

Omay-7.txt

|Kay
|
|
From: Brad Silverberg
To: Jeff Parsons
Subject: Re: jag/coug
Date: Thursday, May 07, 1992 2:10PM

we certainly will sell it as a complete, integrated product. if we sell cougar without the gui (ie, as a version of msdos), then i also like the idea of calling it "msdos nt" or "msdos 386" or "msdos-32 bit" or someother high tech name to signify this is not your father's ms-dos anymore.

we should not sell windows without including the underlying platform (cougar).

at the same time, i believe there will continue to be a need in the market for a non-gui version of this new low-end 32 bit, protectmode platform.

i agree we should not be dinking around with dosshell. in my model, the nice ui work should be in windows.

in fact, in the integrated product, i probably wouldn't even ship dosshell or any character-ui's.

- you raise some good issues certainly that we will continue asking ourselves for a while. at the same time, i believe we need to continue to build something which can be a version of msdos.

|From: Jeff Parsons
|To: Brad Silverberg
|Subject: Re: jag/coug
|Date: Thursday, May 07, 1992 2:34PM
|
||>From bradsi Thu May 7 13:20:47 1992
||Subject: Re: jag/coug
||
||the current thinking is to have the next windows release ("win93") b
e
||integrated with cougar as what you call windos32 v1.0. so then the
||question is whether to sell cougar (ie. the non-gui portion of the o
s)
||separately. i believe yes. i would not release it however before t
he
||matching integrated product is also released.

Omay-7.txt

|
|I used to believe yes, but first of all I worry about the industry
|perception that Windows+DOS is this klunky combination that will neve
r be
|as smooth and reliable as a complete integrated solution like, say, O
S/2.
|Second, we set ourselves up for more cloning by competitors unless we
|completely eliminate the incentive to clone by putting a complete sol
ution
|in a single box so that users say hell, why should I buy another dos
to
|run windows, this already comes with dos. Ultimately, we don't even
want
|them to think about the phrases "requires DOS" or "comes with DOS" an
ymore.
|That also puts our customers in the right frame of mind for NT, which
isn't
|built on DOS at all. WinDos32 v1.0 is one way to do it.
|
||there are two aspects to cougar: as a platform for windows and as th
e
||next msdos. by dividing the line differently between windows and do
s
||than was done in the past (ie, putting the os function into dos, and

||drawing the line at the win386 layer) was done precisely to change t
he
- ||rules of the game.
|
|I know, but I don't think it changes them enough. In the one case, y
ou
|effectively say "hah, clone that!", and the other you say "hah, what
are
|going to clone now". The latter is preferable. The other thing to b
e
|weighed obviously is the demand for a non-gui DOS, where that demand
|will be over a year from now (esp since there is no such thing as a n
on-gui
|mac or a non-gui os/2-preinstalled ps/2 or...), and whether we will w
ant
|to continue fostering that notion that dos and windows are separate
|(mix and match?) entities, even though we didn't develop them that wa
y and
|don't even want buyers to think of them that way. Do we really want
to
|continue dinking around with DOSSHELL for example, when Windows (even
just
|a stripped down version) would provide a perfectly good alternative a

Page 23

MSC 00799480

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1180168
CONFIDENTIAL

Omay-7.txt

nd

|save us some work/maintenance in the process?

|

|Jeff

|

From: Brad Silverberg

To: Paul Maritz

Subject: RE: release decision mail

Date: Thursday, May 07, 1992 2:19PM

" It is worth doing one more incremental release of Windows between now and Cairo." should change to "it is worth doing an incremental release". it is a mistake to imply this is the very last windows on msdos release.

also, i am concerned that i will not be able to pull enough detail and all the presentations in time. i simply have to get reviews done, people are starting to freak out. in addition, the focus of the 3m+L work for the last month has been on option 2, as you know. we should talk in more detail tomorrow about the agenda.

i won't need 45 minutes to discuss refresh plans. that's 15 minutes, 30 at most if unexpected questions come up.

- |From: Paul Maritz

|To: Brad Silverberg; Jim Allchin

|Subject: release decision mail

|Date: Thursday, May 07, 1992 2:37PM

|please send comments tdoay.

|-----
|RELEASE PLANS:

|Jimall, Bradsi, and I met and decided that the Systems release plan will follow

|the following basic framework.

|1. There will be a Win'93 release (code name "Chicago" - please use that from

|now on), which will have following goals and constraints: MSC 00799481
|- targeted at running well on a 386/4MB system.

|- further exploit the 386 (offering better memory management, an IFS mechanism, 32bit device drivers, better support for Win32 application

Page 24

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1180169
CONFIDENTIAL

Omay-7.txt

nd

|save us some work/maintenance in the process?

|

|Jeff

|

|

From: Brad Silverberg

To: Paul Maritz

Subject: RE: release decision mail

Date: Thursday, May 07, 1992 2:19PM

" It is worth doing one more incremental release of Windows between now and Cairo." should change to "it is worth doing an incremental release". it is a mistake to imply this is the very last windows on msdos release.

also, i am concerned that i will not be able to pull enough detail and all the presentations in time. i simply have to get reviews done, people are starting to freak out. in addition, the focus of the 3m+L work for the last month has been on option 2, as you know. we should talk in more detail tomorrow about the agenda.

i won't need 45 minutes to discuss refresh plans. that's 15 minutes, 30 at most if unexpected questions come up.

|From: Paul Maritz

|To: Brad Silverberg; Jim Allchin

|Subject: release decision mail

|Date: Thursday, May 07, 1992 2:37PM

|please send comments tdoay.

|
|-----
|RELEASE PLANS:

|Jimall, Bradsi, and I met and decided that the Systems release plan will follow

|the following basic framework.

|1. There will be a Win'93 release (code name "Chicago" - please use that from

|now on), which will have following goals and constraints: MSC 00799481

| - targeted at running well on a 386/4MB system.

| - further exploit the 386 (offering better memory management, an IFS mechanism, 32bit device drivers, better support for Win32 application

Page 24

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1180170
CONFIDENTIAL

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT

753

U.S. District Court, N. J.
Civil No. 2:96CV645B

Omay-7.txt

s,
(including pre-emptive multitasking of 32bit apps).
|- It will offer "100%" compatibility with Win3.1 device drivers.
|- It will pre-req a 386.
|- it will offer better support for workgroups - significant incremental improvements
over Sparta release 1.
|- it will offer easy of use improvements to offer better support for installation and configuration.
|- it will NOT be aimed at introducing a radically new user interface.
|- beyond OLE-2, MAPI, ODBC it will NOT offer major new systems API's.
|- it will be targeted at a Q3'93 release. Functionality will be tailored to meet this date.
- We will simultaneously release a "MS-DOS 7.0" based on the core of the above technology.
2. Cairo will remain the release of Windows where we will make major innovations in both UI and API's. It provides the underlying distributed functionality that we need to have in order to build upon for the future, and in doing so have an answer to the likes of Notes. Specific decisions wrt Cairo are:
|- Cairo will be targeted at an NT platform only, NT release 2 will be fused with Cairo release 1.
|- Cairo/NT will be targeted at 386/8MB platform, and we will do whatever is needed to make this a reality.
|- Cairo will ship as soon as its schedule permits (i.e. as early in 1994 as possible).
|-
|- Rationale behind Above:
|-
a. Why do a Win'93 release? MSC 00799482
|- We need a release of Windows in 1993 in order to:
|- complete the work needed to make Sparta more of an attractive workgroup solution.
|- solve many of the "mundane" problems that didn't get solved in Windows 3.1 -
|- better hardware detection on setup etc.
|- provide a better low-end 386 OS solution to compete with OS/2 (i.e.

Page 25

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1180171
CONFIDENTIAL

Omay-7.txt

people

{who "just want pre-emptive multi-tasking on a small system", etc.)
|- provide a ship vehicle for OLE-2, MAPI, Win32s API's - experience
has taught
{that until it goes into the shipping version of the OS, it is hard
to get ISVs to pay
{attention to API's.

|
|b. Why not just wait for Cairo?

{Cairo is a major step forward. We should ship Cairo as soon as
possible, but we
{should take the time to get all of its important elements (eg. OFS)
complete and
{thoroughly tested. It will also take time for the market to digest
Cairo. It is worth
{doing one more incremental release of Windows between now and Cairo.

|
|c. Won't Win'93 incrementally grow into enough of Cairo, to ensure
that no-one

{pays attention to full Cairo?

{We are not going to attempt to address in Chicago any of the distribu
ted
{systems and information storage problems (tracking links, summary cat
alogues,
{etc.) that Cairo will solve. We will not attempt any kludges. This
will require
{discipline.

- |
|c. Why not move elements (eg. Shell) of Cairo into Win'93?

{The penalty of defocussing the Cairo team is not worth it. The real
contribution
{of Cairo is the integration of user visible components with the under
lying
{distributed infrastructure - we do not want to compromise or delay th
is.

|
|d. Why base Cairo on NT?

MSC 00799483

{To the end-user, Cairo (whether on NT or on DOS/Windows) will be a ma
jor OS
{upgrade. Further at this point in time (1994), it is unlikely that we
will be
{positioning Windows as being "based on DOS". Hence to the end-user it
will be
{a "Windows" upgrade. There is a lot of upside on focussing our invest
ments
{around one OS technology for the distributed environment (long term w
e cannot
{afford to develop everything twice). The issue then becomes can we ma

Page 26

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1180172
CONFIDENTIAL

Omay-7.txt

ke NT

|ready for prime time in 1994? The answer is "yes" - if we focus on
it, we can.

|

|Questions and issues we need to address:

|

|1. What level of interoperability will we provide for "down-level" Wi
ndows

|systems and Cairo systems? - Jimall.

|

|2. What is the real OLE-2 schedule? - Jimall.

|

|3. What is the penalty of making Chicago be 386 specific, and of maki
ng the

|primary API be Win32 (eg. OLE-2 is 32bit only). What is the impact of
not

|addressing the 286 market? How effective will Win32s be at providing
means to

|address Win3.1 users that do not upgrade to Chicago? - Davidcol & Bob
mu.

|

|4. Provide better definition of features in Chicago - API, UI, and
Workgroup. -

|Bradsi.

|

|5. What is the product release plan for WGA in light of the above? -
Paulma to

|communicate to Danielp.

|

|6. How should we start the process of getting NT & Cairo teams more a
ligned.

|Paulma & Jimall.

|

|STRUCTURE AND PREP NEEDED FOR 5/15 REVIEW WITH BILLG:

|

|I have asked Kayb to schedule time on Tuesday to go over stuff for 5/
15.

|

|Basic agenda for 5/15:

|

|1. Basic Release framework - paulma, 30mins.

MSC 00799484

|

|2. Chicago preliminary definition and issues - bradsi, 60mins

| - present elements of Chicago as best we understand them, and take ac
tion

|items.

Omay-7.txt

|
|3. Win'93 API issues - the 32bit, 286 vs 386 issues. - Davidcol & Bob
mu. -

|60minutes

| - go thru all the issues in saying that "OLE-2 apps are 32bit", i.e.
286 vs. 386,
|size/perf, Win32s on Win3.1, tools, etc.

|4. Cairo update - jimall, 45mins.

| - any changes to definition/thinking on Cairo (ie. implications of
being on one
|platform, down-level client support, schedule goals).

|5. Workgroup apps plans - danielp or designee, 60mins.

| - present elements Mail and Workgroup plans as best understood, and t
ake
|action items.

|6. Other OS plans:

| - Astro update - bradc & mackm - 30mins.

| - Windows 3.1 refresh plans - should we/ when we will do refresh to W
indows,

|we will include Sparta 1 improvements, Win32s, and/or Windows CD
|components? - bradsi - 45 minutes.

| (I am presuming we will have covered Sparta on Monday with Billg).

|Attendees for day 1:

- | Billg, Mikemap, Jimall, Bradsi, Jonl, Steveh, Robg, Perttir, Davec, Pa
ulma,

| Steveh, Bobmu, Johnlu, Mackm, Davidcol, Danielp,
| Brianv (or representative), Darrylr, Chris Graham

|Basic Agenda for 5/16:

|What to do about the really low-end (handhelds) - Billg, Paulma, Robg
, Gregs.

|
From: Brad Silverberg

To: Aaron Reynolds; Chris Guzak; David Cole

Subject: FW: Lotus: Sees Sound Product As Multimedia For Masses

Date: Thursday, May 07, 1992 2:24PM

From: Timothy Raines

To: ITG News Service for Exeuctives

MSC 00799485

Page 28

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1180174
CONFIDENTIAL