From: Russell Siegelman [russs]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 1994 7.44 AM
To: Anthony Bay; Dan Rosen; James 'J' Allard; John Ludwig; Paul Maritz; Peter Neupert
Subject: RE: Netscape (nee Mosaic)

I doubt we are interested in the client given that we are licensing the SpyGlass stuff.

From: Dan Rosen
To: abay; jallard; johnlu; paulma; petern; russs
Subject: Netscape (nee Mosaic)
Date: Friday, December 09, 1994 4:08PM

Based on feedback from many folks, I will go ahead and set up a meeting with Jim Clark of Netscape. I spoke again with Jim and will try to set up either before the holidays or in early January. There is considerable disagreement over what a relationship with Netscape would bring to MSFT (and even more about why we would enter one). The key discussion points with Netscape seem to be:

1) Their client. Would we want to consider licensing it? Is it a backup to our NCSA activity? Should we support it in addition to our own?

2) Their server. Where are they heading? Is there any reason that what they are doing should be incorporated into what we are doing?

3) Security. We are clearly going to compete here. Are there also areas of cooperation in eCom?

4) Administrative. Assuming that there will be more than one winner in Internet-related clients and servers, it is now likely that Netscape will be one and we will be another. Should we begin to think about how our domains work together? Do we cooperate on standards? What about settlements on traffic between domains? etc.

I'm sure that there are others who should have been on the distribution list. Please let me know. Also other topics to discuss.

Jim's key concern is how he might survive a relationship with MSFT (is there any form of win-win). I suspect we will need to address this early in our meeting, or they will be less candid.

Dan

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
134

From: James 'J' Allard [jallard]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 1994 9:42 AM
To: Anthony Bay; Dan Rosen; John Ludwig; Paul Maritz; Peter Neupert; Russell Siegelman; Tom Johnston
Cc: Jim Allchin
Subject: RE: Netscape (nee Mosaic)

i'm not clear why we're interested in a relationship w/ netscape - as i see it, jim and co. have 2 strategic targets - 1. standards (specifically, commerce and security) and 2. the internet server market. in bsd, we have these same goals. that said, i'm not sure that we have a whole lot to talk abt, there is certainly no obvious win-win from where i sit. i'll attend a mtg, but i don't plan to tell them what we're developing in bsd under any circumstances.

to address your points:

| 1) Their client. Would we want to consider licensing it? Is
| it a backup to our NCSA activity? Should we support it in
| addition to our own?

licensing their client legitimizes their security and commerce "standards". this is exactly why they are giving it away for free. only if we want to embrace these standards should we be interested in their client.

| 2) Their server. Where are they heading? Is there any reason
| that what they are doing should be incorporated into what we
| are doing?

they are heading towards a high flat-fee model, and their arrangements w/ first data and boa suggest a % of revenue opp for them too. where do they fit w/ our goals in bsd and ecommerce?

| 3) Security. We are clearly going to compete here. Are there
| also areas of cooperation in eCom?

their security plans are to do some "sideband" winsock hack which addresses only ip, and in a backward way to boot. we will be recommending encrypted rpc (and future, dcom) to the w3c community this week to counter their ssl (secure sockets layer) recommendation. i don't see them embracing ecom given that it's ole based and they are targeting cross-platform and stand to lose thier % of rev opt by embracing our mechanism

| 4) Administrative. Assuming that there will be more than one
| winner in Internet-related clients and servers, it is now
| likely that Netscape will be one and we will be another.
| Should we begin to think about how our domains work together?
| Do we cooperate on standards? What about settlements on
| traffic between domains? etc.

i think all we want to do is to cooperate on a technical level and ensure interoperability to whatever degree makes sense. this is what the w3c consortium is all abt and i believe is a suitable umbrella for discussions of this nature. our server administration tool will be "pluggable" so that third parties can plug stuff in, but i don't see why they'd want to legitimize our server by doing this.

MS98 0137388
CONFIDENTIAL