

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

From joachink Tue Feb 4 09:55:38 1992
To: hankv jeffl peteh petern richardf ronh
Cc: bcllee mikemep yhjeon
Subject: RE: FW: RE: Lotus
Date: Tue Feb 04 10:31:30 PDT 1992

I believe 500k units a year are possible without endangering regular sales
and getting the upgrade business.. COMMENTS?

From peteh Tue Feb 4 09:00:49 1992
To: hankv joachink petern richardf
Cc: bcllee mikemep yhjeon

MS 5002887
CONFIDENTIAL

Plaintiff's Exhibit

7645

Comes V. Microsoft

Subject: RE: FW: RE: Lotus

Date: Tue Feb 4 08:59:39 1992

It would be nice to know the size of the opportunity. How much OEM business would we have gotten with a low-priced version? I can't remember a significant number of cases where the customer wanted an older, low-priced version. I am open-minded about this, but could use some data.

>From jonchink Mon Feb 3 07:42:04 1992
To: hankv petah petern richardf
Cc: bclee nikamap yhjjeon

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

MS 5002888
CONFIDENTIAL

Subject: RE: FW: RE: Lotus
Date: Mon Feb 03 08:17:32 PNYT 1992

What business case do you need? Be able to compete and get some upgrade
business, seems pretty obvious to me.

>From: peteh Mon Feb 3 06:40:17 1992
To: hankv joachink petern richardf
Cc: belea mikonap yhjecn
Subject: RE: FW: RE: Lotus

Date: Mon Feb 3 06:39:42 1992

No, we have not plans to continue selling an older version of

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

Excel after Excel 4.0. Do you think tht there is a compelling
business case for this?

>From jonchink Fri Jan 31 08:57:08 1992
To: hankv peteh petern richardf
Cc: hclaa mikemep yhjecn
Subject: RE: FW: RE: Lotus
Date: Fri Jan 31 09:32:54 PDT 1992

I AM NOT SUPRISED. YES THEY PROBY DID OFFER \$10 for 1-2-3 2.2. They are
specualting to get the mailing list and live on the upgrade revenue.
Pete any ideas to do the same, say with EXL 1.0? or 2, .0 after You ship
4.0?

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

>From: richardf Thu Jan 30 16:41:48 1992
To: banky patch petern
Cc: joachink beles yhjeon patch nikemop
Subject: RE: FW: RE: Lotus

Date: Thu Jan 30 16:40:39 PDT 1992

You Betcha we do not know how sweet a deal Lotus cut Packard Bell here in
the states
but we do know how cheap Benny Alegua their president is from negotiating
Windows license with them.

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

MS 5002891
CONFIDENTIAL

| IN the case of EBell i think Lotus actually reduced the content of the
| product (delivered less)
| but it was more of a marketing abbreviation I think (than actual content
| omitted).
| Lotus and Spinnaker both have been willing to cut very agresive deals of
| late, this one
| does not surprise me.
| richard
|>From peter Thu Jan 30 15:10:06 1992
| To: hankv petah
| Cc: richardf

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

MS 5002892
CONFIDENTIAL

Subject: FW: RE: Lotus

Date: Thu Jan 30 16:10:45 PDT 1992

have you seen this in other parts of the world?

>From: hcllee Wed Jan 29 18:07:26 1992

To: petarn

Cc: lvys jcoup mhpark yhjeon

Subject: FW: RE: Lotus

Date: Thu Jan 30 11:10:53 PDT 1992

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

MS 5002893
CONFIDENTIAL

Do you think Lotus can really do this kind of offerings?
Would you ask any ABU marketing team how Lotus is doing
in other places for CRM deal?

Thanks
BC Lee

>From yhjjeon Wed Jan 29 20:04:31 1992 .
To: ivys joonp mhpark
Cc: bclee ch-net
Subject: RE: Lotus

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

MS 5002894
CONFIDENTIAL

Date: Wed Jan 29 20:05:48 PDT 1992

\$10 for 1-2-3 2.2K ?

Y.H.

>From: joonp Wed Jan 29 19:04:48 1992
To: ivys mbpark yhjecn
Cc: bilee ch-net
Subject: Lotus

Date: Wed Jan 29 19:04:22 1992

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

MS 5002895
CONFIDENTIAL

Samsung senior manager of SM marketing insisted
Lotus offered \$10 royalty bundle deal.
And asked the possibility MS will do royalty deal of 11 Excel.

Thanks,
Joong

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

MS 5002896
CONFIDENTIAL

any idea why po week claimed os/2 atm was so much faster than atm
under 3.1? sounds strange.

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Nancy Lanning
Subject: Re: Help for MSKK
Date: Monday, April 13, 1992 12:03PM

phil is on vacation this week. don't know what his plans for next
week are. i prefer to keep karlst here. i am already sending some
people over for next week. from what I can tell, kk needs a lot of
help and will require a longer term commitment by redmond to help.

this review has been known for a long time. why are you coming to me
only now?

From: Nancy Lanning
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: Re: Help for MSKK
Date: Monday, April 13, 1992 9:28AM

Will philba be able to go over for next week's project review?
If so, should I follow-up with him directly to finalize plans?
If not, is it possible for karlst to come next week and then
have philba come later to follow-up?

Redmond's participation in next week's meeting is key since
we're at a point in the FE Win31 project when all 3 dev teams
must start closing dev and finalizing test plans, yet they
don't really have the expertise to do this well so they
really need Redmond's help. While having someone go over later
will still be useful, I don't know when we'll be getting the 3
teams together again after the project review next week so I
really want to take advantage of the this meeting as much as
possible.

Thanks.

>From bradsi Sun Apr 12 18:15:22 1992
To: nancyla
Subject: Help for MSKK
Date: Sun Apr 12 18:14:40 1992

I prefer to send Philba. He has great experience in the area
as well as experience with KK.

Phil's spent the most time with these issues and is in the best
position to make a great contribution.

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Sharon Hornstein
Subject: FW: Win 3.1 "box"
Date: Monday, April 13, 1992 12:05PM

From: Dennis Adler
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: Win 3.1 "box"
Date: Monday, April 13, 1992 9:59AM

How can I get a copy of the "real product" in the box? I've seen
some floating around inside EWGROUP, and would love to get the real thing.

/dennis

From: Brad Silverberg
To: 'richt'
Subject: product for pr
Date: Monday, April 13, 1992 12:06PM

how could we have been "backordered" on product for the press? were
you aware of this?? this is terrible. he _have_ to give press