From bradsi Mon Apr 29 11:05:50 1991
To: bobgu davidcol philba timbr
Subject: Re: More Undocumented Windows
Date: Mon Apr 29 11:05:46 1991

totally agree, bob!

| > From bobgu Mon Apr 29 09:23:45 1991
| To: bradsi davidcol philba timbr
| Subject: Re: More Undocumented Windows
| Date: Mon Apr 29 09:18:35 1991
|
|
|
| | |
| | | Brad, one very major item I forgot in my previous list:
| | |
| | | Microsoft really need to publish the source code for all the
| | | built-in controls (EDIT, etc.), just like the source for DefWindowProc
| | | was made available. It's nearly impossible to subclass things in a
| | | rational way, because it's difficult to tell how they implement their
| | | behavior in the first place. This of course has been a common complaint
| | | for years.
|
| Call me paranoid, but the day we publish sources to the controls is the day
| we can no longer enhance them. This isn't just speculation. We have has
| to add numerous work-arounds in our code to satisfy some app that has
| reverse-engineered some internal feature of a control and assumed that it
| would never change.
|
| The basic question is how hard we want to push for a common user interface
| vs the desire of ISV's to create custom controls by hacking ours. Hopefully,
| the AFX project will eliminate this problem.
|
|
| | |
| | | Frankly, I also think it would be useful to release in some wau
| | | the source code for various system utilities, such as Program Manager,
| | | File Manager, Task Manager, etc. Perhaps Microsoft already does this
| | | through "Microsoft University" courses? Actually, that would make a very
| | | interesting and useful book, by the way, sort of along the lines of the
| | | "Inside Windows" book you were discussing: a detailed walkthrough of the
| | | source code for several key Windows components. Would be very enlightening.
|
| The question here is when are we going to publish our shell API's? To date,
| all the "juicy" API's needed to write a shell have been undocumented.
|
| Soap Box Statement
| ------------------
|
| This group has been MUCH to lax when it comes to adding API in the product.
| Both external and internal. We don't do any sort of API policing within

| the group. ISV usability issues are rarely considered. For example, the
| palette support API is a total mess because the developers doing the work
| decided what the API would look like without regard to how the ISV would use
| it. For undocumented API's we add them at will without thinking about
| whether or not they should be documented. They are hacked in ugly things
| that often eventually get documented. PrestoChangoSelector is one of these.
| We need to do a better job at this.
|

6
From bradsi Mon Apr 29 11:10:21 1991
To: jimall
Subject: Re: FW: Re: change in Win3.1
Date: Mon Apr 29 11:10:20 1991

thanks. i agree with ericr's viewpoint. we should do it
right, if we can.

schedules for 3.1: will ship the same time. but we do have to fix
some additional things we hadn't planned on.

7
From bradsi Mon Apr 29 11:56:04 1991
To: bradc
Subject: Re: dos announce
Date: Mon Apr 29 11:56:03 1991

what do you think? i'd rather not send the whole development team.
but if they'd be very bummed then I'd reconsider. did the whole
developement team go to the win announce?

8
From bradsi Mon Apr 29 11:58:47 1991
To: pattys
Cc: jodys
Subject: ISV support issues
Date: Mon Apr 29 11:58:44 1991

good ideas!

| > From bobgu Mon Apr 29 11:20:34 1991
| To: bradsi
| Subject: ISV support issues
| Date: Mon Apr 29 11:16:03 1991

| There needs to be SENIOR developers/program managers in the Windows group
| whose job it is to:
|
| - Act as PSS-Development intermediaries
| - Reduct the support overhead from developers
| - Feedback product weaknesses to development based on ISV feedback
| - Work closely with User-Ed to create usefull manuals
| - Create real-world sample apps that do real things.
| - Monitor Compuserve and other popular BB's to gleen usefull information
|
| These people need to be free from any product responsibilities and be 100%
| totally focused on driving User-Ed and PSS to provide quality ISV support.
| The reporting structure of these people has to be free and clear of the
| groups that have product responsibilities. Take the past SDK groups as
| an example of what happens when ISV support people are a sub-group of the
| retail product development group.
|
| It's great to hear that you get 5 new heads to do things like this. I hope
| they don't get mired down in the political muck of getting a product out
| the door.
|
| - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
|
| Now, here's the real kicker - wouldn't it be a good idea to have all of
| this in place and available for Win 4 by the time ISV's started using the
| product???!!!
|
| - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
|
|
| That's all for now....
|
| - BobGu
|

9
From bradsi Mon Apr 29 11:59:31 1991
To: bobgu
Subject: Re: ISV support issues
Date: Mon Apr 29 11:59:30 1991

great ideas. I've talked to pattys (gm pss) about having you
on the developers support strike team, and she agreed.
you should hear from her shortly (maybe today).

##
10
From bradsi Mon Apr 29 12:00:30 1991

To: davidcol
Subject: some ideas
Date: Mon Apr 29 12:00:29 1991

| >From stewk Mon Apr 29 11:29:41 1991
| To: bradsi steveb
| Subject: some ideas
| Date: Sun Apr 28 11:26:36 1991
|
|
| 1. To Improve Win3.1 Robustness:
|
| * Buy "Robustness" Tools
| Purchase a suite of Win backup/recovery tools from Symantec
| or some other vendor and bundle with Win3.1.
|
| * Completely Eliminate the UAE Message.
| Replace it with a "Global Protection Fault" message ala OS/2 2.0 so that we
| appear no worse than OS/2 2.0. Plus make attempts at diagnosing
| the problem with a help dialog box. We will still be inferior in that
| we require rebooting. But we will signal to users that we've revamped our
| error handling, that the scheme is similar to OS/2 2.0's, and
| that it is in some ways better because of our help dialog.
|
|
| 2. To Discount the Better-Windows-than-Windows Claim:
|
| * Put in OS/2 2.0 and WLO-detection into Win3.1.
| If an app is WLO, then run it. If OS/2 2.0 exists and the app is not
| a WLO app, then put up an error message indicating that:
| - the app is not certified by MS
| - that it can be run at one's own risk.
| Hard for IBM to make a Better Windows claim with such a scheme in place.
|
| Once we detect the existence of OS/2 2.0, there may be other special
| warnings we can emit that highlight legitimate problems with Windows apps
| running on top of OS/2 2.0. For example, a message, each time one
| prints, that says the the Windows and OS/2 printer models are different
| and that output will be different between the two systems.
|

##
11
From bradsi Mon Apr 29 12:04:17 1991
To: tonya
Subject: Re: DOS/Win and IBM
Date: Mon Apr 29 12:04:13 1991

a good sign