CLC Apparel Licensee Analysis Report for The WRC

2005-06 Ranking	Apparel Licensee Name	Percentage of Total Apparel Royalties Generated by Each	
	NIKE USA Inc.		All c
	Knights Apparel Inc.	34.22%	com
	4004 Incorporated Top Of The World		The
	Champion Custom Products		The
	Zephyr Graf-X		Con
	Team Edition Apparel Inc.	12.87%	
	Russell Corporation		The
	JanSport Inc.		just
	Twins Enterprise Inc. VF Imagewear Inc.		The
	Mighty-Mac	9.38%	from
	Gear For Sports		with
14	Outerstuff Ltd.		
	Colosseum Athletics Corporation		The
	J America		clas
	Next Inc. dba NCC Apparel adidas Team Inc	8.08%	thos
	Outdoor Cap Company Inc.		Eac
	T-Shirt International Inc.		com
	Cotton Exchange-The		(e.g
	College Concepts LLC	4.80%	App
	MJ Soffe Co. Inc.		III
	Antigua Group Inc. Game-The		The
	New Era Cap Co. Inc.		The
	Drew Pearson Marketing	3.83%	not
	Reebok International		
	Cutter & Buck		Rep
	Viatran Inc.		roya
	G-III Leather Fashions Inc.	3.26%	incl
	Step Ahead Sportswear Vesi Inc.		All f
	Tri-Lake Inc.		data
	Jones & Mitchell Sportswear Inc.		roya
36	Kid Athlete	2.42%	
	MV Sport		The
	Synergism Company		from may only
	New Agenda Columbia Sportswear		
	Merge Left Inc.		Offiny
	League Collegiate Wear	1.56%	
43	Headmaster Inc.		
	Tommy Hilfiger Golf by Club Colors		
	Third Street Sportswear		
	Majestic Athletic Legacy Athletic	1.27%	
	5th & Ocean Clothing		
	Holloway Group Inc.		
	CC Creations Ltd.		
	Pro-Ad Sports Inc.	1.15%	
	Midwest Graphics Inc.		
	U-Trau Inc.		
	New World Graphics Ashworth Inc.		
	Vantage Custom Classics		1
	Pine Hosiery Mills Inc.		
	OT Sports Industries Inc.	0.99%	
	Ruppshirts Inc.		
	Atlantis Sportswear		
	College Kids LLP Hands On Originals		
	Dodger Industries	0.85%	
	University Square American Needle		
65	Walrus Brands LLC		
	Sara Lynn Togs	0.76%	
	Little King Mfg. Co. Inc.		
	T.I.S. Inc.		
	Careman Sportswear		
	Oarsman Sportswear Collegiate Marketing Services		1
	Camp David		
	Ouray Sportswear	0.66%	
	Collegeware USA		
	Under Armour Inc.		mi .

Comments/Considerations for Analyzing Data represents collections of royalties from July, 2005 - June, 2006, which is the most recently ted full fiscal year for the CLC Consortium. valty calculations on this chart represents gross royalty collections across all properties in the onsortium, including not just universities, but also other licensed properties such as NCAA, ences, College bowl games, Heisman Trophy Trust. alty calculations on this chart represent gross royalty collections across all properties, not se in the WRC, or those that have signed on to the DSP. ralty totals here only represent collections for CLC Consortium members, not any royalties e hundreds of independent universities, SMA, LRG, or those colleges and universities licensing programs. ta included in this ranking does not include any apparel sales made by companies that are ed by CLC as "Local" Licensees (which are substantial companies in some college towns) or hat are primarily Non-Apparel Licensees that also sell some apparel products. ompanies' total combines certain labels within the same licensee, consistent with how these nies are internally classified by CLC, not in accordance with how sold in the marketplace tarter by Knights Apparel and Pro Player by Knights Apparel are both bundled under Knights I Inc. als at left do not include Promotional royalties, whether Apparel or Non-Apparel. als shown on this chart do include headwear, miscellaneous apparel, and other categories ditionally defined by all entities as "Apparel."

Represents total royalties for licensees classified by CLC as Apparel licensees, whether those oyalties are apparel or non-apparel royalties; therefore common accessories (e.g., duffel bags) are ncluded in these figures.

All figures shown here represent royalties collected, not gross sales amounts, which means that the data includes many variables based on royalty rate, minimum royalty per unit amounts, unearned royalty guarantees paid by licensees (for sales not generated), etc.

The totals shown on this chart do include audit recoveries and also potentially multiple payments from licensees (due to late or inconsistent royalty payment patterns). Because of this, the rankings may not be precisely accurate since these royalty collections would not reflect accurate sales for only the fiscal year time period.