Exhibit H

Rebecca Borowitz

From: Ted Normand
Sent: Thursday, March 09, 2006 2:46 PM
To: 'Shaughnessy, Todd'
Subject: RE: Privilege Log for Documents Re-Claimed as Privileged

Todd --

I thought I had been clear in our discussions about the plain distinction between SCO's request for the limited log on the documents identified in the mid-January letter versus the much, much larger supplemental log SCO has been preparing for many weeks (like the much, much larger supplemental log IBM has been preparing during that time). I had informed you that, pursuant to IBM's own view of SCO's obligations, SCO wanted the limited log in order to pursue a motion on re-called documents that I had informed you SCO had already concluded were not privileged. In contrast, I did not understand IBM to have concluded that it would move against any SCO documents on the grounds that they were not privileged -- not that IBM had waived any rights to do so, but that IBM had no present intent to do so. In addition, as I thought I had said to you during one of our calls, SCO has long been preparing and will produce its supplemental privilege log next week, and has never suggested that IBM has waived any rights to pursue the documents identified in the privilege log. Regards,

Ted

From: Shaughnessy, Todd [mailto:tshaughnessy@swlaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 09, 2006 2:04 PM
To: Ted Normand
Subject: RE: Privilege Log for Documents Re-Claimed as Privileged

Ted,
For at least as long as you have been requesting this information from IBM, I have been clearly, consistently, and repeatedly requesting from you, as part of those discussions, a date by which we can expect to receive SCO's supplemental log. To date, you have not even confirmed that SCO will be providing one, let alone when. We believe these logs should be exchanged on the same date, as previously ordered by the Court. SCO, however, apparently believes that IBM must provide a log, but SCO need not do so.

Despite the incongruity of SCO's position, and despite my numerous attempts to resolve it, we are nevertheless providing a supplemental log. You should receive it tomorrow or Saturday. I note that SCO has recalled documents as privileged (without basis, we believe), such as the document recalled during the deposition of Jay Peterson. SCO has done so without even acknowledging that it would log such documents. SCO therefore has left us no choice but to seek relief from the court, both with respect to documents SCO has recalled as privileged but for which it refuses to provide a privilege log, and with respect to SCO's refusal in general to provide a privilege log.

Todd

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
801.257.1937 (direct)
801.257.1900 (general)
801.257.1800 (fax)

From: Ted Normand [mailto:TNormand@BSFLLP.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 09, 2006 8:16 AM
To: Shaughnessy, Todd
Subject: RE: Privilege Log for Documents Re-Claimed as Privileged

Todd --

Please confirm on your end when IBM plans to send us the privilege-log entries for the mid-January letter. As I have said clearly to you at least six times in the last six weeks, according to IBM (on threat of a charge of unethical conduct by its counsel if SCO were to file a motion based on anything other than the log), SCO needs those entries to prosecute its right to claim that IBM's re-claim of privilege is improper. If IBM continues to decline to produce a log on those documents, as it has refused to do for months, then SCO will file a motion and leave it to the Court to resolve whatever ethics issues get raised. Thanks.

Ted

From: Shaughnessy, Todd [mailto:tshaughnessy@swlaw.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2006 9:11 PM
To: Ted Normand
Subject: RE: Privilege Log for Documents Re-Claimed as Privileged

Ted,
I believe (though I'm not positive) that the plan is to get you a fully-updated privilege log by the end of the week.

When can we expect SCO's updated log?

Todd

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
801.257.1937 (direct)
801.257.1900 (general)
801.257.1800 (fax)

From: Ted Normand [mailto:TNormand@BSFLLP.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2006 7:34 AM
To: Shaughnessy, Todd
Subject: Privilege Log for Documents Re-Claimed as Privileged

Todd --

Although we talked about a few things last night, I wanted to send this note to confirm that IBM is making an effort this week to send us a privilege log for (at least) the documents identified in the text of the mid-January letter to me regarding documents that IBM had claimed as privilege in depositions and otherwise in the previous months. As I have said before in requesting such a log, if IBM adheres to its position that SCO could not even file a motion to compel such documents on any basis other than the information about such documents provided in a privilege log, then IBM should produce such a privilege log. Regards,

Ted