

Date: Mon Oct 15 08:57:11 1990

we need to meet on this this week. ok?

Ok, but...

What do you want to cover? Is there anything I should do to prepare?

bob

#####

716

From w-carrin Mon Oct 15 12:18:05 1990

To: bradsi

Subject: Getting the word out about DR DOS

Cc: kathrynh russw

Date: Mon Oct 15 12:09:08 1990

Concerns have been raised that DR-DOS incompatibilities and flaws are being overlooked by reviewers. Bringing competitors flaws to the press attention is always tricky, especially as Microsoft becomes larger and is seen as domineering over the PC industry. However, we do want reviewers to know about these problems. Below is the approach that Kathryn and I recommend taking:

Over the next couple months, Kathryn and I are going to be in touch with a lot of editors regarding MS-DOS 5.0. We'll basically be covering all the key editors except for the weeklies and we'll be talking to them about other things.

We recommend that we \*informally\* plant the bug of FUD in their ears. "Have you heard about problems with DR DOS?" "That security feature is a neat idea and, gosh, such a feature would be great, but it's just too easily circumvented." "Gee, it's unfortunate that DR DOS can't be loaded high all the time. MS-DOS 5.0 can." We'll do this very tactfully.

Here's why we think this approach, rather than a more publicly aggressive approach, is best:

- \* Our long-lead tours alone should have raised a lot of FUD about DR DOS, as MS-DOS 5.0 has everything DR DOS has plus a little more, and it is from Microsoft at half the price. We saw this in the PC Computing piece.
- \* There are two real problems, both features of DR DOS that MS-DOS 4.0 doesn't have - load DOS high and security features. The "load high" makes life annoying as it doesn't work all the time.

X 207990  
CONFIDENTIAL

DEPOSITION EXHIBIT  
117  
5/7/92  
SILVERMAN  
d.c.f.

The security features may lead someone to a false sense of security and someone may break into their payroll.

- \* There is a DR-DOS forum on CompuServe that editors can tap into if they want information. If there is a lot of noise from users, it will get to the press.
- \* If Digital Research came to Microsoft for help making DR DOS work with Windows, would Microsoft help them? Maybe not?
- \* The press is looking for instances of "big, bad Microsoft" tromping on little guys who are trying to make the world a better place -- in this case by offering a "better" DOS.

We should absolutely get the word out -- in a personal, noninfamatory way. Thank you for providing the details. It is still possible, no matter how thorough we are, that a random reviewer will not be covered, or that an editor will choose to only present the positive side of DR DOS's story.

Please let us know if you feel comfortable with this approach.

Carrine/Kathryn

#####

717

From davidthi Mon Oct 15 12:20:23 1990

To: DOSDev mohans

Cc: AaronR BradSi

Subject: Re: Re : High Memory Usage

Date: Mon Oct 15 12:19:21 1990

- 1) EMM386 needs command line options to exclude adapter RAM areas. Also, after running autoexec.bat, run a program to look at the PHYSICAL memory located at the UMB locations to see if something is now there - and print a warning if there is.
- 2) Most device drivers need more memory when they start than once they are loaded. Some others need more when they are running. Your optimal order usually is to load the ones that need the most initialization memory first and the ones that keep the same size or grow last. Otherwise you end up with a bunch of UMB space that is used only during device driver or TSR initialization and sits empty after that.
- 3) Have DOS use an API to re/alloc/free this space. Also allow DOS to move its buffers, etc there AFTER autoexec.bat is run - allowing it to take up the remaining UMB space left over from init code.
- 4) Why can't DOS go in a UMB - this should be easier than HMA (no A20) but

X 207991  
CONFIDENTIAL