Lynn E. Williams (Legal)

From:	Paul Maritz
To:	David Cutler; Brad Silverberg
Cc:	Bill Gates; Jim Allchin; Mike Maples
Subject:	RE: nt/chicago base team interactions
Date:	Mon, Dec 13, 1993 10:36AM

I have scheduled a systems division meeting for next Tuesday, in part to go over material from the PDC for folk, but mainly to address issues rasied below, and outline the priorities:

1. Our biggest issue in systems business is to not allow another competitor to get a grip on the desktop. By allowing OS/2 to become a semi-credible Windows clone, and by having no good multitasking offering in the 4-8MB range, we are at risk. This means our number 1 priority is to get Chicago shipping with the features that will ensure large number of Win3.1 users upgrade to it and not to OS/2, and any other Windows clone. I could give black/white directions such as "Chicago may not add/modify any feature" or alternatively "Chicago should need not talk to NT group", but this would be wrong as well. Instead Chicago has to only add features where it is important for them to do so, and where it is needed they have to get input from the NT team.

2. The next hard issue is what to do about NT releases and their timing. We could delay Daytona to be a "fuller" subset of Chicago. This would mean letting NT go for over a year without an update release to address the size/perf/function issues that are needed to turn some of the current negative perceptions around. This is a wrong thing to do. We need to get Daytona out. An inevitable consequence is the "NT gap", and the tensions it gives rise to.

3. Given that we have to do Daytona, Moshed (who generally has most accurate assesment of schedules) says that we could not turn another release of NT until Q1'CY95 at the earliest. So the issue becomes on of should we take another quarter, and get additional function (directory, DFS, OFS) which can help versus Novell on the server.

These problems, and the frustrations assoicated with them, will only go away when we have "one" offering for the desktop and "one" offering for the server. It is and will be a priority to get to "one" over the next two-three years. Today the size constraints of the installed base forces us to have two. This means that we have to our teams talk to each other, and we have to deal with the tensions that will result.

> From: David Cutler
> To: Brad Silverberg
> Cc: Bill Gates; Jim Allchin; Mike Maples; Paul Maritz
> Subject: RE: nt/chicago base team interactions
> Date: Saturday, December 11, 1993 9:39AM
>
> The lack of synergy and common goals between the Chicago and
> NT groups should come as no surprise to you or anybody else.
> How can you expect synergy between these groups when there is
> no synergy in the corporate strategy for these products?
>
> Some time ago the hype about Win32c started and confused
> everyone. Then Chicago was preannounced as the 32-bit follow
> on to Win3.1 making it sound like it had all the features of
> NT while still running in 4mb. Then NT's next release was
> limited both in schedule and content to focus on Cairo. This
> left little or no time for NT to dovetail with the Chicago
> features or schedule. Thus the family stands "separated" until
> Cairo.
>
> We are now telling people to write APPs to OLE 2.01 and
> they'll run on both systems. The ISVs, however, will see the

light and have, or will, put NT on the backburner to focus on
Chicago. Unfortunately there is no time in the NT schedule to
include all the Chicago features especially when the design
changes so rapidly and NT's schedule is relatively fixed. What
do you tell an ISV that wants to develop APPs on NT targeted
for Chicago?

So when the NT group meets with the Chicago group, there is
always resistence to add anything. A feature added to Chicago
at this point cannot be added to NT. Presumedly the feature is
being added for some good purpose and forms one more reason
why Chicago APPs will not run on NT if they take advantage of
Chicago specific features.

You and I can send all the messages we want to our groups, but
until there is synergy in the company strategy for these
products and both groups can see the mutual benefit of
supporting each other no real cooperation or synergy can
exist.

d

From: Brad Silverberg
To: David Cutler; David Cole; Jim Allchin
Cc: Dennis Adler; John Ludwig; Karl Stock
Subject: FW: nt/chicago base team interactions
Date: Friday, December 10, 1993 1:27PM

JohnLu was in a meeting yesterday between the chicago and nt core guys to
discuss classID/linkID issues. He relayed to me that he was shocked and,
well horrified, at what he observed. It especially came as a surprise to
him because the relationships he has with the NT team, namely with DaveTh,
are positive and cooperative.

I asked him to send me mail on this meeting because it's something both
teams have to fix. Each team is guilty and must must must make a more
serious effort to improve the relationship. It starts with mutual respect
and mutual recognition that we need BOTH products to be successful. Chicago
needs NT; NT needs Chicago. We are in this together and will sink or swim
together.

I want my guys to understand that if I hear of this kind of behavior again,
they will be shot. Healthy debate is fine. Even private opinions about
one's own or other's work are fine. [We can't legislate thought.] But
pissing and disruptive, non-cooperative behvior will not be tolerated. We
are one company, one division, one os family.

From: John Ludwig
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: nt/chicago base team interactions
Date: Friday, December 10, 1993 1:04PM

per yoru request, some mail on this.

in the classid/linkid meeting with the nt guys, i was surprised at the level
of friction between the teams and lack of cooperation. i guess i have heard
from you and davidcol that relations can be really bad between the core os
teams, this is the first time i saw how unproductive it could be.

it's hard to get a handle on what the root of the problem is and how to fix

it. a couple of things that struck me

1   overall i saw lack of clear goal to make chicago apps run well on nt.
    having them run but not honoring the new apis is really lame. no one
    seemed to care about this. this is a very surprising point of view to
    me. both us and the nt guys seemed not to care. i can't get away
    with this in networking -- everyone expects chicago and nt to work
    very well on the two ends of a transaction, in practice this means we
    need to support common apis and protocols well. i think we are going
    to get hammered from customers on this.

    = > seems like you should discuss with paul and jim.

2   guys like markz and markl seem to have little understanding of the
    importance of chicago to the overall corp and the need to solve
    some problems in chicago. which is unfortunate because they are key
    guys. but they don't pitch in and help. they just look for ways to
shut
    us down. this attitude needs to get corrected.

    = > you should speak with jim.

3   i also saw guys on our team pooh-pooh nt as a product. this is
    bad bad practice. our judgement on nt as a product is worthless.
    the market will decide. thomasf was pretty bad this way, other
    guys were chuckling at his comments tho.

    = > i will talk with thomas

4   the nt guys seemed to be leaderless. there was no single nt voice
    of reason saying "look guys, maybe we think the chicago guys are
    stupid for wanting this, but lets work thru the costs here. we will
    hash out the bigger issue at a different level with different people."
    markcl is not a strong enough voice here.

    = > someone on jim's team needs to play this role.