To: dosdin
Subject: Thai
Date: Thu Mar 21 19:15:47 1991

food's here

561
From billg Thu Mar 21 20:00:47 1991
To: aaronr steveb
Subject: Re: Win 3.1 compatible WinWord 1.1A
Cc: bradsi martyta
Date: Thu Mar 21 20:00:46 1991

I think you should be careful with this amateur lawyering.

Who made a statement that any wall exists between applications and systems? No one from Microsoft ever did. Our competitors have trotted that out as a straw man just to shoot it down. It seems you have fallen for that. There isnt a wall and we never said there was.

On the contrary we try and work with Microsoft applications and other peoples applications groups as closely as we can. Our windows group tests major windows applications and tries to figure out what causes problems. We will have 3.1 in a long beta test and other applications vendors will have plenty of opportunity to test their applications and work with us to see if problems are in windows or in the application. As many as we can we will fix in windows 3.1 because it is a major problem for anyone to have to update applications. The willingness of our applications groups to be early guinea pigs for flaky systems software is a drain on them - just like Ray Ozzies willingness to take the source code of windows and report bugs was a drain on him (his code is sold by our biggest competitor). I wish more ISVs wanted early flaky code and would trace the bugs down carefully. Its not a competitive advantage in ay way shape or form.

Its a shame that Microsoft has not been the first to ship windows applications in any major cetgory - unlike we were on the macintosh. It turns out when we did ship we shipped good products but it is that the has helped us rather than being first. Our applications has had resources drained off to do things like windows write. Has the systems group ever done anything like windows write for the applications group?

The product that Microsoft was the first vendor to ship a spreadsheetr on other than macintosh was the OS/2 presentation manager. Duty for the applications group that cost over a year of their time - not something we would have done otherwise.

Our applications group has been totally open about their windows strategy - our openness in explaining what we are doing is a burden imposed by also having a systems group. Every speech I have given

for the last 8 years talked about our commitment to do à family of windows applications first.

From aaronr Thu Mar 21 18:06:04 1991
To: billg steveb
Cc: bradsi
Subject: Re: Win 3.1 compatible WinWord 1.1A
Date: Thu Mar 21 17:59:20 1991

Well sproket gaged on this the first time, so lets try again.

>From aaronr Thu Mar 21 17:38:40 1991
To: billg billn steveb
Cc: bradsi davidcol philba
Subject: Re: Win 3.1 compatible WinWord 1.1A
Date: Thu Mar 21 17:33:24 1991

Name of someone on the opbu mail alias
V
>From xxxxx Thu Mar 21 16:39:54 1991
To: opbu <-- Mail alias composed 100% of people in the APPS division as confirmed by doing a PHONE on them all.
Cc: xxxxxx xxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxx xxxxxx
Subject: Win 3.1 compatible WinWord 1.1A
Date: Thu Mar 21 16:35:47 1991

As some of you may have heard, a bug in SDM causes WinWord 1.X to rip every time it paints certain controls (like on the ribbon or ruler) when running under debug Win 3.1 . I've patched a copy of 1.1A to remove the bug and placed it on:

\\xxxxx\xxxxx\winword\winword.exe

I've played around with it and it works just fine (Naturally, no warranty is expressed or implied :-)). Those of you who are working with or on Win 3.1 may want to snag this if you want to run winword.

Win 3.1 guys, you may want to spread this around your group.

xxxx, I don't know if you want to do something with what's on toolsvr. We may want to put a Win31 dir under the 11A release point with the patched version.

****

Pretending that I am a legal type person doing discovery type stuff I am rather inclined to say:

Microsoft applications division was in possesion of pre release copies of Windows 3.10 well in advance of any non-Microsoft Windows ISVs

thus giving the Microsoft Applications Division a substantial competitive advantage over any non-Microsoft Windows ISV.

Any statement that a "wall" of some kind exists between the Microsoft applications and systems divisions is obviously completely false.

562
From nathanm Thu Mar 21 20:01:08 1991
To: bradsi
Subject: Win 3.1 shell
Date: Thu Mar 21 20:59:26 PDT 1991

How do I get it?

Nathan

563
From carriet Thu Mar 21 20:37:19 1991
To: bradsi
Subject: hi --
Date: Thu Mar 21 20:34:22 1991

I am out tomorrow and monday, but return Tuesday. If you're
still here tonight we can talk, or I can call you Tuesday.
Just let me know. CT 63008

564
From tomle Thu Mar 21 20:47:26 1991
To: bradsi sharonh
Subject: Dos Program Management headcount Docs
Date: Thu Mar 21 20:44:41 1991

I built the case and left the document in your mailbox. I left the extra GA we discussed in the beta group.

Tom

565
From bradc Thu Mar 21 21:39:48 1991
To: bradsi steveb tonya
Subject: FW: Bye bye to DOS $
Date: Wed Mar 20 01:37:15 PDT 1991

I am researching to get more details.

FYI

>From richmac Tue Mar 19 17:17:53 1991
To: rgms
Cc: bradc
Subject: Bye bye to DOS $

Date: Tue Mar 19 17:15:05 1991

Note the reference to IBM's actions at BofA and potentially
Ford on DOS RUP.

>From mikemap Tue Mar 19 09:25:33 1991
To: jeffbo tonyry
Cc: billbrew bobmc davidv dwood edjohn genek richmac
Subject: Re: Ford update
Date: Tue Mar 19 09:24:05 1991

Spoke to Don Storteboom and Bill Lassila this morning. They were very happy with the progress on the demo. They were also pleased with the briefing. There biggest concern was the convergence of LanMan and Lan Server. They would really like that to happen. They said that the briefing was causing them to do a much broader think about their direction
that they planned.

I asked about the concern they voiced to Jeff. Don said that when they visited us they did not see an IBM host. They dont think we understand large mainframe processing. We will have to work on this over the long term. He did not make a big deal out of it however.

Another interesting fact. Yesterday I was at Bank of America. We have a

plan to sell them the DOS Rup. IBM has come in and offered to give DOS 5

away to the bank. I would expect them to do the same at Ford.

|>From jeffbo Mon Mar 18 14:02:27 1991
|To: tonyry
|Subject: Ford update
|Cc: billbrew bobmc davidv dwood edjohn genek mikemap richmac
|Date: Mon Mar 18 16:58:44 1991
|
|I have just finished a meeting with Don Storteboom and Bill Lassila.
|Basically we talked about theissues for the upcoming presentation of
|our solution for Ford.
|It will last about a week. The users at the APO will be asked to try out

|the proposed solution to see how it works. There will be no formal
presentation
|per se, they want us to give them the systems and a paper with our
recommendation
|on it.
|As far as Win 3.0 goes, Ty Carlson is going to be here Thursday to talk

to them
|and he says that most of the issues (if not all) on contention between Lan
|Server and Windows 3 are fixed. That is good for them, but not for Lan Man.
|I could use some positioning help here. It seems that if we cannot deliver
|the feature set they want, they will go with Lan Server. On the other hand,
|if convergence and feature similarity is there soon, we can propose a Lan
|Man platform.
|Word Perfect has promised them beta by the week of 4-1, althought hey promised
|the same code on 3-1. At the very least, we will get a fair shot at unseating
|them, and if they come in with a 2Mb program, they may be dead.
|We are proposing CommServer 1.1 for SNA, but their product will not be ALPHA
|until after the presentation. Don said that if this is our recommndation, we
|do not have to show this piece at this time, but can at the 6-1 showing.

|Paulwo is working on fnding a suitable ASYNC product. It would be very nice
|if there was one we had a purchasing agreement with like we do with DCA, then
|Ford could have the 'one stop shopping' they desire. David, any suggestions here
|would be welcome.
|This was a good meeting, with Don saying we are doing an excellent job and
|to just keep doing what we have been doing. I will propose the idea that

|David came up with about having a white board session with them to get
|a start i=on creating a total network architecture. This will show that we
|are willing to learn what we don't know about their business. Great idea

|David! The apps portion will be pretty well covered by local staff,
|and we will incorporate the apps Genek has written here also.
|I will keep all informed as to the disposition of dinner Tuesday night
|with Peterson, Lassila and Ballmer, and I expect to have a phone conversation
|with DavidV and genek Wed.
|\001Any ideas wold be greatly appreciated.
|

Non-Responsive Material
Redacted

Non-Responsive Material
Redacted