Non-responsive material redacted

420
From janineh Tue Mar 26 14:51:50 1991
To: andyhi sheriv
Cc: bradsi davidcol kaysaw tonya
Subject: RE: IBM questions about 3.1 code
Date: Tue Mar 26 14:49:46 1991

The only exception I would take with this is the DPMI code issue.
It has nothing to do with them being able to build a product.
It has to do with their desire to back this code into 3.0a.

It is true we know what files have been modified for DPMI client
support. What is also true is that SteveB was very, very
reluctant to send this to them. It is again also true that IBM
has not spent any time trying to find out where or what the code
should be. They aren't even looking in the right part of the
code.

It isn't my call as to whether or not we tell them. I just don't
see why we should help them when we didn't want to give it to
them in the first place. It is entirely independent of the
committment we have to help them build the product.

|>From sheriv Tue Mar 26 14:39:49 1991
|To: andyhi
|Cc: bradsi davidcol janineh kaysaw tonya
|Subject: RE: IBM questions about 3.1 code
|Date: Tue Mar 26 14:37:28 PDT 1991
|
|Well, the intent of the contract was to license them a product that
|would build. We not only over-committed ourselves on that, but are
|now appearing reluctant to assist them with resources to get them
|to a point where they can build product.
|
|Both davidcol and bradsi said in the Ballmer/Reiswig meeting last
|week that we'd provide the resources IBM needs to get the product
|built. Period. I really think that 1) since it's a fairly

|trivial effort to tell them how to locate the DPMI code (2 minutes!!?),
|we should just do that and 2) set timg's expectations so that he
|understands that he may have to spend a couple hours with them
|initially to get them up and running on how to build the product,
|but after that initial training experience, the requests will taper
|off.
|
|Janine, when I talked to you yesterday, I didn't realize that bradsi
|and davidcol had made these commitments in the meeting. We should
|stick by them, especially when it's a relatively small work effort.
|Believe me, we get far more negative press at IBM from being this
|resistant than you can imagine, and we should endeavor to at least appear
|reactive to their requests. If they really become a support burden,
|then we should revisit the issue, but we need to keep our commitments
|for now.
|
|>From   andyhi Tue Mar 26 12:05:15 1991
|To: sheriv
|Cc: janineh
|Subject: IBM questions about 3.1 code
|Date: Tue Mar 26 12:02:39 PDT 1991
|
|I just got a second phone message from beth schreiber asking questions
|on how to locate the DPMI code in the 3.1 source drop of 3/15.
|
|What contractual obligation do we have to help them, and how do we want
|to respond?
|
|Janineh double-checked what we shipped, and the DPMI code is definitely
|in there.
|
|I don't want ibm boca to get the idea that we will help them at all on
|this, if we aren't obligated.
|
|Thanks
|Andy
|

421
From tonya Tue Mar 26 15:00:58 1991
To: andyhi davidcol
Cc: bradsi sheriv
Subject: RE: Reiswig mtg summary
Date: Tue Mar 26 15:03:41 PDT 1991

 there is an internal debate going on within IBM. the s/w
guys want to give us the source and have us deal with the
headaches of maintaining it. the h/w guys want to keep the
source because this is a proprietary thing they want to
protect. we are trying to get source but it may be a drawn
out debate.

>From   andyhi Tue Mar 26 14:43:35 1991