

will get upset. There is a strong likelihood however that we could get rid of debug exec2bin and link. That is 60 pages and 15% of the user's ref/guide

One thing we can get rid of though is the user's guide which is geared at the user which has never used MS DOS before That's 62 pages and about 15% more of the manual right there.

Finally as far as GW BASIC is concerned we need to incorporate a quick reference or whether we like it or not we will get zillions of calls for the manual.

Susan Johnson

From: mlrowl
To: mlrowl
Cc: sriram; tomie
Subject: DOS 4.0 Retail Upgrade Tree
Date: Thursday, September 22, 1988 12:17PM

Sriram and I created a project for the DOS 4.0 retail upgrade. We put it on \\TROJAN\DOS2. The project is called 40RETAIL.

-Mike

Susan Johnson

From: blig
To: pascalr; russw; tomie
Cc: philba
Subject: Dr dos
Date: Thursday, September 22, 1988 12:41PM

You never sent me a response on the question of what things an app would do that would make it run with MSDOS and not run with DR-DOS. Is there any version check or api that they fail to have? Is their feature they have that might get in our way? I am not looking for something they cant get around. I am looking for something that their current binary fails on.

This is a fairly urgent question for me and I have received nothing.

Susan Johnson

From: tomie
To: pascalr; russw
Cc: philba; tomie
Subject: Dr dos
Date: Thursday, September 22, 1988 1:28PM



X 565988 CONFIDENTIAL

EXH 1 DATE 5/17/02
WITNESS Barrett
MARY W. MILLER

MS98 0185971 CONFIDENTIAL

I am assuming your handling this one based on the info you got from AaronR pascal. Please correct me if I am wrong?

Tom

P.S. I am referring to Bill's question

Susan Johnson

From: roberta
To: anthony; davidma; vich
Cc: msSteen; raype
Subject: NP faults in device drivers
Date: Thursday, September 22, 1988 1:35PM

After discussing this with Ross Cook, I decided to do some research. On page 8-91 of the IBM OS/2 Technical Reference, Vol 1, (VerifyAccess) I see the following paragraph:

Once the process has been verified as having the needed access to a specific address location, the device driver *can't* need to request access verification each time it yields the CPU during task-time processing of this process's request. If the process makes a new request, then the device driver must request access verification.

If I were reading this, I would not assume that I had to do any kind of locking of the segment. The next paragraph says

Note also that, prior to requesting the Lock on user process-supplied addresses, the device driver must verify the user process's access to the memory with the VerifyAccess Dev-lp call. The device driver must not yield the CPU between the VerifyAccess and the Lock, "otherwise the user process could shrink the segment before it has been locked" (emphasis mine). Once the user access has been verified, the device driver may convert the virtual address to a physical address and lock the memory. The access verification is valid for the duration of the lock.

So the documentation implies that the only reason you'd want to lock a segment would be to prevent a shrink (and presumably a free). There is no mention anywhere in the VerifyAccess man page that says anything about having to protect the segment from swapping or discarding.

I suggest someone check our documentation on this.

It may be wrong, but it's documented, albeit badly. A question: can we detect if a device driver was built with 1.0 tools, or something similar? We may be able to do something to let 1.0 DOs run unhindered. I asked why this was never seen before, and Ross told me that the EE guys tend to run machines with lots of memory, so they've just never had this happen before.

Based on the above, I'm leaning towards either taking out the message or putting it under vstrict control. Comments?

-rpr