From: Brad Silverberg
To: Bill Gates; Paul Maritz
Subject: FW: Doubledisk summary
Date: Friday, May 15, 1992 5:22PM

as i mentioned this afternoon, dd was here today. all systems go.

From: Richard Freedman
To: Ben Slivka; Bill Pope; Brad Chase; Brad Silverberg; Eric Straub;
Karl Stock; Mack Mccauley
Cc: SYS MS-DOS Marketing Team; Richard Freedman
Subject: Doubledisk summary
Date: Friday, May 15, 1992 4:26PM

Bradc, billp and I met w/Anatoly Tikhman and his lawyer Don Reinke
today to go over the contract. Karlst and bens sat in for a bit to
hash out some technical issues.

Bottom line: we have a deal. Some changes in details, but nothing
major. We made a few concessions predicated on getting the code by
6/1, which looks very likely. Details below.

Acceptance and Payment
======================
Anatoly will send object next tuesday. We will test to make sure it is
ok. After contract signing and source drop, we will compile the
source. Our only grounds for rejecting the source will be if it
doesn't binary compare to the object tested before signing. Once we
accept, we pay $750K. We can kill deal if the sources do not compare.

We then pay $400K on shipping MS-DOS 6 or on 6/30/93, whichever is
earlier, $150K on shipping 1 mm MS-DOS 6 Upgrades, and another $150K on
shipping 2 mm. These terms did not change.

Vertisoft will develop the Stacker conversion utility to our spec.
Once it works, we accept and pay $100K. We cannot kill deal by
rejecting the conversion utility; we can only withhold the $100K.

Total payment = $750K + $400K + $150K + $150K + $100K = $1,550K

Exclusivity
===========
We have a total exclusive to DoubleDisk, meaning that Anatoly can't
sell it to anyone, with the following exceptions:
* He may sell or license to end users directly or via normal software
distribution. Normal distribution does not include OEMs.

MS-PCA 2612071

CONFIDENTIAL

* He may not bundle DoubleDisk except with his own technology that we
will list explicitly in the contract.

Other
====
* We agreed to exchange improvements for the term of the agreement (4
years)
* We agreed to give him any documentation we create
* He agreed that the UI for DoubleDisk will not be identical to ours.
He will change, at a minimum, colors and messages.
* He agreed to provide the following manpower free: 6 months of a
programmer on-site, 3 months of a second programmer on- or off-site,
and 1 month of a tester on-site.
* We agreed to provide quarterly updates of our MS-DOS 6 Upgrade
shipments.
* If code is here by 6/1, we agreed to shorten the period during which
we can exercise our buyout option from 4 years after contract signing
to 1/1/95.
* We agreed to let him continue fulfilling direct mail orders for 90
days after we exercise the buyout option.
* If code is here by 6/1, we agreed to split legal fees should we be
sued for infringement on the conversion utility.

From· Brad Silverberg
To: David Cole; John Ludwig; Eric Rudder; Mack Mccauley
Subject: FW: Norton Desktop for Windows
Date: Friday, May 15, 1992 5:24PM

————————
From: Aaron Getz
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: Norton Desktop for Windows
Date: Friday, May 15, 1992 4:26PM

I've been using Norton Desktop as my shell for a couple of weeks now.
  My overall reaction is mixed.

I hated the last version of Norton Desktop.   It was excruciatingly
slow, it's inteterface was inelegant, and the directory tree
structure was already expanded.   Of course, I was comparing this to
Win 3.1's file manager and program manager.

I generally like this version of Norton Desktop. The only reason I'm
tempted to stop using it is because applications are running
annoyingly slow on my machine. I've got an fast 386sx/20 with 6meg
of memory. I'm not really sure if this is a result of 'Stacker', an
old version of 'Bullet' or 'Norton Desktop'. The new version of
Desktop seems much speedier than the old when you are actually using
the shell.

The main functionality that I use is the ability to mix program items
and groups in the top level of the program manager.   This has
basically saved me all my juggling with the present day program
manager.   Part of what makes this nice is the very well integrated
and fairly large icon library.

Having the file manager windows be SMI is also an improvement.
Because of the fact that they are not clipped by an upper level
window and the default size and positioning of windows, it is very
easy to open two file manager windows on the screen.   This is
critical for easy of move/copy operations.   The fact that the
drive icons do not have friendly names is a big minus.

I used SmartErase for awhile, but it caused some problems so I turned
it off. The whole process was a pain in the rear

Viewers are cool in concept, but they are two slow, and seemingly
non-interruptible   It is almost always easier to just open the
file.   I love the view functionality which exists in Word 2.0.

I don't drag items to the desktop to create push buttons. This just
clutters up my screen   The ability to put the items directly into
the main group of the program manager makes this unnecessary.   I
just use this window when I want to launch things.   At the beginning

<div align="center">

MS-PCA 2612072

CONFIDENTIAL

</div>