DU [1] - 6599:6 | 6543:15 |
| develop [1] - 6567:11 | dimensions | 6520:13, 6555:8 | during [17] - 6531:10, | earned [2] - 6575:15, |
| development [4] 6518:16, 6518:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6539:21 } \\ & \text { Dintzer [1] - 6499: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISTRICT }_{[3]}-6496: 1, \\ & 6496: 1,6496: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6532: 4,6532: 18, \\ & 6537: 8,6542: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6575:24 } \\ & \text { earning }[1]-6553: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6565:7, 6583:3 | DINTZER [1] - 6496:13 | document [18] - | 6542:15, 6544:13, | earnings [5] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { device }[2]-6514: 3, \\ & 6524: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { direct }[23]-6504: 7, \\ 6513 \cdot 25-6514 \cdot 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6521: 12,6527: 5, \\ & 6531: 5,6553: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6545: 1,6550: 19, \\ & 6554: 3,6560: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6535: 22,6553: 24, \\ & 6554: 11,6554: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| dialogue ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6525:14 | 6514:5, 6514:15 | 6557:16, 6558:19, | 560:18, 6561:16, | 61:17 |
| differ [1] - 6587:5 | 14:20, 6514:24 | 563:6, 6585:7 | 564:1, 6567:8, | easy [1] - 6528:14 |
| difference [3] - | 6515:5, 6515:11, | 6596:24, 6596:25, | 6567:13, 6605:4 | ecosystem [1] - |
| 6512:1, 6513:15, | 6515:19, 6548:9, | 6597:6, 6597:10, | DX. 006 [1] - 6566:13 | 6599:24 |
| 6577:1 | 6552:19, 6552:22 | 6597:14, 6597:17, | DX0273 [2]-6535:5, | educational [1] - |
| differences [1] | 553:2, 6554:24 | 597:21, 6598:11, | 6535:16 | 6501:2 |
| 6511:8 | 5:13, 6555:15 | 599: | DX0308 [3]-6557:13, | effective [1] - 6595:18 |
| different [50] - | 6555:19, 6556:16 | documents [2] | 6571:21, 6575:19 | effectively ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6582:5 |
| 6505:10, 6508:10, | 6558:2, 6563:1, | 6511:2, 6516 | DX0590 [1] - 6545:24 | efficiencies [3] - |
| 6509:17, 6513:13, | 6576:22, 6576:24 | DOJ [3] - 6496:13, | DX0592 [1] - 6569:23 | 6593:7, 6593:9, |
| 6513:14, 6513:20, | DIRECT [2] - 6500:2, | 6499:6, 6533:23 | DX2026 [5] - 6553:15, | 6593:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6513:21, 6526:7 } \\ & 6526: 9,6528: 8, \end{aligned}$ | Direct [2] - 6498:4, | $\begin{gathered} \text { dollar [2] } \\ 6518: 9 \end{gathered}$ | 6554:5, 6554:10, <br> 6554:22, 6561:15 | efficiency [2] 6554:13, 6596:20 |
| 6528:9, 6528:10, | 6 | dollars [3] - 6575:2, | DX2026................ | efficient [1] - 6595:18 |
| 6528:16, 6528:24, | direction $[1]-6590: 7$ directly [13] | 6575:23, 6596:19 done[3]-6592:6, | 6498:10 | either [3]-6507:9, |
| 6529:20, 6529:23, 6547:1, 6547:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { directly [13] - 6511:5, } \\ & 6514: 2,6514: 4, \end{aligned}$ | done [3]-6592:6, 6595:22, 6605:7 | $6498: 10$ | 6549:4, 6599:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6547: 1,6547: 10, \\ & 6547: 18,6548: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 6514:2, 6514:4, <br> 6514:12, 6514:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6595:22, 6605:7 } \\ & \operatorname{dot}[2]-6578: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DX2027[3] - 6498:10, } \\ 6554: 13,6554: 19 \end{gathered}$ | elaborate [1] - 6511:7 <br> eligible [2] - 6520:21, |
| 6548:4, 6553:9, | 547:16, 6547:22, | 579:14 | DX2028 [1] - 6554:19 | 6550:21 |
| 6556:19, 6556:22, | $6553: 5,6555: 1,$ | dots [3] - 6509:2 | DX2028................ | embrace [1] - 6520:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6556:23, 6566:14, } \\ & \text { 6569:4, 6569:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6557: 4,6577: 6, \\ & 6577: 8.6577: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 6509:20 <br> DoubleClic | .............. [1] | emphasis [2] 6531:7, 6558:8 |
| 6574:18, 6577:5, | director ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6501:11 | 6603:19 |  | empirically ${ }_{[2]}$ - |
| 6577:22, 6583:10, | directors [1] - 6567:9 | doubled [2] - 6534:21, | $6563: 13,6563: 16$ | $6532: 23,6561: 5$ |
| 6583:14, 6583:16, 6584:4, 6585:5, | disadvantages [4] 6602:6, 6602:7 | 6536:7 | DX2030. | employed [2] - |
| 6587:6, 6587:7, | 6603:12, 6603:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { down [10] - 6516: } \\ & \text { 6518:4, } 6520: 9 \end{aligned}$ | .................. [1] | 6500:11, 6581:21 |
| 6588:25, 6589:18, | discuss [5] -6504:13, | $45: 2,6560: 25$ | D18 [2] - 6539:10, | 6604:11 |
| 6590:25, 6591:3, | 6525:1, 6560:6, | 564:21, 6566:24, | 6543:7 | employment ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| 6594:18, 6594:19, | 6590:11, 6605:3 | 6572:3, 6572:5, | dynamic [10] | 6500:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6599:13, 6599:17, } \\ & \text { 6600:1, 6602:13, } \end{aligned}$ | discussed [10] 6537:5, 6538:13 | 6586:15 | 6526:21, 6537:25, | empty [1] - 6597:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6600:1, 6602:13, } \\ & \text { 6603:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6537:5, 6538:13, } \\ & \text { 6549:18, 6549:23, } \end{aligned}$ | download [2] 6513:8, 6559:1 | 6538:1, 6538:10, $6539 \cdot 18,6539 \cdot 20$ | enables [1] - 6582:4 |
| differentiation [1] - | 6565:15, 6570:11, | downloaded [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6539:18, 6539:20, } \\ & \text { 6539:21, 6574:20, } \end{aligned}$ | encompass [1] 6506:7 |
| 6529:7 | 6575:6, 6576:5, | 6576:20, 6577:14 | 574:22, 6579:9 | encouraging [1] - |
| differentiator ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 6590:25, 6600:5 | downloads [5] - | dynamics [5] - | 6557:4 |
| 6600:25 | discussing [7]- | 6558:25, 6559:9, | 6523:18, 6537:25, | end [6] - 6515:4, |
| difficult [2] - 6596:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6527:8, 6536:16, } \\ & \text { 6536:20, } 6551: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6562:9, 6562:13, } \\ & 6562: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6553:9, 6574:3, } \\ & 6577: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6519:13, 6529:19, } \\ & \text { 6531:8, 6564:25, } \end{aligned}$ |



| exploring [2] - | 6566:11, 6567:12, | 6544:12 | 6514:17, 6519:2, | 6599:13, 6599:16, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6586:23 | 6590:11, 6591:11, | Floor [2] - 6496:22, | 6522:9, 6537:12, | 6604:3, 6604:18 |
| expressed [2] - | 6600:18, 6600:20 | 6497:6 | $6537: 16,6537: 22$ $6550 \cdot 1,6550: 4$ | generate [3] - 6503:9, |
| 6513:10, 6537:22 <br> expressing [1] - | 6602:15, 6604:23 <br> February [1] - 6535:8 | fluidly [1] - 6596:22 <br> focus [8] - 6506:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 6550: 1,6550: 4, \\ & 6556: 5,6599: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 6503:12, 6568:12 <br> generated [1] - 6555:1 |
| 6530:20 | fee [2]-6532:15, | 8:2, 6556:1 | 6604:4, 6604:8 | generates |
| ex | 50:1 | 83:6, 6584:23 | frequency [1] - 6574:4 | 6552:19 |
| 45:1 | feed [1] - 6588:25 | 6589:25, 6596:10 | frequent [1] - 6513:23 | generic [1] - 6520:4 |
| extension [1] - 6585:1 | feedback [2] | 6596:12 | frequently [9] - | given [3]-6531:16, |
| extent [3] - 6584:7, | $6590: 15,6590: 2$ | focused [6] - 6528:2, | 6514:15, 6517:13, 6530:1, 6543:12 | 6538:23, 6568:18 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 6592:17, 6592:20 } \\ \text { extreme }[2]-6565: 3, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fees [3] - 6604:5, } \\ & 6604: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6529:3, 6529:4, } \\ & 6557: 25,6558: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6530:1, 6543:12, } \\ & \text { 6543:16, 6543:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { global }[5]-6555: 6, \\ 6572: 1,6595: 3, \end{gathered}$ |
| 565:9 | felt []] - 6526:5 | 58:12 | 49:15, 6574:5, | 6595: |
| eye ${ }_{11}$ - 6567:14 | 6531:22, 6545:11 | focuses [2] - 6600:12 | 603 | globally [2] - 6555:20, |
| F | 6533:3, 6572:15, | 6507:22, 6589 | 57 | Gloria [1] - 6534:1 |
|  | 14, 6585:15 | fold [1] - 6542:2 | 6571:20, 6589:2 | GLORIA [1] - 6497:2 |
| Facebook [1] - 6513:1 | 6593:22 | follow [3] - 6524:14, 6527:6, 6529:12 | frustrating [3] - | goal [1] - 6513:7 |
| faced [3] - 6537:9, 6544:2, 6545:2 | fewer $[5]-6519: 13$ $6523: 1,6524: 10$, | 6527:6, 6529:12 <br> follow-on [1] - 6527:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6525:23, 6526: } \\ & \text { 6532:8 } \end{aligned}$ | goals [1] - 6601:6 <br> Goodrich [1] - 6497:5 |
| facing [3] - 6501:14, | 6531:10, 6561:10 | following [3] - 6528:5, | frustration [1] | GOOGLE [1] - 6496:6 |
| $6560: 17,6560: 22$ <br> fact [2] - 6601:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { filing [2] - 6557:14, } \\ & 6605: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 6576:20, 6586:5 <br> football [1] - 6559: | $\begin{gathered} 6530: 20 \\ \text { fulfill }[1]-65 \end{gathered}$ | Google [158] - 6499:5, |
| 6601:22 | filings [4]-6535:22, | footprint [1] - 6592:11 | full [5] - 6523:7 | 6506:8, 6506:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { factors [2] - 6539:3, } \\ & 6555: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6571: 12,6571: 15, \\ & 6571: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FOR }_{[3]}-6496: 1, \\ & 6499: 24,6581: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6546:3, 6546:7, } \\ & \text { 6599:11, 6599:23 } \end{aligned}$ | 6506:10, 6506:12, 6506:14, 6506:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { facts }[2]-6561: 18 \\ & 6562: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { financial [5] - } \\ & 6535: 23,6545: 9 \end{aligned}$ | forego [1] - 6533:6 foregoing [1]-6606:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fun }[1]-6567: 25 \\ & \text { function }[1]-6502: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6507:1, 6507:2, } \\ & \text { 6507:15, 6507:1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { fair }[8]-6534: 20, \\ 6534: 22,6538: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6546: 16,6553: 25, \\ & 6561: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { form }[3]-6505: 16,$ | functionality [1] 6568:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6508:21, 6508:23, } \\ & \text { 6509:4, 6509:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 6538:17, 6542:11, | finished [1] - 6514:13 | formats [5] - 6551:22 | functionally [2] | 6509:20, 6510:1, |
| 6564:25, 6575:15, | finite [1] - 6518:1 | 6559:25, 6587:10, | 6528:25, 6564:11 | 510:9, 6510:1 |
| 6588:2 | firm [1]-6513:3 | 6588:14, 6600:1 | functions [4] | 511:6, 6511:9 |
| fairer ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6575:17 | first [18] - 6504:18, | forms [4]-6552:3 | 6591:10, 6591:11, | 511:11, 6512:1, |
| fairly [1] - 6589:17 | 520:18, 6520:20, | 55:22, 6572:20 | 6600:25, 6602:15 | 5512:6, 6512:17, |
| fall $[1]-6599: 18$ | 6521:2, 6525:25, | 6576:7 | fungible [1] - 6575:3 | 6513:9, 6513:23, |
| falsehood [1] - | 6530:13, 6538:16, | forth [2]-6537:1 | funnel [3] - 6587:13, | 513:24, 6514:13, |
| 6532:11 | 6538:17, 6558:22, | 6596:22 | 6587:14, 6588:19 | 514:16, 6514:18, |
| familiar [10]-6504:1, | 6578:12, 6584:24, | forward [3] - 6522:20, |  | 515:15, 6515:16, |
| 6505:11, 6509:6, <br> 6510:16, 6510:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 6585: 25,6586: 9, \\ & 6595: 20,6597: 5, \end{aligned}$ | 6530:5, 6530:14 <br> foundation [2] | G | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6515:19, 6515:21, } \\ & 6516: 5,6516: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| 6521:3, 6549:16, $6568 \cdot 9,6568: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6597:24, 6600:9, } \\ & \text { 6602:11 } \end{aligned}$ | 6569:12, 6600:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gain }_{[1]}-6541: 16 \\ & \text { game }[1]-6580: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 6517:25, 6518:23, 6518:24, 6519:1, |
| 6569:13 | five [5] - 6508:9 | four [17]-6509:18, 6509:22, 6510:5, | $\text { gap }_{[1]}-6533: 17$ | 6519:12, 6519:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { familiarize [1] - } \\ & 6585: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6511: 15,6515: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 6510:19, 6516:17, | General [1]-6496:21 general [15]-6502:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6519:20, 6522:1, } \\ & 6522: 5,6522: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| family [2] - 6503:1, 6511:15 | flat [3] - 6522:12, 6531:17, 6532:1 | $6523: 24,6527: 1,$ | 6506:5, 6508:8, 6515:15, 6517:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6522:10, 6522:12, } \\ & \text { 6522:17, 6523:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\operatorname{far}[2]-6510: 7$ | flavor [1] - 6565:7 | $92: 2,6599: 10$ | $6527: 23,6528: 2,$ | 524:24, 6525:1, |
| 6528:22 | flight [4]-6503:1, | 6599:13, 6599:17 | 6529:2, 6542:11, | 6525:7, 6525:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { farm }[1]-6602: 23 \\ & \text { faster }[3]-6542 \cdot 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6519: 21,6566: 23, \\ & 6570: 25 \end{aligned}$ | four-year [2] - 6522:13 | 6568:22, 6569:5, 6577:8, 6580:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6525:14, 6525:19, } \\ & \text { 6526:5, 6526:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 6543:5, 6605:10 | $\text { Flight }[1] \text { - 6519:20 }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fourth }[2]-6546: 7 \\ & 6557: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $6580: 14,6592: 8$ | 6526:10, 6526:17, |
| favor [1] - 6506:14 | flights [4]-6500:16, | fraction [2] - 6556:10, | generally [16] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6527:7, 6527:20, } \\ & 6528: 2,6528: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| feature ${ }_{[7]}-6564: 11$, 6566:18, 6566:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6507:16, 6519:8, } \\ & 6562: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 6556:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6507:9, 6516:15, } \\ & 6538: 25,6573: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6528: 2,6528: 12, \\ & 6529: 4,6529: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 6567:17, 6567:21, | flip [2] - 6513:9, | 6532:5 | $6580: 8,6584: 2$ | 529:25, 6530:7, |
| 6569:9, 6569:20 | $65$ | Francisco [1] - 6501:8 | 6584:20, 6587:22, | 6530:11, 6530:13, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { features [11] - 6519:6, } \\ 6557: 9,6562: 22, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FlipKey [4] - 6540:14, } \\ & 6544: 8,6544: 10, \end{aligned}$ | frankly [1] - 6579:9 <br> free [13]-6510:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6588:13, 6588:18, } \\ & 6590: 23,6597: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6530:21, 6531:9, } \\ & \text { 6531:15, 6531:17, } \end{aligned}$ |




| lean-back [1] - 6588:4 | 6551:13, 6570:16 | 6523:3, 6525:5 | ma | 6603:22, 6604:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| learn [1] - 6504:22 | lodging [4]-6520:5, | 6527:6, 6530:6 | 6603:19, 6603:22 | measures [1] |
| learned [1] - 6505:8 | 6520:25, 6546:8 | 6530:9, 6530:13, | marketing [23] | 6551:21 |
| least [3] - 6590:3, | logo [1] - 6599:5 | 6530:15, 6530:16, | 6501:19, 6501:25, | mechanism [5] |
| 6595:7, 6605:17 | logos [2] - 6586:12, | 6530:17, 6530:18, | 6505:17, 6506:19, | 6525:15, 6525:16, |
| leave [2] - 6580:25, | 6598:8 | $6532: 2,6534: 15$, $6536: 16,6536 \cdot 20$ | 6506:20, $6506: 21$, | 6574:18, 6574:19, $6580 \cdot 9$ |
| 6581:2 | long-established ${ }^{11]}$ - | 536:16, 6536:20 | 6506:23, 6510:19 | 6580: |
| led [2] - 6525:11, | 6517:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6537:2, 6537:22, } \\ & \text { 6548:11, 6548:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 6515:12, 6526:16, 6548:12, 6548:25 | media [17] - 6503:23, <br> $6505 \cdot 24,6512 \cdot 23$, |
| 6530:8 | longer-lasting [1] | 6548:11, 6548:14 | 6548:12, 6548:25, | $6505: 24,6512:$ |
| left [1] - 6509:19 | 6558:3 | mails [1] - 6530:1 | 6551:15, 6552:11, | 6513:1, 6513:3, |
| leisure [1] - 6517:8 | look [15] - 6513:13, | main ${ }^{[2]}$ - 6531:7, | 6552:13, 6556:11, | 6548:22, 6548:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { less [11]-6509:18, } \\ & 6515: 19,6517: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6519:25, 6522:22, } \\ & 6526: 12,6527: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 6601:19 <br> Maine [1] - 6497 | $\begin{aligned} & 6558: 2,6558: 24, \\ & 6564: 19,6582: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6548:25, 6549:3, } \\ & \text { 6551:15, 6551:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 6523:8, 6523:14, | 532:2, | major [6] - 6545:9, | 583:11, 6584:21, | 575:20, 6583:18, |
| 6524:4, 6537:22, | 36:2, 6539:19 | 6584:13, 6584:1 | 6587:19 | 85:25, 6588:20, |
| 6561:5, 6574:25, | 6552:5, 6553:11 | 591:13, 6591:19 | marketplace [7] - | 88:21 |
| 6595:11, 6596:5 | 6553:18, 6555:9, | 6592:2 | 501:13, 6531:11, | meet [3]-6500:7, |
| level [10]-6512:4, | 6578:25, 6593:5 | majority [7] - 6552:19, | 33:10, 6583:23, | 6504:10, 6534:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6529:8, 6532:3, } \\ & \text { 6545:16, 6575:2, } \end{aligned}$ | looked [4] - 6505:17, <br> 6525:14, 6530:9 | 6555:18, 6580:14, 6595:12, 6595:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6593:5, 6593:6, } \\ & \text { 6593:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { meeting }[11]-6505: 3, \\ & 6525: 4,6525: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| 6589:24, 6590:1, | 6534:2 | 6595:23, 6596:6 | marketplaces [1] | 525:11, 6525:24, |
| 6590:4, 6590:6 | looking [11] - 6524:15, | manage [11] | 6602:14 | :6, 6530:8 |
| Levi [1] - 6501:8 | 6542:1, 6553:16, | 6544:23, 6582:4, | markets [2] - 6542:12, | 6530:13, 6530:17, |
| Liberty ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6496:21 | 6554:21, 6561:13, | 82:5, 6583:8 | 6573:10 | 530:20, 6530:22 |
| life [1] - 6595:17 | 75:18, 6582:8, | 89:13, 6591:7 | Marriott [1] - 6502:22 | meetings [5] - |
| light ${ }_{[1]}-6605: 12$ | 6586:23, 6587:25, | 6592:16, 6593:25, | master's [2]-6501:5 | 6504:12, 6504:15, |
| likelihood [2] - | 6596:19, 6599:15 | 6599:16, 6602:15 | match [1] - 6520:7 | 04:21, 6515:18, |
| 6518:6, 6559:18 | looks [3] - 6519:19, | 6602:25 | materially [1] - | 6525:6 |
| likely [2] - 6513:21, | 6525:21, 6541:22 | managed [2] 6502:11, 65 | 6524:19 | MEHTA [1] - 6496:10 |
| 6528:10 | lower [2]-6531:25 | management [3] | 6533:12 | 6504:8, 6504:19, |
| limited [1] - 6568:16 | 6594:25 | 6502:12, 6530:7 | matter [1] - 6606:5 | 6546:20 |
| linear ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6538:9 | loyalty [11] - 6528:17, | 6598:5 | matters [1] - 6539:1 | members [6] - |
| lines [1] - 6543:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 6547: 1,6547: 3, \\ & 6556: 24,6558: 13, \end{aligned}$ | Manager [2] 6603:20, 6604:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Maui [2] - } 6567: 22, \\ & 6567: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6546: 24,6546: 25, \\ & 6558: 14,6558: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { link }[9] \text { - 6510:5, } \\ & \text { 6514:16, 6514:17, } \end{aligned}$ | 6558:24, 6561:22, | manager [2] - 6526:2, | maximize [2] | 6561:22, 6569:25 |
| 6524:3, 6548:14, | 6562:24, 6567:2 | 6530:19 | 6551:18, 6573:5 | mentioned [13] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6549:3, 6549:12, } \\ & 6549: 16,6576: 18 \end{aligned}$ | luck [1] - 6515:4 lunch [2] - 6605:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { managers [2] - } \\ & 6544: 19,6544: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { McKenzie [2] - 6501:7, } \\ & 6501: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6506:15, 6506:18, } \\ & 6507: 12,6512: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| links [15] - 6509:22, 6514•19, 6516.23 | 6605:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { managing [2] - } \\ & 6590: 24,6598: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { mean }[22]-6507: 5, \\ 6507: 13,6507: 24, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6519:17, 6534:14, } \\ & \text { 6537:8, 6542:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 6517:4, 6517:23, | M | manually [2] 6593:22, 6596:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6521:6, 6528:1, } \\ & \text { 6537:15, 6559:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6548: 22,6549: 6, \\ & 6550: 24,6567: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6527:1, 6527:3, <br> 6550:2, 6550:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { magnitude }[1] \text { - } \\ & 6592: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{map}_{[15]}-6509: 1, \\ 6509: 13,6509: 16, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6578:24, 6583:19, } \\ & \text { 6587:21, 6587:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6595:1 } \\ & \text { meritless [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 6550:10, 6550:13, <br> 6550:17, 6550:22 | MAIER ${ }_{[22]}$ - 6497:2, $6521: 17,6530: 25$, | $\begin{aligned} & 6509: 18,6509: 19, \\ & 6509: 20,6509: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 6592:6, 6593:11 $6595: 16,6596: 1,$ | $\begin{gathered} 6532: 23 \\ \text { met [2]-6534:7, } \end{gathered}$ |
| list [3] - 6514:11, | 6534:1, 6534:5 | 10:7, 6511:1, | 596:9, 6596:11, | 6534:8 |
| 6567:23, 6591:16 | $6535: 2,6535: 4,$ | 6512:3, 6522:20, | 3597:25, 6598:6, | meta [46] - 6505:19, |
| listed [1] - 6592:3 <br> listening [1] - 6530:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6535:16, 6535:17, } \\ & \text { 6539:15, 6548:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6523: 25,6525: 9 \\ & 6527: 1,6527: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6601:4, 6602:11, } \\ & 6604: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6505:20, 6505:21, } \\ & \text { 6507:12, 6507:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
| listening [1] - 6530:1 listings [2] - 6538:14, | 6554:5, 6554:11 | March [1] - 6502:3 | meaningful ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $6508: 2,6508: 4$ |
| 6550:13 | 6554:20, 6560:1, | marginal ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6524:22 | 6515:6 | 508:20, 6508:23, |
| literally [1] - 6580:13 | 6560:12, 6563:13, 6563:17, 6569:15, | Marin [3] - 6591:21, | means [6] - 6531:21, | 6510:8, 6511:24, 6512:3, 6512:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { live }[1]-6500: 5 \\ & \text { LLC [2] }-6496: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 6576:3, 6576:6, | marked [9] - 6539:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 6550: 5,6559: 3, \\ & 6600: 23,6601: 5, \end{aligned}$ | 6512:21, 6516:21, |
| 6499:5 | 6:9 | 6540:25, 6553:14, | 6602:12 | 518:11, 6524:8 |
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