

Non-responsive material redacted

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Joachim Kempin
Subject: RE: Compuadd EXPRESS.
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 11:49AM

fabulous.

From: Joachim Kempin
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: Compuadd EXPRESS.
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 11:04AM
Signed:

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Joachim Kempin
Cc: Brad Chase
Subject: RE: Important - DR DOS rumor
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 11:52AM

I do not understand this joachim.

I can easily imagine novell running a big advertisement that says, Now, Microsoft Endorses DR-DOS. They will go to every one our own com's saying how this is proof that their is completely compatible with ms-dos. Even Microsoft now agrees, they will say.

Is this what you want?

From: Joachim Kempin
To: Brad Chase; Susan Boeschen
Cc: Brad Chase; Brad Silverberg; Donna Garrison; John Williams; Serylo Pineda
Subject: RE: Important - DR DOS rumor

B Chase
EXHIBIT NO. 40
10-9-91
J.R. HEAD

MS 5062993
CONFIDENTIAL

DEFENDANT'S
EXHIBIT
5772

MS-PCA 1114698
CONFIDENTIAL

Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 11:14AM

You are completely out of line BRAD. We cannot tie MS-DOS sales to APPS sales and that is what you are suggesting. I take their money for WORKS and continue to turn the DOS situation around which we lost because we slipped product schedules in the first place.

>From: bradc Fri May 29 17:58:08 1992
To: susanb
Cc: bradc bradsi donnaeg joachniak johnwil sergiop
Subject: RE: Important - DR DOS rumor

X-MSMail-Message-ID: 87968F7A
X-MSMail-Conversation-ID: 87968F7A
X-MSMail-MiscRemark: Microsoft Mail -- 3.0.620
From: Brad Chase (bradc@microsoft.com)
Date: Fri, May 29 92 17:54:07 PDT

this is a difficult mail. i am familiar with OEMs effort to convert them to MS-DOS and in fact one of my people has been trying to assist (Sergio may I pls have an update by end of day tuesday?). Moreover, i do not argue your rights as an application group but we do need to look at the larger picture here. Over here in systems we go out and tell the world that DR DOS is not MS-DOS (which it is not) and that one of the key benefits of MS-DOS is compatibility now and in the future. We reinforce that OEMs and ISVs primarily test their applications on MS-DOS and not DR DOS (which is true) and that consequently there is compatibility risk now and in the future if a user goes with DR DOS. This has proven true as DR has already had 5 revs of DR DOS 6 since their sept release.

However, if we put ROM Works on this machine it is equivalent to MS endorsing DR as equivalent to MS-DOS. DR can stand up and tell the world (including other OEMs) that even MS apps group thinks DR DOS is fine. Even if you do no work in house by agreeing you are saying you are comfortable with the quality of Works running on DR DOS. Moreover, MS is helping to sell a machine with an OS that is a aggressive and well funded competitor. Would anyone in this company do a deal with IBM and OS/2? i think not.

I realize that if you don't do the deal then it will go to one of your competitors and I realize there is short term revenue involved but i am not sure at the macro level that this is the best thing for the company. Feedback is welcome, i will get a complete brief from Sergio so I understand all the facts (including the revenue for the Works group) and will make sure we re-double our efforts to get ms-dos on this palmtop so the issue goes away. In the mean time this deal has me very concerned.

thx

From: Susan Boeschen
To: Brad Chase
Cc: Brad Silverberg; Donna Garrison; John Williams; Sergio Pineda
Subject: Important - DR DOS rumor
Date: Fri, May 29, 1992 2:33PM

Comodore is creating a palmtop product for the US and Euro markets targeted for shipment during the Fall timeframe. They have opted to go with DR DOS ROM version due to a contractual commitment with DRI and price issues. There is no option to leverage an MSDOS/Apps deal. The OEM team is still working to convert them.

They have expressed interest in our ROM Works product, and we have been negotiating for a 100K commitment from them. We are not offering a special version of the product. This is our regular ROM Works product and we have been very clear that we will not change the product to address any DR DOS quirks. We've also told them that our product is untested under DR DOS. As with all ROM Works projects, we will do compatibility testing here on campus to insure proper performance.

While we're behind the OEM team in their negotiations to get MS DOS on this machine and will cooperate in any way we can, we're an application group and will offer our product on any platform it runs on. We have Mac products and at Bill's directive went pretty far down the development path in the past with both Deskmate and Atari versions as well. In this case we're not offering any special development work as it doesn't make sense from a business perspective but "yes" it's possible we will cut a ROM Works deal for a DR DOS machine unless the OEM

MS 5062994
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1114699
CONFIDENTIAL

group can get them to convert to MS DOS.

We cannot leverage an MS DOS deal with apps, and the OEM team is going at them hard to convert.

>From susamb Thu May 28 16:17:17 1992
To: donnay johnwil
Subject: ROM Works

Date: Thu May 28 16:16:18 1992

Can you please give me more details on our ROM Works deal.

>From brado Thu May 28 15:30:33 1992
X-MSMail-Message-ID: F2E6E4ED
X-MSMail-Conversation-ID: F2E6E4ED
X-MSMail-WiseRemark: Microsoft Mail -- 3.0.620
From: Brad Chase Cbrado@microsoft.com
To: susamb
Date: Thu, May 28 92 15:26:13 PDT
Subject: Important - DR DOS rumor
Cc: brado bradsl sergiop

Susan could you fill me on on a vicious rumor that we are doing a special version of Works in ROM to support the ROM version of DR DOS for a Commodore machine? Is it true? what is the scoop? one of our test guys heard this from susan

thx.
Brad

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Joachim Kempin
Cc: Brad Chase
Subject: RE: RE: MS-DOS 3.22 support in FFS
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 11:56AM

i want to move oem's to the current version. supporting old versions is a major headache and i believe unnecessary. the only version i am considering is rom 3.22 temporarily.

i would like to say, "If you want the most current technology (ie, flash), you need the new version of the os". in addition, other technologies, like compression, will only be tested for msdos5 and above.

we've gotten the size of rom dos 5 down to 3.22 levels or very close. it should not be an issue

From: Joachim Kempin
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: FW: RE: MS-DOS 3.22 support in FFS
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 11:22AM

>From rayka Sat May 30 10:58:45 1992
To: fernandd sergiop
Cc: osman rayka sandyd sheriv
Subject: RE: MS-DOS 3.22 support in FFS

Date: Sat May 30 10:57:48 PDT 1992

I believe that this is a major problem because companies like Psion, Intel, and my embedded customers have been using FMFS 1.0 with older MS-DOS version such as MS-DOS ROM Version 3.22. We don't how many OEMs have been using FMFS 1.0 and will be using FFS with older versions of MS-DOS because Intel, Curtis, Databooks and Annabooks have sold a number of their Flash development kits with FMFS 1.0.

Because of MS-DOS ROM Version 5.0's size, I don't think that general purpose palmtop people like Psion and HP will be switching from their current MS-DOS Versions with their current systems. HP might not be using FMFS 1.0 with their HP95LX but FFS makes this more attractive for their MS-DOS ROM Version 3.22 HP 95LS. In a number of embedded systems, the OEM will not change the version of MS-DOS that they ROM'd.

MS 5062995
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1114700)
CONFIDENTIAL)

you been riding much?

From: Antonio Salarno (Millennium Micro)
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: RE: RE:
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 3:35PM

OH... THAT shift level... yeah, wearing the edges makes sense.

Don't know the scoop myself. Jobs really tore him up regarding being a manager and doing the technical stuff of late. Article in the Mercury. Let me know if you need the article...

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Joachim Kempin
Cc: Brad Chase; Susan Boesch
Subject: RE: Important - DR DOS rumor
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 2:46PM

this may have nothing to do with endorsement from YOUR point of view but will have everything to do with endorsement from Novell's. You will see, Novell will be telling each of our oem's that Microsoft has now endorsed dr-dos.

From: Joachim Kempin
To: Brad Silverberg
Cc: Brad Chase; Susan Boesch
Subject: RE: Important - DR DOS rumor
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 3:15PM

This has nothing to do with endorsement. I completely agree with Susan, MS-DOS needs to be sold on its own merits. DR-DOS seems to be working fine with WORKS, no reason to decline a deal. I actually think it is great to close it, not only because of the \$ I might get but because of the alibi. I could actually demonstrate that we do not tie things together.

>From: bradsi Tue Jun 2 12:56:40 1992
To: joachink
Cc: brad
Subject: RE: Important - DR DOS rumor

X-MSMail-Message-ID: A1AEE06F
X-MSMail-Conversation-ID: A1AEE06F
X-MSMail-WiseRemark: Microsoft Mail -- 3.0.620
From: Brad Silverberg (bradsi@microsoft.com)
Date: Tue, Jun 02 92 11:52:44 PDT

i do not understand this joachin.

i can easily imagine novell running a big advertisement that says, Now, Microsoft Endorses DR-DOS. They will go to every one our own oem's saying how this is proof that their is completely compatible with ms-dos. Even Microsoft now agrees, they will say.

Is this what you want?

From: Joachim Kempin
To: Brad Chase; Susan Boesch
Cc: Brad Chase; Brad Silverberg; Donna Garrison; John Williams; Sergio Pineda
Subject: RE: Important - DR DOS rumor
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 11:14AM

You are completely out of line BRAD. We cannot tie MS-DOS sales to APPS sales and that is what you are suggesting. I take their money for WORKS and continue to turn the DOS situation around which we lost because we slipped product schedules in the first place.

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Sharon Hornstein
Subject: reoxy
Date: Tuesday, June 02, 1992 2:47PM

MS 5062983
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1114701
CONFIDENTIAL