From:	Ben Slivka
Sent:	Friday, April 18, 1997 5:24 PM
To:	Hyer Bercaw; Sara Williams (DRG); Brad Lovering; Yuval Neeman; Charles Fitzgerald
Cc:	Paul Gross; Tod Nielsen; Farhana Ahmad; Tom Button; Drew Fletcher; Jeff Robbins; Chris Shaffer; Bob Muglia (Exchange); John Ludwig
Subject:	RE: aimtech wants to redist jvc

OK, sounds like we're all in agreement. Sara's 0..4 points, plus AFC support. The tricky part will be language that says they must support our stuff exclusively in preference to Sun's - I think as long as we have language that their product should not give "preference" to Sun over MS (level playing field), I'm happy, because I expect our technology to be better than Sun's.
Comments?
--bens

——Original Message——
From:	Hyer Bercaw
Sent:	Friday, April 18, 1997 10:16 AM
To:	Sara Williams (DRG); Brad Lovering; Yuval Neeman; Ben Slivka; Charles Fitzgerald
Cc:	Paul Gross; Tod Nielsen; Farhana Ahmad; Tom Button; Drew Fletcher; Jeff Robbins; Chris Shaffer
Subject:	RE: aimtech wants to redist jvc

We excluded JVC from the redistributables in the SDK so that competitors could not just use our compiler without providing something in return. A special agreement with individual ISVs regarding the SDK would probably be a good option.

Hyer Bercaw
Visual J++ Product Manager
www.microsoft.com/visualJ

——Original Message——
From:	Sara Williams (DRG)
Sent:	Friday, April 18, 1997 9:55 AM
To:	Brad Lovering; Yuval Neeman; Hyer Bercaw; Ben Slivka; Charles Fitzgerald
Cc:	Paul Gross; Tod Nielsen; Farhana Ahmad; Tom Button; Drew Fletcher; Jeff Robbins; Chris Shaffer
Subject:	RE: aimtech wants to redist jvc

yes - I think we should do the whole sdk, but right now we explicitly exclude jvc.

- Sara

——Original Message——
From:	Brad Lovering
Sent:	Friday, April 18, 1997 9:55 AM
To:	Sara Williams (DRG); Yuval Neeman; Hyer Bercaw; Ben Slivka; Charles Fitzgerald
Cc:	Paul Gross; Tod Nielsen; Farhana Ahmad; Tom Button; Drew Fletcher; Jeff Robbins; Chris Shaffer
Subject:	RE: aimtech wants to redist jvc

Why don't we just have them redist our entire SDK? I think this achieves both our goals.. and avoid us the cost of supporting strange component mixes.

——Original Message——
From:	Sara Williams (DRG)
Sent:	Friday, April 18, 1997 9:31 AM
To:	Yuval Neeman; Hyer Bercaw; Ben Slivka; Charles Fitzgerald

1

definitely agree that we should extract full platform support in return for redist rights

requirements:

0. redist our VM and IE4
1. use RNI and COM and not JNI for any native code calling
2. use our debug and jit api
3. support SQL Server, IIS
4. no support for sun interfaces where a MS one exists (need to find better legalese, of course)

what else?

- Sara

----Original Message----
From: Yuval Neeman
Sent: Friday, April 18, 1997 9:14 AM
To: Hyer Bercaw; Ben Silva; Charles Fitzgerald
Cc: Paul Gross; Tod Nielsen; Sara Williams (DRG); Farhana Ahmad; Tom Button; Drew Fletcher; Brad Lovering;
          Jeff Robbins; Chris Sheffer
Subject: RE: amtech wants to redist jvc

JVC will have syntax to support calling into native entry points and com.
You have to realize there is cost in doing this, and it can also slow us down on future innovation.
I will look into the cost issue.
Once we license it to one isv many will want to follow.
If we do this we shpuld extract full platform support.

Yuval.

----Original Message----
From: Hyer Bercaw
Sent: Friday, April 18, 1997 8:57 AM
To: Ben Silva; Charles Fitzgerald; Yuval Neeman
Cc: Paul Gross; Tod Nielsen; Sara Williams (DRG); Farhana Ahmad; Tom Button
Subject: RE: amtech wants to redist jvc

Please realize that the JVC compiler is code agnostic (i.e. it doesn't care if you use JNI, RNI, or COM). The compiler does not force them to be tied to our platforms in any way.

We should only license JVC to solid supporters of our system strategy. We have not licensed JVC in the past because the companies that requested it didn't support our systems strategy. An example is NetDynamics who wanted everything to run on Netscape and who did not want to support native SQL server, but who did support Oracle and Sybase. They were pretty rude as well.

We are willing to evaluate licensing JVC to supporters of MS systems strategy. However, we need to make sure that the lock to our platform is in the contract because the lock isn't in JVC.

Hyer Bercaw
Visual J++ Product Manager
www.microsoft.com/visualJ

----Original Message----
From: Ben Silvka
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 1997 10:48 PM
To: Charles Fitzgerald; Hyer Bercaw; Yuval Neeman
Cc: Paul Gross; Tod Nielsen; Sara Williams (DRG)

2

Subject: RE: airntech wants to redist jvc
Importance: High

As pgross emphasized repeatedly today during his talk at the AICG meeting, the #1 goal of the tools division is to further the aims of the platform team.
We should absolutely license JVC to all comers!
Anyone who disagrees should please explain why.
Thanks, bens

——Original Message——
From: Charles Fitzgerald
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 1997 8:55 PM
To: Ben Slivka
Subject: FW: airntech wants to redist jvc

I think this is a battle to fight with yuval, but makes sense.

——Original Message——
From: Sara Williams (DRG)
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 1997 12:21 PM
To: Hyer Bercaw
Cc: Charles Fitzgerald; Jing de Jong-Chen
Subject: airntech wants to redist jvc

I know that answer of record has been no, but I think that we should reconsider.

There is a whole class of java tools that don't compete w/ vj who need to redist a java compiler. If they can't use ours, they'll redist sun's.

Having these ISVs redist our jvc gives us great leverage. First, we can require them to redist our VM as well. Secondly, we control the code they generate - get them to use native code, we generate JNI, and then all the apps built with that tool are tied to our VM.

Our compiler is FAR faster. Aimtech told me that if the Sun compiler takes 24 seconds to compile a piece of code, our jvc will do it in 2-3 seconds. They are ready and willing to talk publically about this, so this could be a big win.

How do we make this happen?

Thanks,
Sara