seen it. So we had a very friendly discussion on the points
in the mail. I told Mark we would send him more up to date
info on our estimated added COGS (hence David's mail below).
He was pleasantly surprised that WLO are down to two disks.

Kenlyn

| > From davidwo Mon Jan 7 13:48:42 1991
| To: markwa
| Cc: kenlyne
| Subject: WLO size for Win 3.1 SDK
| Date: Mon Jan 07 13:45:24 1991
|
| Hi Mark,
| Kenlyn told me she and you had talked this morning about
| the size of WLO 1.0 and how much this would affect your
| COGS for the 3.1 SDK.
|
| First of all, I think it's vital that we merge the two
| kits and not consider making wlo a fulfillment item. As
| Kenlyn explained this morning, our company's systems
| strategy calls for a solid bridge to OS/2 3.0 and wlo
| is that bridge. We really need to push isvs to use wlo
| now and integrate it throughout their development--not
| as an afterthought.
|
|
| That said, the additional size increment to include WLO
| would be:
|
|
| Files:
| Mapping Layer DLLs   1125K
| Utilities, doc, intl files   900K
| Samples   220K
| ──────
| 2245K (or 2.2 MB)
|
| Since the link libraries are the same libs as used by
| Windows 3.1, there are not extra libs. Therefore the
| disks required to hold these files would be:
|
|
| Type   Quantity
| ───────────────   ───────
| 5.25" HD (1.2 MB   2
| 3.5" HD (1.44 MB)   2
|
|
| I'm not sure what the exact disk costs are, but I believe
| they are < = $1 for 5.25" and between $1 and $2 for 3.5".

| In addition to the disk requirements, there will be about
| 50 extra doc pages, but I don't think this is significant
| compared to the size of your docs already.
|
| Let me know if you need more information. Also, please
| invite Kenlyne and I to any meetings you have on this
| subject so we may properly represent our side of the
| fence. Thanks.
| David
|

Steve Wells

From: kenlyne
To: stevewe
Cc: davidwo
Subject: Windows Progress
Date: Mon, Jan 14, 1991 2:37PM

... just wondering if you've had a chance to talk about the
Windows 3.1 issues with BradSi or SteveB yet, and if there
are any updates.

Issues:
1) assuring that the WLO will be in the Win 3.1 SDK, as
opposed to being a fulfillment item.

2) code changes needed to "clean up" the applets so they
are portable with the WLO.

I've got a developer and tester in the Porthole group asking
if they should try to make the code changes in the applets
in their "spare time."

So if it doesn't look like we will convince the windows
group to raise the priority of this work, then we should get
working on this soon. Otherwise, there are plenty of other
things we can do with "spare time."

Besides meeting contractual obligations with IBM, as DavidWo
suggested, the converted applets might make a nice packet to
send inquiring minds along with the WLO data sheet.

Thanks,
Kenlyn