same time, different place.

85
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 11:41:30 1991
To: bobgu karlst philba
Cc: davidcol markwa
Subject: Re:
Date: Mon Feb 04 11:41:27 1991

we need to get together with them this afternoon. I got
more flame mail from mannyv on the subject. Markwa, can you
set it up. We need to talk face to face, not over email.

|>From bobgu Mon Feb 4 11:19:01 1991
| To: karlst philba
| Cc: bradsi davidcol
| Subject: Re:
| Date: Mon Feb 04 11:15:09 1991
|
|
| Grrrr...... Please ignore DavidN's mail. I don't think he understands that
| they get the sources to the 3.1 stuff. We didn't do this in a vacume.
|
|
| |>From karlst Mon Feb 4 10:47:30 1991
| | To: bobgu philba
| | Cc: bradsi davidcol
| | Subject: Re:
| | Date: Mon Feb 04 10:44:24 1991
| |
| |
| | The decision to change our debug api support was made at the sdk/tool/app
| | minireview. Why wasn't a language guy there, or at least informed
| | immediately afterwards? Antitrust has nothing to do with this. This is
| | bullshit. We need to work with these language guys just like we need to work
| | with the network guys.
| |
| | Technically and product-wise I'm inclined to think we made the right decision,
| | but we can't work in a vacuum with other groups depending on us.
| |
| | |>From philba Mon Feb 4 10:38:08 1991
| | |To: bobgu karlst
| | |Cc: bradsi davidcol
| | |Subject:
| | |Date: Mon Feb 04 11:35:12 1991
| | |
| | |
| | |comments?
| | |
| | |>From davidn Mon Feb 4 09:40:34 1991
| | |To: philba steveb
| | |Cc: fredg gerdi mannyv
| | |Date: Mon Feb 04 09:39:54 PDT 1991

EXH 48 DATE 5/17/02
WITNESS Barrett
MARY W. MILLER

| | |There is a flaw in Windows "level playing field" strategy, and it
| | |surfaced last Friday when we learned that the Windows group was
| | |replacing WinDebug with another debug API. This will cost the
| | |Sequoia group a few wasted man-months of effort, and I imagine the hit
| | |on other companies is as bad if not worse.
| | |
| | |I can understand the "anti-trust" argument of this strategy, but even
| | |so, something fell through the crack for this to happen. The Toolhelper
| | |library specification has been around for two months at least. I don't
| | |know how long the new debug API has been brewing, although at least
| | |parts of it have been around for much longer (the new USER functions
| | |LockInput, DirectedYield, etc.) We just learned of the Toolheper DLL
| | |(and new debug API) last Friday.
| | |
| | |Also, not to underrate the abilities of the developers in the Windows
| | |group, but are they going to write a debugger? How well do they know
| | |the needs of debugger writers? My point is that this API decision was
| | |made without any input from us or the rest of the debugger-developing
| | |community, as far as I can tell. WinDebug had flaws that we complained
| | |about (as I'm sure others did) for some time. Wouldn't it have been
| | |better to work together on a solution? At the very least, as soon as
| | |the decision was made to drop WinDebug, it would have been nice to know
| | |so we could adjust our schedules.
| | |-- dn
| | |
| | |
| |
|

86
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 11:42:19 1991
To: davidcol philba richab
Subject: Re: offline
Date: Mon Feb 04 11:42:18 1991

yes, davest.

87
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 11:44:49 1991
To: davidn fredg gerdi
Subject: Re: What are we doing wrong?
Date: Mon Feb 04 11:44:46 1991

| >From markwa Mon Feb 4 11:29:45 1991
| To: bradsi mannyv
| Cc: bobgu
| Subject: Re: What are we doing wrong?
| Date: Mon Feb 04 11:21:07 1991
|
|

| Manny, I've appended an email below that I sent to ThomasL
| on Saturday. It addresses some of your concerns, and explains
| some of the history.
|
| We plan on having a 3.0-compatible version of ToolHelp ready
| in 3 weeks. You won't have to wait until late March to test
| under 3.0.
|
| If you choose to stay with Windebug, we will guarantee that
| internal assumptions made by WinDebug will be kept up to
| but not past Windows 3.1, or, in those cases where we
| might violate those assumptions, we will adequately
| coordinate such changes according to Languages' agreement.
|
| To prevent the mistake I made of not sending out the ToolHelp
| spec to Languages at the same time I sent it to tool ISVs,
| I'm including all of the Languages program managers on my
| WinWord mail merge list. Note, we did not discuss the new
| debugger interface with tool ISVs prioir to sending out
| the spec. Windows Development discussed the idea of the
| new debugger interface informally prioir to Jan 21, but
| they didn't get serious about the idea until that date.
| On Jan 22, in an SDK mini-review meeting, we decided to
| prepare a proposal for tool ISVs and Languages. On Jan 24
| we sent the proposal out. That was the date we intended
| to solicit feedback from Languages, as well as other ISVs.
| We weren't working with other tool ISVs behind Languages'
| back. That I failed to send you the spec on Jan 24 was
| obviously not intentional.
|
| – Mark
|
| | >From markwa Sat Feb 02 15:06:03 1991
| | To: billbr davewe jeffbe keithv stevefi thomasl
| | Cc: bobgu gregl lisawi
| | Subject: new Windows debugger i/f, TOOLHELP.DLL
| | Date: Sat Feb 02 15:05:55 1991
| |
| |
| | I talked with several of you and your developers Friday about
| | the new Windows debugger interface. This is a follow-up, to
| | make sure I've given you all the information you'll need.
| |
| | The Windows group decided back on Tues, Jan 22 to prepare a
| | proposal for a new debugger interface, to replace Windebug.
| | The motivations for this are:
| | (1) We still have work to do on Windebug, particularly merging
| | two separate versions of Windebug used by, respectively,
| | debuggers and the Languages profiler.
| | (2) Windebug is expensive for us to support.
| | (3) Windebug lacks important features, such as the ability
| | to support multiple debuggers, so you can more easily
| | debug a debugger.
| | (4) The Windebug API is awkward to use.

|| (5) The Windebug API includes excess features that most
|| debugger writers ignore and do themselves, such as
|| breakpoint management.
|| The work required to do a new better debugger interface
|| was considered to be nore more than the work to finish
|| Windebug and support. And, it was our educated guess
|| that debugger writers would find it more desirable to
|| switch over to the new debugger interface than to continue
|| using Windebug.
||
|| On Jan 24, Windows Development prepared a specification for
|| the new debugger interface. The plan was to send it out
|| to tool ISVs and Languages, get feedback, and make a
|| decisions as to whether to go over to the new debugger
|| interface. I sent this spec out to several tool ISVs
|| on that day. It was a crazy day and I forgot to send
|| this spec to all of you. I believe this is the most
|| embarrassing thing I've ever done at MS. You're now
|| on my WinWord mail merge list of tool ISVs, so I won't
|| goof up again.
||
|| So, anyway, you now have the proposed TOOLHELP debugger
|| interface late. I'm putting a copy of it in your
|| interoffice mail box today.
||
|| Although Windows Development is already beginning
|| implementation of the new debugger interface, we will
|| still certainly respond to your feedback and suggestions.
|| Please send the feedback to BobGu, and cc me.
||
|| We recognize that our suddenly changing the debugger interface
|| might be disruptive to your development schedules. We
|| certainly don't want this to be a net loss from your
|| point of view. Feedback from other tool ISVs is that
|| they welcome the change to a new debugger interface.
|| Nevertheless, if changing to the new debugger interface
|| is more trouble to you than it's worth, then we can
|| offer you an alternative.
||
|| If you were planning on the non-blocking 3.1 WINDEBUG.DLL
|| being in retail Windows 3.1, and you don't want to switch
|| over to the new debugger interface, the Windows group will
|| hand back to Languages the Windebug sources, along with
|| any additional work we've done here. Languages can of
|| course then modify the sources at will and ship the
|| resulting DLL with your products. In the special case
|| of the CVW, we would ship CVW 3.05 in the 3.1 SDK along
|| with the Languages-owned version of WINDEBUG.DLL; but
|| we wouldn't include WINDEBUG.DLL in retail 3.1 Windows.
||
|| The new debugger interface resides in TOOLHELP.DLL
|| along with a lot of other good stuff that will be
|| useful for "dump" commands in debuggers, and
|| HeapWalk-like tools. For example, there are APIs

|| to walk the local and global heaps. The spec I'm
|| giving you for TOOLHELP.DLL is a good bit out of
|| date. I'll provide you with a much more up-do-date spec
|| by Friday, Feb 8. Some of the known changes are:
|| — there will be a GP fault handler (registered callback)
|| — we're dropping the atom walking APIs
|| — we're dropping the LTD table access APIs
|| — we'll probably do a FatalExit handler
|| — the TOOLHELP.DLL will support Windows 3.0
||
|| In three weeks (by Feb 22), we expect to have a fully
|| functional TOOLHELP.DLL, including the debugger interface,
|| and including support for Windows 3.0.
||
|| Languages will be able to test using the new TOOLHELP
|| debugger interface while running under Windows 3.0.
||
|| Note, although we plan on making TOOLHELP compatible
|| with Windows 3.0, we currently have no plans to make
|| a final release of it before 3.1 ships. That is, we
|| have no plans for releasing it such that Languages or
|| other tool ISVs would be able to bundle it with a
|| 3.0 tool. If Languages wants to explore this possibility,
|| please be prepared to lobby very hard, because it is
|| very expensive for the Windows group to release a
|| product out of sync with the rest of the Windows project.
||
|| Finally, Languages will certainly be interested in
|| testing its debuggers with TOOLHELP under Windows 3.1.
|| Our first Windows 3.1 beta is scheduled for 3/25. This
|| is the time that Languages can plan on starting tests
|| under Windows 3.1.
||
|| Hope all of the above gives you a sufficiently clear
|| picture of the debugger interface situation. Please
|| accept my sincere apologies for having not sent you
|| the spec on Jan 24.
||
|| Thanks — Mark
||
||
|
|

88
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 11:57:36 1991
To: bobgu davidcol markwa
Cc: philba
Subject: and now from borland...
Date: Mon Feb 04 11:57:32 1991

you're going to love the timing on this. just got this mail:

Date: Mon Feb 04, 1991 12:54 pm EST
From: Rick Schell / MCI ID: 382-4346

TO: * Brad Silverberg / MCI ID: 430-4498
Subject: Windebug

I'm following up on our conversation Friday. We have had significant
problems with the early version of WINDEBUG.DLL and have been told
that no new version will be available until TOOLHELP is completed,
much as I told you. Details are as follows:

   A non-blocking version of WINDEBUG was released to us (and other
   ISV's apparently) based on a late July source base.

   Mark W thought that we had been updated in October, but we were
   told that no updates were released to *anyone* outside Microsoft.
   It isn't clear whether a later version exists inside or not, though
   we were told that Microsoft is aware of the bugs in WINDEBUG and
   has been working with the Codeview group to get them out. So a
   later version may be in use internally to Microsoft.

   After wasting much time trying to use WINDEBUG, Eric S took a shot
   at debugging the WINDEBUG code, and found many serious bugs that
   basically render it brain-dead.

   In following up with MarkW, Eric was told that no new version would
   be produced, that WINDEBUG is obsolete and that it will be replaced
   by TOOLHELP, but that TOOLHELP is still unreleasable.

What we need to get moving again is source code to the latest version
of WINDEBUG that Microsoft has. We could then write an adaptation
layer to emulate the TOOLHELP API and fix some of the bugs ourselves.
It would cost us time and energy, but we could progress. Otherwise,
we will not be able to work on a Windows-hosted debugger until TOOLHELP
is made available.

As far as I know, the source agreement for WINDEBUG should cover us
receiving the latest sources. We just need someone (like Mark) to
follow up for us and get them to us - hopefully with some of the bugs
already fixed, assuming work has been done since last July.

We'd appreciate your assistance.

Thanks.
Rick.

89
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 12:01:13 1991
To: debbiew mannyv
Subject: Re:
Date: Mon Feb 04 12:01:12 1991

I'm free anytime after 2pm.

What do you want to accomplish, Manny? MarkWa should definitely
be there.

Btw, you shouldn't read conspiratorial things into this. Believe me,
Borland had absolutely nothing to do with it. MarkWa's mail described
the situation very well.

90
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 13:45:08 1991
To: nataliey
Subject: Re: Recruiting
Date: Mon Feb 04 13:45:06 1991

sure. see you then.

91
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 13:52:22 1991
To: debbiew mannyv
Subject: Re:
Date: Mon Feb 04 13:52:20 1991

| >From mannyv Mon Feb 4 12:36:43 1991
| To: bradsi debbiew
| Subject: Re:
| Date: Mon Feb 04 12:30:16 1991
|
|
| I (at least), don't suggest anything conspiratorial. I've talked to
| Mark and I understand how this mess came about. The only way that
| Borland enters into this is that we'd thought that our early work
| would be paying off for us in QC/Win. That although Borland is
| releasing Windows tools in Feb, that come June we'd have the
| first fully Windows hosted environment and that this would be
| an advantage. Because of Win 3.1 slipping and because our Windebug
| work turns out to be a mistake, all of this goes away.
|
| The only thing I find disappointing in all this is how little
| attention we got in this whole thing. What I want to accomplish
| is to make sure that you understand how this affects our products
| and to assure that we're not blocked until 3.1 becomes publicly
| available.
|
| I also hope that the whole brouhaha encourages you to seek our
| opinions in a more timely fashion.
|

Why was this topic not considered important enough
until some tool vendor other than Languages got involved?
Why are we not being consulted on these issues and hearing
about them only after our competitors do?

This is not what happened, Manny. That kind of statement _does_
suggest a conspiratorial view. As you know, Mark just screwed up,
plain and simple. Just as we need to stay in closer touch with you,
you guys should have someone who polls Mark on a periodic basis to
see what's going on.

See you at 2.

92
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 13:55:12 1991
To: doswar naveenj
Subject: Re: Space savings for DOS 5
Date: Mon Feb 04 13:55:03 1991

please tell me precisely which files we are now planning to
ship. And which files we previously were planning and are
not now.

in addition, I'd like to hear an "ack" from brianv or jimall
on this plan.

thanks.

93
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 14:03:16 1991
To: carriet
Cc: carriet
Subject: Re: Did you think this would meet your objectives?
Date: Mon Feb 04 14:03:15 1991

let's wait till spring. i don't want to fly anyone to the
mideast right now...

94
From bradsi Mon Feb 04 14:33:21 1991
To: sharonh
Cc: monicar
Subject: Re: FW: Tropical Party!
Date: Mon Feb 04 14:33:19 1991

see what budget we have available for employee morale.