drop ship directly to them to get them product faster?

brad

96
From bradsi Tue Jul 16 17:50:13 1991
To: russs winball
Cc: richab
Subject: Re: competition from Novell?
Date: Tue, 16 Jul 91 17:49:54 PDT

Novell buying DRI is very bad news.

We're going to need some good thought on how we work with them
now.

> >From russs Tue Jul 16 16:17:56 1991
> To: winball
> Cc: bradsi richab
> Subject: competition from Novell?
> Date: Tue Jul 16 16:16:02 PDT 1991
>
> TOday's CRN has a front cover story based on a Novell internal memo
> (hah!) that talks about Novell's development priority for the next year.
> The top priority is to ship something called the "Shared Local Resource
> Program" a peer to peer network operating system "designed to steal the
> thunder from Artisoft's LANtastic and other low-end networking systems".
> There is a schedule published that shows the product shipping in 3Q
> '91.   There is also an associated article that talks about (claims to
> talk about) some of the features. All the article says is that a Novell
> spokesperson confirmed the memo and the product's existence, but would
> not elaborate. Believe what you will.
>
> In a move that may or may not be related, Novell purchased Digital
> Reseach today, the guys that make DR DOS. Maybe a peer to peer product
> based on DR DOS?

97
From bradsi Tue Jul 16 18:01:24 1991
To: richab richt
Cc: bradc jonro josephk
Subject: Re: reg
Date: Tue, 16 Jul 91 18:01:17 PDT

the setup change would be trivial. Have you looked at ms money
yet? I haven't.

> >From richt Tue Jul 16 16:25:37 1991
> To: bradsi richab
> Subject: reg
> Cc: bradc jonro josephk
> Date: Tue Jul 16 16:23:24 1991
>
> Current thinking is:
>
> 1) Need to know DOS5 sweepstakes experience ASAP. Bradc, when will
> measurement be done on this.
>
> 2) Setup change. Not convinced that this will work, but if it is
> little change to setup, we should do it. Given current state of Win 3.1,
> I wouldn't want to do it.
>
> 3) Separate setup. This plus the idea that registration means you are
> a Champion is pretty interesting. Particularly if you combine it with
> the requirement that MSD gets started and figures out everything that
> the machine does (which goes on the disk). I think it would be a very, very
> interesting experiement to try this. I'm not sure I understand the
> cost of doing this since I would expect that we'd write a little database
> thing to collect it off the disk automatically (but I will speak with
> Richab to understand). Wouldn't it be nice if a user could call, we
> could call up his configuration and then start talking. I would voite
> for a pilot in Win 3.1

Date: Mon Jul 15 09:21:33 1991

Vern Raburn, CEO of Slate is a friend of Jonathan Schmidt at Performance.
He called Vern last week and told him about a <10k program that sits
inside Netbios and "hides all the differences between netware and msnet".
Vern said it sounds great. Jonathon asked who he should sell it to -
lotus, banyan and vern said Microsoft. Apparently Jonathon said they did
some Os/2 printing work for us but now we are impossible to talk to -
we never call him back.

I have no idea what the facts are but someone should definetly contact
Jonathon and find out what he has done and any complaints he might have.
Maybe he has done something interesting.

The reason I copy both Mike and Brad directly is that I am not sure
if the windows-networking or Lan man groups know Jonathon
best. All of this could be random but please do call.

7
From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:18:20 1991
To: billg mikemur
Cc: jimall steveb
Subject: Re: Performance Technology
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:18:15 PDT

I'll take it and check it out.

>From billg Mon Jul 15 09:21:35 1991
To: bradsi mikemur
Subject: Performance Technology
Cc: jimall steveb
Date: Mon Jul 15 09:21:33 1991

8
From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:21:01 1991
To: davidcol
Subject: commdlg.dll sources
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:21:00 PDT

I hate this kind of shit. We were going to give it to them anyways.
Now the thing got escalated and it will look like we gave it to them
because they screamed, which will just encourage them.

>From dougk Mon Jul 15 09:25:08 1991
To: davidcol steveh
Subject: commdlg.dll sources
Cc: billg bradsi brucery steveb
Date: Mon Jul 15 09:24:23 1991

        Apps is not suppose to look at Windows source since external
        ISVs don't get the opportunity. We make exceptions for
        both external ISVs and MS apps when it's time critical
        for them.

This is pure and utter BULLSHIT! As BillG said at the latest Apps Division
meeting, the "Chinese wall" is a figment of the media. Systems and Apps are
supposed to work together. We have a number of outstanding COMMDLG bugs (more
than half of Barney's total outstanding bugs). If being able to look at the
sources can help resolve them, WHY WON'T YOU LET US DO IT??

If you're so concerned about fairness, let the ISV's look too. What are you
afraid of? That someone else is going to come out with a competing COMMDLG?
Get real! It's in the interest of all of us, Systems, Apps, AND external
ISV's to get a working commdlg package as soon as possible.

For that matter, I think that Apps should be able to look at any Windows
source. As a practical matter, we do, whether you like it or not. And as
a result, we've been able to track down a number of bugs, both in our code
and in Windows code, saving everyone a hell of a lot of time, and making
both products better. Again, if it's really fairness you're concerned
about, make the Windows source available to ISV's too. Having looked at
a bunch of Windows source, I've always wondered whether the real reason you
don't want people to see it is because you're embarrassed by the quality of
it.

So let's get reasonable here. Give us the ability to look at commdlg
sources; we'll help you find and fix bugs, and we'll all be better off.

     Doug

9
From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:22:36 1991
To: davidcol dougk steveh
Cc: billg brucery steveb
Subject: Re: commdlg.dll sources
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:22:32 PDT

Relax. We had already decided to give you r/o access to commdlg
source.

> >From dougk Mon Jul 15 09:25:08 1991
> To: davidcol steveh
> Subject: commdlg.dll sources
> Cc: billg bradsi brucery steveb
> Date: Mon Jul 15 09:24:23 1991

     Apps is not suppose to look at Windows source since external
     ISVs don't get the opportunity. We make exceptions for
     both external ISVs and MS apps when it's time critical
     for them.

This is pure and utter BULLSHIT! As BillG said at the latest Apps Division
meeting, the "Chinese wall" is a figment of the media. Systems and Apps are
supposed to work together. We have a number of outstanding COMMDLG bugs (more
than half of Barney's total outstanding bugs). If being able to look at the
sources can help resolve them, WHY WON'T YOU LET US DO IT??

If you're so concerned about fairness, let the ISV's look too. What are you
afraid of? That someone else is going to come out with a competing COMMDLG?
Get real! It's in the interest of all of us, Systems, Apps, AND external
ISV's to get a working commdlg package as soon as possible.

For that matter, I think that Apps should be able to look at any Windows
source. As a practical matter, we do, whether you like it or not. And as
a result, we've been able to track down a number of bugs, both in our code
and in Windows code, saving everyone a hell of a lot of time, and making
both products better. Again, if it's really fairness you're concerned
about, make the Windows source available to ISV's too. Having looked at
a bunch of Windows source, I've always wondered whether the real reason you
don't want people to see it is because you're embarrassed by the quality of
it.

So let's get reasonable here. Give us the ability to look at commdlg
sources; we'll help you find and fix bugs, and we'll all be better off.

     Doug

10
From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:23:28 1991