

1
File : c:\bradsi\novell.fld
Messages : .

26
From ericst Wed Aug 7 17:00:50 1991
To: bradc bradsi tonle tonya
Cc: andyhi johnen marionj mikedr
Subject: Notes from 8/6 IBM review
Date: Wed, 07 Aug 91 17:03:25 PDT

Summary

Both sides felt the meeting was productive. We agreed to start doing monthly status via video conferences. Got some good feedback on their needs, and addressed a lot of their issues with us. This group seems sincerely interested in working with us. Of course, their direction could be changed by a VP mandate, but I don't think any of them (development/Test/Planning) would be happy about that.

This poses an interesting question: Do we work with them as we did on DOS 5, furthering their belief that we are useful and that moving away would be painful, or do we be vague about DOS 6 plans and unresponsive to IBM requests? I believe that if we alienate this group, the odds of IBM moving to DRI would go up substantially. This group is our only ally at IBM who don't want to do that (possibly HW would care).

I strongly recommend that we work to keep good relations with them, being responsive to their needs. It will be difficult to maintain a good relationship with them if we don't talk about future DOS plans, or if we are overly concerned about competing with them in the Upgrade business.

Tonya -->> Perhaps we can setup an addendum to our DOS contract which keeps them from sharing any of our DOS discussions with DOS Clone makers?

DRI

- Comments were off the record from Barbara. Their executives have asked about moving to this, but their DOS group has bitterly opposed. She has noted that it would be great pain for them to go to DRI. With MS-DOS they understand what it takes to get the job done, they know who to talk and they have means to quickly transfer data (DASIS/DUNE). She says that as long as we are working with them, they (her level) will adamantly oppose any move to DRI.

- They (IBM Exec's) are concerned that we may put 32-bit API into DOS (Barbara mentioned that this was the fire which she kept getting dragged out of our meeting for), but she points out that we couldn't do it by Jan, the committed date for OS/2, so the point is mute - either they succeed with OS/2, or it doesn't matter...

5671

2
- Barbara also noted that DRI is likely to add the same features to DOS which their afraid we will add (32-bit, vdm's). She doesn't see a good business case for them to go to DRI as long as we're working together on DOS.

Work Items/Deliverables:

IBM Deliverables:

- 8514 check code to MS this week.
- list of all changes they've incorporated into DOS 5 by the end of this week.
- draft DOS 6 wish list by 8/23, including the postponed bugs they view as important. We will discuss their list on a 9/3 video conf call.

MS Deliverables/Work items:

- They would like to get the Beta Test Guide in soft copy so they can do internal beta testing of future releases. I agreed to look into this.
- They are frustrated with ownership of the International issues. They want a technical contact in MSKK, Ireland, and Redmond IPG. Ideally they'd have one contact who owns all of them. I agreed to look into this.
- IBM wants to use same RAID. Will save them substantial time in transfer of bugs (On DOS 5 it took a full time person to transfer bug inf, and they inf was not always transferred correctly). I agreed to look into again.
- Reassure IBM that we will not announce (50a).
- keep them abreast of changes we make to our DOS plans.
- Send them the latest error messages.

Other Notes:

They want to use Premier Online support for DOS

Testing:

- They want to shift their test effort to be more reliant on ours, focusing on the IBM HW aspect more than the DOS compatibility aspect. They will review the tests I sent them to determine to what degree they can do this.
- They want a compatibility test that they can have their HW guys run on pre-EVT HW. This will allow them to identify compatibility problems in time to fix them in HW. By the time EVT HW is built, it is expensive for them to change the HW.
- They didn't get any feedback on their HCT results. They need timely feedback on whether they have problems.

C:\DH1LD000.MAI

Tue Aug 06 17:46:00 1991

Plaintiffs' Exhibit
5343
Comes v. Microsoft

X 541176
CONFIDENTIAL

X 541177
CONFIDENTIAL

- We to tell IBM what our test team would like them to test.

ROMDOS Addendum (and 50a)
I told them that the ROMDOS addendum would include some changes for disk based as well. They expressed strong concern that we include them in our plans on whether to announce the changes. I told them we didn't intend to (they don't want to), but I'd check back and reassure them on the status of this.

- They would prefer no new artwork. That has turned out to be one of the most time consuming challenges for their international releases (they have only released US version).

- They had an issue with DOSSMAP.EXE on our CIS forum. They want source for the changes. I was surprised to learn we have that on CIS. Agreed to look into. Also assured them we'd give them sources for changes which affect OEM product, and that we did not intend to put random new files on CIS.

- They need to know our position on their open service requests in a more timely fashion. I told them I'd see about getting weekly drops on their problem status.

- Reiterated that we would provide them CSD's twice a year (as earlier agreed), with fixes only for problems both of us agree are critical. If we don't fix a problem they deem critical, they will provide us with the code to review prior to their shipping their fix.

ISO
- Apparently this will be required for all new products in Europe after Jun '93. IBM wants to know if we have any plans to make dosshell conform to this standard. I have a copy of the standard - it mainly addresses font sizes. we should look at for DOSSHELL.

Future DOS
- They mentioned that they want to value add some things to DOS to differentiate PC-DOS on IBM hardware.

- They want to know our timeframe for the next DOS. This impacts their budgeting plans, so they need to know when we plan to ship it, and whether it will be a major or minor rev. I told them it was not defined yet and we need to know what it is before we ship it.

- They asked about our DOS 6 plans, but I turned it around and asked what they wanted. They had a few things, but really didn't seem to have thought it through.

Build
- They had a lot of issues with our builds. We need to be better about providing them with bug fix titles, SLM logs, tag files, and OAK docs. They wasted a lot of

bandwidth on builds.

- We need to do a better job of informing when builds will not be sent. They were real frustrated on this one (I managed to make them accept that this was a problem with them not having Brenda/John raise as an issue when it happens).

- IBM wants better support for modifyng SETUP.INI and for building version with IBM strings. They are spending too much time on these activities.

- They want us to tell them which strings we change.

Quality (Malcome Malridge):
They have some quality goals (Malcome Malridge (sp??)) which they get pressure to meet. They want to quantify quality and improve it in future releases. This is important to them because they must pass reports on this to Laumbach. I noted flaws in their models and suggest that they incorporate frequency into raw problem counts, as well as use calls per unit sold as a measure. They also wanted a measure of quality prior to ship, so I suggested usability testing and beta bug curve models. They agreed that the ultimate goal of quality is customer satisfaction.

Eric.