

KLA TENCOR CORP
Form 10-Q
January 29, 2007
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-Q

(Mark One)

Quarterly Report Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934
For the quarterly period ended: September 30, 2006

or

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 0-9992

KLA-Tencor Corporation

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware
(State or other jurisdiction of
incorporation or organization)

160 Rio Robles
San Jose, California
95134

04-2564110
(I.R.S. Employer
Identification No.)

Edgar Filing: KLA TENCOR CORP - Form 10-Q

(Address of principal executive offices)

(Zip Code)

(408) 875-3000

(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

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 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 No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, or a non-accelerated filer. See definition of accelerated filer and large accelerated filer in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large accelerated filer Accelerated filer Non-accelerated filer

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

As of December 31, 2006 there were 199,725,957 shares of the Registrant's Common Stock, \$0.001 par value, outstanding.

Table of Contents

INDEX

	Page Number
<u>Explanatory Note Regarding Restatements</u>	3
<u>PART I FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u>	
Item 1 <u>Financial Statements (Unaudited)</u>	
<u>Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets as of September 30, 2006 and June 30, 2006</u>	4
<u>Condensed Consolidated Statements of Operations for the Three Months Ended September 30, 2006 and 2005</u>	5
<u>Condensed Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the Three Months Ended September 30, 2006 and 2005</u>	6
<u>Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements</u>	7
Item 2 <u>Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	33
Item 3 <u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</u>	53
Item 4 <u>Controls and Procedures</u>	54
<u>PART II OTHER INFORMATION</u>	
Item 1 <u>Legal Proceedings</u>	59
Item 1A <u>Risk Factors</u>	64
Item 2 <u>Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds</u>	74
Item 6 <u>Exhibits</u>	74
<u>SIGNATURES</u>	75
<u>EXHIBIT INDEX</u>	76

Table of Contents

EXPLANATORY NOTE REGARDING RESTATEMENTS

This Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for our quarter ended September 30, 2006 includes restatements of our condensed consolidated financial statements for our quarter ended September 30, 2005 (and related disclosures). See Note 2, Restatements of Consolidated Financial Statements and Special Committee and Company Findings, to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements for a detailed discussion of the effect of the restatements.

As a result of an investigation of our historical stock option practices by a Special Committee of our Board of Directors, we discovered that certain of our stock options, primarily those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002, had been retroactively priced for all employees who received these grants (less than 15% of these options were granted to executive officers). This means that the option exercise price was not the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date of the option, but instead was a lower market price on an earlier date. The actual grant date when the essential actions necessary to grant the option were completed, including the final determination of the number of shares to be granted to each employee and the exercise price is the correct measurement date to determine the market price of the option shares under the accounting rules in effect at the time. More than 95% of the total in-the-money value (market price on the actual grant date minus exercise price) of all of our retroactively priced options was attributable to those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002.

We previously applied Accounting Principles Board (APB) Opinion No. 25, Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees, and its related Interpretations and provided the required pro forma disclosures of Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 123, Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation, through the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. Under APB Opinion No. 25, a non-cash, stock-based compensation expense was recognized for any option for which the exercise price was below the market price on the actual grant date. Because each of our retroactively priced options had an exercise price below the market price on the actual grant date, there should have been a charge for each of these options under APB Opinion No. 25 equal to the number of option shares, multiplied by the difference between the exercise price and the market price on the actual grant date. That expense should have been amortized over the vesting period of the option. Starting in our fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, we adopted SFAS No. 123(R), Share-Based Payment. As a result, for fiscal year 2006, the additional stock-based compensation expense required to be recorded for each retroactively priced option was equal to the incremental fair value of these options on the actual grant date over the remaining vesting period of the option. We did not record these stock-based compensation expenses under APB Opinion No. 25 or SFAS No. 123(R) related to our retroactively priced options in our previously issued financial statements, and that is why we are restating them in this filing. To correct our past accounting for stock options, we recorded additional pre-tax, non-cash, stock-based compensation expense of (a) \$348 million for the periods July 1, 1994 to June 30, 2005 under APB Opinion No. 25 and (b) \$27 million for the period from July 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 under SFAS No. 123(R). We expect to amortize an additional \$1 million of such pre-tax charges under SFAS No. 123(R) in future periods to properly account for past retroactively priced option grants.

Management reviewed the findings of the Special Committee and conducted its own internal review of our past stock option grants and other aspects of our historical financial statements. Management agrees with the Special Committee that there was retroactive pricing of stock options granted to all option holders, primarily from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002. The restatements included in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q include adjustments arising from the Special Committee investigation and management's internal review.

Unless otherwise noted, all of the information in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q is as of September 30, 2006. This Report does not reflect any subsequent events that occurred after September 30, 2006 other than the Special Committee investigation, resulting restatements and related matters. We will later restate our previously filed financial statements for the quarters ended December 31, 2005 and March 31, 2006 when included in our Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q for the quarters ended December 31, 2006 and March 31, 2007, respectively. We have not amended and do not intend to amend any of our previously filed Annual Reports on Form 10-K or Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q for the periods affected by the restatements. Such previous filings should not be relied upon.

Table of Contents**PART I. FINANCIAL INFORMATION****ITEM 1. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Unaudited)**

KLA-TENCOR CORPORATION

Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets

(Unaudited)

<i>(in thousands)</i>	September 30, 2006	June 30, 2006
ASSETS		
Current assets:		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 1,199,969	\$ 1,129,191
Marketable securities	1,225,814	1,196,605
Accounts receivable, net	415,403	439,899
Inventories	490,988	449,156
Deferred income taxes	253,691	253,811
Other current assets	63,166	74,581
Total current assets	3,649,031	3,543,243
Land, property and equipment, net	394,239	395,412
Other assets	647,913	637,256
Total assets	\$ 4,691,183	\$ 4,575,911
LIABILITIES, MINORITY INTEREST AND STOCKHOLDERS EQUITY		
Current liabilities:		
Accounts payable	\$ 107,247	\$ 95,192
Deferred system profit	218,589	226,142
Unearned revenue	81,448	80,543
Other current liabilities	534,673	600,604
Total current liabilities	941,957	1,002,481
Commitments and contingencies (Note 11)		
Minority interest in subsidiary	4,086	5,439
Stockholders' equity:		
Common stock and capital in excess of par value	1,476,483	1,421,373
Retained earnings	2,249,472	2,137,710
Accumulated other comprehensive income	19,185	8,908
Total stockholders' equity	3,745,140	3,567,991
Total liabilities, minority interest and stockholders' equity	\$ 4,691,183	\$ 4,575,911

See accompanying notes to condensed consolidated financial statements (unaudited).

Table of Contents

KLA-TENCOR CORPORATION

Condensed Consolidated Statements of Operations

(Unaudited)

<i>(in thousands except per share data)</i>	Three months ended September 30, 2005	
	2006	As restated (1)
Revenues:		
Product	\$ 530,927	\$ 399,001
Service	98,436	85,260
Total revenues	629,363	484,261
Costs and operating expenses:		
Costs of revenues*	270,119	215,137
Engineering, research and development*	99,293	98,770
Selling, general and administrative*	105,961	95,364
Total costs and operating expenses	475,373	409,271
Income from operations	153,990	74,990
Interest income and other, net	22,457	14,076
Income before income taxes and minority interest	176,447	89,066
Provision for income taxes	41,368	14,324
Income before minority interest	135,079	74,742
Minority interest	843	745
Net income	\$ 135,922	\$ 75,487
Net income per share:		
Basic	\$ 0.68	\$ 0.38
Diluted	\$ 0.67	\$ 0.37
Weighted-average number of shares:		
Basic	199,416	197,408
Diluted	203,323	203,292

* includes the following amounts related to equity awards

Costs of revenues	\$ 8,587	\$ 7,178
Engineering, research and development	11,705	13,029
Selling, general and administrative	16,755	19,520

Edgar Filing: KLA TENCOR CORP - Form 10-Q

- (1) See Note 2, Restatements of Consolidated Financial Statements and Special Committee and Company Findings, to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements (unaudited)

See accompanying notes to condensed consolidated financial statements (unaudited).

Table of Contents

KLA-TENCOR CORPORATION

Condensed Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows

(Unaudited)

<i>(in thousands)</i>	Three months ended September 30, 2005	
	2006	As restated (1)
Cash flows from operating activities:		
Net income	\$ 135,922	\$ 75,487
Adjustments to reconcile net income to net cash provided by operating activities:		
Depreciation and amortization	14,798	17,814
Non-cash, stock-based compensation	37,047	39,727
Tax benefit from employee stock options	465	7,354
Excess tax benefit from stock-based compensation cost	(1,045)	(4,491)
Minority interest	(843)	(745)
Net loss (gain) on sale of marketable securities and other investments	2,199	(441)
Changes in assets and liabilities, net of effect of acquisitions of businesses:		
Accounts receivable, net	20,626	20,984
Inventories	(43,104)	(37,967)
Other assets	991	(13,027)
Accounts payable	12,209	(9,288)
Deferred system profit	(7,553)	(27,631)
Other current liabilities	(64,744)	(55,287)
Net cash provided by operating activities	106,968	12,489
Cash flows from investing activities:		
Capital expenditures, net	(12,313)	(18,049)
Purchase of available-for-sale securities	(1,156,837)	(1,236,258)
Proceeds from sale of available-for-sale securities	1,001,712	1,260,882
Proceeds from maturity of available-for-sale securities	133,271	63,036
Net cash (used in) provided by investing activities	(34,167)	69,611
Cash flows from financing activities:		
Issuance of common stock	18,600	56,142
Stock repurchases		(35,488)
Payment of dividends to stockholders	(24,160)	(23,709)
Proceeds from sale of minority interest in subsidiary		1,579
Excess tax benefit from stock-based compensation cost	1,045	4,491
Net cash (used in) provided by financing activities	(4,515)	3,015
Effect of exchange rate changes on cash and cash equivalents	2,492	244
Net increase in cash and cash equivalents	70,778	85,359
Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of period	1,129,191	663,163
Cash and cash equivalents at end of period	\$ 1,199,969	\$ 748,522

Edgar Filing: KLA TENCOR CORP - Form 10-Q

Supplemental cash flow disclosures:

Income taxes paid, net	\$	83,868	\$	8,660
Interest paid	\$	737	\$	297

(1) See Note 2, Restatements of Consolidated Financial Statements and Special Committee and Company Findings, to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements (unaudited)
See accompanying notes to condensed consolidated financial statements (unaudited).

Table of Contents

KLA-TENCOR CORPORATION

Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements

(Unaudited)

NOTE 1 BASIS OF PRESENTATION

Basis of Presentation. The condensed consolidated financial statements have been prepared by KLA-Tencor Corporation ("KLA-Tencor" or the "Company") pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"). Certain information and footnote disclosures normally included in financial statements prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America have been condensed or omitted pursuant to such rules and regulations. In the opinion of management, the unaudited interim financial statements reflect all adjustments (consisting only of normal, recurring adjustments) necessary for a fair statement of the financial position, results of operations and cash flows for the periods indicated. These financial statements and notes, however, should be read in conjunction with Item 8, "Financial Statements and Supplementary Data" included in the Company's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, filed with the SEC on January 29, 2007.

The condensed consolidated financial statements include the accounts of KLA-Tencor and its majority-owned subsidiaries, and the ownership interests of minority investors are recorded as minority interests. All significant intercompany balances and transactions have been eliminated. The Company has included the results of operations of acquired companies from the date of acquisition. See Note 5 "Business Combinations."

The results of operations for the three month period ended September 30, 2006 are not necessarily indicative of the results that may be expected for any other interim period or for the full fiscal year ending June 30, 2007.

Management Estimates. The preparation of the condensed consolidated financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities at the date of the condensed consolidated financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting periods. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Recent Accounting Pronouncements. In September 2006, the SEC staff issued Staff Accounting Bulletin ("SAB") No. 108, "Considering the Effects of Prior Year Misstatements when Quantifying Misstatements in Current Year Financial Statements." SAB No. 108 was issued in order to eliminate the diversity of practice surrounding how public companies quantify financial statement misstatements. SAB No. 108 requires registrants to quantify the impact of correcting all misstatements using both the "rollover" method, which focuses primarily on the impact of a misstatement on the income statement and is the method that was previously used by the Company, and the "iron curtain" method, which focuses primarily on the effect of correcting the period-end balance sheet. The use of both of these methods is referred to as the "dual approach" and should be combined with the evaluation of qualitative elements surrounding the errors in accordance with SAB No. 99, "Materiality." The provisions of SAB No. 108 are effective for the Company for fiscal years beginning July 1, 2006. The adoption of SAB No. 108 did not have a material impact on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

Table of Contents

In September 2006, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued Statement of Financial Accounting Standard (SFAS) No. 157, Fair Value Measurements. SFAS No. 157 defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and expands disclosures about fair value measurements. The provisions of SFAS No. 157 are effective for the Company for fiscal years beginning July 1, 2008. The Company is evaluating the impact of the provisions of this statement on its consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

In September 2006, the FASB issued SFAS No. 158, Employers Accounting for Defined Benefit Pension and Other Postretirement Plans. SFAS No. 158 requires employers to fully recognize the obligations associated with single-employer defined benefit pension, retiree healthcare and other post-retirement plans in their financial statements. The provisions of SFAS No. 158 are effective for the Company as of the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2007. The Company is evaluating the impact of the provisions of this statement on its consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

In June 2006, the FASB published FASB Interpretation No. 48 (FIN), Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes an interpretation of FASB Statement No. 109 which clarifies the accounting for uncertainty in income taxes recognized in an enterprise s financial statements in accordance with SFAS No. 109, Accounting for Income Taxes. This Interpretation prescribes a recognition threshold and measurement attribute for the financial statement recognition and measurement of a tax position taken or expected to be taken in a tax return. This Interpretation also provides guidance on derecognition, classification, interest and penalties, accounting in interim periods, disclosure, and transition. This Interpretation is effective for the Company in fiscal years beginning July 1, 2007. The Company is evaluating the impact of the provisions of this Interpretation on its consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

In February 2006, the FASB issued SFAS No. 155, Accounting for Certain Hybrid Financial Instruments, an amendment of SFAS No. 133, Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities, and SFAS No. 140, Accounting for Transfers and Servicing of Financial Assets and Extinguishments of Liabilities. This Statement permits fair value remeasurement for any hybrid financial instrument that contains an embedded derivative that otherwise would require bifurcation. This Statement is effective for the Company for all financial instruments acquired or issued after July 1, 2007. The adoption of SFAS No. 155 is not expected to have a material effect on the Company s consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In June 2005, the FASB issued SFAS No. 154, Accounting Changes and Error Corrections, a replacement of APB Opinion No. 20, Accounting Changes, and SFAS No. 3, Reporting Accounting Changes in Interim Financial Statements. SFAS No. 154 changes the requirements for the accounting for and reporting of a change in accounting principle. Previously, most voluntary changes in accounting principles required recognition via a cumulative effect adjustment within net income of the period of the change. SFAS No. 154 requires retrospective application to prior periods financial statements, unless it is impracticable to determine either the period-specific effects or the cumulative effect of the change. SFAS No. 154 is effective for the Company for accounting changes made in fiscal years beginning July 1, 2006; however, the Statement does not change the transition provisions of any existing accounting pronouncements. The adoption of SFAS No. 154 did not have a material effect on the Company s consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In March 2005, the FASB published FIN No. 47, Accounting for Conditional Asset Retirement Obligations, which clarifies that the term, conditional asset retirement obligation, as used in SFAS No. 143, Accounting for Asset Retirement Obligations, refers to a legal obligation to perform an asset retirement activity in which the timing and (or) method of settlement are conditional on a future event that may or may not be within the control of the entity. The uncertainty about the timing and (or) method of settlement

Table of Contents

of a conditional asset retirement obligation should be factored into the measurement of the liability when sufficient information exists. The Interpretation also clarifies when an entity would have sufficient information to reasonably estimate the fair value of an asset retirement obligation. The adoption of this Interpretation did not have a material effect on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In December 2004, the FASB issued SFAS No. 153, *Exchanges of Nonmonetary Assets*, an amendment of APB Opinion No. 29. SFAS No. 153 addresses the measurement of exchanges of nonmonetary assets and redefines the scope of transactions that should be measured based on the fair value of the assets exchanged. SFAS No. 153 was effective for the Company for nonmonetary asset exchanges beginning in the first quarter of fiscal 2006. The adoption of SFAS No. 153 did not have a material effect on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In November 2004, the FASB issued SFAS No. 151, *Inventory Costs*, an amendment of Accounting Research Bulletin (ARB) No. 43, Chapter 4. SFAS No. 151 clarifies that abnormal inventory costs such as costs of idle facilities, excess freight and handling costs, and wasted materials (spoilage) are required to be recognized as current period charges. The provisions of SFAS No. 151 are effective for the Company for fiscal years beginning July 1, 2005. The adoption of SFAS No. 151 did not have a material impact on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

NOTE 2 RESTATEMENTS OF CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND COMPANY FINDINGS

Special Committee Investigation of Historical Stock Option Practices

On May 22, 2006, the Wall Street Journal published an article about stock option backdating that questioned the stock option practices at several companies, including KLA-Tencor. On May 23, 2006, the Company received a subpoena from the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of California (USAO) and a letter of inquiry from the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regarding the Company's stock option practices. Later on May 23, 2006, the Board of Directors appointed a Special Committee composed solely of independent directors to conduct a comprehensive investigation of the historical stock option practices. The Special Committee promptly engaged independent legal counsel and accounting experts to assist with the investigation. The investigation included an extensive review of the Company's historical stock option practices, accounting policies, accounting records, supporting documentation, email communications and other documentation, as well as interviews of a number of current and former directors, officers and employees. On September 27, 2006, the Special Committee reported the bulk of its findings and recommendations to the Board of Directors.

Findings and Remedial Actions

On September 28, 2006, the Company announced that it would have to restate its previously issued financial statements to correct its past accounting for stock options. As a result of the Special Committee investigation, the Company discovered that certain of its stock options, primarily those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002, had been retroactively priced for all employees who received these grants. This means that the option exercise price was not the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date of the option, but instead was a lower market price on an earlier date. The actual grant date when the essential actions necessary to grant the option were completed, including the final determination of the number of shares to be granted to each employee and the

Table of Contents

exercise price is the correct measurement date to determine the market price of the option shares under the accounting rules in effect at the time. More than 95% of the total in-the-money value (market price on the actual grant date minus exercise price) of all of the Company's retroactively priced options was attributable to those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002.

The Company previously applied Accounting Principles Board (APB) Opinion No. 25, Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees, and its related Interpretations and provided the required pro forma disclosures under Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 123, Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation through its fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. Under APB Opinion No. 25, a non-cash, stock-based compensation expense was required to be recognized for any option for which the exercise price was below the market price on the actual grant date. Because each of the Company's retroactively priced options had an exercise price below the market price on the actual grant date, there should have been a non-cash charge for each of these options under APB Opinion No. 25 equal to the number of option shares, multiplied by the difference between the exercise price and the market price on the actual grant date. That expense should have been amortized over the vesting period of the option. Starting in its fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, the Company adopted SFAS No. 123(R), Share-Based Payment. As a result, beginning in fiscal year 2006, the additional stock-based compensation expense required to be recorded for each retroactively priced option is equal to the incremental fair value of the option on the actual grant date, amortized over the remaining vesting period of the option. The Company did not record these stock-based compensation expenses under APB Opinion No. 25 or SFAS No. 123(R) related to its retroactively priced options in the Company's previously issued financial statements, and that is why the Company is restating them in this filing. To correct the Company's past accounting for stock options, it recorded additional pre-tax, non-cash, stock-based compensation expense of (a) \$348 million for the periods from July 1, 1994 to June 30, 2005 under APB Opinion No. 25 and (b) \$27 million for the period from July 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 under SFAS No. 123(R). The Company expects to amortize an additional \$1 million of such pre-tax charges under SFAS No. 123(R) in future periods to properly account for past retroactively priced stock options.

By October 16, 2006, the Special Committee had substantially completed its investigation. The Special Committee concluded that (1) there was retroactive pricing of stock options granted to all employees who received options, primarily during the periods from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002 (less than 15% of these options were granted to executive officers), (2) the retroactively priced options were not accounted for correctly in the Company's previously issued financial statements, (3) the retroactive pricing of options was intentional, not inadvertent or through administrative error, (4) the retroactive pricing of options involved the selection of fortuitously low exercise prices by certain former executive officers, and other former executives may have been aware of this conduct, (5) the retroactive pricing of options involved the falsification of Company records, resulting in erroneous statements being made in financial and other reports previously filed with the SEC, as well as in information previously provided to the Company's independent registered public accounting firm, and (6) in most instances, the retroactive pricing of options violated the terms of the Company's stock option plans. Because virtually all holders of retroactively priced options issued by the Company were not involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing, the Board of Directors decided that the Company should continue to honor the options that violated the terms of the Company's stock option plans, except in certain individual cases as described below.

The Special Committee concluded that, with a few immaterial exceptions, the retroactive pricing of stock options stopped after June 30, 2002. After that time, there were procedures in place to provide reasonable assurance that stock options were priced on the grant date. The Special Committee also concluded that none of the Company's independent Directors was involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing of stock options. Based on the Special Committee's report, the Board of Directors concluded that no current members of management were involved in the retroactive pricing of stock options. During its investigation of the Company's historical stock option practices, the Special Committee did not find evidence of any other financial reporting or accounting issues.

As a result of the Special Committee investigation, on October 16, 2006, the Company terminated its employment relationship and agreement with Kenneth L. Schroeder, and the Company announced its intent to cancel all outstanding stock options held by

Table of Contents

Mr. Schroeder that were retroactively priced or otherwise improperly granted. Those options were canceled in December 2006. Mr. Schroeder was the Company's Chief Executive Officer and a member of its Board of Directors from mid-1999 until January 1, 2006, and was a member of the Company's stock option committee from 1994 until December 31, 2005. From January 1, 2006 to October 16, 2006, Mr. Schroeder was employed as a Senior Advisor to the Company. On November 10, 2006, Mr. Schroeder's counsel informed the Company that Mr. Schroeder contests the Company's right to terminate his employment relationship and agreement and to cancel any of his options. The Company intends to vigorously defend any claims that may be made by Mr. Schroeder regarding these matters, which could involve a material amount.

Also on October 16, 2006, Stuart J. Nichols, Vice President and General Counsel, resigned. Mr. Nichols and the Company entered into a Separation Agreement and General Release under which Mr. Nichols' outstanding retroactively priced stock options have been re-priced by increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006.

On October 16, 2006, Kenneth Levy, Founder and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Company, retired as a director and employee, and was named Chairman Emeritus by the Board of Directors. Mr. Levy and the Company entered into a Separation Agreement and General Release under which Mr. Levy's outstanding retroactively priced stock options have been re-priced by increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006. Mr. Levy was the Company's Chief Executive Officer from 1975 until mid-1999 (with the exception of mid-1997 to mid-1998), was a member of the Company's Board of Directors from 1975 until his retirement, was Chairman of the Board of Directors from 1999 until his retirement, and was a member of the Company's stock option committee from 1994 until use of that committee was suspended in the fall of 2006.

On December 21, 2006, Jon D. Tompkins resigned as a director of the Company, and the Company agreed to modify the outstanding options held by Mr. Tompkins (all of which were fully vested) to extend the post-termination exercisability period to December 31, 2007, which is the last day of the calendar year in which those options would have terminated in the absence of such extension. Mr. Tompkins, the Chief Executive Officer of Tencor Instruments before its merger into the Company in mid-1997, was the Company's Chief Executive Officer from mid-1997 to mid-1998, was a member of the Company's stock option committee from mid-1997 until mid-1999, and was a member of the Company's Board of Directors from mid-1997 until his resignation.

Although the Board of Directors concluded that John H. Kispert, the Company's President and Chief Operating Officer, was not involved in and was not aware of the improper stock option practices, based on the Special Committee's recommendation, his outstanding retroactively priced options have been re-priced because he served as Chief Financial Officer during part of the period in question. This re-pricing involved increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006.

Table of Contents*Restatement and Impact on Financial Statements*

In addition to restating the consolidated financial statements in response to the Special Committee's findings, the Company is recording additional non-cash adjustments that were previously considered to be immaterial relating primarily to the accounting for employee stock purchase plans, corrections for the recognition of deferred tax assets, the release of tax reserves, the timing of revenue recognition, gains and losses on hedging contracts and the calculation of minority interest. The Company has also corrected the classification of certain amounts presented as cash and cash equivalents and marketable securities relating to investments in Variable Rate Demand Notes. For the fiscal years ended June 30, 2004 and prior, the Company previously recorded no stock-based compensation expense; therefore, the additional stock-based compensation expense noted below represents the total stock-based compensation expense for these periods. For the year ended June 30, 2005, the Company recorded \$2.9 million of stock-based compensation with a related tax benefit of \$1.1 million in its previously reported financial statements. For fiscal 2005, total stock-based compensation was \$37.0 million with a related tax benefit of \$12.1 million. The income statement impact of the restatement is as follows (in thousands):

Years ended June 30,	Total effect			Cumulative		
	at June 30, 2005	2005	2004	effect at July 1, 2003	2003	2002
Net income, as previously reported		\$ 466,695	\$ 243,701			
Additional compensation expense resulting from improper measurement dates for stock option grants	\$ (347,817)	(34,086)	(53,208)	\$ (260,523)	(70,032)	(76,582)
Tax related effects	117,776	12,149	22,320	83,307	22,866	25,009
Additional compensation expense resulting from improper measurement dates for stock option grants, net of tax	(230,041)	(21,937)	(30,888)	(177,216)	(47,166)	(51,573)
Other adjustments, net of tax	(991)	291	(337)	(945)		
Total decrease to net income	\$ (231,032)	(21,646)	(31,225)	\$ (178,161)		
Net income, as restated		\$ 445,049	\$ 212,476			

Years ended June 30,	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996	1995
Additional compensation expense resulting from improper measurement dates for stock option grants	\$ (59,261)	\$ (23,296)	\$ (17,630)	\$ (5,219)	\$ (2,852)	\$ (2,747)	\$ (2,904)
Tax related effects	17,262	7,198	6,054	1,861	1,036	983	1,038
Additional compensation expense resulting from improper measurement dates for stock option grants, net of tax	\$ (41,999)	\$ (16,098)	\$ (11,576)	\$ (3,358)	\$ (1,816)	\$ (1,764)	\$ (1,866)

The Company adopted SFAS No. 123(R) effective July 1, 2005. The grant date fair values of stock options granted prior to fiscal year 2006 were changed as a result of the findings that certain stock option grants were retroactively priced. This change resulted in additional stock-based compensation expense of \$22 million (and a related tax benefit of \$12 million) being recognized in fiscal year 2006 and \$5 million (and a related tax benefit of \$1.6 million) in the quarter ended September 30, 2006 under SFAS No. 123(R).

The cumulative effect of the restatements up through June 30, 2003 increased additional paid-in capital by \$356 million from \$815 million to \$1.2 billion, increased deferred stock-based compensation from zero to \$130 million, decreased retained earnings by \$178 million from \$1.4 billion to \$1.2 billion, and increased total stockholders' equity by \$49 million from \$2.2 billion to \$2.3 billion.

Diluted shares in fiscal years 2004 and 2005 also increased as a result of the restatement adjustments to correct the past accounting for stock options that were retroactively priced. The Company uses the treasury stock method to calculate the weighted-average shares used in the diluted EPS calculation. As part of the restatement, the Company revised its treasury stock calculations in accordance with SFAS No. 128, Earnings Per Share. These calculations assume that (i) all retroactively priced options are exercised, (ii) the Company repurchases shares with the proceeds of

Edgar Filing: KLA TENCOR CORP - Form 10-Q

these hypothetical exercises along with the tax benefit resulting from the hypothetical exercises, and (iii) any unamortized deferred stock-based compensation is also used to repurchase shares.

Table of Contents

In addition, the Company evaluated the impact of the restatement on its global tax provision. The Company and its subsidiaries file tax returns in multiple tax jurisdictions around the world. In certain jurisdictions, including, but not limited to, the United States and the United Kingdom, the Company is able to claim a tax deduction relative to stock options. In those jurisdictions, where a tax deduction is claimed, the Company has recorded deferred tax assets, totaling \$51.6 million at June 30, 2005, to reflect future tax deductions to the extent the Company believes such assets to be recoverable. The Company also believes that it should not have taken a United States tax deduction in prior years for stock option related amounts pertaining to certain executives under Internal Revenue Code (IRC) Section 162 (m). Section 162 (m) limits the deductibility of compensation above certain thresholds. The Company has determined that excess deductions were taken on prior tax returns due to the finding that retroactive pricing of certain stock options occurred. As a result, the Company's tax liabilities have increased by approximately \$8 million.

Because virtually all holders of retroactively priced options issued by the Company were not involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing, the Company has taken and intends to take certain actions to deal with the adverse tax consequences that may be incurred by the holders of retroactively priced options. The adverse tax consequences are that retroactively priced stock options vesting after December 31, 2004 (409A Affected Options) subject the option holder to a penalty tax under IRC Section 409A (and, as applicable, similar penalty taxes under California and other state tax laws). One such action by the Company is to offer to amend the 409A Affected Options to increase the exercise price to the market price on the actual grant date or, if lower, the market price at the time of the amendment. The amended options would not be subject to taxation under IRC Section 409A. Under IRS regulations, these option amendments had to be completed by December 31, 2006 for anyone who was an executive officer when he or she received 409A Affected Options; the amendments for non-officers cannot be offered until after this Report is filed and do not need to be completed until December 31, 2007. Another action is to approve bonuses payable to holders of the amended options to compensate them for the resulting increase in their option exercise price. The amount of these bonuses would be effectively repaid to the Company if and when the options are exercised and the increased exercise price is paid (but there is no assurance that the options will be exercised). Finally, the Company intends to compensate certain option holders who have already exercised 409A Affected Options for the additional taxes they incur under IRC Section 409A (and, as applicable, similar state tax laws).

Three of the Company's option holders were subject to the December 31, 2006 deadline described above. Accordingly, in December 2006, the Company offered to amend the 409A Affected Options held by Mr. Wallace, the Company's Chief Executive Officer, and two former executive officers to increase the exercise price so that these options will not subject the option holder to a penalty tax under IRC Section 409A. All three individuals accepted the Company's offer. In addition, the Company agreed to pay each of the three individuals a cash bonus in January 2008 equal to the aggregate increase in the exercise prices for his amended options. For Mr. Wallace, the amount of this bonus is \$0.4 million. To account for these actions, the Company will record a net charge of \$0.3 million in the quarter ended December 31, 2006. The Company plans to take similar actions with respect to the outstanding 409A Affected Options granted to non-officers as soon as possible after the filing of this Report. The Company estimates that the total cash payments needed to deal with the adverse tax consequences of retroactively priced options granted to non-officers will be approximately \$30 million.

With respect to the individuals whose options were canceled or re-priced by the Company following the Special Committee investigation, no bonuses of the type described above will be paid.

The following tables have been revised to reflect the impact of the additional non-cash charges for stock-based compensation expense and related tax effects as well as additional non-cash adjustments that were previously considered to be immaterial and the correct classification as marketable securities of Variable Rate Demand Notes on:

the condensed consolidated statements of operations for the three months ended September 30, 2005.

the condensed consolidated statements of cash flows for the three months ended September 30, 2005.

Table of Contents

Condensed Consolidated Statements of Operations

(Unaudited)

<i>(In thousands, except per share data)</i>	Three Months Ended September 30, 2005		
	As previously reported	Adjustments	As restated
Revenues:			
Product	\$ 399,950	\$ (949)	\$ 399,001
Service	83,910	1,350	85,260
Total revenues	483,860	401	484,261
Costs and operating expenses:			
Costs of revenues*	214,220	917	215,137
Engineering, research and development*	96,751	2,019	98,770
Selling, general and administrative*	92,051	3,313	95,364
Total costs and operating expenses	403,022	6,249	409,271
Income from operations	80,838	(5,848)	74,990
Interest income and other, net	14,776	(700)	14,076
Income before income taxes and minority interest	95,614	(6,548)	89,066
Provision for income taxes	19,681	(5,357)	14,324
Income before minority interest	75,933	(1,191)	74,742
Minority interest	745		745
Net income	\$ 76,678	\$ (1,191)	\$ 75,487
Net income per share:			
Basic	\$ 0.39	\$ (0.01)	\$ 0.38
Diluted	\$ 0.38	\$ (0.01)	\$ 0.37
Weighted-average number of shares:			
Basic	197,408		197,408
Diluted	202,715	577	203,292

* includes the following amounts related to equity awards

Costs of revenues	\$ 6,811	\$ 367	\$ 7,178
Engineering, research and development	11,010	2,019	13,029
Selling, general and administrative	17,007	2,513	19,520

Table of Contents

Condensed Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows

(in thousands)

	Three Months Ended September 30, 2005		
	As previously reported	Adjustments	As restated
Cash flows from operating activities:			
Net income	\$ 76,678	\$ (1,191)	\$ 75,487
Adjustments to reconcile net income to net cash provided by operating activities:			
Depreciation and amortization	17,114	700	17,814
Non-cash, stock-based compensation	34,828	4,899	39,727
Minority interest	(745)		(745)
Net gain on sale of marketable securities and other investments	(441)		(441)
Tax benefit from employee stock options	14,145	(6,791)	7,354
Excess tax benefit from stock-based compensation cost	(5,018)	527	(4,491)
Changes in assets and liabilities:			
Accounts receivable, net	21,141	(157)	20,984
Inventories	(36,310)	(1,657)	(37,967)
Other assets	(15,085)	2,058	(13,027)
Accounts payable	(9,288)		(9,288)
Deferred system profit	(29,552)	1,921	(27,631)
Other current liabilities	(55,505)	218	(55,287)
Net cash provided by operating activities	11,962	527	12,489
Cash flows from investing activities:			
Purchase of property, plant and equipment	(18,049)		(18,049)
Purchase of available-for-sale securities	(1,236,258)		(1,236,258)
Proceeds from sale of available-for-sale securities	1,260,882		1,260,882
Proceeds from maturity of available-for-sale securities	63,036		63,036
Net cash provided by investing activities	69,611		69,611
Cash flows from financing activities:			
Issuance of common stock	56,142		56,142
Payment of dividends to stockholders	(23,709)		(23,709)
Excess tax benefit from stock-based compensation cost	5,018	(527)	4,491
Stock repurchases	(35,488)		(35,488)
Proceeds from sale of minority interest in subsidiary	1,579		1,579
Net cash provided by financing activities	3,542	(527)	3,015
Effect of exchange rate changes on cash and cash equivalents	244		244
Net increase in cash and cash equivalents	85,359		85,359
Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of period	663,163		663,163
Cash and cash equivalents at end of period	\$ 748,522	\$	\$ 748,522
Supplemental cash flow disclosures:			
Income taxes paid, net	\$ 8,660		\$ 8,660
Interest paid	\$ 297		\$ 297

Table of Contents

In the third quarter of fiscal 2006, the Company corrected the classification of its Variable Rate Demand Notes with reset dates of 90 days or less, moving them from cash equivalents to short-term investments on the Consolidated Balance Sheets. All Balance Sheets in these consolidated financial statements present Variable Rate Demand Notes in marketable securities.

Also, as a result of these changes, purchases and sales of Variable Rate Demand Notes are now presented as investing activities, rather than as changes in cash and cash equivalents. The impact of this change on the Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows was as follows:

Three months ended September 30, 2005
As originally

<i>(in thousands)</i>	reported	As restated
Cash used for purchase of available-for-sale securities	\$ (950,852)	\$ (1,236,258)
Proceeds from sale of available-for-sale securities	\$ 884,090	\$ 1,260,882
Proceeds from maturity of available-for-sale securities	\$ 58,336	\$ 63,036
Net cash (used in) provided by investing activities	\$ (26,475)	\$ 69,611

Edgar Filing: KLA TENCOR CORP - Form 10-Q

Other	10,278	10,335
	\$ 647,913	\$ 637,256
Other current liabilities		
Warranty and retrofit	\$ 53,409	\$ 50,604
Compensation and benefits	276,351	281,815
Income taxes payable	84,610	126,750
Other accrued expenses	120,303	141,435
	\$ 534,673	\$ 600,604

Table of Contents**NOTE 4 GOODWILL AND OTHER INTANGIBLE ASSETS****Goodwill**

The carrying value of goodwill was \$49.4 million and \$49.3 million as of September 30, 2006 and June 30, 2006, respectively, and was allocated to KLA-Tencor's reporting units pursuant to SFAS No. 142, Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets. In accordance with SFAS No. 142, KLA-Tencor completed its annual evaluation of the goodwill by reporting unit during the quarter ended December 31, 2005, and concluded that there was no impairment. There have been no significant events or circumstances affecting the valuation of goodwill subsequent to the impairment test performed in the second quarter of fiscal year 2006.

Other Intangible Assets

The components of other intangible assets as of September 30, 2006 and June 30, 2006 were as follows (in thousands):

	September 30, 2006			June 30, 2006		
	Gross Carrying Amount	Accumulated Amortization	Net Amount	Gross Carrying Amount	Accumulated Amortization	Net Amount
Existing technology	\$ 13,078	\$ 5,471	\$ 7,607	\$ 13,078	\$ 5,018	\$ 8,060
Patents	18,161	5,972	12,189	18,161	5,622	12,539
Trademark	1,225	796	429	1,225	775	450
Other	200	200		200	200	
Total	\$ 32,664	\$ 12,439	\$ 20,225	\$ 32,664	\$ 11,615	\$ 21,049

During the three months ended September 30, 2005, the Company entered into an agreement to license certain patents for approximately \$13.4 million which will be amortized over a period of 10 years. For the three month periods ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, amortization expense for other intangible assets was \$0.8 million and \$1.2 million, respectively. Based on the intangible assets recorded as of September 30, 2006, and assuming no subsequent additions to, or impairment of the underlying assets, the remaining estimated amortization expense is expected to be as follows (in thousands):

Fiscal year ending June 30:	Amount
2007 (remaining 9 months)	\$ 2,551
2008	3,030
2009	2,906
2010	2,906
2011	2,906
Thereafter	5,926
Total	\$ 20,225

Table of Contents**NOTE 5 BUSINESS COMBINATIONS**

The business combinations completed during fiscal years 2006 and 2005 are disclosed in Note 6 to Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 8 of the Company's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006.

In connection with the acquisitions completed during fiscal year 2005, KLA-Tencor is subject to a \$9.1 million contingent cash payment based on the continued employment of certain employees over two years. The contingency is accounted for as compensation expense over the contingent employment period. During the second quarter of fiscal 2006, \$5.4 million of this amount was paid. As of September 30, 2006, \$3.7 million of this payment remains outstanding.

NOTE 6 EARNINGS PER SHARE

Basic earnings per share (EPS) is calculated by dividing net income available to common stockholders by the weighted-average number of common shares outstanding during the period. Diluted earnings per share is calculated by using the weighted-average number of common shares outstanding during the period increased to include the number of additional shares of common stock that would have been outstanding if the dilutive potential shares of common stock had been issued. The dilutive effect of outstanding options and restricted stock is reflected in diluted earnings per share by application of the treasury stock method, which includes consideration of stock-based compensation required by SFAS No. 123(R), Share-Based Payment and SFAS No. 128, Earnings Per Share.

The following table sets forth the computation of basic and diluted earnings per share (in thousands, except per share amounts):

	Three months ended September 30, 2005	
	2006	As restated
Numerator:		
Net Income	\$ 135,922	\$ 75,487
Denominator:		
Weighted-average shares outstanding, excluding unvested restricted stock	199,416	197,408
Effect of dilutive options and restricted stock	3,907	5,884
Denominator for diluted earnings per share	203,323	203,292
Basic earnings per share	\$ 0.68	\$ 0.38
Diluted earnings per share	\$ 0.67	\$ 0.37

Potentially dilutive securities that were excluded from the computation of diluted earnings per share for the above periods because their effect would have been anti-dilutive were as follows (in thousands except price data):

	Three months ended September 30, 2006	
	2006	2005
Number of shares	20,179	15,293

Table of Contents

During the third quarter of fiscal 2005, the Company's Board of Directors authorized a quarterly cash dividend of \$0.12 per share. The total amount of dividends paid during the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was \$24.2 million and \$23.7 million, respectively.

NOTE 7 STOCK-BASED COMPENSATION

Effective July 1, 2005, KLA-Tencor adopted the provisions of SFAS No. 123(R), Share-Based Payment. SFAS No. 123(R) establishes accounting for stock-based awards exchanged for employee services. Accordingly, stock-based compensation cost is measured at grant date, based on the fair value of the award, and is recognized as expense over the employee's requisite service period. The Company previously applied APB Opinion No. 25, Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees, and its related Interpretations and provided the required pro forma disclosures of SFAS No. 123, Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation.

During the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, the Company granted approximately 0.2 million and 4.0 million stock options with an estimated total grant date fair value of \$1.9 million and \$43.2 million after estimated forfeitures, respectively. During the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, the Company recorded stock-based compensation related to stock options of \$30.0 million and \$34.5 million, respectively. During the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, the Company recorded \$5 million and \$5 million, respectively, of stock-based compensation expense as a result of the restatement.

As of September 30, 2006, the unrecognized stock-based compensation balance related to stock options was \$194.0 million and will be recognized over an estimated weighted-average amortization period of 3.2 years.

The following table shows stock-based compensation capitalized as inventory and deferred system profit as of September 30, 2006 and June 30, 2006.

(in million)	September 30, 2006	June 30, 2006
Inventory	\$ 6.1	\$ 6.0
Deferred system profit	\$ 1.6	\$ 1.6

Valuation Assumptions.

In connection with the adoption of SFAS No. 123(R), the Company reassessed its valuation technique and related assumptions. The Company estimates the fair value of stock options using a Black-Scholes valuation model, consistent with the provisions of SFAS No. 123(R), SEC SAB No. 107 and the Company's prior period pro forma disclosures of net earnings, including stock-based compensation (determined under a fair value method as prescribed by SFAS No. 123). The fair value of each option grant is estimated on the date of grant using the Black-Scholes option valuation model and the straight-line attribution approach with the following weighted-average assumptions:

Table of Contents

	Three months ended September 30,	
	2006	2005
Stock option plan:		
Expected stock price volatility	35%	29%
Risk free interest rate	5.0%	4.0%
Dividend yield	1.2%	1.0%
Expected life of options (in years)	4.4	4.9
Stock purchase plan:		
Expected stock price volatility	35%	36%
Risk free interest rate	5.1%	3.5%
Dividend yield	1.2%	1.1%
Expected life of options (in years)	1.3	1.3

SFAS No. 123(R) requires the use of option-pricing models that were not developed for use in valuing employee stock options. The Black-Scholes option-pricing model was developed for use in estimating the fair value of short-lived exchange traded options that have no vesting restrictions and are fully transferable. In addition, option-pricing models require the input of highly subjective assumptions, including the option's expected life and the price volatility of the underlying stock. The expected stock price volatility assumption was determined using the implied volatility of the Company's common stock. Prior to the adoption of SFAS No. 123(R), the Company used a combination of historical and implied volatility in deriving its expected volatility assumption. The Company determined that implied volatility is more reflective of market conditions and a better indicator of expected volatility than a blended volatility.

Equity Incentive Program.

The Company's equity incentive program is a broad-based, long-term retention program that is intended to attract and retain key employees, and align stockholder and employee interests. The equity incentive program consists of two plans: one under which non-employee directors may be granted options to purchase shares of the Company's stock, and another in which non-employee directors, officers, key employees, consultants and all other employees may be granted options to purchase shares of the Company's stock, restricted stock units and other types of equity awards. For the past several years, stock options (except for the retroactively priced option grants) have generally been granted at the market price of the Company's common stock on the date of grant, generally have a vesting period of five years and are exercisable for a period not to exceed seven years (ten years for options granted prior to July 1, 2005) from the date of issuance. Restricted stock units may be granted with varying criteria such as time-based or performance-based vesting. Substantially all of the Company's employees that meet established performance goals and qualify as key employees participate in its main equity incentive plan.

Table of Contents

The following table summarizes the combined activity under the equity incentive plans for the indicated periods:

	Available For Grant	Awards Outstanding	Weighted- Average Exercise Price
Balances as of June 30, 2006	6,318,430	30,362,292	\$ 40.00
Plan shares expired	(427,498)		
Options granted	(190,071)	190,071	\$ 41.45
Restricted stock units granted(2)	(4,564,240)		
Restricted stock units canceled(2)	76,412		
Options canceled/expired/forfeited	686,949	(686,949)	\$ 45.34
Options exercised		(645,123)	\$ 28.45
Balances as of September 30, 2006	1,899,982	29,220,291	\$ 40.34

- (1) Employees received stock options totaling 2,007,283 shares of common stock as an advance on their fiscal year 2006 stock option grants in the first quarter of fiscal 2005. The grant was equivalent to 50% of the employee's fiscal year 2005 stock option grant. These advanced grant options vest on a six (6) year schedule with 20% of the option shares vesting upon completion of two (2) years of service and the remaining 80% of the option shares vesting in a series of forty-eight (48) successive equal monthly installments upon completion of each additional month of continuous service over the remainder of the vesting term.
- (2) Any 2004 Equity Incentive Plan awards of restricted stock, performance shares, performance units or deferred stock units with a per share or unit purchase price lower than 100% of fair market value on the grant date shall be counted against the total number of shares issuable under the plan as 1.8 shares for every one share subject thereto.

The aggregate intrinsic value in the table above represents the total pre-tax intrinsic value, based on the Company's closing stock price of \$44.47 as of September 30, 2006, which would have been received by the option holders had all option holders exercised their options as of that date. The total number of in-the-money options exercisable as of September 30, 2006 was 11.2 million shares.

The weighted-average grant date fair value of options, as determined under SFAS No. 123(R), granted during the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was \$13.51 and \$14.28 per share, respectively.

The total intrinsic value of options exercised during the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was \$10.0 million and \$40.3 million, respectively. The total cash received from employees as a result of employee stock option exercises during the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was approximately \$18.4 million and \$56.3 million, respectively. In connection with these exercises, the tax benefits realized by the Company for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was \$3.6 million and \$14.1 million, respectively.

The Company settles employee stock option exercises with newly issued common shares.

Restricted Stock Units.

During the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, the Company's Board of Directors approved the grant of 2.5 million and 30,000 shares, respectively, of restricted stock units to selected employees. Beginning in the fiscal year 2007, the restricted stock units generally vest in two equal installments on the second and fourth anniversaries of the date of grant. Prior to fiscal year 2007, the restricted stock units generally vested in two equal installments on the fourth and fifth anniversaries of the date

Table of Contents

of the grant. The value of the restricted stock units was based on the closing market price of the Company's common stock on the date of award. The total grant date fair value of the restricted stock units granted during the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was \$81.3 million and \$1.1 million, respectively, after estimated forfeitures. Stock-based compensation cost for restricted stock units for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was \$2.5 million and \$0.8 million, respectively.

As of September 30, 2006, the total unrecognized stock-based compensation balance related to restricted stock units was \$104.9 million and will be recognized over an estimated weighted-average amortization period of 3.8 years.

Employee Stock Purchase Plan.

KLA-Tencor's Employee Stock Purchase Plan (ESPP) provides that eligible employees may contribute up to 10% of their eligible earnings toward the semi-annual purchase of KLA-Tencor's common stock. The employee's purchase price is derived from a formula based on the fair market value of the common stock at the time of enrollment into the offering period versus the fair market value on the date of purchase. Offering periods are generally two years in length. The compensation cost in connection with the plan for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was \$4.5 million and \$4.4 million, respectively. There were no shares purchased under the employee stock purchase plan during the three months ended September 30, 2006.

The plan shares are replenished annually on the first day of each fiscal year by virtue of an evergreen provision. The provision allows for share replenishment equal to the lesser of 2,000,000 shares or the number of shares which KLA-Tencor estimates will be required to issue under the plan during the forthcoming fiscal year. At September 30, 2006, a total of 1,803,864 shares were reserved and available for issuance under this plan. On September 28, 2006, the ESPP plan was suspended due to the ongoing stock option investigation.

Former Chief Executive Officer Agreement and Termination.

During November 2005, the Company announced that effective January 1, 2006, Kenneth L. Schroeder would cease to be its Chief Executive Officer and would thereafter be employed as a Senior Advisor. The Company and Mr. Schroeder also revised his prior agreement with the Company and defined the salary, bonus payout and equity award vesting during the period of his employment as a Senior Advisor. Effective January 1, 2006, the Company determined that all service conditions associated with certain prior equity awards under the terms of the revised agreement with Mr. Schroeder had been satisfied; and accordingly, the Company recorded at that time an additional non-cash, stock-based compensation charge of approximately \$9.8 million relating to these equity awards. The above mentioned charge is included as a component of Selling, General and Administrative expense during fiscal 2006. On October 16, 2006, following the Special Committee investigation of the Company's historical stock option practices, the Company terminated all aspects of Mr. Schroeder's employment relationship and agreement with the Company. As a result, vesting of Mr. Schroeder's then outstanding stock options and restricted stock awards immediately ceased, and the 890,914 unvested option shares and 100,000 unvested restricted stock award shares held by Mr. Schroeder at the time of termination were canceled. Accordingly, in the second quarter of fiscal 2007 the Company will reverse approximately \$20 million of the non-cash, stock-based compensation charge recorded in prior periods. In December 2006, the Company canceled 596,740 vested option shares held by Mr. Schroeder as of the time of termination, representing those shares that had been retroactively priced or otherwise improperly granted.

Table of Contents

On September 19, 2006, the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors approved awards of restricted stock units covering a total of 2,535,689 shares of the Company's common stock to employees of the Company, including the executive officers. The restricted stock units were awarded under the Company's 2004 Equity Incentive Plan and each unit will entitle the recipient to one share of common stock when the applicable vesting requirements for that unit are satisfied. However, for each share actually issued under the awarded units, the share reserve under the Plan will be reduced by 1.8 shares, as provided under the terms of such Plan.

NOTE 8 STOCK REPURCHASE PROGRAM

In July 1997, the Board of Directors authorized KLA-Tencor to systematically repurchase shares of its common stock in the open market. This plan was put into place to reduce the dilution from KLA-Tencor's employee benefit and incentive plans such as the stock option and employee stock purchase plans, and to return excess cash to the Company's shareholders. Since the inception of the repurchase program in 1997 through June 30, 2006 the Board of Directors had authorized KLA-Tencor to repurchase a total of 27.8 million shares, including 10 million shares authorized in February 2005.

The Company's systematic buyback program was suspended in May 2006. The Company intends to recommence purchases under the stock repurchase program as soon as possible after it has returned to full compliance with applicable SEC reporting requirements.

Share repurchases for the three months ended September 30, 2005 were as follows (in thousands):

	Three months ended September 30, 2005
Number of shares of common stock repurchased	739
Total cost of repurchase	\$ 35,488
As of September 30, 2005, the amount related to unsettled share repurchases was \$2.9 million.	

Table of Contents**NOTE 9 COMPREHENSIVE INCOME**

The components of comprehensive income, net of tax, are as follows (in thousands):

	Three months ended September 30, 2005	
	2006	As restated
Net Income	\$ 135,922	\$ 75,487
Other comprehensive income (loss):		
Currency translation adjustments	(1,107)	(4,116)
Gain on cash flow hedging instruments	5,094	2,712
Unrealized gains (losses) on investments, net of taxes (benefits) of \$3,742 and (\$2,587) for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, respectively	6,290	(4,349)
Other comprehensive income (loss)	10,277	(5,753)
Total comprehensive income	\$ 146,199	\$ 69,734

NOTE 10 EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLANS

KLA-Tencor sponsors various retirement and pension plans, including defined contribution and defined benefit plans which cover most employees worldwide. Several of KLA-Tencor's foreign subsidiaries have retirement plans for full-time employees, some of which are defined benefit plans. KLA-Tencor does not sponsor defined benefit plans in the United States.

Net periodic pension cost, determined in accordance with SFAS No. 87 Employer's Accounting for Pensions for KLA-Tencor's defined benefit retirement plans for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 include the following components (in thousands):

	Three months ended September 30, 2005	
	2006	2005
Service Cost	\$ 447	\$ 534
Interest Cost	140	127
Expected Return on Assets	(52)	(43)
Amortization of Net Transitional Obligation	8	40
Amortization of Net Gain	33	47
Net periodic pension cost	\$ 576	\$ 705

KLA-Tencor contributed \$274,000 and \$211,000 to its foreign subsidiary defined benefit pension plans for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, respectively, and expects to contribute \$756,000 during the remainder of fiscal year 2007.

NOTE 11 COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

Factoring KLA-Tencor has agreements with financial institutions to sell certain of its trade receivables and promissory notes from customers without recourse. During the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, approximately \$79.8 million and \$54.5 million of receivables were sold under these arrangements, respectively. KLA-Tencor does not believe it is at risk for any material losses as a result of these agreements.

Table of Contents

In addition, from time to time KLA-Tencor will discount without recourse Letters of Credit (LCs) received from customers for payment of goods. During the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 several LCs were sold with proceeds totaling \$30.2 million and \$17.7 million, respectively. Discounting fees of \$0.4 million and \$0.1 million for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, respectively, were equivalent to interest expense and were recorded in interest and other income net.

Facilities. KLA-Tencor leases certain of its facilities under operating leases, which qualify for operating lease accounting treatment under SFAS No. 13 Accounting for Leases and, as such, these facilities are not included on its Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet.

The following is a schedule of operating leases payments (in thousands):

Fiscal year ending June 30,	Amount
2007 (remaining 9 months)	\$ 4,887
2008	4,904
2009	3,633
2010	2,166
2011	1,508
Thereafter	2,472
Total minimum lease payments	\$ 19,570

Purchase Commitments. KLA-Tencor maintains certain purchase commitments with its suppliers to ensure a smooth and continuous supply chain for key components. KLA-Tencor's liability in these purchase commitments is generally restricted to a forecasted time-horizon as mutually agreed upon between the parties. This forecasted time-horizon can vary among different suppliers. The Company's purchase commitments were approximately \$211 million as of September 30, 2006. Actual expenditures will vary based upon the volume of the transactions and length of contractual service provided. In addition, the amounts paid under these arrangements may be less in the event that the arrangements are renegotiated or canceled. Certain agreements provide for potential cancellation penalties.

Guarantees. KLA-Tencor provides standard warranty coverage on its systems for twelve months, providing labor and parts necessary to repair the systems during the warranty period. KLA-Tencor accounts for the estimated warranty cost as a charge to costs of revenues when revenue is recognized. The estimated warranty cost is based on historical product performance and field expenses. Utilizing actual service records, KLA-Tencor calculates the average service hours and parts expense per system and applies the actual labor and overhead rates to determine the estimated warranty charge. KLA-Tencor updates these estimated charges every quarter. The actual product performance and/or field expense profiles may differ, and in those cases KLA-Tencor adjusts warranty accruals accordingly.

Table of Contents

The following table provides the changes in the product warranty accrual for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 (in thousands):

	Three months ended September 30,	
	2006	2005
Beginning balance	\$ 45,642	\$ 46,647
Accruals for warranties issued during the period	14,254	9,969
Changes in liability related to pre-existing warranties	(2,470)	(972)
Settlements made during the period	(10,443)	(10,798)
Ending balance	\$ 46,983	\$ 44,846

KLA-Tencor is a party to a variety of agreements pursuant to which it may be obligated to indemnify the other party with respect to certain matters. Typically, these obligations arise in connection with contracts and license agreements or the sale of assets, under which the Company customarily agrees to hold the other party harmless against losses arising from a breach of warranties, representations and covenants related to such matters as title to assets sold, validity of certain intellectual property rights, non-infringement of third-party rights, and certain income tax-related matters. In each of these circumstances, payment by the Company is typically subject to the other party making a claim to and cooperating with the Company pursuant to the procedures specified in the particular contract. This usually allows the Company to challenge the other party's claims or, in case of breach of intellectual property representations or covenants, to control the defense or settlement of any third-party claims brought against the other party. Further, the Company's obligations under these agreements may be limited in terms of amounts, activity (typically at the Company's option to replace or correct the products or terminate the agreement with a refund to the other party), and duration. In some instances, the Company may have recourse against third parties and/or insurance covering certain payments made by the Company.

It is not possible to predict the maximum potential amount of future payments under these or similar agreements due to the conditional nature of the Company's obligations and the unique facts and circumstances involved in each particular agreement. Historically, payments made by the Company under these agreements did not have a material effect on its business, financial condition, results of operations or cash flows.

The Company maintains \$25 million of short-term credit facilities in various locations to fund overdraft, Customs guarantee for VAT, and letter of credits needs of its subsidiaries in Europe and Asia. A total of \$20 million was outstanding under these facilities as of September 30, 2006.

Government Inquiries Relating to Historical Stock Option Practices. On May 23, 2006, the Company received a subpoena from the USAO requesting information relating to its past stock option grants and related accounting matters. Also on May 23, 2006, the Company received a letter from the SEC making an informal inquiry and request for information on the same subject matters. The Company is cooperating fully with the USAO and SEC inquiries and intends to continue to do so. These inquiries likely will require the Company to expend significant management time and incur significant legal and other expenses, and could result in civil and criminal actions seeking, among other things, injunctions against the Company and the payment of significant fines and penalties by the Company, which may adversely affect its results of operations and cash flow.

The Company has also responded to inquiries from the U.S. Department of Labor, which is conducting an examination of its 401(k) Savings Plan. The Company is cooperating fully with this examination and intends to continue to do so.

Table of Contents

The Company cannot predict how long it will take to or how much more time and resources it will have to expend to resolve these government inquiries, nor can it predict the outcome of these inquiries. Also, there can be no assurance that other inquiries, investigations or actions will not be started by other United States federal or state regulatory agencies or by foreign governmental agencies.

Late SEC Filings and Nasdaq Delisting Proceedings. Due to the Special Committee investigation and the resulting restatements, the Company did not file on time its Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006. As a result, the Company received two Nasdaq Staff Determination letters, dated September 14, 2006 and November 14, 2006, respectively, stating that it was not in compliance with the filing requirements of Marketplace Rule 4310(c)(14) and, therefore, that the Company's stock was subject to delisting from the Nasdaq Global Select Market. The Company appealed this determination and requested a hearing before a Nasdaq Listing Qualifications Panel. On October 26, 2006, the Company attended a hearing, at which it sought appropriate exceptions to the filing requirements from the Panel pending completion and filing of the Company's delinquent reports. On January 3, 2007, the Panel granted the Company's request for continued listing of its stock on the Nasdaq Global Select Market, subject to the condition that the Company file its Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006 on or before January 31, 2007.

Shareholder Derivative Litigation Relating to Historical Stock Option Practices. Beginning on May 22, 2006, several persons and entities identifying themselves as shareholders of KLA-Tencor filed derivative actions purporting to assert claims on behalf of and in the name of the Company against various of the Company's current and former directors and officers relating to its accounting for stock options issued from 1994 to present. The complaints in these actions allege that the individual defendants breached their fiduciary duties and other obligations to the Company and violated state and federal securities laws in connection with the Company's historical stock option granting process, its accounting for past stock options, and historical sales of stock by the individual defendants. Three substantially similar actions are pending, one in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California (which consists of three separate lawsuits consolidated in one action); one in the California Superior Court for Santa Clara County; and one in the Delaware Chancery Court.

The plaintiffs in the derivative actions have asserted claims for violations of Sections 10(b) (including Rule 10b-5 thereunder), 14(a), and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, unjust enrichment, breach of fiduciary duty and aiding and abetting such breach, negligence, misappropriation of information, abuse of control, gross mismanagement, waste of corporate assets, breach of contract, constructive fraud, rescission, and violations of California Corporations Code section 25402, as well as a claim for an accounting of all stock option grants made to the named defendants. KLA-Tencor is named as a nominal defendant in these actions. On behalf of KLA-Tencor, the plaintiffs seek unspecified monetary and other relief against the named defendants. The plaintiffs are James Ziolkowski, Mark Ziering, Alaska Electrical Pension Fund, Jeffrey Rabin, and Benjamin Langford. The individual named defendants are current directors and officers; Edward W. Barnholt, H. Raymond Bingham, Robert T. Bond, Jeffrey L. Hall, Stephen P. Kaufman, John H. Kispert, Lida Urbanek and Richard P. Wallace; and former directors and officers; Robert J. Boehlke, Leo Chamberlain, Gary E. Dickerson, Richard J. Elkus, Jr., Dennis J. Fortino, Kenneth Levy, Michael E. Marks, Stuart J. Nichols, Arthur P. Schnitzer, Kenneth L. Schroeder and Jon D. Tompkins. Current director David C. Wang and former director Dean O. Morton were originally named as defendants in one of the derivatives actions filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, but were dropped as named defendants as of December 22, 2006 upon the filing of a consolidated complaint in that action.

The derivative actions are at an early stage. Discovery has not commenced, and the defendants are not yet required to respond to the complaints. The Company's Board of Directors has appointed a Special Litigation Committee (SLC) composed solely of

Table of Contents

independent directors to conduct an independent investigation of the claims asserted in the derivative actions and to determine the Company's position with respect to those claims. The SLC's investigation is in progress. The Company cannot predict whether these actions are likely to result in any material recovery by or expense to KLA-Tencor.

Shareholder Class Action Litigation Relating to Historical Stock Option Practices. KLA-Tencor and various of its current and former directors and officers were named as defendants in a putative securities class action filed on June 29, 2006 in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Two similar actions were filed later in the same court, and all three cases have been consolidated into one action. The complaints allege claims under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as a result of the Company's past stock option grants and related accounting and reporting, and seek unspecified monetary damages and other relief. The plaintiffs seek to represent a class consisting of purchasers of KLA-Tencor stock between February 13, 2001 and May 22, 2006 who allegedly suffered losses as a result of material misrepresentations in KLA-Tencor's SEC filings during that period. The lead plaintiffs, who seek to represent the class, are the Police and Fire Retirement System of the City of Detroit, the Louisiana Municipal Police Employees' Retirement System, and the City of Philadelphia Board of Pensions and Retirement. The defendants are KLA-Tencor, Edward W. Barnholt, H. Raymond Bingham, Robert J. Boehlke, Robert T. Bond, Gary E. Dickerson, Richard J. Elkus, Jr., Jeffrey L. Hall, Stephen P. Kaufman, John H. Kispert, Kenneth Levy, Michael E. Marks, Kenneth L. Schroeder, Jon D. Tompkins, Lida Urbanek and Richard P. Wallace.

This litigation is at an early stage. Discovery has not commenced, the court has not yet determined whether the plaintiffs may sue on behalf of any class of purchasers, and the defendants are not yet required to respond to the complaints. The Company intends to vigorously defend this litigation.

As part of a derivative lawsuit filed in the Delaware Chancery Court on July 21, 2006 (described above), a plaintiff claiming to be a KLA-Tencor shareholder also asserted a separate putative class action claim against the Company and certain of its current and former directors and officers alleging that shareholders incurred damage due to purported dilution of KLA-Tencor common stock resulting from historical stock option granting practices.

The Company cannot predict the outcome of the shareholder class action cases (described above), and it cannot estimate the likelihood or potential dollar amount of any adverse results. However, an unfavorable outcome in this litigation could have a material adverse impact upon the financial position, results of operations or cash flows for the period in which the outcome occurs and in future periods.

Indemnification Obligations. Subject to certain limitations, the Company is obligated to indemnify its current and former directors, officers and employees in connection with the investigation of the Company's historical stock option practices and related government inquiries and litigation. These obligations arise under the terms of the Company's certificate of incorporation, its bylaws, applicable contracts, and Delaware and California law. The obligation to indemnify generally means that the Company is required to pay or reimburse the individuals' reasonable legal expenses and possibly damages and other liabilities incurred in connection with these matters. The Company is currently paying or reimbursing legal expenses being incurred in connection with these matters by a number of its current and former directors, officers and employees. Although the maximum potential amount of future payments KLA-Tencor could be required to make under these agreements is theoretically unlimited, the Company believes the fair value of this liability is adequately covered within the reserves it has established for currently pending legal proceedings.

Other Legal Matters. The Company is named from time to time as a party to lawsuits in the normal course of its business. Litigation in general, and intellectual property and securities litigation in particular, can be expensive and disruptive to normal business operations. Moreover, the results of legal proceedings are difficult to predict.

Table of Contents**NOTE 12 DERIVATIVE INSTRUMENTS AND HEDGING ACTIVITIES**

KLA-Tencor's foreign subsidiaries operate and sell KLA-Tencor's products in various global markets. As a result, KLA-Tencor is exposed to changes in foreign currency exchange rates. KLA-Tencor utilizes foreign currency forward exchange contracts to hedge against certain future movements in foreign exchange rates that affect certain foreign currency denominated sales and purchase transactions. KLA-Tencor does not use derivative financial instruments for speculative or trading purposes. As of September 30, 2006, KLA-Tencor had foreign exchange forward contracts maturing throughout fiscal 2007 to sell \$204.9 million and purchase \$4.6 million, in foreign currency, primarily Japanese Yen.

NOTE 13 SEGMENT REPORTING AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

KLA-Tencor reports one reportable segment in accordance with the provisions of SFAS No. 131 Disclosures about Segments of an Enterprise and Related Information. Operating segments are defined as components of an enterprise about which separate financial information is evaluated regularly by the chief operating decision maker in deciding how to allocate resources and in assessing performance. KLA-Tencor's chief operating decision makers are the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Operating Officer.

KLA-Tencor is engaged primarily in designing, manufacturing, and marketing yield management and process monitoring systems for the semiconductor industry. All operating units have been aggregated due to their inter-dependencies, commonality of long-term economic characteristics, products and services, the production processes, class of customer and distribution processes. The Company's service products are an extension of the system product portfolio and provide customers with spare parts and fab management services (including system preventive maintenance and optimization services) to improve yield, increase production uptime and throughput and lower the cost of ownership. Since KLA-Tencor operates in one segment, all financial segment information required by SFAS No. 131 can be found in the condensed consolidated financial statements.

KLA-Tencor's significant operations outside the United States include manufacturing facilities in Israel and Singapore, and sales, marketing and service offices in Western Europe, Japan, and the Asia Pacific region. For geographical revenue reporting, revenues are attributed to the geographic location in which the customer is located. Long-lived assets consist primarily of net property and equipment and are attributed to the geographic region in which they are located.

The following is a summary of revenues by geographic region for three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 (in thousands).

	Three months ended September 30, 2005	
	2006	As restated
Revenue:		
United States	\$ 130,257	\$ 98,332
Europe & Israel	70,319	71,216
Japan	107,266	111,970
Taiwan	137,297	81,055
Korea	87,315	84,575
Asia Pacific	96,909	37,113
Total	\$ 629,363	\$ 484,261

Table of Contents

Long-lived assets by geographic region as of September 30, 2006 and June 30, 2006 were as follows (in thousands):

	September 30, 2006	June 30, 2006
Long-lived assets:		
United States	\$ 362,180	\$ 366,714
Europe & Israel	11,932	9,503
Japan	3,590	3,665
Taiwan	1,835	1,919
Korea	6,313	6,216
Asia Pacific	18,667	17,730
Total	\$ 404,517	\$ 405,747

The following is a summary of revenues by major products for three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 (as a percentage of total revenue).

	Three months ended September 30,	
	2006	2005
Revenue:		
Defect inspection	64%	62%
Metrology	15	17
Service	15	16
Other	6	5
Total	100%	100%

For the three months ended September 30, 2006, no customer accounted for greater than 10% of revenue. For the three months ended September 30, 2005, two customers accounted for 16% and 11% of revenue, respectively. As of September 30, 2006, no customer accounted for greater than 10% of net accounts receivable. As of September 30, 2005, three customers accounted for 17%, 13% and 11% of net accounts receivable, respectively.

NOTE 14 SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

On October 11, 2006, the Company acquired all of the shares of ADE Corporation (ADE), a supplier of semiconductor process control solutions. Per the Amended Merger Agreement between the Company and ADE, the Company paid \$482 million (which included goodwill and intangibles of \$262 million and \$137 million, respectively) in cash to the shareholders of ADE. The acquisition will be accounted for as a purchase.

On October 12, 2006, the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors of the Company approved an alternative financial benefit for all employees below the vice president level who had been active participants in the ESPP before it was temporarily suspended on September 28, 2006. The alternative financial benefit is intended to compensate such employees for the estimated financial benefit they would have realized had the ESPP continued in operation after September 28, 2006 and until December 31, 2006. On January 24, 2007, the Compensation Committee extended this alternative financial benefit into 2007 to cover the period until the ESPP suspension ends.

On October 16, 2006, the Company terminated all aspects of its employment relationship and agreement with Kenneth L. Schroeder, former Chief Executive Officer of the Company. Also on October 16, 2006, Stuart J. Nichols, General Counsel of the Company, resigned, and Kenneth Levy, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Company, retired as a director and employee. In December 2006, all outstanding retroactively priced vested options held by Mr. Schroeder were canceled. Accordingly, in the second quarter of fiscal 2007 the Company will reverse approximately \$20 million of the non-cash, stock-based compensation recorded in prior periods. Also, on October 16, 2006 all outstanding retroactively priced options held by Mr. Levy and Mr. Nichols were re-priced. The exercise price of each re-priced option was increased to the market price on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental change will be recognized on the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006. Further, although the Board of Directors concluded that John H. Kispert, the Company's President and Chief

Edgar Filing: KLA TENCOR CORP - Form 10-Q

Operating Officer, was not involved in and was not aware of the improper stock option practices, based on the Special Committee's recommendation, his outstanding retroactively priced options were re-priced in December 2006, because he served as Chief Financial Officer during part of the period in question. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006.

Table of Contents

In November 6, 2006, the Board of Directors of the Company declared a quarterly cash dividend of 12 cents per share and, as a result, \$24 million was paid on December 1, 2006 to stockholders of record on November 15, 2006.

In November 2006, as part of the long-term business plan, the Company decided to sell certain real estate properties owned by the Company in San Jose, California and Livermore, California. The Company will record an asset impairment charge of approximately \$56 million in the quarter ended December 31, 2006. In addition, the Company reduced its work-force by approximately 150 people and will accrue in the quarter ended December 31, 2006 approximately \$10 million in severance charges, which will be paid over the next twelve months.

On December 21, 2006, Jon D. Tompkins resigned as a director of the Company, and the Company agreed to modify the outstanding options held by Mr. Tompkins (all of which were fully vested) to extend the post-termination exercisability period to December 31, 2007, which is the last day of the calendar year in which those options would have terminated in the absence of such extension.

Because virtually all holders of retroactively priced options issued by the Company were not involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing, the Company has taken and intends to take certain actions to deal with the adverse tax consequences that may be incurred by the holders of retroactively priced options. The adverse tax consequences are that retroactively priced stock options vesting after December 31, 2004 (409A Affected Options) subject the option holder to a penalty tax under IRC Section 409A (and, as applicable, similar penalty taxes under California and other state tax laws). One such action by the Company is to offer to amend the 409A Affected Options to increase the exercise price to the market price on the actual grant date or, if lower, the market price at the time of the amendment. The amended options would not be subject to taxation under IRC Section 409A. Under IRS regulations, these option amendments had to be completed by December 31, 2006 for anyone who was an executive officer when he or she received 409A Affected Options; the amendments for non-officers cannot be offered until after this Report is filed and do not need to be completed until December 31, 2007. Another action is to approve bonuses payable to holders of the amended options to compensate them for the resulting increase in their option exercise price. The amount of these bonuses would be effectively repaid to the Company if and when the options are exercised and the increased exercise price is paid (but there would be no assurance that the options would be exercised). Finally, the Company intends to compensate certain option holders who have already exercised 409A Affected Options for the additional taxes they incur under IRC Section 409A (and, as applicable, similar state tax laws).

Three of the Company's option holders were subject to the December 31, 2006 deadline described above. Accordingly, in December 2006, the Company offered to amend the 409A Affected Options held by Mr. Wallace, the Company's Chief Executive Officer, and two former executive officers to increase the exercise price so that these options will not subject the option holder to a penalty tax under IRC Section 409A. All three individuals accepted the Company's offer. In addition, the Company agreed to pay each of the three individuals a cash bonus in January 2008 equal to the aggregate increase in the exercise prices for his amended options. For Mr. Wallace, the amount of this bonus is \$0.4 million. To account for these actions, the Company will record a net charge of \$0.3 million in the quarter ended December 31, 2006. The Company plans to take similar actions with respect to the outstanding 409A Affected Options granted to non-officers as soon as possible after the filing of this Report. The Company estimates that the total cash payments needed to deal with the adverse tax consequences of retroactively priced options granted to non-officers will be approximately \$30 million.

With respect to the individuals whose options were canceled or re-priced by the Company following the Special Committee investigation, no bonuses of the type described above will be paid.

On January 7, 2007, the Company signed a definitive merger agreement to acquire Therma-Wave, Inc. through a cash tender offer of \$1.65 per share, or a total of approximately \$74 million. Therma-Wave develops, manufactures, markets and services process control metrology systems used in the manufacture of semiconductors. The transaction is subject to customary closing conditions, including regulatory approvals and the acquisition by the Company of a majority of the voting power of Therma-Wave in the tender offer.

Table of Contents**ITEM 2. MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS****SPECIAL NOTE REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS**

This report contains certain forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. All statements other than statements of historical fact may be forward-looking statements. You can identify these and other forward-looking statements by the use of words such as may, will, could, would, should, expects, plans, anticipates, relies, believes, estimates, predicts, intends, potential, continue, or the negative of such terms, or other comparable terminology. Forward-looking statements also include the assumptions underlying or relating to any of the foregoing statements. Such forward-looking statements include, among others, those statements regarding the future impact of the restatement of our historical financial statements, shareholder litigation and related matters arising from the discovery that we had retroactively priced stock options (primarily from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002) and had not accounted for them correctly; forecasts of the future results of our operations; the percentage of spending that our customers allocate to process control; orders for our products and capital equipment generally; sales of semiconductors; the allocation of capital spending by our customers; growth of revenue in the semiconductor industry, the semiconductor capital equipment industry and business; technological trends in the semiconductor industry; our future product offerings and product features; the success and market acceptance of new products; timing of shipment of backlog; the future of our product shipments and our product and service revenues; our future gross margins; the future of our selling, general and administrative expenses; international sales and operations; maintenance of our competitive advantage; success of our product offerings; creation and funding of programs for research and development; attraction and retention of employees; results of our investment in leading edge technologies; the effects of hedging transactions; the effect of the sale of trade receivables and promissory notes from customers; our future income tax rate; dividends; the completion of any acquisitions of third parties, or the technology or assets thereof; benefits received from any acquisitions and development of acquired technologies; sufficiency of our existing cash balance, investments and cash generated from operations to meet our operating and working capital requirements; and the adoption of new accounting pronouncements.

Our actual results may differ significantly from those projected in the forward-looking statements in this report. Factors that might cause or contribute to such differences include, but are not limited to, those discussed in this section. You should carefully review these risks and also review the risks described in other documents we file from time to time with the Securities and Exchange Commission. You are cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. We expressly assume no obligations to update our forward-looking statements in this report that occur after the date hereof.

Restatements of Consolidated Financial Statements and Special Committee and Company Findings*Special Committee Investigation of Historical Stock Option Practices*

On May 22, 2006, the Wall Street Journal published an article about stock option backdating that questioned the stock option practices at several companies, including KLA-Tencor. On May 23, 2006, we received a subpoena from the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of California (USAO) and a letter of inquiry from the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regarding our stock option practices. Later on May 23, 2006, our Board of Directors appointed a Special

Table of Contents

Committee composed solely of independent directors to conduct a comprehensive investigation of our historical stock option practices. The Special Committee promptly engaged independent legal counsel and accounting experts to assist with the investigation. The investigation included an extensive review of our historical stock option practices, accounting policies, accounting records, supporting documentation, email communications and other documentation, as well as interviews of a number of current and former directors, officers and employees. On September 27, 2006, the Special Committee reported the bulk of its findings and recommendations to our Board of Directors.

Findings and Remedial Actions

On September 28, 2006, we announced that we would have to restate our previously issued financial statements to correct our past accounting for stock options. As a result of the Special Committee investigation, we discovered that certain of our stock options, primarily those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002, had been retroactively priced for all employees who received these grants. This means that the option exercise price was not the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date of the option, but instead was a lower market price on an earlier date. The actual grant date when the essential actions necessary to grant the option were completed, including the final determination of the number of shares to be granted to each employee and the exercise price is the correct measurement date to determine the market price of the option shares under the accounting rules in effect at the time. More than 95% of the total in-the-money value (market price on the actual grant date minus exercise price) of all of our retroactively priced options was attributable to those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002.

We previously applied Accounting Principles Board (APB) Opinion No. 25, Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees, and its related Interpretations and provided the required pro forma disclosures under Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 123, Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation through our fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. Under APB Opinion No. 25, a non-cash, stock-based compensation expense was required to be recognized for any option for which the exercise price was below the market price on the actual grant date. Because each of our retroactively priced options had an exercise price below the market price on the actual grant date, there should have been a non-cash charge for each of these options under APB Opinion No. 25 equal to the number of option shares, multiplied by the difference between the exercise price and the market price on the actual grant date. That expense should have been amortized over the vesting period of the option. Starting in our fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, we adopted SFAS No. 123(R), Share-Based Payment. As a result, beginning in fiscal year 2006, the additional stock-based compensation expense required to be recorded for each retroactively priced option is equal to the incremental fair value of the option on the actual grant date, amortized over the remaining vesting period of the option. We did not record these stock-based compensation expenses under APB Opinion No. 25 or SFAS No. 123(R) related to our retroactively priced options in our previously issued financial statements, and that is why we are restating them in this filing. To correct our past accounting for stock options, we recorded additional pre-tax, non-cash, stock-based compensation expense of (a) \$348 million for the periods from July 1, 1994 to June 30, 2005 under APB Opinion No. 25 and (b) \$27 million for the period from July 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 under SFAS No. 123(R). We expect to amortize an additional \$1 million of such pre-tax charges under SFAS No. 123(R) in future periods to properly account for past retroactively priced stock options.

By October 16, 2006, the Special Committee had substantially completed its investigation. The Special Committee concluded that (1) there was retroactive pricing of stock options granted to all employees who received options, primarily during the periods from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002 (less than 15% of these options were granted to executive officers), (2) the retroactively priced options were not accounted for correctly in our previously issued financial statements, (3) the retroactive pricing of options was intentional, not inadvertent or through administrative error, (4) the retroactive pricing of options involved the selection of fortuitously low exercise prices by certain former executive officers, and other former executives may have been aware of this conduct, (5) the retroactive pricing of options involved the falsification of Company records, resulting in erroneous statements

Table of Contents

being made in financial and other reports previously filed with the SEC, as well as in information previously provided to our independent registered public accounting firm, and (6) in most instances, the retroactive pricing of options violated the terms of our stock option plans. Because virtually all holders of retroactively priced options issued by the Company were not involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing, the Board of Directors decided that we should continue to honor the options that violated the terms of the Company's stock option plans, except in certain individual cases as described below.

The Special Committee concluded that, with a few immaterial exceptions, the retroactive pricing of stock options stopped after June 30, 2002. After that time, there were procedures in place designed to provide reasonable assurance that stock options were priced on the grant date. The Special Committee also concluded that none of our independent Directors was involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing of stock options. Based on the Special Committee's report, our Board of Directors concluded that no current members of management were involved in the retroactive pricing of stock options. During its investigation of our historical stock option practices, the Special Committee did not find evidence of any other financial reporting or accounting issues.

As a result of the Special Committee investigation, on October 16, 2006, we terminated our employment relationship and agreement with Kenneth L. Schroeder, and we announced our intent to cancel all outstanding stock options held by Mr. Schroeder that were retroactively priced or otherwise improperly granted. Those options were canceled in December 2006. Mr. Schroeder was the Company's Chief Executive Officer and a member of its Board of Directors from mid-1999 until January 1, 2006, and was a member of the Company's stock option committee from 1994 until December 31, 2005. From January 1, 2006 to October 16, 2006, Mr. Schroeder was employed as a Senior Advisor to the Company. On November 10, 2006, Mr. Schroeder's counsel informed us that Mr. Schroeder contests our right to terminate his employment relationship and agreement and to cancel any of his options. We intend to vigorously defend any claims that may be made by Mr. Schroeder regarding these matters, which could involve a material amount.

Also on October 16, 2006, Stuart J. Nichols, Vice President and General Counsel, resigned. Mr. Nichols and we entered into a Separation Agreement and General Release under which Mr. Nichols' outstanding retroactively priced stock options have been re-priced by increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006.

On October 16, 2006, Kenneth Levy, Founder and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Company, retired as a director and employee, and was named Chairman Emeritus by our Board of Directors. Mr. Levy and we entered into a Separation Agreement and General Release under which Mr. Levy's outstanding retroactively priced stock options have been re-priced by increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006. Mr. Levy was the Company's Chief Executive Officer from 1975 until mid-1999 (with the exception of mid-1997 to mid-1998), was a member of the Company's Board of Directors from 1975 until his retirement, was Chairman of the Board of Directors from 1999 until his retirement, and was a member of the Company's Stock Option Committee from 1994 until use of that committee was suspended in the fall of 2006.

On December 21, 2006, Jon D. Tompkins resigned as a director of the Company, and we agreed to modify the outstanding options held by Mr. Tompkins (all of which were fully vested) to extend the post-termination exercisability period to December 31, 2007, which is the last day of the calendar year in which those options would have terminated in the absence of such extension. Mr. Tompkins, the Chief Executive Officer of Tencor Instruments before its merger into the Company in mid-1997, was the Company's Chief Executive Officer from mid-1997 to mid-1998, was a member of the Company's stock option committee from mid-1997 until mid-1999, and was a member of the Company's Board of Directors from mid-1997 until his resignation.

Table of Contents

Although the Board of Directors concluded that John H. Kispert, our President and Chief Operating Officer, was not involved in and was not aware of the improper stock option practices, based on the Special Committee's recommendation, his outstanding retroactively priced options have been re-priced because he served as Chief Financial Officer during part of the period in question. This re-pricing involved increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006.

Restatement and Impact on Financial Statements

In addition to restating the consolidated financial statements in response to the Special Committee's findings, we are recording additional non-cash adjustments that were previously considered to be immaterial relating primarily to the accounting for the employee stock purchase plans, corrections for the recognition of deferred tax assets, the release of tax reserves, the timing of revenue recognition, gains and losses on hedging contracts and the calculation of minority interest. We have also corrected the classification of certain amounts presented as cash and cash equivalents and marketable securities relating to investments in Variable Rate Demand Notes. For the fiscal years ended June 30, 2004 and prior, we previously recorded no stock-based compensation expense; therefore, the additional stock-based compensation expense noted below represents the total compensation stock-based expense for these periods. For the year ended June 30, 2005, we recorded \$2.9 million of stock-based compensation with a related tax benefit of \$1.1 million in its previously reported financial statements. For fiscal 2005, total stock-based compensation was \$37.0 million with a related tax benefit of \$12.1 million. The income statement impact of the restatement is as follows (in thousands):

Years ended June 30,	Total effect			Cumulative		
	at June 30, 2005	2005	2004	effect at July 1, 2003	2003	2002
Net income, as previously reported		\$ 466,695	\$ 243,701		\$ 137,191	\$ 216,166
Additional compensation expense resulting from improper measurement dates for stock option grants	\$ (347,817)	(34,086)	(53,208)	\$ (260,523)	(70,032)	(76,582)
Tax related effects	117,776	12,149	22,320	83,307	22,866	25,009
Additional compensation expense resulting from improper measurement dates for stock option grants, net of tax	(230,041)	(21,937)	(30,888)	(177,216)	(47,166)	(51,573)
Other adjustments, net of tax	(991)	291	(337)	(945)	3,970	1,091
Total decrease to net income	\$ (231,032)	(21,646)	(31,225)	\$ (178,161)	(43,196)	(50,482)
Net income, as restated		\$ 445,049	\$ 212,476		\$ 93,995	\$ 165,684

Table of Contents

Years ended June 30,	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996	1995
Additional compensation expense resulting from improper measurement dates for stock option grants	\$ (59,261)	\$ (23,296)	\$ (17,630)	\$ (5,219)	\$ (2,852)	\$ (2,747)	\$ (2,904)
Tax related effects	17,262	7,198	6,054	1,861	1,036	983	1,038
Additional compensation expense resulting from improper measurement dates for stock option grants, net of tax	\$ (41,999)	\$ (16,098)	\$ (11,576)	\$ (3,358)	\$ (1,816)	\$ (1,764)	\$ (1,866)

We adopted SFAS No. 123(R) effective July 1, 2005. The grant date fair values of stock options granted prior to fiscal year 2006 were changed as a result of the findings that certain stock option grants were retroactively priced. This change resulted in additional stock-based compensation expense of \$22 million (and a related tax benefit of \$12 million) and \$5 million (and a related tax benefit of \$1.6 million) being recognized in fiscal year 2006 and in the quarter ended September 30, 2006, respectively, under SFAS No. 123(R).

Government Inquiries Relating to Historical Stock Option Practices

We are cooperating fully with the USAO and SEC inquiries and intend to continue to do so. These inquiries likely will require us to expend significant management time and incur significant legal and other expenses, and could result in civil and criminal actions seeking, among other things, injunctions against the Company and the payment of significant fines and penalties by the Company, which may adversely affect our results of operations and cash flow. We cannot predict how long it will take or how much more time and resources we will have to expend to resolve these government inquiries, nor can we predict the outcome of these inquiries.

Late SEC Filings and Nasdaq Delisting Proceedings

Due to the Special Committee investigation and the resulting restatements, we did not file on time our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006. As a result, we received two Nasdaq Staff Determination letters, dated September 14, 2006 and November 14, 2006, respectively, stating that we were not in compliance with the filing requirements of Marketplace Rule 4310(c)(14) and, therefore, that our stock was subject to delisting from the Nasdaq Global Select Market. We appealed this determination, attended a hearing, and obtained approval of our request for continued listing of our stock on the Nasdaq Global Select Market, subject to the condition that we file our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006 on or before January 31, 2007.

With the filing of our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006, we believe we have returned to full compliance with SEC reporting requirements and Nasdaq listing requirements, and, therefore, that the Nasdaq delisting matter is now closed. However, SEC comments on these Reports (or other reports that we previously filed) or other factors could render us unable to maintain an effective listing of our common stock on the Nasdaq Global Select Market or any other national securities exchange.

Table of Contents

Shareholder Litigation Relating to Historical Stock Option Practices

Several derivative actions have been filed purporting to assert claims on behalf of and in the name of the Company against various of our current and former directors and officers relating to our accounting for stock options issued from 1994 to the present. The complaints in these actions allege that the individual defendants breached their fiduciary duties and other obligations to the Company and violated state and federal securities laws in connection with our historical stock option granting process, our accounting for past stock options, and historical sales of stock by the individual defendants. On behalf of KLA-Tencor, the plaintiffs seek unspecified monetary and other relief against the named defendants. The derivative actions are at an early stage. Our Board of Directors has appointed a Special Litigation Committee (SLC) composed solely of independent Directors to conduct an independent investigation of the claims asserted in the derivative actions and to determine the Company's position with respect to those claims. The SLC's investigation is in progress. We cannot predict whether these actions are likely to result in any material recovery by or expense to KLA-Tencor.

KLA-Tencor and various of our current and former directors and officers were named as defendants in several putative securities class action lawsuits that have been consolidated into one action. The complaints allege claims under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as a result of our past stock option grants and related accounting and reporting, and seek unspecified monetary damages and other relief. The plaintiffs seek to represent a class consisting of purchasers of KLA-Tencor stock between February 13, 2001 and May 22, 2006 who allegedly suffered losses as a result of material misrepresentations in KLA-Tencor's SEC filings during that period. This litigation is at an early stage. One of the derivative actions noted above also includes a putative class action claim on behalf of KLA-Tencor shareholders against the Company and certain of our current and former directors and officers alleging that shareholders incurred damage due to purported dilution of KLA-Tencor common stock resulting from historical stock option granting practices. The Company intends to vigorously defend these litigations.

We cannot predict the outcome of the shareholder class action cases described above and we cannot estimate the likelihood or potential dollar amount of any adverse results. However, an unfavorable outcome in this litigation could have a material adverse impact upon the financial position, results of operations or cash flows for the period in which the outcome occurs and in future periods.

CRITICAL ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES AND POLICIES

The preparation of our Consolidated Financial Statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires management to make estimates and assumptions in applying our accounting policies that affect the reported amounts of assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses, and related disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities. We based these estimates and assumptions on historical experience, and evaluate them on an on-going basis to ensure they remain reasonable under current conditions. Actual results could differ from those estimates. We discuss the development and selection of the critical accounting estimates with the Audit Committee of our Board of Directors on a quarterly basis, and the Audit Committee has reviewed the Company's related disclosure in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. The items in our financial statements requiring significant estimates and judgments are as follows:

Allowance for Doubtful Accounts. A majority of our trade receivables are derived from sales to large multinational semiconductor manufacturers throughout the world. In order to monitor potential credit losses, we perform ongoing credit evaluations of our customers financial condition. An allowance for doubtful accounts is maintained for potential credit losses based upon our assessment of the expected collectibility of all accounts receivable. The allowance for doubtful accounts is reviewed on a quarterly basis to assess the adequacy of the allowance. We take into consideration (1) any circumstances of which we are aware of a

Table of Contents

customer's inability to meet its financial obligations; and (2) our judgments as to prevailing economic conditions in the industry and their impact on our customers. If circumstances change, and the financial condition of our customers are adversely affected and unable to meet their financial obligations to us, we may need to take additional allowances, which would result in a reduction of our net income.

Inventories. Inventories are stated at the lower of cost (on a first-in, first-out basis) or market. Demonstration units are stated at their manufacturing cost and reserves are recorded to state the demonstration units at their net realizable value. We review the adequacy of our inventory reserves on a quarterly basis. We review and set standard costs semi-annually at current manufacturing costs in order to approximate actual costs. Our manufacturing overhead standards for product costs are calculated assuming full absorption of forecasted spending over projected volumes, adjusted for excess capacity. Abnormal inventory costs such as costs of idle facilities, excess freight and handling costs, and wasted materials (spoilage) are recognized as current period charges. We write down inventory based on forecasted demand and technological obsolescence. These factors are impacted by market and economic conditions, technology changes, new product introductions and changes in strategic direction and require estimates that may include uncertain elements. Actual demand may differ from forecasted demand and such differences may have a material effect on recorded inventory values.

Warranty. We provide standard warranty coverage on our systems for 40 hours per week for twelve months, providing labor and parts necessary to repair the systems during the warranty period. We account for the estimated warranty cost as a charge to costs of revenues when revenue is recognized. The estimated warranty cost is based on historical product performance and field expenses. Utilizing actual service records, we calculate the average service hours and parts expense per system and apply the labor and overhead rates to determine the estimated warranty charge. We update these estimated charges on a quarterly basis. The actual product performance and/or field expense profiles may differ, and in those cases we adjust our warranty reserves accordingly. The difference between the estimated and actual warranty costs tends to be larger for new product introductions as there is limited or no historical product performance to estimate warranty expense; more mature products with longer product performance histories tend to be more stable in our warranty charge estimates. Non-standard warranty generally includes services incremental to the standard 40-hour per week coverage for twelve months. Non-standard warranty is deferred as unearned revenue and is recognized ratably as revenue when the applicable warranty term period commences. See Note 11 to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements - Commitments and Contingencies for a detailed description.

Revenue Recognition. We recognize revenue when persuasive evidence of an arrangement exists, the sale price is fixed or determinable, delivery has occurred or services have been rendered, and collectibility is reasonably assured. System revenue includes hardware and software that is incidental to the product. We generally recognize system revenue upon acceptance by the customer that the system has been installed and is operating according to pre-determined specifications. This acceptance is generally evidenced by an acceptance document signed by the customer. In certain cases, our policy does not require written acceptance from the customer and we recognize system revenue upon shipment. Total revenue recognized without a written acceptance from the customer was approximately 6.4%, 6.2% and 3.2% of total revenue for the three months ended September 30, 2006, June 30, 2006 and September 30, 2005, respectively. The fluctuation of revenue exceptions is primarily driven by the shipment patterns of tools that have already met the required acceptance criteria. Shipping charges billed to customers are included in system revenue and the related shipping costs are included in costs of revenues.

Revenue from software license fees is typically recognized upon shipment if collection of the resulting receivable is probable, the fee is fixed or determinable, and vendor-specific objective evidence exists to allocate a portion of the total fee to any undelivered elements of the arrangement. Such undelivered elements in these arrangements typically consist of services and/or unspecified software upgrades. If vendor-specific objective evidence does not exist for the undelivered elements of the arrangement, all revenue is

Table of Contents

deferred until such evidence does exist, or until all elements are delivered, whichever is earlier. In instances where an arrangement to deliver software requires significant modification or customization, license fees are recognized under the percentage of completion method of contract accounting. We periodically review the software element of our systems in accordance with AICPA Statement of Position (SOP) No. 97-2, Software Revenue Recognition and Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF) Issue No. 03-05, Applicability of SOP 97-2 to Non-Software Deliverables in an Arrangement Containing More-Than-Incidental Software.

Trade-in rights are occasionally granted to customers to trade in tools in connection with subsequent purchases. We estimate the value of the trade-in right and reduce the revenue of the initial sale.

Spare parts revenue is recognized when the product has been shipped, risk of loss has passed to the customer, and collection of the resulting receivable is probable.

Service and maintenance revenue is recognized ratably over the term of the maintenance contract. If maintenance is included in an arrangement which includes a software license agreement, amounts related to maintenance are allocated based on vendor specific objective evidence. Consulting and training revenue is recognized when the related services are performed.

The deferred system profit balance equals the amount of deferred system revenue that was invoiced and due on shipment less applicable product and warranty costs.

We also defer the fair value of non-standard warranty bundled with equipment sales as unearned revenue. Non-standard warranty includes services incremental to the standard 40-hour per week coverage for twelve months. Non-standard warranty is recognized ratably as revenue when the applicable warranty term period commences.

Stock-Based Compensation. Prior to July 1, 2005, we applied APB Opinion No. 25, Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees, and its related Interpretations and provided the required pro forma disclosures of SFAS No. 123, Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation. In accordance with APB Opinion No. 25, a non-cash, stock-based compensation expense was recognized for any options for which the exercise price was below the market price on the actual grant date. The charge for the options with an exercise price below the market price on the actual grant date was equal to the number of options multiplied by the difference between the exercise price and the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. That expense was amortized over the vesting period of the option. Beginning July 1, 2005, we have accounted for stock-based compensation using the fair value of stock options using a Black-Scholes valuation model, consistent with the provisions of SFAS No. 123(R), Securities and Exchange Commission Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) No. 107. We elected to adopt the modified prospective application method as provided by SFAS No. 123(R). Accordingly, during fiscal year 2006, we recorded stock-based compensation cost totaling the amount that would have been recognized had the fair value method, under SFAS No. 123, been applied since the effective date of SFAS No. 123 for the pre-fiscal 2006 grants and under SFAS No. 123(R) for the fiscal year 2006 grants. SFAS No. 123(R) requires the use of option pricing models that were not developed for use in valuing employee stock options. The Black-Scholes option-pricing model was developed for use in estimating the fair value of short-lived exchange traded options that have no vesting restrictions and are fully transferable. In addition, option-pricing models require the input of highly subjective assumptions, including the option's expected life and the price volatility of the underlying stock. The expected stock price volatility assumption was determined using the implied volatility of the Company's common stock. We determined that implied volatility is more reflective of market conditions and a better indicator of expected volatility than a blended volatility. Prior to the adoption of SFAS No. 123(R), we used a combination of historical and implied volatility in deriving the expected volatility assumption. In November 2005, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued FASB Staff Position (FSP) No. 123(R)-3, Transition Election Related to Accounting for Tax Effects of Share-Based Payment Awards (FSP 123R-3). We have elected not to adopt the alternative transition method provided in the FSP 123R-3 for calculating the tax effects of stock-based compensation pursuant to SFAS No. 123(R). We followed paragraph 81 of SFAS No. 123(R) to calculate the initial pool of excess tax benefits and to determine the subsequent impact on the Additional Paid-in-Capital (APIC) pool and Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows of the tax effects of employee stock-based compensation awards that are outstanding upon adoption of SFAS No. 123(R). See Note 7 to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements Stock-Based Compensation for a detailed description.

Table of Contents

Contingencies and Litigation. We are subject to the possibility of losses from various contingencies. Considerable judgment is necessary to estimate the probability and amount of any loss from such contingencies. An accrual is made when it is probable that a liability has been incurred or an asset has been impaired and the amount of loss can be reasonably estimated. We accrue a liability and charge operations for the estimated costs expected to be incurred over the next twelve months of adjudication or settlement of asserted and unasserted claims existing as of the balance sheet date. See Note 11 to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements Commitments and Contingencies for a detailed description.

Income Taxes. We account for income taxes in accordance with SFAS No. 109, Accounting for Income Taxes, which requires that deferred tax assets and liabilities be recognized using enacted tax rates for the effect of temporary differences between the book and tax bases of recorded assets and liabilities. SFAS No. 109 also requires that deferred tax assets be reduced by a valuation allowance if it is more likely than not that a portion of the deferred tax asset will not be realized. We have determined that our future taxable income will be sufficient to recover all of our deferred tax assets. However, should there be a change in our ability to recover our deferred tax assets, we could be required to record a valuation allowance against our deferred tax assets. This would result in an increase to our tax provision in the period in which we determined that the recovery was not probable.

On a quarterly basis, we provide for income taxes based upon an estimated annual effective income tax rate. The effective tax rate is highly dependent upon the geographic composition of worldwide earnings, tax regulations governing each region, availability of tax credits and the effectiveness of our tax planning strategies. We carefully monitor the changes in many factors and adjust our effective income tax rate on a timely basis. If actual results differ from these estimates, this could have a material effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

In addition, the calculation of our tax liabilities involves dealing with uncertainties in the application of complex tax regulations. We recognize liabilities for anticipated tax audit issues in the U.S. and other tax jurisdictions based on our estimate of whether, and the extent to which, additional tax payments are probable. If we ultimately determine that payment of these amounts is unnecessary, we reverse the liability and recognize a tax benefit during the period in which we determine that the liability is no longer necessary. We record an additional charge in our provision for taxes in the period in which we determine that the recorded tax liability is less than we expect the ultimate assessment to be.

Effects of Recent Accounting Pronouncements.

In September 2006, the SEC staff issued Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) No. 108, Considering the Effects of Prior Year Misstatements when Quantifying Misstatements in Current Year Financial Statements. SAB No. 108 was issued in order to eliminate the diversity of practice surrounding how public companies quantify financial statement misstatements. SAB No. 108 requires registrants to quantify the impact of correcting all misstatements using both the rollover method, which focuses primarily on the

Table of Contents

impact of a misstatement on the income statement and is the method we had previously used, and the iron curtain method, which focuses primarily on the effect of correcting the period-end balance sheet. The use of both of these methods is referred to as the dual approach and should be combined with the evaluation of qualitative elements surrounding the errors in accordance with SAB No. 99, Materiality. The provisions of SAB No. 108 are effective for the Company for fiscal years beginning July 1, 2006. The adoption of SAB No. 108 did not have a material impact on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In September 2006, the FASB issued SFAS No. 157, Fair Value Measurements. SFAS No. 157 defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and expands disclosures about fair value measurements. The provisions of SFAS No. 157 are effective for the Company for fiscal years beginning July 1, 2008. We are evaluating the impact of the provisions of this statement on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

In September 2006, the FASB issued SFAS No. 158, Employers' Accounting for Defined Benefit Pension and Other Postretirement Plans. SFAS No. 158 requires employers to fully recognize the obligations associated with single-employer defined benefit pension, retiree healthcare and other postretirement plans in their financial statements. The provisions of SFAS No. 158 are effective for the Company as of the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2007. We are evaluating the impact of the provisions of this statement on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

In June 2006, the FASB published FASB Interpretation No. (FIN) 48, Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes—an interpretation of FASB Statement No. 109—which clarifies the accounting for uncertainty in income taxes recognized in an enterprise's financial statements in accordance with SFAS No. 109, Accounting for Income Taxes. This Interpretation prescribes a recognition threshold and measurement attribute for the financial statement recognition and measurement of a tax position taken or expected to be taken in a tax return. This Interpretation also provides guidance on derecognition, classification, interest and penalties, accounting in interim periods, disclosure, and transition. This Interpretation is effective for the Company in fiscal years beginning July 1, 2007. We are evaluating the impact of the provisions of this Interpretation on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

In February 2006, the FASB issued SFAS No. 155, Accounting for Certain Hybrid Financial Instruments, an amendment of SFAS No. 133, Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities, and SFAS No. 140, Accounting for Transfers and Servicing of Financial Assets and Extinguishments of Liabilities. This Statement permits fair value remeasurement for any hybrid financial instrument that contains an embedded derivative that otherwise would require bifurcation. This Statement is effective for the Company for all financial instruments acquired or issued after July 1, 2007. The adoption of SFAS No. 155 is not expected to have a material effect on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In June 2005, the FASB issued SFAS No. 154, Accounting Changes and Error Corrections, a replacement of APB Opinion No. 20, Accounting Changes, and SFAS No. 3, Reporting Accounting Changes in Interim Financial Statements. SFAS No. 154 changes the requirements for the accounting for and reporting of a change in accounting principle. Previously, most voluntary changes in accounting principles required recognition via a cumulative effect adjustment within net income of the period of the change. SFAS No. 154 requires retrospective application to prior periods' financial statements, unless it is impracticable to determine either the period-specific effects or the cumulative effect of the change. SFAS No. 154 is effective for the Company for accounting changes made in fiscal years beginning July 1, 2006; however, the Statement does not change the transition provisions of any existing accounting pronouncements. The adoption of SFAS No. 154 did not have a material effect on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

Table of Contents

In March 2005, the FASB published FIN 47, *Accounting for Conditional Asset Retirement Obligations*, which clarifies that the term, conditional asset retirement obligation, as used in SFAS No. 143, *Accounting for Asset Retirement Obligations*, refers to a legal obligation to perform an asset retirement activity in which the timing and (or) method of settlement are conditional on a future event that may or may not be within the control of the entity. The uncertainty about the timing and (or) method of settlement of a conditional asset retirement obligation should be factored into the measurement of the liability when sufficient information exists. The Interpretation also clarifies when an entity would have sufficient information to reasonably estimate the fair value of an asset retirement obligation. The adoption of this Interpretation did not have a material effect on our consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In December 2004, the FASB issued SFAS No. 153, *Exchanges of Nonmonetary Assets*, an amendment of APB Opinion No. 29. SFAS No. 153 addresses the measurement of exchanges of nonmonetary assets and redefines the scope of transactions that should be measured based on the fair value of the assets exchanged. SFAS No. 153 is effective for the Company for nonmonetary asset exchanges beginning in the first quarter of fiscal 2006. The adoption of SFAS No. 153 did not have a material effect on our consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In November 2004, the FASB issued SFAS No. 151, *Inventory Costs*, an amendment of Accounting Research Bulletin (ARB) No. 43, Chapter 4. SFAS No. 151 clarifies that abnormal inventory costs such as costs of idle facilities, excess freight and handling costs, and wasted materials (spoilage) are required to be recognized as current period charges. The provisions of SFAS No. 151 are effective for the Company for fiscal years beginning July 1, 2005. The adoption of SFAS No. 151 did not have a material impact on our consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

Table of Contents**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

KLA-Tencor Corporation is the world's leading supplier of process control and yield management solutions for the semiconductor and related microelectronics industries. Our portfolio of products, software, analysis, services and expertise is designed to help integrated circuit manufacturers manage yield throughout the entire wafer fabrication process from research and development to final mass production yield analysis.

Revenues, income from operations and net income, cash flow from operations, and diluted earnings per share are some of the key indicators we use to monitor our financial condition and operating performance. The following table sets forth some of the key quarterly unaudited financial information which we use to manage our business.

	Fiscal year 2007		Fiscal year 2006		
	First Quarter Ended September 30, 2006	First Quarter Ended September 30, 2005 As restated	Second Quarter Ended December 31, 2005 As restated	Third Quarter Ended March 31, 2006 As restated	Fourth Quarter Ended June 30, 2006
(in millions)					
Revenues	\$ 629	\$ 484	\$ 488	\$ 520	\$ 579
Income from operations	\$ 154	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 85	\$ 75
Net income	\$ 136	\$ 75	\$ 77	\$ 97	\$ 132

Industry Trends

Industry analysts have predicted that semiconductor revenues and semiconductor equipment revenues will each grow in the ranges of -5% to +10% in calendar year 2007. Over the longer term, we expect process control to continue to represent a higher percentage of our customers capital spending. We believe this percentage increase in process control spending will be driven by the demand for more precise diagnostics capabilities to address multiple new defects as a result of further shrinking of device feature sizes, the transition to new materials, new devices and circuit architecture, new lithography challenges and fab process innovation. We anticipate these factors will drive increased demand for our products and services. The key drivers for growth in the semiconductor equipment industry in calendar year 2007 are the transition to 300 millimeter fabs, the increased demand for consumer electronics and the strength of the NAND flash market.

Table of Contents**RESULTS OF OPERATIONS****Revenues and Gross Margin**

<i>(in millions)</i>	Three months ended		
	September 30, 2006	June 30, 2006	September 30, 2005 As restated
Revenues:			
Product	\$ 531	\$ 483	\$ 399
Service	98	96	85
Total revenues	\$ 629	\$ 579	\$ 484
Costs of revenues	\$ 270	\$ 284	\$ 215
Stock-based compensation expense included in costs of revenues	\$ 9	\$ 10	\$ 7
Gross margin percentage	57%	51%	56%
Stock-based compensation expense included in costs of revenues as a percentage of revenue	1%	2%	1%

Product revenues

Product revenues increased \$48 million or 10% to \$531 million during the first quarter of fiscal 2007 from \$483 million during the fourth quarter of fiscal 2006. Product revenues increased \$132 million or 33% to \$531 million during the first quarter of fiscal 2007 from \$399 million during the same period in the previous fiscal year. The increase in product revenue was primarily the result of fulfilling a higher level of orders received in prior quarters. Our customers' increased capital spending in the area of process control and yield management is due to the increasing complexity of processing in their fabs. As more complex chips are produced, new materials such as copper are introduced and device feature sizes are reduced.

Per our revenue recognition policy, we do not require written acceptance from the customer under certain situations. Revenue recognized without a written acceptance by the customer was approximately 6.4%, 6.2% and 3.2% of total revenue for the three months ended September 30, 2006, June 30, 2006 and September 30, 2005, respectively.

For the three months ended September 30, 2006 and June 30, 2006, no customer accounted for greater than 10% of revenue. For the three months ended September 30, 2005, two customers accounted for 16% and 11% of revenue, respectively.

Service revenues

Service revenues increased \$2 million or 2% to \$98 million during the first quarter of fiscal 2007 from \$96 million during the fourth quarter of fiscal 2006. Service revenues increased \$13 million or 15% to \$98 million during the first quarter of fiscal 2007

Table of Contents

from \$85 million during the same period in the previous fiscal year. Service revenue is generated from maintenance service contracts, as well as time and material billable service calls made to our customers after the expiration of the warranty period. The increase in service revenue from the three months ended September 30, 2005 to three months ended September 30, 2006 is due to an increase in the number of post-warranty systems installed at our customers' sites and the degree of utilization of those systems. Service revenues remained relatively flat from the three months ended June 30, 2006 to three months ended September 30, 2006.

Revenues by region

Revenues by region for the periods indicated were as follows (in millions):

	Three months ended					
	September 30, 2006		June 30, 2006		September 30, 2005	
United States	\$ 130	21%	\$ 141	24%	\$ 98	20%
International:						
Europe & Israel	70	11	84	14	71	15
Japan	108	17	120	21	112	23
Taiwan	137	22	107	19	81	17
Korea	87	14	60	10	85	17
Asia Pacific	97	15	67	12	37	8
Total	\$ 629	100%	\$ 579	100%	\$ 484	100%

A significant portion of our revenue continues to be generated in Asia where a substantial portion of the world's semiconductor manufacturing capacity is located.

Gross margin

Our gross margin fluctuates with revenue levels and product mix, and is affected by variations in costs related to manufacturing and servicing our products. The gross margin percentage increased by 6 percentage points to 57% during the first quarter of fiscal year 2007 compared to 51% during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2006. The improvement in gross margin during the first quarter of fiscal year 2007 compared to the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2006 is primarily due to charges related to ceased development work related to CDSEM recorded during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2006. During the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2006, we ceased development work on the next generation equipment for CDSEM and incurred charges of \$27 million related to write-offs of inventory as well as for liabilities incurred related to the decision to cease future development of CDSEM. Although we have ceased future development of CDSEM, we will continue to service previously sold equipment.

Table of Contents**Engineering, Research and Development (R&D)**

<i>(in millions)</i>	Three months ended		
	September 30,	June 30,	September 30,
	2006	2006	2005
			As restated
R&D expenses	\$ 99	\$ 99	\$ 99
Stock-based compensation expense included in R&D expenses	\$ 12	\$ 11	\$ 13
R&D expenses as a percentage of total revenues	16%	17%	20%
Stock-based compensation expense included in R&D expenses as a percentage of total revenues	2%	2%	3%

R&D expenses remained relatively flat compared to fourth quarter of fiscal 2006 and first quarter of fiscal 2006.

R&D expenses include the benefit of \$3 million, \$4 million and \$3 million of external funding received during the three months ended September 30, 2006, June 30, 2006, and September 30, 2005, respectively, for certain strategic development programs conducted with several of our customers and from government grants. We expect our R&D expenses to increase in absolute dollars as we accelerate our investments in critical programs focusing on new technologies and enhancements to existing products.

Our future operating results will depend significantly on our ability to produce products and provide services that have a competitive advantage in our marketplace. To do this, we believe that we must continue to make substantial investments in our research and development. We remain committed to product development in new and emerging technologies as we address the yield challenges our customers face at future technology nodes.

Table of Contents**Selling, General and Administrative (SG&A)**

<i>(in millions)</i>	Three months ended		
	September 30, 2006	June 30, 2006	September 30, 2005 As restated
SG&A expenses	\$ 106	\$ 121	\$ 95
Stock-based compensation expense included in SG&A expenses	\$ 17	\$ 16	\$ 20
SG&A expenses as a percentage of total revenues	17%	21%	20%
Stock-based compensation expense included in SG&A expenses as a percentage of total revenues	3%	3%	4%

SG&A expenses decreased \$15 million or 12% to \$106 million during the first quarter of fiscal 2007 from \$121 million during the fourth quarter of fiscal 2006. The decrease in SG&A expenses compared to the immediately prior quarter is primarily due to higher accrual of litigation costs in the fourth quarter of fiscal 2006 attributable to the stock option investigation. SG&A expenses increased \$11 million or 12% to \$106 million during the first quarter of fiscal 2007 from \$95 million during the same period in the previous fiscal year. The increase in SG&A expenses compared to the same period in the prior fiscal year is due to company mandated time-off during the first quarter of fiscal 2006 (which reduced our expenses for the first quarter of fiscal 2006) and \$2.5 million charges related to stock option investigations in the first quarter of fiscal 2007 and the higher accrual of litigation costs for the fourth quarter of fiscal 2006 related to the stock options investigation.

During November 2005, we announced that effective January 1, 2006, Kenneth L. Schroeder would cease to be our Chief Executive Officer and would thereafter be employed as a Senior Advisor. The Company and Mr. Schroeder also revised his prior agreement with the Company and defined the salary, bonus payout and equity award vesting during the period of his employment as a Senior Advisor. Effective January 1, 2006, we determined that all service conditions associated with certain prior equity awards under the terms of the revised agreement with Mr. Schroeder had been satisfied; accordingly we recorded an additional non-cash, stock-based compensation charge of approximately \$9.8 million relating to these equity awards. The above-mentioned charge is included as a component of Selling, General and Administrative expense during fiscal 2006. On October 16, 2006, following the Special Committee investigation of our historical stock option practices, we terminated all aspects of Mr. Schroeder's employment relationship and agreement with the Company. As a result, vesting of Mr. Schroeder's then outstanding stock options and restricted stock awards immediately ceased, and the 890,914 unvested option shares and 100,000 unvested restricted stock award shares held by Mr. Schroeder at the time of termination were canceled. Accordingly, in the second quarter of fiscal 2007 we will reverse approximately \$20 million of the non-cash, stock-based compensation charge recorded in prior periods. In December 2006, we canceled 596,740 vested option shares held by Mr. Schroeder as of the time of termination, representing those shares that had been retroactively priced or otherwise improperly granted.

In November 2006, as part of the long-term business plan, we decided to sell certain real estate properties owned by the Company in San Jose, California and Livermore, California. Based on this recent development and the significant decrease in the market value of these assets, we will record an asset impairment charge of approximately \$56 million in the quarter ended December 31, 2006. In addition, we reduced our work-force by approximately 150 people and will accrue approximately \$10 million in severance charges in the quarter ended December 31, 2006 to be paid over the next twelve months.

Table of Contents**Interest Income and Other, Net**

<i>(in millions)</i>	September 30, 2006	Three months ended June 30, 2006	September 30, 2005
Interest income and other, net	\$ 22	\$ 20	\$ 14

Percentage of total revenues	3%	3%	3%
------------------------------	----	----	----

Interest income and other, net is comprised primarily of interest income earned on the investment and cash portfolio, realized gains or losses on sales of marketable securities, as well as income recognized upon settlement of certain foreign currency contracts. The increase in interest income and other, net, compared to the same period in the prior fiscal year and compared to the fourth quarter of 2006 is primarily due to the increase in cash levels and short-term interest rates.

Provision for Income Taxes

Our effective income tax rate was 23.4% and 16.1% for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, respectively. The current quarter increase in the effective tax rate is primarily due to expiration of the federal research and development tax credit, the phase-out of the Extraterritorial Income (ETI) exclusion, and a decrease in the benefit from tax exempt interest. In general, the effective income tax rate differs from the statutory rate of 35% largely as a function of benefits realized from our ETI exclusion, research and development tax credits and tax exempt interest. Our benefits for income taxes related to equity awards were \$11.4 million and \$15.4 million for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and September 30, 2005, respectively.

Our future effective income tax rate depends on various factors, such as tax legislation, the geographic composition of our pre-tax income, non tax-deductible expenses incurred in connection with acquisitions, amounts of tax-exempt interest income and research and development credits as a percentage of aggregate pre-tax income, and the effectiveness of our tax planning strategies.

Equity Incentive Program

The Company's equity incentive program is a broad-based, long-term retention program that is intended to attract and retain key employees, and align stockholder and employee interests. The equity incentive program consists of two plans: one under which non-employee directors may be granted options to purchase shares of our stock, and another in which non-employee directors, officers, key employees, consultants and all other employees may be granted options to purchase shares of our stock, restricted stock units and other types of equity awards. For the past several years, except for the retroactively priced stock options, stock options have generally been granted at market price of our common stock on the date of grant, generally have a vesting period of five years and are exercisable for a period not to exceed seven years (ten years for options granted prior to July 1, 2005) from the date of issuance. Restricted stock units may be granted with varying criteria such as time-based or performance-based vesting. Substantially all of our employees that meet established performance goals and qualify as key employees participate in our main equity incentive plan.

On October 18, 2004, the Company's stockholders approved the 2004 Equity Incentive Plan (the 2004 Plan) which provides for the grant of options to purchase shares of the Company's common stock, stock appreciation rights, restricted stock, performance shares, performance units and deferred stock units to our employees, consultants and members of our Board of Directors. Since the adoption of the 2004 Plan, no further grants are permitted under the 1982 Stock Option Plan or 2000 Non-Statutory Stock Option Plan. The 2004 Plan permits the issuance of 12,500,000 shares of common stock, of which 1.9 million shares are available for grant as of September 30, 2006. At that date, awards for 29.2 million shares are outstanding under all plans.

Table of Contents

Stock-Based Compensation Expense

Effective July 1, 2005, we adopted the provisions of SFAS No. 123(R), Share-Based Payment. SFAS No. 123(R) establishes accounting for stock-based awards exchanged for employee services. Accordingly, stock-based compensation cost is measured at grant date, based on the fair value of the award which is computed using a Black-Scholes option valuation model, and is recognized as expense over the employee's requisite service period.

During the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, we recorded stock-based compensation expense of \$37.0 million and \$39.7 million, respectively, of which \$5 million and \$5 million was attributable to the restatement.

Compensation expense recognized for all stock options for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was \$30.0 million and \$34.5 million, respectively. As of September 30, 2006, the unrecognized stock-based compensation after estimated forfeitures related to stock options was \$194.0 million and is expected to be recognized over an estimated weighted-average amortization period of 3.2 years.

Compensation expense recognized in connection with the employee stock purchase plan was \$4.5 million and \$4.4 million for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, respectively.

Compensation expense recognized for all restricted stock units for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005 was \$2.5 million and \$0.8 million, respectively. As of September 30, 2006, the unrecognized stock-based compensation after estimated forfeitures related to restricted stock units was \$104.9 million. That cost is expected to be recognized over an estimated weighted-average amortization period of 3.8 years.

Table of Contents**LIQUIDITY AND CAPITAL RESOURCES**

<i>(in millions)</i>	September 30, 2006	June 30, 2006
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,129
Marketable securities	1,226	1,197
Total cash, cash equivalents and marketable securities	\$ 2,426	\$ 2,326
Percentage of total assets	52%	51%

<i>(in millions)</i>	September 30, 2006	Three months ended September 30, 2005 As restated
Cash provided by operating activities	\$ 107	\$ 12
Cash (used in) provided by investing activities	(34)	70
Cash (used in) provided by financing activities	(4)	3
Effect of exchange rate changes on cash and cash equivalents	2	
Net increase in cash and cash equivalents	\$ 71	\$ 85

We have historically financed our operations through cash generated from operations. Cash provided by operating activities during the three months ended September 30, 2006 consisted primarily of net income of \$136 million increased by non-cash depreciation and amortization of \$15 million and stock-based compensation of \$37 million, and changes in working capital, which primarily reflects a decrease in accounts receivable of \$21 million due to improved collection efforts, partially offset by an increase in inventory of \$43 million to meet the production demand triggered by new order increases from previous quarters as well as anticipated future demand, and a decrease in other liabilities of \$65 million due to tax payments made in the quarter ended September 30, 2006.

Cash provided by operating activities during the three months ended September 30, 2005 consisted primarily of net income of \$75 million increased by non-cash depreciation and amortization of \$18 million and stock-based compensation of \$40 million, and changes in working capital which primarily reflects a decrease in accounts receivable of \$21 million partially offset by a decrease in deferred system profit of \$28 million, an increase of \$38 million in inventory due primarily to ramping up production in anticipation of revenue growth and a decrease in other liabilities of \$55 million was primarily due to tax payments made in the quarter ended September 30, 2005.

Investing activities typically consist of purchases and sales or maturities of marketable securities, purchases of capital assets to support long-term growth and acquisitions of technology or other companies to allow access to new markets or emerging technologies.

Table of Contents

Cash (used in) provided by financing activities primarily consists of the following:

quarterly cash dividend paid to common stock,

cash paid for stock repurchases, offset by

net proceeds from the exercise of employee stock options and activity related to the Employee Stock Purchase Plan.

During the third quarter of fiscal 2005, our Board of Directors also approved the initiation of a quarterly cash dividend and declared a dividend of 12 cents per share of our outstanding common stock. The dividend for the second quarter of fiscal 2007 was declared on November 6, 2006 and was paid on December 1, 2006 to our stockholders of record on November 15, 2006. The total amount of dividends paid during the second quarter of fiscal year 2007 was \$24 million.

On October 11, 2006, we acquired all of the shares of ADE Corporation (ADE), a supplier of semiconductor process control solutions. Per the Amended Merger Agreement between the Company and ADE, we paid \$482 million (which included goodwill and intangibles of \$262 million and \$137 million, respectively) in cash to the shareholders of ADE. The acquisition will be accounted for as a purchase.

The following is a schedule summarizing our significant obligations to make future payments under contractual obligations as of September 30, 2006 (in millions):

	Total	Payments Due by Fiscal Year					Thereafter
		2007(1)	2008	2009	2010	2011	
Operating leases	\$ 19.6	\$ 4.9	\$ 4.9	\$ 3.6	\$ 2.2	\$ 1.5	\$ 2.5
Cash purchase of ADE	\$ 482.0	\$ 482.0					
Operating leases	\$ 501.6	\$ 486.9	\$ 4.9	\$ 3.6	\$ 2.2	\$ 1.5	\$ 2.5

(1) Remaining 9 months

We have agreements with financial institutions to sell certain of our trade receivables and promissory notes from customers without recourse. During the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, approximately \$80 million and \$55 million of receivables were sold under these arrangements, respectively.

In addition, from time to time we will discount without recourse, Letters of Credit (LCs) received from customers in payment of goods. During the three months ended September 30, 2006 and 2005, several LCs were sold with proceeds totaling \$30 million and \$18 million, respectively. Discounting fees were \$0.4 million and \$0.1 million for the three months ended September 30, 2006 and September 30, 2005, respectively.

We maintain certain purchase commitments with our suppliers to ensure a smooth and continuous supply chain for key components. Our liability in these purchase commitments is generally restricted to a forecasted time-horizon as mutually agreed upon between the parties. This forecasted time-horizon can vary among different suppliers. We estimate our purchase commitments as of September 30, 2006 to be approximately \$211 million, most of which we expect to spend in the current fiscal year. Actual expenditures will vary based upon the volume of the transactions and length of contractual service provided. In addition, the amounts paid under these arrangements may change in the event that the arrangements are renegotiated or canceled. Certain agreements provide for potential cancellation penalties.

Table of Contents

We provide standard warranty coverage on our systems for 40 hours per week for twelve months, providing labor and parts necessary to repair the systems during the warranty period. We account for the estimated warranty cost as a charge to cost of revenues when revenue is recognized. The estimated warranty cost is based on historical product performance and field expenses. The actual product performance and/or field expense profiles may differ, and in those cases we adjust our warranty reserves accordingly. The difference between the estimated and actual warranty costs tends to be larger for new product introductions as there is limited or no historical product performance to estimate warranty expense; more mature products with longer product performance histories tend to be more stable in our warranty charge estimates. Non-standard warranty coverage generally includes services incremental to the standard 40-hour per week coverage for twelve months. See Note 11 to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements Commitments and Contingencies for a detailed description.

We are involved in several litigation cases as described in Note 11 to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements. We cannot predict the outcome of these cases and we cannot estimate the likelihood or potential dollar amount of any adverse results.

Working capital increased to \$2.7 billion as of September 30, 2006, compared to \$2.5 billion at June 30, 2006. At September 30, 2006, our principal sources of liquidity consisted of \$2.4 billion of cash, cash equivalents, and marketable securities. Our liquidity is affected by many factors, some of which are based on the normal ongoing operations of the business, and others of which relate to the uncertainties of global economies and the semiconductor and the semiconductor equipment industries. Although cash requirements will fluctuate based on the timing and extent of these factors, our management believes that cash generated from operations, together with the liquidity provided by existing cash balances, will be sufficient to satisfy our liquidity requirements for at least the next twelve months.

Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

Under our foreign-currency risk management strategy, we utilize derivative instruments to protect our interests from unanticipated fluctuations in earnings and cash flows caused by volatility in currency exchange rates. This financial exposure is monitored and managed as an integral part of our overall risk management program which focuses on the unpredictability of financial markets and seeks to reduce the potentially adverse effects that the volatility of these markets may have on our operating results. We continue our policy of hedging our current and anticipated foreign currency exposures with hedging instruments having tenors of up to twelve months. As of September 30, 2006, we had cash flow hedge contracts, maturing throughout fiscal 2007 to sell \$204.9 million and purchase \$4.6 million, in foreign currency, primarily Japanese Yen. As of June 30, 2006, we had other foreign currency hedge contracts maturing throughout fiscal year 2007 to sell \$167.5 million and purchase \$15.2 million, in foreign currency, primarily Japanese Yen.

I TEM 3. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK

We are exposed to financial market risks, including changes in interest rates, foreign currency exchange rates and marketable equity security prices. To mitigate these risks, we utilize derivative financial instruments, such as foreign currency hedges. We do not use derivative financial instruments for speculative or trading purposes. All of the potential changes noted below are based on sensitivity analyses performed on our financial position as of September 30, 2006. Actual results may differ materially.

As of September 30, 2006, we had an investment portfolio of fixed income securities of \$1.2 billion, excluding those classified as cash and cash equivalents. These securities, as with all fixed income instruments, are subject to interest rate risk and will fall in value if market interest rates increase. If market interest rates were to increase immediately and uniformly by 10% from levels as of September 30, 2006, the fair value of the portfolio would decline by \$8.7 million.

Table of Contents

As of September 30, 2006, we had net forward contracts to sell \$336.7 million in foreign currency in order to hedge certain currency exposures (see Note 12 to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements under *Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities*). If we had entered into these contracts on September 30, 2006, the U.S. dollar equivalent would be \$343.3 million. A 10% adverse move in all currency exchange rates affecting the contracts would decrease the fair value of the contracts by \$42.6 million. However, if this occurred, the fair value of the underlying exposures hedged by the contracts would increase by a similar amount. Accordingly, we believe that the hedging of our foreign currency exposure should have no material impact on net income or cash flows.

ITEM 4. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES*Special Committee Investigation of Historical Stock Option Practices*

On May 22, 2006, the Wall Street Journal published an article about stock option backdating that questioned the stock option practices at several companies, including KLA-Tencor. On May 23, 2006, the Company received a subpoena from the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of California (USAO) and a letter of inquiry from the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regarding the Company's stock option practices. Later on May 23, 2006, the Board of Directors appointed a Special Committee composed solely of independent directors to conduct a comprehensive investigation of the Company's historical stock option practices. The Special Committee promptly engaged independent legal counsel and accounting experts to assist with the investigation. The investigation included an extensive review of the Company's historical stock option practices, accounting policies, accounting records, supporting documentation, email communications and other documentation, as well as interviews of a number of current and former directors, officers and employees. On September 27, 2006, the Special Committee reported the bulk of its findings and recommendations to the Board of Directors.

Findings and Remedial Actions

On September 28, 2006, the Company announced that it would have to restate its previously issued financial statements to correct its past accounting for stock options. As a result of the Special Committee investigation, the Company discovered that certain of its stock options, primarily those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002, had been retroactively priced for all employees who received these grants. This means that the option exercise price was not the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date of the option, but instead was a lower market price on an earlier date. The actual grant date when the essential actions necessary to grant the option were completed, including the final determination of the number of shares to be granted to each employee and the exercise price is the correct measurement date to determine the market price of the option shares under the accounting rules in effect at the time. More than 95% of the total in-the-money value (market price on the actual grant date minus exercise price) of all of the Company's retroactively priced options was attributable to those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002.

The Company previously applied Accounting Principles Board (APB) Opinion No. 25, *Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees*, and its related Interpretations and provided the required pro forma disclosures under Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 123, *Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation*, through its fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. Under APB Opinion No. 25, a non-cash, stock-based compensation expense was required to be recognized for any option for which the exercise price was below the market price on the actual grant date. Because each of the Company's retroactively priced options had an exercise price below the market price on the actual grant date, there should have been a non-cash charge for each of these options under APB Opinion No. 25 equal to the number of option shares, multiplied by the difference between the exercise price and the market price on the actual grant date. That expense should have been amortized over the vesting period of the option. Starting in its fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, the Company adopted SFAS No. 123(R), *Share-Based Payment*. As a result, beginning in fiscal year 2006, the additional stock-based compensation expense required to be recorded for each retroactively priced option is equal to the incremental fair value of the option on the actual grant date, amortized over the remaining vesting period of the option. The Company did not record these stock-based compensation expenses under APB Opinion No. 25 or SFAS No. 123(R) related to its retroactively priced options in the Company's previously issued financial statements, and that is why it is restating them in this filing. To correct the Company's past accounting for stock options, it recorded additional pre-tax, non-cash, stock-based compensation expense of (a) \$348 million for the periods from July 1, 1994 to June 30, 2005 under APB Opinion No. 25 and (b) \$27 million for the period from July 1, 2005 to September 30, 2006 under SFAS No. 123(R). The Company expects to amortize an additional \$1 million of such pre-tax charges under SFAS No. 123(R) in future periods to properly account for past retroactively priced stock options.

Table of Contents

By October 16, 2006, the Special Committee had substantially completed its investigation. The Special Committee concluded that (1) there was retroactive pricing of stock options granted to all employees who received options, primarily during the period from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002 (less than 15% of these options were granted to executive officers), (2) the retroactively priced options were not accounted for correctly in the Company's previously issued financial statements, (3) the retroactive pricing of options was intentional, not inadvertent or through administrative error, (4) the retroactive pricing of options involved the selection of fortuitously low exercise prices by certain former executive officers, and other former executives may have been aware of this conduct, (5) the retroactive pricing of options involved the falsification of Company records, resulting in erroneous statements being made in financial and other reports previously filed with the SEC, as well as in information previously provided to the Company's independent registered public accounting firm, and (6) in most instances, the retroactive pricing of options violated the terms of the Company's stock option plans. Because virtually all holders of retroactively priced options issued by the Company were not involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing, the Board of Directors decided that the Company should continue to honor the options that violated the terms of the Company's stock option plans, except in certain individual cases as described below.

The Special Committee concluded that, with a few immaterial exceptions, the retroactive pricing of stock options stopped after June 30, 2002. After that time, there were procedures in place designed to provide reasonable assurance that stock options were priced on the grant date. The Special Committee also concluded that none of the Company's independent Directors was involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing of stock options. Based on the Special Committee's report, the Board of Directors concluded that no current members of management were involved in the retroactive pricing of stock options. During its investigation of the Company's historical stock option practices, the Special Committee did not find evidence of any other financial reporting or accounting issues.

As a result of the Special Committee investigation, on October 16, 2006, the Company terminated its employment relationship and agreement with Kenneth L. Schroeder, and the Company announced its intent to cancel all outstanding stock options held by Mr. Schroeder that were retroactively priced or otherwise improperly granted. Those options were canceled in December 2006. Mr. Schroeder was the Company's Chief Executive Officer and a member of its Board of Directors from mid-1999 until January 1, 2006, and was a member of the Company's stock option committee from 1994 until December 31, 2005. From January 1, 2006 to October 16, 2006, Mr. Schroeder was employed as a Senior Advisor to the Company. On November 10, 2006, Mr. Schroeder's counsel informed the Company that Mr. Schroeder contests the Company's right to terminate his employment relationship and agreement and to cancel any of his options. The Company intends to vigorously defend any claims that may be made by Mr. Schroeder regarding these matters, which could involve a material amount.

Also on October 16, 2006, Stuart J. Nichols, Vice President and General Counsel, resigned. Mr. Nichols and the Company entered into a Separation Agreement and General Release under which Mr. Nichols' outstanding retroactively priced stock options have been re-priced by increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006.

On October 16, 2006, Kenneth Levy, Founder and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Company, retired as a director and employee, and was named Chairman Emeritus by the Company's Board of Directors. Mr. Levy and the Company entered into a Separation Agreement and General Release under which Mr. Levy's outstanding retroactively priced stock options have been re-priced by increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006. Mr. Levy was the Company's Chief Executive Officer from 1975 until mid-1999 (with the exception of mid-1997 to mid-1998), was a member of the Company's Board of Directors from 1975 until his retirement, was Chairman of the Board of Directors from 1999 until his retirement, and was a member of the Company's stock option committee from 1994 until use of that committee was suspended in the fall of 2006.

On December 21, 2006, Jon D. Tompkins resigned as a director of the Company, and the Company agreed to modify the outstanding options held by Mr. Tompkins (all of which were fully vested) to extend the post-termination exercisability period to December 31, 2007, which is the last day of the calendar year in which those options would have terminated in the absence of such extension. Mr. Tompkins, the Chief Executive Officer of Tencor Instruments before its merger into the Company in mid-1997, was the Company's Chief Executive Officer from mid-1997 to mid-1998, was a member of the Company's stock option committee from mid-1997 until mid-1999, and was a member of the Company's Board of Directors from mid-1997 until his resignation.

Although the Board of Directors concluded that John H. Kispert, the Company's President and Chief Operating Officer, was not involved in and was not aware of the improper stock option practices, based on the Special Committee's recommendation, his outstanding retroactively priced options have been re-priced because he served as Chief Financial Officer during part of the period in question. This re-pricing involved increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006.

Table of Contents

Restatement and Impact on Financial Statements

This Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q includes restatements of the following previously filed financial statements and data (and related disclosures): (1) the Company's consolidated financial statements as of and for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2005 and 2004; (2) the Company's selected consolidated financial data as of and for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2005, 2004, 2003 and 2002, and (3) the Company's unaudited quarterly financial data for the first three quarters in our fiscal year ended June 30, 2006 and for all quarters in our fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. As a result of the restatements, the related disclosures included in the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements have been revised if indicated as restated.

The total effect of the restatements up through June 30, 2005 resulted in pre-tax, non-cash, stock-based compensation charges in the amount of \$348 million under APB Opinion No. 25. Effective July 1, 2005, the Company adopted SFAS No. 123(R). The grant date fair values of stock options granted prior to the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006 were changed as a result of the findings that certain stock option grants were retroactively priced. This change resulted in additional stock-based compensation expense of \$22 million and a related tax benefit of \$12 million being recognized in fiscal year 2006 under SFAS No. 123(R).

In addition, the Company evaluated the impact of the restatements on its global tax provision. The Company and its subsidiaries file tax returns in multiple tax jurisdictions around the world. In certain jurisdictions, including, but not limited to, the United States and the United Kingdom, the Company is able to claim a tax deduction relative to stock options. In those jurisdictions, where a tax deduction is claimed, the Company has recorded deferred tax assets, totaling \$51.6 million at June 30, 2005, to reflect future tax deductions to the extent the Company believes such assets to be recoverable. The Company also believes that it should not have taken a United States tax deduction in prior years for stock option related amounts pertaining to certain executives under Internal Revenue Code (IRC) Section 162 (m). Section 162 (m) limits the deductibility of compensation above certain thresholds. The Company has determined that excess deductions were taken on prior tax returns due to the finding that retroactive pricing of certain stock options occurred. As a result, the Company's tax liabilities have increased by approximately \$8 million.

Because virtually all holders of retroactively priced options issued by the Company were not involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing, the Company has taken and intends to take certain actions to deal with the adverse tax consequences that may be incurred by the holders of retroactively priced options. The adverse tax consequences are that retroactively priced stock options vesting after December 31, 2004 (409A Affected Options) subject the option holder to a penalty tax under IRC Section 409A (and, as applicable, similar penalty taxes under California and other state tax laws). One such action by the Company is to offer to amend the 409A Affected Options to increase the exercise price to the market price on the actual grant date or, if lower, the market price at the time of the amendment. The amended options would not be subject to taxation under IRC Section 409A. Under IRS regulations, these option amendments had to be completed by December 31, 2006 for anyone who was an executive officer when he or she received 409A Affected Options; the amendments for non-officers cannot be offered until after this Report is filed and do not need to be completed until December 31, 2007. Another action is to approve bonuses payable to holders of the amended options to compensate them for the resulting increase in their option exercise price. The amount of these bonuses would be effectively repaid to the Company if and when the options are exercised and the increased exercise price is paid (but there is no assurance that the options will be exercised). Finally, the Company intends to compensate certain option holders who have already exercised 409A Affected Options for the additional taxes they incur under IRC Section 409A (and, as applicable, similar state tax laws).

Three of the Company's option holders were subject to the December 31, 2006 deadline described above. Accordingly, in December 2006, the Company offered to amend the 409A Affected Options held by Richard P. Wallace, the Company's Chief Executive Officer, and two former executive officers to increase the exercise price so that these options will not subject the option holder to a penalty tax under IRC Section 409A. All three individuals accepted the Company's offer. In addition, the Company agreed to pay each of the three individuals a cash bonus in January 2008 equal to the aggregate increase in the exercise prices for his amended options. For Mr. Wallace, the amount of this bonus is \$0.4 million. To account for these actions, the Company will record a net charge of \$0.3 million in the quarter ended December 31, 2006. The Company plans to take similar actions with respect to the outstanding 409A Affected Options granted to non-officers as soon as possible after the filing of this Report. The Company estimates that the total cash payments needed to deal with the adverse tax consequences of retroactively priced options granted to non-officers will be approximately \$30 million.

With respect to the individuals whose options were canceled or re-priced by the Company following the Special Committee investigation, no bonuses of the type described above will be paid.

Table of Contents

Remediation of Past Material Weaknesses in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

As a result of the Special Committee investigation, the Company identified certain material weaknesses in its internal control over financial reporting in periods ending prior to June 30, 2006. Before June 30, 2002, the Company did not have sufficient safeguards in place to monitor its control practices regarding stock option pricing and related financial reporting and to foster an effective flow of information between those responsible for stock option pricing and those responsible for financial reporting. Inadequate training, communication and coordination in and among the Company's human resources, stock administration, legal and finance functions prevented the Company from assuring that stock options were priced and accounted for correctly, primarily from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002.

In addition, the stock option pricing process during that time period was overly dependent on certain former executive officers of the Company, and was administered by a stock option committee that was not always properly constituted and sometimes acted outside the scope of the authority delegated to it by the Company's Board of Directors. The individual who served as the Company's Chief Executive Officer during part of that time period and continuing until midway through the last fiscal year, was involved in the past retroactive pricing of stock options. To that extent, the material weaknesses in the Company's internal control over financial reporting continued until midway through the last fiscal year. However, no issues regarding stock option pricing and accounting arose during the year ended June 30, 2006.

Since mid-2002, the Company has made a number of important changes in its controls related to granting, pricing and accounting for stock options. In addition, the Company's Board of Directors elected a new management team and approved new procedures for approving stock options and other equity awards. These changes including the following:

In response to certain of the reporting requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, which requires executive officers to report stock option grants within two business days, the Company implemented new procedures for stock option grants that were designed to provide reasonable assurance that stock options were priced on the actual grant date. Since that time, with a few immaterial exceptions, there have been no instances of retroactive pricing of stock options.

Also in response to the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, the Company established a confidential hotline for use by employees to report actual or suspected wrongdoing and to answer questions about business conduct. Reports may be made anonymously, and all reports are investigated. Information about this hotline is available on the Company's internal and external websites, and employees are reminded of its existence at least annually.

Effective July 1, 2005, the Company adopted SFAS No. 123(R) and added controls in its stock administration, human resources and finance functions to ensure that stock-based compensation expenses are recorded correctly. In addition, the Company hired individuals knowledgeable about the requirements of SFAS No. 123(R).

In January 2006, a new management team elected by the Board of Directors took office. The new management team is led by Richard P. Wallace, the Chief Executive Officer. After joining the Company in 1988, Mr. Wallace had spent most of his career in business unit roles, with no responsibility for corporate functions and no participation in the stock option granting process until mid-2005. During January 2006, well before the stock option issues were discovered, Mr. Wallace launched a number of key initiatives designed to foster open and direct communications and to establish a tone at the top based on integrity and excellence. Mr. Wallace regularly communicates with all employees to reinforce these values, and the Company believes that these values have been embraced by the management team and general employee population.

As a result of the Special Committee investigation, in the fall of 2006, the Board of Directors suspended use of the stock option committee and delegated sole authority for granting stock options and restricted stock awards to the full Compensation Committee, subject to ratification by the Board of Directors, with the grant date being the date of the Compensation Committee approval and with the pricing based on the market price on the grant date. The Board of Directors may in the future evaluate the possibility of again using a stock option committee, and, if so, the Company will implement additional controls designed to assure that the stock option committee is properly constituted and acts within the scope of its delegated authority.

Edgar Filing: KLA TENCOR CORP - Form 10-Q

The Company believes that these changes remediated the past material weaknesses identified above and reduced to remote the likelihood that any retroactive pricing of stock options or any material error in accounting for stock options could have occurred during the last fiscal year and not been detected as of June 30, 2006. As a result, the Company believes that the likelihood that a material error in its financial statements could have originated during the last fiscal year and not been detected as of June 30, 2006 was remote.

Table of Contents

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Attached as exhibits to this Annual Report are certifications of the Company's Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and Chief Financial Officer (CFO), which are required in accordance with Rule 13a-14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (Exchange Act). This Controls and Procedures section includes the information concerning the controls evaluation referred to in the certifications, and it should be read in conjunction with the certifications for a more complete understanding of the topics presented.

The Company conducted an evaluation of the effectiveness of the design and operation of its disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in the Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Exchange Act) (Disclosure Controls) as of the end of the period covered by this Report required by Exchange Act Rules 13a-15(b) or 15d-15b. The controls evaluation was conducted under the supervision and with the participation of the Company's management, including the CEO and CFO. Based on this evaluation, the CEO and our CFO have concluded that as of the end of the period covered by this report the Company's disclosure controls and procedures were effective at a reasonable assurance level.

Definition of Disclosure Controls

Disclosure Controls are controls and procedures designed to reasonably assure that information required to be disclosed in the Company's reports filed under the Exchange Act, such as this Report, is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC's rules and forms. Disclosure Controls are also designed to reasonably assure that such information is accumulated and communicated to the Company's management, including the CEO and CFO, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure. The Company's Disclosure Controls include components of its internal control over financial reporting, which consists of control processes designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of its financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles in the U.S. To the extent that components of the Company's internal control over financial reporting are included within its Disclosure Controls, they are included in the scope of the Company's annual controls evaluation.

Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting

The Company's management is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting as defined in Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f) under the Exchange Act. Under the supervision and with the participation of the Company's management, including the CEO and CFO, the Company conducted an evaluation of the effectiveness of its internal control over financial reporting based on criteria established in the framework in Internal Control - Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. Based on this evaluation, the Company's management concluded that the Company's internal control over financial reporting was effective as of June 30, 2006. The assessment by the Company's management of the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of June 30, 2006 has been audited by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, an independent registered public accounting firm, as stated in their report which appears on page 100.

Limitations on the Effectiveness of Controls

The Company's management, including the CEO and CFO, does not expect that the Company's Disclosure Controls or internal control over financial reporting will prevent all error and all fraud. A control system, no matter how well designed and operated, can provide only reasonable, not absolute, assurance that the control system's objectives will be met. Further, the design of a control system must reflect the fact that there are resource constraints, and the benefits of controls must be considered relative to their costs. Because of the inherent limitations in all control systems, no evaluation of controls can provide absolute assurance that all control issues and instances of fraud, if any, within the Company have been detected. These inherent limitations include the realities that judgments in decision making can be faulty and that breakdowns can occur because of simple error or mistake. Controls can also be circumvented by the individual acts of some persons, by collusion of two or more people, or by management override of the controls. The design of any system of controls is based in part on certain assumptions about the likelihood of future events, and there can be no assurance that any design will succeed in achieving its stated goals under all potential future conditions. Over time, controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions or deterioration in the degree of compliance with policies or procedures. Because of the inherent limitations in a cost-effective control system, misstatements due to error or fraud may occur and not be detected.

Changes in Internal Control over Financial Reporting

There were no changes in the Company's internal control over financial reporting that occurred during the most recent fiscal quarter that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

Table of Contents**PART II. OTHER INFORMATION****ITEM 1. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS***Special Committee Investigation of Historical Stock Option Practices*

On May 22, 2006, the Wall Street Journal published an article about stock option backdating that questioned the stock option practices at several companies, including KLA-Tencor. On May 23, 2006, we received a subpoena from the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of California (USAO) and a letter of inquiry from the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regarding our stock option practices. Later on May 23, 2006, our Board of Directors appointed a Special Committee composed solely of independent directors to conduct a comprehensive investigation of our historical stock option practices. The Special Committee promptly engaged independent legal counsel and accounting experts to assist with the investigation. The investigation included an extensive review of our historical stock option practices, accounting policies, accounting records, supporting documentation, email communications and other documentation, as well as interviews of a number of current and former directors, officers and employees. On September 27, 2006, the Special Committee reported the bulk of its findings and recommendations to our Board of Directors.

Findings and Remedial Actions

On September 28, 2006, we announced that we would have to restate our previously issued financial statements to correct our past accounting for stock options. As a result of the Special Committee investigation, we discovered that certain of our stock options, primarily those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002, had been retroactively priced for all employees who received these grants. This means that the option exercise price was not the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date of the option, but instead was a lower market price on an earlier date. The actual grant date when the essential actions necessary to grant the option were completed, including the final determination of the number of shares to be granted to each employee and the exercise price is the correct measurement date to determine the market price of the option shares under the accounting rules in effect at the time. More than 95% of the total in-the-money value (market price on the actual grant date minus exercise price) of all of our retroactively priced options was attributable to those granted from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002.

We previously applied Accounting Principles Board (APB) Opinion No. 25, Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees, and its related Interpretations and provided the required pro forma disclosures under Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 123, Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation, through our fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. Under APB Opinion No. 25, a non-cash, stock-based compensation expense was required to be recognized for any option for which the exercise price was below the market price on the actual grant date. Because each of our retroactively priced options had an exercise price below the market price on the actual grant date, there should have been a non-cash charge for each of these options under APB Opinion No. 25 equal to the number of option shares, multiplied by the difference between the exercise price and the market price on the actual grant date. That expense should have been amortized over the vesting period of the option. Starting in our fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, we adopted SFAS No. 123(R), Share-Based Payment. As a result, beginning in fiscal year 2006, the additional stock-based compensation expense required to be recorded for each retroactively priced option is equal to the incremental fair value of the option on the actual grant date, amortized over the remaining vesting period of the option. We did not record these stock-based compensation expenses under APB Opinion No. 25 or SFAS No. 123(R) related to our retroactively priced options in our previously issued financial statements, and that is why we are restating them in this filing. To correct our past accounting for stock options, we recorded additional pre-tax, non-cash, stock-based compensation expense of (a) \$348 million for the periods July 1, 1994 to June 30, 2005 under APB Opinion No. 25 and (b) \$27 million for the period from July 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 under SFAS No. 123(R). We expect to amortize an additional \$1 million of such pre-tax charges under SFAS No. 123(R) in future periods to properly account for past retroactively priced stock options.

Table of Contents

By October 16, 2006, the Special Committee had substantially completed its investigation. The Special Committee concluded that (1) there was retroactive pricing of stock options granted to all employees who received options, primarily during the periods from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002 (less than 15% of these options were granted to executive officers), (2) the retroactively priced options were not accounted for correctly in our previously issued financial statements, (3) the retroactive pricing of options was intentional, not inadvertent or through administrative error, (4) the retroactive pricing of options involved the selection of fortuitously low exercise prices by certain former executive officers, and other former executives may have been aware of this conduct, (5) the retroactive pricing of options involved the falsification of Company records, resulting in erroneous statements being made in financial and other reports previously filed with the SEC, as well as in information previously provided to our independent registered public accounting firm, and (6) in most instances, the retroactive pricing of options violated the terms of our stock option plans. Because virtually all holders of retroactively priced options issued by the Company were not involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing, the Board of Directors decided that we should continue to honor the options that violated the terms of our stock option plans, except in certain individual cases as described below.

The Special Committee concluded that, with a few immaterial exceptions, the retroactive pricing of stock options stopped after June 30, 2002. After that time, there were procedures in place designed to provide reasonable assurance that stock options were priced on the grant date. The Special Committee also concluded that none of our independent Directors was involved in or aware of the retroactive pricing of stock options. Based on the Special Committee's report, our Board of Directors concluded that no current members of management were involved in the retroactive pricing of stock options. During its investigation of our historical stock option practices, the Special Committee did not find evidence of any other financial reporting or accounting issues.

As a result of the Special Committee investigation, on October 16, 2006, we terminated our employment relationship and agreement with Kenneth L. Schroeder, and we announced our intent to cancel all outstanding stock options held by Mr. Schroeder that were retroactively priced or otherwise improperly granted. Those options were canceled in December 2006. Mr. Schroeder was the Company's Chief Executive Officer and a member of its Board of Directors from mid-1999 until December 31, 2005, and was a member of the Company's stock option committee from 1994 until December 31, 2005. From January 1, 2006 to October 16, 2006, Mr. Schroeder was employed as a Senior Advisor to the Company. On November 10, 2006, Mr. Schroeder's counsel informed us that Mr. Schroeder contests our right to terminate his employment relationship and agreement and to cancel any of his options. We intend to vigorously defend any claims that may be made by Mr. Schroeder regarding these matters, which could involve a material amount.

Also on October 16, 2006, Stuart J. Nichols, Vice President and General Counsel, resigned. Mr. Nichols and we entered into a Separation Agreement and General Release under which Mr. Nichols' outstanding retroactively priced stock options have been re-priced by increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006.

On October 16, 2006, Kenneth Levy, Founder and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Company, retired as a director and employee, and was named Chairman Emeritus by our Board of Directors. Mr. Levy and we entered into a Separation

Table of Contents

Agreement and General Release under which Mr. Levy's outstanding retroactively priced stock options have been re-priced by increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS No. 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006. Mr. Levy was the Company's Chief Executive Officer from 1975 until mid-1999 (with the exception of mid-1997 to mid-1998), was a member of the Company's Board of Directors from 1975 until his retirement, was Chairman of the Board of Directors from 1999 until his retirement, and was a member of the Company's Stock Option Committee from 1994 until use of that committee was suspended in the fall of 2006.

On December 21, 2006, Jon D. Tompkins resigned as a director of the Company, and we agreed to modify the outstanding options held by Mr. Tompkins (all of which were fully vested) to extend the post-termination exercisability period to December 31, 2007, which is the last day of the calendar year in which those options would have terminated in the absence of such extension. Mr. Tompkins, the Chief Executive Officer of Tencor Instruments before its merger into the Company in mid-1997, was the Company's Chief Executive Officer from mid-1997 to mid-1998, was a member of the Company's stock option committee from mid-1997 until mid-1999, and was a member of the Company's Board of Directors from mid-1997 until his resignation.

Although the Board of Directors concluded that John H. Kispert, our President and Chief Operating Officer, was not involved in and was not aware of the improper stock option practices, based on the Special Committee's recommendation, his outstanding retroactively priced options have been re-priced because he served as Chief Financial Officer during part of the period in question. This re-pricing involved increasing the exercise price to the market price of the option shares on the actual grant date. Under SFAS 123(R), no incremental charge will be recognized in the financial statements for the quarter ended December 31, 2006.

After the Special Committee substantially completed its investigation, a number of follow-up activities continued, especially in connection with the preparation of our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006. The Special Committee also continues to assist the Company in connection with the government inquiries described below. Additional follow-up activities may be required.

Government Inquiries Relating to Historical Stock Option Practices

On May 23, 2006, we received a subpoena from the USAO requesting information relating to our past stock option grants and related accounting matters. Also on May 23, 2006, we received a letter from the SEC making an informal inquiry and request for information on the same subject matters. We are cooperating fully with the USAO and SEC inquiries and intend to continue to do so. These inquiries likely will require us to expend significant management time and incur significant legal and other expenses, and could result in civil and criminal actions seeking, among other things, injunctions against the Company and the payment of significant fines and penalties by the Company, which may adversely affect our results of operations and cash flow.

We have also responded to inquiries from the U.S. Department of Labor, which is conducting an examination of our 401(k) Savings Plan. We are cooperating fully with this examination and intend to continue to do so.

We cannot predict how long it will take to or how much more time and resources we will have to expend to resolve these government inquiries, nor can we predict the outcome of these inquiries. Also, there can be no assurance that other inquiries, investigations or actions will not be started by other United States federal or state regulatory agencies or by foreign governmental agencies.

Late SEC Filings and Nasdaq Delisting Proceedings

Due to the Special Committee investigation and the resulting restatements, we did not file on time our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006. As a result, we received two Nasdaq Staff Determination letters, dated September 14, 2006 and November 14, 2006, respectively, stating that we

Table of Contents

were not in compliance with the filing requirements of Marketplace Rule 4310(c)(14) and, therefore, that our stock was subject to delisting from the Nasdaq Global Select Market. We appealed this determination and requested a hearing before a Nasdaq Listing Qualifications Panel. On October 26, 2006, we attended a hearing, at which we sought appropriate exceptions to the filing requirements from the Panel pending completion and filing of our delinquent reports. On January 3, 2007, the Panel granted our request for continued listing of our stock on the Nasdaq Global Select Market, subject to the condition that we file our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006 on or before January 31, 2007.

With the filing of our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006, we believe we have returned to full compliance with SEC reporting requirements and Nasdaq listing requirements, and, therefore, that the Nasdaq delisting matter is now closed. However, we cannot predict whether the SEC will review these Reports and, if so, whether the SEC will have comments on these Reports (or other reports that we previously filed) that may require us to file amended reports with the SEC. In addition, we cannot predict whether the Nasdaq Listing Qualifications Panel will concur that we are in compliance with all relevant listing requirements. If either of those events occurs, we might be unable to remain in compliance with SEC reporting requirements and Nasdaq listing requirements, and, therefore, we might be unable to maintain an effective listing of our common stock on the Nasdaq Global Select Market or any other national securities exchange.

Shareholder Derivative Litigation Relating to Historical Stock Option Practices

Beginning on May 22, 2006, several persons and entities identifying themselves as shareholders of KLA-Tencor filed derivative actions purporting to assert claims on behalf of and in the name of the Company against various of our current and former directors and officers relating to our accounting for stock options issued from 1994 to the present. The complaints in these actions allege that the individual defendants breached their fiduciary duties and other obligations to the Company and violated state and federal securities laws in connection with our historical stock option granting process, our accounting for past stock options, and historical sales of stock by the individual defendants. Three substantially similar actions are pending, one in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California (which consists of three separate lawsuits consolidated in one action); one in the California Superior Court for Santa Clara County; and one in the Delaware Chancery Court.

The plaintiffs in the derivative actions have asserted claims for violations of Sections 10(b) (including Rule 10b-5 thereunder), 14(a), and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, unjust enrichment, breach of fiduciary duty and aiding and abetting such breach, negligence, misappropriation of information, abuse of control, gross mismanagement, waste of corporate assets, breach of contract, constructive fraud, rescission, and violations of California Corporations Code section 25402, as well as a claim for an accounting of all stock option grants made to the named defendants. KLA-Tencor is named as a nominal defendant in these actions. On behalf of KLA-Tencor, the plaintiffs seek unspecified monetary and other relief against the named defendants. The plaintiffs are James Ziolkowski, Mark Ziering, Alaska Electrical Pension Fund, Jeffrey Rabin, and Benjamin Langford. The individual named defendants are current directors and officers; Edward W. Barnholt, H. Raymond Bingham, Robert T. Bond, Jeffrey L. Hall, Stephen P. Kaufman, John H. Kispert, Lida Urbanek and Richard P. Wallace; and former directors and officers; Robert J. Boehlke, Leo Chamberlain, Gary E. Dickerson, Richard J. Elkus, Jr., Dennis J. Fortino, Kenneth Levy, Michael E. Marks, Stuart J. Nichols, Arthur P. Schnitzer, Kenneth L. Schroeder and Jon D. Tompkins. Current director David C. Wang and former director Dean O. Morton were originally named as defendants in one of the derivatives actions filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, but were dropped as named defendants as of December 22, 2006 upon the filing of a consolidated complaint in that action.

Table of Contents

The derivative actions are at an early stage. Discovery has not commenced, and the defendants are not yet required to respond to the complaints. Our Board of Directors has appointed a Special Litigation Committee (SLC) composed solely of independent directors to conduct an independent investigation of the claims asserted in the derivative actions and to determine the Company s position with respect to those claims. The SLC s investigation is in progress. We cannot predict whether these actions are likely to result in any material recovery by or expense to KLA-Tencor.

Shareholder Class Action Litigation Relating to Historical Stock Option Practices

KLA-Tencor and various of our current and former directors and officers were named as defendants in a putative securities class action filed on June 29, 2006 in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Two similar actions were filed later in the same court, and all three cases have been consolidated into one action. The complaints allege claims under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as a result of our past stock option grants and related accounting and reporting, and seek unspecified monetary damages and other relief. The plaintiffs seek to represent a class consisting of purchasers of KLA-Tencor stock between February 13, 2001 and May 22, 2006 who allegedly suffered losses as a result of material misrepresentations in KLA-Tencor s SEC filings during that period. The lead plaintiffs, who seek to represent the class, are the Police and Fire Retirement System of the City of Detroit, the Louisiana Municipal Police Employees Retirement System, and the City of Philadelphia Board of Pensions and Retirement. The defendants are KLA-Tencor, Edward W. Barnholt, H. Raymond Bingham, Robert J. Boehlke, Robert T. Bond, Gary E. Dickerson, Richard J. Elkus, Jr., Jeffrey L. Hall, Stephen P. Kaufman, John H. Kispert, Kenneth Levy, Michael E. Marks, Kenneth L. Schroeder, Jon D. Tompkins, Lida Urbanek and Richard P. Wallace.

This litigation is at an early stage. Discovery has not commenced, the court has not yet determined whether the plaintiffs may sue on behalf of any class of purchasers, and the defendants are not yet required to respond to the complaints. The Company intends to vigorously defend this litigation.

As part of a derivative lawsuit filed in the Delaware Chancery Court on July 21, 2006 (described above), a plaintiff claiming to be a KLA-Tencor shareholder also asserted a separate putative class action claim against KLA-Tencor and certain of our current and former directors and officers alleging that shareholders incurred damage due to purported dilution of KLA-Tencor common stock resulting from historical stock option granting practices. The Company intends to vigorously defend this litigation.

We cannot predict the outcome of the shareholder class action cases (described above), and we cannot estimate the likelihood or potential dollar amount of any adverse results. However, an unfavorable outcome in this litigation could have a material adverse impact upon our financial position, results of operations or cash flows for the period in which the outcome occurs and in future periods.

Indemnification Obligations

Subject to certain limitations, we are obligated to indemnify our current and former directors, officers and employees in connection with the investigation of our historical stock option practices and related government inquiries and litigation. These obligations arise under the terms of our certificate of incorporation, our bylaws, applicable contracts, and Delaware and California law. The obligation to indemnify generally means that we are required to pay or reimburse the individuals reasonable legal expenses and possibly damages and other liabilities incurred in connection with these matters. We are currently paying or reimbursing legal expenses being incurred in connection with these matters by a number of our current and former directors, officers and employees. Although the maximum potential amount of future payments KLA-Tencor could be required to make under these agreements is theoretically unlimited, the Company believes the fair value of this liability is adequately covered within the reserves it has established for currently pending legal proceedings.

Table of Contents

Other Legal Matters

We are named from time to time as a party to lawsuits in the normal course of our business. Litigation in general, and intellectual property and securities litigation in particular, can be expensive and disruptive to normal business operations. Moreover, the results of legal proceedings are difficult to predict.

ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

Our operating results and stock price have varied widely in the past, and our future operating results will continue to be subject to quarterly variations based upon numerous factors, including those listed in this section and throughout this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. Our stock price will continue to be subject to daily variations as well. In addition, our future operating results and stock price may not follow any past trends.

We believe the factors that could make our results fluctuate and difficult to predict include:

- i our ability to successfully address and resolve all issues arising from the discovery that we had retroactively priced stock options (primarily from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002) and had not accounted for them correctly;
- i the cyclical nature of the semiconductor industry;
- i global economic uncertainty;
- i competitive pressure;
- i our ability to develop and implement new technologies and introduce new products;
- i our ability to maintain supply of key components;
- i our ability to manage our manufacturing requirements;
- i our reliance on services provided by third parties;
- i our customers' acceptance and adoption of our new products and technologies;
- i our ability to protect our intellectual property;
- i our ability to attract, retain, and replace key employees;
- i our ability to manage risks associated with acquisitions;

- i litigation regarding IP and other business matters;
- i worldwide political instability;
- i earthquake and other uninsured risks;
- i our ability to comply with recently enacted and proposed changes in securities laws and regulations;
- i future changes in accounting and tax standards or practices;
- i changing regulatory environment;
- i our exposure to fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates; and
- i our ability to successfully modify new systems and guard against computer viruses.

Operating results also could be affected by sudden changes in customer requirements and other economic conditions affecting customer demand and the cost of operations in one or more of the global markets in which we do business. As a result of these or other factors, we could fail to achieve our expectations as to future revenue, gross profit and income from operations. Our failure to meet the performance expectations set and published by external sources could result in a sudden and significant drop in the price of our stock, particularly on a short-term basis, and could negatively affect the value of any investment in our stock.

Table of Contents

The discovery that we had retroactively priced stock options (primarily from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2002) and had not accounted for them correctly has had, and may continue to have, a material adverse effect on our financial results.

We cannot predict the outcome of the pending government inquiries or shareholder lawsuits, and we may face additional government actions, shareholder lawsuits and other legal proceedings related to our historical stock option practices and the remedial actions we have taken. All of these events have required us, and will continue to require us, to expend significant management time and incur significant accounting, legal, and other expenses. This could divert attention and resources from the operation of our business and adversely affects our financial condition and results of operations.

The Special Committee investigation of our historical stock option practices and resulting restatements has been time consuming and expensive, and has had a material adverse effect on us.

The Special Committee investigation and restatement activities have required us to expend significant management time and incur significant accounting, legal, and other expenses. The resulting restatements have had a material adverse effect on our results of operations. We have recorded additional pre-tax, non-cash, stock-based compensation expense (a) of \$348 million for the periods from July 1, 1994 to June 30, 2005 under APB Opinion No. 25 and (b) \$27 million for the period from July 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 under SFAS No. 123(R). We expect to amortize an additional \$1 million of such expenses in future periods. In addition, we have established a Special Litigation Committee to oversee the litigation matters that arose out of the investigation and the restatements and we cannot predict what additional actions may be required by these Committees. The period of time necessary to resolve these follow-up matters is uncertain, and these matters could require significant additional attention and resources.

The ongoing government inquiries relating to our historical stock option practices are time consuming and expensive and could result in injunctions, fines and penalties that may have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

The inquiries by the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of California (USAO) and the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) into our historical stock option practices are ongoing. We have fully cooperated with the USAO and the SEC and intend to continue to do so. The period of time necessary to resolve these inquiries is uncertain, and we cannot predict the outcome of these inquiries or whether we will face additional government inquiries, investigations or other actions related to our historical stock option practices. These inquiries will likely require us to continue to expend significant management time and incur significant legal and other expenses, and could result in civil and criminal actions seeking, among other things, injunctions against the Company and the payment of significant fines and penalties by the Company, which may have a material adverse effect on our financial condition, results of operations and cash flow.

We have not been in compliance with SEC reporting requirements and Nasdaq listing requirements and may continue to face compliance issues with both. If we are unable to remain in compliance with SEC reporting requirements and Nasdaq listing requirements, there may be a material adverse effect on the Company and our stockholders.

Due to the Special Committee investigation and resulting restatements, we could not file our periodic reports with the SEC on time and faced the possibility of delisting of our stock from the Nasdaq Global Select Market. With the filing of our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended June 30, 2006 and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2006, we believe we have returned to full compliance with SEC reporting requirements and Nasdaq listing requirements and, therefore, that the

Table of Contents

Nasdaq delisting matter is now closed. However, if the SEC has comments on these Reports (or other reports that we previously filed) that require us to file amended reports, or if the Nasdaq Listing Qualifications Panel does not concur that we are in compliance with applicable listing requirements, we may be unable to maintain an effective listing of our stock on a national securities exchange. If this happens, the price of our stock and the ability of our stockholders to trade in our stock could be adversely affected. In addition, we would be subject to a number of restrictions regarding the registration of our stock under federal securities laws, and we would not be able to issue stock options or other equity awards to our employees or allow them to exercise their outstanding options, which could adversely affect our business and results of operations.

We have been named as a party to a number of shareholder derivative and class action lawsuits relating to our historical stock option practices, and we may be named in additional lawsuits in the future. This litigation could become time consuming and expensive and could result in the payment of significant judgments and settlements, which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

In connection with our historical stock option practices and resulting restatements, a number of derivative actions were filed against certain of our current and former directors and officers purporting to assert claims on the Company's behalf. In addition, a number of securities class action complaints were filed against us and certain of our current and former directors and officers seeking damages related to our historical stock option practices and the resulting investigation, inquiries and restatements. There may be additional lawsuits of this nature filed in the future. We cannot predict the outcome of these lawsuits, nor can we predict the amount of time and expense that will be required to resolve these lawsuits. If these lawsuits become time consuming and expensive, or if there are unfavorable outcomes in any of these cases, there could be a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our insurance coverage will not cover our total liabilities and expenses in these lawsuits, in part because we have a significant deductible on certain aspects of the coverage. In addition, subject to certain limitations, we are obligated to indemnify our current and former directors, officers and employees in connection with the investigation of our historical stock option practices and the related government inquiries and litigation. We currently hold insurance policies for the benefit of our directors and officers, although our insurance coverage may not be sufficient in some or all of these matters. Furthermore, the insurers may seek to deny or limit coverage in some or all of these matters, in which case we may have to self-fund all or a substantial portion of our indemnification obligations.

We are subject to the risks of additional lawsuits in connection with our historical stock option practices, the resulting restatements, and the remedial measures we have taken.

In addition to the possibilities that there may be additional governmental actions and shareholder lawsuits against us, we may be sued or taken to arbitration by former officers and employees in connection with their stock options, employment terminations and other matters. These lawsuits may be time consuming and expensive, and cause further distraction from the operation of our business. The adverse resolution of any specific lawsuit could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

Our efforts to correct past material weaknesses in our internal controls may not have been sufficient, and we may discover additional material weaknesses in our internal controls.

As a result of the Special Committee investigation and our management's internal review of our historical stock option practices and related matters, we identified past material weaknesses in our internal controls and procedures (see Item 4 Controls and Procedures). A material weakness is a control deficiency, or combination of them, that results in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement in our financial statements will not be prevented or detected. We believe that we have remedied the past material weaknesses in our internal controls and procedures, but there can be no assurance that our corrections were sufficient or fully effective, or that we will not discover additional material weaknesses in our internal controls and procedures in the future.

Failure to maintain effective internal controls may cause us to delay filing our periodic reports with the SEC, affect our Nasdaq listing, and adversely affect our stock price.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, as directed by Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, adopted rules requiring public companies to include a report of management on internal control over financial reporting in their annual reports on Form 10-K that contain an assessment by management of the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting. In addition, our independent registered public accounting firm must attest to and report on management's assessment of the effectiveness of the internal control over financial reporting. Although we review our internal control over financial reporting in order to ensure compliance with the Section 404 requirements, if our independent registered public accounting firm is not satisfied with our internal control over financial reporting or the level at which these controls are documented, designed, operated or reviewed, or if the independent registered public accounting firm interprets the requirements, rules and/or regulations differently from our interpretation, then they may decline to attest to management's assessment or may issue a report that is qualified. This could result in an adverse reaction in the financial marketplace due to a loss of investor confidence in the reliability of our financial statements, which ultimately could negatively impact our stock price.

Federal securities laws, rules and regulations, as well as Nasdaq rules and regulations, require companies to maintain extensive corporate governance measures, impose comprehensive reporting and disclosure requirements, set strict independence and financial expertise standards for audit and other committee members and impose civil and criminal penalties for companies and their chief executive officers, chief financial officers and directors for securities law violations. These laws, rules and regulations have increased and will continue to increase the scope, complexity and cost of our corporate governance, reporting and disclosure practices, which could harm our results of operations and divert management's attention from business operations.

It may be difficult or costly to obtain director and officer insurance coverage as a result of our stock options problems.

We expect that the issues arising from our previous retroactive pricing of stock options will make it more difficult to obtain director and officer insurance coverage in the future. If we are able to obtain this coverage, it could be significantly more costly than in the past, which would have an adverse effect on our financial results and cash flow. As a result of this and related factors, our directors and officers could face increased risks of personal liability in connection with the performance of their duties. As a result, we may have difficulty attracting and retaining qualified directors and officers, which could adversely affect our business.

Table of Contents

The semiconductor equipment industry is highly cyclical. The purchasing decisions of our customers are highly dependent on the economies of both the local markets in which they are located and the semiconductor industry worldwide. If we fail to respond to industry cycles, our business could be seriously harmed.

The timing, length and severity of the up-and-down cycles in the semiconductor equipment industry are difficult to predict. This cyclical nature of the industry in which we operate affects our ability to accurately predict future revenue and, thus, future expense levels. When cyclical fluctuations result in lower than expected revenue levels, operating results may be adversely affected and cost reduction measures may be necessary in order for us to remain competitive and financially sound. During a down cycle, we must be in a position to adjust our cost and expense structure to prevailing market conditions and to continue to motivate and retain our key employees. In addition, during periods of rapid growth, we must be able to increase manufacturing capacity and personnel to meet customer demand. We can provide no assurance that these objectives can be met in a timely manner in response to industry cycles.

Our business is ultimately driven by the global demand for electronic devices by consumers and businesses. A majority of our annual revenue is derived from outside the United States, and we expect that international revenue will continue to represent a substantial percentage of our revenue. A protracted global economic slowdown may adversely affect our business and results of operations.

A majority of our annual revenue is derived from outside the United States, and we expect that international revenue will continue to represent a substantial percentage of our revenue. Our international revenue and operations are affected by economic conditions specific to each country and region. Because of our significant dependence on international revenue, a decline in the economies of any of the countries or regions in which we do business could negatively affect our operating results. Managing global operations and sites located throughout the world presents challenges associated with, among other things, cultural diversity and organizational alignment. Moreover, each region in the global semiconductor equipment market exhibits unique characteristics that can cause capital equipment investment patterns to vary significantly from period to period. Periodic local or international economic downturns, trade balance issues, political instability or terrorism in regions where we have operations along with fluctuations in interest and currency exchange rates could negatively affect our business and results of operations. Although we attempt to manage near-term currency risks through the use of hedging instruments, there can be no assurance that such efforts will be adequate.

Our future performance depends, in part, upon our ability to continue to compete successfully worldwide.

Our industry includes large manufacturers with substantial resources to support customers worldwide. Some of our competitors are diversified companies with greater financial resources and more extensive research, engineering, manufacturing, marketing and customer service and support capabilities than we. We face competition from companies whose strategy is to provide a broad array of products and services, some of which compete with the products and services that we offer. These competitors may bundle their products in a manner that may discourage customers from purchasing our products, including pricing such competitive tools significantly below our product offerings. In addition, we face competition from smaller emerging semiconductor equipment companies whose strategy is to provide a portion of the products and services, similar to what we offer, using innovative technology to sell products into specialized markets. Loss of competitive position could negatively affect our prices, customer orders, revenue, gross margins, and market share, any of which would negatively affect our operating results and financial condition.

Table of Contents

If we do not develop and introduce new products and technologies in a timely manner in response to changing market conditions or customer requirements, our business could be seriously harmed.

Success in the semiconductor equipment industry depends, in part, on continual improvement of existing technologies and rapid innovation of new solutions. For example, in the current semiconductor industry, the size of semiconductor devices continues to shrink and the industry is currently transitioning to the use of new materials and innovative fab processes. While we expect these trends will increase our customers reliance on our diagnostic products, we cannot ensure that they will directly improve our business. These and other evolving customer needs require us to respond with continued development programs and to cut back or discontinue older programs, which may no longer have industry-wide support. Technical innovations are inherently complex and require long development cycles and appropriate staffing of highly qualified employees. Our competitive advantage and future business success depend on our ability to accurately predict evolving industry standards, to develop and introduce new products which successfully address changing customer needs, to win market acceptance of these new products and to manufacture these new products in a timely and cost-effective manner.

In this environment, we must continue to make significant investments in research and development in order to enhance the performance and functionality of our products, to keep pace with competitive products and to satisfy customer demands for improved performance, features and functionality. Substantial research and development costs typically are incurred before we confirm the technical feasibility and commercial viability of a product, and not all development activities result in commercially viable products. There can be no assurance that revenue from future products or product enhancements will be sufficient to recover the development costs associated with such products or enhancements. In addition, we cannot ensure that these products or enhancements will receive market acceptance or that we will be able to sell these products at prices that are favorable to us. Our business will be seriously harmed if we are unable to sell our products at favorable prices or if the market in which we operate does not accept our products.

Our business would be harmed if we do not receive sufficient parts to meet our production requirements in a timely and cost-effective manner.

We use a wide range of materials in the production of our products, including custom electronic and mechanical components, and we use numerous suppliers to supply these materials. We generally do not have guaranteed supply arrangements with our suppliers. Because of the variability and uniqueness of customers' orders, we do not maintain an extensive inventory of materials for manufacturing. We seek to minimize the risk of production and service interruptions and/or shortages of key parts by selecting and qualifying alternative suppliers for key parts, monitoring the financial stability of key suppliers and maintaining appropriate inventories of key parts. Although we make reasonable efforts to ensure that parts are available from multiple suppliers, key parts may be available only from a single supplier or a limited group of suppliers.

Disruption of our manufacturing facilities due to earthquake, flood, other natural catastrophic events or terrorism could result in cancellation of orders or loss of customers and could seriously harm our business.

Most of our manufacturing facilities are located in the United States, with small operations located in Israel and Singapore. Operations at our manufacturing facilities and our assembly subcontractors are subject to disruption for a variety of reasons, including work stoppages, acts of war, terrorism, fire, earthquake, energy shortages, flooding or other natural disasters. Such disruption could

Table of Contents

cause delays in shipments of products to our customers. We cannot ensure that alternate production capacity would be available if a major disruption were to occur or that, if it were available, it could be obtained on favorable terms.

We outsource a number of services to third-party service providers which decreases our control over the performance of these functions; disruptions or delays at our third-party service providers could adversely impact our operations.

We outsource a number of services including our transportation and logistics management of spare parts to domestic and overseas third party service providers. While outsourcing arrangements may lower our cost of operations, they also reduce our direct control over the services rendered. It is uncertain what effect such diminished control will have on the quality or quantity of products delivered or services rendered, or our ability to quickly respond to changing market conditions. Disruptions or delays at our third-party service providers due to events such as regional economic, business, environmental, political, or informational technology system failures or military actions could adversely impact our operations and our ability to ship products, manage our product inventory or record and report financial and management information on a timely and accurate basis.

Our success is dependent in part on our technology and other proprietary rights. If we are unable to maintain our lead or protect our proprietary technology, we may lose valuable assets and market share.

Our success is dependent in part on our technology and other proprietary rights. We own various United States and international patents and have additional pending patent applications relating to some of our products and technologies. The process of seeking patent protection is lengthy and expensive, and we cannot be certain that pending or future applications will actually result in issued patents or that issued patents will be of sufficient scope or strength to provide meaningful protection or commercial advantage to us. Other companies and individuals, including our larger competitors, may develop technologies and obtain patents relating to our technology that are similar or superior to our technology or may design around the patents we own, adversely affecting our business.

We also maintain trademarks on certain of our products and services and claim copyright protection for certain proprietary software and documentation. However, we can give no assurance that our trademarks and copyrights will be upheld or successfully deter infringement by third parties.

While patent, copyright and trademark protection for our intellectual property is important, we believe our future success in highly dynamic markets is most dependent upon the technical competence and creative skills of our personnel. We attempt to protect our trade secrets and other proprietary information through confidentiality and other agreements with our customers, suppliers, employees and consultants and through other security measures. We also maintain exclusive and non-exclusive licenses with third parties for strategic technology used in certain products. However, these employees, consultants and third parties may breach these agreements and we may not have adequate remedies for wrongdoing. In addition, the laws of certain territories in which we develop, manufacture or sell our products may not protect our intellectual property rights to the same extent as do the laws of the United States.

Table of Contents

We might be involved in intellectual property disputes or other intellectual property infringement claims that may be costly to resolve, prevent us from selling or using the challenged technology and seriously harm our operating results and financial condition.

As is typical in the semiconductor equipment industry, from time to time we have received communications from other parties asserting the existence of patent rights, copyrights, trademark rights or other intellectual property rights which they believe cover certain of our products, processes, technologies or information. Litigation tends to be expensive and requires significant management time and attention and could have a negative effect on our results of operations or business if we lose or have to settle a case on significantly adverse terms. Our customary practice is to evaluate such infringement assertions and to consider whether to seek licenses where appropriate. However, we cannot ensure that licenses can be obtained or, if obtained, will be on acceptable terms or that costly litigation or other administrative proceedings will not occur. The inability to obtain necessary licenses or other rights on reasonable terms, or instigation of litigation or other administrative proceedings could seriously harm our operating results and financial condition.

We depend on key personnel to manage our business effectively and if we are unable to attract, retain, and motivate our key employees, our sales and product development could be harmed.

Our employees are vital to our success, and our key management, engineering and other employees are difficult to replace. We generally do not have employment contracts with our key employees. Further, we do not maintain key person life insurance on any of our employees. The expansion of high technology companies worldwide has increased demand and competition for qualified personnel. If we are unable to retain key personnel, or if we are not able to attract, assimilate or retain additional highly qualified employees to meet our needs in the future, our business and operations could be harmed.

We have made and we expect to continue to make acquisitions that could cause diversion of company's resources and our operating results could be harmed.

In addition to our efforts to develop new technologies from internal sources, we also seek to acquire new technologies from external sources. As part of this effort, we may make acquisitions of, or significant investments in, businesses with complementary products, services and/or technologies. Acquisitions involve numerous risks, including management issues and costs in connection with the integration of the operations and personnel, technologies and products of the acquired companies, the possible write-downs of impaired assets, and the potential loss of key employees of the acquired companies. The inability to manage these risks effectively could seriously harm our business.

We are predominantly uninsured for losses and interruptions caused by terrorist acts and acts of war. If international political instability continues or increases, our business and results of operation could be harmed.

The threat of terrorism targeted at the regions of the world in which we do business, including the United States, increases the uncertainty in our markets. Any act of terrorism which affects the economy or the semiconductor industry could adversely affect our business. Increased international political instability, disruption in air transportation and further enhanced security measures as a result of terrorist attacks, and the continuing instability in the Middle East, may hinder our ability to do business and may increase our costs of operations. Such continuing instability could cause us to incur increased costs in transportation, make such transportation unreliable, increase our insurance costs, and cause international currency markets to fluctuate. This same instability could have the same effects on our suppliers and their ability to timely deliver their products. If this international political instability continues or increases, our business and results of operations could be harmed. We are predominantly uninsured for losses and interruptions caused by terrorist acts and acts of war.

Table of Contents

We self insure certain risks including earthquake risk. If one or more of the uninsured events occurs, we could suffer major financial loss.

We purchase insurance to help mitigate the economic impact of certain insurable risks; however, certain other risks are uninsurable or are insurable only at significant costs and cannot be mitigated with insurance. An earthquake could significantly disrupt our manufacturing operations, most of which are conducted in California. It could also significantly delay our research and engineering effort on new products, most of which is also conducted in California. We take steps to minimize the damage that would be caused by an earthquake, but there is no certainty that our efforts will prove successful in the event of an earthquake. We self insure earthquake risks because we believe this is the prudent financial decision based on our large cash reserves and the high cost and limited coverage available in the earthquake insurance market. Certain other risks are also self insured either based on a similar cost benefit analysis, or based on the unavailability of insurance. If one or more of the uninsured events occurs, we could suffer major financial loss.

A change in accounting standards or practices or a change in existing taxation rules or practices can have a significant effect on our reported results and may even affect reporting of transactions completed before the change is effective.

New accounting pronouncements and taxation rules and varying interpretations of accounting pronouncements and taxation practice have occurred and may occur in the future. Changes to existing rules or the questioning of current practices may adversely affect our reported financial results or the way we conduct our business.

For example, the adoption of Statement of Financial Accounting Standard (SFAS) No. 123(R), which required us to measure all employee stock-based compensation awards using a fair value method beginning in fiscal year 2006 and record such expense in our consolidated financial statements had a material impact on our consolidated financial statements, as reported under accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

We are exposed to various risks related to the regulatory environments where we perform our operation and conduct our business.

We are subject to various risks related to new, different, inconsistent or even conflicting laws, rules and regulations that may be enacted by legislative bodies and/or regulatory agencies in the countries in which we operate and with which we must comply including environmental and safety regulations.

We are exposed to foreign currency exchange rate fluctuations; although we hedge certain currency risks, we may still be adversely affected by changes in foreign currency exchange rates or declining economic conditions in these countries.

We have some exposure to fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates, primarily the Japanese Yen. We have international subsidiaries that operate and sell our products globally. We routinely hedge these exposures in an effort to minimize the impact of currency rate fluctuations, but these hedges may be inadequate to protect us from currency rate fluctuations. To the extent that these hedges are inadequate, our reported financial results or the way we conduct our business could be adversely affected.

Table of Contents

We are exposed to fluctuations in the market values of our portfolio investments and in interest rates; impairment of our investments could harm our earnings.

Our investment portfolio consists of both corporate and government securities that have a maximum maturity of 10 years. The longer the duration of these securities, the more susceptible they are to changes in market interest rates and bond yields. As yields increase, those securities with a lower yield-at-cost show a mark-to-market unrealized loss. All unrealized losses are due to changes in interest rates and bond yields. We have the ability to realize the full value of all these investments upon maturity.

We rely upon certain critical information systems for our daily business operation, our inability to use or access these information systems at critical points in time could unfavorably impact the timeliness and efficiency of our business operation.

Our global operations are linked by information systems, including telecommunications, the internet, our corporate intranet, network communications, email and various computer hardware and software applications. Despite our implementation of network security measures, our tools and servers are vulnerable to computer viruses, break-ins, and similar disruptions from unauthorized tampering with our computer systems and tools located at customer sites. Any such event could have an adverse effect on our business, operating results, and financial condition.

Acquisitions are an important element of our strategy but, because of the uncertainties involved, we may not find suitable acquisition candidates and we may not be able to successfully integrate and manage acquired businesses.

Part of our growth strategy is to pursue acquisitions. There can be no assurance that we will find suitable acquisition candidates or that acquisitions we complete will be successful. In addition, we may use equity to finance future acquisitions, which would increase our number of shares outstanding and be dilutive to current shareholders.

If we are unable to successfully integrate and manage acquired businesses or if acquired businesses perform poorly, then our business and financial results may suffer. It is possible that the businesses we have acquired, such as ADE Corporation, which we acquired on October 11, 2006, as well as businesses that we may acquire in the future, may perform worse than expected or prove to be more difficult to integrate and manage than expected. If that happens, there may be a material adverse effect on our business and financial results for a number of reasons, including:

we may have to devote unanticipated financial and management resources to acquired businesses;

we may not be able to realize expected operating efficiencies or product integration benefits from our acquisitions;

we may have to write-off goodwill or other intangible assets; and

we may incur unforeseen obligations or liabilities in connection with acquisitions.

Table of Contents

We may experience difficulties with our enterprise resource planning (ERP) system or other IT systems. System failure or malfunctioning may result in disruption of operations and the inability to process transactions, and this could adversely affect our financial results.

System failure or malfunctioning could disrupt our ability to timely and accurately process and report key components of the results of our consolidated operations, our financial position and cash flows. Any disruptions or difficulties that may occur in connection with our ERP system or other systems could also adversely affect our ability to complete important business processes such as the evaluation of our internal controls and attestation activities pursuant to Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. If we encounter unforeseen problems with regard to our ERP system or other systems, our business could be adversely affected.

ITEM 2. UNREGISTERED SALES OF EQUITY SECURITIES AND USE OF PROCEEDS

Our systematic buyback program was halted on May 18, 2006.

ITEM 6. EXHIBITS

- 31.1 Certification of Chief Executive Officer under Rule 13a-14(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.
- 31.2 Certification of Chief Financial Officer under Rule 13a-14(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.
- 32 Certification of Chief Executive Officer Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 1350, as Adopted Pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.

Table of Contents

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned thereunto duly authorized.

KLA-Tencor Corporation
(Registrant)

January 26, 2007
(Date)

/s/ RICHARD P. WALLACE
Richard P. Wallace
Chief Executive Officer
(Principal Executive Officer)

January 26 , 2007
(Date)

/s/ JEFFREY L. HALL
Jeffrey L. Hall
Senior Vice President and
Chief Financial Officer
(Principal Financial Officer and
Principal Accounting Officer)

Table of Contents

KLA-TENCOR CORPORATION

EXHIBIT INDEX

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Description	Incorporated by Reference			
		Form	File No.	Exhibit Number	Filing Date
31.1	Certification of Chief Executive Officer under Rule 13a-14(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934				
31.2	Certification of Chief Financial Officer under Rule 13a-14(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934				
32	Certification of Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350				