

EXHIBIT # 9
 WITNESS Muglia
 DATE 2-8-09
 ZOYA SPENCER (206)382-9695

From: Bob Muglia
To: Christopher Graham
Subject: FW: Office Shell
Date: Saturday, July 03, 1993 7:21AM

I don't know what happened, it was sent to you...

bob

From: Bob Muglia
To: Paul Maritz
Cc: Christopher Graham; Jim Allchin
Subject: Office Shell
Date: Thursday, July 01, 1993 6:13PM

I've talked to both Chris and Jim in detail about this. I think there are three options:

1. Status quo

We leave the org and objectives pretty much as is. Chicago continues along their path, exposing shell extensibility. Where possible, we convert the shell extensibility mechanism to OLE. The apps group continues enhancing Word/Excel.

Although this is the current plan, it seems like a bad option no matter how you view it. Chicago is in a catch-22 situation - their extensibility mechanism isn't compatible with anything, yet it's not at all clear that they can meet their size goals using OLE. In any case, whatever they do is the standard which apps will be written to (and what Cairo must be compatible with).

Word and Excel are forced to battle against their competitors on even turf. Given that Lotus and Wordperfect have largely caught up, they almost certainly lose ground - if not in market share, then in margins.

Chicago, of course, sells in high volume. But we don't reap the benefits of this.

2. Office Shell

Although there are conflicting opinions about whether this would work organizationally (Jim has valid concerns), it would be possible to solve the problems I outlined in the "status quo" approach by forming a team in apps which focused on shipping an integrated office product, including the shell.

Organizationally, this would likely take the form of a single design team in applications (with stevem playing a significant role), and two development teams - Mack over here and another one in apps. In order for this to work, the design team would need to consider the requirements of both office and Cairo. From a development perspective, you'd need to have one team which owns the core code, with the other team making modifications appropriate for their product. It makes sense to start with the Cairo code (the Chicago shell would NOT meet the needs for office). Thus, it probably makes sense to have Mack drive the code design, with the office development team working from that code base.

The one thing which must be understood about this plan is that it is NOT a plan which pulls Chicago features into Office for the benefits of our apps. As currently planned, the features one could pull from Chicago ARE NOT compelling enough to do the Office shell. What this plan does is pull features from Cairo into Office, and thus onto the MS-DOS/Chicago platform. If you look at what Chris is proposing, the vast majority of the Office features are things we are either planning to do in Cairo, or are beyond the current Cairo plans.

As far as timeframes go, the integrated office shell will ship in the same timeframe as Cairo (18-24 months from now).

The net effect of this plan is that our applications move forward significantly. We probably pull-in by two years or more some key features which would differentiate our apps. On the other hand, we do this by

MX 1389851
 CONFIDENTIAL

FL AG 0019001
 CONFIDENTIAL

pulling features which previously differentiated Cairo from Chicago. Do not kid yourself about the net effect on Cairo - it becomes much less compelling. The net result of this is that it is much harder for us to move corporations to NT on the desktop, thus delaying our ability to achieve a single OS kernel.

3. Bet on Cairo

At one point long ago, I think this was the plan... ;)

Everything you might anticipate doing with in the office shell could be done on Cairo, it could be done in a more architecturally correct way, and it could be done with less effort.

Given that the office shell borrows ideas from Cairo and is likely based on Cairo code, it's pretty clear that doing all this work on one platform would be less effort than doing it on two.

The issue is of course, that nobody outside building 5 believes Cairo will sell in volume in an acceptable timeframe.

However, this really is the plan which makes the most sense. Organizationally, it requires the least perturbations. It keeps a UI design center in Systems (rather than having all UI expertise in apps). It moves the apps forward and allows them to differentiate themselves from their competitors.

The Cairo product spec would have to change to meet the needs of apps, but this could actually happen if there was focus on building apps for Cairo. We would succeed in moving to a single OS kernel.

From a Chicago perspective, you'd do whatever makes sense to get the shell extensibility in-sync with Cairo - that probably means a combination of removing interfaces and changing some to be compatible with Cairo.

You'd certainly continue to fund update releases of apps product for Chicago - but you'd invest heavily in Office for Cairo.

Although I know it's a stretch for people to consider this, I think we're doing a disservice to ourselves by ruling it out without consideration. At a minimum, I think we should think thru what Cairo would need to do (in terms of size, speed, features, distribution, etc.) in order for us to "bet on Cairo".

bob