

From bradsi Fri Nov 1 20:36:47 1991  
To: billg paulma staveb  
Subject: Re: Os/2 compatibility  
Date: Fri Nov 1 20:36:45 1991  
Status: RO

From philba Fri Nov 1 17:19:32 1991  
To: bradsi  
Subject: Re: Os/2 compatibility  
Date: Fri, 01 Nov 91 16:59:55 PST

In general, our most viable approach is to tie our product to enhanced mode. unfortunately, to do it right, we would have to do a bunch of work and I don't believe we would be able to then make march. sorry for the can't do attitude but every time we start tinkering, we slip.

3. Code pages. Since IBM uses the strange approach to code pages in Os/2 doesn't that create some incompatibility with Windows?

there is a cute little demo that we should cook up. use any windows app to write a text file with extended characters — like german or french, read it into an os/2 app — the extended characters should be different. we can also generalize this to the network case and really make some hay with corporate people. good fud. we would have to be careful though since we are also vulnerable due to msdos and the sins of codepages past.

4. Metafile exchange - doesn't this break or show bad results or speed?

since their mf support is not done yet (ok, I haven't seen it), its hard to say but I would be surprised if there wasn't some sort of performance or feature penalty. we should get scottlu to spend some time on this — I bet we can come up with a great demo here.

5. Device drivers. Can't we get there to be lots of device drivers they can't do anything with?

this is hard for printer drivers, given unidriver. its not that hard to port and once available, they use any minidrivers out there. They would have to be criminally stupid not to be doing this. Hmm... Obviously, display drivers are almost impossible to port and 'real' printer driver are a close second. One other issue — lin is looking at what we can patent in the unidriver/minidriver area. once the license runs out, we can enforce any patents (or gouge them up the butt on royalties). I don't know if we have much of a case here.

I read the article in the IBM journal on the mgfx stuff and had lin look it over. Its very clear to us that their approach is going to be incredibly slow — they put a layer in between the engine and windows driver. Lets hope (but not assume) they are counting on it.

I will check on the sonic stuff.

mouse isn't very interesting.

VxDs are another area we should exploit. Having 50 developers stand up and say they have VxDs that are an integral part of their app would be cool. IBM would have "no" response other than 'they can rewrite them for os.2'

We should design some of our extensions explicitly so that IBM can't run them under Os/2. We need to put some real thinking into this. They think they get to clone us forever based on the stupid marketing slogan. We have to humiliate such a claim.

At least we have to have some great 3.1 dependent stuff. Also we need to diverge our user interface from theirs. What does an app do not to run under Os/2?

I don't see how we can change the UI now and ship in March, this is thin ice...