Erik Stevenson

From: davidcol
To: bradsi
Cc: jonro
Subject: FW: PDC / Systems strategy
Date: Thursday, October 21 1993 9:51AM

I need to let you guys battle with jonl, I think if I get directly involved
his view of me will hamper the effort.

One thing that jonl is missing is that we must make some choices:

- we can't do 2 releases of Win32s within a few months of each others. We
either do one in April which has just OLE, or we do one sync'd with Chicago.

- if we decide to do an OLE only release in April, then that forces us to
enable a Win16 hedge for ISVs.

From: Jonathan Lazarus
To: bradsi
Cc: davidcol; paulma
Subject: RE: PDC / Systems strategy
Date: Thursday, October 21, 1993 12:35AM

I spoke with Doug. We aren't far apart. You and I agreed to focus the
PDC around Chicago as a target. He is just correctly trying to insure
that we get the fullest possible support for OLE2 whose implementation
is for many ISVs orthogonal to Chicago. Some ISVs will target Chicago
others will target OLE/Win32S and expect to run well on Chicago. The
big bang is a valid strategy but we can't let it blind us.

> From: Brad Silverberg
> To: Jonathan Lazarus
> Cc: David Cole; Paul Maritz
> Subject: FW: PDC / Systems strategy
> Date: Tuesday, October 19, 1993 2:02PM
>
>
> When we met last week, Jon, I thought we agreed on the Chicago-bang
> approach, which follows our systems strategy; rather than the win32s,
> api-strategy approach. Can you please get Doug in synch? He's on a
> different plan.
>
> We agreed that ISV's don't buy api strategies. Rather, they target high
> volume platforms. Therefore we need to get them to make commitments to
> Chicago. Use Chicago as the lure for them to "unwittingly" follow the api
> path we want. Since NT is not going to be high volume for the next few
> years, trying to get them to target nt will be a fruitless effort. If, on
> the other hand, we get them to target chicago, and also build the
necessary
> bridges back to win 3.1 (including better win32s story for when chicago
> comes out), then we win all around.
>
> ---
>
> From: davidcol
> To: bradsi; jonro
> Cc: davidcol; dennisad; johnlu
> Subject: PDC / Systems strategy
> Date: Tuesday, October 19, 1993 1:31PM

Dennisad, Johnlu, bobmu, doughe and I all met today to hash out some issues
with the PDC. We had the expected squables about Cairo being at the beginning or in the middle, was winpad in the main session or in a breakout
etc. None of it really mattered because we are in disgreement about what the goal of the PDC is.

Doug's goal is to send a strong message to the ISVs to build Win32/OLE apps
(Win32s apps actually). We are updating Win32s in April with OLE 2 to enable this, and we are doing NT 1.0a to help as well. We give them this message in Dec 93, and we expect that from May 94 - July 94 (assuming Chicago doesn't slip too much) ISVs should be releasing Win32s - OLE enabled
apps. That message is augmented with additional features they can take advantage of on Chicago if they are targetting a Q3 or Q4 release of their app.

This is of course not the big bang path the Chicago team wants to be on. We
want all the ISVs to target Chicago with a Chicago optimized release of their apps within a small delta of Chicago shipping. ISVs want a Win 3.1 hedge, we are exploring that. It's safe to say that getting an updated version of Win32s to sync with Chicago means cancelling the current planned
release of Win32s. I also will be a little extreme and say that any ISV who
is targetting a May 94 release of their app, should delay and optimize for Chicago instead. I personally don't think we can get the ISV big bang on the current path of pushing for Win32s/OLE release in the months just proceeding Chicago shipment. We want ISVs focused on Chicago. This will help us generate revenue and get ISVs to 32-bits and OLE.

A hybred path is to do what doughe recommends for the PDC, but lobby our own
apps group to help us with the big bang.

This basic issue needs to be resolved before we can settle on the right PDC
agenda and presentations. There is clearly a choice here to make. Doughe and I can't decide on our own, we are firmly planted on opposite sides. If
I read bobmu right, he likes current POR since it helps NT. I will be very
disappointed if we once again blow a major opportunity to leverage our strength of having a high volume os.

This issue needs to get resolved at the bradsi/jonl/paulma level since it requires some changes in release strategies if we want/can do the Win 3.1 hedge. Paul is out of town, so doug will try to get bradsi and jonl together.