EXHIBIT 11

From:	Andy Rubin.	Sent:4/13/2006 3:41 PM.
To: [-]	Dan Bornstein.	
Cc: [-]	Steve Horowitz.	
Bcc: [-]	.	
Subject:	Re: What are we doing?.	

Obvious question - please define:

"the currently-envisioned time frame"?
and
"the currently-targeted amount"

On Apr 13, 2006, at 3:35 PM, Dan Bornstein wrote:

>> We need to provide an alternative to MSFT, and we need to do it in
>> such a way as we don't fragment 3rd party developers. See the next
>> slide in the deck for fragmentation: Java has very little
>> fragmentation, and it's adoptable. If we play our cards right, we
>> can also leverage not only existing developers, but applications as
>> well.
>
> That sounds like an argument for adopting the MIDP model for
> third-party apps, not developing a new app model.
>
>> Since we are Open Source, and the cost for our platform is close to
>> zero, we lower the total BOM by about 10%. That savings and some
>> careful choices in hardware specs helped us create our slogan:
>> "Smartphone features at featurephone prices".
>>
>> BTW, my definition of smartphone is a phone that has an open API for
>> 3rd party developers and whose own applications use that same API.
>
> Ok, even conceding the point about BOM, I do not believe we can make a
> smartphone by your definition in the currently-envisioned time frame,
> with the scope of development as currently outlined in the PRD, and
> have it be one that can be good enough to sell the currently-targetted
> amount. In the current nominal plan, there is too much that is new to
> expect everything to totally fall into place in a 1.0 release.
> Something still has to give.
>
>> I've cc'd android-team.
>
> I think you forgot to; please go ahead.
>
> -dan