

Debra Vogt

From: Bill Gates
To: Mike Maples; Paul Maritz; Pete Higgins; Steve Ballmer
Subject: RE: OS synchronization
Date: Saturday, November 06, 1993 8:10AM

I thought Paul's mail was a very good summary of the situation.

I am personally in favor of a very open discussion of these issues where we involve this group for a period to see if we agree and then broaden the discussion out.

The organizational challenges are hard - the dependencies are hard. However I believe in the synchronized strategy. I agree with Paul it would require some OFFICE'95 focus around it to make it worthwhile. Paul's description just reinforced my enthusiasm for the synchronized strategy.

We need to try and align Messages, technologies, and products as much as possible. This would be a big step in that direction. We need an organizational structure that can handle the non-perfect alignment of these things but the current systems plan is just too hard to allow us to improve a lot of things.

Some of the features that people don't think about much like graphics, printing, some UI stuff, etc., is almost impossible to improve on our current leapfrog strategy. Also I think OFS which is big time leveraged on the client is properly timed as late '95 with applications support in the synched strategy.

From: Paul Maritz
To: Bill Gates; Mike Maples; Pete Higgins; Steve Ballmer
Subject: RE: OS synchronization
Date: Thursday, November 04, 1993 6:38PM

Please treat memo below as confidential, and don't forward (at all) - but I would be interested in your feedback/views.

<<File Attachment: SYNC.DOC>>

From: Bill Gates
To: Paul Maritz
Cc: Mike Maples
Subject: OS synchronization
Date: Monday, November 01, 1993 12:04AM

This doesn't require any response since it's just a sort of repetitive point in an ongoing discussion.

We have to synchronize our OS releases in order to do innovation without insanity.

We are wasting so much effort in trying to keep these things sane and it is debilitating effort. It's unempowering and confusing. The differences are getting bigger and choking us.

Shipping an OS that is not a big apps platform is asking for failure. If OFS has to be on the client that is fine but OFS is too big for the mainstream until late '95.

My heretical view is that shipping both Cairo and Chicago 2 in late '95 would be the best if realistic.

I thought about giving apps OFS and the Shell to ship but I worry that OFS might be so big people would laugh at our applications.

Plaintiff's Exhibit
7701
Comes V. Microsoft