

CONFIDENTIAL

Non-responsive Material Redacted

From chuckst Wed Nov 6 18:38:46 1991
To: philba
Cc: scottq
Subject: Scott's 9/30/91 mail re: DRDOS
Date: Tue Feb 23 17:07:06 PDT 1993

>From scottq Mon Sep 30 13:57:38 1991
To: dosdev
Subject: detect dr dos 6.0
Date: Mon Sep 30 13:50:35 1991

X0592196

Does anybody know how to detect dr dos 6.0? Bambi will not

WinMail 1.21 philba Tue Feb 23 16:49:36 1993 Page: 160

run properly on dr dos 6.0 because of a quirk in their device driver handling, so we need to detect them.

Scott

CONFIDENTIAL

From chuckst Wed Nov 6 18:40:05 1991
To: philba
Cc: scottq
Subject: More Bambi/DR-DOS mail
Date: Tue Feb 23 17:07:11 PDT 1993

>From chuckst Sun Sep 29 17:16:46 1991
To: mikedr philba scottq
Subject: Bambi on DR-DOS 6.0
Date: Sun Sep 29 17:16:39 1991

I tracked down a serious incompatibility with DR-DOS 6 -- They don't use the 'normal' device driver interface for >32M partitions. Instead of setting the regular START SECTOR field to 0ffffh and then using a brand new 32-bit field the way MS-DOS has always done, they simply extended the start sector field by 16 bits.

This seems like a foolish oversight on their part and will likely result in extensive incompatibilities when they try to run with 3rd part device drivers.

I've patched a version of Bambi to work with DRD6, and it seems to run Win 3.1 without difficulty. This same problem may have caused other problems with Win 3.1 and the swapfile under DRD6.

It is possible to make Bambi work, assuming we can come up with a reasonably safe method for detecting DRD6. The runtime hit would be minimal in time and space, although we would have a couple of instructions in the main code path for checking the 'special' DRD6 flag.

What do we think? Should we test further with the patched Bambi to see if there are any more incompatibilities????

Non-responsive Material Redacted

X0592197

WinMail 1.21

philba

Tue Feb 23 16:49:36 1993

Page: 161

MS-PCA 1143048
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1143048