

From: Mike Homer <mikeh@netscape.com> [mikeh@netscape.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 21, 1995 5:02 PM
To: Dan Rosen
Cc: <jimb@neon.netscape.com>; <pmarca@neon.netscape.com>
Subject: Requests for Final RNAPH.DLL

Dan -

Here are the email messages I mentioned requesting RNAPH.DLL as well as information regarding one other technical question we have that would allow us to finish our Win95 Dial-Up product. As you can see, we have made several requests of the appropriate people (priority tech support and Chris Jones) and have made no progress for the last couple of weeks at getting answers. Please do anything you can to help. We are ready to ship our Win 95 product that coexists well with your browser through use of the internal stack and dialer of Win 95 and this is all that is holding us up.

Thanks,
Mike H.

Return-Path: julieh@netscape.com
Date: Sat, 16 Sep 1995 18:41:57 -0700
X-Sender: julieh@pop.mcom.com
To: mikeh
From: Julie Herendeen <julieh@netscape.com>
Subject: Microsoft Not Responding!
Cc: troy, daver, paquin

Mike,

I'm not getting anywhere with Microsoft on the the development issues for the 32-bit version of PE. Troy and I have had numerous exchanges with Microsoft Premium support people and Chris Jones but no luck. This is going to really impact our product schedule and features if we do not get information this coming week.

We need to escalate this issue. I think the only way we will get any attention from them is to have either you or Jim B. talk to them (Dan Rosen, Chris Jones) and underscore the importance of us getting this information. Everything we need for the PE 32 product is included in the Microsoft Plus product so it is not as if they do not have the information.

Here is what we need:

1. Final version of RNAPH.DLL. Currently we have release candidate 1. We have been asking for this since early July.
2. GenInstall routines. We need these so we can prompt the user to install dial-up networking and Microsoft Exchange with the Win 95 CD if the user does not already have them installed. We have been asking for this since early August. If we do not get this we will have to tell the user to manually configure MS Exchange and Dial-Up networking before installing our product. This would really compromise the user-friendliness of our product.

Let me know how you think I should move forward with Microsoft. Below is just a small sampling of our email exchange with MS on these issues.

Julie

>Date: Thu, 14 Sep 1995 14:33:10
>To: normanho@microsoft.com
>From: Julie Herendeen <julieh@netscape.com>
>Subject: RE: SRX950907000832
>Cc: chrisjo@microsoft.com, troy

MS98 0153540
CONFIDENTIAL

>
>Norman,
>
>I understand from Troy that Leon is looking for a contact for Troy.
However, Leon said he will be out of the office tomorrow so he may not be
able to find someone to help us out until early next week. So once again we
are being told to wait.
>
>We need a contact to help us out on these issues today or tomorrow, not
next Monday. We have already lost weeks in our development cycle because we
are waiting for information from Microsoft on these install issues.
>
>Can you emphasize to Leon the importance of getting a contact for us quickly?
>
>Julie
>
>
>>Date: Thu, 14 Sep 1995 10:53:26
>>To: Norman Hodne <normanho@microsoft.com>
>>From: Julie Herendeen <julieh@netscape.com>
>>Subject: RE: SRX950907000832
>>Cc: chrisjo@microsoft.com, troy
>>
>>Norm,
>>
>>Thanks for getting back to us. We understand that some of these issues
take more than 4 hours to track down. However, we have been working with
Microsoft to get an answer on the GenInstall issues for over a month. We
are no further along now than we were four weeks ago. Microsoft's Plus
product handles these same install issues just fine so I don't understand
why it is so difficult to communicate these issues to us.
>>
>>I want to make sure that Troy has a single technical contact who is
accessible and very knowledgeable about installation issues. To date, Troy
has been bounced around from one contact to another. First Bill, then Dan,
then Leon. We need to have a single contact assigned who can work
continuously with Netscape.
>>
>>Thanks,
>>
>>Julie
>>
>>
>>At 07:29 AM 9/14/95 -0700, Norman Hodne wrote:
>>>Troy/Julie,
>>>
>>>It seems that I have done you a injustice by telling you that we respond to
>>>answers with 4 hours. When I said respond what is meant by that is we get
>>>back to the originator of the request and get further clarification of the
>>>problem, and hopefully give a solution or a work around. One of the
>>>reasons that people purchase premier agreements for developer support, is
>>>that they know that they have more in-depth and complex issues. Many times
>>>the issues that we get have never been asked by another customer, and may
>>>never again be asked for by a customer. In these instances, when the
>>>documentation doesn't exist, or products were not designed with a certain
>>>feature, function or usage in mind, these issues can take much longer to
>>>solve. There isn't a guarantee on when a problem can be resolved, and in
>>>some rare cases, there isn't an acceptable near-term resolution.
>>>
>>>Right now, we don't know what the final outcome of your issue will be, only
>>>that we are working it, are talking to all the right people, and are
>>>looking for a way to solve it for you. With your help and cooperation,
>>>working together, we can hopefully find a good solution for you.
>>>
>>>You will be receiving more updates later today.
>>>
>>>Thanks,
>>>Norm
>>>Unit Manager, Strategic Customers and Products Unit
>>>
>>>_____
>>>From: Troy Chevalier[SMTP:troy@netscape.com]

MS98 0153541
CONFIDENTIAL

>>>Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 1995 11:08 AM

>>>To: Premier ISV Support Request (Xenix DL)

>>>Cc: julieh@netscape.com

>>>Subject: SRX950907000832

>>>

>>>It's been a week, and I'm still no closer to having a solution
>>>to the problems I submitted.

>>>

>>>So far I have had a DDK guy (Bill) help me for a couple of
>>>days, then I was transferred to Premier ISV and Dan had it,
>>>and then maybe Leon. It seemed that the calls I needed to
>>>make were in fact DDK calls and not SDK calls, so I don't
>>>know who is handling it now.

>>>

>>>Thanks,

>>>Troy

>>>

>>>Troy Chevalier

>>>Netscape Communications Corp.

>>>501 E. Middlefield Rd.

>>>Mt. View, CA 94043

>>>+1 (415) 528-2679

Return-Path: troy@netscape.com

Date: Thu, 07 Sep 95 07:45:44 -0700

From: Troy Chevalier <troy@netscape.com>

To: isvsup@microsoft.com, julieh, troy

Subject: Win 95 DDK - GenInstall()

Problem:

I am trying to write some code that will install
one of the optional software components (e.g. Dial-Up
networking or the Phone Dialer)

My Code:

Here's some code I was using to test installing the
Phone Dialer:

```
HINF hInf;  
RETERR err;
```

```
// Open the .INF file and call GenInstall()  
err = IpOpen("applets.inf", &hInf);  
err = GenInstall(hInf, "Dialer", GENINSTALL_DO_ALL);  
err = IpClose(hInf);
```

Problem:

I always get error 414 (ERR_GEN_DO_FILES) returned by the
call to GenInstall(). If I go into the Add/Remove Programs
folder, there will be a check mark next to the Phone Dialer,
but it is not properly installed: no Shortcut on the Start
Menu and no files installed; I was never prompted to insert
the Windows 95 CD

Please contact:

Troy Chevalier

Netscape Communications Corp.

+1 (415) 528-2679

troy@netscape.com

Either email or phone is fine. I'm probably easier
to get a hold of by email

Return-Path: troy@netscape.com

Date: Thu, 07 Sep 95 07:53:16 -0700

From: Troy Chevalier <troy@netscape.com>

To: isvsup@microsoft.com, julieh, troy

Subject: Win 95 DDK - DiCallClassInstaller()

Problem:

I am trying to write some code that will check if

MS98 0153542
CONFIDENTIAL

the Dial-Up Adapter is installed, and if not install it and the MS TCP protocol stack

My Code:

Here's some code I was using:

```
LPDEVICE_INFO lpDi;
RETERR      err;

// Get the list of installed adapter devices
err = DiGetClassDevs(&lpDi, "Net", NULL, DIGCF_PROFILE);

// See if the dial-up adapter is installed (my routine)
if (!FindDialUpAdapter(lpDi)) {
    DEVICE_INFO di;

    // It isn't there so add it
    memset(&di, 0, sizeof(di));
    di.cbSize = sizeof(di);
    strcpy(di.szDescription, "Dial-Up Adapter");
    strcpy(di.szClassName, "Net");
    err = DiCallClassInstaller(DIF_INSTALLDEVICE, &di);
}
}
```

Problem:

I don't get an error back (returns 0), but the adapter isn't added (if I go into the Network control panel I won't see it), and I am never prompted for the Windows 95 CD, so no files are copied. The next time I call DiGetClassDevs(), the Dial-Up Adapter will be in the list, even though it isn't properly installed

It seems the Ndi (Network Device Installer) routines would be useful for binding the dial-up adapter and MS TCP protocol stack, but I'm not having much luck with using them either

Please contact:

Troy Chevalier
Netscape Communications Corp.
+1 (415) 528-2679
troy@netscape.com

Either email or phone is fine. I'm probably easier to get a hold of by email

--
Mike Homer

Vice President, Marketing
Netscape Communications
501 E. Middlefield Rd.
Mountain View, Ca.

Voice: 415-528-2669
Fax: 415-528-4120
Email: mikeh@netscape.com
Web: home.netscape.com

MS98 0153543
CONFIDENTIAL