DISH Network CORP Form 10-K February 21, 2014 <u>Table of Contents</u>

## **UNITED STATES**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

# Form 10-K

(Mark One)

x ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2013

OR

0 TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

•

FOR THE TRANSITION PERIOD FROM TO

Commission file number: 0-26176

# **DISH Network Corporation**

2

## Edgar Filing: DISH Network CORP - Form 10-K

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Nevada (State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)

> 9601 South Meridian Boulevard **Englewood**, Colorado (Address of principal executive offices)

88-0336997 (I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)

80112

(Zip Code)

Registrant s telephone number, including area code: (303) 723-1000

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Title of each class Class A common stock, \$0.01 par value Name of each exchange on which registered The Nasdaq Stock Market L.L.C.

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act: None

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. Yes x No o

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act. Yes o No x

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes x No o

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes x No o

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K (§229.405 of this chapter) is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of registrant s knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K. o

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of large accelerated filer, accelerated filer and smaller reporting company in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large	accelerated filer x	
-------	---------------------	--

Accelerated filer o

Non-accelerated filer o (Do not check if a smaller reporting company) Smaller reporting company o

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Act). Yes o No x

As of June 30, 2013, the aggregate market value of Class A common stock held by non-affiliates of the registrant was \$9.0 billion based upon the closing price of the Class A common stock as reported on the Nasdaq Global Select Market as of the close of business on the last trading day of the month.

As of February 14, 2014, the registrant s outstanding common stock consisted of 219,907,827 shares of Class A common stock and 238,435,208 shares of Class B common stock, each \$0.01 par value.

### DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The following documents are incorporated into this Form 10-K by reference:

Portions of the registrant s definitive Proxy Statement to be filed in connection with its 2014 Annual Meeting of Shareholders are incorporated by reference in Part III.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

### <u>PART I</u>

	Disclosure Regarding Forward-Looking Statements	i
Item 1.	Business	1
<u>Item 1A.</u>	Risk Factors	22
<u>Item 1B.</u>	Unresolved Staff Comments	42
<u>Item 2.</u>	Properties	42
<u>Item 3.</u>	Legal Proceedings	42
Item 4.	Mine Safety Disclosures	53

### PART II

Item 5.	Market for Registrant s Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities	53
<u>Item 6.</u>	Selected Financial Data	55
<u>Item 7.</u>	Management s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations	59
<u>Item 7A.</u>	Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk	87
<u>Item 8.</u>	Financial Statements and Supplementary Data	88
<u>Item 9.</u>	Changes in and Disagreements With Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure	88
<u>Item 9A.</u>	Controls and Procedures	89
Item 9B.	Other Information	89

### PART III

Item 10.	Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance	91
Item 11.	Executive Compensation	91
Item 12.	Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters	91
Item 13.	Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence	91
Item 14.	Principal Accounting Fees and Services	91
	PART IV	
Item 15.	Exhibits, Financial Statement Schedules	91
<u>nem 15.</u>	Exhibits, I maneral Statement Schedules	91
	<u>Signatures</u>	99
	Index to Consolidated Financial Statements	F-1

#### DISCLOSURE REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

We make forward-looking statements within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 throughout this report. Whenever you read a statement that is not simply a statement of historical fact (such as when we describe what we believe, intend, plan, estimate, expect or anticipate will occur and other similar statements), you must remember that our expectations may not be achieved, even though we believe they are reasonable. We do not guarantee that any future transactions or events described herein will happen as described or that they will happen at all. You should read this report completely and with the understanding that actual future results may be materially different from what we expect. Whether actual events or results will conform with our expectations and predictions is subject to a number of risks and uncertainties. For further discussion see *Item 1A. Risk Factors.* The risks and uncertainties include, but are not limited to, the following:

### **Competition and Economic Risks Affecting our Business**

• We face intense and increasing competition from satellite television providers, cable companies and telecommunications companies, especially as the pay-TV industry has matured, which may require us to increase subscriber acquisition and retention spending or accept lower subscriber activations and higher subscriber churn.

• Competition from digital media companies that provide or facilitate the delivery of video content via the Internet may reduce our gross new subscriber activations and may cause our subscribers to purchase fewer services from us or to cancel our services altogether, resulting in less revenue to us.

• Sustained economic weakness, including continued high unemployment and reduced consumer spending, may adversely affect our ability to grow or maintain our business.

• Our competitors may be able to leverage their relationships with programmers to reduce their programming costs and offer exclusive content that will place them at a competitive advantage to us.

• We face increasing competition from other distributors of unique programming services such as foreign language and sports programming that may limit our ability to maintain subscribers that desire these unique programming services.

#### **Operational and Service Delivery Risks Affecting our Business**

• If we do not continue improving our operational performance and customer satisfaction, our gross new subscriber activations may decrease and our subscriber churn may increase.

• If our gross new subscriber activations decrease, or if our subscriber churn, subscriber acquisition costs or retention costs increase, our financial performance will be adversely affected.

• Programming expenses are increasing and could adversely affect our future financial condition and results of operations.

• We depend on others to provide the programming that we offer to our subscribers and, if we lose access to this programming, our gross new subscriber activations may decline and our subscriber churn may increase.

• We may not be able to obtain necessary retransmission consent agreements at acceptable rates, or at all, from local network stations.

We may be required to make substantial additional investments to maintain competitive programming offerings.

Any failure or inadequacy of our information technology infrastructure could disrupt or harm our business.

• We currently depend on EchoStar Corporation and its subsidiaries, or EchoStar, to design, develop and manufacture all of our new set-top boxes and certain related components, to provide a majority of our transponder capacity, and to provide digital broadcast operations and other services to us. Our business would be adversely affected if EchoStar ceases to provide these products and services to us and we are unable to obtain suitable replacement products and services from third parties.

i

### Table of Contents

• We operate in an extremely competitive environment and our success may depend in part on our timely introduction and implementation of, and effective investment in, new competitive products and services, the failure of which could negatively impact our business.

• Technology in our industry changes rapidly and our inability to offer new subscribers and upgrade existing subscribers with more advanced equipment could cause our products and services to become obsolete.

• We rely on a single vendor or a limited number of vendors to provide certain key products or services to us such as information technology support, billing systems, and security access devices, and the inability of these key vendors to meet our needs could have a material adverse effect on our business.

• Our sole supplier of new set-top boxes, EchoStar, relies on a few suppliers and in some cases a single supplier, for many components of our new set-top boxes, and any reduction or interruption in supplies or significant increase in the price of supplies could have a negative impact on our business.

• Our programming signals are subject to theft, and we are vulnerable to other forms of fraud that could require us to make significant expenditures to remedy.

• We depend on third parties to solicit orders for our services that represent a significant percentage of our total gross new subscriber activations.

• We have limited satellite capacity and failures or reduced capacity could adversely affect our business.

• Our satellites are subject to construction, launch, operational and environmental risks that could limit our ability to utilize these satellites.

• We generally do not carry commercial insurance for any of the in-orbit satellites that we use, other than certain satellites leased from third parties, and could face significant impairment charges if one of our satellites fails.

We may have potential conflicts of interest with EchoStar due to our common ownership and management.

• We rely on key personnel and the loss of their services may negatively affect our businesses.

### Acquisition and Capital Structure Risks Affecting our Business

• We made a substantial investment to acquire certain AWS-4 wireless spectrum licenses and other assets from DBSD North America Inc. ( DBSD North America ) and TerreStar Networks, Inc. ( TerreStar ) and to acquire certain 700 MHz wireless spectrum licenses. We will need to make significant additional investments or partner with others to commercialize these licenses and assets.

• To the extent we commercialize our wireless spectrum licenses, we will face certain risks entering and competing in the wireless services industry and operating a wireless services business.

• We may pursue acquisitions and other strategic transactions to complement or expand our businesses that may not be successful and we may lose up to the entire value of our investment in these acquisitions and transactions.

• We may need additional capital, which may not be available on acceptable terms or at all, to continue investing in our businesses and to finance acquisitions and other strategic transactions.

• A portion of our investment portfolio is invested in securities that have experienced limited or no liquidity and may not be immediately accessible to support our financing needs, including investments in public companies that are highly speculative and have experienced and continue to experience volatility.

• We have substantial debt outstanding and may incur additional debt.

• It may be difficult for a third party to acquire us, even if doing so may be beneficial to our shareholders, because of our ownership structure.

• We are controlled by one principal stockholder who is also our Chairman.

#### Legal and Regulatory Risks Affecting our Business

• Our business depends on certain intellectual property rights and on not infringing the intellectual property rights of others.

• We are party to various lawsuits which, if adversely decided, could have a significant adverse impact on our business, particularly lawsuits regarding intellectual property.

• Our ability to distribute video content via the Internet involves regulatory risk.

• Changes in the Cable Act of 1992 ( Cable Act ), and/or the rules of the Federal Communications Commission ( FCC ) that implement the Cable Act, may limit our ability to access programming from cable-affiliated programmers at non-discriminatory rates.

• The injunction against our retransmission of distant networks, which is currently waived, may be reinstated.

• We are subject to significant regulatory oversight, and changes in applicable regulatory requirements, including any adoption or modification of laws or regulations relating to the Internet, could adversely affect our business.

• Our business depends on FCC licenses that can expire or be revoked or modified and applications for FCC licenses that may not be granted.

• We are subject to digital high-definition (HD) carry-one, carry-all requirements that cause capacity constraints.

• There can be no assurance that there will not be deficiencies leading to material weaknesses in our internal control over financial reporting.

• We may face other risks described from time to time in periodic and current reports we file with the Securities and Exchange Commission, or SEC.

All cautionary statements made herein should be read as being applicable to all forward-looking statements wherever they appear. Investors should consider the risks described herein and should not place undue reliance on any forward-looking statements. We assume no responsibility for updating forward-looking information contained or incorporated by reference herein or in other reports we file with the SEC.

Unless otherwise required by the context, in this report, the words DISH Network, the Company, we, our and us refer to DISH Network Corporation and its subsidiaries, EchoStar refers to EchoStar Corporation and its subsidiaries, and DISH DBS refers to DISH DBS Corporation and its subsidiaries, a wholly-owned, indirect subsidiary of DISH Network.

iii

#### PART I

Item 1. BUSINESS

### **OVERVIEW**

DISH Network Corporation was organized in 1995 as a corporation under the laws of the State of Nevada. We started offering the DISH® branded pay-TV service in March 1996 and are the nation s third largest pay-TV provider. Our common stock is publicly traded on the Nasdaq Global Select Market under the symbol DISH. Our principal executive offices are located at 9601 South Meridian Boulevard, Englewood, Colorado 80112 and our telephone number is (303) 723-1000.

DISH Network Corporation is a holding company. Its subsidiaries (which together with DISH Network Corporation are referred to as DISH Network, the Company, we, us and/or our, unless otherwise required by the context) operate two primary business segments.

• **DISH.** The DISH branded pay-TV service ( DISH ) had 14.057 million subscribers in the United States as of December 31, 2013. The DISH branded pay-TV service consists of Federal Communications Commission ( FCC ) licenses authorizing us to use direct broadcast satellite ( DBS ) and Fixed Satellite Service ( FSS ) spectrum, our satellites, receiver systems, third-party broadcast operations, customer service facilities, a leased fiber network, in-home service and call center operations, and certain other assets utilized in our operations. In addition, we market broadband services under the dishNET brand.

• *Wireless.* In 2008, we paid \$712 million to acquire certain 700 MHz wireless spectrum licenses, which were granted to us by the FCC in February 2009 subject to certain interim and final build-out requirements. On March 9, 2012, we completed the acquisitions of 100% of the equity of reorganized DBSD North America, Inc. (DBSD North America) and substantially all of the assets of TerreStar Networks, Inc. (TerreStar), pursuant to which we acquired, among other things, 40 MHz of AWS-4 wireless spectrum licenses held by DBSD North America (the DBSD Transaction) and TerreStar (the TerreStar Transaction). The financial results of DBSD North America and TerreStar are included in our financial results beginning March 9, 2012. The total consideration to acquire the DBSD North America and TerreStar assets was approximately \$2.860 billion. The FCC issued an order, which became effective on March 7, 2013, modifying our AWS-4 licenses to expand our terrestrial operating authority. That order imposed certain limitations on the use of a portion of the spectrum and also mandated certain interim and final build-out requirements for the licenses. As we review our options for the commercialization of this wireless spectrum, we may incur significant additional expenses and may have to make significant investments related to, among other things, research and development, wireless testing and wireless network infrastructure. See Note 16 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion.

*Discontinued Operations Blockbuster*.On April 26, 2011, we completed the acquisition of most of the assets of Blockbuster, Inc. (the Blockbuster Acquisition ). Blockbuster primarily offered movies and video games for sale and rental through multiple distribution channels such as retail stores, by-mail, digital devices, the blockbuster.com website and the BLOCKBUSTER On Demand® service. Since the Blockbuster Acquisition, we continually evaluated the impact of certain factors, including, among other things, competitive pressures, the ability of significantly fewer company-owned domestic retail stores to continue to support corporate administrative costs, and other issues impacting the

store-level financial performance of our company-owned domestic retail stores. These factors, among others, previously led us to close a significant number of company-owned domestic retail stores during 2012 and 2013. On November 6, 2013, we announced that Blockbuster would close all of its remaining company-owned domestic retail stores and discontinue the Blockbuster by-mail DVD service. As of December 31, 2013, Blockbuster had ceased all material operations. See Note 10 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion.

#### **Business Strategy**

Our business strategy is to be the best provider of video services in the United States by providing high-quality products, outstanding customer service, and great value. We promote DISH branded programming packages as providing our subscribers with a better price-to-value relationship than those available from other subscription television providers. We believe that there continues to be unsatisfied demand for high-quality, reasonably priced television programming services.

• *High-Quality Products.* We offer a wide selection of local and national programming, featuring more national and local high-definition (HD) channels than most pay-TV providers. We have been a technology leader in our industry, introducing award-winning DVRs, dual tuner receivers, 1080p video on demand, and external hard drives. To maintain and enhance our competitiveness over the long term, we introduced the Hopper® set-top box during the first quarter 2012, which a consumer can use, at his or her option, to view recorded programming in HD in multiple rooms. During the first quarter 2013, we introduced the Hopper set-top box with Sling, which promotes a suite of integrated features and functionality designed to maximize the convenience and ease of watching TV anytime and anywhere, which we refer to as DISH Anywhere, that includes, among other things, online access and Slingbox placeshifting technology. In addition, the Hopper with Sling has several innovative features that a consumer can use, at his or her option, to watch and record television programming through certain tablet computers and combines program-discovery tools, social media engagement and remote-control capabilities through the use of certain tablet computers and smart phones. We recently introduced the Super JoeyTM receiver. A consumer can use, at his or her option, the Super Joey combined with the Hopper to record up to eight shows at the same time.

• *Outstanding Customer Service.* We strive to provide outstanding customer service by improving the quality of the initial installation of subscriber equipment, improving the reliability of our equipment, better educating our customers about our products and services, and resolving customer problems promptly and effectively when they arise.

• *Great Value.* We have historically been viewed as the low-cost provider in the pay-TV industry in the U.S. because we seek to offer the lowest everyday prices available to consumers after introductory promotions expire.

*Programming.* We provide programming that includes more than: (i) 280 basic video channels, including, but not limited to, 25 regional sports channels and 70 channels of pay-per-view content, (ii) 70 Sirius Satellite Radio music channels, (iii) 30 premium movie channels, (iv) 10 specialty sports channels, (v) 3,100 standard definition and HD local channels, and (vi) 300 Latino and international channels. Although we distribute over 3,100 local channels, a subscriber typically may only receive the local channels available in the subscriber s home market. As of December 31, 2013, we provided local channels in standard definition in all 210 TV markets in the U.S. and local channels in HD in more than 190 markets in the U.S.

*Receiver Systems.* Our subscribers receive programming via equipment that includes a small satellite dish, digital set-top receivers, and remote controls. Some of our advanced receiver models feature DVRs, HD capability, multiple tuners (for independent viewing on separate televisions) and Internet-protocol compatibility (to view movies and other content on televisions via the Internet and a broadband connection). We rely on EchoStar to design and manufacture all of our new receivers and certain related components. See *Item 1A Risk Factors*.

*Blockbuster*@*Home.* Blockbuster@HomeTM gives DISH subscribers streaming access to more than 10,000 movies and TV shows via their TV and online access to more than 25,000 movies and TV shows via their computer.

*dishNET.* On September 27, 2012, we began marketing our satellite broadband service under the dishNET brand. This service leverages advanced technology and high-powered satellites launched by Hughes Communications, Inc (Hughes) and ViaSat, Inc. (ViaSat) to provide broadband coverage nationwide. This service primarily targets approximately 15 million rural residents that are underserved, or unserved, by wireline broadband, and provides download speeds of up to 10 megabits of data per second (Mbps). We lease the customer premise equipment to

1
• ,
4

#### Table of Contents

subscribers and generally pay Hughes and ViaSat a wholesale rate per subscriber on a monthly basis. Currently, we generally utilize our existing DISH distribution channels under similar incentive arrangements as our pay-TV business to acquire new broadband subscribers.

In addition to the dishNET branded satellite broadband service, we also offer wireline voice and broadband services under the dishNET brand as a competitive local exchange carrier to consumers living in a 14-state region (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming). Our dishNET branded wireline broadband service provides download speeds of up to 20 Mbps.

We primarily bundle our dishNET branded services with our DISH branded pay-TV service, to offer customers a single bill, payment and customer service option, which includes a discount for bundled services. In addition, we market and sell our dishNET branded services on a stand-alone basis.

**DISH Anywhere.** A consumer can use DISH Anywhere, at his or her option, to remotely control certain features of their DVRs as well as view live TV and DVR recordings (with required compatible hardware) using the DISH Anywhere application on compatible devices such as smartphones and tablets, or on laptops and home computers by accessing dishanywhere.com. Dishanywhere.com offers more than 85,000 movies, television shows, clips and trailers.

#### **Content Delivery**

*Digital Broadcast Operations Centers.* The principal digital broadcast operations facilities we use are EchoStar s facilities located in Cheyenne, Wyoming and Gilbert, Arizona. We also use six regional digital broadcast operations facilities owned and operated by EchoStar that allow us to maximize the use of the spot beam capabilities of certain satellites. Programming content is delivered to these facilities by fiber or satellite and processed, compressed, encrypted and then uplinked to satellites for delivery to consumers. EchoStar provides certain broadcast services to us, including teleport services such as transmission and downlinking, channel origination services, and channel management services pursuant to a broadcast agreement ending on December 31, 2016. See Note 20 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion of our Related Party Transactions with EchoStar.

*Satellites.* Our DISH branded programming is primarily delivered to customers using satellites that operate in the Ku band portion of the microwave radio spectrum. The Ku-band is divided into two spectrum segments. The portion of the Ku-band that allows the use of higher power satellites 12.2 to 12.7 GHz over the United States is known as the Broadcast Satellite Service band, which is also referred to as the DBS band. The portion of the Ku-band that utilizes lower power satellites 11.7 to 12.2 GHz over the United States is known as the FSS band.

Most of our programming is currently delivered using DBS satellites. To accommodate more bandwidth-intensive HD programming and other needs, we continue to explore opportunities to expand our satellite capacity through the acquisition of new spectrum, the launching of more technologically advanced satellites, and the more efficient use of existing spectrum via, among other things, better modulation and compression technologies.

We own or lease capacity on 14 DBS satellites in geostationary orbit approximately 22,300 miles above the equator. For further information concerning these satellites and satellite anomalies, please see the table and discussion under *Satellites* below.

*Conditional Access System.* Our conditional access system secures our programming content using encryption so that only authorized customers can access our programming. We use microchips embedded in credit card-sized access cards, called smart cards, or security chips in our receiver systems to control access to authorized programming content ( Security Access Devices ).

Our signal encryption has been compromised in the past and may be compromised in the future even though we continue to respond with significant investment in security measures, such as Security Access Device replacement programs and updates in security software, that are intended to make signal theft more difficult. It has been our prior experience that security measures may only be effective for short periods of time or not at all and that we

### Table of Contents

remain susceptible to additional signal theft. During 2009, we completed the replacement of our Security Access Devices and re-secured our system. We expect additional future replacements of these devices will be necessary to keep our system secure. We cannot ensure that we will be successful in reducing or controlling theft of our programming content and we may incur additional costs in the future if our system s security is compromised.

#### **Distribution Channels**

While we offer receiver systems and programming through direct sales channels, a majority of our gross new subscriber activations are generated through independent third parties such as small satellite retailers, direct marketing groups, local and regional consumer electronics stores, nationwide retailers, and telecommunications companies. In general, we pay these independent third parties a mix of upfront and monthly incentives to solicit orders for our services and provide customer service. In addition, we partner with certain telecommunications companies to bundle DISH branded programming with broadband and/or voice services on a single bill.

#### Competition

As of December 31, 2013, our 14.057 million subscribers represent approximately 14% of pay-TV subscribers in the United States. We face substantial competition from established pay-TV providers and increasing competition from companies providing/facilitating the delivery of video content via the Internet to computers, televisions, and mobile devices. As of September 30, 2013, roughly 100 million U.S. households subscribe to a pay-TV service.

• *Other Direct Broadcast Satellite Operators.* We compete directly with the DirecTV, the largest satellite TV provider in the U.S. which had 20.2 million subscribers as of September 30, 2013, representing approximately 20% of pay-TV subscribers.

• *Cable Television Companies*. We encounter substantial competition in the pay-TV industry from numerous cable television companies that operate via franchise licenses across the U.S. According to industry benchmarks, 99% of U.S. housing units are passed by cable. As of September 30, 2013, cable television companies have more than 54.8 million subscribers, representing approximately 55% of pay-TV subscribers. Cable companies are typically able to bundle their video services with broadband Internet access and voice services and many have significant investments in companies that provide programming content.

• *Telecommunications Companies*. Large telecommunications companies have upgraded older copper wire lines with fiber optic lines in certain markets. These fiber optic lines provide high capacity bandwidth, enabling telecommunications companies to offer video content that can be bundled with their broadband Internet access and voice services. In particular, AT&T Inc. ( AT&T ) and Verizon Communications Inc. ( Verizon ) have built fiber-optic based networks to provide video services in substantial portions of their service areas. As of September 30, 2013, AT&T and Verizon had approximately 5.3 million U-verse and 5.1 million FiOS TV subscribers, respectively. These telecommunications companies represent approximately 10% of pay-TV subscribers.

• Internet Delivered Video. We face competition from content providers and other companies who distribute video directly to consumers over the Internet. Programming offered over the Internet has become more prevalent as the speed and quality of broadband networks have improved. Significant changes in consumer behavior with regard to the means by which they obtain video entertainment and information in response to this emerging digital media competition could materially adversely affect our business, results of operations and financial condition or otherwise disrupt our business.

• *Wireless Mobile Video*. We may also face increasing competition from wireless telecommunications providers who offer mobile video offerings. These mobile video offerings will likely become more prevalent in the marketplace as wireless telecommunications providers implement and expand the fourth generation of wireless communications.

#### Acquisition of New Subscribers

We incur significant upfront costs to acquire subscribers, including advertising, retailer incentives, equipment subsidies and installation. In addition, certain customer promotions to acquire new subscribers result in less programming revenue to us over the promotional period. While we attempt to recoup these upfront costs over the lives of their subscriptions, there can be no assurance that we will be successful in achieving that objective. We employ business rules such as credit requirements and contractual commitments, and we strive to provide outstanding customer service, to increase the likelihood of customers keeping their DISH service over longer periods of time. Our subscriber acquisition costs may vary significantly from period to period.

*Advertising.* We use print, radio, television and Internet media, on a local and national basis to motivate potential subscribers to call DISH, visit our website or contact independent third party retailers.

*Retailer Incentives.* In general, we pay retailers an upfront incentive for each new subscriber they bring to DISH that results in the activation of qualified programming and generally pay retailers small monthly incentives for up to 60 months; provided, among other things: (i) the retailer continuously markets, promotes and solicits orders for DISH products and services; (ii) the retailer continuously provides customer service to DISH Pay-TV subscribers; and (iii) the customer continuously subscribes to qualified programming.

*Equipment.* We incur significant upfront costs to provide our new subscribers with in-home equipment, including advanced HD and DVR receivers, which most of our new subscribers lease from us. While we seek to recoup these upfront equipment costs mostly through monthly fees, there can be no assurance that we will be successful in achieving that objective. In addition, upon deactivation of a subscriber we may refurbish and redeploy their equipment which lowers future upfront costs. However, our ability to capitalize on these cost savings may be limited as technological advances and consumer demand for new features may render the returned equipment obsolete.

Installation. We incur significant upfront costs to install satellite dishes and receivers in the homes of our new customers.

*New Customer Promotions.* We often offer programming at no additional charge and/or promotional pricing during introductory periods for new subscribers. While such promotional activities have an economic cost and reduce our subscriber-related revenue, they are not included in our definitions of subscriber acquisition costs or the Pay-TV SAC metric.

#### **Customer Retention**

We incur significant costs to retain our existing customers, mostly by upgrading their equipment to HD and DVR receivers. As with our subscriber acquisition costs, our retention upgrade spending includes the cost of equipment and installation. In certain circumstances, we also offer programming at no additional charge and/or promotional pricing for limited periods for existing customers in exchange for a contractual commitment. A component of our retention efforts includes the installation of equipment for customers who move. Our subscriber retention costs may vary significantly from period to period.

#### **Customer Service**

*Customer Service Centers*. We use both internally-operated and outsourced customer service centers to handle calls from prospective and existing customers. We strive to answer customer calls promptly and to resolve issues effectively on the first call. We intend to better use the Internet and other applications to provide our customers with more self-service capabilities over time. During the first quarter 2012, we implemented new sales and customer care systems to improve the customer experience. In addition, during 2011, we implemented a new interactive voice response system.

*Installation and Other In-Home Service Operations*. High-quality installations, upgrades, and in-home repairs are critical to providing good customer service. Such in-home service is performed by both DISH Network employees and a network of independent contractors and includes, among other things, priority technical support, replacement equipment, cabling and power surge repairs for a monthly fee. During 2011, we implemented a new in-home appointment scheduling system.

*Subscriber Management*. We presently use, and depend on, CSG Systems International, Inc. s (CSG) software system for the majority of DISH Network subscriber billing and related functions. During the first quarter 2012, we implemented a new billing system with CSG.

#### Wireless Spectrum

On March 2, 2012, the FCC approved the transfer of 40 MHz of AWS-4 wireless spectrum licenses held by DBSD North America and TerreStar to us. On March 9, 2012, we completed the DBSD Transaction and the TerreStar Transaction, pursuant to which we acquired, among other things, certain satellite assets and wireless spectrum licenses held by DBSD North America and TerreStar. The total consideration to acquire the DBSD North America and TerreStar assets was approximately \$2.860 billion.

Our consolidated FCC applications for approval of the license transfers from DBSD North America and TerreStar were accompanied by requests for waiver of the FCC s Mobile Satellite Service (MSS) integrated service and spare satellite requirements and various technical provisions. On March 21, 2012, the FCC released a Notice of Proposed Rule Making proposing the elimination of the integrated service, spare satellite and various technical requirements associated with the AWS-4 licenses. On December 11, 2012, the FCC approved rules that eliminated these requirements and gave notice of its proposed modification of our AWS-4 authorizations to, among other things, allow us to offer single-mode terrestrial terminals to customers who do not desire satellite functionality. On February 15, 2013, the FCC issued an order, which became effective on March 7, 2013, modifying our AWS-4 licenses to expand our terrestrial operating authority. That order imposed certain limitations on the use of a portion of this spectrum, including interference protections for other spectrum users and power and emission limits that we presently believe could render 5 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2000-2005 MHz) effectively unusable for terrestrial services and limit our ability to fully utilize the remaining 15 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2005-2020 MHz) for terrestrial services. These limitations could, among other things, impact the ongoing development of technical standards associated with our wireless business, and may have a material adverse effect on our ability to commercialize these licenses. That order also mandated certain interim and final build-out requirements for the licenses. By March 2017, we must provide terrestrial signal coverage and offer terrestrial service to at least 40% of the aggregate population represented by all of the areas covered by the licenses (the AWS-4 Interim Build-Out Requirement ). By March 2020, we were required to provide terrestrial signal coverage and offer terrestrial service to at least 70% of the population in each area covered by an individual license (the AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement ). On December 20, 2013, the FCC issued a further order that, among other things, extended the AWS-4

Final Build-Out Requirement by one year to March 2021 (the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement ). If we fail to meet the AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement, the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement may be accelerated by one year, from March 2021 to March 2020. If we fail to meet the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement, our terrestrial authorization for each license area in which

we fail to meet the requirement may terminate.

The FCC s December 20, 2013 order also conditionally waived certain FCC rules for our AWS-4 spectrum licenses to allow us to repurpose 20 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2000-2020 MHz) for downlink (the AWS-4 Downlink

Waiver ). The AWS-4 Downlink Waiver and the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement are conditioned upon us bidding at least a net clearing price equal to the aggregate reserve price of \$1.56 billion in the auction of wireless spectrum known as the H Block. The auction commenced January 22, 2014. Under the FCC s anti-collusion and anonymous bidding rules for this auction, we are not permitted to disclose publicly our interest level or activity level in the auction, if any, at this time. If we fail to meet this bidding condition, or if we fail to notify the FCC whether we intend to use our uplink spectrum for downlink by June 20, 2016, the AWS-4 Downlink Waiver will terminate, and the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement will revert back to the AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement. The FCC has adopted rules for the H Block spectrum band that is adjacent to our AWS-4 spectrum licenses. Depending on the outcome of the standard-setting process for the H Block and our ultimate decision regarding the AWS-4 Downlink Waiver, the rules that the FCC adopted for the H Block could further impact the remaining 15 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2005-2020 MHz), which may have a material adverse effect on our ability to commercialize the AWS-4 licenses.

In 2008, we paid \$712 million to acquire certain 700 MHz wireless spectrum licenses, which were granted to us by the FCC in February 2009. At the time they were granted, these licenses were subject to certain interim and final build-out requirements. By June 2013, we were required to provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 35% of the geographic area in each area covered by each individual license (the 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement). By June 2019, we were required to provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 35% of the geographic area in each area covered by each individual license (the 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement). As discussed below, these requirements have since been modified by the FCC.

On September 9, 2013, we filed a letter with the FCC in support of a voluntary industry solution to resolve certain interoperability issues affecting the lower 700 MHz spectrum band (the Interoperability Solution ). On October 29, 2013, the FCC issued an order approving the Interoperability Solution Order ), which requires us to reduce power emissions on our 700 MHz licenses. As part of the Interoperability Solution Order, the FCC, among other things, approved our request to modify the 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement so that by March 2017 (rather than the previous deadline of June 2013), we must provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 40% of our total E Block population (the Modified 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement ). The FCC also approved our request to modify the 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement so that by March 2021 (rather than the previous deadline of June 2013), we must provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 70% of the population in each of our E Block license areas (the Modified 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement ). These requirements replaced the previous build-out requirements associated with our 700 MHz licenses. While the modifications to our 700 MHz licenses would provide us additional time to complete the build-out requirements, the reduction in power emissions could have an adverse impact on our ability to fully utilize our 700 MHz licenses. If we fail to meet the Modified 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement, the Modified 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement may be accelerated by one year, from March 2021 to March 2020, and we could face the reduction of license area(s). If we fail to meet the Modified 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement, our authorization may terminate for the geographic portion of each license in which we are not providing service.

We will need to make significant additional investments or partner with others to, among other things, finance the commercialization and build-out requirements of these licenses and our integration efforts, including compliance with regulations applicable to the acquired licenses. Depending on the nature and scope of such commercialization, build-out, and integration efforts, any such investment or partnership could vary significantly. There can be no assurance that we will be able to develop and implement a business model that will realize a return on these spectrum licenses or that we will be able to profitably deploy the assets represented by these spectrum licenses, which may affect the carrying value of these assets and our future financial condition or results of operations.

### **New Business Opportunities**

From time to time we evaluate opportunities for strategic investments or acquisitions that may complement our current services and products, enhance our technical capabilities, improve or sustain our competitive position, or otherwise offer growth opportunities.

#### **Relationship with EchoStar**

On January 1, 2008, we completed the distribution of our technology and set-top box business and certain infrastructure assets (the Spin-off) into a separate publicly-traded company, EchoStar. DISH Network and EchoStar operate as separate publicly-traded companies and, except for the Satellite and Tracking Stock Transaction discussed below, neither entity has any ownership interest in the other. However, a substantial majority of the voting power of the shares of both DISH Network and EchoStar is owned beneficially by Charles W. Ergen, our Chairman, and by certain trusts established by Mr. Ergen for the benefit of his family. EchoStar is our sole supplier of digital set-top boxes and digital broadcast operations. In addition, EchoStar provides a majority of our transponder capacity and is a key supplier of related services to us. See *Item 1A. Risk Factors* and Note 20 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for more information.

### SATELLITES

**DBS Satellites**. Most of our programming is currently delivered using DBS satellites. We continue to explore opportunities to expand our available satellite capacity through the use of other available spectrum. Increasing our available spectrum is particularly important as more bandwidth intensive HD programming is produced and to address new video and data applications consumers may desire in the future. We currently utilize satellites in geostationary orbit approximately 22,300 miles above the equator detailed in the table below.

Satellites	Launch Date	Degree Orbital Location	Estimated Useful Life (Years)
Owned:			
EchoStar I (1)(5)	December 1995	77	12
EchoStar VII (2)(5)	February 2002	119	15
EchoStar X (2)(5)	February 2006	110	15
EchoStar XI (2)(5)	July 2008	110	15
EchoStar XIV (5)	March 2010	119	15
EchoStar XV	July 2010	45	15
Leased from EchoStar:			
EchoStar VIII (1)(3)(4)	August 2002	77	NA
EchoStar IX (1)(3)	August 2003	121	NA
EchoStar XII (1)(4)	July 2003	61.5	NA
Nimiq 5 (1)(3)	September 2009	72.7	NA
EchoStar XVI (1)	November 2012	61.5	NA
QuetzSat-1 (1)(3)	September 2011	77	NA

Leased from Other Third Party:			
Anik F3	April 2007	118.7	NA
Ciel II	December 2008	129	NA
Under Construction:			
EchoStar XVIII	2015	110	15

(1) See Note 20 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion of our Related Party Transactions with EchoStar.

(2) During the fourth quarter 2012, the estimated useful life of these satellites was extended from 12 years to

15 years on a prospective basis based on management s assessment of, among other things, these satellites useful lives, technological obsolescence risk, estimated remaining fuel life and estimated useful lives of our other DBS satellites. This increase in the estimated useful life of these satellites had an immaterial effect on our results of operations.

(3) We lease a portion of the capacity on these satellites.

(4) We generally have the option to renew each lease on a year-to-year basis through the end of the respective satellite s useful life.

(5) On February 20, 2014, we entered into agreements with EchoStar pursuant to which, among other things, we will transfer these satellites to EchoStar and lease back certain satellite capacity on these satellites. See below for further discussion.

#### **Recent Developments**

Recent developments with respect to certain of our satellites are discussed below.

#### **Related Party Transactions with EchoStar**

On February 20, 2014, we entered into agreements with EchoStar to implement a transaction pursuant to which, among other things: (i) on March 1, 2014, we will transfer to EchoStar and Hughes Satellite Systems Corporation (HSSC), a wholly-owned subsidiary of EchoStar, five satellites (EchoStar I, EchoStar VII, EchoStar X, EchoStar XI and EchoStar XIV, including related in-orbit incentive obligations and interest payments of approximately \$59 million) and approximately \$11 million in cash in exchange for shares of a series of preferred tracking stock issued by EchoStar and shares of a series of preferred tracking stock issued by HSSC; and (ii) beginning on March 1, 2014, we will lease back certain satellite capacity on these five satellites (collectively, the Satellite and Tracking Stock Transaction). See Note 21 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion.

*AWS-4 Satellites.* As a result of the DBSD Transaction and the TerreStar Transaction, three AWS-4 satellites were added to our satellite fleet, including two in-orbit satellites (D1 and T1) and one satellite under construction (T2). See the table below for further information.

Satellites	Launch Date	Degree Orbital Location	Estimated Useful Life (Years)
Owned:			
T1	July 2009	111.1	15
D1	April 2008	92.85	15
	-		
Under Construction:			

T2(1)

<sup>(1)</sup> Launch date and operational requirements have not yet been determined.

Based on the FCC s rules applicable to our AWS-4 authorizations no longer requiring an integrated satellite component or ground spare and on our evaluation of the satellite capacity needed for our wireless segment, among other things, during the second quarter 2013, we concluded that T2 and D1 represented excess satellite capacity for the potential commercialization of our wireless spectrum. As a result, during the second quarter 2013, we wrote down the net book value of T2 from \$270 million to \$40 million and the net book value of D1 from \$358 million to \$150 million, and recorded an impairment charge in our wireless segment of \$438 million in Impairment of long-lived assets on our Consolidated Statements of Operations and Comprehensive Income (Loss) for the year ended December 31, 2013. Our fair value estimates for these satellites were determined based upon, among other things, probability-weighted analyses utilizing the income and/or cost approaches. The estimates used in our fair value analysis are considered Level 3 in the fair value hierarchy. While we are no longer required to operate an integrated satellite component, we are currently planning on using T1 in the commercialization of our wireless spectrum or for other commercial purposes. In addition, T1 is subject to certain Canadian satellite regulations, including, among

other things, an integrated satellite component. If T1 is not used in the commercialization of our wireless spectrum, we may need to impair it in the future. As of December 31, 2013, the net book value for T1 was \$353 million.

During the fourth quarter 2013, we and EchoStar amended and restated the development agreement with respect to the T2 satellite (the Amended and Restated T2 Development Agreement ) to provide EchoStar with the option to purchase our rights in the T2 satellite for \$55 million, exercisable at any time between January 1, 2014 and (i) the expiration or earlier termination of the Amended and Restated T2 Development Agreement or (ii) December 19, 2014, whichever occurs sooner. See Note 20 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion of our Related Party Transactions with EchoStar.

#### Satellites Under Construction

*EchoStar XVIII.* On September 7, 2012, we entered into a contract with Space Systems/Loral, Inc. (SS/L) for the construction of EchoStar XVIII, a DBS satellite with spot beam technology designed for, among other things, HD programming. During October 2013, we entered into an agreement with ArianeSpace S.A. (Ariane) for launch services for this satellite, which is expected to be launched during 2015.

#### Satellite Anomalies

Operation of our DISH branded pay-TV service requires that we have adequate satellite transmission capacity for the programming we offer. Moreover, current competitive conditions require that we continue to expand our offering of new programming. While we generally have had in-orbit satellite capacity sufficient to transmit our existing channels and some backup capacity to recover the transmission of certain critical programming, our backup capacity is limited.

In the event of a failure or loss of any of our satellites, we may need to acquire or lease additional satellite capacity or relocate one of our other satellites and use it as a replacement for the failed or lost satellite. Such a failure could result in a prolonged loss of critical programming or a significant delay in our plans to expand programming as necessary to remain competitive and thus may have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Prior to 2013, certain of our satellites have experienced anomalies, some of which have had a significant adverse impact on their remaining useful life and/or commercial operation. There can be no assurance that future anomalies will not impact the remaining useful life and/or commercial operation of any of the satellites in our fleet. See Long-Lived Assets in Note 2 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for further discussion of evaluation of impairment. There can be no assurance that we can recover critical transmission capacity in the event one or more of our in-orbit satellites were to fail. We generally do not carry commercial insurance for any of the in-orbit satellites that we use, other than certain satellites leased from third parties, and therefore, we will bear the risk associated with any uninsured in-orbit satellite failures. Recent developments with respect to certain of our satellites are discussed below.

*EchoStar XII*. Prior to 2010, EchoStar XII experienced anomalies resulting in the loss of electrical power available from its solar arrays, which reduced the number of transponders that could be operated. In September 2012, November 2012, and January 2013, EchoStar XII experienced additional solar array anomalies, which further reduced the electrical power available. During the third quarter 2013, EchoStar XII experienced us that EchoStar XII will likely experience further loss of available electrical power that will impact its operational capability, and EchoStar reduced the remaining estimated useful life of the satellite to 18 months. Pursuant to our satellite lease agreement with EchoStar, we are entitled to a reduction in our monthly recurring lease payments in the event of a partial loss of satellite capacity or complete failure of the satellite. Since the number of useable transponders on EchoStar XII depends on, among other things, whether EchoStar XII is operated in CONUS which provides service to the continental United States, spot beam, or hybrid CONUS/spot beam mode, we are unable to determine at this time the actual number of transponders that will be available at any given time or how many transponders can be used during the remaining estimated life of the satellite. This satellite is currently not in service and serves as an in-orbit spare.

#### **GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS**

Our operations, particularly our DBS operations and our wireless spectrum licenses, are subject to significant government regulation and oversight, primarily by the FCC and, to a certain extent, by Congress, other federal agencies and foreign, state and local authorities. Depending upon the circumstances, noncompliance with legislation or regulations promulgated by these authorities could result in limitations on, or the suspension or revocation of, our licenses or registrations, the termination or loss of contracts or the imposition of contractual damages, civil fines or criminal penalties, any of which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. These governmental authorities could also adopt regulations or take other actions that would adversely affect our business prospects.

Furthermore, the adoption or modification of laws or regulations relating to video programming, satellite services, wireless telecommunications, broadband, the Internet or other areas of our business could limit or otherwise adversely affect the manner in which we currently conduct our business. If we become subject to new regulations or legislation or new interpretations of existing regulations or legislation that govern Internet network neutrality, for example, we may be required to incur additional expenses or alter our business model. The manner in which legislation governing Internet network neutrality may be interpreted and enforced cannot be precisely determined, which in turn could have an adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Wireless services and our wireless spectrum licenses are subject to regulation by the FCC and other federal, state and local, as well as international, governmental authorities. The licensing, construction, operation, sale and interconnection arrangements of wireless telecommunications systems are regulated by the FCC and, depending on the jurisdiction, other federal and international, state and local regulatory agencies. In particular, the FCC imposes significant regulation on licensees of wireless spectrum with respect to how radio spectrum is used by licensees, the nature of the services that licensees may offer and how the services may be offered, and resolution of issues of interference between spectrum bands. The FCC grants wireless licenses for terms of generally ten years that are subject to renewal or revocation. There can be no assurances that our wireless spectrum license area. For further information related to our licenses and build-out requirements related to our wireless spectrum licenses see *Item 1A. Risk Factors*.

The following summary of regulatory developments and legislation in the United States is not intended to describe all present and proposed government regulation and legislation affecting the video programming distribution, satellite services, wireless telecommunications and broadband industries. Government regulations that are currently the subject of judicial or administrative proceedings, legislative hearings or administrative proposals could change these industries to varying degrees. We cannot predict either the outcome of these proceedings or any potential impact they might have on these industries or on our operations.

#### FCC Regulations Governing our DBS Operations

*FCC Jurisdiction over our DBS Satellite Operations*. The Communications Act gives the FCC broad authority to regulate the operations of satellite companies. Specifically, the Communications Act gives the FCC regulatory jurisdiction over the following areas relating to communications satellite operations:

• the assignment of satellite radio frequencies and orbital locations, the licensing of satellites and earth stations, the granting of related authorizations, and evaluation of the fitness of a company to be a licensee;

• approval for the relocation of satellites to different orbital locations or the replacement of an existing satellite with a new satellite;

• ensuring compliance with the terms and conditions of such assignments, licenses, authorizations and approvals; including required timetables for construction and operation of satellites;

- avoiding interference with other radio frequency emitters; and
- ensuring compliance with other applicable provisions of the Communications Act and FCC rules and regulations.

### Table of Contents

To obtain FCC satellite licenses and authorizations, satellite operators must satisfy strict legal, technical and financial qualification requirements. Once issued, these licenses and authorizations are subject to a number of conditions including, among other things, satisfaction of ongoing due diligence obligations, construction milestones, and various reporting requirements. Necessary federal approval of these applications may not be granted in a timely manner, or may be granted subject to conditions which may be cumbersome.

*Overview of our DBS Satellites, Authorizations and Contractual Rights for Satellite Capacity*. Our satellites are located in orbital positions, or slots, that are designated by their western longitude. An orbital position describes both a physical location and an assignment of spectrum in the applicable frequency band. Each DBS orbital position has 500 MHz of available Ku-band spectrum that is divided into 32 frequency channels. Through digital compression technology, we can currently transmit between nine and 13 standard definition digital video channels per DBS frequency channel. Several of our satellites also include spot-beam technology that enables us to increase the number of markets where we provide local channels, but reduces the number of video channels that could otherwise be offered across the entire United States.

The FCC has licensed us to operate a total of 50 DBS frequency channels at the following orbital locations:

• 21 DBS frequency channels at the 119 degree orbital location, capable of providing service to the continental United States (CONUS); and

29 DBS frequency channels at the 110 degree orbital location, capable of providing service to CONUS.

In addition, we currently lease or have entered into agreements to lease capacity on satellites using the following spectrum at the following orbital locations:

• 500 MHz of Ku-band FSS spectrum that is divided into 32 frequency channels at the 118.7 degree orbital location, which is a Canadian FSS slot that is capable of providing service to CONUS, Alaska and Hawaii;

• 32 DBS frequency channels at the 129 degree orbital location, which is a Canadian DBS slot that is capable of providing service to most of the United States;

• 32 DBS frequency channels at the 61.5 degree orbital location, capable of providing service to most of the United States;

• 24 DBS frequency channels at the 77 degree orbital location, which is a Mexican DBS slot that is capable of providing service to most of the United States and Mexico; and

• 32 DBS frequency channels at the 72.7 degree orbital location, which is a Canadian DBS slot that is capable of providing service to CONUS.

We also have month-to-month FSS capacity available from EchoStar on a satellite located at the 121 degree orbital location and a lease for FSS capacity available from EchoStar on a satellite located at the 103 degree orbital location.

*Duration of our DBS Satellite Licenses*. Generally speaking, all of our satellite licenses are subject to expiration unless renewed by the FCC. The term of each of our DBS licenses is ten years. Our licenses are currently set to expire at various times. In addition, at various times we have relied on special temporary authorizations for our operations. A special temporary authorization is granted for a period of only 180 days or less, subject again to possible renewal by the FCC. Generally, our FCC licenses and special temporary authorizations have been renewed by the FCC on a routine basis, but there can be no assurance that the FCC will continue to do so.

*Opposition and Other Risks to our Licenses*. Several third parties have opposed in the past, and we expect these or other parties to oppose in the future, some of our FCC satellite authorizations and pending and future requests to the FCC for extensions, modifications, waivers and approvals of our licenses. In addition, we must comply with numerous FCC reporting, filing and other requirements in connection with our satellite authorizations. Consequently, it is possible the FCC could revoke, terminate, condition or decline to extend or renew certain of our authorizations or licenses.

#### Table of Contents

**4.5 Degree Spacing Tweener Satellites**. The FCC has proposed to allow so-called tweener DBS operations DBS satellites operating at orbital locations 4.5 degrees (half of the usual nine degrees) away from other DBS satellites. The FCC granted authorizations to Spectrum Five and EchoStar for tweener satellites at the 86.5 and 114.5 degree orbital locations. Even though these authorizations were subsequently cancelled because the FCC determined that the licensees did not meet certain milestone requirements, Spectrum Five and EchoStar have requested reconsideration of the FCC s determinations for both of these licensees. Tweener operations close to our licensed orbital locations (including Spectrum Five s proposed use at the 114.5 degree orbital location) could cause harmful interference to our service and constrain our future operations. The FCC has not completed its rulemaking on the operating and service rules for tweener satellites.

*Interference from Other Services Sharing Satellite Spectrum*. The FCC has adopted rules that allow non-geostationary orbit fixed satellite services to operate on a co-primary basis in the same frequency band as DBS and FSS. The FCC has also authorized the use of multichannel video distribution and data service (MVDDS) licenses in the DBS band. MVDDS licenses were auctioned in 2004. MVDDS systems are now only beginning to be commercially deployed in a few markets. We have MVDDS licenses in 82 out of 214 geographical license areas. Despite regulatory provisions intended to protect DBS and FSS operations from harmful interference, there can be no assurance that operations by other satellites or terrestrial communication services in the DBS and FSS bands will not interfere with our DBS and FSS operations and adversely affect our business.

Satellite Competition from Additional Slots and Interference. DirecTV has obtained FCC authority to provide service to the United States from a Canadian DBS orbital slot, and EchoStar has obtained authority to provide service to the United States from both a Mexican and a Canadian DBS orbital slot. Further, we have also received authority to do the same from a Canadian DBS orbital slot at 129 degrees and a Canadian FSS orbital slot at 118.7 degrees. The possibility that the FCC will allow service to the U.S. from additional foreign slots may permit additional competition against us from other satellite providers. It may also provide a means by which to increase our available satellite capacity in the United States. In addition, a number of administrations, such as Great Britain and the Netherlands, have requested authority to add orbital locations serving the U.S. close to our licensed slots. Such operations could cause harmful interference to our satellites and constrain our future operations.

*Rules Relating to Broadcast Services*. The FCC imposes different rules for subscription and broadcast services. We believe that because we offer a subscription programming service, we are not subject to many of the regulatory obligations imposed upon broadcast licensees. However, we cannot be certain whether the FCC will find in the future that we must comply with regulatory obligations as a broadcast licensee, and certain parties have requested that we be treated as a broadcaster. If the FCC determines that we are a broadcast licensee, it could require us to comply with all regulatory obligations imposed upon broadcast licensees, which in certain respects are subject to more burdensome regulation than subscription television service providers.

*Public Interest Requirements*. The FCC imposes certain public interest obligations on our DBS licenses. These obligations require us to set aside four percent of our channel capacity exclusively for noncommercial programming for which we must charge programmers below-cost rates and for which we may not impose additional charges on subscribers. The Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (STELA) requires the FCC to decrease this set-aside to 3.5 percent for satellite carriers who provide retransmission of state public affairs networks in 15 states and are otherwise qualified. The FCC, however, has not yet determined whether we qualify for this decrease in set-aside. The obligation to provide noncommercial programming may displace programming for which we could earn commercial rates and could adversely affect our financial results. We cannot be sure that, if the FCC were to review our methodology for processing public interest carriage requests, computing the channel capacity we must set aside or determining the rates that we charge public interest programmers, it would find them in compliance with the public interest requirements.

*Separate Security, Plug and Play.* Cable companies are required by law to separate the security from the other functionality of their set-top boxes. Set-top boxes used by DBS providers are not currently subject to such separate security requirement. However, the FCC is considering a

possible expansion of that requirement to DBS set-top boxes. Also, the FCC adopted the so-called plug and play standard for compatibility between digital television sets and cable systems. That standard was developed through negotiations involving the cable and consumer electronics industries, but not the satellite television industry. The FCC s adoption of the standard was accompanied by certain rules regarding copy protection measures that were applicable to us. We appealed the FCC s decision

### Table of Contents

regarding the copy protection measures to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit (D.C. Circuit) and on January 15, 2013 the D.C. Circuit vacated the FCC s decision. The FCC is also considering various proposals to establish two-way digital cable plug and play rules. That proceeding also asks about means to incorporate all pay-TV providers into its plug and play rules. The cable industry and consumer electronics companies have reached a tru2way commercial arrangement to resolve many of the outstanding issues in this docket. We cannot predict whether the FCC will impose rules on our DBS operations that are based on cable system architectures or the private cable/consumer electronics tru2way commercial arrangement. Complying with the separate security and other plug and play requirements would require potentially costly modifications to our set-top boxes and operations. We cannot predict the timing or outcome of this FCC proceeding.

Retransmission Consent. The Copyright Act generally gives satellite companies a statutory copyright license to retransmit local broadcast channels by satellite back into the market from which they originated, subject to obtaining the retransmission consent of local network stations that do not elect must carry status, as required by the Communications Act. If we fail to reach retransmission consent agreements with such broadcasters, we cannot carry their signals. This could have an adverse effect on our strategy to compete with cable and other satellite companies that provide local signals. While we have been able to reach retransmission consent agreements with most of these local network stations, from time to time there are stations with which we have not been able to reach an agreement. We cannot be sure that we will secure these agreements or that we will secure new agreements on acceptable terms, or at all, upon the expiration of our current retransmission consent agreements, some of which are short-term. In recent years, national broadcasters have used their ownership of certain local broadcast stations to attempt to require us to carry additional cable programming in exchange for retransmission consent of their local broadcast stations. These requirements may place constraints on available capacity on our satellites for other programming. Furthermore, the rates we are charged for retransmitting local channels have been increasing. We may be unable to pass these increased programming costs on to our customers, which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations. In addition, the broadcast stations demands for higher rates have resulted in more frequent negotiating impasses and interruptions of service. During these interruptions, our subscribers in the affected markets lack access to popular programming and may switch to another multichannel distributor that may be able to provide them with such programming. The FCC is currently considering changes to its rules governing retransmission consent disputes that are designed to provide more guidance to the negotiating parties on good-faith negotiation requirements and to improve notice to consumers in advance of possible service disruptions. We cannot predict the timing or outcome of this FCC proceeding.

*Digital HD Carry-One, Carry-All Requirement*. To provide any full-power local broadcast signal in any market, we are required to retransmit all qualifying broadcast signals in that market ( carry-one, carry-all ). The FCC adopted digital carriage rules that required DBS providers to phase in carry-one, carry-all obligations with respect to the carriage of full-power broadcasters HD signals by February 17, 2013 in markets in which they elect to provide local channels in HD. We have met this requirement in all applicable markets. In addition, STELA has imposed accelerated HD carriage requirements for noncommercial educational stations on DBS providers that do not have a certain contractual relationship with a certain number of such stations. We have entered into such contractual relationships with the requisite number of PBS stations to comply with the requirements. The carriage of additional HD signals on our pay-TV service could cause us to experience significant capacity constraints and prevent us from carrying additional popular national programs and/or carrying those national programs in HD.

In addition, there is a pending rulemaking before the FCC regarding whether to require DBS providers to carry all broadcast stations in a local market in both standard definition and HD if they carry any station in that market in both standard definition and HD. If we were required to carry multiple versions of each broadcast station, we would have to dedicate more of our finite satellite capacity to each broadcast station. We cannot predict the timing or outcome of this rulemaking process.

*Distant Signals*. Pursuant to STELA, we were able to obtain a waiver of a court injunction that previously prevented us from retransmitting certain distant network signals under a statutory copyright license. Because of that waiver, we may provide distant network signals to eligible subscribers. To qualify for that waiver, we are required to provide local service in all 210 local markets in the U.S. on an ongoing basis. This condition poses a significant strain on our capacity. Moreover, we may lose that waiver if we are found to have failed to provide local service in any of the 210 local markets. If we lose the waiver, the injunction could be reinstated. Furthermore, depending on the severity of the failure, we may also be subject to other sanctions, which may include, among other things,

damages. Pursuant to STELA, our compliance with certain conditions of the waiver is subject to continued oversight.

*Cable Act and Program Access*. We purchase a large percentage of our programming from cable-affiliated programmers. Pursuant to the Cable Act of 1992 (Cable Act), cable providers had been prohibited from entering into exclusive contracts with cable-affiliated programmers. The Cable Act directed that this prohibition expire after a certain period of time unless the FCC determined that the prohibition continued to be necessary. On October 5, 2012, the FCC allowed this prohibition to expire. While the FCC has issued a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking aimed at serving some of the same objectives as the prohibition, there can be no assurances that such protections will be adopted or be as effective as the prohibition if they are adopted. In the event this decision is reconsidered by the FCC or reviewed by a court of appeals, we cannot predict the timing or outcome of any subsequent FCC decision.

As a result of the expiration of this prohibition on exclusivity, we may be limited in our ability to obtain access at all, or on nondiscriminatory terms, to programming from programmers that are affiliated with cable system operators. In addition, any other changes in the Cable Act, and/or the FCC s rules that implement the Cable Act, that currently limit the ability of cable-affiliated programmers to discriminate against competing businesses such as ours, could adversely affect our ability to acquire cable-affiliated programming at all or to acquire programming on non-discriminatory terms.

Furthermore, the FCC had imposed program access conditions on certain cable companies as a result of mergers, consolidations or affiliations with programmers. The expiration of the exclusivity prohibition in the Cable Act triggered the termination of certain program access conditions that the FCC had imposed on Liberty Media Corporation (Liberty). In July 2012, similar program access conditions that had applied to Time-Warner Inc. (Time-Warner) expired as previously scheduled. These developments may adversely affect our ability to obtain Liberty s and Time-Warner s programming, or to obtain it on non-discriminatory terms. In the case of certain types of programming affiliated with Comcast Corporation (Comcast) through its control of NBCUniversal Media, LLC (NBCUniversal), the prohibition on exclusivity will still apply until January 2018. During that time, we have the right to subject the terms of access to NBCUniversal s programming to binding arbitration if we and the programmer cannot reach agreement on terms, subject to FCC review. There can be no assurance that this procedure will result in favorable terms for us or that the FCC conditions that establish this procedure will be prevented from expiring on their own terms.

In addition, affiliates of certain cable providers have denied us access to sports programming they feed to their cable systems terrestrially, rather than by satellite. The FCC has held that new denials of such service are unfair if they have the purpose or effect of significantly hindering us from providing programming to consumers. However, we cannot be sure that we can prevail in a complaint related to such programming and gain access to it. Our continuing failure to access such programming could materially and adversely affect our ability to compete in regions serviced by these cable providers.

*MDU Exclusivity*. The FCC has found that cable companies should not be permitted to have exclusive relationships with multiple dwelling units (e.g., apartment buildings). In May 2009, the D.C. Circuit upheld the FCC s decision. While the FCC requested comments in November 2007 on whether DBS and Private Cable Operators should be prohibited from having similar relationships with multiple dwelling units, it has yet to make a formal decision. If the cable exclusivity ban were to be extended to DBS providers, our ability to serve these types of buildings and communities would be adversely affected. We cannot predict the timing or outcome of the FCC s consideration of this proposal.

*Net Neutrality.* During 2010, the FCC imposed rules of nondiscrimination and transparency upon wireline broadband providers. While this decision provides certain protection from discrimination by wireline broadband providers against our distribution of video content via the Internet, it may still permit wireline broadband providers to provide certain services over their wireline broadband network that are not subject to these requirements. Although the FCC imposed similar transparency requirements on wireless broadband providers, which includes AWS

licensees, it declined to impose a wireless nondiscrimination rule. Instead, wireless broadband Internet providers are prohibited from blocking websites and applications that compete with voice and video telephony services. The FCC s net neutrality rules were challenged in Federal court. On January 14, 2014, the D.C. Circuit

### Table of Contents

upheld the FCC s transparency rule, but vacated both the nondiscrimination and anti-blocking rules. It is uncertain if the D.C. Circuit s ruling will be challenged or if the FCC will initiate further proceedings to make rules in accordance with the D.C. Circuit s decision; therefore, we cannot predict the practical effect of these rules and related proceedings on our ability to distribute our video content via the Internet.

*Comcast-NBCUniversal.* In January 2011, the FCC and the Department of Justice approved a transaction between Comcast and General Electric Company (General Electric), pursuant to which they joined their programming properties, including NBC, Bravo and many others, in a venture, NBCUniversal, controlled by Comcast. During March 2013, Comcast completed the acquisition of substantially all of General Electric s remaining interest in NBCUniversal. The FCC conditioned its approval on, among other things, Comcast complying with the terms of the FCC s order on network neutrality (even if that order is vacated by judicial or legislative action) and Comcast licensing its affiliated content to us, other traditional pay-TV providers and certain providers of video services over the Internet on fair and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions, including, among others, price. If Comcast does not license its affiliated content to us on fair and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions, we can seek binding arbitration and continue to carry such content while the arbitration is pending. However, it is uncertain how these conditions may be interpreted and enforced by the FCC; therefore, we cannot predict the practical effect of these conditions.

### FCC Regulation of our Wireless Spectrum Licenses

On March 2, 2012, the FCC approved the transfer of 40 MHz of AWS-4 wireless spectrum licenses held by DBSD North America and TerreStar to us. On March 9, 2012, we completed the DBSD Transaction and the TerreStar Transaction, pursuant to which we acquired, among other things, certain satellite assets and wireless spectrum licenses held by DBSD North America and TerreStar. The total consideration to acquire the DBSD North America and TerreStar assets was approximately \$2.860 billion.

Our consolidated FCC applications for approval of the license transfers from DBSD North America and TerreStar were accompanied by requests for waiver of the FCC s MSS integrated service and spare satellite requirements and various technical provisions. On March 21, 2012, the FCC released a Notice of Proposed Rule Making proposing the elimination of the integrated service, spare satellite and various technical requirements associated with the AWS-4 licenses. On December 11, 2012, the FCC approved rules that eliminated these requirements and gave notice of its proposed modification of our AWS-4 authorizations to, among other things, allow us to offer single-mode terrestrial terminals to customers who do not desire satellite functionality. On February 15, 2013, the FCC issued an order, which became effective on March 7, 2013, modifying our AWS-4 licenses to expand our terrestrial operating authority. That order imposed certain limitations on the use of a portion of this spectrum, including interference protections for other spectrum users and power and emission limits that we presently believe could render 5 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2000-2005 MHz) effectively unusable for terrestrial services and limit our ability to fully utilize the remaining 15 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2005-2020 MHz) for terrestrial services. These limitations could, among other things, impact the ongoing development of technical standards associated with our wireless business, and may have a material adverse effect on our ability to commercialize these licenses. That order also mandated certain interim and final build-out requirements for the licenses. By March 2017, we must provide terrestrial signal coverage and offer terrestrial service to at least 40% of the aggregate population represented by all of the areas covered by the licenses (the AWS-4 Interim Build-Out Requirement ). By March 2020, we were required to provide terrestrial signal coverage and offer terrestrial service to at least 70% of the population in each area covered by an individual license (the AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement ). On December 20, 2013, the FCC issued a further order that, among other things, extended the AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement by one year to March 2021 (the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement ). If we fail to meet the AWS-4 Interim Build-Out Requirement, the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement may be accelerated by one year, from March 2021 to March 2020. If we fail to meet the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement, our terrestrial authorization for each license area in which we fail to meet the requirement may terminate.

The FCC s December 20, 2013 order also conditionally waived certain FCC rules for our AWS-4 spectrum licenses to allow us to repurpose 20 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2000-2020 MHz) for downlink (the AWS-4 Downlink Waiver ). The AWS-4 Downlink Waiver and the Modified

AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement are conditioned upon us bidding at least a net clearing price equal to the aggregate reserve price of \$1.56 billion in the auction of

### Table of Contents

wireless spectrum known as the H Block. The auction commenced January 22, 2014. Under the FCC s anti-collusion and anonymous bidding rules for this auction, we are not permitted to disclose publicly our interest level or activity level in the auction, if any, at this time. If we fail to meet this bidding condition, or if we fail to notify the FCC whether we intend to use our uplink spectrum for downlink by June 20, 2016, the AWS-4 Downlink Waiver will terminate, and the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement will revert back to the AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement. The FCC has adopted rules for the H Block spectrum band that is adjacent to our AWS-4 spectrum licenses. Depending on the outcome of the standard-setting process for the H Block and our ultimate decision regarding the AWS-4 Downlink Waiver, the rules that the FCC adopted for the H Block could further impact the remaining 15 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2005-2020 MHz), which may have a material adverse effect on our ability to commercialize the AWS-4 licenses.

In 2008, we paid \$712 million to acquire certain 700 MHz wireless spectrum licenses, which were granted to us by the FCC in February 2009. At the time they were granted, these licenses were subject to certain interim and final build-out requirements. By June 2013, we were required to provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 35% of the geographic area in each area covered by each individual license (the 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement). By June 2019, we were required to provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 35% of the geographic area in each area covered by each individual license (the 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement). As discussed below, these requirements have since been modified by the FCC.

On September 9, 2013, we filed a letter with the FCC in support of a voluntary industry solution to resolve certain interoperability issues affecting the lower 700 MHz spectrum band (the Interoperability Solution ). On October 29, 2013, the FCC issued an order approving the Interoperability Solution Order ), which requires us to reduce power emissions on our 700 MHz licenses. As part of the Interoperability Solution Order, the FCC, among other things, approved our request to modify the 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement so that by March 2017 (rather than the previous deadline of June 2013), we must provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 40% of our total E Block population (the Modified 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement ). The FCC also approved our request to modify the 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement so that by March 2021 (rather than the previous deadline of June 2013), we must provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 70% of the population in each of our E Block license areas (the Modified 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement ). These requirements replaced the previous build-out requirements associated with our 700 MHz licenses. While the modifications to our 700 MHz licenses would provide us additional time to complete the build-out requirements, the reduction in power emissions could have an adverse impact on our ability to fully utilize our 700 MHz licenses. If we fail to meet the Modified 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement, the Modified 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement may be accelerated by one year, from March 2021 to March 2020, and we could face the reduction of license area(s). If we fail to meet the Modified 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement, our authorization may terminate for the geographic portion of each license in which we are not providing service.

We will need to make significant additional investments or partner with others to, among other things, finance the commercialization and build-out requirements of these licenses and our integration efforts, including compliance with regulations applicable to the acquired licenses. Depending on the nature and scope of such commercialization, build-out, and integration efforts, any such investment or partnership could vary significantly. There can be no assurance that we will be able to develop and implement a business model that will realize a return on these spectrum licenses or that we will be able to profitably deploy the assets represented by these spectrum licenses, which may affect the carrying value of these assets and our future financial condition or results of operations.

*MVDDS*. In 2010, we purchased all of South.com, L.L.C., which is an entity that holds MVDDS licenses in 37 markets in the United States. In October 2012, we agreed to purchase additional MVDDS licenses in 45 markets from an affiliate of Cablevision Systems Corporation (Cablevision). We are currently leasing four of these licenses to a wholly-owned subsidiary of Cablevision. We have MVDDS licenses in 82 out of 214 geographical license areas, including Los Angeles, New York City, Chicago and several other major metropolitan areas. By August 2014, we are required to meet certain FCC build-out requirements related to our MVDDS licenses. In addition, we are subject to certain FCC service rules applicable to these licenses. Part or all of our MVDDS licenses may be terminated if these FCC build-out requirements are not satisfied.

### State and Local Regulation

We are also regulated by state and local authorities. While the FCC has preempted many state and local regulations that impair the installation and use of towers and consumer satellite dishes, our businesses nonetheless may be subject to state and local regulation, including, among others, zoning regulations that affect the ability to install consumer satellite antennas or build out wireless telecommunications networks.

### **International Regulation**

We are subject to regulation by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and our satellites must be registered in the United Nations (UN) Registry of Space Objects. The orbital location and frequencies for certain of our satellites are subject to the frequency registration and coordination process of the ITU. The ITU Radio Regulations define the international rules, regulations, and rights for a satellite and associated earth stations to use specific radio frequencies at a specific orbital location. These rules, which include deadlines for the bringing of satellite networks into use, differ depending on the type of service to be provided and the frequencies to be used by the satellite. On our behalf, various countries have made and may in the future make additional filings for the frequency assignments at particular orbital locations that are used or to be used by our current satellite networks and potential future satellite networks we may build or acquire.

Our satellite services also must conform to the ITU service plans for Region 2 (which includes the United States). If any of our operations are not consistent with this plan, the ITU will only provide authorization on a non-interference basis pending successful modification of the plan or the agreement of all affected administrations to the non-conforming operations. Certain of our satellites are not presently entitled to any interference protection from other satellites that are in conformance with the plan. Accordingly, unless and until the ITU modifies its service plans to include the technical parameters of our non-conforming operations, our non-conforming satellites, along with those of other non-conforming satellite operators, must not cause harmful electrical interference with other assignments that are in conformance with the ITU service plans.

#### **Registration in the UN Registry of Space Objects**

The United States and other jurisdictions in which we license satellites are parties to the UN Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space. The UN Convention requires a satellite s launching state to register the satellite as a space object. The act of registration carries liability for the registering country in the event that the satellite causes third party damage. Administrations may place certain requirements on satellite licensees in order to procure the necessary launch or operational authorizations that accompany registration of the satellite. In some jurisdictions, these authorizations are separate and distinct, with unique requirements, from the authorization to use a set of frequencies to provide satellite services. There is no guarantee that we will be able to procure such authorizations even if we already possess a frequency authorization.

#### **Export Control Regulation**

The delivery of satellites and related technical information for purposes of launch by foreign launch service providers is subject to strict export control and prior approval requirements. We are required to obtain import and export licenses from the United States government to receive and deliver certain components of direct-to-home satellite television systems. In addition, the delivery of satellites and the supply of certain related ground control equipment, technical services and data, and satellite communication/control services to destinations outside the United States are subject to export control and prior approval requirements from the United States government (including prohibitions on the sharing of certain satellite-related goods and services with China).

### PATENTS AND OTHER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Many entities, including some of our competitors, have or may in the future obtain patents and other intellectual property rights that cover or affect products or services that we offer or that we may offer in the future. In general, if a court determines that one or more of our products or services infringe intellectual property rights held by others, we may be required to cease developing or marketing those products or services, to obtain licenses from the holders

### Table of Contents

of the intellectual property rights at a material cost, or to redesign those products or services in such a way as to avoid infringing any patent claims. If those intellectual property rights are held by a competitor, we may be unable to obtain the intellectual property rights at any price, which could adversely affect our competitive position.

We may not be aware of all intellectual property rights that our products or services may potentially infringe. In addition, patent applications in the United States are confidential until the Patent and Trademark Office either publishes the application or issues a patent (whichever arises first) and, accordingly, our products may infringe claims contained in pending patent applications of which we are not aware. Further, the process of determining definitively whether a claim of infringement is valid often involves expensive and protracted litigation, even if we are ultimately successful on the merits.

We cannot estimate the extent to which we may be required in the future to obtain intellectual property licenses or the availability and cost of any such licenses. Those costs, and their impact on our results of operations, could be material. Damages in patent infringement cases can be substantial, and in certain circumstances can be trebled. To the extent that we are required to pay unanticipated royalties to third parties, these increased costs of doing business could negatively affect our liquidity and operating results. We are currently defending multiple patent infringement actions. We cannot be certain the courts will conclude these companies do not own the rights they claim, that our products do not infringe on these rights and/or that these rights are not valid. Further, we cannot be certain that we would be able to obtain licenses from these persons on commercially reasonable terms or, if we were unable to obtain such licenses, that we would be able to redesign our products to avoid infringement.

### ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

We are subject to the requirements of federal, state, local and foreign environmental and occupational safety and health laws and regulations. These include laws regulating air emissions, water discharge and waste management. We attempt to maintain compliance with all such requirements. We do not expect capital or other expenditures for environmental compliance to be material in 2014 or 2015. Environmental requirements are complex, change frequently and have become more stringent over time. Accordingly, we cannot provide assurance that these requirements will not change or become more stringent in the future in a manner that could have a material adverse effect on our business.

### SEGMENT REPORTING DATA AND GEOGRAPHIC AREA DATA

For segment reporting data and principal geographic area data for 2013, 2012 and 2011, see Note 17 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

### **EMPLOYEES**

We had approximately 25,000 employees at December 31, 2013, of which approximately 22,000 employees were located in the United States. We generally consider relations with our employees to be good. Approximately 60 employees in three of our field offices have voted to have a union represent them in contract negotiations. While we are not currently a party to any collective bargaining agreements, we are currently

negotiating collective bargaining agreements at these offices.

### WHERE YOU CAN FIND MORE INFORMATION

We are subject to the informational requirements of the Exchange Act and accordingly file our annual reports on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K, proxy statements and other information with the SEC. The public may read and copy any materials filed with the SEC at the SEC s Public Reference Room at 100 F Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20549. Please call the SEC at (800) SEC-0330 for further information on the operation of the Public Reference Room. As an electronic filer, our public filings are also maintained on the SEC s Internet site that contains reports, proxy and information statements, and other information regarding issuers that file electronically with the SEC. The address of that website is http://www.sec.gov.

### WEBSITE ACCESS

Our annual reports on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K and amendments to those reports filed or furnished pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act also may be accessed free of charge through our website as soon as reasonably practicable after we have electronically filed such material with, or furnished it to, the SEC. The address of that website is http://www.dish.com.

We have adopted a written code of ethics that applies to all of our directors, officers and employees, including our principal executive officer and senior financial officers, in accordance with Section 406 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and the rules of the SEC promulgated thereunder. Our code of ethics is available on our corporate website at http://www.dish.com. In the event that we make changes in, or provide waivers of, the provisions of this code of ethics that the SEC requires us to disclose, we intend to disclose these events on our website.

### EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF THE REGISTRANT

(furnished in accordance with Item 401(b) of Regulation S-K, pursuant to General Instruction G(3) of Form 10-K)

The following table and information below sets forth the name, age and position with DISH Network of each of our executive officers, the period during which each executive officer has served as such, and each executive officer s business experience during the past five years:

Name	Age	Position
Charles W. Ergen	60	Chairman
Joseph P. Clayton	64	President and Chief Executive Officer and Director
W. Erik Carlson	44	Executive Vice President, DNS and Service Operations
Thomas A. Cullen	54	Executive Vice President, Corporate Development
James DeFranco	60	Executive Vice President and Director
R. Stanton Dodge	46	Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary
Bernard L. Han	49	Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer
Michael Kelly	52	President, Blockbuster L.L.C.
Roger J. Lynch	51	Executive Vice President, Advanced Technologies
Robert E. Olson	54	Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
David M. Shull	41	Executive Vice President and Chief Commercial Officer

*Charles W. Ergen.* Mr. Ergen is our executive Chairman and has been Chairman of the Board of Directors of DISH Network since its formation and, during the past five years, has held executive officer and director positions with DISH Network and its subsidiaries. Mr. Ergen also serves as executive Chairman and Chairman of the Board of Directors of EchoStar. Mr. Ergen co-founded DISH Network with his spouse, Cantey Ergen, and James DeFranco, in 1980.

Joseph P. Clayton. Mr. Clayton has served as our President and Chief Executive Officer and has been a member of our Board of Directors since June 2011. Mr. Clayton served as Chairman of Sirius Satellite Radio Inc. (Sirius) from November 2004 through July 2008 and served as Chief Executive Officer of Sirius from November 2001 through November 2004. Prior to joining Sirius, Mr. Clayton served as President of Global

Crossing North America, as President and Chief Executive Officer of Frontier Corporation and as Executive Vice President, Marketing and Sales - Americas and Asia, of Thomson S.A. Mr. Clayton previously served on the Board of Directors of Transcend Services, Inc. from 2001 until April 2012 and on the Board of Directors of EchoStar from October 2008 until June 2011.

*W. Erik Carlson.* Mr. Carlson has served as our Executive Vice President, DNS and Service Operations since February 2008 and is responsible for overseeing our residential and commercial installations, customer billing and equipment retrieval and refurbishment operations. Mr. Carlson previously was Senior Vice President of Retail Services, a position he held since mid-2006. He joined DISH Network in 1995 and has held operating roles of increasing responsibility over the years.

### Table of Contents

*Thomas A. Cullen.* Mr. Cullen has served as our Executive Vice President, Corporate Development since July 2011. Mr. Cullen served as our Executive Vice President, Sales, Marketing and Programming from April 2009 until July 2011 and as our Executive Vice President, Corporate Development from December 2006 until April 2009. Before joining DISH Network, Mr. Cullen served as President of TensorComm, a venture-backed wireless technology company. From August 2003 to April 2005, Mr. Cullen was with Charter Communications Inc., serving as Senior Vice President, Advanced Services and Business Development from August 2003 until he was promoted to Executive Vice President in August 2004.

*James DeFranco*. Mr. DeFranco is one of our Executive Vice Presidents and has been one of our vice presidents and a member of the Board of Directors since our formation. During the past five years he has held various executive officer and director positions with our subsidiaries. Mr. DeFranco co-founded DISH Network with Charles W. Ergen and Cantey Ergen, in 1980.

*R. Stanton Dodge.* Mr. Dodge has served as our Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary since June 2007 and is responsible for all legal and government affairs for DISH Network and its subsidiaries. Mr. Dodge has served on the Board of Directors of EchoStar since March 2009. Mr. Dodge also served as EchoStar s Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary from October 2007 to November 2011 pursuant to a management services agreement between DISH Network and EchoStar. Since joining DISH Network in November 1996, he has held various positions of increasing responsibility in DISH Network s legal department.

*Bernard L. Han.* Mr. Han has served as our Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer since April 2009 and is in charge of all sales, operations and information technology functions for DISH Network. Mr. Han served as Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of DISH Network from September 2006 until April 2009. Mr. Han also served as EchoStar s Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer from January 2008 to June 2010 pursuant to a management services agreement between DISH Network and EchoStar. From October 2002 to May 2005, Mr. Han served as Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Northwest Airlines, Inc.

*Michael Kelly*. Mr. Kelly has served as the President of Blockbuster L.L.C since May 2011. Mr. Kelly served as our Executive Vice President, Direct, Commercial and Advertising Sales from December 2005 until May 2011 and as Executive Vice President of DISH Network Service L.L.C. and Customer Service from February 2004 until December 2005.

*Roger J. Lynch.* Mr. Lynch has served as our Executive Vice President, Advanced Technologies since November 2009. Mr. Lynch also serves as EchoStar s Executive Vice President, Advanced Technologies. In addition, in July 2012, Mr. Lynch was named Chief Executive Officer of DISH Digital Holding L.L.C., an entity which is owned two-thirds by us and one-third by EchoStar (DISH Digital). Prior to joining DISH Network, Mr. Lynch served as Chairman and CEO of Video Networks International, Ltd., an internet protocol television (IPTV) technology company in the United Kingdom from 2002 until 2009.

*Robert E. Olson.* Mr. Olson has served as our Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer since April 2009. Mr. Olson was the Chief Financial Officer of Trane Commercial Systems, the largest operating division of American Standard, from April 2006 to August 2008. From April 2003 to January 2006, Mr. Olson served as the Chief Financial Officer of AT&T s Consumer Services division and later its Business Services division.

*David M. Shull.* Mr. Shull has served as our Executive Vice President and Chief Commercial Officer since March 2013 and is responsible for overseeing our video content acquisition and packaging, product management, marketing and advertising sales. Mr. Shull previously was our Senior Vice President of Programming, a position he held since December 2008. He joined DISH Network in 2004 and has held various positions of increasing responsibility over the years.

There are no arrangements or understandings between any executive officer and any other person pursuant to which any executive officer was selected as such. Pursuant to the Bylaws of DISH Network, executive officers serve at the discretion of the Board of Directors.

### Item 1A. RISK FACTORS

The risks and uncertainties described below are not the only ones facing us. If any of the following events occur, our business, financial condition or results of operations could be materially and adversely affected.

#### **Competition and Economic Risks Affecting our Business**

We face intense and increasing competition from satellite television providers, cable companies and telecommunications companies, especially as the pay-TV industry has matured, which may require us to increase subscriber acquisition and retention spending or accept lower subscriber activations and higher subscriber churn.

Our business is primarily focused on providing pay-TV services and we have traditionally competed against satellite television providers and cable companies, some of whom have greater financial, marketing and other resources than we do. Many of these competitors offer video services bundled with broadband, telephony services, HD offerings, interactive services and video on demand services that consumers may find attractive. Moreover, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures and alliances among cable television providers, telecommunications companies and others may result in, among other things, greater financial leverage and increase the availability of offerings from providers capable of bundling television, broadband and telephone services in competition with our services. We and our competitors increasingly must seek to attract a greater proportion of new subscribers from each other s existing subscriber bases rather than from first-time purchasers of pay-TV services. In addition, because other pay-TV providers may be seeking to attract a greater proportion of their new subscribers from our existing subscriber base, we may be required to increase retention spending.

Competition has intensified in recent years as the pay-TV industry has matured and the growth of fiber-based pay-TV services offered by telecommunications companies such as Verizon and AT&T continues. These fiber-based pay-TV services have significantly greater capacity, enabling the telecommunications companies to offer substantial HD programming content as well as bundled services. This increasingly competitive environment may require us to increase subscriber acquisition and retention spending or accept lower subscriber activations and higher subscriber churn. Further, as a result of this increased competitive environment and the maturation of the pay-TV industry, future growth opportunities of our core pay-TV business may be limited and our margins may be reduced, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, financial condition and cash flow.

Competition from digital media companies that provide or facilitate the delivery of video content via the Internet may reduce our gross new subscriber activations and may cause our subscribers to purchase fewer services from us or to cancel our services altogether, resulting in less revenue to us.

Our business is primarily focused on pay-TV services, and we face competition from providers of digital media, including companies that offer online services distributing movies, television shows and other video programming. Moreover, new technologies have been, and will likely continue to be, developed that further increase the number of competitors we face with respect to video services. For example, online platforms that provide for the distribution and viewing of video programming compete with our pay-TV services. These online platforms may cause our subscribers to disconnect our services. In addition, even if our subscribers do not disconnect our services, they may purchase a certain portion of the services that they would have historically purchased from us through these online platforms, such as pay per view movies, resulting in less

revenue to us. Some of these companies have greater financial, marketing and other resources than we do. In particular, programming offered over the Internet has become more prevalent as the speed and quality of broadband and wireless networks have improved. In addition, consumers are spending an increasing amount of time accessing video content via the Internet on their mobile devices. These technological advancements and changes in consumer behavior with regard to the means by which they obtain video content could reduce our gross new subscriber activations and could materially adversely affect our business, results of operations and financial condition or otherwise disrupt our business.

Sustained economic weakness, including continued high unemployment and reduced consumer spending, may adversely affect our ability to grow or maintain our business.

A substantial majority of our revenue comes from residential customers whose spending patterns may be affected by sustained economic weakness and uncertainty. Economic weakness and uncertainty persisted during 2013. Our ability to grow or maintain our business may be adversely affected by sustained economic weakness and uncertainty, including the effect of wavering consumer confidence, continued high unemployment and other factors that may adversely affect the pay-TV industry. In particular, economic weakness and uncertainty could result in the following:

• *Fewer gross new subscriber activations and increased subscriber churn*. We could face fewer gross new subscriber activations and increased subscriber churn due to, among other things: (i) a downturn in the housing market in the United States combined with lower discretionary spending; (ii) increased price competition for our products and services; and (iii) the potential loss of retailers, who generate a significant portion of our new subscribers, because many of them are small businesses that are more susceptible to the negative effects of economic weakness. In particular, subscriber churn may increase with respect to subscribers who purchase our lower tier programming packages and who may be more sensitive to sustained economic weakness, including, among others, our pay-in-advance subscribers.

• Lower pay-TV average monthly revenue per subscriber ( Pay-TV ARPU ). Our Pay-TV ARPU could be negatively impacted by aggressive introductory offers by our competitors and the growth of video content being delivered via the Internet. Furthermore, due to lower levels of disposable income, our customers may downgrade to lower cost programming packages, elect not to purchase premium services or pay per view movies or may disconnect our services and choose to replace them with less expensive alternatives such as video content delivered via the Internet, including, among others, video on demand.

• *Higher subscriber acquisition and retention costs*. Our profits may be adversely affected by increased subscriber acquisition and retention costs necessary to attract and retain subscribers during a period of economic weakness.

Our competitors may be able to leverage their relationships with programmers to reduce their programming costs and offer exclusive content that will place them at a competitive advantage to us.

The cost of programming represents the largest percentage of our overall costs. Certain of our competitors own directly or are affiliated with companies that own programming content that may enable them to obtain lower programming costs or offer exclusive programming that may be attractive to prospective subscribers. Unlike our larger cable and satellite competitors, we have not made significant investments in programming providers. For example, in January 2011, the FCC and the Department of Justice approved a transaction between Comcast and General Electric pursuant to which they joined their programming properties, including NBC, Bravo and many others that are available in the majority of our programming packages, in a venture, NBCUniversal, controlled by Comcast. During March 2013, Comcast completed the acquisition of substantially all of General Electric s remaining interest in NBCUniversal. This transaction may affect us adversely by, among other things, making it more difficult for us to obtain access to NBCUniversal s programming networks on nondiscriminatory and fair terms, or at all. The FCC conditioned its approval on, among other things, Comcast licensing its affiliated content to us, other traditional pay-TV providers and certain providers of video services over the Internet on fair and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions, including, among others, price. If Comcast does not license its affiliated content to us on fair and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions, we can seek binding arbitration and continue to carry such content while the arbitration is pending. However, it is uncertain how these conditions may be interpreted and enforced

by the FCC; therefore, we cannot predict the practical effect of these conditions.

# We face increasing competition from other distributors of unique programming services such as foreign language and sports programming that may limit our ability to maintain subscribers that desire these unique programming services.

We face increasing competition from other distributors of unique programming services such as foreign language and sports programming, including programming distributed over the Internet. There can be no assurance that we will maintain subscribers that desire these unique programming services. For example, the increasing availability of foreign language programming from our competitors, which in certain cases has resulted from our inability to renew programming agreements on an exclusive basis or at all, could contribute to an increase in our subscriber churn. Our agreements with distributors of foreign language programming have varying expiration dates, and some agreements are on a month-to-month basis. There can be no assurance that we will be able to grow or maintain subscribers that desire these unique programming services such as foreign language and sports programming.

### **Operational and Service Delivery Risks Affecting our Business**

### If we do not continue improving our operational performance and customer satisfaction, our gross new subscriber activations may decrease and our subscriber churn may increase.

If we are unable to continue improving our operational performance and customer satisfaction, we may experience a decrease in gross new subscriber activations and an increase in subscriber churn, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. To improve our operational performance, we continue to make significant investments in staffing, training, information systems, and other initiatives, primarily in our call center and in-home service operations. These investments are intended to help combat inefficiencies introduced by the increasing complexity of our business, improve customer satisfaction, reduce subscriber churn, increase productivity, and allow us to scale better over the long run. We cannot, however, be certain that our spending will ultimately be successful in improving our operational performance. In the meantime, we may continue to incur higher costs to improve our operational performance. While we believe that these costs will be outweighed by longer-term benefits, there can be no assurance when or if we will realize these benefits at all. If we are unable to improve our operational performance, our future gross new subscriber activations and existing subscriber churn may be negatively impacted, which could in turn adversely affect our revenue growth and results of operations.

# If our gross new subscriber activations decrease, or if our subscriber churn, subscriber acquisition costs or retention costs increase, our financial performance will be adversely affected.

We may incur increased costs to acquire new subscribers and retain existing subscribers. Our subscriber acquisition costs could increase as a result of increased spending for advertising and the installation of more HD and DVR receivers, which are generally more expensive than other receivers. Meanwhile, retention costs may be driven higher by increased upgrades of existing subscribers equipment to HD and DVR receivers. Additionally, certain of our promotions, including, among others, pay-in-advance, allow consumers with relatively lower credit scores to become subscribers. These subscribers typically churn at a higher rate.

Our subscriber acquisition costs and our subscriber retention costs can vary significantly from period to period and can cause material variability to our net income (loss) and adjusted free cash flow. Any material increase in subscriber acquisition or retention costs from current levels could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

### Programming expenses are increasing and could adversely affect our future financial condition and results of operations.

Our programming costs currently represent the largest component of our total expense and we expect these costs to continue to increase. The pay-TV industry has continued to experience an increase in the cost of programming, especially local broadcast channels and sports programming. Our ability to compete successfully will depend, among other things, on our ability to continue to obtain desirable programming and deliver it to our subscribers at competitive prices.

2	4
4	-

When offering new programming, or upon expiration of existing contracts, programming suppliers have historically attempted to increase the rates they charge us for programming. We expect this practice to continue, which, if successful, would increase our programming costs. As a result, our margins may face further pressure if we are unable to renew our long-term programming contracts on favorable pricing and other economic terms.

In addition, increases in programming costs could cause us to increase the rates that we charge our subscribers, which could in turn cause our existing subscribers to disconnect our service or cause potential new subscribers to choose not to subscribe to our service. Therefore, we may be unable to pass increased programming costs on to our customers, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

# We depend on others to provide the programming that we offer to our subscribers and, if we lose access to this programming, our gross new subscriber activations may decline and our subscriber churn may increase.

We depend on third parties to provide us with programming services. Our programming agreements have remaining terms ranging from less than one to up to several years and contain various renewal, expiration and/or termination provisions. We may not be able to renew these agreements on favorable terms or at all, and these agreements may be terminated prior to expiration of their original term. Certain programmers have, in the past, temporarily limited our access to their programming. For example, during 2012, our gross new subscriber activations and subscriber churn were negatively impacted as a result of multiple programming interruptions and threatened programming interruptions related to contract disputes with several content providers. We typically have a few programming contracts with major content providers up for renewal each year and if we are unable to renew any of these agreements or the other parties terminate the agreements, there can be no assurance that we would be able to obtain substitute programming, or that such substitute programming provided by major content providers and/or programming programming. In addition, loss of access to programming, particularly programming provided by major content providers and/or programming popular with our subscribers, could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations, including, among other things, our gross new subscriber activations and subscriber churn rate.

### We may not be able to obtain necessary retransmission consent agreements at acceptable rates, or at all, from local network stations.

The Copyright Act generally gives satellite companies a statutory copyright license to retransmit local broadcast channels by satellite back into the market from which they originated, subject to obtaining the retransmission consent of local network stations that do not elect must carry status, as required by the Communications Act. If we fail to reach retransmission consent agreements with such broadcasters, we cannot carry their signals. This could have an adverse effect on our strategy to compete with cable and other satellite companies that provide local signals. While we have been able to reach retransmission consent agreements with most of these local network stations, from time to time there are stations with which we have not been able to reach an agreement. We cannot be sure that we will secure these agreements or that we will secure new agreements on acceptable terms, or at all, upon the expiration of our current retransmission consent agreements, some of which are short-term. During the second quarter 2012, the four major broadcast television networks filed lawsuits against us alleging, among other things, that the PrimeTime Anytime and AutoHop features of the Hopper set-top box breach their retransmission consent agreements. In the event a court ultimately determines that we breached the terms of these retransmission consent agreements, we may be subject, among other things, to substantial damages and we may lose access to programming or may not be able to renew certain of our retransmission consent agreements and other programming agreements on favorable terms or at all. Even if we ultimately prevail in these actions, there can be no assurance that we will be able to renew our retransmission consent agreements or enter into new agreements with these broadcast networks. In such event, there can be no assurance that we will be able to obtain substitute programming, or that such substitute programming would be comparable in quality or cost to our existing programming. In recent years, national broadcasters have used their ownership of certain local broadcast stations to require us to carry additional cable programming in exchange for retransmission consent of their local broadcast stations. These requirements may place constraints on available capacity on our satellites for other programming. Furthermore, the rates we are charged for retransmitting

local channels have been increasing substantially. We may be unable to pass these increased programming costs on to our customers, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

#### We may be required to make substantial additional investments to maintain competitive programming offerings.

We believe that the availability and extent of HD programming and other value-added services such as access to video via smartphones and tablets continues to be a significant factor in consumers choice among pay-TV providers. Other pay-TV providers may have more successfully marketed and promoted their HD programming packages and value-added services and may also be better equipped and have greater resources to increase their HD offerings and value-added services to respond to increasing consumer demand. In addition, even though it remains a small portion of the market, consumer demand for 3D televisions and programming, as well as higher resolution programming, will likely increase in the future. We may be required to make substantial additional investments in infrastructure to respond to competitive pressure to deliver enhanced programming, and other value-added services, and there can be no assurance that we will be able to compete effectively with offerings from other pay-TV providers.

### Any failure or inadequacy of our information technology infrastructure could disrupt or harm our business.

The capacity, reliability and security of our information technology hardware and software infrastructure (including our billing systems) are important to the operation of our current business, which would suffer in the event of system failures or cyber attacks. Likewise, our ability to expand and update our information technology infrastructure in response to our growth and changing needs is important to the continued implementation of our new service offering initiatives. Our inability to expand or upgrade our technology infrastructure could have adverse consequences, which could include the delayed implementation of new service offerings, service or billing interruptions, and the diversion of development resources. For example, during 2011, we implemented new interactive voice response and in-home appointment scheduling systems. We also implemented a new billing system as well as new sales and customer care systems in the first quarter 2012. We are relying on third parties for developing key components of these systems and ongoing service after their implementation. Third parties may experience errors, cyber attacks or disruptions that could adversely impact us and over which we may have limited control. Interruption and/or failure of any of these new systems could disrupt our operations and damage our reputation thus adversely impacting our ability to provide our services, retain our current subscribers and attract new subscribers.

In addition, although we take protective measures and endeavor to modify them as circumstances warrant, our information technology hardware and software infrastructure may be vulnerable to cyber attacks including, among other things, unauthorized access, misuse, computer viruses or other malicious code, computer denial of service attacks and other events that could have a security impact. If one or more of such events occur, this potentially could jeopardize our customer and other information processed and stored in, and transmitted through, our information technology hardware and software infrastructure, or otherwise cause interruptions or malfunctions in our operations, which could result in significant losses or reputational damage. We may be required to expend significant additional resources to modify our protective measures or to investigate and remediate vulnerabilities or other exposures, and we may be subject to litigation and financial losses.

We currently depend on EchoStar and its subsidiaries, to design, develop and manufacture all of our new set-top boxes and certain related components, to provide a majority of our transponder capacity, and to provide digital broadcast operations and other services to us. Our business would be adversely affected if EchoStar ceases to provide these products and services to us and we are unable to obtain suitable replacement products and services from third parties.

EchoStar is our sole supplier of digital set-top boxes and digital broadcast operations. In addition, EchoStar provides a majority of our transponder capacity and is a key supplier of related services to us. We purchase digital set-top boxes from EchoStar pursuant to a contract that expires on December 31, 2014. We have an option, but not the obligation, to extend this contract for one additional year. EchoStar provides digital broadcast operations to us pursuant to a contract that expires on December 31, 2016. EchoStar has no obligation to supply digital set-top

boxes or digital broadcast operations to us after these dates. We may be unable to renew agreements for digital set-top boxes or digital broadcast operations with EchoStar on acceptable terms or at all. Equipment, transponder leasing and digital broadcast operation costs may increase beyond our current expectations. EchoStar s inability to develop and produce, or our inability to obtain, equipment with the latest technology, or our inability to obtain transponder

capacity and digital broadcast operations and other services from third parties, could adversely affect our gross new subscriber activations and subscriber churn rate and cause related revenue to decline.

Furthermore, due to the lack of compatibility of our infrastructure with the set-top boxes of a provider other than EchoStar, any transition to a new supplier of set-top boxes could take a significant period of time to complete, cause us to incur significant costs and negatively affect our gross new subscriber activations and subscriber churn. For example, the proprietary nature of the Sling technology and certain other technology used in EchoStar s set-top boxes may significantly limit our ability to obtain set-top boxes with the same or similar features from any other provider of set-top boxes.

If we were to switch to another provider of set-top boxes, we may have to implement additional infrastructure to support the set-top boxes purchased from such new provider, which could significantly increase our costs. In addition, differences in, among other things, the user interface between set-top boxes provided by EchoStar and those of any other provider could cause subscriber confusion, which could increase our costs and have a material adverse effect on our gross new subscriber activations and subscriber churn. Furthermore, switching to a new provider of set-top boxes may cause a reduction in our supply of set-top boxes and thus delay our ability to ship set-top boxes, which could have a material adverse effect on our gross new subscriber churn rate and cause related revenue to decline.

# We operate in an extremely competitive environment and our success may depend in part on our timely introduction and implementation of, and effective investment in, new competitive products and services, the failure of which could negatively impact our business.

Our operating results are dependent to a significant extent upon our ability to continue to introduce new products and services and to upgrade existing products and services on a timely basis, and to reduce costs of our existing products and services. We may not be able to successfully identify new product or service opportunities or develop and market these opportunities in a timely or cost-effective manner. The research and development of new, technologically advanced products is a complex and uncertain process requiring high levels of innovation and investment. The success of new product and service development depends on many factors, including among others, the following:

- difficulties and delays in the development, production, timely completion, testing and marketing of products and services;
- the cost of the products and services;
- proper identification of customer need and customer acceptance of products and services;
- the development of, approval of and compliance with industry standards;
- the significant amount of resources we must devote to the development of new technologies; and
- the ability to differentiate our products and services and compete with other companies in the same markets.

If our products and services, including without limitation, our Hopper and Joey set-top boxes, are not competitive or do not work properly, our business could suffer and our financial performance could be negatively impacted. If the quality of our products and services do not meet our

customers expectations or our products are found to be defective, then our sales and revenues, and ultimately our reputation, could be negatively impacted.

# Technology in our industry changes rapidly and our inability to offer new subscribers and upgrade existing subscribers with more advanced equipment could cause our products and services to become obsolete.

Technology in the pay-TV industry changes rapidly as new technologies are developed, which could cause our products and services to become obsolete. We and our suppliers may not be able to keep pace with technological developments. If the new technologies on which we intend to focus our research and development investments fail to achieve acceptance in the marketplace, our competitive position could be negatively impacted causing a reduction in our revenues and earnings. We may also be at a competitive disadvantage in developing and introducing complex new products and services because of the substantial costs we may incur in making these products or services available across our installed base of approximately 14 million subscribers. For example, our competitors could use proprietary technologies that are perceived by the market as being superior. Further, after we have incurred substantial costs, one or more of the products or services under our development, or under development by one or more of our strategic partners, could become obsolete prior to it being widely adopted.

In addition, our competitive position depends in part on our ability to offer new subscribers and upgrade existing subscribers with more advanced equipment, such as receivers with DVR and HD technology and by otherwise making additional infrastructure investments, such as those related to our information technology and call centers. Furthermore, the continued demand for HD programming continues to require investments in additional satellite capacity. We may not be able to pass on to our subscribers the entire cost of these upgrades and infrastructure investments.

New technologies could also create new competitors for us. For instance, we face increasing consumer demand for the delivery of digital video services via the Internet, including providing what we refer to as DISH Anywhere. We expect to continue to face increased threats from companies who use the Internet to deliver digital video services as the speed and quality of broadband and wireless networks continues to improve.

Technological innovation is important to our success and depends, to a significant degree, on the work of technically skilled employees. We rely on EchoStar to design, develop and manufacture set-top boxes with advanced features and functionality and solutions for providing digital video services via the Internet. If EchoStar is unable to attract and retain appropriately technically skilled employees, our competitive position could be materially and adversely affected. In addition, delays in the delivery of components or other unforeseen problems associated with our technology may occur that could materially and adversely affect our ability to generate revenue, offer new products and services and remain competitive.

We rely on a single vendor or a limited number of vendors to provide certain key products or services to us such as information technology support, billing systems, and security access devices, and the inability of these key vendors to meet our needs could have a material adverse effect on our business.

Historically, we have contracted with a single vendor or a limited number of vendors to provide certain key products or services to us such as information technology support, billing systems, and security access devices. If these vendors are unable to meet our needs because they fail to perform adequately, are no longer in business, are experiencing shortages or discontinue a certain product or service we need, our business, financial condition and results of operations may be adversely affected. While alternative sources for these products and services exist, we may not be able to develop these alternative sources quickly and cost-effectively which could materially impair our ability to timely deliver our products to our subscribers or operate our business. Furthermore, our vendors may request changes in pricing, payment terms or other contractual obligations between the parties, which could cause us to make substantial additional investments.

Our sole supplier of new set-top boxes, EchoStar, relies on a few suppliers and in some cases a single supplier, for many components of our new set-top boxes, and any reduction or interruption in supplies or significant increase in the price of supplies could have a negative impact on our business.

EchoStar relies on a few suppliers and in some cases a single supplier, for many components of our new set-top boxes that we provide to subscribers in order to deliver our digital television services. Our ability to meet customer demand depends, in part, on EchoStar s ability to obtain timely and adequate delivery of quality materials, parts and

components from suppliers. In the event of an interruption of supply or a significant price increase from these suppliers, EchoStar may not be able to diversify sources of supply in a timely manner, which could have a negative impact on our business. Further, due to increased demand for products, many electronic manufacturers are experiencing shortages for certain components. EchoStar has experienced in the past and may continue to experience shortages driven by raw material availability, manufacturing capacity, labor shortages, industry allocations, natural disasters, logistical delays and significant changes in the financial or business conditions of our suppliers that negatively impact our operations. Any such delays or constraints could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations, including, among other things, our gross new subscriber activations.

# Our programming signals are subject to theft, and we are vulnerable to other forms of fraud that could require us to make significant expenditures to remedy.

Increases in theft of our signal or our competitors signals could, in addition to reducing gross new subscriber activations, also cause subscriber churn to increase. We use microchips embedded in credit card-sized cards, called smart cards or Security Access Devices.

Our signal encryption has been compromised in the past and may be compromised in the future even though we continue to respond with significant investment in security measures, such as Security Access Device replacement programs and updates in security software, that are intended to make signal theft more difficult. It has been our prior experience that security measures may only be effective for short periods of time or not at all and that we remain susceptible to additional signal theft. During 2009, we completed the replacement of our Security Access Devices and re-secured our system. We expect additional future replacements of these devices will be necessary to keep our system secure. We cannot ensure that we will be successful in reducing or controlling theft of our programming content and we may incur additional costs in the future if our system security is compromised.

We are also vulnerable to other forms of fraud. While we are addressing certain fraud through a number of actions, including terminating retailers that we believe violated our business rules, there can be no assurance that we will not continue to experience fraud which could impact our gross new subscriber activations and subscriber churn. Sustained economic weakness may create greater incentive for signal theft and other forms of fraud, which could lead to higher subscriber churn and reduced revenue.

# We depend on third parties to solicit orders for our services that represent a significant percentage of our total gross new subscriber activations.

Most of our retailers are not exclusive to us and some of our retailers may favor our competitors products and services over ours based on the relative financial arrangements associated with marketing our products and services and those of our competitors. Furthermore, most of these retailers are significantly smaller than we are and may be more susceptible to sustained economic weaknesses that make it more difficult for them to operate profitably. Because our retailers receive most of their incentive value at activation and not over an extended period of time, our interests may not always be aligned with our retailers. It may be difficult to better align our interests with our retailers because of their capital and liquidity constraints. Loss of these relationships could have an adverse effect on our subscriber base and certain of our other key operating metrics because we may not be able to develop comparable alternative distribution channels.

We have limited satellite capacity and failures or reduced capacity could adversely affect our business.

Operation of our programming service requires that we have adequate satellite transmission capacity for the programming we offer. Moreover, current competitive conditions require that we continue to expand our offering of new programming. While we generally have had in-orbit satellite capacity sufficient to transmit our existing channels and some backup capacity to recover the transmission of certain critical programming, our backup capacity is limited.

Our ability to earn revenue depends on the usefulness of our satellites, each of which has a limited useful life. A number of factors affect the useful lives of the satellites, including, among other things, the quality of their construction, the durability of their component parts, the ability to continue to maintain proper orbit and control over

### Table of Contents

the satellite s functions, the efficiency of the launch vehicle used, and the remaining on-board fuel following orbit insertion. Generally, the minimum design life of each of our satellites ranges from 12 to 15 years. We can provide no assurance, however, as to the actual useful lives of any of these satellites. Our operating results could be adversely affected if the useful life of any of our satellites were significantly shorter than the minimum design life.

In the event of a failure or loss of any of our satellites, we may need to acquire or lease additional satellite capacity or relocate one of our other satellites and use it as a replacement for the failed or lost satellite, any of which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. Such a failure could result in a prolonged loss of critical programming or a significant delay in our plans to expand programming as necessary to remain competitive. A relocation would require FCC approval and, among other things, a showing to the FCC that the replacement satellite would not cause additional interference compared to the failed or lost satellite. We cannot be certain that we could obtain such FCC approval. If we choose to use a satellite in this manner, this use could adversely affect our ability to satisfy certain operational conditions associated with our authorizations. Failure to satisfy those conditions could result in the loss of such authorizations, which would have an adverse effect on our ability to generate revenues.

#### Our satellites are subject to construction, launch, operational and environmental risks that could limit our ability to utilize these satellites.

*Construction and launch risks.* A key component of our business strategy is our ability to expand our offering of new programming and services. To accomplish this goal, from time to time, new satellites need to be built and launched. Satellite construction and launch is subject to significant risks, including construction and launch delays, launch failure and incorrect orbital placement. Certain launch vehicles that may be used by us have either unproven track records or have experienced launch failures in the recent past. The risks of launch delay and failure are usually greater when the launch vehicle does not have a track record of previous successful flights. Launch failures result in significant delays in the deployment of satellites because of the need both to construct replacement satellites, which can take more than three years, and to obtain other launch opportunities. Significant construction or launch delays could materially and adversely affect our ability to generate revenues. If we were unable to obtain launch insurance, or obtain launch insurance at rates we deem commercially reasonable, and a significant launch failure were to occur, it could impact our ability to fund future satellite procurement and launch opportunities.

In addition, the occurrence of future launch failures for other operators may delay the deployment of our satellites and materially and adversely affect our ability to insure the launch of our satellites at commercially reasonable premiums, if at all. Please see further discussion under the caption *We generally do not carry commercial insurance for any of the in-orbit satellites that we use, other than certain satellites leased from third parties, and could face significant impairment charges if one of our satellites fails below.* 

*Operational risks*. Satellites are subject to significant operational risks while in orbit. These risks include malfunctions, commonly referred to as anomalies that have occurred in our satellites and the satellites of other operators as a result of various factors, such as satellite manufacturers errors, problems with the power systems or control systems of the satellites and general failures resulting from operating satellites in the harsh environment of space.

Although we work closely with the satellite manufacturers to determine and eliminate the cause of anomalies in new satellites and provide for redundancies of many critical components in the satellites, we may experience anomalies in the future, whether of the types described above or arising from the failure of other systems or components.

Any single anomaly or series of anomalies could materially and adversely affect our operations and revenues and our relationship with current customers, as well as our ability to attract new customers for our pay-TV services. In particular, future anomalies may result in the loss of individual transponders on a satellite, a group of transponders on that satellite or the entire satellite, depending on the nature of the anomaly. Anomalies may also reduce the expected useful life of a satellite, thereby reducing the channels that could be offered using that satellite, or create additional expenses due to the need to provide replacement or back-up satellites. You should review the disclosures relating to satellite anomalies set forth under Note 8 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 15 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

### Table of Contents

*Environmental risks.* Meteoroid events pose a potential threat to all in-orbit satellites. The probability that meteoroids will damage those satellites increases significantly when the Earth passes through the particulate stream left behind by comets. Occasionally, increased solar activity also poses a potential threat to all in-orbit satellites.

Some decommissioned satellites are in uncontrolled orbits that pass through the geostationary belt at various points, and present hazards to operational satellites, including our satellites. We may be required to perform maneuvers to avoid collisions and these maneuvers may prove unsuccessful or could reduce the useful life of the satellite through the expenditure of fuel to perform these maneuvers. The loss, damage or destruction of any of our satellites as a result of an electrostatic storm, collision with space debris, malfunction or other event could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We generally do not carry commercial insurance for any of the in-orbit satellites that we use, other than certain satellites leased from third parties, and could face significant impairment charges if one of our satellites fails.

Generally, we do not carry launch or in-orbit insurance on the owned satellites we use. We currently do not carry in-orbit insurance on any of our satellites, other than certain satellites leased from third parties, and generally do not use commercial insurance to mitigate the potential financial impact of launch or in-orbit failures because we believe that the cost of insurance premiums is uneconomical relative to the risk of such failures. If one or more of our in-orbit satellites fail, we could be required to record significant impairment charges.

### We may have potential conflicts of interest with EchoStar due to our common ownership and management.

Questions relating to conflicts of interest may arise between EchoStar and us in a number of areas relating to our past and ongoing relationships. Areas in which conflicts of interest between EchoStar and us could arise include, but are not limited to, the following:

Cross officerships, directorships and stock ownership. We have certain overlap in directors and executive officers with EchoStar, which may lead to conflicting interests. Our Board of Directors and executive officers include persons who are members of the Board of Directors of EchoStar, including Charles W. Ergen, who serves as the Chairman of EchoStar and us. The executive officers and the members of our Board of Directors who overlap with EchoStar have fiduciary duties to EchoStar s shareholders. For example, there is the potential for a conflict of interest when we or EchoStar look at acquisitions and other corporate opportunities that may be suitable for both companies. In addition, certain of our directors and officers own EchoStar stock and options to purchase EchoStar stock. Mr. Ergen owns approximately 47.1% of EchoStar s total equity securities (assuming conversion of all Class B Common Stock into Class A Common Stock) and beneficially owns approximately 50.2% of EchoStar s total equity securities (assuming conversion of only the Class B Common Stock held by Mr. Ergen into Class A Common Stock). Under either a beneficial or equity calculation method, Mr. Ergen controls approximately 80.8% of the voting power of EchoStar. Mr. Ergen s ownership of EchoStar excludes 5,738,471 shares of its Class A Common Stock issuable upon conversion of shares of its Class B Common Stock currently held by certain trusts established by Mr. Ergen for the benefit of his family. These trusts own approximately 6.4% of EchoStar s total equity securities (assuming conversion of all Class B Common Stock into Class A Common Stock) and beneficially own approximately 11.9% of EchoStar s total equity securities (assuming conversion of only the Class B Common Stock held by such trusts into Class A Common Stock). Under either a beneficial or equity calculation method, these trusts possess approximately 11.0% of EchoStar s total voting power. These ownership interests could create actual, apparent or potential conflicts of interest when these individuals are faced with decisions that could have different implications for us and EchoStar. Furthermore, Charles W. Ergen, our Chairman, and Roger Lynch, Executive Vice President, Advanced Technologies, are employed by both us and EchoStar. These individuals may have actual or apparent conflicts of interest with respect to matters involving or affecting each company.

• *Intercompany agreements with EchoStar*. We have entered into certain agreements with EchoStar pursuant to which we have provided or provide EchoStar with certain professional services for which EchoStar pays us our cost plus a fixed margin. In addition, we have entered into a number of intercompany agreements covering matters such as tax sharing and EchoStar s responsibility for certain liabilities previously

### Table of Contents

undertaken by us for certain of EchoStar s businesses. We have also entered into certain commercial agreements with EchoStar pursuant to which EchoStar, among other things, sells set-top boxes and related equipment to us at specified prices. The terms of certain of these agreements were established while EchoStar was a wholly-owned subsidiary of us and were not the result of arm s length negotiations. The allocation of assets, liabilities, rights, indemnifications and other obligations between EchoStar and us under the separation and other intercompany agreements we entered into with EchoStar, in connection with the Spin-off, may have been different if agreed to by two unaffiliated parties. Had these agreements been negotiated with unaffiliated third parties, their terms may have been more favorable, or less favorable, to us. In addition, conflicts could arise between us and EchoStar in the interpretation or any extension or renegotiation of these existing agreements.

• *Additional intercompany transactions.* EchoStar or its affiliates have and will continue to enter into transactions with us or our subsidiaries or other affiliates. Although the terms of any such transactions will be established based upon negotiations between EchoStar and us and, when appropriate, subject to the approval of a committee of the non-interlocking directors or in certain instances non-interlocking management, there can be no assurance that the terms of any such transactions will be as favorable to us or our subsidiaries or affiliates as may otherwise be obtained between unaffiliated parties.

• *Business opportunities.* We have historically retained, and in the future may acquire, interests in various companies that have subsidiaries or controlled affiliates that own or operate domestic or foreign services that may compete with services offered by EchoStar. We may also compete with EchoStar when we participate in auctions for spectrum or orbital slots for our satellites. In addition, EchoStar may in the future use its satellites, uplink and transmission assets to compete directly against us in the subscription television business.

We may not be able to resolve any potential conflicts, and, even if we do so, the resolution may be less favorable to us than if we were dealing with an unaffiliated party.

Other than certain joint arrangements between DISH Network and EchoStar, we do not have agreements with EchoStar that would prevent either company from competing with the other.

### We rely on key personnel and the loss of their services may negatively affect our businesses.

We believe that our future success will depend to a significant extent upon the performance of Charles W. Ergen, our Chairman, and certain other executives. The loss of Mr. Ergen or of certain other key executives could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. Although all of our executives have executed agreements limiting their ability to work for or consult with competitors if they leave us, we do not have employment agreements with any of them. To the extent our officers are performing services for EchoStar, this may divert their time and attention away from our business and may therefore adversely affect our business.

### Acquisition and Capital Structure Risks Affecting our Business

We made a substantial investment to acquire certain AWS-4 wireless spectrum licenses and other assets from DBSD North America and TerreStar and to acquire certain 700 MHz wireless spectrum licenses. We will need to make significant additional investments or partner with others to commercialize these licenses and assets.

On March 2, 2012, the FCC approved the transfer of 40 MHz of AWS-4 wireless spectrum licenses held by DBSD North America and TerreStar to us. On March 9, 2012, we completed the DBSD Transaction and the TerreStar Transaction, pursuant to which we acquired, among other things, certain satellite assets and wireless spectrum licenses held by DBSD North America and TerreStar. The total consideration to acquire the DBSD North America and TerreStar assets was approximately \$2.860 billion.

Our consolidated FCC applications for approval of the license transfers from DBSD North America and TerreStar were accompanied by requests for waiver of the FCC s MSS integrated service and spare satellite requirements and various technical provisions. On March 21, 2012, the FCC released a Notice of Proposed Rule Making proposing the elimination of the integrated service, spare satellite and various technical requirements associated with the AWS-4 licenses. On December 11, 2012, the FCC approved rules that eliminated these requirements and gave

notice of its proposed modification of our AWS-4 authorizations to, among other things, allow us to offer single-mode terrestrial terminals to customers who do not desire satellite functionality. On February 15, 2013, the FCC issued an order, which became effective on March 7, 2013, modifying our AWS-4 licenses to expand our terrestrial operating authority. That order imposed certain limitations on the use of a portion of this spectrum, including interference protections for other spectrum users and power and emission limits that we presently believe could render 5 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2000-2005 MHz) effectively unusable for terrestrial services and limit our ability to fully utilize the remaining 15 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2005-2020 MHz) for terrestrial services. These limitations could, among other things, impact the ongoing development of technical standards associated with our wireless business, and may have a material adverse effect on our ability to commercialize these licenses. That order also mandated certain interim and final build-out requirements for the licenses. By March 2017, we must provide terrestrial signal coverage and offer terrestrial service to at least 40% of the aggregate population represented by all of the areas covered by the licenses (the AWS-4 Interim Build-Out Requirement ). By March 2020, we were required to provide terrestrial signal coverage and offer terrestrial service to at least 70% of the population in each area covered by an individual license (the AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement ). On December 20, 2013, the FCC issued a further order that, among other things, extended the AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement by one year to March 2021 (the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement ). If we fail to meet the AWS-4 Interim Build-Out Requirement, the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement may be accelerated by one year, from March 2021 to March 2020. If we fail to meet the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement, our terrestrial authorization for each license area in which we fail to meet the requirement may terminate.

The FCC s December 20, 2013 order also conditionally waived certain FCC rules for our AWS-4 spectrum licenses to allow us to repurpose 20 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2000-2020 MHz) for downlink (the AWS-4 Downlink Waiver ). The AWS-4 Downlink Waiver and the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement are conditioned upon us bidding at least a net clearing price equal to the aggregate reserve price of \$1.56 billion in the auction of wireless spectrum known as the H Block. The auction commenced January 22, 2014. Under the FCC s anti-collusion and anonymous bidding rules for this auction, we are not permitted to disclose publicly our interest level or activity level in the auction, if any, at this time. If we fail to meet this bidding condition, or if we fail to notify the FCC whether we intend to use our uplink spectrum for downlink by June 20, 2016, the AWS-4 Downlink Waiver will terminate, and the Modified AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement will revert back to the AWS-4 Final Build-Out Requirement. The FCC has adopted rules for the H Block spectrum band that is adjacent to our AWS-4 spectrum licenses. Depending on the outcome of the standard-setting process for the H Block and our ultimate decision regarding the AWS-4 Downlink Waiver, the rules that the FCC adopted for the H Block could further impact the remaining 15 MHz of our uplink spectrum (2005-2020 MHz), which may have a material adverse effect on our ability to commercialize the AWS-4 licenses.

In 2008, we paid \$712 million to acquire certain 700 MHz wireless spectrum licenses, which were granted to us by the FCC in February 2009. At the time they were granted, these licenses were subject to certain interim and final build-out requirements. By June 2013, we were required to provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 35% of the geographic area in each area covered by each individual license (the 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement). By June 2019, we were required to provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 70% of the geographic area in each area covered by each individual license (the 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement). As discussed below, these requirements have since been modified by the FCC.

On September 9, 2013, we filed a letter with the FCC in support of a voluntary industry solution to resolve certain interoperability issues affecting the lower 700 MHz spectrum band (the Interoperability Solution ). On October 29, 2013, the FCC issued an order approving the Interoperability Solution (the Interoperability Solution Order ), which requires us to reduce power emissions on our 700 MHz licenses. As part of the Interoperability Solution Order, the FCC, among other things, approved our request to modify the 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement so that by March 2017 (rather than the previous deadline of June 2013), we must provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 40% of our total E Block population (the Modified 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement ). The FCC also approved our request to modify the 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement so that by March 2021 (rather than the previous deadline of June 2019), we must provide signal coverage and offer service to at least 70% of the population in each of our E Block license areas (the Modified 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement ). These requirements replaced the previous build-out requirements associated with our 700 MHz licenses. While the modifications to our 700 MHz licenses would provide us additional time to complete the build-out requirements, the

#### Table of Contents

reduction in power emissions could have an adverse impact on our ability to fully utilize our 700 MHz licenses. If we fail to meet the Modified 700 MHz Interim Build-Out Requirement, the Modified 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement may be accelerated by one year, from March 2021 to March 2020, and we could face the reduction of license area(s). If we fail to meet the Modified 700 MHz Final Build-Out Requirement, our authorization may terminate for the geographic portion of each license in which we are not providing service.

We will need to make significant additional investments or partner with others to, among other things, finance the commercialization and build-out requirements of these licenses and our integration efforts, including compliance with regulations applicable to the acquired licenses. Depending on the nature and scope of such commercialization, build-out, and integration efforts, any such investment or partnership could vary significantly. There can be no assurance that we will be able to develop and implement a business model that will realize a return on these spectrum licenses or that we will be able to profitably deploy the assets represented by these spectrum licenses, which may affect the carrying value of these assets and our future financial condition or results of operations.

Based on the FCC s rules applicable to our AWS-4 authorizations no longer requiring an integrated satellite component or ground spare and on our evaluation of the satellite capacity needed for our wireless segment, among other things, during the second quarter 2013, we concluded that T2 and D1 represented excess satellite capacity for the potential commercialization of our wireless spectrum. While we are no longer required to operate an integrated satellite component, we are currently planning on using T1 in the commercialization of our wireless spectrum or for other commercial purposes. In addition, T1 is subject to certain Canadian satellite regulations, including, among other things, an integrated satellite component. If T1 is not used in the commercialization of our wireless spectrum, we may need to impair it in the future, which could materially and adversely affect our future results of operations.

Furthermore, the fair values of wireless licenses and related assets may vary significantly in the future. In particular, valuation swings could occur if:

• consolidation in the wireless industry allows or requires wireless carriers to sell significant portions of their wireless spectrum holdings, which could in turn reduce the value of our spectrum holdings; or

• a sale of spectrum by one or more wireless providers occurs.

In addition, the fair value of wireless licenses could decline as a result of the FCC s pursuit of policies, including auctions, designed to increase the number of wireless licenses available in each of our markets. If the fair value of our wireless licenses were to decline significantly, the value of these licenses could be subject to impairment charges. We assess potential impairments to our indefinite-lived intangible assets annually or more often if indicators of impairment arise to determine whether there is evidence that indicate an impairment condition may exist.

To the extent we commercialize our wireless spectrum licenses, we will face certain risks entering and competing in the wireless services industry and operating a wireless services business.

We will likely be required to make significant additional investments or partner with others to, among other things, finance the commercialization and build-out requirements of our wireless spectrum licenses and our integration efforts including compliance with regulations applicable to these licenses. Depending upon the nature and scope of such commercialization, build-out and integration efforts, any such investment could vary significantly. There can be no assurance that we will be able to develop and implement a business model that will realize a return on these spectrum investments or that we will be able to profitably deploy the assets represented by these spectrum investments, which may affect the carrying value of these assets and our future business, results of operations and financial condition.

To the extent we commercialize our wireless spectrum licenses and enter the wireless services industry, a wireless services business presents certain risks. Any of the following risks, among others, may have a material adverse effect on our future business, results of operations and financial condition.

• *The wireless services industry is competitive and maturing.* We have limited experience in the wireless services industry, which is a competitive and maturing industry with incumbent and established

#### Table of Contents

competitors such as Verizon, AT&T, Sprint Corporation (Sprint) and T-Mobile USA Inc. (T-Mobile). These companies have substantial market share and have more wireless spectrum assets than us. Some of these companies have greater financial, marketing and other resources than us, and have existing cost and operational advantages that we lack. Market saturation is expected to continue to cause the wireless services industry s customer growth rate to moderate in comparison to historical growth rates, leading to increased competition for customers. As the industry matures, competitors increasingly must seek to attract a greater proportion of new subscribers from each other s existing subscriber bases rather than from first-time purchasers of wireless services. In addition, the cost of attracting a new customer is generally higher than the cost associated with retention of an existing customer.

• Our ability to compete effectively would be dependent on a number of factors. Our ability to compete effectively would depend on, among other things, our network quality, capacity and coverage; the pricing of our products and services; the quality of customer service; our development of new and enhanced products and services; the reach and quality of our sales and distribution channels; and capital resources. It would also depend on how successfully we anticipate and respond to various competitive factors affecting the industry, including, among others, new technologies and business models, products and services that may be introduced by competitors, changes in consumer preferences, the demand for services, demographic trends, economic conditions, and discount pricing and other strategies that may be implemented by competitors. It may be difficult for us to differentiate our products and services from other competitors in the industry, which may limit our ability to attract customers. Our success also may depend on our ability to access and deploy adequate spectrum, deploy new technologies and offer attractive services to customers. For example, we may not be able to obtain and offer certain technologies or features that are subject to competitor patents or other exclusive arrangements.

• We would depend on third parties to provide us with infrastructure and products and services. We would depend on various key suppliers and vendors to provide us, directly or through other suppliers, with infrastructure, equipment and services, such as switch and network equipment, handsets and other devices and equipment that we would need in order to operate a wireless services business and provide products and services to our customers. For example, handset and other device suppliers often rely on one vendor for the manufacture and supply of critical components, such as chipsets, used in their devices. If these suppliers or vendors fail to provide equipment or services on a timely basis or fail to meet performance expectations, we may be unable to provide products and services as and when expected by our customers. Any difficulties experienced with these suppliers and vendors could result in additional expense and/or delays in introducing our wireless services, network deployment and management, and service offerings. In addition, these suppliers and vendors may also be subject to litigation with respect to technology on which we would depend, including litigation involving claims of patent infringement, which claims have been growing rapidly in the wireless services industry.

• Wireless services and our wireless spectrum licenses are subject to government regulation. Wireless services and our wireless spectrum licenses are subject to regulation by the FCC and other federal, state and local, as well as international, governmental authorities. These governmental authorities could adopt regulations or take other actions that would adversely affect our business prospects. The licensing, construction, operation, sale and interconnection arrangements of wireless telecommunications systems are regulated by the FCC and, depending on the jurisdiction, other federal and international, state and local regulatory agencies. In particular, the FCC imposes significant regulation on licensees of wireless spectrum with respect to how radio spectrum is used by licensees, the nature of the services that licensees may offer and how the services may be offered, and resolution of issues of interference between spectrum bands. The FCC grants wireless licenses for terms of generally ten years that are subject to renewal or revocation. There can be no assurances that our wireless spectrum licenses will be renewed. Failure to comply with FCC requirements in a given license area could result in revocation of the license for that license area. For further information related to our wireless spectrum licenses, including build-out requirements, see other Risk Factors above.

We may pursue acquisitions and other strategic transactions to complement or expand our businesses that may not be successful and we may lose up to the entire value of our investment in these acquisitions and transactions.

Our future success may depend on opportunities to buy other businesses or technologies that could complement, enhance or expand our current businesses or products or that might otherwise offer us growth opportunities. To pursue this strategy successfully, we must identify attractive acquisition or investment opportunities and successfully complete transactions, some of which may be large and complex. We may not be able to identify or complete attractive acquisition or investment opportunities due to, among other things, the intense competition for these transactions. If we are not able to identify and complete such acquisition or investment opportunities, our future results of operations and financial condition may be adversely affected.

We may be unable to obtain in the anticipated timeframe, or at all, any regulatory approvals required to complete proposed acquisitions and other strategic transactions. Furthermore, the conditions imposed for obtaining any necessary approvals could delay the completion of such transactions for a significant period of time or prevent them from occurring at all. We may not be able to complete such transactions and such transactions, if executed, pose significant risks and could have a negative effect on our operations. Any transactions that we are able to identify and complete may involve a number of risks, including:

• the diversion of our management s attention from our existing businesses to integrate the operations and personnel of the acquired or combined business or joint venture;

• possible adverse effects on our operating results during the integration process;

• a high degree of risk inherent in these transactions, which could become substantial over time, and higher exposure to significant financial losses if the underlying ventures are not successful;

• our possible inability to achieve the intended objectives of the transaction; and

• the risks associated with complying with regulations applicable to the acquired business, which may cause us to incur substantial expenses.

In addition, we may not be able to successfully or profitably integrate, operate, maintain and manage our newly acquired operations or employees. We may not be able to maintain uniform standards, controls, procedures and policies, and this may lead to operational inefficiencies. In addition, the integration process may strain our financial and managerial controls and reporting systems and procedures.

New acquisitions, joint ventures and other transactions may require the commitment of significant capital that would otherwise be directed to investments in our existing businesses. To pursue acquisitions and other strategic transactions, we may need to raise additional capital in the future, which may not be available on acceptable terms or at all.

In addition to committing capital to complete the acquisitions, substantial capital may be required to operate the acquired businesses following their acquisition. These acquisitions may result in significant financial losses if the intended objectives of the transactions are not achieved. Some of the businesses acquired by us have experienced significant operating and financial challenges in their recent history, which in some cases resulted in these businesses commencing bankruptcy proceedings prior to our acquisition. We may acquire similar businesses in the future. There is no assurance that we will be able to successfully address the challenges and risks encountered by these businesses following their acquisition. If we are unable to successfully address these challenges and risks, our business, financial condition and/or results of operations may suffer.

We may need additional capital, which may not be available on acceptable terms or at all, to continue investing in our businesses and to finance acquisitions and other strategic transactions.

We may need to raise additional capital in the future, which may not be available on acceptable terms or at all, to among other things, continue investing in our businesses, construct and launch new satellites, and to pursue acquisitions and other strategic transactions.

Furthermore, weakness in the equity markets could make it difficult for us to raise equity financing without incurring substantial dilution to our existing shareholders. In addition, sustained economic weakness or weak results of operations may limit our ability to generate sufficient internal cash to fund these investments, capital expenditures, acquisitions and other strategic transactions. As a result, these conditions make it difficult for us to accurately forecast and plan future business activities because we may not have access to funding sources necessary for us to pursue organic and strategic business development opportunities.

A portion of our investment portfolio is invested in securities that have experienced limited or no liquidity and may not be immediately accessible to support our financing needs, including investments in public companies that are highly speculative and have experienced and continue to experience volatility.

A portion of our investment portfolio is invested in auction rate securities and strategic investments, and as a result, a portion of our portfolio has restricted liquidity. Liquidity in the markets for these investments has been adversely impacted. If the credit ratings of these securities deteriorate or the lack of liquidity in the marketplace continues, we may be required to record further impairment charges. Moreover, the sustained uncertainty of domestic and global financial markets has greatly affected the volatility and value of our marketable investment securities. In addition, a portion of our investment portfolio includes strategic and financial investments in debt and equity securities of public companies that are highly speculative and have experienced and continue to experience volatility. Typically, these investments are concentrated in a small number of companies. The fair value of these investments can be significantly impacted by the risk of adverse changes in securities markets generally, as well as risks related to the performance of the companies whose securities we have invested in, risks associated with specific industries, and other factors. These investments are subject to significant fluctuations in fair value due to the volatility of the securities markets and of the underlying businesses. The concentration of these investments as a percentage of our overall investment portfolio fluctuates from time to time based on, among other things, the size of our investment portfolio and our ability to liquidate these investments. In addition, because our portfolio may be concentrated in a limited number of companies, we may experience a significant loss if any of these companies, among other things, defaults on its obligations, performs poorly, does not generate adequate cash flow to fund its operations, is unable to obtain necessary financing on acceptable terms, or at all, or files for bankruptcy, or if the sectors in which these companies operate experience a market downturn. To the extent we require access to funds, we may need to sell these securities under unfavorable market conditions, record further impairment charges and fall short of our financing needs.

#### We have substantial debt outstanding and may incur additional debt.

As of December 31, 2013, our total debt, including the debt of our subsidiaries, was \$13.651 billion. Our debt levels could have significant consequences, including:

• requiring us to devote a substantial portion of our cash to make interest and principal payments on our debt, thereby reducing the amount of cash available for other purposes. As a result, we would have limited financial and operating flexibility in responding to changing economic and competitive conditions;

• limiting our ability to raise additional debt because it may be more difficult for us to obtain debt financing on attractive terms; and

• placing us at a disadvantage compared to our competitors that are less leveraged.

In addition, we may incur substantial additional debt in the future. The terms of the indentures relating to our senior notes permit us to incur additional debt. If new debt is added to our current debt levels, the risks we now face could intensify.

#### It may be difficult for a third party to acquire us, even if doing so may be beneficial to our shareholders, because of our ownership structure.

Certain provisions of our certificate of incorporation and bylaws may discourage, delay or prevent a change in control of our company that a shareholder may consider favorable. These provisions include the following:

• a capital structure with multiple classes of common stock: a Class A that entitles the holders to one vote per share, a Class B that entitles the holders to ten votes per share, a Class C that entitles the holders to one vote per share, except upon a change in control of our company in which case the holders of Class C are entitled to ten votes per share;

• a provision that authorizes the issuance of blank check preferred stock, which could be issued by our Board of Directors to increase the number of outstanding shares and thwart a takeover attempt;

• a provision limiting who may call special meetings of shareholders; and

• a provision establishing advance notice requirements for nominations of candidates for election to our Board of Directors or for proposing matters that can be acted upon by shareholders at shareholder meetings.

In addition, pursuant to our certificate of incorporation we have a significant amount of authorized and unissued stock which would allow our Board of Directors to issue shares to persons friendly to current management, thereby protecting the continuity of its management, or which could be used to dilute the stock ownership of persons seeking to obtain control of us.

#### We are controlled by one principal stockholder who is also our Chairman.

Charles W. Ergen, our Chairman, owns approximately 48.9% of our total equity securities (assuming conversion of all Class B Common Stock into Class A Common Stock) and beneficially owns approximately 50.8% of our total equity securities (assuming conversion of only the Class B Common Stock held by Mr. Ergen into Class A Common Stock). Under either a beneficial or equity calculation method, Mr. Ergen controls approximately 85.1% of the total voting power. Mr. Ergen s beneficial ownership of shares of Class A Common Stock excludes 16,992,813 shares of Class A Common Stock issuable upon conversion of shares of Class B Common Stock currently held by certain trusts established by Mr. Ergen for the benefit of his family. These trusts own approximately 3.7% of our total equity securities (assuming conversion of all Class B Common Stock into Class A Common Stock) and beneficially own approximately 7.2% of our total equity securities (assuming conversion of only the Class B Common Stock held by such trusts into Class A Common Stock). Under either a beneficial or equity calculation method, these trusts possess approximately 6.5% of the total voting power. Through his voting power, Mr. Ergen has the ability to elect a majority of our directors and to control all other matters requiring the approval of our stockholders. As a result, DISH Network is a controlled company as defined in the Nasdaq listing rules and is, therefore, not subject to Nasdaq requirements that would otherwise require us to have: (i) a majority of independent directors; (ii) a nominating committee composed solely of independent directors; and (iv) director

nominees selected, or recommended for the Board s selection, either by a majority of the independent directors or a nominating committee composed solely of independent directors. Mr. Ergen is also the principal stockholder and Chairman of EchoStar.

## Legal and Regulatory Risks Affecting our Business

#### Our business depends on certain intellectual property rights and on not infringing the intellectual property rights of others.

We rely on our patents, copyrights, trademarks and trade secrets, as well as licenses and other agreements with our vendors and other parties, to use our technologies, conduct our operations and sell our products and services. Legal challenges to our intellectual property rights and claims of intellectual property infringement by third parties could require that we enter into royalty or licensing agreements on unfavorable terms, incur substantial monetary liability or be enjoined preliminarily or permanently from further use of the intellectual property in question or from the continuation of our businesses as currently conducted, which could require us to change our business practices or

limit our ability to compete effectively or could have an adverse effect on our results of operations. Even if we believe any such challenges or claims are without merit, they can be time-consuming and costly to defend and divert management s attention and resources away from our business. During the second quarter 2012, the four major broadcast television networks filed lawsuits against us alleging, among other things, that the PrimeTime Anytime and AutoHop features of the Hopper set-top box infringe their copyrights. Additionally, Fox has alleged, among other things, that the Sling and Hopper Transfers features of our Hopper set-top box infringe its copyrights. In the event a court ultimately determines that we infringe the asserted copyrights, we may be subject to, among other things, an injunction that could require us to materially modify or cease to offer these features. Moreover, because of the rapid pace of technological change, we rely on technologies developed or licensed by third parties, and if we are unable to obtain or continue to obtain licenses from these third parties on reasonable terms, our business, financial condition and results of operations could be adversely affected.

# We are party to various lawsuits which, if adversely decided, could have a significant adverse impact on our business, particularly lawsuits regarding intellectual property.

We are subject to various legal proceedings and claims which arise in the ordinary course of business, including among other things, disputes with programmers regarding fees. Many entities, including some of our competitors, have or may in the future obtain patents and other intellectual property rights that cover or affect products or services related to those that we offer. In general, if a court determines that one or more of our products or services infringes on intellectual property held by others, we may be required to cease developing or marketing those products or services, to obtain licenses from the holders of the intellectual property at a material cost, or to redesign those products or services in such a way as to avoid infringing the intellectual property. If those intellectual property rights are held by a competitor, we may be unable to obtain the intellectual property at any price, which could adversely affect our competitive position. Please see further discussion under *Item 1. Business Patents and Other Intellectual Property* of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

We may not be aware of all intellectual property rights that our services or the products used in connection with our services may potentially infringe. In addition, patent applications in the United States are confidential until the Patent and Trademark Office either publishes the application or issues a patent (whichever arises first). Therefore, it is difficult to evaluate the extent to which our services or the products used in connection with our services may infringe claims contained in pending patent applications. Further, it is often not possible to determine definitively whether a claim of infringement is valid.

#### Our ability to distribute video content via the Internet involves regulatory risk.

As a result of recent updates to certain of our programming agreements which allow us to, among other things, deliver certain authenticated content via the Internet, we are increasingly distributing video content to our subscribers via the Internet. The ability to continue this strategy may depend in part on the FCC s success in implementing rules prohibiting blocking and discrimination against our distribution of content over networks owned by broadband and wireless Internet providers, as applicable. For more information, see *Item 1. Business Government Regulations FCC Regulations Governing our DBS Operations Net Neutrality* of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Changes in the Cable Act, and/or the rules of the FCC that implement the Cable Act, may limit our ability to access programming from cable-affiliated programmers at non-discriminatory rates.

We purchase a large percentage of our programming from cable-affiliated programmers. Pursuant to the Cable Act, cable providers had been prohibited from entering into exclusive contracts with cable-affiliated programmers. The Cable Act directed that this prohibition expire after a certain period of time unless the FCC determined that the prohibition continued to be necessary. On October 5, 2012, the FCC allowed this prohibition to expire. While the FCC has issued a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking aimed at serving some of the same objectives as the prohibition, there can be no assurances that such protections will be adopted or be as effective as the prohibition if they are adopted. In the event this decision is reconsidered by the FCC or reviewed by a court of appeals, we cannot predict the timing or outcome of any subsequent FCC decision.

#### Table of Contents

As a result of the expiration of this prohibition on exclusivity, we may be limited in our ability to obtain access at all, or on nondiscriminatory terms, to programming from programmers that are affiliated with cable system operators. In addition, any other changes in the Cable Act, and/or the FCC s rules that implement the Cable Act, that currently limit the ability of cable-affiliated programmers to discriminate against competing businesses such as ours, could adversely affect our ability to acquire cable-affiliated programming at all or to acquire programming on non-discriminatory terms.

Furthermore, the FCC had imposed program access conditions on certain cable companies as a result of mergers, consolidations or affiliations with programmers. The expiration of the exclusivity prohibition in the Cable Act triggered the termination of certain program access conditions that the FCC had imposed on Liberty. In July 2012, similar program access conditions that had applied to Time-Warner expired as previously scheduled. These developments may adversely affect our ability to obtain Liberty s and Time-Warner s programming, or to obtain it on non-discriminatory terms. In the case of certain types of programming affiliated with Comcast through its control of NBCUniversal, the prohibition on exclusivity will still apply until January 2018. During that time, we have the right to subject the terms of access to NBCUniversal s programming to binding arbitration if we and the programmer cannot reach agreement on terms, subject to FCC review. There can be no assurance that this procedure will result in favorable terms for us or that the FCC conditions that establish this procedure will be prevented from expiring on their own terms.

In addition, affiliates of certain cable providers have denied us access to sports programming they feed to their cable systems terrestrially, rather than by satellite. The FCC has held that new denials of such service are unfair if they have the purpose or effect of significantly hindering us from providing programming to consumers. However, we cannot be sure that we can prevail in a complaint related to such programming and gain access to it. Our continuing failure to access such programming could materially and adversely affect our ability to compete in regions serviced by these cable providers.

#### The injunction against our retransmission of distant networks, which is currently waived, may be reinstated.

Pursuant to STELA, we obtained a waiver of a court injunction that previously prevented us from retransmitting certain distant network signals under a statutory copyright license. Because of that waiver, we may provide distant network signals to eligible subscribers. To qualify for that waiver, we are required to provide local service in all 210 local markets in the U.S. on an ongoing basis. This condition poses a significant strain on our capacity. Moreover, we may lose that waiver if we are found to have failed to provide local service in any of the 210 local markets. If we lose the waiver, the injunction could be reinstated. Furthermore, depending on the severity of the failure, we may also be subject to other sanctions, which may include, among other things, damages. Pursuant to STELA, our compliance with certain conditions of the waiver is subject to continued oversight.

We are subject to significant regulatory oversight, and changes in applicable regulatory requirements, including any adoption or modification of laws or regulations relating to the Internet, could adversely affect our business.

Our operations, particularly our DBS operations and our wireless spectrum licenses, are subject to significant government regulation and oversight, primarily by the FCC and, to a certain extent, by Congress, other federal agencies and foreign, state and local authorities. Depending upon the circumstances, noncompliance with legislation or regulations promulgated by these authorities could result in the limitations on, or suspension or revocation of, our licenses or registrations, the termination or loss of contracts or the imposition of contractual damages, civil fines or criminal penalties, any of which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. Furthermore, the adoption or modification of laws or regulations relating to video programming, satellite services, wireless telecommunications, broadband, the Internet or other areas of our business could limit or otherwise adversely affect the manner in which we currently conduct our

business. If we become subject to new regulations or legislation or new interpretations of existing regulations or legislation that govern Internet network neutrality, for example, we may be required to incur additional expenses or alter our business model. The manner in which legislation governing Internet network neutrality may be interpreted and enforced cannot be precisely determined, which in turn could have an adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. You should review the regulatory disclosures under the caption *Item 1. Business Government Regulations* of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

<sup>40</sup> 

#### Our business depends on FCC licenses that can expire or be revoked or modified and applications for FCC licenses that may not be granted.

If the FCC were to cancel, revoke, suspend, restrict, significantly condition, or fail to renew any of our licenses or authorizations, or fail to grant our applications for FCC licenses, it could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. Specifically, loss of a frequency authorization would reduce the amount of spectrum available to us, potentially reducing the amount of services available to our subscribers. The materiality of such a loss of authorizations would vary based upon, among other things, the location of the frequency used or the availability of replacement spectrum. In addition, Congress often considers and enacts legislation that affects us and FCC proceedings to implement the Communications Act and enforce its regulations are ongoing. We cannot predict the outcomes of these legislative or regulatory proceedings or their effect on our business.

#### We are subject to digital HD carry-one, carry-all requirements that cause capacity constraints.

To provide any full-power local broadcast signal in any market, we are required to retransmit all qualifying broadcast signals in that market (carry-one, carry-all)). The FCC adopted digital carriage rules that required DBS providers to phase in carry-one, carry-all obligations with respect to the carriage of full-power broadcasters. HD signals by February 17, 2013 in markets in which they elect to provide local channels in HD. We have met this requirement in all applicable markets. In addition, STELA has imposed accelerated HD carriage requirements for noncommercial educational stations on DBS providers that do not have a certain contractual relationship with a certain number of such stations. We have entered into such contractual relationships with the requisite number of PBS stations to comply with the requirements. The carriage of additional HD signals on our pay-TV service could cause us to experience significant capacity constraints and prevent us from carrying additional popular national programs and/or carrying those national programs in HD.

In addition, there is a pending rulemaking before the FCC regarding whether to require DBS providers to carry all broadcast stations in a local market in both standard definition and HD if they carry any station in that market in both standard definition and HD. If we were required to carry multiple versions of each broadcast station, we would have to dedicate more of our finite satellite capacity to each broadcast station. We cannot predict the timing or outcome of this rulemaking process.

#### There can be no assurance that there will not be deficiencies leading to material weaknesses in our internal control over financial reporting.

We periodically evaluate and test our internal control over financial reporting to satisfy the requirements of Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. Our management has concluded that our internal control over financial reporting was effective as of December 31, 2013. If in the future we are unable to report that our internal control over financial reporting is effective (or if our auditors do not agree with our assessment of the effectiveness of, or are unable to express an opinion on, our internal control over financial reporting), investors, customers and business partners could lose confidence in the accuracy of our financial reports, which could in turn have a material adverse effect on our business, investor confidence in our financial results may weaken, and our stock price may suffer.

We may face other risks described from time to time in periodic and current reports we file with the SEC.

## Item 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS

None.

## Item 2. PROPERTIES

The following table sets forth certain information concerning our principal properties related to our business segments. We currently do not have any material properties related to our wireless segment.

	Segment(s)		Leased From	
	Using			Other
Description/Use/Location	Property	Owned	EchoStar (1)	Third Party
Corporate headquarters, Englewood, Colorado	DISH		Х	
Customer call center and general offices, Pine Brook, New Jersey	DISH			Х
Customer call center and general offices, Tulsa, Oklahoma	DISH			