

From: Dan Neault <226827@microsoft.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 1998 7:39 PM
To: David Hostetter <94823@microsoft.com>; John Balciunas <220@microsoft.com>
Cc: James DeBragga <145945@microsoft.com>; Jeff Bialozor <400704@microsoft.com>
Subject: MSB 0013840: RE: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

Your other mail was sent before this one and I'm not clear on the status. This isn't about saving a few dollars on products, but I'm not in favor of approving letting them ship the files. The files in the SDKs are often different than the files in the build. If the supporting vendor in question has the products, they have some version of the files, hopefully the same version, and it seems what you are trying to do is save them some logistics. This would require a redistribution license. If you want us to do this, we will. To do so, we would want to know the name of the company doing the work for them and the location. The contract could be with SGI. Alternately, SGI could compare the files to those in the SDK – or for that matter you could – and advise that the vendors in question get a copy of the SDK and VC 6. Also, the SDK and VC 6 products themselves may allow for redistribution.

I know this is urgent, but these things always are. I'm not comfortable breaking the rules when a license can be done in a day.

Please let us know if you want to do this.

Thanks,
–Dan
—Original Message—

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: David Hostetter
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 1998 12:55 PM
To: Dan Neault; John Balciunas
Cc: James DeBragga
Subject: MSB 0013840: FW: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

More info: It looks like these files are contained in other readily available products (see below). I am planning on giving SGI the green light to ship those specific file to the customer so long as the customer has the products in which they appear. Suggestions/Comments?

Thanks,
Davidhos

—Original Message—

Plaintiff's Exhibit

9618

Comes V. Microsoft

Confidential

MSPCAIABR 0021730

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: Paul Bronowski
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 1998 11:28 AM
To: David Hostetter; Bret Grinslade; Eric Sassaman
Subject: MSB 0013840: RE: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

Comments below in blue...
Paul

-----Original Message-----

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: David Hostetter
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 1998 11:16 AM
To: Bret Grinslade; Paul Bronowski; Eric Sassaman
Subject: MSB 0013840: RE: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

Hi All,
These are the files that SGI really is interested in using... they do not appear to be in the SDK that we ship. Do you happen to know if they might be in some other product that we ship (so I do not have to get a separate license for these file for the third party company)?

- sdk\inc\crt\ctype.h (In the Platform SDK from current NT builds, but also ships in VC6)
- sdk\inc\crt\string.h (NOT in the Platform SDK, but ships in VC6)
- sdk\inc\crt\stdarg.h (In the Platform SDK from current NT builds, but also ships in VC6)
- sdk\inc\ntverp.h (In the Platform SDK from cert-server, but also ships in VC6)
- sdk\lib\placefil.txt (NOT in the Platform SDK, don't know if it's in VC6)
- sdk\inc\mfc30\afxres.h
- sdk\inc\mfc40\afxres.h
- sdk\inc\mfc42\afxres.h

A version of afxres.h exist in a Platform SDK sample, but it is not a global header. This file ships with VC 4.x, 5.x, 6.x MFC headers.

- sdk\inc\mfc30\winres.h
- sdk\inc\mfc40\winres.h
- sdk\inc\mfc42\winres.h

A version of afxres.h exist in a Platform SDK sample, but it is not a global header. This file ships with VC 4.x, 5.x, 6.x MFC headers.

- sdk\inc\crt\except.h (In the Platform SDK from current NT builds, but also ships in VC6)

Thanks for any help you can provide.

Davidhos

-----Original Message-----

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: Bret Grinslade
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 1998 2:17 PM
To: David Hostetter
Cc: Steve Wright
Subject: MSB 0013840: RE: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

Are these things developers should get from Microsoft? We would like to make sure the SDK has the right OpenGL bits.Thx.

—Original Message—

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: David Hostetter
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 1998 1:46 PM
To: Paul Bronowski; Eric Sassaman
Cc: Bret Grinslade
Subject: MSB 0013840: RE: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

Thanks All!
Please do not worry about this issue any longer... I had SGI do a file comparison and they determined that they have extra files not included in the SDK (real bumner).

Thanks again for the suggestions and assistance!

Davidhos

—Original Message—

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: Paul Bronowski
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 1998 1:26 PM
To: Eric Sassaman; David Hostetter
Cc: Bret Grinslade
Subject: MSB 0013840: RE: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

Unless Bret has other ideas, this is very big time hit for us. I would install the current SDK from \\devkits\release\sdk\daily and compare notes. If you really want to figure out where files are coming from, you can scan all the BOMs (*.txt) in //ORVILLE/RAZZLE/src/setup/BOM/platformsdk. The second column in each BOM contains tagnames that are defined in servname.txt, which defines the pickup location (server\share). The third column in the BOMs specifies the subdir where the file specified in the first column lives. If you are going fishing, I'd just use "findstr.exe /i [filename] *.txt".

Thanks,
Paul

-----Original Message-----

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: Eric Sassaman
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 1998 12:51 PM
To: David Hostetter
Cc: Paul Bronowski
Subject: MSB 0013840: RE: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

Such a list does not exist in simple format. Paul, jump in anytime. The SDK pulls files from all over the place. It's easy to find out *where* a particular file in the SDK came from, but no concise list of which files from which particular src server/tree are in the SDK and where they are in the SDK.

Nor are all the files from the NT source tree in one place in the SDK. I can give you a dir list of headers/libs, but it's going to include a lot more than what came from one particular NT source tree.

With excruciating pain you could construct such a list from //ORVILLE/RAZZLE/src/setup/BOM/platformsdk. Look at servname.txt to see the definitions of the "short" server names, then those short names are referenced in all the .txt files. It's pretty much undoable.

Thanks for the info on Dan, I'll definitely file that one away. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: David Hostetter
Sent: Saturday, October 31, 1998 5:52 PM
To: Eric Sassaman
Subject: MSB 0013840: RE: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

I was just curious if *you* knew which subdirectories/files were included in the SDK (from our build tree)... For your info, most of the source license deals go through Dan Neault now (previously it was through JBa).

I have asked SGI to look at the SDK to verify, but was looking for an internal resource to check with, thus my mail to you. I'll follow up with Jean or someone else in dev.

Thanks for the reply!

Davidhos

-----Original Message-----

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: Eric Sassaman
Sent: Friday, October 30, 1998 7:02 PM
To: David Hostetter
Subject: MSB 0013840: RE: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

If you mean that want to put all the headers they listed below in the Platform SDK, that's just totally unrealistic. We don't add a bunch of headers and libs to the SDK on customer request. We publish only what's publicly documented, and all the public apis are in there, and no more. We certainly won't publish info on undocumented APIs/flags.

If you mean they want to send all those directories to a 3rd party that isn't covered by their license agreement, that's an issue that needs to be worked out with the folks that worked out the original licensing agreement with them. I have no idea who that would be, I'd start from the source and get a copy of the license agreement and see who worked on that on our side.

If you're asking "are the files below already in the SDK", then they can simply check, but note that the files we ship in the SDK may be different than the ones in the NT src tree. Basically, if it's a documented API, we ship headers/interfaces for it.

-----Original Message-----

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: David Hostetter
Sent: Friday, October 30, 1998 9:35 AM
To: Eric Sassaman
Subject: MSB 0013840: SGI NT 4.0 SDK question

Eric,
Sorry for hitting you out of the blue, but I thought you might be able to help. SGI is used to working with the NT source, however they have some international issue that they want to do some outsourcing. They want to share the files to an outside party listed below (in the mail), but want to ensure those are publicly available files in the standard SDK. Could you provide any help or pointers?

Thanks,
Davidhos

-----Original Message-----

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

From: Mark Fleisher [<<mailto:mfleisher@esd.sgi.com>>]
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 1998 6:35 PM
To: David Hostetter
Cc: Kathy Hargis; Simon Zarrin; Ken Klingman
Subject: MSB 0013840: FW: kit directories

David,

Per your conversation with Kathy this evening, here are the directories we intend to ship. We'll talk tomorrow,

Mark

> -----Original Message-----

> *****

BRISTOL TECH V. MICROSOFT
CONFIDENTIAL

> *****

From: Joe Brenner [SMTP:doom@latveria.engr.sgi.com]

> Sent: Thursday, October 29, 1998 6:16 PM

> To: mfeisher@latveria.engr.sgi.com

> Subject: MSB 0013840: kit directories

>

>

> As promised...

>

>

> Current list of required directories for international kit:

>

> These are the ones that I think I definitely need:

>

> nt\public\tools*

> toolroot*

> nt\public\oak\bin*

> nt\public\sdk\inc*

> nt\private\developr*

> nt\public\sdk\lib*

> nt\public\sdk\lib\386*

> nt\private\sgi*

> nt\lib\386*

> tools\bid+re\installs\SureRestore 2 Installation*

> docs\endusr\help*

> l10n*

>

> These are the questionable ones, which at this point I

> think won't be needed:

>

> nt\private\bidtools*

> nt\private\inc*

>

> I don't believe the following location did anything for me,

> so I've dropped it:

>

> nt\private\sdktools\tools*