
From: Scott Harrison
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2003 6:04 PM
To: Michael Halcoussis
Cc: Theresa Venhuis
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

Correct, the SPAD issue I brought up is whole unrelated to the API change, except for the aspect the same resources are involved in the work. In general, the risk related to the API change is with Reboot Avoidance.

To add to my list of items for tracking / closing would be closing on a plan for OPK and EDP related deliverables.

eg I know we need to tweak 3 long filenames to use short file names in the package to make dell happy with the OPK deliverables. Re EDP there are some work around / "feature adss" in the form of supporting the setting of additional registry keys that have been provided to customers that we could consider rolling up into a refresh of the package that is currently on the web site... (eg adding support for the QFE which controls Radio Tuner network traffic would be something in this category for example)

From: Michael Halcoussis
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2003 5:51 PM
To: Scott Harrison
Cc: Theresa Venhuis
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

What I believe Linda is really getting at is "given the change to get rid of the API" are we at risk in any of the other areas she describes below. For instance your response about spad, seems to be independent to the API change, she wants to know if SPAD work had to change to implement the API change which in turn increases risk, etc

Michaelh

----- Original Message -----

From: Scott Harrison
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2003 8:30 PM
To: Michael Halcoussis; Theresa Venhuis
Subject: FW: Crescent setup...

To discuss Linda's questions with you:

1) Re Task Bar player and reboots: We should not need to do additional work for the task bar player upgrades, assuming all of the work the setup and player team did to handle this case for RTM is good. We of course need to validate this with testing. This will be covered as a part of the scheduled test pass. We could be proactive and do some initial smoke testing to see if there is anything obvious, but I think the bug fix that we need from the Windows team in the MSOBCI dll would make this difficult. I will look into this further to see a) if we can do any investigation here with the reboot bug and b) understand even if we wanted to do this when could we schedule this testing given all of the other current deliverables we are trying to get finished before we schedule the corona 9.1 testing.

2) Re SPAD: There is only one issue that I am aware of in the SPAD world. We don't re-register for the Shell CD burning link once someone else has taken it over. However to date, no one has implemented code to take over the shell link. The risk is at some point in the future a 3rd party could register for the shell task and when set wmp as the "default" player via SPAD we don't re-register for the shell task feature. Really this is not a violation of the agreement but it means we are not being as aggressive about re-asserting as the default handler as we could be and there are potential usability issues where a user sets something they don't want and there is not an easy way

1/7/2005

Plaintiff's Exhibit

8624

Comes V. Microsoft

MS-CC-RN 00000380289
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

to set it back to the Windows default. At the present time there are no real world scenarios for this but the interface is documented for 3rd party registration and could become a real world scenario in the future. We should probably consider fixing this bug; I will follow up with Linda directly to get her feedback to be able to close on this issue. My recommendation is we fix this bug.

3) Re setup logic: It's a different setup engine doing the work but other than making MSOBCI smarter about when a reboot is really required I don't think the change between using our code and their code is a significant difference in "file copy logic". In terms of "the file copy logic" used nothing has changed in terms of the spec. We expect older files to be updated with newer files. I think Linda is probably referring to other logic, like say file association code, which is completely unaffected by this change. The risk of the engine change related to logic should be localized to issues related to reboot avoidance.

4). the primary PM/spec related issue would be to:

- 1) Close on if we want to fix the registration for the Shell CD burning task bug or not
- 2) Clearly spec out the expected changes for the msoobci.dll fix. (to make sure we get an implementation that just plugs-into our existing code) to help avoid significant and possibly any future changes on our part as a result of getting the updated version of msoobci.dll
- 3) Get the Windows team to agree to a delivery schedule for the fixes to msoobci.dll
- 4) Spec out general behavioral changes related to the change in the supported platforms for 9.1

Re #1 should to be bought off by Linda

Re #2 currently without the fix from MSOBCI.DLL we have a significant regression in our reboot scenarios. Specifically there is a flag we can set to make msoobci.dll try to replace files that are in use, when set it will try to rename the file and if successful queue up the temp file name for removal, when not set it will just queue up the file for replacement on reboot. In both of these cases, if the file is in use regardless if its locked for exclusive access they return a reboot is required. The bug is when you use the flag it always returns reboot needed when it can successfully rename and replace the file, and effectively delay the clean up of the temp file name to a future time. What we need for them to do is return Reboot_Required when a file is locked and can not be cleaned up on a future reboot, and something like Reboot_Recommended if they are able to rename the file and copy the new one as the target file name.

RE#3 This per discussion with the Windows team last week is likely out to October. I might be able to pressure them to bring this in but was told they are currently booked for the next two months doing LH PDC and WS03 SP1 work.

Re #4 this is fairly minimal but there are some minor tweaks that need to be made to restrict the packages from installing on platforms that are no longer supported for 9.1. This just needs a spec and explicit review by the right managers to make sure we are all expecting the same thing.

From: Linda Averett
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2003 1:09 PM
To: Scott Harrison; Chadd Knowlton; Michael Halcoussis
Cc: Mark Hanson (DMD); Rick Prologo
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

Specifically – is there any new dev work to deal with player issues that caused a lot of trouble for the v9 setup. Things like taskbar player (when the older version already had one running), first run and its many incarnations, SPAD registration and maintenance of the current state of SPAD, etc?

You seem to be saying the only change is to the part that actually copies the files – ie, no change to the setup logic.

1/7/2005

It would seem that at minimum there would be extra pm work to determine the logic for upgrading XPv8 to 9.1 vs XPv9 to 9.1 and to evaluate the points I raise above. Likewise, the dev work to address any issues raised in this investigation.

----- Original Message -----

From: Scott Harrison
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2003 12:56 PM
To: Linda Averett; Chadd Knowlton; Michael Halcoussis
Cc: Mark Hanson (DMD); Rick Prologo
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

The change is to use msoobci.dll the published out of band installer with an INF to copy files rather than our own INF parser which uses setupapi and some crypto and wfp api to deal with WFP. The change was to define a new INF parser in the setup manager which will call out to msoobci.dll to parse and run the infs vs calling our own custom inf parser to parse and run the inf.

- 1) The change will remove our usage of the undocumented WFP api. There is not really a lot of other advantage technically speaking. (if we supported an upgrade scenario say Win2k to XP we would get better support for the upgrade scenario and not regressing newer files on the down-level system to older files shipped in the os, but given that 9.1 is XP only we wont really have a supported upgrade path to take advantage of this) It's mostly a political hot potato "to do the right thing" by using recommended api rather than undocumented and not recommended API.
- 2) We used the "current release" of msoobci.dll but we are asking for a bug fix to improve reboot avoidance. We don't maintain msoobci code, it's owned by the Windows base team. (setup) other than possible LH/WS03 schedule conflicts they will support our usage of this code.
- 3) We need to schedule dev/test analysis to quantify if there is additional work related to upgrading 9.0 to 9.1 in the area of reboot avoidance.
- 4) The bulk of the work to implement msoobci.dll is done at this point; there is about a day of clean up to replicate the change from the MPSETUP91 to the MPSETUPXP91 package. (given that 9.1 is xp only we only need to ship the MPSETUPXP package) Other than digging into any reboot issues the outstanding work is negligible from a dev perspective. Either way it's a full test pass from a setup perspective. Doing any work on 9.1 detracts from other scheduled work such as WS03SP1 or LH given the setup team has to contend with all of the projects.

From: Linda Averett
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2003 12:24 PM
To: Chadd Knowlton; Michael Halcoussis
Cc: Scott Harrison; Mark Hanson (DMD); Rick Prologo
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

I would like a more complete description of the term "setup work". There are all sorts of things that some of our execs think are included when we say "setup work". Some of the items are out of scope for this release

I would like to know the following before answering:

1. What does the "ms out of band" package enable from a setup point of view?
2. Did we modify the "ms out of band" engine or did we use the standard one?
3. Summary of new dev work required independent of reboot? Dev work required for reboot issues? For taskbar player issues (there were tons of these in Corona) Dev, test, and pm estimates? Schedule?
4. Impact on Longhorn

We really need to know the scope before we can determine the correct approach.

Thanks, Linda

----- Original Message -----

From: Chadd Knowlton
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2003 11:56 AM
To: Michael Halcoussis; Linda Averett

1/7/2005

Cc: Scott Harrison; Mark Hanson (DMD); Rick Prologo
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

Hmmm... Perhaps we have to

Has any testing been done on this yet? Do we have firm commitment from the setup team that they'll make the requisite changes to help avoid reboots? Setup has been a surprisingly difficult and problematic area for us in the past so any major re-work like this is not welcomed by the risk averse.

From: Michael Halcoussis
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2003 11:15 AM
To: Linda Averett; Chadd Knowlton
Cc: Scott Harrison; Mark Hanson (DMD); Rick Prologo
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

My conclusion is that we need to do the setup work based on the legal risk. Does anyone disagree?

Michaelh

----- Original Message -----

From: Scott Harrison
Sent: Friday, August 08, 2003 5:54 PM
To: Michael Halcoussis; Mark Hanson (DMD); Rick Prologo
Cc: Linda Averett; Chadd Knowlton
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

I did have a discussion with GeneB this week who is taking over compliance related matters from cmeyers. He did mention there were risks associated with using undocumented API's in future releases from those that have previously been granted exception under security clause of the settlement agreement. The recommendation is to not use undocumented api's or to document the apis. We can't document this particular API, the WFP api, since it's a back door to WFP and that means anyone could effectively bypass WFP. (say with a virus or a Trojan app)

The basis of the setup work does eliminate our reliance on undocumented WFP API calls. It is a change to incorporate what we did in some of the "NEW" corona packages to use the MS Out Of Band install engine (msoobci.dll in WMP and WMFDist setup packages.) We have already shipped some of the corona packages using this technology (a redist package used inside of the encoder install and a couple of QFE's) but did not change WMP or WMFDist distribution packages because we made a very conscious decision not to change those packages during the corona project.

Currently both the new and old setup packages are in the tree. So there is nothing to "un-do or back out" based on what has been done should we choose to go either way. But also realize this work is already done for the most part. There is some clean up work to complete the transition but what is checked in has undergone fairly extensive setup testing on the XP platform. Also we have been using msoobci for some time and again we did ship some of the corona packages and several QFE's using the msoobci technology.

At this point the test pass from a setup perspective is going to be a full test pass regardless of the decision. We don't save anything up front either way we go. The obvious difference is triaging any issues that we uncover with the testing. The only issues that are anticipated are ones related to reboot avoidance. The package setup and overall setup management is not changing much, the key change is what engine is being used as the file copy mechanism, setup_wm.exe vs msoobci.dll

There is 1 bug fix that we need from the windows team to improve the reboot avoidance in their engine and we are engaged with them on getting the changes implemented. I don't have a bought off schedule from them yet on when they will deliver the improvement for reboot avoidance. They are currently scheduled out a couple of months but anticipated that Octoberish was likely not going to be a problem.

Let me know if there are any additional questions or information that would be relevant to making a decision.

1/7/2005

MS-CC-RN 00000380292
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Scott-

From: Michael Halcoussis
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2003 1:54 PM
To: Scott Harrison; Mark Hanson (DMD); Rick Prologo
Cc: Linda Averett; Chadd Knowlton
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

Scott as we discussed you are looking into the legal reasons why we still might do this work.

From: Scott Harrison
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2003 9:46 AM
To: Mark Hanson (DMD); Rick Prologo
Cc: Michael Halcoussis; Linda Averett; Chadd Knowlton
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

I was told this needed to happen by mikebeck based on a commitment he made to jimall. Don't misunderstand my message, I would be happy not to do this but recommend getting buy off from mikebeck to close the decision. We should discuss if you need some background.

From: Mark Hanson (DMD)
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2003 9:44 AM
To: Scott Harrison; Rick Prologo
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

doing this work was not bought off on by linda, chadd, dennisfl, and the other pums (except michaelh he was not in attendance).

---- Original Message ----

From: Scott Harrison
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2003 9:42 AM
To: Rick Prologo
Cc: Mark Hanson (DMD)
Subject: RE: Crescent setup...

Rick we need to discuss. This has been approved/mandated by mikebeck/brianv/jimall.

From: Rick Prologo
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2003 9:41 AM
To: Scott Harrison
Cc: Mark Hanson (DMD)
Subject: Crescent setup...

The setup change for Crescent (9.1) was not a bought off feature by the PUMs. Therefore, this code should not be going into the Crescent tree and the 9.0 setup package should be used. It is trusted and stable. There are several bugs in PS that are against the new setup, please resolve as Won't Fix.

Thanks,
Rick

1/7/2005

MS-CC-RN 00000380293
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL