

68
From sheriv Wed Sep 4 11:13:45 1991
To: bradsi
Subject: Re: DPMS licensing to OEMS.
Date: Wed Sep 04 11:13:15 PDT 1991

Intel now thinks they would rather license source to DOS/X to accomplish their goals, rather than go the DPMS route. Have we ever done this before w/OEMs? Can do w/Intel?

>From bradsi Thu Aug 22 14:57:55 1991
To: sheriv
Subject: Re: DPMS licensing to OEMS.
Date: Thu, 22 Aug 91 14:54:16 PDT

a dpms version of windows will only run standard mode. the dpms server takes care of the virtual memory management and multiple virtual machines.

we are willing to produce dpms-client versions of windows for oem's who license Windows and make corresponding commitments to windows. we will not be providing the dpms-client version as the retail product.

it would also be up to the oem to do all the testing and support.

>From sheriv Thu Aug 22 14:36:36 1991
To: bradsi
Subject: DPMS licensing to OEMS.

>>do they want a dpms windows, or just a dpms server?

Intel has a DPMS server. They want a version of Windows that will run on top of their server.

They currently have Windows in Standard Mode and would like to get it into Enhanced Mode.

>From sheriv Wed Aug 14 17:26:12 1991
Subject: Re: DPMS licensing to OEMS.

Intel is looking for a version of Windows that will run on top of a DPMS-client host o/s (ie., their industrial, multitasking, multiuser "iRMK-for-Windows" o/s). RMK today runs Win apps in real mode. Intel is targetting enhanced mode to allow DOS apps to run in separate windows (as opposed to full-screen), and they need either DPMS to do this, or could also modify DOSX source to achieve this (if we would license them source). Obviously their first choice would be to get DPMS code.

FYI, iRMK-for-Win runs concurrently w/DOS on a single microprocessor. After loading DOS, the user can switch to RMK, which suspends DOS and switches the MP into full 32-bit mode and encapsulates DOS as a VM86 task. The user can switch between the DOS prompt and RMK environment (used for real-time app devlt). RMK is 32-bit, multitasking, multi-user, preemptive (sound familiar?)

69
From bens Wed Sep 4 11:15:52 1991
To: jimt moshed
Cc: bradsi johnen nackm paulma
Subject: Re: DOS/WIN32 bugs in NIBUG database
Date: Wed, 04 Sep 91 11:15:24 PDT

[retransmission, in case this got lost in yesterdays alias fiasco]

I'm confused. Back in May, johnen and moshed agreed that we *would* use a common database. What has changed? It is not like the DOS group is going to generate a ton of bugs before end of September, so we're not going to perturb your work.

It seems like a lot of extra effort for us to create a temporary DOS bug database...

MSC 00703023

CONFIDENTIAL

MX 6168323
CONFIDENTIAL

Plaintiff's Exhibit

9506

Comes V. Microsoft