Microsoft attendees --

Anthony Bay -- MS Network guy -- Internet-related services, as well as some business applications.
J Allard -- internetworking in Bus Sys Div -- WinNT WS & Server, plus BackOffice.
Tom Reardon -- client platform
Chris Jones -- systems division
Barb Fox -- consumer systems, STT and crypto
Dan Rosen -- strategic relationships
Richard Wolf -- MS Office, workgroup functions

Mike Homer's Agenda --
(1) Review of the items.
(2) Go through each category.

Dan Rosen --
Key issues from MS point of view --
Chris --
MS's strategic role and partners in the Internet business. MS believes set of things that are provided in Internet servers and browsers that will be in the core operating systems or given away with the OSs, as a facility like the Win32 API. What MS needs is someone -- a partner -- who is going to take those core services to build on top of them and create solutions for customers. MS has some ideas about what these features are, where the line is, and who the partners should be. All of the relationship points revolve around critical fact of -- is Netscape the kind of company that's going to partner with MS on this or not? Will MS & NS be able to cooperate & agree on the line, where it's drawn, etc. If not, companies will compete. If so, then arrangement can be highly beneficial, with "aligned interests".

JB -- concern about what the line is, where will it move, who is to say where it will move, etc. We would like assurances as to who gets to move the line, who says the line will be moved, etc.

Chris -- agrees that that's the problem -- there's a set of services we want to enable by bundling with the OS. As MS there is benefit to drawing a line to create a value-add, for *a* partner. Is NS that company?

JB -- key issue comes down to, how much money is my partner making. If he's profitable, then the line generally moves.

Dan Rosen -- Wants us to both feel like we both won, even when the line moves over time. Basic Rosen assumption is that together we're going to make the market grow more quickly than we will separately. So if we can do what we're talking about, the market becomes bigger faster. And smaller percentage of large market is better than larger percentage of small market. So there's a way for both of us to win.

MH -- go through these items one at a time...

Client #1 -- what are the viewers and what do they do? Richard and Anthony take the lead -- Rosen sez: as we look at kinds of content customers want, in certain cases it's worth having a viewer rather than a full program. We already have a Word viewer. Richard: it expands our market to make

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
33

CONFIDENTIAL

viewers available for these Office apps -- freely available for Office app formats (Excel, PowerPoint, etc.). Chris -- viewers as technology are the core piece you need to access data on the network.

Guy in black & white striped shirt --
Blackbird has BBML format. HTML with extensions for embedding. It's a way to lay out objects and import them in a dynamic way. Blackbird is an 80-person team -- publishing tools for online services. BB tries to do the right thing for publishers. Publishers don't care if MS publishes the format, makes it open. What they want are enhancements.

Normal browsers will not be able to view Blackbird content. Blackbird viewer would make that possible. MS hasn't made a decision to open the format or not to, but is leaning towards not to.

TR -- knows that Marc hammers on the open stuff. MS will support HTML. Blackbird solves a different problem, two-dimensional page layout, and that's a different problem. Trying to embrace HTML rather than displace it.

DR -- problem with Acrobat is that it's more oriented towards print media. MS started from basic principles and is creating definitive electronic publishing story. It is going to embrace HTML. When we started Blackbird, no one knew the Internet was going to explode like it did.

Blackbird isn't quite beta -- kind of alpha. MS Interactive Media Conference coming up in July (18th, in Long Beach); kit will be available shortly. msninfo@microsoft.com gets you info on how to be a content provider for MSN.

Lots of work in Blackbird to support dynamic content, updating on the back end. BB is like live version of Pagemaker.

DR -- just like the Web made the Internet exciting, Blackbird makes electronic publishing exciting.

There are going to be publishing tools that IPs are going to use. There needs to be client support for those tools, and that's why we're talking about this.

DocObject:

Two containers that exist are Binder and Mail. Others under development as well. There will be lots of DocObject objects. MS is going to evangelize the hell out of this. Currently is not MS's intention to license the ability to create containers. MS would consider licensing us the ability to turn Navigator into a container, IN THE CONTEXT OF THE LARGER DEAL. Proposal with viewers is that Blackbird viewer, e.g., would drop into the Netscape Navigator container. MS will be putting a lot of work into this. The Office Compatible program is fairly easy to get into, ... BUT:
DocObject APIs have been abstracted out into a layer above the normal Office Compatible program and people who want to use them are picked specifically by MS and are arbitrary -- MS reserves right to say who's in and who's out.
Again, part of the broader discussion -- BOTH for container and for object.
"There are things we can do if we're working together that we can't do otherwise."

CONFIDENTIAL

NSC017099
CONFIDENTIAL

Explicit threat that if another browser gets out ahead on this (implicitly that if MS chooses another preferred ISV), then we're hosed.

[DocObject paper handout]

Catapult APIs -- API set for HTTP, Gopher, MIME, etc. This is an "opportunity" to extend protocols (by MS). This is the abstraction layer that they want all ISVs to use. Some of this is stuff we can just go do; opportunity for a closer relationship is that "it's closer". Haven't decided how they're going to be released. Very open to our feedback; want it. Spec is stable and MS is building apps to it. In broader relationship, "process and pattern" for this is normal course of events, where we're a special partner.

Re accessing MSN --

If we didn't have a tighter relationship, you'd be back to what a normal ISV can do. If we do have a tight relationship -- then you can get tight integration. MS has no plans to do this, but "it's on the table as part of the greater relationship".

There will be a level of MSN content that's Web-accessible. There will be another level that we charge for. Etc.

MH question -- what does it take beyond viewers to access core MSN content? "We would be happy to work with you on making this work, under the right circumstances."

"We do believe that we're going to have more noses on MSN in 12 months than any of our competitors."

If someone wants to publish content within MSN, they couldn't use a Netscape server to do that. How do you enable a publisher to use a Netscape server for this? Again, something we could make happen in the broader relationship.

Hard questions about what our client business is after MS builds in MSN and our browser -- pointed questions, hostile questions, etc. "What do you do?"

Would you be interested in having a partnership where NS gets all the non-Win95 stuff and MS gets all the Win95 stuff? If NS doesn't want to, then that's one thing. If NS does want to, then we can have our special relationship.
THREAT THAT MS WILL OWN THE WIN95 CLIENT MARKET AND THAT NETSCAPE SHOULD STAY AWAY.

DR -- key business proposition:
There's an arrangement where NS is a first-mover on this new MS platform.
DR -- also, we have limited interest in cross-platform.

What parts of MSN worry Netscape?

Let's clearly identify areas of competition...

MSN guy --
There could be a way where a Microsoft Network content offering could

CONFIDENTIAL

in fact be hosted on a Netscape server -- that is, Netscape server software gets used to run a service that's accessible to MSN customers, with MS's current MSN economic model in place. It's on the table -- making Netscape servers work inside this "logical MSN" -- but they refuse to talk about it until we have the broader relationship established.

"We need an ISV who is going to take our platform and services and go sell things to people..."

"We consider Lotus Notes a threat, and if you want to be/compete with Lotus Notes, then we don't want to give you help."

We need to know what you're going to do on our platform before we can figure out how much we want to help you as a preferred developer on our platform.

JB: How are we a threat to MS? "Lotus Notes is a big supporter of NT, Windows clients, etc. I don't think that we'd get into the same type of strategic relationship -- wouldn't invite them in -- because some of the things we're doing as a company are worked against by Notes." Multiple people said this.

JB: What about RAS APIs? Mike: That's a problem. DR: We can fix that problem. In a perfect world, anyone can plug into that. With a special relationship with you, you'll be the first to plug into it. Others will in the future.

DR: We need to give you code. Our alternative is to give you stuff that wasn't developed for that purpose. There's internal stuff that implements internal APIs, and those APIs are only known inside Microsoft. "We have yet to decide distribution." JB sez MS has gained advantage as a result, and they agree.

J Allard: "Depending on how we walk out of this room today, we have a solution for your problem..." or else in 3 months.

DR: "If we had a special relationship, you wouldn't be in this position."

Really perturbed because we put so much client stuff on the list, and they consider the client functionality to be something they build into the platform.

Server stuff --

"This gets into the hairy business questions that no one wants to answer." J Allard.

Obviously we have some plans in the future that overlap with your stuff.

BackOffice is a platform and our best friends are ISVs and integrators.

Potential point of contention --

Single most important element of your business is NSAPI. That's an API. Therefore that's a platform. Horrors. That's in conflict with us.

CONFIDENTIAL NSC017101 CONFIDENTIAL

DR: "We share a belief that the Web is going to be a phenomenal area of growth, and that NT is a preferred way to get that growth happening."

JA: What if Communications Server drops into BackOffice?

JA: Line is drawn above basic HTTP and basic extension API.

Bundling of free eval version of Communications Server is problematic because NT just shipped, won't ship again for 9-12 months. But there's all kinds of things we can do.

JB/JA: agreed that line is drawn between Communications Server and Commerce Server.

JA: If we were to modify NSAPI and start bundling it as part of our platform, what would your response be on non-NT platforms?

DR: "If we look out two years there'll only be one platform anyway." "If you can shoot for 95%, why can't we have 100%?"

DR: "The Internet is the democratization of network computing."

JA: "What could you do with NT and Excel? There's lots of things we can do together?"

Authoring --

We're not going to publish the Word format. "We want access to data formats to be open through code and not specifications."

"We'd like to find ways to work together so there's no surprises." "We don't want to be in a situation where on Windows you're switching to someone else's because the data formats changed on us."

TR: "It would make me feel a lot better to formalize this..."

DR: "Together we are going to be market leaders -- rather just exert market leadership ourselves."

Equity --

If we're doing a deal of this scope, we would see an equity investment as a natural extension of that.

JB: Are these other things dependent on these?

"It certainly isn't independent. If the meeting had turned out completely differently and we were going to compete in a lot of areas, then we clearly don't want to do this. But if we're going to cooperate a lot we think it would be beneficial to do the investment and have active participation in the company. It makes it easier to do all of the above. It's a weak condition. We'd like you to consider it. We're reasonably serious -- discussed with Bill/Nathan/Paul. Positive motivations: gives us more

insight into your direction, makes us want to invest more in the above areas, it makes it easier to do everything on this list. It means we're sort of engaged -- it's a stronger form of friendship. Our investment in any Internet-related software company, when they go public, significantly raises the valuation when that company goes public. If Bill Gates thinks a company is good enough for his money, it's good enough for investor's money."

"Our ability to have a tighter relationship with you -- it would raise our comfort level -- versus doing these things with some other developer -- it's a weak condition. It's an influencing role we want."

On the platform -- what will MS do on the platform side for 6 months?

They know what's coming out in August and slightly after August. They have lots of ideas for 12 months out, but no solid plans.

Process question? --

They'll go draft a set of lines in the sand, and then Netscape will visit Redmond and get all-day briefings and have brainstorming sessions.

JB: What are the principles?

They want us to provide list of things we want to see above the line. They want us to give them all our new product ideas, basically. E.g. what would we like from MSN?

JB: Why are we so important?

DR: "The net causes all sorts of new paradigms. One of the things that MS has come into in network businesses, ITV, MSN, etc. is that we are entering businesses as MS that go beyond our traditional core competencies. Therefore we need to select partners. You need to get a core group of partners that you have a close rel'ship with and you trust. We realized right away we needed a partner in the access business, so we got UUNet, close relationship, invest time and money, etc. We look at other areas and say, we really need people where, if we're going to build an Internet platform, we need one preferential partner and you guys are wonderful and so on... Netscape is basically compatible with MS, and a lot of other companies are not. If we invest energy into this partnership, things will happen. Can we align visions so both sides can win over time? Our most precious resource is people... it's a significant issue for us. So we want a partner where that investment will pay good dividends, etc."

JB: Compare it to UUNet. UUNet is not in MS's business, at all. We're a pure SW company, you are too, why partner up too much?

DR: "Our biggest leverage points are from other software companies. We wouldn't be very successful if only MS apps ran on MS platforms. That's why we're a platform company. We don't usually go invest in just one particular company..."

JB: How many SW companies do you have investments with?

DR: "Lightspan, UUNet, etc. A lot of acquisitions. Our trend over time is more things like this. Trying to find ways to be better partners."

--

Marc Andreessen
Netscape Communications Corp.
marca@netscape.com

CONFIDENTIAL