EXHIBIT 22

FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT SB
309
Cummins 4-21-09

From: Rick Cummins [rick.cummins@oracle.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2006 9:16 PM
To: LACHS ROBERT M; MCLEOD JAMES L.; BLACKFORD JAMES M; MILORADOVITCH LEE ANN MARIE
Subject: PSFT Analysis - CONFIDENTIAL
Attachments: Stephen.Johnston.vcf

Rob, Jamie, James, and Lee Ann,

Please do NOT share this with anyone. The analysis is very rudimentary at this point. However, I suggested the analysis below to Chris and he then had Steve pull some numbers together. Based on rough data it shows that there is little to no positive uplift in our current model. This helps the case of simplified pricing. We will see where it goes from here.

Rick

-----Original Message-----
From: Chris Madsen [mailto:Chris.Madsen@oracle.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2006 2:08 PM
To: 'Jones,Juan'
Cc: 'rick.cummins@oracle.com'; 'Johnston,Stephen'
Subject: [Fwd: Re: PSFT Analysis]

Juan, Steve put this data together as a result of your comments about moving PS/JDE away from their pricing models and move to the simplified Oracle Pricing Model for next year. What this simple analysis says is that the PS uplift program (that everyone says is so productive) is really having no positive impact at all. Also, we know that the legacy of these agressive uplifts many times is driving large customers to third parties. So in my opinion, if we move to the Oracle uplift model, it should have positive impact on contract base growth and more efficient utilization of resources. Of course this does not even take into account the efficencies of scale if we make the entire contract base the same. We can sell the hell out of this.

Regards,

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Re: PSFT Analysis
Date: Mon, 09 Jan 2006 17:25:29 -0800
From: Steve Johnston <Stephen.Johnston@oracle.com>
Reply-To: Stephen.Johnston@oracle.com
Organization: Oracle Corporation
To: Chris Madsen <Chris.Madsen@oracle.com>
References:<43C2A61D.3030906@oracle.com> <43C2C1C4.19B29AD@oracle.com>

Chris - per our conversation, I've revised the grid below to reflect what I believe to be the true impact of uplifts.

I am inclined to agree with your analysis that we should go to the same pricing model as the ORCL groups have been using for two reasons: **(1)** we have not seen a substantial increase in bookings due to uplifts in the time since we have inherited PSFT, and **(2)** we have lost several large accounts to third party providers due to high uplifts in contracts with PSFT pricing.

In the grid below, I've adjusted the Q1 available to renew to reflect what I believe to be the true pool of opportunities that were available in Q1.

(1) IMPACT OF UPLIFTS

	Q1	Q2	YTD
ADJUSTED Available to Renew	$58.4M	$187.8M	$246.2M
Less: True Cancellations by Start Date	<$4.5M>	<$7.8M>	<$12.3M>
Result: Remaining Available to Renew	$53.9M	$180.0M	$233.9M
Bookings by Start Date	$53.9M	$173.4M	$227.3M
Booked / ATR	0%	96.3%	97.2%
Uplift % Estimate	**0%**	<3.7%>	<2.8%>

Even after removing cancellations (many of which are due to customers moving to third party providers as described below), this shows that the positive impact of remaining customer uplifts is non-existent.

(2) NOTABLE PSFT CANCELLATIONS

There has been $21M in true cancellations through December 2005, a 5.2% cancellation rate YTD. This is well above the Oracle standard of 4% (achieved in FY05).

Below are 12 large accounts (totaling $6.5M) that have been lost to due high PSFT pricing / customers moving to cheaper third party providers.

- Lexmark ($1.2M) - canceled in Q1, moved to Tomorrow Now, who is supporting customer for $250K.
- PTL Information Technology Services ($1.2M) - canceled in Q2, customer moved to third party provider.
- TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION REDACTED [redacted]
- Amgen ($660K) - canceled in Q3, customer moving to Tomorrow Now, who will be supporting customer at less than 50% of our price.
- Apria Health Care ($521K) - canceled in Q3, customer moving to Tomorrow Now.
- TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION REDACTED [redacted]
- Borders Group ($409K) - canceled in Q2, customer moved to third party provider.
- LS Management Incorporated ($329K) - canceled in Q3, customer moving to third party provider.
- TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION REDACTED [redacted]
- TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION REDACTED [redacted]
- TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION REDACTED [redacted]
- TEXT REMOVED - NOT RELEVANT TO MOTION REDACTED [redacted]

Thanks,
Steve

Steve Johnston wrote:

Hi Chris - I'll give you a call. A couple of things regarding this analysis:

There's many factors in the system numbers that don't allow for a true growth analysis. This a good start but keep in mind that this is a very rough draft and not firm.

I also am not sure that the PSFT ATR for Q1 was calculated correctly. Contracts that didn't appear valid were revived and renewed, making the pool of contracts available larger than calculated when compiling quotas/territories.

This is the way I would calculate a rough-draft growth model, using actual PSFT numbers, through 30-Nov-2005:

	Q1	Q2	YTD
Available to Renew	$53.1M	$187.8M	$240.9M
Less: True Cancellations by Start Date	-$4.5M	-$7.8M	-$12.3M
Result: Remaining Available to Renew	$48.6M	$180.M	$228.6M
Bookings by Start Date	$53.9M	$173.4M	$227.3M
Booked / ATR	110.9%	96.3%	99.4%
Uplift % Estimate	10.9%	-3.7%	-0.6%

In summary:
- the Q1 ATR is understated, giving the impression that there was uplifts were impressive in Q1 when actually they were not. I believe the true uplift % for Q1 to be close to zero.

- including Q3, there have been $21M in true cancellations for PSFT, which is far more than uplifts generated year-to-date.

- the PSFT business is in decline due to cancellations, specifically large cancellations where we are losing business to 3rd party competitors. Any uplifts I have seen are being negated by this loss of business.

Thanks,
Steve

Chris Madsen wrote:

FYI, I want to discuss this with you and get your insight.