



There is 1 Reply.

#: 112497 S2/OS/2 & Utils [8]
24-Apr-91 06:33:50
Sb: #112455-OS2 2 Beta Free on BBS!
Fm: Richard Hong 76011,2744
To: DON BRADY 72065,122

By including the include files, will you also include the libs? A lot of us can do without the neat tools (I personally rarely take the time to learn them - I use MSC 6 and never loaded the PWB) but of course we need the libs to link with.

Beta documentation on a "don't even think about calling for help" basis would be helpful.

Don't worry about support; since MS won't support what we've paid for, how can you look bad not supporting your giveaways? If MS accomplished one thing, it was making a generation of developers learn to forego support.

Rich

From alistair Wed Apr 24 11:29:25 1991
To: cameronm jonl
Cc: isvmkt
Subject: Oracle: Could be very political email, OS/2 2.0 & NT
Date: Wed Apr 29 17:34:08 PDT 1992

Date: Wed Apr 24 11:29:16 1991

I need to answer these very reasonable questions from Oracle as a followup to my meeting with 12 of their techy developers last week as part of the Crush thing.

These questions cut to the heart of our involvement in OS/2 2.0 and what will be in boxes containing NT.

I've tried to answer the questions, and elaborate to correctly reflect our thinking about the importance of 2.0 - ie I'm trying to show them that IBM have nothing new, that they will run windows apps, but suggest to them that the product will be late if it contains all that they've promised.

I'm trying to do all this, with care, because there's a real risk that the email may end up in front of IBM faces.

Also, I hope that this may grow to become the model answer we need

X 546931
CONFIDENTIAL

for similar important ISVs.

Please read on...

To: uunet!us.oracle.com!jbaranow
Cc: uunet!us.oracle.com!rbramley

|>From uunet!us.oracle.com!jbaranow Tue Apr 23 18:22:01 1991

|Would you please route the following questions to the appropriate person(s)?

I think I'm appropriate for both, as below:

|1) OS/2 2.0 - what is the expected release date?

Really, part of the 're-alignment' between IBM & MS puts us in a very weak position for answering this question - IBM have committed, in public, last week, to many many questioners that it will be delivered this year. That is really our best information.

| - is the kernel implemented as a 16 bit architecture and only the
| user end of the API's are actually 32 bits?

What was shown last week, was incredibly like the code we delivered to IBM last fall. Before that time, Microsoft had been solely responsible for the coding of OS/2 2.0.

They showed exactly the same Dos functionality - "Better Dos than Dos" is delivered through memory backfill in the 640K -> Mono or CGA card boundary - and only for Char-based apps - 640K is the boundary imposed by the video card memory, and char apps, which need only assume a mono or CGA card - can go all the way up to the start of the mono or cga memory, ie 0xB000 or 0xB800 - the best a dos app can see is 640+32K or 640+64K, but a Dos/VGA app can only see 640K. Since it's Dos emulation, and the File System is in OS/2 - then the Dos overhead is low, as is the case for Dos 5, where Dos is loaded above 640K - thus both Dos 5 & OS/2 2.0 give the app around 620K memory and more with backfill techniques.

Otherwise the dos hardware driver work they showed was delivered by us - we fully virtualised the DMA access in dos sessions.

The windows demo they did fooled the press! It was simply excel 2.1 with the windows run-time running in real mode in a dos box - we'd shown cga/ega/vga graphics apps running in a window many times before. We know in time they'll do a fine job of running windows apps - they've licensed the windows source code from us - and since win 3.1 is able to be OEMed to run on DPMI servers - its just that, the work they'll have

CONFIDENTIAL
X 546932

to do to complete DPMI, and then deliver on the promised Windows/PM integration will be very significant, and it may either cause them to miss their 1991 date, or else deliver this full, promised windows support later. The safe guess is that they'll be able to run win3.1 in standard mode in a sepearte screen group - further work is hard, but doable given time.

Again, knowing what we delivered to IBM, and knowing what is in the current SDKs, we know that OS/2 2.0 has a 16-bit PM, with 32-bit interfaces. Part of the announcement inferred that Micrografx will help IBM port PM to 32-bits - our feeling is that this is very significant work. Again, the safe assumption is that 16-bit with 32-bit interface is what will be in the product if its a 1991 delivery - this could cause a slip, or full 32-bit PM could come later. Also, the kernel has 16-bit device driver interfaces, with some new 32-bit entry points. The virtual memory manager moved from segment swapping to 4K page swapping.

| - will there be a Windows binary compatibility layer in the first
| release? If not, when?

My above paragraph about windows & dpmi explains the state of what IBM has said it will deliver. We feel sure IBM will deliver Windows compatibility in the box, but that it may be sepearte screen group at first, or else the product might slip.

That's why Microsoft is continuing on the "Windows Libraries for OS/2" as they better deliver on the promise of adding the Windows APIs to OS/2, as we will do in later versions of OS/2 on the NT kernel. WLO truly runs Windows apps as PM apps, with all the implied clipboard and DDE interchange capabilities.

|2) NT - what version of OS/2 will the OS/2 API be?

An NT product which delivers the OS/2 API will support the 32-bit OS/2 API - that implies the OS/2 2.0 32-bit API - because OS/2 has been somewhat of a wandering target, we have 'iced' the work we have done on the OS/2 subsystem, to be 'thawed' when we can fully know what that the API will be.

We are concentrating 100% on the Win32 API on NT - That API will be stateless with respect to the NT API, and the semantics of the Win32 API will be the same as the NT API - therefore a developer who wanted to get to the raw NT API (an unusual case, but one which some database vendors might wish) can mix and match Win32 & NT APIs, but cant mix NT & OS/2 APIs.

We'll deliver a Win32 & NT development kit to 'the masses' this year, and to Oracle much earlier. Win32-based platforms will be delivered next year.

Its hard to answer definatively about the OS/2 subsystem. Certainly we're frozen at the moment - certainley it'll be the OS/2 32-bit API which we'd choose, and we believe that people will move from the 16-bit OS/2 API in time, but if OS/2 2.0 doesnt deliver performance, and no-one does the 16->32 bit work, then the OS/2 16-bit API becomes important, and we havent planned to support that at present. The 16-bit os/2 API is also non-portable, so it couldnt fulfull all our goals.

- will NT be priced and marketed so that stand-alone OS/2 2.0 will be discouraged if not dropped altogether? Or must we learn to live with plain DOS, WIN32 on DOS, WIN32 on NT, OS/2 on NT, AND stand-alone OS/2?

Our feeling is that OS/2 Version 3 absolutely supercedes OS/2 Version 2. It will deliver the same or better Dos subsystem, the Win32 subsystem with thunking to run Win16 applications, on MIPS it will use x86 emulation and on 386/486 it will use Virtual 86 techniques to run todays dos & Windows apps - 16-bit Windows apps end up calling windows so often that even on MIPS with x86 emulation, they go fast, since the Windows APIs are supported natively.

Then there's the OS/2 subsystem & the POSIX subsystem.

I've explained the frozen/thaw & the 32/16-bit quandry around the OS/2 subsystem above - and I explained in our meeting that the POSIX subsystem really is a check-list item for us to be able to sell NT-based products into the government, and will likely be an optional extra.

Our feeling now is that we'll deliver NT & Win32 with or without the OS/2 subsystem - that this will be a function of how fast IBM deliver, and how much those OS/2 APIs really matter.

Either way, we feel that OS/2 V3, which is NT+DOS+Win32+OS2-32(+POSIX) will fully displace OS/2 V2.

If the NT+DOS+Win32(+POSIX) product is delivered without the OS/2 subsystem, it will displace OS/2 V2 everywhere except where the OS/2 API is what's important.

You'll have to live with plain DOS for the forseable future, but there's really no room for new innovative work there.

The Win32 API is totally consistant between DOS+Win32 & NT+Win32, so living with Win32 should be simple. You should always write to the Win32 API, but your perfomance database products may get some benefit from using NT APIs when they find them - this could even be a descision taken by the code at run-time.

X 546934
CONFIDENTIAL

We dont intend that NT will ever be seen without the Win32 API, so the question left is, to what extent will the OS/2 API matter?

That's a hard one!

|Obsequiously,

|James A. Baranowski

|Sr. Member Technical Staff

|Desktop Products

|500 Oracle Parkway MD 40P9 Redwood Shores CA 94065

|415/506-2806 Room 914

|"Things only appear harder than they seem."

I'm sure you understand the implications of these answers, and that I've tried to put together honest answers which reflect our thinking.

The public positioning of these facts is a delicate matter.

Alistair.

From jonl Wed Apr 24 23:27:51 1991

To: alistair cameronm

Cc: isvmkt

Subject: Oracle: Could be very political email, OS/2 2.0 & NT

Date: Wed Apr 29 17:34:38 PDT 1992

Date: Wed Apr 24 23:25:54 1991

I think this reply is too rude. We have to be careful about what we say about the IBM plans and demos particularly in writing. I also would advise against specific answers regarding our NT packaging plans -- I'm not sure what we will do.

Also, though we have doubts about IBMs ability to execute they are capable of surprising us. We should be clear that thw work will be tough but not speculate on methodology. For example, IBM may be able to deliver enhanced mode Win.

From carls Thu Apr 25 11:33:18 1991

To: billyg cameronm johnsa jonl mikehal paulma steveb tonya w-cheryl

Subject: RE: Marshall Mosely, Dataquest

Date: Wed Apr 29 17:34:38 PDT 1992

Date: Thu Apr 25 11:30:21 PDT 1991

I got a phone call from Marshall Mosely of Dataquest asking

WinMail 1.21

lynnra

Wed Apr 29 17:17:39 1992

Page: 141

X 546935
CONFIDENTIAL

me to respond to a bunch of questions regarding RISC and the ACE announcement. Waggener Edstrom asked me to respond to them. Since they wanted to attribute to Microsoft, I insisted on knowing who the client was--it is IBM. I thought it might interest you that IBM is doing this survey, and what sort of questions they are asking:

Do you think 3-4 years from now there will a single operating environment that makes applications portable to different CPUs?

What would make you develop for a new CPU?

Assuming that RISC based systems are available at PC price points, but have 3-4 times the performance of PCs, what features would you add to your products to take advantage of the increases in capability?

What would make you write for one CPU vs. another?

What would be the lead time for the development of an application for a new microprocessor?

Is it easy to port to another environment?

Do you understand ACE and think it will succeed?

Are you doing any RISC development?

Would the Patriot Partners Constellation project make you port to RISC?

From camerom Fri Apr 26 15:14:30 1991

To: isvmkt

Subject: IBM OS/2 2.0

Date: Wed Apr 29 17:34:45 PDT 1992

Date: Fri Apr 26 15:14:18 PDT 1991

Ideas and things we need to do:

1.) State of the Nation report - we are really really late in doing another one of these. Its important especially now. We will have to be especially careful to include and track OS/2 2.0 activity in the ISV community. Let's discuss this more at our Monday meeting.

2.) "IBMISV" alias (or "OS2ISV" alias) - Let's start an alias for identifying and tracking OS/2 2.0 ISVs. By establishing an alias and telling other people about it we can get others in the company to be our eyes and ears and track down the backsliders more quickly and

WinMail 1.21

lynnra

Wed Apr 29 17:17:39 1992

Page: 142

X 546936
CONFIDENTIAL