From richab Thu Nov 1 10:09:42 1990
To: bobt bradsi cameronm lioneljo markwa russw w-carrin
Subject: Open Tools press release
Cc: kathrynh
Date: Thu Nov 1 10:09:41 1990

1.   Do we want to talk about open tools (lowercase) or Open Tools (upper
case)? Is this something we want to trademark or a way of describing
our new approach?   I can see either, but if we want to use the
phrase for our approach only and try to protect it from other's usage,
then we need to get legal involved, etc.

2. Open implies that we're closed now. While this is pretty much
true, do we want to be precieved in this manner? Would it be better
to take an approach that implies that were more openn with the new program
but not closed today (whitewater is an example of how we're not closed
today).

3. How concerned with the "...it's about time." reaction that we're likely
to get in the press. "...Microsoft waits till something is popular before
taking an open strategy. Makes no sense..."

4. It seems to me that their is an opportunity to associate this change
with bradsi (this may happen anyway), which I think could be positive and
would help enstablish him as the new Windows guy. Giving bradsi a quote
in the release would do this. Comments?

5. Have we considered a quote from someone like Multiscope? It could be
positioned less as removing an absolute barrier and more as listening to
this important class of isv and implementing changes accordingly.

6. I think I'm OK with being specific on 3.1. The downside to this
is that we are not completely buttoned up on the details. Being specific
in the release implies that we have it all figured out. Saying "..the
next release of Windows and the Windows SDK..." will have the same effect, but
might cut us a bit more latitude so far as being totally buttoned up on
implementation details.

As is I think the release flys. The above are things to consider
if we haven't.

rich