

EXHIBIT
Evslin-9
7/16/93
JEANNE MARIE MARUCCI

Erik Stevenson

From: Laura Jennings
To: Daniel Petre; Darryl Rubin; Tom Evslin
Cc: Mike Maples
Subject: RE: system/apps retreat
Date: Wednesday, June 16, 1993 11:26AM

I strongly agree with Darryl that there will be enough confusion in the marketplace without having two different mail clients (which is actually 3 or 4 including the Mail box itself), development work aside. Let's be realistic--what would we cut out? It's not like we have a ton of separable features in Capone (and remember that Capone is now the basis for W16 as well). Rules and extraneous features aren't in there, just good, core, useful mail features. We made this mistake once before on WFW and the spell checker. It cost us more in fulfillment, PSS calls and field and customer confusion than we saved by not shipping the spell-checker in every WFW box.

Yes, the one that goes in Office should be 16-bit, or even better, we should include both 16 and 32-bit versions to minimize confusion. (Really confusing for us to have a different Windows requirement for the Mail client than for the rest of Office.) My assumption has been that once the Mail client was in every version of Chicago, it wouldn't need to be in Office and we can consider that as an option still as well. But artificially crippling the client in Chicago to have there be more features in the Office version does not make sense. Minor feature additions to a minor component of Office will hardly motivate many more people to buy Office, and we will pay more for this in terms of customer confusion than we will gain, even if there was no additional development work required.

And FYI, the July issue of the WPG MicroNews is on WGA. Some MBU UE folks and Billspe in SIMBU collaborated on the article.

From: Darryl Rubin
To: danielp; lauraj; tomev
Cc: mikemap
Subject: RE: system/apps retreat
Date: Wednesday, June 16, 1993 10:07AM

I think the mail clients in Chicago and the Office should be the same. I don't think that extra mail features are going to have anything significant to do with a person's decision to buy Office. Also, the distinction between the Chicago shell and the Office shell will only be regarding extensibility. The idea of having mail be shell integrated in Chicago is still valid, and still the right idea in my opinion.

From: Tom Evslin
To: Daniel Petre; Laura Jennings
Cc: Darryl Rubin; Mike Maples
Subject: system/apps retreat
Date: Wed, Jun 16, 1993 5:46AM

Pls don't forward.

A few things came up of importance to wgd.

1. A very interesting plan was developed and tentatively adopted to bundle the extensibility of Chicago shell and some of the shell sizzle with Office rather than release with Chicago itself. This makes these features a

compelling reason to buy Office rather than icing on the cake of an OS we can't make as much profit on. Implication is that the mail client in Chicago might not want to be as full featured as the mail client in Office or Mail itself. Perhaps this is even the 16 bit client if Explorer is not extensible in Chicago itself. This was not discussed in any detail but we should be thinking about it. Pls give me your thoughts so I can write follow-on mail. I think we should push for full MAPI to be in Chicago but that may be controversial.

It is too soon to pass this on to the client teams or other people in wgd who I know will welcome another change like a hole in the head but it is likely to become the Chicago POR around midJuly.

2. DavidV presented a far more developed plan for unification of database strategy including Carr, EMS, and a to be developed engine. Although he presented it as immediate replacing all efforts, it is much more realistic two or three years out. I spoke to PaulMa, RogerH, DavidFu, and MikeMap after and all agreed that ems must go forward as planned (Paul the weakest on this) and that we will review the db strategy as it develops to make sure we have a convergence plan. I especially asked these four to make sure this does not spread as rumor of the demise of ems and all agreed. It is very clear that EMS' value is strongly linked to it delivery date. It's all we have in that timeframe to compete with NOTES and it's key that it stay in that timeframe.

3. Darryl presented EMS to general interest but some skepticism that we can get it all done. There was no objection when he presented exposing MAPI in the 16bit client altho I'm not sure everybody understood the implication of this.

4. There will be greater emphasis on synergy including a billg memo that there is no Chinese wall nor any legal or ethical reason for having one. All groups including us need to be more proactive in planning and working together. A couple of specifics - we need to plan with JimAll's people how the directories will eventually converge: we need to see if it is possible to get NT 1.1 to include support for Netware 4.0 directories and then have EMS inherit this from NT rather than support Netware directly. I'll get the right contacts in systems to work on this but we are going to have to spare some time of valuable people.

5. The respect people have for wgd has increased greatly in the last year thanks to 3.0. But there is not general knowledge that we now lead our category or that we have released anything since 3.0. Has there been anything in MicroNews about 3.2, remote, new gateways, eforms designer - I don't remember? Anyway, we need to be more LYF.