| VLADS | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---------|----|-----|-----|-----|
| WINBETA | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| WINWAR | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 65 | 143 | 142 | 350 |

PLAINTIFF'S Comes v. Microsoft

From mackm Mon Jan 27 12:58:23 1992

To: richt Cc: bradsi

Subject: FYI:FW: OS|2 2.0 Date: Mon Jan 27 12:57:38 PDT 1992

>From aarono Sun Jan 26 22:33:34 1992

To: cougar panther Subject: OS 2 2.0

Date: Sun Jan 26 22:31:26 PDT 1992

Disclaimer: Since this info is from someone at IRM, its accuracy is of course questionable. Take it as such.

I was speaking to one of my spies at IBM the other day. He said (as most of you already know) that OS| |2 2.0 is a dog in 4M and really needs 8M to run properly (sound like any other big OS's you know??). He also said that IBM is targeting sales of 2,000,000 units in the first year. If this happens they will "declare victory" and go home. IBM has already acknowledged that they will make no money off of OS| |2 but are pushing it as part of "Corporate Strategy". (I wonder how stock holders would feel about a Corporate Strategy that involves loosing money?). He also said that it will be shipped as "Cheaper that DOS+WINDOWS" (Perhaps this should be passed on to marketing?).

He also mentioned "Booting a DOS box" off of a floppy drive in order to get network support (He didn't get into too much detail on this but it seems that this method allows for support of other networks and their real mode drivers (I'm skeptical that support would be that much of a

They are also very nervous about NT (surprise, surprise, surprise). He kept talking about it as "that vapor-ware stuff". They may use this line to attack NT when OS \mid 2 2.0 starts shipping.

-AaronO

From w-collin Mon Jan 27 13:06:59 1992 To: bradsi davidcol martyta petermi w-clairl Subject: The message

Cc: w-pamed

Date: Mon Jan 27 13:01:56 1992

I saw, but did not save, some of the earlier mail. Can someone send me the current draft of the text for review?

>From w-clairl Mon Jan 27 11:32:46 1992 To: w-collin Subject: message Cc: martyta w-pamed Date: Mon Jan 27 11:30:56 1992

can you sign up for this?

>From martyta Mon Jan 27 09:32:33 1992 To: davidcol w-clairl Cc: bradsi petermi w delonl Subject: RE: THE message Date: Mon Jan 27 09:25:36 PDT 1992

I would vote for Collins to come up something.

>From davidcol Sat Jan 25 13:44:56 1992

To: martyta w-clairl

bradši petermi w-delonl

Subject: THE message

MS-PCA 2612008

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL Bradsi asked us to come up with better message for when the MS-DOS detection doesn't find MS-DOS. The message should have a spin on it that gives a better impression that Windows and MS-DOS are part of the same OS.

Who is the best person in PR to work on this with me? I'm not the best word-smither in the world and am hoping to get connected with someone who it. -thanks

Here's a list of issues which came up as a result of my application compatibility question posted in CIS. Pretty low response rate so far. Good news is far better than the bad news it bad. Just the bad news in this email.

From: Brian Moura [76702,1337]

- 1. ATM font support in 3.1 PostScript driver. Brian says that ATM fonts aren't recognized and printed with the Win 3.1 postscript driver. But they are with the Micrographx driver.
- => johnen, you heard of this bug before? Ya suppose the fonts are just installed in the wrong win.ini section. Please forward to your guy who knows about ATM.
- 2. Novell bug that forces NEC 386sx to display in ${\tt B\&W}$ vs Color when Novell driver loaded.
- => johnen, you mentioned this was in winbeta. I think it should be moved over to winbug and solved.

From: James Gerber [75006,1171]

- 3. WordPerfect and Freelance need UNIDRV from build 61d to print.
- => johnen's people are trying to repro this problem to see what the deal is. Any status?
- 4. Attachmate Windows 3.22 (SmartPad is smaller than 3.1.061d and earlier and labels don't quite fit on buttons)
- => this bug in the database somewhere? It's a regression from 61d which means there could be a problem here. johnen, can you follow up with terrib on this?
- 5. Crosstalk Windows 1.2 (type font prob when a DOS box is open).
- => this is an issue for many people, karlst, do you know where we are on this? I don't think it's just a Xtalk problem since one guy reported it against Charmap.

From: Jeff Thomson [71460,3222]

- 6. XTALK 1.2 function key and status line fonts are displayed incorrectly if a DOS session is running when XTALK is started.
- 7. When attempting to set the FontName property of a Visual Basic control to certain non-TT fonts (Courier and System in particular) when the Lucida fonts are installed, the font is always forced to Lucida Sans Typewriter + bold + italic.
- => I think this this the bug davidw fixed in build 69.

From: David B. Nanian [70531,2236]

MS-PCA 2612009

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL