

From: Steven Sinofsky
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 1999 12:13 AM
To: Jon DeVaan
Subject: RE: Feb 10 preliminary product plan review

I'm sorry I was terse. I'm just feeling a lot of stress over this meeting because we're not ready and because I know that bill won't be happy even if he doesn't rant. And I do feel like I'm preparing for this based on a timeline that isn't consistent with where we are, not when we're ready to have the discussions.

I think we just need to think about what bill really wants/needs to worry about at this point in the process. PhotoDraw, Project, Publisher, and the Mac should rightfully be pretty low in the priorities. We do need to have a meaningful talk about competing with Notes and the investments we make in Office (or decide not to make). I don't think we need all these people and when I think of the downside (andy/david talking or the huge loss in credibility that can come should bill decide to rant) and weigh it against any morale benefits or teamwork, it nets out that this should be the smallest meeting possible.

It is hard for me to argue to keep andrew or richard out of this if andyhe is there. This is just me trying to minimize the damage that can happen. There are so many good conversations we can have -- OLEDB, Platinum schedule, choices to make viz Notes, hosting, etc. When I think about these, each one of them is better had with 6 people if at all possible. I can repeat the presentation 10 times for others in exchange for that one shot at making progress with bill/paul/steve.

I mean I'm ready to have the Office team cut by 1/3rd, but I don't want that to happen in front of the photodraw team :-)

-----Original Message-----

From: Jon DeVaan
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 1999 9:16 PM
To: Steven Sinofsky
Subject: RE: Feb 10 preliminary product plan review

Mostly because there are things in their product areas that need to be different than the main things. We could try to arrange the timing so that you could go before everyone else arrives. That would be awkward though. You really don't think you can trust them to respect where we are at in the timeline?

-----Original Message-----

From: Steven Sinofsky
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 1999 3:23 PM
To: Jon DeVaan
Subject: RE: Feb 10 preliminary product plan review

Why all these people even? ben, andy, greg, kathleen, thacher?

With all these people I don't want more than like 10 minutes.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jon DeVaan
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 1999 3:01 PM
To: Paul Gross (Exchange); Steven Sinofsky; Todd Warren (Exchange); Jeff Teper (Exchange); Rich Tong (Exchange); Eric Lockard (Exchange); David Thacher; Kathleen Hebert (Schoenfelder); Ben Waldman; Andy Held; Andy Schulert; Brian MacDonald; Gregory Faust
Cc: Bob Muglia (Exchange); Jan Shanahan (Exchange); Jeff Olund; Akio Fujii; Jon DeVaan
Subject: Feb 10 preliminary product plan review

I talked to Bob about how we want to handle Feb 10. Here is how we'd like to proceed. We plan to keep attendance small, basically the people on this list. If you have others you think need to come, let Bob and me know. This is a very rough start on what we should do, please let me know what you'd like to see done differently. In particular I bet the outline inside the divisions will change a lot.

Here is the rough outline of what we'd like to present. I will work out a timeline very soon. Send me the length of time you think you need for your part.

I. ATG overall

a. The three focus areas (BobMu, JonDe, Design Team) Talk about the three areas, hopefully the partnerships, and other info as far as the design team process can get us by Feb 10.

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

**MS/CR 0015476
CONFIDENTIAL**

- b. State of the business (RichT) (Rich, we haven't talked about this yet, so let's talk you me and Bob asap)
- c. Hosting (BobMu)
- d. Release timeline (BobMu)
- II. Division Plans
 - a. Server Apps common (ToddW, JanShan)
 - i. Exchange (EricL)
 - ii. PKM (JeffTe)
 - iii. <More per BobMu, ToddW, EricL, JeffTe>
 - b. DAD common (really Office) (SteveSi, JeffO, AkioF)
 - i. Excel/Access (RichardM)
 - ii. Word/PowerPoint (RalfHa)
 - iii. Outlook (KurtD)
 - iv. FrontPage (AndySchu)
 - v. Publisher (DavidT)
 - vi. Small Business (DavidT)
 - vii. PhotoDraw (AndyH)
 - viii. Project (Kathleen)
 - ix. Mac BU (BenW)
 - x. IIT (GregFa)
 - xi. NetDocs (BrianMac)
 - c. Developer common (PGross)
 - i. <per PGross>
- III. Wrap-up (BobMu)

The basic flow is to have the division and product presentations focus on the differences to avoid redundancy. Using Office as an example, Office will list its priority areas as understood for Office NRO. Suppose there was no linkage in the Office presentation to the "Make MS software the center of gravity for business technology" ATG focus area. Then the Office presentation has to say, "We're not doing MMSSTCOGFBT." Later on in our example, PhotoDraw is presenting. PhotoDraw says, "We're doing all the Office stuff," and lists the things they are focusing on in addition to that. If that doesn't make sense, let me know. Groups should assume they are presenting about the release they are currently working on, and the one after that. It is OK to have guesses and conjecture about the future, just state them as such. I know SteveB wants the day to be interactive, so be prepared for that. You'll need to explain why you rank stuff the way you do on the fly.

We have a couple open issues, but the above should give people enough info to make progress for Feb 10. The first open issue is, the feature meat behind the three ATG areas. Right now it looks like we'll be able to describe how and who will make progress on those, but only very high level sub areas. If you have a suggestion about how to do that differently, let me and Bob know. The second issue is whether the release timeline is a simple rollup of the group plans, or something different. Right now it's a rollup. There is some possibility that can change, but again, we can all make good progress this way.

Thanks! Let me and Bob know if you have any questions or comments.

Jon

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

**MS/CR 0015477
CONFIDENTIAL**