

**From:** Suzan Fine Delbene  
**Sent:** Monday, May 12, 1997 5:09 PM  
**To:** Brad Silverberg; John Ludwig; David Cole  
**Cc:** Brad Chase; Will Poole  
**Subject:** Lotus Terms and Status

Here are the terms that we are proceeding on with Lotus:

**Lotus Obligations:**

- Lotus will ship IE 4.0 with all of their products, and no other browser during the term of the agreement.
- Lotus will supply Microsoft with detailed documentation describing the interaction of the Notes client with the Notes server.

**Microsoft Obligations:**

- Provide Lotus with the IE 4.0 IEAK with the ability to customize all of the channels on the channel bar prior to shipment
- Provide Lotus/IBM with code necessary to develop an OS/2 version of IE 4.0. Any code supplied by Microsoft would be used only in the development of the OS/2 version of IE 4.0 and could not be used in any other Lotus or IBM products.
- Provide Lotus with the ability to distribute NetMeeting with all of their products.  
(Johnlu/Blake/Brian will discuss parameters to this tomorrow)
- Microsoft will provide Lotus with documentation describing the interaction between Outlook and Exchange that is equivalent in breadth to the Lotus documentation of Notes' client and server interaction.

**If Lotus is interested:**

- Microsoft will supply Lotus with a version of Outlook Express that they can rebrand and distribute with their products.  
(lotus has the preview. No feedback yet from them)

Please let me know if you have an issue with any of the terms. I'm will be discussing the terms more generally with Lotus later in the week, with the hopes of having a legal agreement drafted and reviewed by them for next week.

Billbl says that the calendaring discussions are going well. I don't see any reason to include this in the agreement.

My issue is the documentation of Notes. Right now we have this together in one deal, but the Notes/Outlook documentation is contentious and will make the IE distribution harder to close. I have the letter that Papows sent to Jimall, and as far as I know, discussion of these terms would be the first formal response since he sent the letter. Since we are willing to give on the OS/2 front we might be ok here, but Bradsi, you should be prepared for a potential call from Papows on that part of it. I'll give you a heads up if this is the case.

Thanks,  
Suzan

*suzanf@microsoft.com*  
*(206)936-4013*



MS98 0112497  
CONFIDENTIAL