

Erik Stevenson

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Jim Allchin; bobmu; bradsi; davidcol
Subject: RE: The chicago big bang
Date: Friday, October 22, 1993 7:25PM

From: Jim Allchin
To: bobmu; bradsi; davidcol
Subject: RE: The chicago big bang
Date: Friday, October 22, 1993 7:04PM

These are all very good points.

The only point I disagree with is the "religion" comment. This isn't religion. I think that the Chicago only way is much higher risk as I said in my mail before.

= > I agree that "Chicago Only" is not the right thing either. We want people to hit all our targets with a single arrow.

I agree with the volume comment and that is clearly why 32bit hasn't made it. Actually just having 32 bits on Chicago won't make 32 bits happen either unless there is an advantage. The thing that WILL happen is OLE. And unless we change something it will be in 16 bits on win3.1. I believe Chicago APIs are no where near as important to an ISV as OLE (16 bit!) This may be the problem in getting agreement. I'm not sure.

= > I fully agree. No problem getting agreement (from me at least <g>).

= > ISV's have "broken the code". They will listen to us in systems talk all day about what we want them to do, but they will see what ms apps does, and follow. ms apps didn't do nt apps for release with nt; others followed their lead. ms apps are now on a major ole push, so i'll bet other isv's are now on a crash effort to get ole2 support in and neutralize any advantage ms apps might have. if we do only one thing at the pdc, it should be to announce that ms apps are planning to have chicago apps ready to ship near chicago release. that one act will cause a stampede out of the auditorium so these guys can call the office and get people going asap on chicago.

And since we want people to go to 32bits we need to make the message easy. The easy message is win32 and ole2. I think this supports our mission. I hope you don't think anyone is suggesting we shouldn't talk about the Chicago APIs. Of course we're going to do that. It seems the disagreement is on how we focus the conference: Chicago specific apis or on the win32 and ole 2 set of interfaces which we can maximize across win32s, Chicago, and NT. Of course, some ISVs absolutely will target Chicago specific apis. But, there is a reasonable number that will want to just do win32s level functionality with ole (32bits). That will give them the biggest market. It just so happens that this will run on NT also.

= > Hmm, not sure why many isv's will target win32s with ole. i can see ole2 (16), but why would they want to make their app bigger and slower on 3.1? what's the advantage to them?

I believe DRG concurs with the above logic. Anyway, I think we have a valid fundamental disagree. I think that we need Paul to return to work out how we will resolve this. Do you have any other ideas?

Page 1544

MS7087847
CONFIDENTIAL

EXH 50 DATE 2/14/02
WITNESS Silverberg
MARY W. MILLER

=> I'm not sure we're really that far apart...

jim

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Bob Muglia; David Cole; Jim Allchin
Subject: RE: The Chicago big bang
Date: Friday, October 22, 1993 6:11PM

Message-Id: <9310230112.AA15496@itgmsm>
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

Unfortunately, ISV's don't care about our API strategy. They don't write to our operating systems because they like our api's, or because they like Microsoft, or because they want to believe in NT. A winning strategy to the api war must address what isv's care about.

What they do care about is one thing: volume. It's really that simple. They will target the volume platform. Today that volume platform is Win 3.1, and that's what they are writing to. We have spent the last two years evangelizing Win32. DRG has done a good job. But where are the Win32 apps? They won't appear until there is a volume platform that runs them well. No amount of evangelizing, hoping and praying will do; only volume counts.

What about Win32s? Why aren't isv's targeting win32s? After all, you could say that gives them the biggest leverage and runs on all the platforms. The reason is again very clear, as succinctly put by Chris Peters, "How does it help me compete with WordPerfect?" ISV's have scarce resources and they are in very competitive markets. [How many besides Microsoft made money last year?] ISV's can choose to invest in extra features, or they can use those same resources to make their app bigger and slower on the only platform that they care about right now, Win 3.1. They don't care that going to Win32s also lets them run on NT; they only care about Win 3.1 and beating their competitor.

A perfect data point which proves my point is Microsoft apps. Why didn't they make sure they had NT apps out right away? Why are they continuing to target win 3.1?

At the same time, I fully understand and work every day to promote our api strategy. It's the right thing for "us" (msft systems). So the trick is to ship a high volume product that contains the api's we want isv's to target.

Further, we need to build bridges to our other platforms. There are three things the bridges provide: (1) By building a bridge back to win 3.1, we allow the isv to target Chicago but still cover win 3.1. The isv's are reluctant to just target Chicago and leave win 3.1 behind. [Again, msft apps a perfect example.]. This is what the win32s bridge should do. (2) By building a bridge to Win NT, we thus make it very easy for an ISV to target Chicago and still (with only a minor amount of effort) run his app on the platform we want to supplant Chicago over time, NT. (3) By building a bridge to Cairo, we ensure that all Chicago apps are also great Cairo apps, and that Chicago desktops are great clients to Cairo servers.

There are only two ways we get isv's to target NT: either NT is high volume; or they can build a successful product for another platform and in the process, their app runs on NT.

ISV's move slowly to new platforms. If Win 3.1 is king today, why should they target something else? So that we can make our API strategy succeed, we need some other product to replace it in high volume and carry the api's

we want to promote. The product with the best chance of that is Chicago. [I hope a year from now we are saying The King is dead, Long live the King.] Therefore, the best thing we can do to win our api war is to do everything possible to make Chicago succeed. Once we have them on Chicago, we've got them on NT and Cairo, too (and if we do Win32s right, win 3.1 also).

This is how to win the api war.

Some other interesting data I just received from the MS Languages group. They surveyed about 200 isv's, about 50 each of top isv's, smaller isv's, corporate isv's, and solution providers. 83% said they are not yet interested in Win32 development.

We have the chance to use our silver bullet. We can either use it on religion which the ISV's don't care about, or we can get them excited about products, and thus win the war.

From: Jim Allchin
To: bobmu; bradsi; davidcol
Subject: RE: The chicago big bang
Date: Thursday, October 21, 1993 8:45AM

I think we are looking at this all wrong. I will cover the high points here, but perhaps we should talk after brad's back in town, etc.

In short, I think we should sell win32 and ole 2. And I think the PDC should be restructured where we focus on these and we use the platform story: win32s, Chicago, NT, Cairo to support the story. It shouldn't be focused on the platforms - other than to push the consistency message. Here's why.

1. ISVs are overloaded now. They do not have 32bit apps and they do not have OLE apps. Conclusion: above all else they are going to do ole 2 (16). It will take all our might to get them to get to 32bits and ole2 (32 bits).

If we tell them to write to Chicago, then our message becomes quite dilluted. We will not have a good plan for win32s nor NT for Chicago enabled apps. I don't see this getting fixed. This move will splinter the huge momentum that we will have if we just focus on win32 and ole.

Our story of win32 and ole support is so compelling. We will have it on all the platforms: win31 (with win32s), Chicago, NT, and Cairo. That makes the decision very easy for an ISV!

If we don't unify then there is a chance that they will focus on ole 2 (16) above all else for a quite a while time frame. That means a delay to Chicago apps. I have talked to many people. Now that Winword is shipping and Office soon, it is clear that everyone is going to after them. We must get unified or we will lose.

2. There is another issue that really bothers me. One way to win in the market is to give our apps group an advantage. That advantage could be Chicago enabled apps. We should get all ISVs to write to win32 and OLE 2(32) for all the platforms (including win3.1) and tell our apps group to enable for Chicago. I'm not saying that we shouldn't talk about features or anything, I'm just saying that we use this opportunity to our advantage.

On the topic of the PDC, I think the current agenda plan is wrong. We will have the two products competing instead of complementing. It could be very bad for the ISVs and certainly would be bad internally. We would be setting the teams up to try and outdo each other. This would be very bad.

Chicago is going to win provided it delivers on the promise of NT (32 bits, multitasking, 4MB size and June next year). It seems that we should just hammer the win32 and ole message and leverage the family story. I worry about looking confused to the press and the ISVs if we try and deviate from this message. I worry about OS/2 getting movement if our story isn't rock solid.

We could look so coordinated if we could just focus on the win32, OLE story. We discussed a joint presentation between david and bob yesterday in a meeting we had the PDC topic. It would be a combined platform presentation. I think it is a great idea. It would really drum home that no developer should think about anything other than Microsoft platforms.

I also think we need a section for server applications also. I want to hammer NLMs and push people to write NT server applications.

jim