From:	Brad Silverberg
Sent:	Wednesday, October 25, 1995 11:07 AM
To:	Ben Slivka; Chris Jones; David Cole; John Ludwig; Paul Maritz (Xenix)
Cc:	Thomas Reardon
Subject:	RE: No Half Measures: How we should meet the Netscape Challenge

yeah, you could use the IE 2.0 features for background sounds to have your browser go Woof! Woof! Woof! when you view the Dogs page. Think of the possibilities.

From:	John Ludwig[SMTP:johnlu@msg.microsoft.com]
Sent:	Wednesday, October 25, 1995 8:09 AM
To:	· Paul Maritz (Xenix); Brad Silverberg (Xenix); Ben Slivka; Chris Jones, David Cole
Cc:	Thomas Reardon
Subject:	RE: No Half Measures: How we should meet the Netscape Challenge

the content point is interesting. we aren't making any money off of dogs, wine guide, complete basketball, frank lloyd wright, and other illustrious titles. should we pay someone to repurpose them and give them away on the net to our users.

on the other hand, these titles may be no more successful on the net than they were on cd

From:	David Cole
Sent:	Wednesday, October 25, 1995 7:22 AM
To:	Paul Maritz (Xenix); Brad Silverberg (Xenix); John Ludwig; Ben Slivka; Chris Jones
Cc:	Thomas Reardon
Subject:	RE: No Half Measures: How we should meet the Netscape Challenge

I agree with John, but would also add as a compelling client features:

- performance. 28.8 is boring WEB browsing. finding a way to dramatically improve performance vs netscape on same speed lines is super compelling. having oems pre-cache things on the hard disk is one angle to this. we should have some smart people investigate other approaches that minimize bits the get sent over the wire for equivalent content. don't limit our thinking here. can new things like Intels MMX or Compaqs MEU or a DSP be used to achieve even faster levels of decompression for maximum compressed stuff on the wire. (then patent it of course once we figure it out)

Regarding content:

- we should put every MS consumer title we do on the internet and make sure our browser is the best way to view. have clever pricing schemes like pay-per-view instead of subscriptions. things like Cinemania on CD are crap anyway, they should be updated daily.

From:	John Ludwig
Sent:	Wednesday, October 25, 1995 1:04 AM
To:	Paul Maritz (Xenix), Brad Silverberg (Xenix), Ben Slivka; Chris Jones
Cc:	Thomas Reardon; David Cole
Subject:	RE: No Half Measures: How we should meet the Netscape Challenge

there are some fine ideas in here, i will need to read more carefully. let me address two things tho

firstly i don't understand why you don't want to do nashville in 96. the windows box is still an incredible asset for us, it is a huge mistake in my mind to continue to compete browser-to-browser with netscape. the windows box and related business agreements are what will let us bring our oems, isvs, ihvs to bear on the issue. we can redefine the contents of nashville if we wish but it is wrong to ignore this asset. don't view

1

nashville as some external event out of your control that you are slaved to -- we will make nashville the release we need to get internet content out the door.

secondly, none of this addresses the fundamental challenge the client team has -- "what is going to make netscape users convert to iexplore?" docobj, ocxes, vb scripting -- they are all necessary but not sufficient, at best we have a me too solution.

i agree with ericr's point that "content drives browser adoption". we need to articulate the content types that can drive usage and adoption, and then build the features to handle these. let me suggest some things i think are compelling.

- *games. this is a compelling standalone software market, it will be compelling on the net too. games sdk II should focus on the internet. we should work with the games sdk team to make our browser the best games platform on the planet. we should set up low latency games servers with uunet in every major metro area. we should make sure directplay works well with these servers. we should make favorites part of games sdk -- you should be able to pass around your favorite doom location to your friend. we should maintain high scores nationwide and run tournaments. we should consider distributing some popular game engines with our browser. we should become the premiere game shareware distribution site. we should look into simple licensing/metering schemes to help our games isvs get revenue for games distributed online.*
- *family content. we should make the internet safe for the family. deliver on our ratings work. define the tags needed in html and support them. a lot of the work we need to do for CAs and trust hierarchy will apply here as well.*
- *windows apps. followup on bill's point about making every windows app an internet app. buy the citrix stuff or finish the conferencing stuff. integrate the citrix or conferencing client into our frame. set up for fee app servers that let you trial or run any windows app on the planet.*
- *support. the way you get ms support for beta program, final products, msdn, etc, is over the internet (yes we still support voice calls tho). this is the cheapest, highest quality support path for our products. rev the voiceview support agent tools to work over the internet connection. huge work by our pss org required here.*

From:	Ben Slivka
Sent:	Tuesday, October 24, 1995 10:18 PM
To:	Brad Silverberg (Xenix); John Ludwig; Chris Jones; Paul Maritz (Xenix)
Cc:	Thomas Reardon
Subject:	No Half Measures: How we should meet the Netscape Challenge

After the billg Internet review today, here are my thoughts on the priorities for PSD and the rest of Microsoft. Some of this may be controversial, but this is a serious battle for Microsoft, so I think we need to take some quick, decisive steps. For PSD in particular, I think we have to do even more
cloning (esp. LiveScript) of Netscape, and we have to focus on Win95 — not Nashville.

Issues

1.   **How are going to staff our Internet efforts?**
Reassign existing, successful MS employees now. If we're serious about the Internet, we have to take our scarce, talented folks and apply them to the important projects immediately. This applies to projects that have high market share (losing some good folks won't hurt them too much), and low market share (not making any money now anyway). NS has at least 238 employees (I counted up their people page).
→ *It is essential that we move people in a wholesale fashion by 11/15/95 (before Thanksgiving). This is a real test of our ability to adapt as a corporation.*
2.   **Should we really do Nashville in 1996?**
NO. The overhead of doing a Windows release is high, the pressure to do non-Internet work is high, and it faces an adoption hurdle just like Win95. Yes, shell integration is super cool, but we probably wouldn't really ship it until 1997, and even then corporate/school customers would take until 1998 to adopt it. *It just won't help us soon enough to matter!* The choice of a Web browser is a much, much easier choice (especially if it is free!)
→ *We should focus on 2 or 3 Win95-hosted releases of Internet Explorer in 1996.*
3.   **Should we license Java, or get someone (Starwave?) to write a Java OCX?**
NO (for now). If we have OC hosting in Q1 96, then web authors can write/use OCs to get cool behavior that they would have otherwise used Java for.
→ *Only do Java if number of Java sites grows and OCX+LiveScript doesn't gain market share.*
4.   **How are we going to make www.microsoft.com engaging?**
DO IT. We need to get a high-energy, focused individual to own and lead a group to make this site a happening place. Our

2

presense on the Internet now is lethargic.

→ *A strong group program manager with an interest in publishing/events would be ideal.*

5.   What group should build the web site management tool?

Pick ONE. The key here is to get a strong core group of people quickly focused on this effort – combine smart folks from BSD with server experience and smart folks from Office with authoring experience. Get something done quickly, and then iterate quickly to improve. The leader of this group must obviously have very special skills. JonDe?

6.   Are we going to add one-button sign-up for other online services?

No. We should work with CIS and AOL to get them to use our browser/platform, even if that means putting them in the Windows box with MSN.

7.   Do we need a Win16 client story?

No. This is a lot of work, we don't have an OC story, and the Internet Setup Wizard is a tremendous amount of work. NS doesn't have Java support on Win16 now (I don't know if they plan to add).

How Microsoft should respond

1.   Clone their client technology early and often (full embrace strategy)

2.   Add key Microsoft technologies to our client and target our tools at that client (full extend strategy): *Open OC architecture should enable a lot of parallel development efforts by MS groups and ISVs.*

3.   Spend money and people evangelizing IExplore 2.0: *Get Starwave, other influential web sites to use our inline AVIs, background sounds, marquees, VRML; give away hardware/software, pay for solution providers to get interesting content companies up on the web who are not yet there (if there are any); Provide free services (News, Stock Quotes, Search) to IExplore customers*

4.   Spend money and people evangelizing and selling our existing products to corporations: *BackOffice, VB, Office, Exchange, etc. are the solutions to the problems that Netscape is trying to solve.*

PSD: Internet Explorer 3.0 for Q1/96 release

1.   Host OCs: *philco working on this already*

2.   Clone Netscape LiveScript: *2 SDEs; can control OCs with LiveScript, get to market faster than waiting for VB(?)*

3.   Support Netscape Frames: *4-6 weeks development effort*

4.   Signed code, online repository for same, download/install process: *2 SDEs*

5.   Host DocObjects: *Alternative to Netscape plug-ins; solution is better technically, we can get Adobe, Macromedia, etc. to write these*

6.   Collect/Contract/Develop in-house a set of compelling OCs: *Give web authors cool, easy stuff to use; have to wrap all Windows controls as OCs, too.*

7.   Deliver Quartz MPEG, QT, PNG, BMP, WMF progressive OCs: *More compelling content*

8.   Fresh Favorites (NS SmartMarks competitor): *1 SDE; Customers like IExplore ease-of-use, build on that!*

9.   ZIP compression in http for HTML/VRML: *VRML compresses 10:1, HTML at least 2:1; requires coordination with Gibraltar, gives better low-bandwidth performance*

10.   Customizable, movable toolbar: *More end-user features*

11.   VRML 1.1 Viewer: *Add whatever cool features we can get done (I'll have 2 SDEs come 12/1, probably a PM as well)*

12.   Seamless Navigator-to-IExplore upgrade: *4-6 week development effort*

13.   Clone rest of Netscape Navigator 2.0 HTML enhancements: *1 SDE*

[<big>, <small>, <sub>, <sup>, <p> & <div> right/center/left alignment, server push, http file upload]

14.   Work w/Word team to add "RTF" extensions to HTML: *1-2 SDEs; put Netscape on HTML treadmill*

15.   Sweeper services: Async Monikers, History/Favorites, caching

16.   Add 2D, transparency, etc. extensions to HTML: *Get ahead of Netscape for once!*

PSD: Internet Explorer 4.0 for Q3/96 release

1.   Support (Safe)VB scripting of OCs (in HTML)

2.   More OCs

3.   More "RTF" extensions to HTML

4.   OLE Automation of IExplore

5.   HTML OC

Developer Division

1.   Develop and ship VB4 "save as HTML": *I think this is a great way to deliver VB applications over the web – it is the fastest way to leverage our development tools and bring an Internet client scripting tool to market*

2.   Work with RobWell to get SaveVB done: *2 SDEs*

3.   Get VB5 with real HTML Forms[3] editing container to market quickly: *Gives better HTML fidelity*

4.   Improve VC++/MFC/etc. to enable simple creation of run-time-only OCs

Consumer

3

1.   Quill team should focus on HTML editing Forms cubed container
2.   Leverage MediaView team to work on

Office
1.   Lots of "Save as HTML" support
2.   Give requirements for HTML extensions to PSD to improve fidelity of "Save as HTML"
3.   Push Office 96 in corporations as solution for internal "web" publishing

BSD
1.   Execute on current Gibraltar 1.0, 1.1, 2 0 plans
2.   Add smart people to work on improving search services (send content index from individual server to a central search service)
3.   Refocus Cairo/OFS teams on the Web

AT
1.   bfox's group should assist with certificate hierarchy for signed code
2.   Any cool technology that could turn into OCs in 1996 to plug into IExplore?

BlackBird
1.   I'm really concerned that these guys are irrelevant – they need to focus on the authoring problem, and leverage the server and client platforms provided by BSD and PSD.
2.   Need someone other than PatFer as leader

MOS
1.   Improve performance of MSN
2.   Add good News and Stock quote feeds ASAP – that's all I use AOL for (and www.yahoo.com and www.pcquote.com or www.secapl.com)
3.   Move to Sweeper & Gibraltar as quickly as possible while maintaining quality of offerings
4.   Sicely stuff seems like a good thing
5.   Giving away e-mail accounts? Seems to generous, can MSN handle the load anyway?

Why is Netscape where they are today?
1.   Filled a vacuum: *no one else was developing a "high-quality" web browser*
2.   Added useful HTML extensions that enriched presentation of online content: *web publishers had to use NS extensions to make their sites cool to attract visitors*
3.   Did essential marketing with leading web sites: *the "Michael Jordan" effect: established cachet*
4.   Continued to lead with new features on a regular basis: *LiveScript, Java, FrameSets, etc.*
5.   Recognized niche for online application delivery not served by existing solutions: *VB, C, etc. as they exist today not small, fast enough for low-bandwidth links*

Where is Netscape going?
1.   Leverage their Internet cachet into the corporate market: *Get corporations to believe that NS tools enable better information sharing and collaboration than current tools like VB, PowerBuilder, Exchange, Notes, etc.*
2.   Continue to invest in broad reach Internet client/server technology: *There is no money being made on the Internet today, but if traffic continues to grow and eCommerce takes off, setting the standard and selling clients (as well as servers) is big money*
3.   Render Windows itself irrelevant: *Establish new platform*

– bens

4