



MICHAEL H. HAMMER
202 303 1110
mhammer@willkie.com

October 18, 2010

FILED/ACCEPTED

1875 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1238
Tel: 202 303 1000
Fax: 202 303 2000

BY HAND DELIVERY

OCT 18 2010

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: *In the Matter of Applications of Comcast Corporation, General Electric Company and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses or Transfer Control of Licensees, MB Docket No. 10-56*

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Comcast Corporation (“Comcast”) hereby submits its responses to the Commission’s October 4, 2010 Second Information and Document Request (the “Second Request”).¹ This submission is being produced pursuant to the Protective Order² and Second Protective Order³ in this proceeding and consistent with the instructions contained in the Second Request and the Commission’s May 21 Letter⁴ as supplemented or modified by directions from Commission staff.⁵ Attached hereto are (1) an index of the contents of this Submission, (2) an index of documents that Comcast possesses solely in redacted form, and (3) an index of the native Excel files included in the Submission.

¹ See Letter from William T. Lake, Chief, Media Bureau, to Michael H. Hammer, Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP, MB Docket No. 10-56 (Oct. 4, 2010).

² *Applications of Comcast Corporation, General Electric Company, and NBC Universal Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses or Transfer Control of Licensees*, Protective Order, MB Docket No. 10-56, DA 10-370 (MB Mar. 4, 2010).

³ *Applications of Comcast Corporation, General Electric Company, and NBC Universal Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses or Transfer Control of Licensees*, Second Protective Order, MB Docket No. 10-56, DA 10-371 (MB Mar. 4, 2010).

⁴ *In the Matter of Applications of Comcast Corporation, General Electric Company and NBC Universal, Inc. for Consent to Assign Licenses or Transfer Control of Licensees*, Information and Discovery Request for Comcast Corporation, MB Docket No. 10-56 (rel. May 21, 2010) (“May 21 Letter”).

⁵ See, e.g., Letter from William T. Lake, Chief, Media Bureau, to Michael H. Hammer, James L. Casserly, Michael D. Hurwitz, and Brien C. Bell, Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP, MB Docket No. 10-56 (June 3, 2010) (“Revised Instructions”).



No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCD

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
October 18, 2010
Page 2

Pursuant to the Protective Orders, Comcast is submitting two copies of this filing redacted for public inspection. Also pursuant to the Protective Orders, Comcast is submitting to the Secretary's Office under separate cover one copy of the Confidential and Highly Confidential versions of this filing. Finally, also pursuant to the Protective Orders and staff instructions, Comcast is providing the Confidential and Highly Confidential versions of the complete Submission to Commission staff in paper and electronic format.

Comcast will make the Confidential and Highly Confidential versions of this filing available pursuant to the terms of the Protective Orders. Parties interested in securing access to the Confidential or Highly Confidential versions of this filing should contact Brien Bell, Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP, 1875 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20006, (202) 303-1164, BBell@willkie.com.

Comcast has made diligent efforts to ensure that none of the documents it is submitting herewith is privileged under the attorney-client privilege or attorney work product doctrine. To the extent that any privileged documents may have been inadvertently produced, such production does not constitute waiver of any applicable privilege. Comcast requests that any privileged documents inadvertently produced be returned to Comcast as soon as such inadvertent production is discovered by any party, and reserves all rights to seek the return of any such documents.

Pursuant to Instruction No. 7(d)(3) of the Revised Instructions and the May 21 Letter, Comcast certifies that it has fully and completely complied with the Request consistent with the Instructions and Revised Instructions, and as modified and clarified by discussions with Commission staff.

If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,



Michael H. Hammer
Counsel to Comcast Corporation

Enclosures

cc: Vanessa Lemmé

Comcast Corporation
 FCC Second Information and Document Request
 MB Docket No. 10-56
 Index of Native Excel Files
 October 18, 2010

Native File	First Bates Number	Last Bates Number
72-COM-00000110.XLSX	72-COM-00000110	72-COM-00000114
73-COM-00000001.XLS	73-COM-00000001	73-COM-00000187
73-COM-00000188.XLS	73-COM-00000188	73-COM-00000418
73-COM-00000419.XLS	73-COM-00000419	73-COM-00000716
73-COM-00000717.XLS	73-COM-00000717	73-COM-00001156
73-COM-00001157.XLS	73-COM-00001157	73-COM-00001464
73-COM-00001465.XLS	73-COM-00001465	73-COM-00001958
73-COM-00001959.XLS	73-COM-00001959	73-COM-00002214
73-COM-00002215.XLS	73-COM-00002215	73-COM-00002438
74-COM-00000001.XLS	74-COM-00000001	74-COM-00000005
74-COM-00000006.XLS	74-COM-00000006	74-COM-00000006
74-COM-00000007.XLS	74-COM-00000007	74-COM-00000018
76-COM-00000001.XLS	76-COM-00000001	76-COM-00000110
81-COM-00000005.XLS	81-COM-00000005	81-COM-00000008
82-COM-00000001.XLS	82-COM-00000001	82-COM-00000001
83-COM-00000001.XLS	83-COM-00000001	83-COM-00000001
86-COM-00000001.XLS	86-COM-00000001	86-COM-00000001
89-COM-00000309.XLSX	89-COM-00000309	89-COM-00000313
89-COM-00000628.XLSM	89-COM-00000628	89-COM-00000645
89-COM-00000960.XLS	89-COM-00000960	89-COM-00000990
89-COM-00001105.XLS	89-COM-00001105	89-COM-00001109
89-COM-00001139.XLS	89-COM-00001139	89-COM-00001145
89-COM-00001662.XLSX	89-COM-00001662	89-COM-00001666
89-COM-00002943.XLSX	89-COM-00002943	89-COM-00002951
89-COM-00002952.XLSX	89-COM-00002952	89-COM-00002961
89-COM-00002962.XLSX	89-COM-00002962	89-COM-00002971
89-COM-00002972.XLSX	89-COM-00002972	89-COM-00002981
89-COM-00002982.XLS	89-COM-00002982	89-COM-00003005
89-COM-00003006.XLSX	89-COM-00003006	89-COM-00003037
89-COM-00003038.XLS	89-COM-00003038	89-COM-00003057
89-COM-00003058.XLS	89-COM-00003058	89-COM-00003080
89-COM-00003081.XLS	89-COM-00003081	89-COM-00003103
89-COM-00003104.XLS	89-COM-00003104	89-COM-00003127
89-COM-00003128.XLS	89-COM-00003128	89-COM-00003151
89-COM-00003152.XLS	89-COM-00003152	89-COM-00003175
89-COM-00003176.XLS	89-COM-00003176	89-COM-00003180
89-COM-00003181.XLS	89-COM-00003181	89-COM-00003187
89-COM-00003188.XLS	89-COM-00003188	89-COM-00003195
89-COM-00003196.XLS	89-COM-00003196	89-COM-00003198
89-COM-00003199.XLS	89-COM-00003199	89-COM-00003202
89-COM-00003203.XLS	89-COM-00003203	89-COM-00003206
89-COM-00003207.XLSX	89-COM-00003207	89-COM-00003219

Native File	First Bates Number	Last Bates Number
89-COM-00003220.XLSX	89-COM-00003220	89-COM-00003232
92-COM-00000001.XLS	92-COM-00000001	92-COM-00000001
92-COM-00000002.XLS	92-COM-00000002	92-COM-00000010
92-COM-00000011.XLS	92-COM-00000011	92-COM-00000022
92-COM-00000023.XLS	92-COM-00000023	92-COM-00000034
92-COM-00000035.XLS	92-COM-00000035	92-COM-00000039
92-COM-00000040.XLS	92-COM-00000040	92-COM-00000044
92-COM-00000045.XLS	92-COM-00000045	92-COM-00000049
93-COM-00000001.XLS	93-COM-00000001	93-COM-00000003
93-COM-00000004.XLS	93-COM-00000004	93-COM-00000005
93-COM-00000006.XLS	93-COM-00000006	93-COM-00000027
93-COM-00000028.XLS	93-COM-00000028	93-COM-00000029
93-COM-00000030.XLS	93-COM-00000030	93-COM-00000031
93-COM-00000032.XLS	93-COM-00000032	93-COM-00000038
93-COM-00000039.XLS	93-COM-00000039	93-COM-00000045
93-COM-00000046.XLS	93-COM-00000046	93-COM-00000051

Comcast Corporation
FCC Second Information and Document Request
MB Docket No. 10-56
Index of Documents that Comcast Possesses Solely in Redacted Form
October 18, 2010

Bates Range	Custodian
Request 65	
65-COM-00000016 – 65-COM-00000037	NetworkShare
65-COM-00000038 – 65-COM-00000074	NetworkShare
65-COM-00000080 – 65-COM-00000125	NetworkShare
65-COM-00001951 – 65-COM-00001957	NetworkShare

Comcast Corporation
 FCC Second Information and Document Request
 MB Docket No. 10-56
 Index of Documents Produced
 October 18, 2010

Bates Range	Custodian
Request 65	
65-COM-00000001-65-COM-00002976	NetworkShare
Request 66	
66-COM-00000001-66-COM-00000824	NetworkShare
Request 67	
67-COM-00000001-67-COM-00000864	NetworkShare
Request 68	
68-COM-00000001-68-COM-00000123	NetworkShare
Request 69	
69-COM-00000001-69-COM-00001066	NetworkShare
Request 70	
70-COM-00000001-70-COM-00000327	NetworkShare
Request 72	
72-COM-00000001-72-COM-00000051	Waz, Joseph
72-COM-00000052-72-COM-00000068	Schwartz, Samuel
72-COM-00000069-72-COM-00000087	Connors, Bill
72-COM-00000088-72-COM-00000114	Lessem, Todd
72-COM-00000115-72-COM-00000116	NetworkShare
Request 73	
73-COM-00000001-73-COM-00002438	Comcast
Request 74	
74-COM-00000001-74-COM-00000005	Goodwin, Dan
74-COM-00000006-74-COM-00000018	Comcast
Request 76	
76-COM-00000001-76-COM-00000110	Comcast
Request 81	

Bates Range	Custodian
81-COM-00000001-81-COM-00000008	Comcast
Request 82	
82-COM-00000001-82-COM-00000001	Comcast
Request 83	
83-COM-00000001-83-COM-00000001	Comcast
Request 86	
86-COM-00000001-86-COM-00000001	Comcast
Request 87	
87-COM-00000001-87-COM-00000117	NetworkShare
Request 89	
89-COM-00000001-89-COM-00000018	Coblitz, Mark
89-COM-00000019-89-COM-00000053	Juliano, David
89-COM-00000054-89-COM-00000200	Vonk, John
89-COM-00000201-89-COM-00000265	Herrin, Charlie
89-COM-00000266-89-COM-00000689	Schwartz, Samuel
89-COM-00000690-89-COM-00000759	Kerekes, Diana
89-COM-00000760-89-COM-00000764	Ridall, John
89-COM-00000765-89-COM-00001082	Werner, Tony
89-COM-00001083-89-COM-00001304	Joy, Aljit
89-COM-00001305-89-COM-00001423	Palmatier, Jon
89-COM-00001424-89-COM-00001451	Smit, Neil
89-COM-00001452-89-COM-00001574	NetworkShare
89-COM-00001575-89-COM-00003504	Xcalibur Portal
89-COM-00003505-89-COM-00003596	Team CIM
Request 91	
91-COM-00000001-91-COM-00000032	Comcast
Request 92	
92-COM-00000001-92-COM-00000049	Comcast
Request 93	
93-COM-00000001-93-COM-00000051	Comcast
Request 94	
94-COM-00000001-94-COM-00000011	Comcast

Bates Range	Custodian
Request 95	
95-COM-00000001-95-COM-00000111	Comcast

**RESPONSES OF COMCAST CORPORATION TO THE COMMISSION'S
SECOND INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT REQUEST**

- 65. Provide the Company's two most recent agreements, including all attachments and amendments thereto, for distribution of each Regional Sports Network in all markets to the following entities: Time Warner Cable ("TWC"), DIRECTV, DISH, Cox, Charter, Cablevision, Bright House, Mediacom, CableOne, Wide Open West, RCN, Verizon and AT&T.**

Where such agreements have been made, responsive documents have been produced herewith.

- 66. Provide the Company's two most recent agreements with each of the following entities, including all attachments and amendments thereto, related to each entity's distribution of "E!": TWC, DIRECTV, DISH, Cox, Charter, Cablevision, Bright House, Mediacom, CableOne, Wide Open West, RCN, Verizon and AT&T.**

Responsive documents have been produced herewith. {{

}}

- 67. Provide the Company's two most recent agreements with each of the following entities, including all attachments and amendments thereto, related to each entity's distribution of the Golf Channel: TWC, DIRECTV, DISH, Cox, Charter, Cablevision, Bright House, Mediacom, CableOne, Wide Open West, RCN, Verizon and AT&T.**

Responsive documents have been produced herewith. {{

}}

- 68. Provide the Company's two most recent agreements with each of the following entities, including all attachments and amendments thereto, related to each entity's distribution of Style: TWC, DIRECTV, DISH, Cox, Charter, Cablevision, Bright House, Mediacom, CableOne, Wide Open West, RCN, Verizon and AT&T.**

Responsive documents have been produced herewith. {{

}}

- 69. Provide the Company's two most recent agreements with each of the following entities, including all attachments and amendments thereto, related to each entity's**

distribution of Versus: TWC, DIRECTV, DISH, Cox, Charter, Cablevision, Bright House, Mediacom, CableOne, Wide Open West, RCN, Verizon and AT&T.

Responsive documents have been produced herewith. {{

}}

70. **Provide the Company’s two most recent agreements with each of the following entities, including all attachments and amendments thereto, related to each entity’s distribution of Sprout: TWC, DIRECTV, DISH, Cox, Charter, Cablevision, Bright House, Mediacom, CableOne, Wide Open West, RCN, Verizon and AT&T.**

Where such agreements have been made, responsive documents have been produced herewith. {{

}}

71. **Describe in detail any plans the Company has to deploy broadband service to unserved and/or underserved areas.**

Comcast continues to examine opportunities to expand its broadband footprint to deliver broadband Internet service to unserved and/or underserved areas. For example, Comcast regularly deploys broadband plant to new areas and homes within its authorized franchise areas to accommodate population growth and new demand. Moreover, Comcast is exploring alternative means to deploy broadband Internet service to consumers, including by deploying new WiFi services in certain areas and offering its HighSpeed2Go service in 21 markets by the end of the year.

Comcast’s High-Speed Internet (“HSI”) service is currently available to over 99% of the homes Comcast’s cable systems pass. Comcast faces significant competition from competing Internet service providers in virtually every area it serves. Comcast is deploying DOCSIS 3.0 technology throughout its network and, to date, has deployed it across {{ }} of its HSI footprint. DOCSIS 3.0 enables Comcast to increase the provisioned speeds its customers receive and to offer consumers new, faster tiers of service. Comcast currently offers consumers a number of tiers of service to meet their varying needs, starting with its economy service at \$24.95 per month.

72. **Describe in detail all the Company’s subscriber acquisition plans related to the Fisher Communications dispute. In addition, provide all e-mails, correspondence and other documents related to the related to the dispute, including, but not limited to, all e-mails, if any, that Comcast sent to Fisher Communications related to <http://www.onlycharlieknows.com>. Also provide the number of visitors to that website that were redirected to the Company’s website during the dispute.**

Responsive documents have been produced herewith.

As discussed below, Comcast did not implement any subscriber acquisition plans related to the Fisher Communications (“Fisher”)/Dish Network dispute.

The Fisher/Dish Network dispute commenced in December 2008 and concluded in June 2009.

In April 2009, {{

}}.

{{

}}

Ultimately, {{ }} and the Fisher/Dish Network dispute was resolved in June 2009. Accordingly, the number of visitors to onlycharlieknows.com that were redirected to the Company’s website during the dispute was zero.

- 73. With regard to Exhibits 4.1(a)-4.7(g) submitted in response to the May 21, 2010 Information and Discovery Request, provide all available data from June 2005 through the most recent date for which data is available. Also, provide this data at the zip code, sub region, entity and DMA level of specificity, as available. In addition, with regard to Exhibit 3.2, provide the Comcast entity identification number for each zip code.**

Available data responsive to Request 73 are provided in Excel spreadsheet format as Exhibits 73.1(a)–73.8, which are included with the information and data produced herewith and have been designated as 73-COM-00000001 – 73-COM-00002438.

Exhibits 73.1(a)–73.7(g) correspond to Exhibits 4.1(a)–4.7(g) submitted by Comcast in response to the May 21, 2010 Information and Discovery Request. The explanations provided and limitations described in Comcast’s response to Requests 4(a)–4(g) of the May 21, 2010 Information and Discovery Request apply to the data provided in these exhibits.

In addition, Exhibit 73.8 provides the entity identification numbers corresponding to each zip code identified in Exhibit 3.2 submitted by Comcast in response to the May 21, 2010 Information and Discovery Request. Unlike sub-region boundaries, which have remained relatively stable over time, entity boundaries have shifted, and certain entities have been

consolidated into others. Accordingly, while Exhibit 73.8 provides information on the current correspondence between entity identification numbers and zip codes, Exhibit 73.8 may not reflect the correspondences that existed between entity identification numbers and zip codes in the past.

- 74. Provide Project Cavalry deployment data for each market by month from the initial deployment to the present, including newly deployed homes for each month, as well as the cumulative totals of deployed homes in each DMA by month. Also, provide any internal analyses of customer losses, increased call center volumes, or other such incidents related to Cavalry deployment.**

Responsive documents have been produced herewith.

In addition, information and data responsive to Request 74 have been provided in Excel spreadsheet format as Exhibits 74(a), 74(b), and 74(c), which are included with the information and data produced herewith and have been designated as 74-COM-00000006 – 74-COM-00000018.

Exhibits 74(a) and 74(b) provide the number of Comcast video subscribers that were migrated to the Project Cavalry channel lineup each month from initial deployment through September 2010. Comcast does not maintain precise monthly data on Project Cavalry migration in the ordinary course of business; nor does it maintain any data on Project Cavalry migration at a DMA level in the ordinary course. Accordingly, the data supplied in Exhibits 74(a) and 74(b) are estimates derived from best efforts at interpolation and translation of available data and are necessarily imprecise.

Exhibit 74(c) provides data on dedicated call center volumes related to Cavalry deployment.

- 75. Provide a detailed description of all factors that caused the expansion of the Company's footprint in Eugene and Portland, Oregon, between January 2009 and June 2009 ("Expansion"), including, but not limited to, an explanation of the reason why Comcast's footprint grew at a faster rate during the period of Expansion than during the months prior to January 2009 and after June 2009. Explain whether any new nodes were added during the Expansion and, if so, identify the locations of homes passed added to the Comcast footprint. Describe in detail whether the increase in footprint size during the Expansion was a planned expansion or was a response to changes in market competition. Provide all e-mails, correspondence and other documents, as well as data related to these issues.**

Responsive documents have been produced herewith.

The premise of this request is incorrect: Comcast did not increase the rate of expansion of its footprint in Eugene and Portland, Oregon, during the Fisher/Dish Network dispute. The increase in reported homes passed in Eugene and Portland, Oregon, between January and June 2009 is largely an artifact of improvements in Comcast's information on the

number of homes passed by its cable systems in those areas, rather than a reflection of true increases in homes passed. Specifically, the rollout of Project Cavalry in Eugene and Portland, which commenced in November 2008 and concluded in June 2009, required Comcast to install equipment in multiple dwelling unit buildings (“MDUs”) in Eugene and Portland. This process provided Comcast with better information regarding the number of units in those MDUs that are passed by Comcast’s cable systems, resulting in an increase in reported MDU units without an increase in actual units served by the cable system. Over the same time frame, {{

}}, it resulted in the appearance of an increase in the number of homes passed by Comcast’s cable systems in Eugene and Portland.

Absent these effects, Comcast believes that the rate of homes-passed growth observed in Eugene and Portland between January and June 2009 would have been similar to the rates of homes-passed growth observed prior to January 2009 and after June 2009. Apart from node splitting in the ordinary course of business, no new nodes were added in Portland and Eugene between January and June 2009. In addition, all buildouts of Comcast’s cable systems in Portland and Eugene during that time frame were planned, budgeted, and approved in 2008, and did not reflect a response to changes in market competition in 2009.

- 76. Provide all data related to the extent of competitor overbuilding within the Company’s footprint, expressing the data at the zip code, entity and DMA level of specificity, as the percentage of homes passed by each competing firm. To the maximum extent possible, organize and provide this data by competing firms, which should include, without limitation, any successors in interest to former Regional Bell Operating Companies, RCN, and WOW. Provide this data by month from 2004 to the most recent date for which such data is available.**

Information and data responsive to Request 76 have been provided in Excel spreadsheet format as Exhibits 76(a) and 76(b), which are included with the information and data produced herewith and have been designated as 76-COM-00000001 – 76-COM-00000110. {{

}} In addition, Comcast has no means of precisely determining the extent of overbuilding by Verizon and AT&T. The data provided in Exhibits 76(a) and 76(b) are imprecise estimates based on, among other things, the locations of Comcast subscribers who self-report that they are migrating to either Verizon or AT&T. In addition, in some instances, the overbuilt homes reported for a given entity may in fact represent an estimate of all overbuilt homes within a given Comcast region. {{

}}

77. Describe, with particularity, the HITS service, including, but not limited to, the nature and extent of Comcast’s participation in the selection and configuration of the programming lineups of MVPDs not affiliated with Comcast that use the service.

HITS (also known as “Headend in the Sky”) refers to a suite of services provided by the Comcast Media Center (“CMC”). CMC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Comcast whose business involves the transport of linear programming networks and video-on-demand (“VOD”) content to cable operators and other MVPDs via CMC’s network of satellites. The HITS platform delivers over 280 linear programming networks, from well-recognized networks like CNN, Discovery, and Hallmark; to independent niche networks like BBC America, the Outdoor Channel, RFD TV, and JCTV; to pay-per-view channels. Most programming networks are delivered in standard-definition (“SD”) format, but HITS also makes 24 networks available in high-definition (“HD”) format. In addition to the HITS service, CMC provides transport services for VOD content from over 300 programming networks.¹

In order to provide these services, CMC obtains non-exclusive rights from programmers to uplink their content to leased satellite transponders for transmission to the headends of MVPDs that purchase CMC services. Importantly, CMC has *no* exclusive agreements with respect to either linear or VOD content. Likewise, CMC provides its transport services to MVPDs on a non-exclusive basis. MVPDs are free to mix-and-match services from CMC and other transport providers, and MVPDs are not required to take CMC services on a bundled basis.

CMC offers a range of different HITS services in an effort to accommodate the particular needs of different MVPDs. For example, the HITS Quantum and HITS QuickTake services are designed for cable operators seeking to migrate their systems to all-digital in a cost-efficient manner. These turn-key services enable such operators to deliver digital services to their customers without having to make capital investments in equipment, maintenance, and support at each digital headend; rather, many of these functions are managed at CMC facilities rather than individual headends.²

CMC’s MVPD customers are free to arrange for transport for any programming network or VOD content they have licensed that is delivered by CMC. CMC’s MVPD customers may configure their programming lineup in whatever way they choose. CMC has

¹ There is one VOD solution in the HITS suite of services. This service, called VOD In a Box, is an integrated, pre-engineered VOD solution designed specifically to allow cable systems to deploy and operate VOD services simply and cost effectively. See <http://www.comcastmediacenter.com/hits-quantum/vod-in-a-box.html> (last visited Oct. 8, 2010). However, it only includes about 3,000 hours of programming, considerably less than what many systems offer today.

² See, e.g., <http://www.comcastmediacenter.com/hits-quantum/hits-quicktakeplus.html> (last visited Oct. 8, 2010). Recently, CMC announced that it is offering a discount on its HITS Quantum Services. See Mike Reynolds, *CMC Dangles Digital Carrots Offers Discounts on HITS Quantum Services Through End of 2010*, Multichannel News, July 6, 2010, available at http://www.multichannel.com/article/454486-CMC_Dangles_Digital_Carrots.php.

designed its services to give MVPD customers maximum flexibility to meet their particular business needs. For example, MVPDs have the option to pass through HITS-delivered linear programming networks directly to customers without any further reconfiguration, encryption, or encoding in the headend. However, MVPDs can choose to take any of the networks from the HITS transponders and arrange those networks at their headends in a manner that best suits their needs (though doing so usually requires that they possess or purchase additional equipment and employ or hire additional staff with relevant expertise). CMC has built this type of flexibility into its transport services for both linear programming networks and VOD content.

- 78. Describe the operation of the Company’s managed services, including PPV, VOD, and video delivery (DLC) services (and any others provided by CMC and iNDemand to other MVPDs. For each service, describe how it is sold, who pays for it (the MVPD, or the subscriber, or the network) and in what manner, and who must arrange for the license (the MVPD or Comcast).**

CMC provides all of its transport services to MVPDs in a manner similar to that in which it provides its HITS services.³ CMC aggregates the content at its facilities, and distributes the content via satellite to MVPDs around the country. For an MVPD to receive the services via satellite, the MVPD will need a satellite dish to downlink the programming, as well as certain “receive” equipment at the headend. In the case of VOD services, this receive equipment is called a “catcher” and is provided by CMC to the MVPD {{ }}. Beyond the catcher, the MVPD will need servers and other headend equipment to deliver the VOD service to its customers.⁴ In the case of linear programming networks, as noted above, the MVPD can either pass through the networks as received via HITS, or supply its own headend equipment for reconfiguring and other functions.

CMC sells transport services for linear programming networks and VOD content to MVPDs. For the linear programming networks, CMC’s customers generally pay CMC a fee based on the type of HITS service that the MVPD has purchased and the number of programming networks that the customer receives via HITS. For example, {{

³ For purposes of this Information Request, the Media Bureau clarified that the term “managed services” refers to CMC’s HITS and VOD transport services, and does not include services that the Commission has termed “specialized services” and which are the subject of a Public Notice in GN Docket No. 09-191. *See Further Inquiry Into Two Under-Developed Issues In the Open Internet Proceeding*, Public Notice, DA 10-1667 (Sept. 1, 2010). In addition to its HITS and VOD lines of business, CMC provides a service to several MSOs in the Denver and Albuquerque markets that are unable to receive strong signals from local broadcast stations. CMC will uplink those broadcasters’ signals to satellite transponders leased by CMC, and then deliver the signals to the headends of MSOs who subscribe to the service. CMC also provides non-transport services, such as an interactive TV application support service – called HITS AxIS – and content authorization solutions for its MVPD customers. Revenues and costs associated with these services are included below in response to Request 83.

⁴ The MVPD can purchase and configure that additional equipment itself, or it can avoid this additional expense by using the HITS VOD In a Box solution, described above.

}}⁵ Alternatively, {{

}}.

With respect to CMC’s transport services for VOD content, {{

with respect to {{
}} The only exception to this is

}}

Importantly, with very limited exceptions, programmers and MVPDs enter into a separate contract – distinct from the transport agreements that both sides might have with CMC – that gives the MVPDs the rights to distribute the programming to their customers.⁶ The programmers, not CMC, control contractual access to their programming. In addition, MVPDs have discretion with respect to which CMC services they purchase. For example, MVPDs, not CMC, can pick and choose which programming networks they want transported to their headends via HITS; and MVPDs, not CMC, decide how those programming networks will be arranged in their channel lineups.

Like CMC, iN DEMAND also provides VOD content to MVPDs, but, in contrast to CMC, it also obtains from programmers the right to license their content to MVPDs.⁷ So, rather than having to contract independently with individual programmers (as is the case with CMC services), an MVPD will license content directly from iN DEMAND. As Comcast has noted previously, iN DEMAND generally acquires rights to sports packages and other content on a non-exclusive basis. Moreover, in the one example highlighted in this proceeding where iN DEMAND does have exclusive rights – NHL Center Ice – iN DEMAND has elected to waive those rights.⁸ In some cases, iN DEMAND contracts

⁵ CMC offers 24 different HD programming networks using eight different satellite transponders (three networks per transponder). Under the package described above, an MVPD can choose any HD network from {{ }} different transponders, or up to total of {{ }} HD networks. For an additional fee, the customer can select additional HD networks from the other transponders.

⁶ The only exceptions are nine Spanish-language programming networks for which CMC negotiates both licensing and transport agreements with MVPDs. The nine networks are located on HITS transponder QC 12, and include History Channel en Español, mun2, Discovery en Español, CineLatino, Cine Mexicano, Fox Sports en Español, CNN en Español, ESPN Deportes, and VeneMovies.

⁷ As Applicants explained in their Opposition and Response, Comcast does not exercise control of iN DEMAND. Rather, iN DEMAND is co-owned by Comcast, Cox, and Time Warner Cable/Bright House and is managed separate and apart from CMC and Comcast’s programming networks. See Comcast Corporation, General Electric Company, and NBC Universal, Inc., Opposition to Petitions to Deny and Response to Comments, MB Docket No. 10-56, at 280-283 (July 21, 2010) (“Opposition and Response”).

⁸ Opposition and Response at 284.

with CMC to provide the transport services (such as for certain of iN DEMAND's pay-per-view channels), but in other cases iN DEMAND provides for transport of its content to its MVPD customers.

79. Explain the advantages the Company's service provides over competing services that would cause an MVPD to choose to utilize the Company's services instead of providing the services itself.

As detailed in response to Request 80, CMC faces vigorous competition from other transport service providers, namely Avail-TVN ("Avail") and EchoStar VIP ("EchoStar"). In addition, many programming networks offer their services over satellite via "direct feeds" that any MVPD with the proper equipment can obtain for free once it licenses the programming – a practice that has become increasingly common among MVPDs. Under this "direct feed" model, the MVPD will have to install additional satellite dishes and other receive equipment at the headend to receive content from particular programmers (*e.g.*, one dish for Disney programming, another dish for Fox programming, and so forth). In contrast, an MVPD using HITS for transport can use a single satellite dish and set of receive equipment to receive programming from the HITS satellites. Beyond "direct feeds," MVPDs may also seek to limit the cost of transport services by arranging for satellite transport to a single headend facility and then "self-provide" content to other headends over their own fiber networks. In light of these various marketplace options, CMC must price its services competitively and demonstrate to potential MVPD customers that its transport services provide a better value than those offered by its transport service competitors or those available pursuant to direct feed and/or self-provisioning approaches.

There are a number of reasons why CMC has been successful in competing with Avail and EchoStar. Unlike Avail and EchoStar, CMC transports all of its programming in MPEG-2 and therefore, is an option to meet the needs of those MVPDs that have not made the investment to transition to MPEG-4.⁹ Although some MVPDs have chosen to make such investments, others have decided to invest their resources on other priorities and find that using CMC best meets their business needs.

There are other reasons why MVPDs may use CMC over competitors. For example, CMC does not demand exclusivity from linear programming networks or VOD content providers, and programmers are free to contract with other transport providers. Furthermore, CMC does not have exclusives with its MVPD customers that require them to receive services only from CMC. This flexibility makes CMC a more attractive option for programmers and MVPDs alike. Lastly, CMC has a long track record in the industry of providing reliable transport services and excellent customer service.

⁹ MPEG-4 allows Avail and EchoStar to carry more programming networks on their satellites (MPEG-4 can be used to squeeze more networks onto a satellite transponder than MPEG-2) and thereby offer a wider range of SD and HD networks to customers. For example, EchoStar carries more ethnic programming than HITS, and both Avail and EchoStar carry more HD programming than HITS. EchoStar boasts that it "currently broadcasts more channels than any other service in the world." See <http://www.echostarvptv.com/ViPContent.aspx>.

Certain MVPDs also may find CMC to be a cost-effective alternative to “direct-feed” and “self-provisioning” arrangements. Direct feeds and self-provisioning are commonplace today among many MVPDs, especially those with the space to set up multiple satellite dishes. Nonetheless, operators may still prefer using a single satellite dish to receive programming networks via HITS rather than investing resources or capital in expanding their headends to accommodate multiple satellite dishes. Comcast’s cable networks use both direct feeds and satellite transport services to deliver certain content to their MVPD customers; similarly, Comcast’s cable systems receive content both via direct feeds and by CMC’s, as well as Avail’s, transport facilities.

- 80. Identify the Company’s competitors in the managed services market. Provide data on the number of total systems served by the Company and each competitor, as well as the number of households and respective market shares of each market participant from 2005 to 2010. Also provide data on the programming networks that the Company provides to each such competitor and the compensation received by the Company for providing the programming. If there is any programming of a network in which that the Company has an attributable interest in that is it currently does not provide to these competitors, provide the reason why it is not.**

CMC faces vigorous competition across its various services. Avail and EchoStar provide similar transport services for linear programming networks, and Avail also provides transport for VOD services.¹⁰ Moreover, rather than using a third-party transport service, many MVPDs obtain their video programming directly from programmers via direct feeds or self-provide by distributing programming to their systems over their own fiber networks. In this competitive environment, no entity can exercise bottleneck control over the transport of content from programmers to MVPDs.

Currently, CMC provides HITS services to approximately three million non-Comcast digital subscribers, or about three percent of the MVPD marketplace.¹¹ That number is down from previous years. Specifically:

¹⁰ Avail also competes with iN DEMAND in licensing VOD and pay-per-view content to MVPDs. Comcast’s cable systems obtain VOD content from Avail, iN DEMAND, and CMC.

¹¹ See Opposition and Response at 279 n.936.

	Comcast Subs ¹²	Non-Comcast Subs
2008	{{	
2009		
2010		}}

With respect to VOD, Avail has reported that it serves approximately 50 million “addressable subscribers”¹³ and is the clear industry leader because it has exclusive rights to a significant amount of VOD content.¹⁴ CMC does not have direct knowledge of the number of subscribers served by its VOD product because the MVPDs serving the VOD customers are under no obligation to share their specific VOD subscriber data with CMC. However, based on publicly available information regarding the Top 25 cable operators who deliver VOD, CMC estimates that it currently delivers VOD services to more than {{ }} subscribers. Comcast does not possess data on the number of households served by Avail and EchoStar or their respective market shares.

Comcast makes its owned-and-operated programming networks available to CMC, Avail, and EchoStar for transport to MVPDs, and also makes these networks available via direct feed to MVPDs (including both the HD and SD feeds of Comcast’s national and regional networks). The degree to which Comcast’s owned-and-operated networks are actually carried by transport service providers varies. For example, Avail and EchoStar note on their web sites that they carry the SD (*i.e.*, E!, Versus, Golf Channel, G4, Style, and PBS Kids Sprout) and the HD (*i.e.*, E! HD, Golf Channel HD, and Versus HD) feeds of Comcast’s national networks. Likewise, EchoStar notes that it also has the right to transport a number of Comcast-affiliated regional sports networks (“RSNs”), including Comcast SportsNet Bay Area, Comcast SportsNet Bay Area HD, Comcast SportsNet Mid-Atlantic, and Comcast SportsNet New England. However, Avail has not yet requested the right to transport the SD or HD feeds of any Comcast RSN. Comcast does not receive any compensation from these vendors for making the feeds available to them.

In contrast, CMC carries the SD feeds of Comcast’s national networks via HITS, but not the HD feeds of these networks, nor the feeds of Comcast’s RSNs. This is largely due to the fact that CMC’s satellites are capacity-constrained. As noted, CMC utilizes MPEG-2, and, as a result, it can accommodate fewer digital networks on its satellites than it could if it utilized MPEG-4 (which is the digital format used by Avail and EchoStar). CMC would not be able to carry the national network HD feeds and RSN feeds without

¹² These numbers include Comcast subscribers that receive service via the HITS satellite platform or via fiber delivery provided by CMC.

¹³ Avail-TVN Ex Parte, MB Dkt. No. 10-56, at 8 (May 18, 2010).

¹⁴ See Opposition and Response at 282 n.945 (“Avail-TVN has certain VOD rights to distribute HBO and Showtime content that neither CMC or iN DEMAND possess.”).

dropping a number of networks that are currently delivered via HITS. CMC has elected not to pursue that option given the potential customer disruption that would result.

With respect to VOD, Comcast uses CMC to transport its owned-and-operated VOD programming content (other than PBS Kids Sprout VOD) to MVPDs and also makes this content available to Avail for transport per Avail's agreement with Comcast. Avail transports this content {{

}}. Aside from its transport agreement with Avail, Comcast also has had separate transport agreements with TVN, a company that recently merged with Avail. Under the TVN VOD delivery pricing model, {{

}}. Other Comcast-affiliated networks had previously used TVN to deliver some of their VOD content to TVN-equipped MVPDs, but found that CMC could do this more cheaply and that CMC equipment and transport was also acceptable to, and already used by, most if not all of these networks' respective MVPD customers, including Verizon, AT&T, Dish Network, RCN, and DirecTV. Comcast concluded that {{

}}.

- 81. What programming networks are offered through the HITS service? How is it decided whether to carry a particular network on this service? Identify the networks that the Company carries on its own systems that are not carried on HITS? Can an MVPD customer of the HITS service determine what programs it will receive, and can it decide to not receive and pay for a particular network carried on HITS? Who pays the networks carried on HITS –the Company or the receiving MVPD? In what manner?**

To make HITS as valuable as possible to existing and potential customers, CMC must ensure that HITS delivers as wide an array of popular programming networks as possible. HITS has been transporting programming networks for the last 17 years, and the lineup of networks included on the HITS platform has grown over time as new satellite transponders have been launched and as digital technology has evolved to allow transponders to carry additional networks. Despite CMC's steady expansion of satellite capacity, CMC's satellite transponders are at or near full capacity.

The HITS platform currently carries 280 linear programming networks, or approximately 85 percent of the most popular programming networks that are carried by cable operators in the United States.¹⁵ As described in more detail below, CMC's decision with respect to the programming that it carries is primarily a function of meeting the transport

¹⁵ A complete listing of the linear programming networks available via HITS is attached as Appendix I and available at <http://www.comcastmediacenter.com/hits-quantum/programming-lineup.asp>.

requirements of its customers within the constraints of the bandwidth that CMC has available to it, regardless of the affiliation of the programming network. In fact, CMC does not carry certain Comcast programming networks, including the RSNs or the HD feeds of Comcast's national networks, because customers' demands led CMC to allocate its available capacity for other programming networks.

Today, the transponders that CMC uses to deliver HITS are at or near full capacity. When slots for new networks become available, CMC will typically poll its customers to determine which new networks should be approached for potential carriage on HITS. In an effort to free up more satellite bandwidth for new networks, CMC is making further changes to the HITS platform to use the available bandwidth more efficiently. As these changes are implemented and additional bandwidth becomes available, CMC will work with its customers to identify additional programming that would be most valuable to add to the HITS lineup.

Regardless of the number of programming networks included on the HITS platform, MVPD customers are free to choose exactly how many – or how few – of the programming networks offered via HITS they wish to receive. There is no requirement that MVPD customers take every network that HITS makes available, or even a specified number of networks. Rather, the MVPD has the option to pay for transport {{
}}.

As noted, MVPD customers cannot receive a programming network via HITS unless the MVPD has a license agreement with that programmer. The same applies to VOD content. With a few exceptions (described above), the license agreement is negotiated between the MVPD and the programmer, without any involvement by CMC. The MVPD usually will pay the programmer a license fee per that agreement. CMC does not pay the programmer or the MVPD.

Comcast uses a mix of transport service providers, direct feeds, and self-provisioning to get content to its headends for distribution to customers. Of note, Comcast's cable systems currently carry over 450 different programming networks that are not carried on the HITS service. As detailed in Exhibit 81.01, which is included with the information and data produced herewith and has been designated 81-COM-00000005 – 81-COM-00000008, these include such well-known networks as TBS and ESPN, as well as independent networks like the NFL Network and the Sportsman Channel, and regional programming like New England Cable News, the Ohio News Network, and numerous regional sports networks.

- 82. Provide a list of the programming networks not carried on HITS that the Company carries on its own systems, as well as VOD content carried by the Company but not carried by the CMC VOD service. Explain whether an MVPD serviced by the HITS service is able to decide what programs it will receive and how revenues/payments for networks carried by CMC services are structured, and from whom they are collected.**

A list of linear programming networks and VOD content carried on Comcast systems but not carried by HITS has been produced as Exhibits 81.01 and 82.01, which are included with the information and data produced herewith and have been designated 81-COM-00000005 – 81-COM-00000008 and 82-COM-00000001.

As described above, CMC gives its MVPD customers the flexibility to use CMC's services in the manner that best suits each MVPD's particular business needs. MVPD customers, not CMC, choose exactly how many – or how few – of the programming networks offered via HITS to receive, and which of those programming services (the carriage rights for which they obtain in direct negotiations with those programming services) to receive. Moreover, CMC places no requirements on its MVPD customers that they must receive certain programming services.

CMC's MVPD customers must pay a transport fee to CMC for the HITS service, as well as a license fee to the programmer for the right to distribute the content to end users.¹⁶ In the limited circumstances where CMC has the rights to license content to MVPDs, the MVPD pays CMC both the transport fee and the license fee, and CMC then pays the programmer its share of the license fee.¹⁷

- 83. Provide all revenue and cost data from 2005 to 2010 by source for the managed services, including but not limited to, annual revenues, ARPU, profit margins per MVPD system and household serviced, capital and operating expenditures and EBITDA. Also, provide data on the annual revenues that the Company generates from supplying programming of a network in which it has an attributable interest to other competing third party transport, VOD and PPV providers from 2005-2010.**

Information and data responsive to this request have been provided as Exhibit 83.01, which is included with the information and data produced herewith and has been designated 83-COM-00000001.

Comcast does not generate revenue from supplying its owned-and-operated programming networks to third parties for transport. To the extent that these transport agreements involve one party paying the other, it is Comcast paying the transport company for the service.

- 84. Describe the Company's decision process for rebranding a programming network and/or shifting programming from one network to another within the Comcast family of businesses, including, but not limited to: (i) the potential costs associated with renegotiating contracts; (ii) promoting the new network; and (iii) loss or gain of subscribers. Furthermore, provide a detailed analysis and supporting data sufficient to show the costs and benefits, including, without limitation, revenues that**

¹⁶ As noted above, CMC's VOD customers {{
}}.

¹⁷ See *supra* n. 6.

were incurred by Comcast: (i) in rebranding the Outdoor Life Channel to Versus; (ii) for shifting programming across two networks; and (iii) for recently launched networks such as G4 and FearNet.

Rebranding

Within the industry, “rebranding” can mean a range of things – from an almost wholesale relaunch of a network under a new name (*e.g.*, Fine Living recently relaunched as Cooking Channel), to a refocusing or refreshing of content (*e.g.*, The Learning Channel rebranded as TLC when it introduced reality programming), to a rebranding that helps market a network’s programming evolution beyond a specific genre (*e.g.*, SciFi recently became Syfy).¹⁸ As a general matter, in all three cases, rebranding is a marketing tool with the objective of giving a network a more prominent and memorable brand identity and thereby attracting more viewership and subscribers.¹⁹

While there have been some prominent rebranding examples in the cable programming industry during the last decade, Comcast has not generally rebranded its programming networks.²⁰ Outdoor Life Network (or “OLN” as it was called) launched in 1995 and was rebranded as Versus in 2006. This was not a relaunch or refocusing but rather a rebranding reflecting the network’s programming evolution (akin to SciFi/Syfy), and so did not involve the renegotiation of any carriage contracts.²¹ The decision to rebrand OLN was largely driven by the new programming rights that the network had already acquired – most prominently NHL regular-season and playoff games, and college football and basketball games – that did not fit neatly within the “outdoor life” theme. In choosing the name Versus, the network sought a brand name that was less directly associated with activities like hunting and fishing and captured the broader theme of competition and adversarial sports. In the estimation of OLN and Comcast’s programming and marketing executives, “Versus” was both memorable and distinct, and was flexible enough to fit a whole range of sports activities under its banner.

The rebranding of OLN to Versus involved upfront marketing and promotional expenditures. When the rebranding first occurred in 2006, Comcast estimates that it spent approximately {{

¹⁸ A wholesale relaunch of a network – with a new programming concept – often will involve re-negotiation of carriage agreements. Most carriage agreements contain a “description of service,” and, if the relaunched network does not correspond to the existing description, the parties may seek to negotiate appropriate terms for the relaunched network.

¹⁹ A network may also be rebranded to indicate a change of ownership. For example, shortly after acquiring a controlling ownership interest in FSN-New England (in 2007), and FSN-Bay Area (in 2008), Comcast renamed the networks “Comcast SportsNet New England” and “Comcast SportsNet Bay Area,” respectively.

²⁰ In 1989, long before Comcast acquired majority ownership and control of the network, the Movietime network was renamed E! Entertainment Television.

²¹ {{

}}

}}.²²

Versus has experienced strong growth in ratings and subscribership since 2006. While Comcast has not quantified how much of this growth is directly attributable to the rebranding per se, Comcast believes that its investment in the Versus brand has more than justified the cost, extending the network’s appeal to a more diverse base of program producers and rights holders and helping the network develop a dedicated following and become an attractive destination for advertisers. Versus now offers a wider variety of branded program series and approximately 900 hours of live or first-run tent-pole event programming annually. On several occasions in 2009 and 2010, Versus has been the number one ad-supported cable network for men between the ages of 25 and 54. Versus’ telecast of game three of the Stanley Cup Final on June 2, 2010, was the highest-rated, most-viewed program in the network’s history, and Versus’ telecasts of games three and four were the highest-rated, most-viewed Stanley Cup Final games on cable television since 2002.²³

Comcast SportsNet (West), which launched in 2004, was rebranded as Comcast SportsNet California (“CSN-CA”) in 2008. Prior to the rebranding, the network was most commonly known by the generic name Comcast SportsNet. The new name “Comcast SportsNet California” was adopted in order to (i) distinguish that network from its new sister network, Comcast SportsNet Bay Area (f/k/a FSN-Bay Area) (“CSN-BA”), which Comcast had acquired in 2007 and soon thereafter rebranded to include the “Comcast SportsNet” name, and (ii) reflect planned future changes in CSN-CA’s programming mix to include not just games of the Sacramento Kings (the rights to which have been held by CSN-CA since 2004) and some local Division I college football and basketball games but also the games of the Oakland A’s (the right to which it acquired beginning with the 2009 MLB season) and the San Jose Sharks (the rights to which it acquired beginning in the 2009-10 NHL season).

²² These rebranding expenses were modest compared to the significant increases in programming costs that Versus incurred during the same period. From 2005 to 2006 alone, Versus’ programming expenses grew from {{ }} to {{ }}. Versus’ programming expenses in 2009 were {{ }}

²³ See Robert Seidman, *Stanley Cup Playoffs Attract Largest Audience Ever; Caps Best Biz Year in NHL History*, TVbytheNumbers, June 14, 2010, available at <http://tvbythenumbers.com/2010/06/14/stanley-cup-playoffs-attract-largest-audience-ever-caps-best-biz-year-in-nhl-history/54045>.

Shifting of Programming

Comcast has not generally shifted programming from one of its networks to another. More typically, one entity (commonly, E! Entertainment Television, Inc., the entity that owns E! and Style) will acquire a license to a bundle of programming (*e.g.*, several movies licensed from a certain studio), and affiliated networks (typically E!, Style, and G4) may share programming or windows from that bundle of rights (*e.g.*, one network will air certain movies and another network will air other movies, or the same movie may air at different times on different networks).

E! and Style share some original programming, but that programming has not shifted from one network to the other. Instead, it may premiere one day on E! and re-air another day on Style.

Shift of A's and Sharks from Comcast SportsNet Bay Area to Comcast SportsNet California

There is one instance, in Northern California, where Comcast has undertaken to shift a significant amount of programming from one network to another in the interest of consumers and sports fans. That programming shift involved the renegotiation of rights agreements and carriage agreements.

As noted, Comcast created the RSN now known as CSN-CA in 2004. Until the spring of 2009, CSN-CA only carried one professional men's team, the Sacramento Kings (NBA), its affiliated WNBA team, and various college sports programming in the Northern California market. In 2007, Comcast acquired a different RSN, SportsChannel Pacific Associates, and, as mentioned above, soon thereafter rebranded that service from "FSN Bay Area" to "Comcast SportsNet Bay Area." CSN-BA also carried sports programming in the Northern California market, and, at the time of its acquisition by Comcast, CSN-BA was overflowing with content, telecasting the games of four professional sports teams – MLB's San Francisco Giants and Oakland A's, the NBA's Golden State Warriors, and the NHL's San Jose Sharks – in addition to Pac-10 and other Division I college events. CSN-BA encountered persistent scheduling problems, as game dates and times for the teams often conflicted with each other. Both the MLB game schedules for Giants and A's, and the Warriors' NBA and Sharks' NHL schedules, resulted in numerous overlapping games – especially during the spring, when all three leagues are in season. Like other RSNs, CSN-BA can only telecast one game at a time on its main feed and has to transmit "conflict games" via an alternate feed, often without HD capacity, for distribution by MVPDs on one or more "overflow" channels. This resulted in viewer confusion and lesser quality – SD – programming. It also created dissatisfaction among the affected teams, leagues, and advertisers, who all have an interest in achieving the widest distribution of the games and channel consistency so that fans can easily find their games.

To address these problems, CSN-BA permitted the A's and Sharks to migrate their programming to CSN-CA in 2009. CSN-BA continues to carry the Giants and Warriors