From:	Bill Gates
To:	Eliyezer Kohen
Cc:	Peter Pathe
Subject:	RE: Transport to the Word business unit
Date:	Monday, November 08, 1993 6:51PM

We only have one group that can make money on text capabilities and that is word.
Destroying the WP market by putting great text technology in the OS that our WORD group does not use is not our business plan. The majority of our profits come from Word and Excel. This is under attack. The only way for us to benefit from advanced text work is to have it shipped in Word. We would not make more money from the OS by putting this in as a rich rich text capability.

I want to maximize the chance we integrate this good work in future versions of our word processors even if that makes it a little less likely that it is integrated in other places as soon.

I am not capable of ever having this technology ever used by work if Nathan and I have to meet and then in a diluted way tell the word group what is going.

Given the goal of word integration as #1 doesnt the organizational plan make the most sense?

We need to have Word stay ahead of its competition. We are finding that challenging. We want the strong group you are talking about to contribute to our business success - specifically allowing Word to win. I will never ship advanced text code that isnt an integral part of word.

The word group wants to lead in technology. Look at the work dale is doing on his rule based "autocorrect" engine. We give them the best chance by having a very smart group working with them.

The UI for advanced text is very important - just an engine is not a solution. The problem needs to be solved as a whole with a goal towards applications success.

From: Eliyezer Kohen
To: Bill Gates
Subject: Transport to the Word business unit
Date: Monday, November 08, 1993 7:30PM

Hi Bill,

I have been informed that you are planning to transport my product group into the Word business unit in order to develop a text engine which will serve a variety of Microsoft products.
I want very respectfully to voice my opinion against this plan. This mail is not about the virtues of our business unit. I hardly qualify to voice an opinion in business matters. But I am an engineer, and this mail is about engineering.

The goal is to successfully develop a text engine which will serve a variety of Microsoft products like Office and Multimedia and that probably will require some changes to our operating systems. The best place to conduct this project is outside of any one of these groups, a place where we can weigh the needs of all of these groups and make the necessary trade-offs. Transported to the Word business unit we will of course be limited by the charter of the Word business unit. This will result in the development of a text engine for Word as opposed to a text engine for Microsoft, thus compounding the already existing problem.

Since I have come to Microsoft I have tried to follow certain software design methods which emphasize architecture design and reliable implementation in small groups as opposed to big groups and debugging.

Example: In the last 18 months we rewrote the TrueType rasterizer achieving considerable gains in performance and memory requirements with almost no assembly coding. Of the total development time 30% was spent designing the new architecture and algorithms, 60% was spent with the implementation, and 10% was spent debugging. In June we released the code (in time) to Chicago

MS-PCA 1519713

HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 152

MX 5049756
CONFIDENTIAL

and Hewlett Packard. Since then we have had a total of less than 10 bugs against the code
We achieved this without using any testers.

My exposure to other groups in Microsoft has shown that these design principles
are not shared by many people. Moreover I have had the experience that these design
methods tend to invariably give rise to increased resistance. Transported
to the Word business unit we shall end up adjusting to their design methods which are
characterized by big groups and debugging. I do not think that we shall be able to develop the
text engine successfully under these conditions.

In the last three years Steve Shaiman has successfully managed us through several
engineering projects while making the best use of our working methods. Through constant
guidance he has given us the broader picture for the projects we have been involved in,
and he has created an environment where our design methodology can benefit the company
in the best way by creating reliable products in time. The right way to successfully
develop the text engine is to have a couple key people (development plus program
management) from the Word business unit be incorporated in our product group in order
to teach us the requirements of Word and to take back the text engine to Word.

You are our boss whom I respect very highly. This mail is not written out of loyalty to any
person, it is in sole consideration of what is the best way to develop the desired text engine.
I do not think that we can develop the text engine successfully under the above
mentioned conditions.

For any further questions I am at your disposal.

Kind regards

Eliyezer