Debra Vogt

From: Bill Gates
To: Paul Maritz
Subject: RE: OLE sources for Logica
Date: Wednesday, April 20, 1994 10:06AM

Independently I told Jim exactly the same thing.

From: Paul Maritz
To: Bill Gates; Brad Silverberg; Jim Allchin; Roger Heinen
Subject: RE: OLE sources for Logica
Date: Tuesday, April 19, 1994 8:46AM

I actually think we should let them do this, provided that we have the safeguards:
- of reasonable royalty and license protetction
- and that we ask Lotus to commit to supporting all of OLE related standards when on Windows (including DocFile).

Having both MS and Lotus committed to using OLE ensues that DSOM/OpenDoc will never get critical mass. This is very important. On the other harnd, I dont think this will have a material effect on OS/2's chances one way or the other as: (i) it will get done later - either Chicago will have succeeded, in which case it really doesnt matter, of Chicago has not succeeded in which case we probably really do want it on OS/2, and (ii) IBM will never endorse it, so it will be a confusing message.

From: Jim Allchin
To: Bill Gates; Brad Silverberg; Paul Maritz; Roger Heinen
Subject: FW: OLE sources for Logica
Date: Saturday, April 16, 1994 9:51AM

I wanted to bring you into this discussion because I want to double check my decision.   Almost everyone except Bobmu is saying I am wrong and that we should license the OLE code to whomever Lotus can get to do the port to OS/2 provided we get a Windows level royalty (say $40-$50).   I have said "no" -- we must follow the WLU deals.   Note here I'm trying to be consistent with everyone.   As you probably know SUN and about 4 others want very badly to license just OLE.

Concerning OS/2....   The "pro" reasons are it will keep Lotus strategically committed to OLE and help prevent OpenDoc from gaining momentum and everyone says the probability of them getting it done anytime soon is small.   The "con" reasons are it helps put life into OS/2.   I have not discussed the patent protection issues associated with keeping OLE together with win32 with people.

I would like your reading on this.

thanks,
jim

From: Doug Henrich
To: Adam Waalkes; Bob Kruger; Bob Muglia; Jim Allchin; Lowell Tuttman; Mark Ryland
Subject: RE: OLE sources for Logica
Date: Friday, April 15, 1994 4:51PM

I look forward to your additional thoughts.... as if we have
not spent enough time on this already<g>.

MS 5036351
CONFIDENTIAL

I will communicate to Lotus that it is looking like we are
headed toward a standard licensing policy on now windows
platforms of licensing Win32/OLE 2 (all of it). I will let
you know how they react.

From: Jim Allchin
To: Adam Waalkes; Bob Kruger; Bob Muglia; Doug Henrich; Lowell Tuttman
Subject: RE: OLE sources for Logica
Date: Friday, April 15, 1994 7:47AM

windows must go with it.   I don't want just OLE to connect
into PM or anything.   This is like taking a handful of the
apis from win32 and letting someone just support them.   It
doesn't make sense to me.   We want the API set to remain
whole.

jim

From: Doug Henrich
To: Adam Waalkes; Bob Kruger; Bob Muglia; Jim Allchin; Lowell Tuttman
Subject: FW: OLE sources for Logica
Date: Thursday, April 14, 1994 9:43PM

I guess this means we will need to start thinking about the
next step with lotus here. I really think we should consider
licensing this to them with similar royality arangements we
have with WLU. And of course, the longer this all takes to
complete the better....

Points to ponder:

1.) How long this will take them to accomplish the port and
testing (conservatively - many months, maybe years), I think
they will be so late to the market with this technology, plus
IBM will never endorse OLE 2 on OS/2 2.0. I am sure they will
be religious about SOM/DSOM. .We had better be very much
further along by then that this is yet again a release behind
the current Windows technology.

2.) We get a nice royality

3.) PR "Open" win.

From: Adam Waalkes
To: Doug Henrich; Janine A Harrison; Sara Williams
Cc: Bob Muglia
Subject: OLE sources for Logica
Date: Wednesday, April 13, 1994 1:51PM

Logica (contractor for Lotus) is fedexing the signed NDA and
addendum to me tomorrow so we need to understand how and when
we can let them see the 32-bit OLE 2.01 code. Janine who
should we work with to do this? There will probably be one
other company (mesa) that will sign the NDA and will need to
look at the code (both are going to price doing the work for
Lotus).

Again this effort is for them to scope the effort necessary to
do the work. I told them this was not shipping code (it will
ship mid-year with Daytona).

Page 120

Sara if this stuff persists after I leave for vacation can you
handle. Shouldn't be much wortk at all.

Adam...