

data, but there may be some issues and potential uses that we haven't considered. Please forward this mail as appropriate -- I need feedback as soon as possible. We are already starting negotiations, and it's important that we be very clear about what we want.

From billg Fri Jan 3 09:21:11 1992
Subject: Office sales
To: mikemap, lewisl
Date: Fri, 3 Jan 92 9:21:07 PST
Mail-Flags: 0000

I was pleased to see what a high percentage of our sales office has become - if I am reading my October figures correctly it was almost 1/3 of non-office word and excel sales. I assume our price is still at \$750 on both the mac and windows platform and will stay there. Paul Brainerd believes our holding onto share in the standalone Mac presentations market is largely based on the visibility that the office offering provides - he may not be objective but he felt that is why he cant get above 25% of the total mac presentations market even though he feels he has the best product. I would suspect that office is also very helpful to word and excel since wordperfect does not have a credible spreadsheet and ami isnt viewed as mainstream at least at this point. I am not sure what else we should be doing with office since I dont really believe in advertising broadly - we can mention it in ads but having more specific ads probably isnt important.

From billg Fri Jan 3 09:40:07 1992
Subject: Money
To: susanb
Date: Fri, 3 Jan 92 9:40:01 PST
Cc: mikemap
Mail-Flags: 0000

I may not be saying anything that you are not already planning but here is my view of Money.

We did a reasonable product with a few neat new ideas but nothing signifigant to "hang our hat on" - unless Intuit had stayed away from the Windows market we ended up with a pretty "me too" offering that wasnt marketed or priced as aggressively. I am amazed at how low they have taken their premetions - either they value market share as a long term asset over all things or the after market profit of add ons and checks is bigger than we think or they manage to only sell a small part of their volume at the very discounted prices. In any case my view of the future is:

1. In February or so we should look at what price they stabilize at - their street versus ours. If it is lower then I think we should lower our price.
2. We should not come out with a new version that is just catch up - investments and check free. We need those features but we shouldnt do a new version until we have something creative that we can get the press and users excited about. Unfortunately I am not knowledgable about the category so I am not a good source of ideas - some use of wizards for common tasks might be helpful.

The only caveat to number 2 (which I am sure you are struggling with) is the desire to enter the European markets early as this category gets established. My assumption is that if we enter at about the same time

the applets, Word, Excel, etc., and a few VB macros that would drive the other apps using DDE. Altogether there were about 35 components. Then they sat me in front of the UI, where I typed things like "I want to write a report". I would get a hit list below (ordered by relevancy), and a set of questions that would decrease the hit list, for example, "Do you want the report to be in Word format?", and "Will you have charts?", and "Is this an annual report?". Then you could launch the hit and get your work done without knowing about the components used. It was pretty neat. With commands, this could be the basis of a very cool task-focused help and Wizards technology.

I don't want to make this too long, but they also have a neat debugging environment, and the user can play alot of what ifs, and optimization games with the system. It supports monitors/triggers. They showed an alpha version of a system to process legacy data into categories using neural and genetic algorithms. Again, they weren't trying to do super-fancy things, but had good performance on a number of standard AI benchmarks. This is learning modeling.

I think there are a number of interesting business arrangements we could look at with Inference for Win4 (I don't know how interested apps is in this -- I know that Word would like to do smarter wizards) that range from full integration into our query system down to just having them supply an applet called "component/task manager" to make workspaces smarter (or whatever our task-orientation thing will be). They seem to be reasonably flexible (they are half consulting business already).

This is one way we can push ahead in user friendliness, esp. in the harsher, more complex world of many components. I think that the Inferen technology can get us a long way in the right direction. I'd like to get this going for Win4 by putting together a low-dependency plan for Inference work.

Edward

From susanb Wed Jan 15 09:57:05 1992
To: joachimk
Subject: Zenith deal
Cc: mikemap
Date: Wed Jan 15 09:53:33 1992
Mail-Flags: 0000

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

My understanding is that you have offered WinWorks at \$0 to Zenith to secure a WinBall deal. WinWorks becomes the placeholder until WinBall ships. This offer should NOT have been made for the following reasons:

- * The offer was made without the knowledge of EBU or the Apps division. It violates all guidelines currently in place and agreed upon by OEM and the business units. We should be consulted before you give our products away.
- * This is not a strategic offering for us. It makes no effort to gain ground on the important business we have invested much time in securing. In fact, Zenith is shipping PFS: WindowWorks on several other machines

MS 5047937
CONFIDENTIAL

- * EBU loses revenue -- unless you've figured out a way to compensate EBU for being a placeholder
- * More important, this may well damage our ability to effectively negotiate a realistic deal with Zenith in the future.

We need to let this deal stand at \$0 for WinWorks because you have already made the offer. After our experience with the Phillips deal where the OEM rep had to pull back after the offer, we know that we cannot pull back after an offer has been made without losing the deal and seriously damaging the relationship. But I want to know what we can do to ENSURE this doesn't happen again.

From joachink Wed Jan 15 12:02:47 1992
 To: susanb
 Cc: mikemap
 Subject: RE: Zenith deal
 Date: Wed Jan 15 12:39:06 PDT 1992
 Mail-Flags: 0000

1. True, not strategic for EBU but for MS. Need to keep competitors out. Hope You understand. (this is actually the first time in 9 years that I agreed to this)
2. Deal is not cooked. This will only happen if they decide to accept our WIN ball delay. decision on MARCH 1st- so today this is academic.
3. They perfectly understand that this is not the rule and I would not worry getting a reasonable deal out of them in the future-trust me.
4. Philips- bad example. I cannot accept deals where we allow to recoup prepaids for three years, but give them pricing for 1 year. And we will get the deal, I am pretty confident about this.

>From susanb Wed Jan 15 09:57:07 1992
 To: joachink
 Cc: mikemap
 Subject: Zenith deal

**HIGHLY
 CONFIDENTIAL**

Date: Wed Jan 15 09:53:33 1992

My understanding is that you have offered WinWorks at \$0 to Zenith to secure a WinBall deal. WinWorks becomes the placeholder until WinBall ships. This offer should NOT have been made for the following reasons:

- * The offer was made without the knowledge of EBU or the Apps division. It violates all guidelines currently in place and agreed upon by OEM and the business units. We should be consulted before you give our products away.
- * This is not a strategic offering for us. It makes no effort to gain ground on the important business we have invested much time in securing. In fact, Zenith is shipping PFS: WindowWorks on several other machines
- * EBU loses revenue -- unless you've figured out a way to compensate EBU for being a placeholder
- * More important, this may well damage our ability to effectively negotiate a realistic deal with Zenith in the future.

**MS 5047938
 CONFIDENTIAL**

We need to let this deal stand at \$0 for WinWorks because you have already made the offer. After our experience with the Phillips deal where the OEM rep had to pull back after the offer, we know that we cannot pull back after an offer has been made without losing the deal and seriously damaging the relationship. But I want to know what we can do to ENSURE this doesn't happen again.

From vijayv Wed Jan 15 12:43:20 1992
To: jeffr mikemap peteh
Subject: Brianmac
Cc: vijayv
Date: Wed Jan 15 12:42:43 1992
Mail-Flags: 0000

Congratulations Jeff !

In response to his question about a role in the Proj group, I had indicated that he could report to JeffLi, which made his choice clearer.

More important, Brian seems excited about working on the PGIM stuff and making it happen. It does seem very unclear what the org looks like or exactly what his role is, but his attitude is very positive. We talked a lot about various items, and I think he is convinced that he needs to and now wants to do more for Microsoft (since MS has been good to him). This has resulted in him dropping the idea of a shorter work week, which is encouraging. A good transition would be after 3.0 is released and a postmortem is done (the latter can be done while he is ramping up on PGIM).

In the next 30 days or so, I'll start the ball rolling. JeffLi will be made development manager for Project, and Brian will move to a group that he works out with Jeff/Daniel. He has been working very hard for a while and will need to rejuvenate, so will probably need to take time off during the transition. Thx.

From hankv Wed Jan 15 12:46:15 1992
To: bradsi garygi jonre jonro richt
Cc: dawntr josephk lewisl mikemap peteh steveb
Subject: Re: Upgrade Workshops
Date: Tue Jan 14 13:46:51 1992
Mail-Flags: 0000

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

I take this as a green light to move forward. All agree that the content has to be consistent and work for the audience as defined. We are signed up for this in Apps, and I'm confident that working together we will easily make this happen. Dawntr's weekly meeting is a good way to check progress to everyone's satisfaction as we move forward.

Thanks,

Hank

>From bradsi Wed Jan 15 11:15:44 1992
To: garygi hankv jonre jonro richt
Cc: dawntr garygi lewisl peteh steveb

MS 5047939
CONFIDENTIAL