Lynn E. Williams (Legal)

From: Paul Maritz
To: Darryl Rubin
Subject: RE: The chicago file system??
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 1993 10:30AM

The only continuation needed is to present issues and our conclusions to steveb/billg - we owe him answer at end of month. You/tom/l should figure out what forum we want to do that.

From: Darryl Rubin
To: Paul Maritz
Subject: RE: The chicago file system??
Date: Wednesday, December 08, 1993 9:34AM

I'll expand on your answers to steveb in mail later today.
One question...you mentioned that work on my proposals
comparison is continuing. Actually, the work that is
continuing is to get together with joeb, a mapi guy, and an
apps guy or two to scope out the file dialogs ideas. I wasn't
planning any further elaboration on the other two proposals or
the analysis of them, as I consider them dead. If you think
something else is needed please let me know.

From: Paul Maritz
To: Steve Ballmer
Cc: Bill Gates; Brad Silverberg; Darryl Rubin; Laura Jennings; Mike Maples; Tom Evslin
Subject: RE: The chicago file system??
Date: Wed, Dec 8, 1993 8:48AM

I met last Friday with darrylr, tomev, lauraj, bradsi, etc. to
go over the Chicago store issues. Darrylr had done a matrix of
things we could/should do and the issues associated with them
- there is more work to be done on this, and we will set up
mtg with you when it is done. But because:
 - documents in LMS are not stored "directly", but are
"attachments" ie, each message is a strange kind of folder
(eg. what should you see when point a file open dialogue at an
LMS folder, what tricks can we do for old applications that do   /
"delete, create" things, etc.),
 - LMS was not implemented as a file system and there is
no way we could re-implement LMS as IFS subsystem and
  ship in CY'94,
there are a lot of issues that darrylr has uncovered and that
need work. These issues and the fact that we are running out
of runway for 1994 shipment , mean that we will probably have
to do less rather than more.

However see below for some comments on your questions - darrylr should expand/correct:

From: Steve Ballmer
To: Paul Maritz
Cc: Bill Gates; Mike Maples
Subject: The chicago file system??
Date: Tuesday, December 07, 1993 5:00PM

I read rob Horowtx Novemeber newsletter about nicrosoft today
  I think you all should I will ask debbieh to make sure you
get it (tell me if he is not accurate) it is the best
customer oriented but technical discussion I have read about

Page 190

ole 2 and cairo and why they are valuable After reading it I
have more confused questions about chicago but I think you
guys probably were already focusing on these in the meeting we
had but I raise them anyway

If ole 2 structured storage puts proerties on objects why does
mapi do it again or does it
(ps are mail messages/ new file system files ole 2 objecst si
that the capone design???)
> > LMS/EMS suck up the OLE proerties and make them manifest as
MAPI properties. There needs to be some work done to decide
which properties should be sucked. Why do we have MAPI and OLE
properties - history.

shouldn't the eforms designer basically let you create a
wrapper around any file that makes it an Ole 2 object that you
stick in the mail store and oh by the way if you want to send
it and route it you can do that too
> > In principle yes. This goes back to the issue of
containment raised above. The email "wrapper" on a document
should not be a container as it is today - the routing
information etc should be just OLE properties on the document.
Unfortunately, this is not the case with Capone/Eforms -
darrylr/tomev should comment. Thank history and need to get
something done before OFS again.

how rich shoudl the capone browser be ins hwoing std ole 2
properties   how easy will it be for an end suer to cutomize
for an IS manager
> > Darrylr has proposed the least effort/risk thing to do to
help bridge dichtomy between functionality of Capone/LMS and
Chicago Explorer/FAT is to write a MAPI provider for docfiles
stored in FAT - ie. the provider would suck all the properties
off Docfiles, cache them for fast browsing, and then Capone
could act as your browser for both LMS and FAT. This would
still not solve the issue of having two stores (LMS and FAT).

I knwo maritz is now sayign I told you so he wants to delay
chicago by making it cairo but I do not wnat to delay I know
we need chicago to help us internally rationalize storage   we
need it to help give us an edge in selling server that talk to
it and we need it to be right to compete with notes and we
cannot wait for another windows (not NT) relkease to compete
with notes or do any of the other things
> > We can discuss this more. We should try to make EMS/LMS as
much of an asset as possible given time constraints (having no
solution in CY'94 helps you even less) - but what you are
pointing out is that a comprehensive solution to this requires
(i) an integrated object store on Chicago, and (ii) the notion
of mail messages as wierd containers to go away and be
replaced by real documents (objects) that simply have
properties. The best way to do that is to take the code that
we have running that does all this (OFS) and get it onto
Chicago asap.

I really also think you should think about whether or not to
give lotus and novell chicago betas it is our weapon if sone
right If we do give chicago to lotus I think it should be
only to the smartsuite side somehow I knwo this si all a

little random but it is just more a my cry for help in the
notes business and the server business (w hich are the same
mostly)|

thx