



Lynn E. Williams (Legal)

From: David Weise
To: bradsi; mikemap
Subject: FW: READ: Undocumented Calls
Date: Sun, Feb 14, 1993 4:27PM

care to respond?

thanks!

david

From: Ed Staffin
To: Kraig Brockschmidt; Mark Quindlen; MCS Consultants Communications;
Mike Blaszcak; Todd Laney
Cc: Alistair Banks; Cameron Myhrvold; Technical Forum for Developers of WIN AP
Subject: RE: READ: Undocumented Calls
Date: Sunday, February 14, 1993 4:56PM

Am I missing something here? I thought the flap about using undoc'ed calls was just a bunch of hot air. Everybody in the industry agreed that almost every product, both ms and non-ms, has undoc'ed features. The only concern in the press was whether MS was deliberately not documenting calls to gain an advantage on competitors. If we were not (which I believe is true), then it seems to me that nobody had any complaints.

If we use undoc'ed calls to do something that would otherwise be impossible AND the development community at large is already familiar with the call regardless of it's documentation status, it seems to me we can't get hurt. Mike's example below is a perfect example.

Later ... Ed

From: Mike Blaszcak <mikeblas@microsoft.com>
To: kraigh; markq; mcons; toddla
Cc: alistair; cameronm; wintips
Subject: RE: READ: Undocumented Calls
Date: Saturday, February 13, 1993 4:11PM

Kraig:

I understand Microsoft's sensitivity to this issue, especially in light of things going on with the FTC and all.

However, there are some things you just can't do without using undocumented functions. A very good example is outside of the Windows API: writing a DOS TSR. As far as I know, the call to get the busy flag pointer from DOS is still undocumented, even though every TSR under the sun uses it. Further, calls to get things like The List of Lists from DOS are undocumented by Microsoft.

What if something is documented by a third party, such as Ralph Brown or Andrew Shulman? Can we use those functions, since someone else has documented them?

What if we really need undocumented functionality for something in an application?

.B ekiM

From: Kraig Brockschmidt
To: Mark Quindlen; MCS Consultants Communications; Todd Laney
Cc: Alistair Banks; Cameron Myhrvold; Technical Forum for Developers of WIN AP
Subject: READ: Undocumented Calls
Date: Friday, February 12, 1993 21:16

PLEASE--PLEASE--PLEASE: DO NOT USE UNDOCUMENTED CALLS

Anyone reading this mail avoid using this or any other undocumented function calls UNTIL the function is documented publically. Microsoft has been slammed more than a few times for carelessness like this leaving us here in Systems Marketing to fight fires when the rest of the industry screams. And I mean that the function has to BE public when you ship, not that it has only the INTENTION to be public at some future date.

Everyone on this alias no matter who you are, do not expose or discuss any undocumented calls. Mike Maples has promised that we are not using any undocumented calls in any applications which should include any applet in Windows or the shell. Only systems components like COMMDLG may use such calls.

So please remember to not be careless and mention or use such information: it reflects on the company and can lead to a lot of trouble for a lot of people.

I apologize for my strong response, but I've had to personally deal with all the negative aspects of this sort of thing and want to see any risk of having it happen again eliminated.

= = Kraig

|From: Todd Laney <toddl@microsoft.com>

| there is a undocumented call in GDI called SetObjectOwner(hobj,
| howner) that you can use to mark your global GDI objects as
| being owned by your module, not by the calling task.
| COMMDLG.DLL does exactly this. Why the call that COMMDLG needs
| to call is not documented is left up to andrew.