

From billg Sun Jun 30 21:31:39 1991
To: jonl.steyeb
Subject: Os/2 issues
Cc: martyta.mikehal.paulma.w.pamed
Date: Sun Jun 30 21:31:31 1991

I think we need to pick someone credible to write about robustness and take the application we did to show robustness failure in OS/2 and publish it. Petzold seems like a good choice to do this - it has to be someone technical. Once he does it we can cite whatever he says. I think this is important. Its also key to point out the lack of queue and memory protection. Its also key to point out that device drivers have total privelege in all cases. Its also key to point out that when an application crashes one of the biggest issue is whether its data on disk is in a strange state or not - this is purely an applications issue - neither os/2 or windows have anything to do with it.

I think we need to get some Windows ISVs to speak out about what they have seen in terms of Os/2 running windows applications. Have they ever seen a version that runs standard mode applications? Have they ever seen a version that runs windows applications seamlessly? Have they ever done any speed analysis of running windows applications on Os/2? I think individual ISVs speaking out on this a few new ones each week will remind people that no one has seen anything reasonable about running windows applications for a product that is supposed to ship in October.

I think we need to get people asking IBM about handwriting on windows and multimedia on windows - whoops I mean Os/2.

I think we should refer to Os/2s windows capabilities as Windows cloning. (nathan raised this in his latest email - I had not seen that before). Basicly we have IBM trying to clone our operating system work not by itself but on top of a very complex system. I would like someone to follow up with the Graysons and get their recent view (someone here has to be friends with these guys). Cloning is good because it reminds people that something is a complex moving target and its a followers maneuvre to have to be cloning.

The more I think back on the history of IBM/microsoft I realize how many things have to be explaing for people to understand how hard we tried to work with these guys - these examples may seem a little strange but I think they are relevant:

- topview support in Os.2
- overstaffing so there is no business case
- cannavino asking us never to do new versions of Os/2
- releasing versions without the right testing

I wonder if we could spend time with Bill Lowe, Ed Iacabucci and 4 or 5 others so this history gets told in a reasonable way.

One thing it is hard to explain and maybe we shouldnt is that when 2 people own intellectual property and bid to sell it to the same market its value drops quickly to 0.

More thoughts on tuesday.



MS 5034942
CONFIDENTIAL