| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Ramesh Parameswaran |
| **Sent:** | Saturday, October 18, 1997 11:10 AM |
| **To:** | Viktor Grabner (Systems) |
| **Subject:** | RE: Coopting UNIX |

Blah blah is too polite. If you see below I called it bs

-----Original Message-----
| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | **Viktor Grabner (Systems)** |
| **Sent:** | Friday, October 17, 1997 8:09 AM |
| **To:** | Ramesh Parameswaran |
| **Subject:** | RE: Coopting UNIX |

Sorry, I didn't mean to suggest that you are not focused on ie and oe. I guess it's more of a mental thing for me too, to make an effort to ignore all this strategic blah-blah, just keep an eye out for how this might affect ie and charge ahead (instead of doing tempting thing and jumping right into the discussion.)

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Viktor Grabner (Systems) |
| **Sent:** | Friday, October 17, 1997 7:54 AM |
| **To:** | Ramesh Parameswaran |
| **Subject:** | RE: Coopting UNIX |

blah-blah. let's concentrate on ie, oe.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Ramesh Parameswaran |
| **Sent:** | Thursday, October 16, 1997 9:55 PM |
| **To:** | Viktor Grabner (Systems) |
| **Subject:** | FW: Coopting UNIX |

Don't know if you saw this bs

-----Original Message-----
| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | **Dan Neault** |
| **Sent:** | Sunday, October 12, 1997 3:31 PM |
| **To:** | Bill Gates; John Frederiksen |
| **Cc:** | Paul Maritz; Eric Rudder; Jim Allchin (Exchange); David Vaskevitch; Steve Ballmer; Tod Nielsen; Charles Fitzgerald; Brad Chase; Bob Muglia (Exchange); Rich Tong; Enzo Schiano; Mike Nash; John Frederiksen; Ramesh Parameswaran; David Cole; Morris Beton; David Vaskevitch; Cornelius Willis; Gary Schare; Joe Maloney |
| **Subject:** | RE: Coopting UNIX |

In response to some points you raise below (pls pardon the delay in routing):

2.      Picking Mainsoft as our partner for Windows API's on UNIX and revving up their activities. We need to highlight ISVs that are using this and tie it in to #1 and #3. I don't want this to be free but for ISVs who ask we will find a way to avoid them paying a royalty like we have already done for CA. I have always believed in #2 more than most other people but we have to be serious about it

- Under the new amendment to the existing agreement, Mainsoft has requested waivers for 17 other ISV applications: reviewing these in concert with MorrisB
- We have a draft termsheet (~4 pages) for a new contract almost finalized to send to Mainsoft
  - We now become dependent upon Mainsoft for (i) IE, (ii) DCOM, (iii) SoftImage, (iv) Windows API's on Unix, and (v) SourceSafe on Unix (minor effort) -- we have included relevant groups in the review. The technical/project management/prioritization challenges of keeping these synchronized are non-trivial.
  - Our arrangements with each of SAG and Bristol demonstrated the risk of relying on third-parties for Msft technologies on Unix -- competing business opportunities may distract our partners' best people -- we are highly sensitive to this in our new arrangement with Mainsoft. who aspires to significant growth.

**HIGHLY
CONFIDENTIAL**

MSB 0015101

MSB 000000015101

- Further. Mainsoft is not an overly "strong" company in a sense of management or business track record -- we must be realistic about what they can accomplish
- Accordingly. it may be judicious to maintain Bristol as a second source in the marketplace -- despite their transgressions. I will be briefing JimAll on this shortly
  - If we do renew Bristol, the details of the arrangement will likely differ. and we may stipulate that Mainsoft share certain interface specifications with Bristol
- Beyond maintaining Bristol as a substitute for Mainsoft. we desire to secure necessary buyouts and rights so that we can take this over ourselves if needed -- this is a possibility we should not ignore

4.    Highlight the ability of UNIX workstation users to run Windows applications by using the Citrix software client. We need some examples of this for the sales force when they run into Unix workstations. We may need to be one selling the Citrix client in some cases by buying it from Citrix - some customers will only accept this solution if we stand behind it. Some customers do this today but I couldn't find the case studies on our web site.

- JohnFre is working the marketing issues and should comment on case studies, but in regards to Citrix-specific issues. Citrix will be offering X-Window service in addition to ICA service on Unix. and they are happy to have us reselling any of their Hydra-related products.
  - Additionally, ICA is able to serve individual applications (vs. a desktop), allowing for special pricing programs for specific ISV applications.

... the NEW THING I think we should do....I think we should say that all of the COM+ interfaces are available on UNIX even though we only provide the COM interfaces....We can even have somone like Transarc or one of the old UNIX transaction systems go ahead and implement some of the interfaces. This is great for us. It will never be as cheap or as integrated as it is on the NT platform. We should even encourage them to do this.

- Previous Mainsoft and Bristol agreements allowed them to put any NTS technologies on Unix clients or servers, but we have had a client focus primarily in the Mainsoft renewal
- However, Mainsoft is interested in a pricing model that would allow them host Msft technologies on Unix servers. Bristol has claimed that Unix servers offer more upside for Windows APIs on Unix than clients.
  - We could include COM+ (or some subset thereof) on Unix as part of Mainsoft's stated charter -- with fulfillment of this charter a low priority. This could be instead of. or in addition to, companies such as Transarc
  - Also, if we don't want Mainsoft to be porting some of our server-side technologies, we must be explicit about these

Thanks.
--Dan

(deleted)

Bill,

A number of points in your original email touched on work that Object Marketing is currently doing. Here is some input on those points:

"Taking over the Software AG code in the sense of standing behind it. This didn't get announced at the PDC but I understand the deal is close to getting done. This will be a positive step"

Agreed. Press, consultants and customers do not view Software AG as a credible supplier for COM. We are strengthening this story by providing more direct involvement by Microsoft with the vendors who are licensing this code on their non-Microsoft platforms. Microsoft is now working directly with HP, DEC, SNI, and soon with SGI, to make sure that they can ship COM on their systems as quickly as possible, and that customers know that Microsoft stands

168

behind this code. COM on UNIX and other OS's will be positioned as a great interoperability platform for building three tier applications. The upcoming deal with Software AG aims at accessing additional Software AG ports (including the ports for IBM proprietary systems), and transitioning their experience with cross platform COM to Microsoft. The trick here in the PR space is going to be amplifying Microsoft's involvement without overly marginalizing Software AG.

"Work with the OMG group despite our wariness of them to get them to accept DCOM protocol as one way of doing interop. There was a recent quote where they seemed quite open to this. We should make this official and get it touted heavily. We need a standard answer for how we accommodate Corba"

Any direct work with the OMG will be deftly positioned against us as the beginnings of support by Microsoft of IIOP and CORBA. Instead, we are spending time coopting the individual members of the OMG. One example is our current negotiation with Iona, the leading supplier of CORBA ORBs in the marketplace. The deal which we are discussing is that Iona will license COM directly from Microsoft and make the following statement: "Market realities require that we license COM in order to provide the interoperability which our customers demand" Discussions are continuing on the terms of the deal. Iona will get a stronger interoperability story for their ORB. We will get a great PR win, as well as some fragmentation within the CORBA ORB marketplace (Imagine Visigenic when they see this) We've got a great opportunity here.

The only reason OMG is talking reconciliation is that for the most part they are getting beaten in the press and analyst community these days. A point to keep in mind when thinking about trying to reach accommodation with the OMG is this: According to the OMG themselves, there are expected to be only 45,000 CORBA licenses worldwide at the end of this year. (Source: quote from Chris Stone in the Iona Systems Journal, just before he left the OMG for Novell). Were CORBA not an anti-Microsoft initiative which is useful to "Gang of Four" it would be dead by now.

"Work with IBM to see if we can get any of the interfaces in #1 and #2 on MVS and AIX. Try and agree with them on #6."

Agreed. Trying to work directly with IBM makes sense. Particularly after we get hold of the COM ports for their bread and butter systems. My suggestion is to stop dealing with "Open Systems" groups that are representing IBM in forums like OMG and who have a vested interest in CORBA/Java and instead deal with practical product folks who understand that interoperability with COM in the Microsoft marketplace is a pragmatic requirement. We've had discussions with some of the IBM Austin folks on this issue and we will continue to pursue this.

"Work with Apple to try and get some element of our COM/VM strategy into their so they are not totally in the JAVA camp in a pure way."

Apple has expressed interest in licensing COM. We will be setting up a meeting for next week as a follow-on to the discussions with them by others on VBScript.


—Original Message—

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Bill Gates |
| **Sent:** | Sunday, September 28, 1997 4:58 PM |
| **To:** | Paul Maritz |
| **Cc:** | Eric Rudder; Jim Allchin (Exchange); David Vaskevitch; Steve Ballmer; Tod Nielsen; Charles Fitzgerald; Brad Chase; Bob Muglia (Exchange); Rich Tong |
| **Subject:** | Coopting UNIX |

This message is one in the long history of exchanges of what do we need to do on UNIX to get ISVs to write software in a way that makes NT win. Nowadays the key issue is avoid the JAVA interfaces becoming the primary one ISV's use.

I will argue for continuing to do the things we are already doing with some new emphasis and doing one new thing.

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL**

MSB 0015103

What we are already doing (besides trying to win every sale against UNIX)

1. Taking over the SAG code in the sense of standing behind it. This didn't get announced at the PDC but I understand this deal is close to being done. This will be a positive step.
2. Picking Mainsoft as our partner for Windows API's on UNIX and revving up their activities. We need to highlight ISVs that are using this and tie it in to #1 and #3. I don't want this to be free but for ISVs who ask we will find a way to avoid them paying a royalty like we have already done for CA. I have always believed in #2 more than most other people but we have to be serious about it.
3. Finish a UNIX IE and get some visible users for it. Doing UNIX IE has taught us a lot about #2.
4. Highlight the ability of UNIX workstation users to run Windows applications by using the Citrix software client. We need some examples of this for the sales force when they run into Unix workstations. We may need to be one selling the Citrix client in some cases by buying it from Citrix - some customers will only accept this solution if we stand behind it. Some customers do this today but I couldn't find the case studies on our web site.
5. Survey the ISVs to understand what they need in order to focus on our interfaces. I still haven't seen anything back on this.
6. Work with the OMG group despite our wariness of them to get them to accept DCOM protocol as one way of doing interop. There was a recent quote where they seemed quite open to this. We should make this official and get it touted heavily. We need a standard answer for how we accommodate Corba.
7. Work with IBM to see if we can get any of the interfaces in #1 and #2 on MVS and AIX. Try and agree with them on #6.
8. Work with Apple to try and get some element of our COM/VM strategy into their so they are not totally in the JAVA camp in a pure way.

I don't want the COM on UNIX work and the Windows API's on UNIX work to be viewed as 2 separate things. I don't want IE to be viewed as a separate thing. All of these things should fit together.

Here is the NEW THING I think we should do.

Anything in the world that needs to be done the JAVA guys just define an interface. In fact they take anything we do and define their own interface for it. [Sometimes their interface is nicer than ours because ours is so ugly like OLE DB and its pointers but I will leave that for another message]. The JAVA group DOESN"T care if there is no implementation of the interface or if the implementation costs money or only exists on a few platforms. They just publish the interfaces and declare victory.

I think we should do the same thing. I think we should say that all of the COM+ interfaces are available on UNIX even though we only provide the COM interfaces.

Do COM transactions work on UNIX? Of course because we have defined these interfaces. We can even have somone like Transarc or one of the old UNIX transaction systems go ahead and implement some of the interfaces. This is great for us. It will never be as cheap or as integrated as it is on the NT platform. We should even encourage them to do this.

So the NEW THING is to say that the interfaces are there on UNIX and we are pleased with that.

MSB 0015104

MSB 000000015104