

ORIGINAL



**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

In the Matter of)
)
Polypore International, Inc.,)
a corporation.)

PUBLIC

Docket No. 9327

**COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S POST-TRIAL REPLY FINDINGS OF FACT
VOLUME 1**

RICHARD A. FEINSTEIN
Director
NORMAN ARMSTRONG
Acting Deputy Director
Bureau of Competition

J. ROBERT ROBERTSON
STEVEN DAHM
BENJAMIN GRIS
JOEL CHRISTIE
STEPHEN ANTONIO
CHRISTIAN WOOLLEY
PRIYA VISWANATH

Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20580
Telephone: (202) 326-2008
Fax: (202) 326-2884

CATHARINE MOSCATELLI
Assistant Director
MORRIS BLOOM
Deputy Assistant Director
Bureau of Competition
Mergers II

Counsel Supporting the Complaint

August 7, 2009

Table of Contents

	Page
I. EXHIBIT AND WITNESS INDICES.....	1
A. Exhibit Index.....	1
B. Witness Index.....	1
II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	1
A. Transaction Background.....	1
B. Pre-Hearing Background.....	1
C. Hearing Summary.....	2
III. THE BATTERY SEPARATOR INDUSTRY.....	4
A. Terminology.....	4
B. The Product and The Relevant Product Market.....	10
a. The Role of a Battery Separator.....	10
(a) Physical Characteristics.....	10
(b) End Uses.....	15
(c) Types of Separators.....	23
(d) Daramic Products.....	23
(i) Polyethylene Separators – “Daramic”.....	24
(ii) DARAK Separators.....	28
(iii) Polyvinyl Chloride (“PVC”) Separators.....	29
(e) Microporous Products.....	29
(i) Ace-Sil.....	30
(ii) Flex-Sil.....	31
(iii) CellForce.....	35
(f) Other.....	36
(i) AGM.....	36

	(ii)	PVC.....	37
	(g)	The Manufacturing Process	39
	(i)	PE Separators (manufactured by Daramic) and PE Separators with a Rubber Additive (manufactured by Daramic and Microporous).....	39
	(ii)	Rubber Separators.....	50
	(iii)	Phenolic Resin Separators (manufactured by Daramic) ...	51
	(iv)	Polyvinyl Chloride Separators (manufactured by Daramic)	51
	(h)	The Production Lines.....	51
C.		The Relevant Geographic Market of the Industry	61
	a.	Battery Separator Manufacturers Operate in a Global Market	61
	b.	Battery Manufacturers Also Conduct Their Business in a Global Market.....	77
IV.		The Parties	84
	A.	Polypore/Daramic	84
		a. Before the Acquisition	84
		b. Daramic Management.....	87
		c. Sales.....	88
		d. Contracts and Pricing.....	89
		e. Growth in Asia.....	96
		f. The Acquisition of Microporous.....	97
		g. Synergies Following the Acquisition.....	106
		h. Daramic's Difficulties In the Current Market.....	110
		i. Daramic is Experiencing Declining Margins and Rising Costs.....	112
		j. Daramic Operates In a Stagnant Industry	119
		k. Burden of Acquiring Microporous.....	122
		l. Loss of Important Customers.....	128

m.	Effect of the Strike.....	130
n.	Daramic's Future	130
B.	Microporous Products, L.P.	131
a.	Background.....	131
b.	Ownership History.....	132
c.	Microporous Management.....	134
d.	Manufacturing Plants.....	136
e.	Sales.....	139
f.	Pricing.....	141
g.	Development Projects.....	145
(a)	Project Einstein.....	145
(b)	Project LENO.....	145
(c)	White PE.....	149
(d)	CellForce in SLI.....	150
h.	The Expansion	151
(a)	The Microporous Board's Pullback.....	164
i.	The Ruse – Management's Own Agenda	187
j.	Microporous Products Today.....	193
k.	Efficiencies	201
V.	The Customers.....	207
A.	The "Power" Buyers.....	207
a.	Johnson Controls Inc.....	207
(a)	JCI's Size and Power	207
(b)	JCI's Relationship with Daramic.....	209
(c)	The Proposed Renewal of the Relationship.....	215
(d)	JCI's Relationship with Entek	218

(e)	JCI's Relationship with Microporous	223
(f)	JCI's Joint Ventures and Efforts at Vertical Integration.....	226
(g)	Today	232
b.	Exide Technologies, Inc.....	240
(a)	Background.....	240
(b)	Exide Battery Separator Buying History	241
(i)	Daramic Purchase of the Corydon Plant.....	241
(ii)	Daramic's Prior Supply Agreement.....	245
(c)	Microporous.....	263
(d)	Exide and Entek.....	276
(e)	Exide's Continuing Action	282
c.	EnerSys	292
(a)	EnerSys Battery Separators Buying History.....	294
(i)	Daramic.....	294
1.	Daramic's Sales to EnerSys.....	294
2.	EnerSys' Leverage in Pricing Negotiations	299
3.	Force Majeure Event.....	307
(ii)	Microporous.....	321
1.	EnerSys Enters Into Contract with Microporous	324
2.	EnerSys Intended to Move 100% of its Purchases from Daramic to Microporous	325
3.	EnerSys Refused Microporous Price Increases and Surcharges.....	328
(b)	Today	330
(i)	Other Sources of Supply Are Available.....	330
1.	Entek.....	331
2.	Asian Producers	334

3.	BFR.....	335
4.	Anpei.....	337
5.	Alpha Beta	339
6.	Amer-Sil.....	340
7.	Other Sources.....	345
(c)	EnerSys Testing of Battery Separators	351
(d)	EnerSys' Business Today	354
(e)	The Microporous Acquisition Did Not Result In A Loss Of Technological Innovation	354
(f)	EnerSys' Witnesses Are Not Credible.....	356
d.	Trojan.....	364
(a)	Trojan's Products.....	365
(b)	Trojan's Relationship with Microporous	366
(c)	Trojan and Daramic	369
(d)	Trojan's Bias (and Use of Its Buying Power) Against Daramic.....	377
B.	The Other Buyers.....	384
a.	East Penn.....	384
(a)	East Penn Battery Separator Buying History.....	387
(i)	Daramic.....	387
(ii)	Microporous.....	389
(iii)	Entek.....	392
(iv)	Today	394
b.	Crown Battery Manufacturing Co.	394
(a)	Crown Battery Separator Buying History.....	395
(i)	Daramic.....	395
(ii)	Microporous.....	397

	(iii)	Entek	398
	(iv)	Today	399
c.		Douglas Battery Manufacturing Company	402
	(a)	Douglas Battery Separator Buying History	404
		(i) Daramic.....	404
		(ii) Microporous.....	405
		(iii) Entek	407
		(iv) Today	407
d.		U.S. Battery.....	412
	(a)	U.S. Battery Separator Buying History.....	413
	(b)	U.S. Battery Today	414
	(c)	Separators Used in Deep Cycle Applications	414
	(d)	Flex-Sil.....	416
	(e)	Daramic HD	417
	(f)	CellForce.....	419
e.		Bulldog Battery.....	419
	(a)	Bulldog Battery Separator Buying History.....	421
		(i) Through 2002.....	421
		(ii) 2003.....	421
		(iii) 2006.....	424
		(iv) Post-Acquisition.....	428
		(v) Price Adjustments	429
		(vi) Owensboro Strike.....	431
VI.		The Competition	432
	A.	Entek	432
		a. Company Background	432

b.	Entek's Competitors.....	441
c.	Entek's Current Excess Capacity Crisis	443
d.	Entek's Growth.....	447
(a)	JCI.....	451
(b)	Exide	458
e.	Entek as a Supplier.....	466
f.	Entek's Relationship with Dumas.....	467
g.	Summary Findings.....	467
B.	Other Competitors.....	467
a.	BFR.....	467
b.	NSG.....	481
c.	Anpei.....	489
d.	Separindo	498
e.	Sebang.....	500
f.	Baotou	502
g.	Smaller Competitors	505
(a)	Epoch	505
(b)	M-Arrow and Genius	508
h.	The Threat of Other Competition	509
VII.	Ease of Entry.....	516
A.	Timeliness.....	516
a.	Construction of a PE Production Line	516
b.	Testing of PE Product.....	528
B.	Sufficiency.....	537
C.	Likelihood.....	545
a.	Costs of Constructing a PE Separator Line.....	545

b.	Asian Competitors	550
c.	Entek Excess Capacity	558
d.	Sponsored Entry/Vertical Integration	564
VIII.	The H&V Agreement.....	569
A.	The Cross Agency Agreement Between H&V and Daramic was a Legitimate Sales Joint Venture Between the Companies.....	569
IX.	Remedy	574
A.	There is no Basis for any Required Divestiture of the Feistritz Plant	574
B.	Any Competitive Harm From the Merger Could Be Addressed Through Divestiture of Microporous' PE Line in Piney Flats	580
C.	Conduct Remedy.....	582
X.	Expert Testimony.....	582
A.	Dr. John Simpson.....	582
a.	Simpson Is Biased in Arriving at His Opinions.....	583
b.	Simpson's Methodology Is Flawed	590
c.	Simpson Did Not Do Quantitative Analysis As Required by the Merger Guidelines and Commentary.....	590
d.	Simpson Did Not Follow the Merger Guidelines in Defining His Four Product Markets	597
e.	Simpson Ignored the All PE Separator Market in Arriving at His Opinions.....	605
f.	Simpson Does Not Account for AceSil at All in His Product Markets ..	606
g.	Simpson's Opinion on FlexSil is Contrary to the Facts and Not Supported by Analysis	607
h.	Simpson Fails to Support His Geographic Market with Analysis	608
i.	Simpson's Market Share and Concentration Analysis is Flawed	617
(a)	Simpson Did Not Consider Uncommitted Entrants.....	617
j.	Simpson's HHI Analysis is Incorrect	624

k.	Simpson's opinion regarding competitive effects is flawed and cannot be considered.....	628
l.	Simpson's Opinion on Ease of Entry is Not Supported.....	632
m.	Daramic's Post Acquisition Price Increases Do Not Support the FTC's Position	637
n.	Simpson's Opinion Regarding Monopolization is Flawed.....	646
o.	Simpson's Opinions Regarding Relief Are Overbroad and Unsupported by the Evidence.....	663
p.	Conclusion	671
B.	Dr. Henry Kahwaty.....	671
a.	Foundation for Economic Opinions.....	671
b.	General Economic Opinions.....	673
c.	Product Market Issues.....	701
d.	Geographic Market	711
e.	Concentration and Competitive Effects	722
f.	Economic testimony supports the view that the acquisition would produce no anticompetitive unilateral affects.....	726
g.	No evidence of post-acquisition price increases.....	732
h.	Ease of entry	736
i.	Efficiencies	740
j.	Monopoly power.....	742
k.	Customer contracts.....	745
l.	The Daramic/H&V agreement.....	747
m.	Remedies.....	751
XI.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL BEAR THE BURDEN OF PERSUASION ON ALL ELEMENTS OF A SECTION 7 VIOLATION.....	759
A.	MERGER CHALLENGES HAVE GENERALLY OCCURRED IN INDUSTRIES WHERE THE CONCENTRATION LEVELS SPECIFIED BY THE GUIDELINES HAVE BEEN EXCEEDED SUBSTANTIALLY.....	759

B.	THE GUIDELINES IDENTIFY A FIVE-STEP APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS OF A MERGER OR ACQUISITION.....	760
C.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL MUST PROVE THE RELEVANT PRODUCT MARKET OR MARKETS AND THEY HAVE FAILED TO DO SO.....	760
D.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL MUST PROVE THE RELEVANT GEOGRAPHIC MARKET OR MARKETS AND THEY HAVE FAILED TO DO SO.....	761
E.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL FAIL PROPERLY TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF ALL MARKET PARTICIPANTS FOR PURPOSES OF CALCULATING MARKET CONCENTRATION EVEN IN THE IMPROPER MARKETS THEY ALLEGE.....	761
F.	MARKET SHARES ALONE MAY NOT BE SUFFICIENT TO PREDICT THE COMPETITIVE EFFECTS OF A MERGER OR ACQUISITION.....	762
G.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO SHOW THAT THE ACQUISITION WOULD HARM COMPETITION BECAUSE OF COORDINATED INTERACTION.....	763
H.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO SHOW THAT THE ACQUISITION WOULD HARM COMPETITION BECAUSE OF ANTICOMPETITIVE UNILATERAL EFFECTS.....	764
I.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO SHOW THAT THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT BARRIERS TO ENTRY INTO THE PRODUCTION AND SALE OF BATTERY SEPARATORS.....	766
J.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO SHOW THAT MICROPOROUS WAS A VIABLE POTENTIAL ENTRANT INTO SEGMENTS OF THE BATTERY SEPARATOR INDUSTRY OTHER THAN DEEP CYCLE.....	767
K.	MICROPOROUS WAS IN A PRECARIOUS FINANCIAL CONDITION AS OF THE TIME OF THE ACQUISITION, WHICH SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED ITS COMPETITIVE SIGNIFICANCE.....	768
L.	DARAMIC HAS REALIZED SUBSTANTIAL EFFICIENCIES SINCE THE ACQUISITION AND THESE HAVE GENERATED PROCOMPETITIVE EFFECTS.....	768
M.	CUSTOMER TESTIMONY MAY BE OF LIMITED WEIGHT AND SIGNIFICANCE REGARDING SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES.....	769
N.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S EXPERT LACKED INDEPENDENCE AND FAILED TO PERFORM ANALYSIS NECESSARY TO FORM AND SUBSTANTIATE HIS OPINIONS.....	769

O.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL FAILED TO PROVE THAT DARAMIC ENGAGED IN "MONOPOLIZATION" THROUGH THE USE OF EXCLUSIONARY CONTRACTS.....	770
XII.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL FAILED TO PROVE THAT THE CROSS AGENCY AGREEMENT BETWEEN DARAMIC AND H&V UNLAWFULLY RESTRAINED TRADE.....	772
A.	The Agreement is Governed by the Ancillary Restraints Doctrine.....	772
B.	The FTC's "Inherently Suspect" Doctrine has not been Accepted by the Supreme Court.....	772
XIII.	THE DIVESTITURE AND OTHER RELIEF SOUGHT BY COMPLAINT COUNSEL ARE UNNECESSARILY OVERBROAD TO ADDRESS COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S COMPETITION CONCERNS AND ARE PUNITIVE.....	773
A.	Divestiture of all the Acquired Assets is not Required by Law.....	773
B.	Any Divestiture or other Relief must be Keyed to the Status of the Acquired Company Today if the Acquisition had not Occurred.....	773
C.	Divestiture is an Equitable Remedy the Need for which must be Proved, and Punitive Relief is not Permissible.....	774
D.	Relief, including Divestiture, in a Consummated Merger Case Should be Fashioned Giving Consideration to Post-Transaction Developments and Market Conditions at the Time the Relief is Ordered.....	774
E.	COMPLAINT COUNSEL HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT RECISSION OF DARAMIC'S CONTRACTS IS WARRANTED OR NECESSARY.....	775
XIV.	CONCLUSION.....	775

I. EXHIBIT AND WITNESS INDICES

A. Exhibit Index

1. See Exhibit A hereto.

Response to Finding No. 1:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

B. Witness Index

2. See Exhibit B hereto.

Response to Finding No. 2:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A. Transaction Background

3. On February 29, 2008, a subsidiary of Polypore International, Inc. ("Polypore")

 } (PX0162, *in camera*) Polypore acquired Microporous for approximately \$76 million, \$29 million in cash and \$47 million in assumed debt. (RX1572 at ¶4; PX0800 at 2, *in camera*) Due to the small value of the transaction, the parties were not required to make a premerger notification filing under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Act. (Toth, Tr. 1557, 1559; PX0800 at 2, *in camera*).

Response to Finding No. 3:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.²

B. Pre-Hearing Background

4. On March 7, 2008, the FTC initiated a non-public investigation into the Acquisition. During its investigation, the FTC issued Civil Investigative Demands to Polypore, its Daramic subsidiary and various third parties, and conducted many investigational hearings. The FTC then proceeded to issue a Part 3 Complaint in this matter on September 9, 2008, alleging that the Acquisition violated Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45 ("Section 5") and Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. §18, and that Polypore monopolized or attempted to monopolize certain product markets in North America. (RX 1572

¹ Microporous previously had done business in the battery separator industry under the company name Amerace. (Gilchrist, Tr. 314).

² Complaint Counsel's Findings of Fact is abbreviated as CCFOF. Respondent's Finding of Fact is abbreviated as RFOF. Complaint Counsel's Reply Findings of Fact is abbreviated as CCRF.

at 8-9). On October 15, 2008, Polypore filed its Answer and Defenses, which denied the FTC's allegations and set forth its affirmative defenses. (RX1589).

Response to Finding No. 4:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

5. An initial Scheduling Order was entered in the case on October 22, 2008, setting forth a discovery cut-off date of February 13, 2009 and a trial date of April 14, 2009. (RX1591). Due to extensive third party discovery issues, the Scheduling Order was amended to extend these and other remaining deadlines by four weeks. (ALJ Order dated Feb. 4, 2009).

Response to Finding No. 5:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

C. Hearing Summary

6. The hearing commenced in this case on May 12, 2009 and concluded on June 12, 2009. During the 22 days of actual trial proceedings, live testimony was received into the hearing record from the following 30 witnesses:

Witnesses Related to Polypore/Daramic/Microporous

- Robert Toth, CEO and President of Polypore
- Pierre Hauswald, General Manager and VP of Daramic
- Sterling Tucker Roe, VP of Worldwide Sales and Marketing of Daramic
- Harry Seibert, VP and Business Director of Daramic
- Tim Riney, VP of Finance of Daramic
- Christopher Thuet, Business Director Asia-Pacific of Daramic
- Hans-Peter Gaugl, Managing Director Austrian Facility for Daramic Austria GmbH (also former Manager of Austrian facility for Microporous)
- John Kevin Whear, VP of Technology of Daramic
- Larry Trevathan, VP Operations of Daramic (also former VP Operations of Microporous)
- Steven McDonald, Sales Manager, North America of Daramic (also former Director of Sales of Microporous)
- Michael Gilchrist, formerly CEO and President of Microporous
- George Brilmeyer, formerly Director of Research & Development of Microporous

- Michael Graff, Managing Director of Warburg Pincus (also Chairman of the Board of Directors of Polypore)

Witnesses Related to Battery Manufacturers

- Richard Godber, CEO and President of Trojan Battery
- Donald Wallace, Executive VP of Sales and Marketing of U.S. Battery Mfg. Co.
- Nawaz Qureshi, VP of Engineering and Technology of U.S. Battery Mfg. Co.
- Larry Axt, VP of Global Procurement of EnerSys
- Larry Burkert, Senior Procurement Manager of EnerSys
- John Gagge, Jr., Sr. Director Engineering and Quality Assurance for EnerSys
- John Craig, Chairman, CEO and President of EnerSys
- Rodger Hall, Global VP of Procurement for Johnson Controls Battery
- Mitchell Bregman, Exide Technologies (former procurement council)
- Melvin Gillespie, Jr., VP of Global Procurement for Exide Technologies
- Norman Benjamin, President of Bulldog Battery Corporation
- Dale Leister, Director Procurement Strategy & Supplier Dev., East Penn Mfg.
- James Douglas, Executive VP of Douglas Battery Mfg. Co.
- Arthur Balcerzak, Director of Purchasing for Crown Battery (as consultant)
- Daniel Weerts, Vice President of Sales and Marketing of Entek Holding Company

Expert Witnesses

- John Simpson, FTC Economist (FTC's expert witness)
- Henry J. Kahwaty, Ph.D., Director of LECG (Respondent's expert witness)

Response to Finding No. 6:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

7. In addition, for certain witnesses who were unavailable to attend trial proceedings, testimony was received into the record through admission of certain deposition transcripts and investigational hearings, subject to any lodged objections. See JX3, JX8, JX9.

Response to Finding No. 7:

This material cited does not support the finding. JX3, for the most part, consists of excerpts of investigational hearings and depositions of Respondent personnel. Many of these witnesses were available and did testify at trial. (JX3). In addition, there is no JX9.

8. The hearing record in this case was closed by Order dated June 22, 2009. Concurrent reply briefs and replies to findings of fact are due to be filed by the FTC and Respondent on July 31, 2009. Closing arguments are scheduled for August 20, 2009.

Response to Finding No. 8:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

III. THE BATTERY SEPARATOR INDUSTRY

A. Terminology

9. The following provides a glossary of some of the recurring terms and separator product names referred to in the testimony, documents and deposition/investigational hearing transcripts:

10. **AGM** – initials which refer to “absorbptive glass mat” battery separators. The liquid in the battery is absorbed like a sponge into the glass mat part of the separator and there is no free liquid electrolyte. AGM batteries are sealed and do not need maintenance. (Godber, Tr. 147; Hauswald, Tr. 994-95; Qureshi, Tr. 2055-56).

Response to Finding No. 10:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

11. **ACE-SIL®** – product name of a hard rubber battery separator developed by Microporous (and now sold by Daramic) that is made from rubber silicon. This pure rubber product is very stiff and typically used in very high end stationary applications such as telecommunications, back up power for nuclear plants, and military products. (Gilchrist, Tr. 300; Hauswald, Tr. 992; Roe, Tr. 1748; McDonald, Tr. 3786; RX1638 (physical product sample)).

Response to Finding No. 11:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

12. **Aftermarket** – refers to the market for replacement batteries for products (in contrast to original equipment batteries). (Godber, Tr. 143-44; Gillespie, Tr. 2932).

Response to Finding No. 12:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

13. **Antimony** – refers to an antimony alloy that is sometimes included in the composition of the positive plate of a battery used for deep-cycle applications in order to improve battery performance. Antimony can have a tendency to travel from the positive plate to the negative plate during usage, which could eventually lead to reduced battery performance. The addition of

rubber to a battery separator can help reduce the rate of antimony transfer. (Godber, Tr. 138-40, 149-50; Whear, Tr. 4667-68, 4683-84; PX1791 at 001).

Response to Finding No. 13:

Deep-cycle batteries use a high-antimony lead alloy grid and use high-density active material that takes longer to fall apart. (Qureshi, Tr. 1995). The positive lead alloy grid at U.S. Battery has an antimony content of 5% and the negative grid has an antimony content of 2.75%. (Qureshi, Tr. 1998). The deposition of antimony from the positive plate to the Negative is called antimony poisoning. It is referred to as poisoning because antimony transfer will cause the premature death of the battery. (PX1791 at 001; PX1124 at 001; Godber, Tr. 137-139). The reduction of antimony transfer is important property for separators used in deep-cycle batteries. (Leister, Tr. 4039). The separator plays an important role in scavenging or tying up the antimony in the electrolyte, preventing it from going to the negative plate. (Qureshi, Tr. 2004). Antimony is what makes the battery deep-cycle; if you do not have enough antimony the cycle loses capacity. (Qureshi, Tr. 2001-2002).

14. **Backweb Thickness** – a primary measurement of a battery separator that is the thickness of the substrate in space between membranes of a rib. Simply put, it is the thickness of the separator that is measured between the ribs. The backweb thickness serves to create a wall of insulation in the battery between plates. (Hauswald, Tr. 966-67, 979; Leister, Tr. 4044; Whear, Tr. 4685, 4688; PX669, *in camera*).

Response to Finding No. 14:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

15. **Battery Separators** – products of various composition that are porous insulators placed between positively and negatively charged plates in batteries to prevent electrical short circuits while allowing ionic current to flow through the separators. (Gilchrist, Tr. 314; Hauswald, Tr. 968-69; Benjamin, Tr. 3504; Whear, Tr. 4665-66).

Response to Finding No. 15:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

16. **Black Scum** – refers to a dark-colored residue that can gather on the liquid surface inside a polyethylene or polyethylene-based flooded lead-acid battery during usage. The black scum can result from the interaction of various chemicals and the oil component of a separator through a process of oxidation. (Hauswald, Tr. 1096-98; Brilmeyer, Tr. 1834-35; Whear, Tr. 4707-08).

Response to Finding No. 16:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

17. **CellForce®** – product name for a polyethylene battery separator developed by Microporous (and now sold by Daramic) for deep-cycle applications that includes ground up ACE-SIL® rubber product as an additive in the polyethylene matrix of the separator to improve performance. (Gilchrist, Tr. 337-38, 340; Hauswald, Tr. 672-73, 993; RX1640 (physical product sample)).

Response to Finding No. 17:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

18. **Daramic HD** – product name of a Daramic polyethylene battery separator made with a liquid latex additive for deep-cycle applications. (Hauswald, Tr. 671-72; PX949 at 004, *in camera*; PX319 at 007).

Response to Findign No. 18:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

19. **Darak** – product name of a non-PE Daramic battery separator made with cross-linked phenolic resin for more porosity. The separator is made only in Germany and is typically used in gel type batteries. (Hauswald, Tr. 989-90; Whear, Tr. 4681; PX582 at 051).

Resposne to Finding No. 19:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

20. **Deep-cycle** – refers to certain end use applications for batteries where the batteries are placed in products having a lower amperage draw over a longer duration of time. These batteries are repeatedly discharged deeply to a low state of charge prior to recharging. Example applications include golf carts, floor scrubbers, scissor lifts, utilities, and marine boat applications. (Godber, Tr. 137-38; Gillespie, Tr. 2931; Whear, Tr. 4682, 4694; PX0319 at 007-008).

Response to Finding No. 20:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

21. **FLEX-SIL®** - product name of a premium battery separator product developed by Microporous (and now sold by Daramic) that is made of pure rubber (no polyethylene) for use in deep cycle applications such as golf carts, floor scrubbers and aerial lifts. Flex-Sil product is sold only in "leaf" cut-piece form. (Roe, Tr. 1737, 1749; Hauswald, Tr. 992-93, McDonald, Tr. 3787; RX1639 (physical product sample)).

Response to Finding No. 21:

Flex-Sil's premium status is based more on its price rather than its performance as

compared to Daramic's HD. (PX0423 at 002).

22. **Flooded Lead-Acid Battery** – a battery that has liquid acid in it up to a level above the positive and negative lead plates. Due to repeated charging and discharging, especially in deep-

cycle applications, liquid will have a tendency to evaporate and the battery will need to be watered at certain intervals (except in a sealed, no maintenance automotive battery). (Godber, Tr. 147; Brilmeyer, Tr. 1841; Qureshi, Tr. 2053-54; Whear, Tr. 4682)

Response to Finding No. 22:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

23. **Enveloping** – instead of having the battery separator material cut into separate smaller “leaf” pieces, the battery manufacturer will purchase the material in roll form and itself fold the separator material around the plates of the batteries and seal it on the side (thus “enveloping” the plate like it is in a pouch). (Roe, Tr. 1748-49; Qureshi, Tr. 2036; PX1791 at 002) This process also can be referred to by a battery manufacturer as “sleeving”. (Benjamin, Tr. 3508).

Response to Finding No. 23:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

24. **Gel (Non-Flooded) Battery** – instead of having a liquid lead-acid like flooded batteries, these batteries (such as an AGM battery) have a gel silica that interacts with the positive and negative plates of the battery to allow for ionic transfer. (Godber, Tr. 147; Gaugl, Tr. 4557; Whear, Tr. 4681).

Response to Finding No 24:

The citations do not support this finding. Gel batteries are not the same thing as AGM batteries. In an AGM battery the electrolyte is absorbed into the fiber glass separator and there is no free active material. In a gelled battery, the electrolyte is very thick but free of the separator. (Douglas, Tr. 4053-54). AGM and Gel batteries are both types of sealed batteries but are not one and the same. (Godber, Tr. 147).

25. **Industrial Separators** – refers to separators for all industrial applications for batteries, including industrial motive power or industrial stationary batteries. (Roe, Tr. 1815; Whear, Tr. 4682-83).

Response to Finding No. 25:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

26. **Leaf Separator** – refers to battery separator material that has been cut into pieces (i.e., “leaves”), and many of these pieces will be stacked together in between plates and used in a single battery. (Roe, Tr. 1748-49; PX1791 at 2).

Response to Finding No. 26:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

27. **Motive Power** – refers to an end use application of batteries for certain industrial products that move, such as forklifts and mine equipment. (Gilchrist, Tr. 306; Roe, Tr. 1197; Balcerzak, Tr. 4092; Whear, Tr. 4694).

Response to Finding No. 27:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

28. **OE/OEM** – generally synonymous terms for original equipment or original equipment manufacturer. These types of batteries are installed as original equipment on a product (in contrast to batteries for the “aftermarket” which are replacement batteries). (Roe, Tr. 1762-63; Gillespie, Tr. 2932).

Response to Finding No. 28:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

29. **Overall Thickness** – a primary measurement of a battery separator that measures the overall thickness of the product including the ribs (e.g., thickness of substrate and height of ribs together). Overall thickness serves to provide the space between electrodes and make a reservoir for the liquid. (Hauswald, Tr. 966-67, 979; Leister, Tr. 4044; Whear, Tr. 4688-89). (For demonstrative purposes see PX669, *in camera*).

Response to Finding No. 29:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

30. **PE Separators** – abbreviation for a polyethylene battery separator. Daramic’s polyethylene battery separators are formulated from ultra high molecular weight polyethylene, as well as other ingredients such as silica and oil. (Toth, Tr. 1501, 1549; PX582 at 041, 043). Certain PE separators include additional additives as well. (PX582 at 043-050; PX0949 at 003-004, *in camera*). These products are sold under trade names/trademarks that include Daramic Standard, Daramic HP, Daramic V, Daramic HD, Daramic HPR, Daramic HP-S, Daramic HPO, Daramic Duralife, Daramic W and Daramic CL. (PX582 at 043-050; PX0949 at 003-004, *in camera*).

Response to Finding No. 30:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

31. **Profile** – profile refers to the specifications of a separator and includes the thickness of the backweb as well as the shape of the ribs, i.e., whether they are vertical, diagonal, or S-shaped, along with the height and density of the ribs. Daramic offers a choice of approximately 80 profiles with its battery separators (Whear, Tr.4675-76).

Response to Finding No. 31:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

32. **Reserve Power** – an end use application for batteries where the batteries are used to provide back-up or reserve power to a system. (Gilchrist, Tr. 306; Axt. Tr. 2099; Douglas Tr. 4052-53).

Response to Finding No 32:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

33. **Ribs** – protrusions on the separator. The ribs, which vary in height, thickness or shape from separator to separator, help fix the physical spacing in the battery to make sure there is an appropriate amount of acid between the plates. The shapes and sizes of these ribs make up oart of the “profile” of the separator. (Hauswald, Tr. 966-67; Whear, Tr. 4665-67, 4675-76; PX1791 at 002).

Response to Finding No. 33:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

34. **SLI** – abbreviation refers to an end use application for batteries known as “starter, lighting, and ignition,” which is generally synonymous with an automotive-type application for batteries. Examples of SLI batteries include those placed in automobiles, trucks, buses, boats, snowmobiles, jet skis and recreational vehicles. (Brilmeyer, Tr. 1831-32; Gillespie, Tr. 2390, *in camera*; Leister, Tr. 3976-77).

Response to Finding No. 34:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

35. **Stationary** - refers to an end use application for a battery where the product is stationary, such as large back-up batteries for telecommunications, emergency lighting, UPS or other reserve power application. (Roe, Tr. 1736, 1816-17; Whear, Tr. 4692).

Response to Finding No. 35:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

36. **Traction** – refers to an end use application for batteries in certain industrial products (e.g., electric forklifts). Term generally synonymous with “motive power” applications. “Motive power” is typically referred to in U.S., while “traction” is typically referred to globally. (Roe, Tr. 1250; Balcerzak, Tr. 4092).

Response to Finding No. 36:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

37. **UPS** – refers to an end use application for batteries known as “uninterruptible power supply” or “uninterruptible power source” products. These are batteries for emergency power use in case of a power outage/stoppage. Examples include back-up stationary batteries for computer systems, telecommunications systems, and cell phone towers. UPS batteries are generally considered to be a type of reserve power batteries. (Gilchrist, Tr. 306; Roe, Tr. 1736-37; Brilmeyer, Tr. 1832-33; Douglas Tr. 4052-53).

Response to Finding No. 37:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

38. **VRLA** – abbreviation refers to valve-regulated lead-acid battery. VRLA is simply another name for an AGM battery. (Godber, Tr. 366; Douglas, Tr. 4052).

Response to Finding No. 38:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

B. The Product and The Relevant Product Market

a. The Role of a Battery Separator

(a) Physical Characteristics

39. Lead acid batteries are made up of three primary components: a positive electrode, a negative electrode, and an electrolyte. (PX2110 at 010). The cells of a battery are made up of electrodes which are lead plates that are positively and negatively charged. (PX2110 at 010). The plates are stored in the electrolyte, which is a solution of sulphuric acid. (PX2110 at 010). The cell discharges electrons as the acid slowly changes the lead in the plates into lead sulphate. (PX2110 at 010). An electric current then flows if the terminals are connected through a conductor. (PX2110 at 010). When an electric current is being drawn from a battery it is being discharged. (PX2110 at 010).

Response to Finding No. 39:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

40. A battery separator is a porous insulator placed between two plates of opposing polarity to prevent electrical short circuits while allowing ionic current to flow through the separator. (PX2110 at 010). From this standpoint, a battery separator is a passive element in a lead-acid battery. (Whear, Tr. 4666).

Response to Finding No. 40:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

41. [REDACTED] (PX2110 at 010; Douglas, Tr. 4072, *in camera*; Craig, Tr. 2553 (3-4%)).

Response to Finding No.41:

Complaint Counsel has no specific response.

42. A battery separator serves two primary functions. (Whear, Tr. 4666).

Response to Finding No. 42:

While in general a battery separator may have two primary functions across all types of separators, battery manufacturers in North America demand separators that are designed for specific applications and have particular additives and chemical recipes that make a particular

