

Subject: RE: OEM thank you ad

Date: Mon Apr 22 12:16:35 1991

Right: The add, the letter and a BILLG signed copy.

> From bradsi Mon Apr 22 12:26:44 1991

To: bradc joachimk

Subject: RE: OEM thank you ad

Date: Mon Apr 22 12:24:17 1991

a billg signed copy is a good idea, we should do for domestic too.
but it's not enough -- it's not publicly visible.

55

From bradc Mon Apr 29 11:15:31 1991

To: bradsi

Subject: dos announce

Date: Sun Apr 28 11:11:46 PDT 1991

one thing we have to talk about is who goes from the dos team...
do you want to send the development team? I'll need the marketing team
for demos and on-site support. think tom and eric would be helpful as
would others, but it starts to get hard to draw the line.

thx.

brad

56

From bens Mon Apr 29 11:15:37 1991

To: davidcol lisacr

Cc: bradsi davidw karlst philba ralphl terrib

Subject: more win31 ideas

Date: Mon Apr 29 11:14:06 1991

These are ideas I got from talking with the win31 team on Friday:

1) Drop support for Win /r

Since we have already decided that Win31 is 286+, the only remaining
need for real-mode Windows is: 1) PSS diagnostics, and 2) old-app
support.

X 574961
CONFIDENTIAL

EXH 54 DATE 5/17/02
WITNESS Barrett
MARY W. MILLER

If we provide PSS with a tool that does whatever Win /r does for them, and we assume that everyone has (or will) upgrade to 3.0 apps, here is what we get:

- a) Reduce ISV testing -- only have to test standard and enhanced mode
- b) Reduce MS testing -- only have to test standard and enhanced mode
- c) Reduce Windows code size and complexity:
 - 1. Do not need to GlobalLock/Unlock non-discardable objects
 - 2. Strip out LIM code
 - 3. Windows prolog/epilog do not need INC/DEC BP
- d) Improve Windows performance -- see (c)

2) Add hung app detection

Similar to OS/2, if the user tries to get control (ctrl+esc, etc.) and a win app is running and does not do a get/peekmessage within N seconds, we give the user the opportunity to terminate the application.

Developers would like this. But, do end users ever have this problem?

3) Make Error Messages Friendlier

- a. Remove error messages where Windows "knows" what to do

I recently found this example: If the Print Manager is disabled, then starting the Print Manager produces an error box that tells the user to open the control panel and enable the Print Manager.

A more useful solution is to tell the user the Print Manager is disabled, and ask if the user wants to enable it. Include a help button so the user can find out the implications of this action. If the user says Yes, then do the work to enable the Print Manager, and open it up.

Another example (I saw this in the most recent PC Magazine in the Windows column): When ProgMan cannot find a *.GRP file that is referred to in PROGMAN.INI, it complains. Instead, ProgMan should either silently delete the entry, or should ask the user what to do: delete, search for, or ignore.

- b. Make Error Message Text Friendly

X 574962
CONFIDENTIAL

OS/2 error messages are inundated with mainframe-ese. We should take extra care to make ours nice -- more toward the Macintosh end of the spectrum.

- bens

57
From bradc Mon Apr 29 11:20:15 1991
To: braddir dosmktg
Cc: bradc
Subject: FW: dos fy92
Date: Sun Apr 28 11:14:01 PDT 1991

food for thought. prelim dos forecast for next fiscal year is \$262 million...

pls do not forward...

>From johncon Thu Apr 25 16:51:58 1991
To: bradc
Subject: dos fy92

Date: Thu Apr 25 15:47:32 PDT 1991

92 revenue numbers for dos rup look like this-
us retail \$32M; 600,000/UNITS
DOMESTIC OEM - PACKAGED \$12.8M; 250,692/UNITS
DOMESTIC OEM - ROYALTIES \$96.5M; 7,287,756/UNITS

INTL OEM - ROYALTIES \$121 M ; 8,574,459/UNITS
brad i don't know if oem #'s are final or not . i sent mail to find out.

intl retail numbers haven't been rolled up from all the subs and won't be for about 10 days.

58
From bobgu Mon Apr 29 11:20:34 1991
To: bradsi
Subject: ISV support issues
Date: Mon Apr 29 11:16:03 1991

X 574963
CONFIDENTIAL

Some thoughts on ISV support issues....

Rule of thumb. You cannot support more technical ISV's with less technical support people. It doesn't work. We know this from the way things currently operate with PSS. They hire people that are not technical enough to be developers. Attempt to train them. Put them on-line attempting to answer questions from ISV's that are vastly more technical. ISV's will not put up with this, especially when they get dumb answers from PSS.

The easy questions aren't the issue here. It's the tough ones. These are the ones that nobody knows but a few people in development. Since there is no direct line of communications between PSS and development, the PSS people try to answer the questions to the best of their ability. The ISV get's dumb or incomplete answers. We need to get the complete and correct answer to these questions out to ISV's.

The doc's don't cover the hard questions. The SDK sample apps are too simplistic and don't demonstrate the hard stuff. The ISV's have nowhere else to turn but PSS (if they can afford it). They then get incomplete or incorrect answers from PSS. ISV's can probably get better support from compuserve than they can get from PSS.

Our User-Ed people are great at what they do, but what they do best is manipulate words and facts into manuals. For the most part they are NOT developers. How can you expect a doc writer that has never written a "real" windows app to explain techniques and methodology of windows app writing to an ISV? The 3.1 manuals will have code fragment examples for each API. Great! But how do you weave those API together to do usefull things? That's where the meat is. That's what we don't tell people today. Bottom line - we need more technical expertise in User-Ed. ISV's want technical accuracy and completeness rather than pretty looking and well edited manuals.

The Inside Windows book is a great idea, but that is just one author's take on things. Besides, how much information can you stick in a normal sized book? What we really need to do is to suck the information out of everyone's brain and stick it into some sort of knowledge base. Since we don't have the vulcan mind-meld, it needs to be trivially easy for a DEVELOPER to contribute data to the knowledge base. Today it is impossible. Did you know that even the PSS engineers can't add anything to the knowledge base unless it is approved by their manager and then gets edited by at least one person for "clarity". ISV's want information from other developers, not the party line. Also, this information must be FREE. Bug reporting from ISV's must be FREE. Getting technical assistance from PSS must

X 574964
CONFIDENTIAL

be dirt cheap. We must be willing to loose \$\$'s big time through PSS.
I bet, though, that if we made ISV support really cheap that we would get
enough new business to cover the difference. Assuming the product was worth
the cost.

There needs to be SENIOR developers/program managers in the Windows group
whose job it is to:

- Act as PSS-Development intermediaries
- Reduct the support overhead from developers
- Feedback product weaknesses to development based on ISV feedback
- Work closely with User-Ed to create usefull manuals
- Create real-world sample apps that do real things.
- Monitor Compuserve and other popular BB's to glean usefull information

These people need to be free from any product responsibilities and be 100%
totally focused on driving User-Ed and PSS to provide quality ISV support.
The reporting structure of these people has to be free and clear of the
groups that have product responsibilities. Take the past SDK groups as
an example of what happens when ISV support people are a sub-group of the
retail product development group.

It's great to hear that you get 5 new heads to do things like this. I hope
they don't get mired down in the political muck of getting a product out
the door.

=====

Now, here's the real kicker - wouldn't it be a good idea to have all of
this in place and available for Win 4 by the time ISV's started using the
product???!!!

=====

That's all for now....

- BobGu

59
From joachimk Mon Apr 29 11:22:51 1991
To: bradc bradsi
Cc: bradc jeffl richardf ronh
Subject: RE: OEM thank you ad

X 574965
CONFIDENTIAL

Date: Mon Apr 29 11:00:12 1991

Don't need me if Bill signs the letter. I do not like Your proposal.

> From bradc Mon Apr 29 11:16:02 1991

To: bradsi joachimk

Cc: bradc jeffl richardf ronh

Subject: RE: OEM thank you ad

Date: Sun Apr 28 11:09:50 PDT 1991

can i throw out an alternative? how about having joachim and bill sign the thank you letter that accompnies the ad. given the current state of

affairs seems to me that having bill sign the ad or a FG product may be taken by some as sort of cocky, kinda of like an autograph.

Brad

> From joachimk Mon Apr 22 12:39:19 1991

To: bradc bradsi

Subject: RE: OEM thank you ad

Date: Mon Apr 22 12:16:35 1991

Right: The add, the letter and a BILLG signed copy.

> From bradsi Mon Apr 22 12:26:44 1991

To: bradc joachimk

Subject: RE: OEM thank you ad

Date: Mon Apr 22 12:24:17 1991

a billg signed copy is a good idea, we should do for domestic too. but it's not enough - it's not publicly visible.

60

From stewk Mon Apr 29 11:29:41 1991

To: bradsi steveb

Subject: some ideas

Date: Sun Apr 28 11:26:36 1991

X 574966
CONFIDENTIAL

1. To Improve Win3.1 Robustness:

- * Buy "Robustness" Tools
Purchase a suite of Win backup/recovery tools from Symantec or some other vendor and bundle with Win3.1.
- * Completely Eliminate the UAE Message.
Replace it with a "Global Protection Fault" message ala OS/2 2.0 so that we appear no worse than OS/2 2.0. Plus make attempts at diagnosing the problem with a help dialog box. We will still be inferior in that we require rebooting. But we will signal to users that we've revamped our error handling, that the scheme is similar to OS/2 2.0's, and that it is in some ways better because of our help dialog.

2. To Discount the Better-Windows-than-Windows Claim:

- * Put in OS/2 2.0 and WLO-detection into Win3.1.
If an app is WLO, then run it. If OS/2 2.0 exists and the app is not a WLO app, then put up an error message indicating that:
 - the app is not certified by MS
 - that it can be run at one's own risk.Hard for IBM to make a Better Windows claim with such a scheme in place.

Once we detect the existence of OS/2 2.0, there may be other special warnings we can emit that highlight legitimate problems with Windows apps running on top of OS/2 2.0. For example, a message, each time one prints, that says the the Windows and OS/2 printer models are different and that output will be different between the two systems.

61
From anthony Mon Apr 29 11:32:01 1991
To: bradsi
Subject: pss weekend in june
Date: Mon Apr 29 11:28:18 pdt 1991

(The one steveb mentioned friday). Try to avoid
6/8-6/9 and 6/15-6/16 since I am out of town those
two weekends.

62
From davidw Mon Apr 29 11:41:46 1991
To: bens davidcol lisacr

X 574967
CONFIDENTIAL

Cc: anthony bradsi karlst philba ralph terrib
Subject: more win31 ideas
Date: Mon Apr 29 11:36:08 1991

| > From bens Mon Apr 29 11:19:58 1991

| These are ideas I got from talking with the win31 team on Friday:

| 2) Add hung app detection

| Similar to OS/2, if the user tries to get control (ctrl+esc, etc.) and
| a win app is running and does not do a get/peekmessage within N seconds,
| we give the user the opportunity to terminate the application.

| Developers would like this. But, do end users ever have this problem?

is it hung or is it printing? without threads there is no way
to force an ISV to quickly troll for messages

(I also realized that due to the app hung 'gun to head' approach
it is really hard to get a PM to hang the system by having a PM
app not do Message stuff.)

david

63
From davewe Mon Apr 29 11:44:23 1991
To: philba
Cc: bradsi fredg
Subject:
Date: Mon Apr 29 11:42:39 1991

Please come see me Phil - or let me know when you're in and I will come by
your office. I will try to summarize a couple of points pertaining to your
mail without flaming:

1. C 6AX was intended to be done quickly with almost no beta test.
This meant NO work could be done on the compiler itself except to
recompile a large model version (no source changes). It is
the fact that the code generator is running large model (in order
to take advantage of the extra memory) that is the major reason

X 574968
CONFIDENTIAL

for the slowdown. Optimizing the memory model is significant work and could not be done in the time frame we had.

For the same reason, looking glass was not the answer. We discussed it and DavidW agreed that it was not ready and probably could not have been ready in time without he or someone equally Windows knowledgeable to do the work. We do not have such a person and no one in Windows was suggested either.

2. The problems you cite were reported and fixed (or, in one case a trivial workaround was given) and we have heard nothing more - if they are still occurring why is it they haven't been reported to us? Note that NONE of our beta sites have raised these problems - in fact several were extremely pleased with the fact that their apps ran measurably faster and were smaller. Why is Windows different?
3. C 6AX was not intended to replace the regular compiler in all cases, but rather to provide a version that removed a limitation for some programs/modules. It is NOT required for the majority of our customers - and often only for a few modules for those that do need it.
4. It is (and always was) our intent to do what we can to address the speed issue in C 7. The 16 bit version will likely NEVER be as fast as the DOS version - it is running in protect mode after all - but we can probably improve it somewhat. The 32 bit hosted version should be significantly faster.
5. Finally (small flame) - I suggest that you clean up your own house before knocking others. If you want better development tools for Windows, then give more thought to what you can do to support them. We have had to beg and plead for reasonable support for debuggers, profilers, and yes, even extended compilers (EMM386 happens to be the only VCPI server around that we have problems running under and we have reported a number of bugs against it!) and we get told we can't get it time and again. I still feel like we would have less than we have today (or at least are getting in 3.1) if Borland and others hadn't come in asking for the same things. I'd like to think we work for the same company and have the same goals but sometimes I wonder.... Hell we can't even get you to fix out and out BUGS in Windows without threatening to go to Ballmer first (FORTRAN loader bug) - and this was a \$8M/year product for us! Maybe that's peanuts to Windows but it's a year's profit for us. (flame off).

X 574969
CONFIDENTIAL

You want better tools - we want to do better tools - but this requires some measure of cooperation and interchange of ideas. I'm actually somewhat encouraged with whats gone on with respect to softmode debugging in QC/Win and I'd love to see that kind of work become more common and more productive. I'd be glad to work with you or anyone in your group on that - but its a two-way street. Do you think we can meet somewhere on it?

Dave

| > From fredg Mon Apr 29 09:50:08 1991
| To: davewe
| Subject: FW: windows development tools
| Date: Mon Apr 29 09:50:49 PDT 1991

| > From philba Sun Apr 28 10:10:58 1991
| To: fredg
| Cc: bradsi
| Subject: windows development tools

| Date: Sun Apr 28 10:06:02 1991

| My guys are complaining about the windows development environment.
| The tools are slow and in many cases, optimization doesn't work
| in the DOS environment. We actually dont use the optimization in
| many cases even though we know it would help. I've had several
| people wanting to move to OS/2 so they can get decent performance and
| use the optimizer. This is really bad -- I demand that my guys
| develop under dos. We looked at the dpmi compiler but its a joke
| because the performance is worse than dos and it appears that the
| optimizer gives up in the same spot as the dos compiler. Given the
| new thrust of beating OS/2, we need to have top notch tools for dos
| level development. I understand the approach for sequoia but we are
| hurting now. Is there anything that can be done -- we are willing to
| work with your guys, willing to do beta testing, etc... I want to
| create a better product than OS/2 and better development tools will
| help a lot. At the very least, a high performance, high capacity
| compiler will help us a lot. What can be done? I'll be glad to meet
| with who ever, when ever...

64

X 574970
CONFIDENTIAL