

tabbles  
**PLAINTIFF'S  
EXHIBIT**  
3661  
Comes v. Microsoft

**From:** paulma  
**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 1995 1:01 PM  
**To:** bens; Rick Rashid  
**Cc:** johllu; adamr; danli; Dan Rosen; Thomas Reardon  
**Subject:** RE: Internet (aka Web Windows)

Before we cavalierly decide that we should "punt OLE and OCX's" - we need to decide that we REALLY have to do this. is that harek thinks that he has a subset of OCX's that are small and fast enough for use on Pulsar, but we think we need design something else for the Web case? Adamb also initially decided that he could not use OCX's but decided that they can be made small/simple/fast enough to use in Datadocs which is a scenario at least as demanding as what is being talked about here.

As all of you know, I am a huge fan of getting focussed on the Web, and think it is urgent that we do so, but I will not allow to be an excuse for NIH either. there is an incredible advantage to being able use the same controls that will be used in Access, VB, VC etc. We should not think that Netscape won't be able to define controls either - they will do so, and they be just as light/fast as ours. We have to have some reason for people not to use them.

I am not saying that we HAVE to use OCX's etc either - but I have NOT seen the analysis done, and don't think bens, thomasre have really spent the time talking to Chrisz, Harek, Adamb, etc. Please prove me wrong.

**From:** bens  
**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 1995 12:29 PM  
**To:** paulma; Rick Rashid  
**Cc:** johllu; adamr; danli; Dan Rosen; Thomas Reardon  
**Subject:** RE: Internet (aka Web Windows)

Excellent write up. Here's how I think we proceed.

- 1) thomasre & I are going to spec out the "controls" enhancements over the next few months, but with O'Hare foremost in our minds, it is not going to be something we can give to ISVs until, say, October. We'll also start working on adding VBA to Internet Explorer.
- 2) adamr owns the conferencing/citrix stuff for now
- 3) The BlackBird folks should totally refocus on the Web, punt OLE, forms cubed, and focus on using the standard web protocols (esp. http) and mime types (html, gif, jpeg, etc.). Once they have the framework in place for managing the information on the web site, they can start extending it with new protocols & data types. [You gotta walk before you can run...]
- 4) The NT server team has to get a lot more aggressive about the whole web server management issue - replication, backup, load balancing, "cgi-bin" scripting (with VBA????). Visual Basic Back Office Edition would be a killer way to make it easy to write cool web apps quickly.
- 5) Office has to add "Save as HTML..." to Power Point, and get on a plan to constantly update the richness of their HTML output to match the HTML extensions O'Hare is adding over time
- 6) O'Hare is documenting our existing HTML support, and we have a long list of potential enhancements (some in HTML 3.0, other not yet) that thomasre is going to collate and circulate for feedback (priorities, other idea) to Office, Consumer, MSDN, WinHelp, etc. groups.

Looking at all the groups involved here, it again raises the question of whether we should reorganize some people here to form a single internet group that can focus on this whole space of problems. We'd leave the Office/Consumer folks out of this, but it seems natural to

GOVERNMENT  
EXHIBIT  
1023

MS98 0103392  
CONFIDENTIAL

combine the O'Hare, Black Bird, and NT internet server folks to help improve our focus and provide a single owner for this problem. Comments?

|From: Rick Rashid  
|To: adamr; bens  
|Cc: danli; johnlu; paulma  
|Subject: RE: Internet (aka Web Windows)  
|Date: Friday, April 14, 1995 9:08AM

|Here are my thoughts following our brainstorming meeting last night. I know Ben is planning to summarize his as well so we'll see if there is any similarity :-)

|WinWeb Controls:

| We talked a lot about the notion of adding the ability to invoke Window's controls, OLE embedded objects and OCXs into the browsers and allowing them to be specified as an extension to HTML. Ben was already planning to do some of this. My suggestion would be to push this "very" heavily as a way for ISVs to do enhancements to Web applications. As Ben pointed out, it would be a way to quickly allow our browser to outstrip competitors by adding cool features rapidly. Moreover, we could define new protocols for communicating back and forth between controls and server applications and use that as a means for allowing more interactive Web programming to be developed around Windows using Window's based tools. The key here would be to architect these features well enough for them to provide real enhancement to what can be done with the Web today and to allow rapid extension and the ability to build new, sophisticated applications.

|Web Windows:

| What seems to me to make the most sense here would be to license a server technology like the Citrix solution (assuming we can find something that works well) as a way to allow our browser to seamlessly open a desktop on a Web server. This would be a way to support Web-based telecommuting (e.g., I could follow a url and get to a Windows session back in my company, home, desk, etc.) as well as a way for companies to offer a wide range of Windows NT based services to Web clients. The Citrix (or equivalent) "player" could actually be implemented as one of the WinWeb Controls above and distributed as part of our browser. The PictureTel technology probably isn't right for this because it isn't server based and depends too much on the relationship to the client. We want something here which enhances NT's position as a backend server system and takes advantage of the strength of our ISV community. I don't see anything incompatible about driving the WinWeb controls as a programming model and having his "Web Windows" technology as one of its uses and as a means of increasing its flexibility.

|Web Share:

| The notion of tying the Web into teleconferencing is, I think, another area where the browser could be enhanced to include our conferencing APIs and hooks. URLs could be used to explicitly point to and share applications. We could even have web pages which are "constructed" on the fly to represent sharable desktops with the appropriate shortcuts to applications (or video in a window or audio). This would be a cool way to setup and manage multi-point teleconferencing sessions as well as on-line multi-user training.

MS98 0103393  
CONFIDENTIAL

Web Server strategy:

What seemed most apparent in our meeting was our lack of a coherent Web Server strategy. If we want our applications to survive against competitors they need to become authoring tools for Web publishing and we need a server strategy for replicating, managing, controlling access to, etc. Web documents created by our applications and tools. Thus if I'm doing a "Web Lecture" I should be able to author directly in a next generation PowerPoint which generates the appropriate Web pages properly linked and index with embedded objects, etc. I should be able to produce related spreadsheets which are published as url-linked web pages. I should be able from my desktop to "publish" this lecture on my corporate or private servers, manage them, collect info about their use, restrict access, etc. As Ben pointed out, the Blackbird people are spending a lot of time worrying about the server strategy for document publishing on MSN but we are not applying our brainpower to solving the same problems for the Web. This is a weakness that will hurt us. Properly supported, we could enhance the use of WinWeb controls in server applications, use of MS tools to construct Web documents, etc. and keep our entire desktop environment up to date with potential competitors. Without a good server and network publishing strategy, though, we risk having competitors build applications which do handle the Web well which eventually supplant our own.

-Rick

MS98 0103394  
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA1542383