

From wagged!wa.wagged.com!claire Fri Dec 11 16:33:26 1992
Received: from dosgate.wagged.com by wagged.wagged.COM
id aal4900; Fri, 11 Dec 92 16:04:50 PST
From: CLAIRE@wa.wagged.com
To: RAYB@or.wagged.com, cameronm@microsoft.UUCP,
pcmgatel!bradsi@microsoft.UUCP
Cc: COLLEENL@or.wagged.com, collinsh@microsoft.UUCP, microsoft!jonl,
microsoft!loriyo, microsoft!richt, w-rayb@microsoft.UUCP
Subject: RE: Novell inquiry from Infoworld/Systems Strategy Analysis
Date: Fri, 11 Dec 92 16:04:00 PST
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0
Message-ID: <9212111604.aal4900@wagged.wagged.COM>

ok, I'm worried about this--it will just build more momentum for the
"windows nt is dead" viewpoint and it will confuse customers. Bradsi or
paulma or jonl needs to talk to him.

From: Ray Berardinelli
To: cameronm; bradsi
Cc: Colleen Lacter; Claire Lematta; collinsh; MSloriyo; MSricht; w-rayb
Subject: RE: Novell inquiry from Infoworld/Systems Strategy Analysis
Date: 11 of December, 1992 14:09

Thanks for the input. Brad, I still think it would be best if Stuart could
get such clarification directly from a Microsoft exec. Would you or Richt
could call him early next week at 641-7770 to make sure that Stuart is clear
on Microsoft's systems strategy? Stuart's article will be positioned as a
big year-end "think piece", so we should make sure that Stuart at least has
his facts straight before he presents his opinions in this article. Thanks,
Ray

From: bradsi
To: cameronm
Cc: collinsh; w-rayb
Subject: RE: Novell inquiry from Infoworld/Systems Strategy Analysis
Date: Fri, Dec 11, 1992 11:05AM

yes, for two years, we have said that we'll have a family of windows
operating systems. nothing new.

From: Cameron Myhrvold
To: bradsi
Cc: collinsh; w-rayb
Subject: RE: Novell inquiry from Infoworld/Systems Strategy Analysis
Date: Friday, December 11, 1992 9:40AM

We have told ISVs and industry for years that we will have 2
implementations of Windows: Win32 on NT and Win32 on MS-DOS. This was
a well accepted and well liked strategy. Stuart is saying this
strategy is wrong. I'd remind him of these points. There is no
confusion and no change. We've been on this strategy for at least 2
years. The point is scalability and breadth of product line while
maintaining UI and API consistency.

Cam

From: <RAYB@or.wagged.com>
To: <microsoft!bradsi>; <microsoft!richt>
Cc: <COLLEENL@or.wagged.com>; <CLAIRE@wa.wagged.com>;
<microsoft!cameronm>

MS 5041779
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1181133
CONFIDENTIAL

<microsoft!collinsh>; <microsoft!loriyo>; <microsoft!paulma>;
<microsoft!russ>; <microsoft!sharonh>; <microsoft!tonya>
Subject: FW: Novell inquiry from Infoworld/Systems Strategy Analysis

Here's an update on Infoworld's coverage plans for the ongoing WFW/Netware situation and on Stuart Johnston's analysis of Microsoft's system strategy (see Russ' last bullet below).

Due to a lack of editorial space, next week's issue will carry little or no

mention of Stuart's conversation with Russ on WFW and Netware incompatibilities. Similarly, Stuart's analysis of Microsoft's system strategy has been delayed one week because of lack of editorial space, so Stuart's analysis will appear 12/21.

REDACTED BY AGREEMENT

Comes v. Microsoft

Brad, could you please follow up with Stuart 641-7770 early next week in order to clearly outline Microsoft's strategy and positioning for Windows family members? Clearly we're not in a position to predisclose Chicago, but we need to let Stuart know that Microsoft has a solid, well conceived plan for its future systems products. Thanks, Ray

From: russ
To: rayb
Cc: bradsi; cameronm; CLAIRE; COLLEENL; collinsh; loriyo; paulma; richt; tonya
Subject: RE: Novell inquiry from Infoworld
Date: Tue, Dec 8, 1992 2:28PM

Talked to him today. He is definitely digging his heels in on these issues and looking to make trouble. We can expect some anti-MS, pro-Novell story from him on this.

* Wants to know why they weren't included in beta test. Told him they were invited to come to MS to test and check out the product, but refused. He wouldn't accept this because he said we didn't give them a chance to test with DR-DOS and now it doesn't work with WFW. I told him it was unrealistic

to think we would let them beta test with DR-DOS, that Novell and MS compete

MS 5041780
CONFIDENTIAL

In certain areas and the trick is for the companies to cooperate in some areas and compete in others. I also told him that they haven't sent us a NetWare 4.0 beta yet.

REDACTED BY AGREEMENT

Comes v. Microsoft

* He asked about the contract termination by Novell. Does this mean that customers can count on NetWare support in future versions? He said why wouldn't Novell just develop NetWare 4.0 and have it be incompatible with WFW and put the burden on us for fixing it - just like we did with them on DR-DOS and WFW. I positioned WFW as "Windows" and said it would be suicide

MS-PCA 1181134
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA1181134

for them to come out with a version of NetWare that didn't work with Windows

(bad for us, them and industry).

REDACTED BY AGREEMENT

Comus v. Microsoft

Lastly I said that we wanted to work with them to make sure Windows and NetWare work well together, but if in the

end Novell forced us to we would take it upon ourselves to make it work.

I bet he will quote me here saying something like "it would be suicide for Novell to make NetWare incompatible with Windows" instead of all the times

I said "we want to work with Novell to make NetWare compatible with Windows".

* He harped on the so called "incompatibilities". I told him we went to Novell and looked at their list and found no WFW bugs, only NetWare problems. He said "so you mean there are incompatibilities - does this

mean

that WFW doesn't work with NetWare?" I said, no, WFW works with NetWare, was extensively beta tested, etc. Novell has found a few small problems with utilities, but they are problems with NetWare, not WFW. (true statement). He said "how could they be NetWare problems - doesn't WFW

have

to work with NetWare, not vice versa?" I said that these were problems in the NetWare code that manifest themselves regardless of what the other network in the system is, not WFW specific and reiterated that WFW works fine with NetWare, but didn't really get anywhere with him on this.

* He had some feedback from what he called the "MAPI developers conference"

(I think he meant the WFW ISV conference held here in Redmond last week). He wanted to know when full MAPI is available? He previously was lead to believe around 6/93, now he has heard 13 months from conference. I think this is confusion over when SDK will be done and when full MAPI is rolled into Windows release. Also had head that Lotus said at conference they would support MAPI in VIM? (not sure what this even means). Cameron, I think you should call him back and clarify these things (I am not sure

what

was said at the conference about MAPI release dates, or what Lotus said about VIM).

* He is writing a long analysis piece on MS's "phased strategy of operating

systems" to be run next week (he says on front page). It is on what MS's

OS

strategy has been in recent past and where it is going. It is written in the

vein of what can users expect from MS in the OS area. Asked some questions

on MS-DOS 7 and Chicago: are they rolled together? what is the interface? etc. I declined to answer these. BradSi (or PaulMa?), you need to call

him

back to clarify else I have no idea what he will write, it could be very confusing and wrong.

RussS

MS 5041781
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1181135
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA1181135

From: rayb
To: russs
Cc: COLLEENL; CLAIRE; bradsi; collinsh; loriyo; richt
Subject: Novell inquiry from Infoworld
Date: Friday, December 04, 1992 12:01PM

Infoworld this week talked to David Bradford, a senior legal person at Novell regarding the ongoing dispute over WFW and its incorporation of the Netware requester.

REDACTED BY AGREEMENT
Comes v. Microsoft

This is basically a rehash of what's already been reported, but Johnston seems to want to hone in on the WFW support issues that Novell has raised.

It does *not* sound like IW is planning a major piece on this for Monday's issue. Johnston has requested that someone get back to him today if possible, but said early next week would be OK. Thanks, Ray

MS 5041782
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1181136
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA1181136