

From: Steven Sinofsky
Sent: Friday, October 01, 1999 7:26 PM
To: Steve Ballmer
Subject: RE: Servers that Office connects to

Plaintiff's Exhibit

6657

Comes V. Microsoft

I think we should take advantage of the discontinuity and not saddle ourselves too much. We have the advantage of office already--lets use servers for what they are good at and not try to graft yesterdays paradigm on top of the new one--none of our competitors are doing that (well notes is but they are suffering too).

Long topic. Wish we had time to really discuss. Not just you, but bill too.

I want us to get past the no excitement in office 2000. I am hurt by this "conventional wisdom" because when people get the product they don't feel that way. We set out to build a tco+web friendly release with fewer random features. We got that nailed. It hurts when sales tells me they want more random features now. I have whiplash.

I think we need to get more web servers out there no doubt. But I bet there are more than we think--IT just doesn't have visibility at the top levels. Microsoft is this way too.

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

From: Steve Ballmer <steveb@MICROSOFT.com>
To: Steven Sinofsky <stevesi@MICROSOFT.com>
Sent: Fri Oct 01 14:10:44 1999
Subject: RE: Servers that Office connects to

I know it is a new world but how do we unify or move forward ina clean way with intranets

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

From: Steven Sinofsky
Sent: Friday, October 01, 1999 2:05 PM
To: Steve Ballmer
Subject: RE: Servers that Office connects to

No.

It is more complicated than a mapping. File servers arose out of physical groupings of work. Web servers are more logical because you can build a level of indirection through the "home pages" and because the web server can span lots of different drives and servers through a single namespace.

I wish we could spend more time helping you/bill to learn more about the web stuff. It is a "new world".

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

From: Steve Ballmer <steveb@MICROSOFT.com>
To: Paul Gross (Exchange) <pgross@exchange.microsoft.com>; Bill Gates <billg@MICROSOFT.com>; Bob Muglia (Exchange) <bobmu@exchange.microsoft.com>
CC: Business Leadership Team <blt@microsoft.com>; Steven Sinofsky <stevesi@MICROSOFT.com>; Rich Tong (Exchange) <richt@exchange.microsoft.com>; Eric Rudder <ericr@MICROSOFT.com>
Sent: Fri Oct 01 11:48:28 1999
Subject: RE: Servers that Office connects to

Will win 2k make it easy for it to set up a server where the HTML shares points and the file share points look unified for setup operation and most importantly for the end user that would be great of o2K and win 2K I suspect the answer is no but I raise it one last time

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

From: Paul Gross (Exchange)
Sent: Friday, October 01, 1999 7:17 AM
To: Bill Gates; Bob Muglia (Exchange)
Cc: Business Leadership Team; Steven Sinofsky; Rich Tong (Exchange); Eric Rudder

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

**MS/CR 0022359
CONFIDENTIAL**

Subject: RE: Servers that Office connects to

Bill,

While the story is not perfect out of the chute, I think the vision is good and gets better with each wave of products. I would divide the waves into four time frames:

Office 2000 (now until Platinum and Tahoe ship)
Platinum/Tahoe (2000+2001)
Office 10/Mercury (2001)
Win2K+WebStore (2001+)

While Office 2000's web collab features may not be received well right now, as people begin to see the benefits of the Web Store (combining file servers, web servers and mail servers) at the enterprise level, the story starts to become clearer. There are benefits for KW in the aggregation of the namespace that they can save to. IT will benefit too from the consolidation of servers though that process of consolidation will be slow because it actually will require organizational changes. Tahoe v1 will provide a better departmental solution that will allow the consolidation of file servers and web servers and provide additional functionality to make doc management better as well as providing enterprise search and thereby improving the access to the remaining "knowledge" stores in the enterprise.

In the Office 10 timeframe, the Tahoe features are intended to run ON Exchange so there isn't a separate namespace for versioned files. File, web and mail servers will be very integrated on the intranet. If the benefits to the company are sufficient, we should get KW's clamoring for this consolidation of these servers and IT being supportive for cost reasons. This combined with the improved search work being done in Office 10 should be very compelling to end users.

Post Office 10 and Mercury, we will have deeper integration of the Web Store into Win2K(+). The OS should be providing the integration of the file server, web server and mail store in that timeframe and our products should be supporting that migration.

Paul

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

From: Bill Gates
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 1999 12:15 PM
To: Bob Muglia (Exchange)
Cc: Business Leadership Team; Paul Gross (Exchange); Steven Sinofsky; Rich Tong (Exchange); Eric Rudder
Subject: Servers that Office connects to

I think we have created a huge problem for Office (and the company as a whole) by not having a simple clear strategy for Servers.

Office today mostly works against local file systems and file sharing stores.

Our file sharing stores are a dead end. We never let people do property indexing, rich searching and rich views on these stores. Users know the file servers are bad.

We never made it easy to find a file store - just use the Network neighborhood button.

We have Office innovating in doing cool stuff for Intranet site building.

However we don't have a message about how that makes a company more effective.

We don't have any "wizards" that take you from the scenario to make it easy to build the web site.

We don't have any way of getting those Intranet servers to be pervasive inside companies.

The situation is going to get so fragmented that no one will know what servers they are supposed to have for knowledge workers.

We have 6 different things we are telling customers to do - all wrong.

1. Keep using your current file servers but we fix none of the problems and you get no benefit from Office innovation.
2. Change your server to be just an IIS server. No access to the files from Windows applications except Office. No migration. I don't understand what we would have to do to make this migration simple.
3. Change your server to be an Office Server. Install SQL as part of this. No access to the files from Windows applications. Limited benefits. No migration. This will never get to critical mass. Office should either focus on Platinum or just IIS - not something that requires a SQL install.
4. Change your server to be a Platinum server. This might be the best choice for us but even inside Office they are not

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL **MS/CR 0022360**
CONFIDENTIAL

betting on this. Platinum is packaged as a messaging/collaborative thing so it is NOT designed to be a nice thing you just put on top of a file server and run. This approach is probably the one we need to make work. It might require taking some form of Platinum and making it part of the Windows server offering rather than something with a messaging push. Certainly I want our "internet drive" service to use Platinum rather than just the vanilla file system.

5. Change your server to be a Tahoe server. Until today I thought this was the same as Platinum. Now I am a bit confused on this since apparently Tahoe is not a feature on top of Platinum - it is its own name space.

6. Stop using Office and messing around with servers and just use Casablanca - pay us almost nothing. Don't worry about client richness. Nice UI that guides you through the scenarios.

I think our mistakes here are the most fundamental we are making. These mistakes are not about our fumbblings to try and do something with consumers.

They are about screwing up the knowledge worker market where we get over 100% of our profits.

I think you have to take the lead in getting this fixed but it will require work with the Windows team to figure out a positive approach to how we do it.

People want their file servers to be decent. People have had to buy lots of ugly third party stuff since we didn't fill the vacuum here. We still have no message and no plan to fill the vacuum and it is hurting us in many ways.

Knowledge workers deserve to have rich Intranets. Office has to guide you through the top level scenarios for these Intranets - not just help with individual documents.

Office has to decide to be serious about Platinum because that is what we are moving to be in Windows. Even so we may need to do some different messaging and packaging.

I think the lack of enthusiasm for Office2000 is largely because we messed up on the server piece - no one including NO ONE AT MICROSOFT is using Office2000 for the things we built it for. I know I am not. Apparently some companies have had end users decide to put up IIS servers but Microsoft has not been moving the market in that way and we need to figure out how to do it.

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

**MS/CR 0022361
CONFIDENTIAL**