

From ingate!pcmgatel!richt Mon Dec 21 22:00:53 1992
Received: from microsoft by ingate.microsoft.COM
id aa23305; Mon, 21 Dec 92 12:47:59 PST

From: richt@microsoft.com
To: bradsi@microsoft.com, cameronm@microsoft.com, collinsh@microsoft.com,
davidt@microsoft.com, dwayne@microsoft.com, jonl@microsoft.com,
richt@microsoft.com, steveb@microsoft.com,
pcmgatel!wagged!wa.wagged.com!claire@microsoft.com
Cc: CLAIRE@wa.wagged.com, DEBH@wa.wagged.com, JULIEP@wa.wagged.com,
KELLEYL@or.wagged.com, MELISSAW@wa.wagged.com, billmi@microsoft.com,
martyta@microsoft.com, mikemap@microsoft.com, paulma@microsoft.com,
steveb@microsoft.com, MSA@or.wagged.
Subject: RE: Meeting on Chicago and Cairo
Date: Mon, 21 Mar 92 09:05:00 PST
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0
Message-ID: <9212211247.aa23305@ingate.microsoft.COM>

We should update our system strategy pitch to reflect some of this thinking, particularly the part about two general classes of uses for Win 3.1 family vs. Win NT 3.1 family. I just reviewed the strategy pitch and it could certainly help understand what we are trying to do.

From: Steve Ballmer
To: microsoft!bradsi; microsoft!cameronm; microsoft!collinsh;
microsoft!davidt; microsoft!dwayne; microsoft!jonl; microsoft!richt;
wagged!wa.wagged.com!claire
Cc: CLAIRE; DEBH; JULIEP; KELLEYL; MELISSAW; microsoft!billmi;
microsoft!martyta; microsoft!mikemap; microsoft!paulma; microsoft!steveb;
MSA
Subject: RE: Meeting on Chicago and Cairo
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 1992 5:24PM

i mentioned to jonl today that I like your thinking we need a position on whether there is a win 4 and wfw 4 I think we should refer to those as merged but I might be nuts if you understand the improvements that is not a leap it is a leap if all one understands is wfw today

From: <CLAIRE@wa.wagged.com>
To: <microsoft!bradsi>; <microsoft!cameronm>; <microsoft!collinsh>;
<microsoft!davidt>; <microsoft!dwayne>; <microsoft!jonl>;
<microsoft!richt>
Cc: <KELLEYL@or.wagged.com>; <MSA@or.wagged.com>;
<OBRIEN@or.wagged.com>; <PAMED@or.wagged.com>;
<CLAIRE@wa.wagged.com>; <DEBH@wa.wagged.com>; <JULIEP@wa.wagged.com>;
<MELISSAW@wa.wagged.com>; <microsoft!billmi>; <microsoft!martyta>;
<microsoft!mikemap>; <microsoft!paulma>; <microsoft!steveb>
Subject: Meeting on Chicago and Cairo
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 1992 3:36PM

JonL, Cameron, Bradsi, Richt, DavidT, Dwayne and I met to discuss PR implications of the upcoming January SDR on Chicago and the ongoing interest in Cairo.

Here are the results of the discussion, which will require additional refinement and the resolution of several issues outlined below. The timing of the Windows positioning messages is predicated on the January disclosure to developers--we are going through this work in anticipation of press leaks afterward.

o It is fundamental to position Chicago vs Windows NT in terms of how business users will use them:

MS 5032890
CONFIDENTIAL

Plaintiff's Exhibit

5526

Comes V. Microsoft

RBC 04404

Chicago--for the general business user, for desktop applications
Windows NT--for the business workstations, technical workstations,
servers

o We will always refer to Windows NT as a superset of Windows for MS DOS.

o As a family of operating systems, both Windows for MS DOS and Windows NT will share common technologies:

Windows 3.1 and Windows NT 3.1--OLE 1.0, Win 16, Windows 32s
Chicago and Windows NT X.X--OLE 2.0, Windows 32c (including threads,
preemptive multitasking)

o It will be important to be able to communicate that Windows NT will have the same features as Chicago in some reasonably close timeframe, in order for customers to see that there is family consistency. This is an open issue in terms of product release/development plans (see below)

o We will NOT refer to Chicago as Windows NT lite, although this positioning will be inevitable with the press. We will combat it.

o We will emphasize that MS DOS continues, and that Chicago will require MS DOS. We will not refer to a "merged" product.

o

Open issues:

o Whether to start referring to Chicago as Windows 4.0. The group believes that referring to Chicago as Windows 4.0 would be beneficial in terms of positioning Chicago relative to Windows NT. JonL to follow up with PaulMa

o What we will commit to in terms of a timeframe for "Windows NT 4.0," the definition being when will we say Windows NT will support all the features of Chicago. JonL to follow up.

o Cairo--get agreement to refer to it as "Windows fairy dust" or a set of technologies for Windows, rather than a "product" or "Windows NT 2" least for the near term. JonL to follow up.

MS 5032891
CONFIDENTIAL

RBC 04405