

1298

From chriswo Wed Aug 28 18:20:05 1991

To: gregro winwar

Subject: me next week

Date: Wed Aug 28 18:19:40 1991

I'll be gone next week. Gregro will take my place at the Friday 9am meeting (9/6). If beta 2 doesn't go out, and there are doc issues to be addressed on Wednesday at 8:30, Gregro or Bradh are on call to show up at the meeting. Brad is already on winwar alias--he can forward any necessary info to gregro.

Thanks!

chris

1299

From lisacr Wed Aug 28 18:33:12 1991

To: winteam

Subject: Beta 2 status

Date: Wed, 28 Aug 91 18:26:59 PDT

As Kory said earlier, 43e is it!

There are currently no outstanding problems which are holding up the beta release. Please take the time to update to 43e if you haven't already. We need to be sure we're ready to ship. Its on \pyrex\pre3 and \tools\beta.

Provided we don't find any beta stopping bugs, we will go to PRS on Friday!

If you find something you think is a beta stopper, email WINWAR asap.

Thanks!

Lisa

1300

From pinckney Wed Aug 28 18:44:29 1991

To: Billg Bobmc Bradsi Garygi JonI MSFTPR Martyta Mikede Mikehal Paulma

Richab Richmac Richt Scotto Steveb

Cc: Hankv Mikemap Peteh

Subject: IBM & OS/2 - Windows & OS/2 Conference Trip Report

Date: Tue Aug 27 18:32:21 PDT 1991

Since I don't know many of you, a brief bio preceeds my report. I'm sending this mail because my background gives me a perspective that is somewhat unique at Microsoft.

I am the Excel for the Macintosh and Excel for OS/2 Product Manager, reporting to Hank Vigil. Prior to joining Microsoft in December I spent a year as a consultant and the prior 10 years with IBM. As a consultant, I spent 10-20% of my time presenting IBM's SAA strategy

Plaintiff's Exhibit

7614

Comes V. Microsoft

MS 5052715
CONFIDENTIAL -

to foreign executives of IBM customers. I also did SAA training work and used OS/2 as my primary OS. In my last job at IBM I worked with the software vendors who announced SAA applications at IBM's OfficeVision announcement in 1989, and wrote the original "SAA... A Guide for Evaluating Applications." I was a Marketing Manager in a NY branch office (covering the Dun & Bradstreet account) when OS/2 and SAA were announced in 1987, and I spent 5 years as a marketing rep. (Prior to IBM I spent 3 years as a CPA with Peat Marwick.)

I recently returned from the Windows and OS/2 conference (where I presented Excel head-to-head against 1-2-3 for Windows). This mail is about the sessions I attended relating to IBM & OS/2 vs. Microsoft and Windows. Please mail me if you would like my trip report addressing Lotus and Frank King's Strategy presentation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- IBM had a dominating presence at the conference, even though the attendees appeared to be more Windows than OS/2 oriented.
- IBM clearly understands the issues in trying to revive OS/2 and is taking steps to address them.
- IBM is beginning to clearly articulate their strategy and is trying to reposition Windows as basically being DOS.
- OS/2 has made tremendous advances, and is extremely impressive from the viewpoint of a user sitting in the audience.
- My opinion is that many IBM customers will welcome OS/2 if IBM executes on their strategy, and that in addition to battling IBM for these customers, our challenge will be to insure that there isn't a "trickle down" effect in which smaller customers follow the lead of OS/2 committed companies like the Royal Bank of Canada.

ANALYSIS

*** NOTE: I will not provide a detailed report of conference talks in light of the various detailed mail that has preceded this.***

The conference had a strong IBM presence in the form of a large IBM booth, HUGE banners in front of the hall where the keynotes/main tent sessions were held, the IBM keynote, and IBM influence on other keynotes.

The first day's keynote was by Sheldon Laube, National Director, Information & Technology of Price Waterhouse. The focus was the evolution of the user interface and the benefits to users, however it was also a very strong endorsement of OS/2. The demo which included early versions of Visicalc, Lotus v1.x, and Excel 3.0, was done under OS/2 2.0. The crescendo was a multimedia bit in which a live video feed of Lee Reiswig was displayed in a window and information was transmitted between Sheldon's and Lee's PCs as the two of them conversed.

That afternoon Frank King presented Lotus's strategy followed by a demo of 1-2-3 for Windows. While this session was about their

MS 5052716
CONFIDENTIAL

applications, his discussion of their alliance with IBM and their integration of Notes and CC Mail into OS/2 Extended Services was also an endorsement for IBM.

The second day started with an almost 2 hour OS/2 Strategy Briefing. Joe Guglielmi presented their strategy and Lee Reiswig gave a comprehensive demo of OS/2 technology. This session was VERY effective for IBM and was VERY WELL RECEIVED by the audience. It made clear the threat of OS/2 and the challenge for Windows:

* IBM has traditionally done an excellent job of developing and articulating comprehensive strategies and selling them to customers (the fact that the technology/product often preceeded the strategy notwithstanding). The strategy they presented is quite appealing, and while obviously difficult to execute, their demonstration and the support it got from Sheldon Laube's demo was compelling.

- Joe G. said "... years ago Microsoft and IBM got together and concluded that DOS was insufficient. We designed OS/2 to address ... We still believe that DOS is insufficient." Full 32 bit support is key... (32 bit support was a repeated theme.) He referred to a "popular DOS extender" in contrast.

- "We've listened to you, our customer (another repeated theme) and you've told us that x,y and z are important. We've addressed x,y and z in OS/2 2.0." This discussion focused on reliability and DOS appl. support. They humbly acknowledged their mistakes and talked about better DOS than DOS, better Windows than Windows, thousands of OS/2 beta testers, etc.

- No vendor can do it all. (Implication: If IBM can't, certainly little Microsoft can't). We've developed alliances to embrace the best technologies to address your requirements. Joe G listed a half dozen or so key areas and anywhere from a few to many vendors in each area (including Microsoft in one). He then showed two time lines. One showed OS/2 1.3, 2.0 and 2.X in 1990, 1991 and approx. 1992 or 93. The other showed a new operating system in approx. 1993 emerging from existing technologies (including DCE and DME) and the Apple alliance. Joe G. stated that this OS would use object oriented technology and would have binary compatibility with PM appls. While he talked about OO technology as providing tremendous benefit, he did not explain why.

* Lee Reiswig's demo gave credibility to IBM's strategy. Just as important is the fact that OS/2 looks like the best thing since sliced bread... the interface and ease of use of the Mac with the power, connectivity and IBM support of OS/2. The drag and drop shell looked dramatically easier than Windows, and perhaps even easier than the Mac. The value of their alliance with the key PC communications vendors combined with their own strength in host communications was clearly illustrated. 2.0 APPEARS to be a great product.

* I think that large customers will welcome OS/2 if IBM continues to deliver, and the reaction of the crowd certainly bore this out. If I'm a customer that has committed to OS/2, this session told me

MS 5052717
CONFIDENTIAL

that I made the right choice. If I'm considering OS/2, this session told me I no longer have to bet on operating systems... if Windows is successful I can run Windows appls. under OS/2, and if it's not, I made the right choice. If I'm a large customer, the combination of this presentation and all the presentations I've heard about SAA and enterprise computing, DB2 and distributed database, A/D Cycle and CASE, SystemView and information systems management, etc., tell me that IBM is the vendor that can meet my needs going forward.

* Our Windows and NT strategy is also compelling and I think we will win the desktop, HOWEVER there are important issues in large accounts which I do not see addressed:

1. IBM owns the large account corporate ear. (When I was a marketing manager on Dun and Bradstreet we met at least annually with the CEO, and regularly with the CIO and all IS management. This was typical for large accounts.) It will be difficult to win in large accounts working from the desktop up when IS is rolling out OS/2 appls. from corporate down. If we are not successful at the server level, we are at risk of eventually losing the desktop.
2. IBM owns the large account corporate data. As they add distributed capability to their database products, and start to integrate OS/2 and DB2, how do we sell NT and Windows? I have not heard us articulate a comprehensive enterprise computing strategy even though we talk about distributed processing.

(Both of these items are less important if OS/2 hardware speed and memory requirements relegate it to servers in the first place. However they will still be obstacles.)

3. IBM owns the mainframe. While our ultimate aim is the elimination of mainframes, clearly this is not a near term possibility. They also own the wide area network, and if you include Novell, the LAN. The fact that IBM continues to migrate their mainframe offerings to a client-server world, along with inertia, millions of lines of COBOL, thousands of IS professionals with mainframe skills, IBM PC offerings, etc., insure an IBM rep in every large account for the foreseeable future. How do we insure that whatever success IBM has in large accounts with OS/2 doesn't influence smaller accounts, software vendors, etc.? If we are to win with large accounts and eliminate this issue in the first place, we need to articulate a strategy that addresses the enterprise, an enterprise which currently includes mainframes.

* I think that we need to do a better job of competing with IBM at the strategy game. OS/2 will soon be on the street and if Win 3.1 is not perceived as a radically improved product when it is announced, IBM will recoup some of their disadvantage. Furthermore, we do NOT have a rep in every account so it is even more important that we spread a comprehensive, compelling message far and wide.

(In this regard it should be noted that the Systems and Applications divisions are sending two different messages regarding OS/2 2.0. Systems is saying that IBM is unlikely to properly handle windows apps and Applications is saying we're not building OS/2 specific apps based on IBM's claims. Yes, the underlying logic is that if IBM fails then OS/2 apps will be a moot point, however I think our credibility as a company is enhanced by a clear, complete strategy.)

Michael

1301
From davidcol Wed Aug 28 19:02:26 1991
To: andyhi
Subject: FW: RE: Trouble...
Cc: rickem winwar
Date: Wed Aug 28 19:01:43 1991

we should fix. it's a setup.inf change, right?

1302
From davidcol Wed Aug 28 19:02:49 1991
To: andyhi
Subject: FW: RE: Trouble...
Cc: rickem winwar
Date: Wed Aug 28 19:02:02 1991

we should fix. it's a setup.inf change, right?

>From andyhi Wed Aug 28 17:02:01 1991
To: winwar
Cc: rickem winbeta
Subject: FW: RE: Trouble...
Date: Wed Aug 28 17:00:49 PDT 1991

I just checked setup.inf and the required disk space settings are about 1.5Mb LOW for a new 386 install. I think that we should change these settings for beta2 to avoid the problems below.

These are simple text changes to setup.inf that rickem can make to the existing build.

Objections?

|>From lenalb Wed Aug 28 12:07:53 1991
|To: t-breta
|Cc: winbeta
|Subject: RE: Trouble...
|

MS 5052719
CONFIDENTIAL