From: Charles Fitzgerald
Sent: Tue, 5/8/2001 9:58 PM
To: Graham Clark; Sanjay Parthasarathy; Tom Button; Yuval Neeman
Subject: RE: J2EE Strategy.ppt

Its potentially worse than that -- we both validate x-platform and then demonstrate conclusively we not prepared to deliver on it.

-----Original Message-----
From: Graham Clark
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2001 9:54 PM
To: Charles Fitzgerald; Sanjay Parthasarathy; Tom Button; Yuval Neeman
Subject: RE: J2EE Strategy.ppt

I would like to understand the x-plat strategy, because I don't get it and nor does anyone in the field. It doesn't seem to make ANY sense.

By putting CLI into ECMA, we are inviting x-platform implementations. With Rotor we are even doing some base work on Linux and Solaris.

For enterprise customers/partners, wanting to build enterprise apps, all this is meaningless as there is no mechanism to provide transaction (and other core services) support on these non-Windows implementations. J2EE clearly has a mechanism, albeit faulty, to enable these x-plat services.

I can think of four explanations for our current strategy (as I and the field see it):

1. There is something happening to provide these applications services x-platform that I don't understand (based on Joe's proposition, I doubt it is this).

2. We think that our customers/partners/analysts are stupid and that they won't see our approach as insufficient for real enterprise apps.

3. We are going to evangelise to IBM and others to plug their own transaction services under CLI on Linux (without specifying how). Joe's proposal is to tell them how.

4. We haven't thought thru a strategy that will make sense after anything more than a superficial inspection - if so why are we doing all the Rotor work?

MSSunII 000000089435
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-DEPEX 007061

If the answer is (2) then we have learned nothing from the past 5 years and J2EE will continue to kick our butts. I would rather see Microsoft say x-plat is BS rather than make a half step (Rotor, CLI) that will confuse everyone and lead to continued distrust of our motives for doing it.

-----Original Message-----
From: Charles Fitzgerald
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 5:00 PM
To: Sanjay Parthasarathy; Tom Button; Yuval Neeman
Cc: Graham Clark
Subject: RE: J2EE Strategy.ppt

This is terrifying. A x-plat strategy is not a winning strategy.

-----Original Message-----
From: Sanjay Parthasarathy
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 4:45 PM
To: Tom Button; Yuval Neeman
Cc: Charles Fitzgerald; Graham Clark
Subject: FW: J2EE Strategy.ppt

Sanjay

http://dotnet your .NET Platform resource

-----Original Message-----
From: Graham Clark
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2001 6:52 AM
To: Charles Fitzgerald; Sanjay Parthasarathy
Subject: FW: J2EE Strategy.ppt

Net. Joe Long wants to work with IBM to define a std interface to system services, specificaly those provided by COM+. He thinks IBM would go for this, and it addresses the issue that moving CLR cross-platform is meaningless unless you have a std way to access services such as transactions from it. With our current approach there will be no way for x-plat CLR to do this, hence it is not real.

ChARLES, this is really your area. Joe came to me to talk about field evangelism.

From: Joe Long
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2001 9:00 AM
To: Graham Clark
Subject: J2EE Strategy.ppt

I updated the slides a little bit, particularly the "current strategy" one...made it more J2EE strategy instead of EJB strategy.

Would you like me to try to rope you into the PaulFle, Yuval, Tom Button discussions on this? I'm worried that they don't have a full appreciation for what you and Sanjay have got going with IBM.

Joe