

IBM 05/2

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 1052 Comes v. Microsoft

File : c:\brads\wallbox.fld

Messages :

##### 501  
From pauline Thu Oct 31 08:01:51 1991

To: bens  
Cc: bens billig bobau bradsl steveb  
Subject: RE: can win32s play a part here - other ideas?  
Date: Thu Oct 31 08:10:25 PDT 1991

If we are willing to make Win32s be more Win 3.1 specific (which it currently is as we need the loader hook out), we could probably use this as differentiator of Win 3.1 vs Win 3.0 (which is what IBM will have in OS/2 2.0). I will ask wvin how he sets up his environment.

>From bens Wed Oct 30 21:04:48 1991  
To: pauline  
Cc: bens bobau  
Subject: can win32s play a part here - other ideas?  
Date: Wed Oct 30 21:04:11 1991

I'd want to understand what is most important to customers before we started hacking around on Win 3.1, WinMail, Win32s. We should pick the top 3 features and make it difficult (if not impossible) for IBM to carry them forward on OS/2 2.0 (for Windows apps).

Question is, does IBM provide a simulated Windows "enhanced" mode environment, or just "standard" mode. If IBM doesn't support "enhanced" mode, then we should really get rolling on Win32s, 'cause IBM won't be able to support that.

Now, if we pick Win32s as one of these top three features, it kind of begs the question of which 32-bit programming interface is more important. Also, since Win32s is just a set of DLLs that call Win16 and DPMI -- both of which OS/2 2.0 ostensibly contains -- it should not be a great deal of work (though just a bit more work) for IBM to support it. Remember we're planning to give the DLLs to ISV, so IBM doesn't have to ship Win32s.

I think the key weaknesses of OS/2 2.0 vs. Win 3.1 are as follows:

- 1) Printer Drivers and Video Drivers  
To run PH and Windows apps, you need both the Windows and the OS/2 printer and display drivers. [Is this true?] Setup hell!
- 2) Disk space  
InfoWorld this week said OS/2 2.0 use 15-30Mb of disk space. Win 3.1 is much smaller than that (certainly less than 10Mb).
- 3) Integration of OLE and DDE between Win and OS/2 apps  
Clipboard is doable (although metafiles are probably tricky), but DDE and OLE are probably a bit more messy. Check with scottlu or tomw on the latter topics.

4) Hardware platforms  
5671

MS 0082001 CONFIDENTIAL

C:\DHT\MS-HAI

Thu Oct 31 09:16:52 1991

Win 3.1 is tested on a much wider range of hardware. IBM claimed (this was Mike Kogen at the OS/2 v. Win Condex session) that they have 700-900 machines in a compatibility lab at Boca. Don't know for how long, though. I know MS spends lots of time with DOS and Windows getting them to run on wierd hardware. IBM doesn't have the time...

5) TrueType vs. ATH

IBM definitely doesn't have TrueType in OS/2. If we can show that T2 is much faster than ATH, then we can show how Windows support is a wart in OS/2 2.0:

Copy Win app T2 text to OS/2 app (either v/ie clipboard, OLE, or DDE, whichever method works) and the OS/2 app doesn't get the T2 fonts

From pauline Wed Oct 30 17:52:36 1991

To: bens  
Subject: can win32s play a part here - other ideas?  
Date: Wed Oct 30 17:52:16 PDT 1991

>From billig Wed Oct 30 15:59:49 1991  
To: steveb  
Cc: bradsl, pauline, bobau  
Subject: Os/2 compatibility  
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 91 15:59:25 PST

I think it is critical to make mince meat of this notion IBM is spreading around that OS/2 is better Windows than Windows. Specifically, we have to have concrete features that are - meet in Windows that just aren't present in OS/2 2.0! It makes me mad that we don't have anything to point to. Let me give some examples:

- 1. 32bit applications. Does IBM sup Winmem32? If applications can make DPMI calls I don't understand how the operating system is protected from bad application behavior - anyone who can set up and change selectors can bring the whole system down easily. If 32bit applications don't run then lets take some cool stuff in 32bit form and make it freeware as well as get the major vendors to ship 32bit versions and test the performance.

IBM should be able to (assuming they have time) support Winmem32 -- it's just a layer over DPMI, which they claim to support.

I don't think many ISVs are using this, 'cause it wasn't well thought-out. We should look at Mathematica -- I think they used DPMI.

- 2. Fonts. Will IBM have the truetype rasterizer? If not lets make sure lots of truetype fonts ship when 3.1 does - not just the ones we bundle but lots of other fonts. I suppose they can add truetype in but lets say a lot of the standard help thing we ship with Windows is in a font that's available in truetype which we control (no font with same width tables and a with Windows?)

EXHIBIT 1052/10/31/01  
Mualia

Windows/DOS have code pages, too. I'm not sure we're any better than IBM.

4. Metairie exchange - doesnt this break or show bad results or speed?

Yup, but this is a problem. Certainly the OS/2 -> Windows direction requires more work, since OS/2 has beziers, paths, etc.

5. Device drivers. Cant we get there to be lots of device drivers they cant do anything with?

3270, FAX, Scanner, etc. drivers may pose problems. I think the bigger issue will be that users (and administrators) will have to install two drivers -- one for OS/2 and one for Windows apps.

We should design some of our extensions explicitly so that IBM cant run them under OS/2. We need to put some real thinking into this. They think they get to clone us forever based on the stupid marketing slogan. We have to humiliate such a claim.

Wizards. By sheer volume of odd cases, we may be in pretty good shape already.

At least we have to have some great 3.1 dependant stuff. Also we need to diverge our user interfaces from theirs. What does an app do not to run under OS/2?

Diverge the user interfaces. At this late date for 3.17. You're talking scheduling, if we do anything much. We could add cursor animation, (the rotating hour glass, etc.), and we do have found in 3.1. I'd be careful mentioning this around david@olympus.com. They want to ship in March.

I would like to get together to discuss how we get this cloning off our back and make it visible.

-- bens

P.S. What about OS/2 vs. Win 3.1 performance?

MS 0082002  
CONFIDENTIAL