EXPERT REPORT OF JANES. KINNE

The National Geographic Society ("NGS") has retained me in this case to opine on the amount of the license fees which would have been negotiated for the use of images created by Plaintiffs in the various "Complete National Geographic" CD-ROMs and DVDs ("CNO") published by Mindscape under agreement with NGS.

BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

I have worked in the photographic industry for some 55 years. From 1947 to 1993, that principally involved being an agent for freelance photographers. As such, I was negotiating or supervising the grant of licenses and the accompanying fees for all types of uses, both editorial and commercial, on a daily basis. At times, this activity exceeded 100 different transactions in a single day.

Part of my background included acting as editor or packager on single books or series of titles. All of these publications relied heavily on the image content but also included supporting text.

Throughout my long career, I have been active in the various professional organizations whose membership includes the creators, the users and the agents and vendors of the entire photographic and publishing communities. From the late 1960's to the present day, my involvement in the American Society of Media Photographers (ASMP); the American Society of Pictures Professionals (ASPP); the Picture Agency Council of America (PACA); and the North American Nature Photography Association

(NANPA) has contered on the development of ethical business practices, the creation of standard paperwork, conditions and terms and the education of creators and users on the elements that create value in arriving at fair and reasonable pricing. Toward these ends I was involved in the writing and editing of ASMP's Guide to Business Practice Editions I through 5, and the Stock Photographers Handbook Editions I and 2. I also served as a consultant and editor for Pricing Photography by Michael Heron and David MacTavish.

In the past four years I have testified, either at deposition or at trial, as an expert in the following cases.

2001:

B&B Photo Studio v. New York Post, New York State Supreme Court Levy v. Levy, New York State Supreme Court Sinkovec v. Rick Johnson & Co., Inc., New Mexico State Court Greenberg v. Lens Crafters, U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida George Howard v. City of Tucson, Arizona State Court John Warner v. St. Labre Indian School Education Ass'n, U.S. District Court, District Court, District of Montana, Billings Division

2000:

Edith Shaw Marcus and Meta Shaw Stevens as Temporary Administrators of the Estate of Sam Shaw v. Martin Bressler, Larry Shaw, Susan Shaw, Bressler & Bressler, Valerie Goodman, 1912 Productions, Irv., Marc Weinstein, Individually and d/b/a Color Group, New York State Supreme Court

1999:

Edward Pardee v. Orange Micro, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California

Guthy-Renker v. Gary Bernstein, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California

1998:

Jack Leigh v. Warner Bros., U.S. District Court, Southern District of Georgia, Savannah Division
Kim Taylor Reece v. DFS (Duty Free Shops), U.S. District Court, District of Hawaii
Greg Manguso v. University of California, L.A., California State Court
Focus on Sports v. Emest Lawrence Group, New York State Supreme

Court

P. 37

Boris Raishevich v. Charles Foster, an Officer of the NY State Police U.S. District Courl, Southern District of New York

I am being compensated for my time and expertise at the rate of \$200 per hour. A copy of my curriculum vitae is strached as Exhibit A.

INFORMATION REVIEWED

- a) Certain issues of the magazine in which the images that are the subject of this complaint originally appeared;
- b) The various CD-ROM and DVD products in which these same images appear;
- e) Financial information on the sales figures for the various CD-ROM and DVD products;
- d) Letter dated 6 May 1997 from James Pickerell addressed to Former and Present National Geographic shooters;
- e) The expert report of Plaintiffs' expert Henri Dauman;
- f) The expert report of Plaintiffs' expert Kerry Kuoff,
- g) The expert report of Plaintiffs' expert Barbara Zimmerman;
- h) The expert report of Plaintiff's expert Jonathan Wells;
- i) Industry pricing guides often used in determining price structures,

including:

- Negotiating Stock Photo Prices, by Jim and Cheryl Pickerell, 1993, 1997, 2001 editions;
- Pricing Photography, by Michael Heron and David MacTavish, 1993, 1997, 2002 editions;
- 3) The computer software program Foto Quote;
- 4) ASMP Profossional Business Practices in Photography, 6th Edition.

P. 38

- j) Contracts between Plaintiffs and NGS concerning the publication
 of images and/or texts in National Geographic Magazine;
- k) Documents showing amounts paid by NGS for the use of images in CD-ROM products other than "The Complete National Geographie;"
- 1) Documents showing amounts paid by NGS to stock photographic agencies for the use of images in "The Complete National Geographic;"
- m) Minutes of a meeting of the Board of Trustees of the National Geographic Society on June 12, 1997.

Most importantly, I relied on my 55 years of experience in the real world of negotiating ticenses and fees and in determining suitable budgets for heavily illustrated products.

ANALYSIS

I have a fundamental difference of opinion with all of Plaintiffs' experts as to the nature of "The Complete National Geographic." By long-standing industry accepted definition, this is an editorial product intended to convey facus and information, as opposed to a commercial product which is intended to promote or advertise goods or services. To use any commercial fee structure, therefore, is simply wrong.

Moreover, I disagree with the basic approach taken by Plaintiffs' experts, whereby they set a base fee for the use and then apply multipliers due to a variety of factors. As an initial matter, I understand based on comments by John Pahey to the NGS

Board of Trustees that NGS expected "The Complete National Geographic" to do no better financially than break even. The parties thus would never have anticipated or accounted for in their negotiations the success that the products actually realized. For this reason, the royalty model that I outline below is a better approach because it accounts for the events that actually occurred. Additionally, because my approach provides for royalties payable on all sales, it takes into account all of the varied factors that caused Plaintiffs to apply multipliers, such as the print run, worldwide distribution, and the like.

Plaintiffs' approach is also flawed because certain of the multipliers are simply inappropriate. For example, Plaintiffs use a multiplier of 100% for the right to publish in all languages, when in fact I understand that the product was only published in the English language. Furthermore, two of the multipliers – for "lack of copyright credit" and for "unauthorized use" – have no place in an analysis that attempts, as Mr. Dauman states, "to determine the prices each party would have agreed to had they been reasonably and voluntarily trying to reach an agreement" before publication of the products at issue. These multipliers are only applicable if the negotiation took place after publication. Pinally, even when multiples are used, they are rarely 100%, the amount suggested by Mr. Dauman and Ms. Zimmerman in some instances.

As a result of Plaintiffs' fundamentally flawed approach, the proposed license fees put forth by Plaintiffs' experts are astronomical. In no negotiation of which I am aware did a photographer or writer request or receive such a high fee. The unreasonableness of Plaintiffs' experts' proposed license fees is underscored by comparing them to amounts actually paid by National Geographic Society to third parties

for the use of images in various CD-ROM products. On average, NGS paid \$137 per image in CD-ROM products other than "The Complete National Geographic," NGS paid an a verage \$161 per-in a respect to "The Complete National Geographic," NGS paid an a verage \$161 per-in a respect to "The Complete National Geographic," NGS paid an a verage \$161 per-in a respect to both agencies.

In trying to determine a fee that might have been the result of any value length negotiation prior to the publication of CNG, the first fact established would been the classic editorial nature of this reference set, even though it is an electronic product rather than a truditional print set and is widely sold in retail locations, not just in product rather than a truditional print set and is widely sold in retail locations, not just in bookstores. With that in mind, it is my opinion that a "budgeting approach" would have been used as a framework for negotiating focs to be paid to photographers and writers. Such an approach would have been analogous to the model long used in the publishing Such an approach would have been analogous to the model long used in the publishing world for heavily illustrated books, popularly called "coffee table" books, wherein the appeal to the consumer emanales from the images displayed more than from the written

The model often used by publishers for these "coffee table" books is to set aside a sum equal to a percentage of the "sticker price," or retail price, to pay for all content, both images and text. The percentage can range from 10% to 15%. Historically, the visual content or images commanded two-thirds of this sum, and one-third was the visual content or images commanded two-thirds of this sum, and one-third was rescrived for the texts. To be conservative, I have chosen 15%, with 10% going to photographs and 5% going to texts.

These percentages should be applied to revenues received as a result of sales of the product to end users. Therefore, the figure to which the percentages should

be applied is the revenue received by Mindscape, less its sales to NGS, plus NGS' sales to end users. I am informed that this figure is \$53,724,449. Use of this amount is also conservative because it uses actual sales figures, not the projections which were made before the product was released. I have reviewed John Fahey's statements to the Board of Trustees of National Geographic Society prior to publication of "The Complete National Geographic" that the product was expected to do no better than break even. I have also reviewed certain documents reflecting revenues that the defendants received from the sale of "The Complete National Geographic," as well as the reports of Plaintiffs' financial experts. Based on these documents, I understand that the projections were much lower than the actual sales for "The Complete National Geographic."

Applying the budgeting model, \$8,056,667 (15% of \$53,724,449) would have been set uside to pay photographers and writers. Two-thirds, or \$5,357,072, would have been available to pay photographers. One third, or \$2,683,536, would have been available to pay writers.

This exact model is suggested in the 6 May 1997 letter from James H. Pickerell addressed to "Former and Present National Geographic Shooters," wherein he states:

A reasonable compromise would be for Geographic to set aside a certain percentage of the gross sales of the product which would be shared by the copyright holders based on their proportional share of the total content on the disc set.

Considering the large numbers of images involved the payment per image is likely to be very low, but for photographers who have done a number of stories over the years the gross still may be significant. For example, let's

say that there were 20,000 pictures that were produced by freolancers entitled to royalties. If, as result of sales, \$100,000 goes into the pot to pay the copyright holders each holder would got \$5 per picture.

The next step would be to divide these totals for images and text between the creators of the content proportionately according to each individual's contribution.

The images that were potentially protected by copyright in 1997, and thus would have been considered eligible to be included in the content percentage, are those that appeared from 1923 through 1997. I am informed that approximately 123.075 images appeared during those years. This figure was determined by having a NGS staff member count the number of images appearing in one year's worth of magazines every five years after 1978 and every ten years before 1978. These counts were used to calculate the average number of images that appear in National Geographic Magazine during the course of a year, and that average number was multiplied by 75 (the number of years elapsed between Japuary 1, 1923 and December 31, 1997) to arrive at the 123,075 figure.

Dividing the \$5,367,072 photographer royalty pool by 123.075 photographs establishes that each individual image would carry a value of \$43.60 (nearly 9 times the value of James Pickerell's 1997 example). The per-image figure of \$43.60 then only needs to be multiplied by the number of images each creator provided to arrive at his/her share. Thus, in the case of Fred Ward, who I have been told is the creator of 522 images, his share would be 532 times \$43.60, or a total of \$23,195.20.

The same principle applies to the authors of text pieces. They would share 5%, or \$2,683,536, proportionally according to their contribution. I am informed that, based on a counting exercise done in the same way as that conducted for photographs, approximately 5,775 stories have appeared in the Magazine since 1923. Each individual story therefore would carry a value of \$464.68. The per-story figure would then be multiplied by the number of stories each creator provided to arrive at his/her share. Mr. Ward, who, I am told, wrote nine stories, would have received \$4,182.12.

This report reflects my expert opinion at this time based on all the facts made available to me. Should additional facts become available, I reserve the right to amend my opinion at that time.

Dated:

January 28, 2002

Jane S. Kinne