

**To:** Lisa Wen; Prashant Kantak; syounis; scicarelli; kmontalvo  
**CC:** udhaliwa; jnybeck; rcama; jlodenius; dschrock; pak  
**Sent:** 10/7/1998 9:24:38 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Resending..ParkerVision

Lisa,  
I believe we have made substantial progress since then. To tell you the truth, I am more of a believer now than when I started talking with them.

-We have been able to establish a common language to measure the performance parameters for their technology. Both parties have agreed on a common test setup and the performance numbers we measured using that setup. Thanks to you guys and especially Steve and Saed, we have shown that a relationship with Qualcomm will add value to their goal of maximizing the benefits of this technology whether or not it is useful to our purpose. In return, we would like to share in their success -- perhaps through equity if they are successful in other markets and/or through a favorable licensing agreement if this technology is useful to us in its full or reduced scope. I have constantly conveyed this point to Jeff Parker and he is very aware of it.

-The performance parameters that were tested on this board have been quite encouraging according to our own folks. They have agreed to put in some extra effort to come up with a discrete board in the interim until they get their CMOS parts back which they said they could tweak to get closer to our requirements. Yes, the schedule for the discrete board has slipped and I am planning to use that to extract additional concessions rather than conclude that it is worthless to pursue this further. Jeff Parker has agreed to give me an update every friday on their progress and on any changes to the time schedules, performance goals, etc. He has also agreed that he would be willing to reveal the technology to us since he now has a technology disclosure agreement in place as well as a licensing agreement that he will present to us shortly.

-To answer Upkar's concern that they do not have a complete handle on what they are doing, it is to our advantage to exploit that opportunity and shepherd them along the right (our) path. It is an inefficient process, but from his point of view, as the CEO of a public company, he is constantly torn between maximizing the short-term benefits (value of an agreement in the wireless LAN area, say) and a more risky, but long-term benefit in the digital phone market given the limited amount of resources he has. I believe he is closer to getting the technology validated for the wireless LAN application. I am trying to get him to give more importance to our needs. I am not expecting 100% attention to us, but it is still better than what we had when we started out.

In short, we just have to deal with their culture and be ready when we need to make a move.

Prashant

At 09:17 AM 10/7/98 -0700, Lisa Wen wrote:

>Isn't it funny that I went thru this same thing back in april and here we  
>are 6 months later going thru it again with little to no progress?

>Thanks for still tracking this.

>lisa

>

>At 6:42 PM -0700 10/5/98, Prashant Kantak wrote:

>>Folks,

>>

>>The 2-4 week time window for PV to come back to us with a discrete board is

>>now open (since last thursday), but we have no idea what progress they

>>have/haven't made.

>>

>>In this context, Jeff Parker got back to me friday late afternoon. He

>>mentioned that he and his folks have been busy completing patent documents,

>>etc. have not devoted themselves full time to fulfilling the goals we had

>>set when we last met in the lab. He also pleaded ignorance on knowledge of

>>the status of the effort. I have chided him for, first and foremost, not

>>in Florida, and secondly for not showing a strong enough commitment to us.  
>>  
>>Given his other random musings during my conversations with him, I gathered  
>>that he (they) are devoting much of their efforts to wireless LAN  
>>applications -- which might end up being a complete waste, especially since  
>>wireless LAN has not taken off for reasons other than ParkerVision's  
>>technology. In any case, regardless of the real reasons for this delay, I  
>>believe that since he has yanked our chain, I would like to tighten the  
>>noose around him and use this situation as a bargaining tool since we have  
>>baited him enough with our interest.  
>>  
>>If the folks from ParkerVision call you, please get as much information  
>>from them as possible as to the status of their efforts, timeframes, etc.  
>>but please DO NOT give out any information on our judgement of their  
>>technology (given their latest numbers, whether good or bad) and any time  
>>frame when they could come down to do another demo with us. Please refer  
>>them to me. Also, please keep me informed if you guys hear from them,  
>>since I would like to know what they have (or haven't) told you when I talk  
>>to them. We also need to provide one voice from our end in this situation  
>>  
>>Thanks for your cooperation.  
>>Prashant  
>