CONFIDENTIAL

Non-Responsive Material Redacted

From bradsi Thu Nov 7 09:15:49 1991
To: davidcol debrav philba
Cc: billp
Subject: Re: More Bambi/DR-DOS mail
Date: Tue Feb 23 17:07:42 PDT 1993

if you keep looking, you'll see there was follow up mail from
either chuckst or johnhe that says he made a mistake and drdos
was doing things ok.

> >From philba Thu Nov 7 08:37:13 1991
> To: bradsi davidcol debrav
> Cc: billp
> Subject: More Bambi/DR-DOS mail
> Date: Thu, 07 Nov 91 08:30:11 PST

> >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

MSC 090003098
CONFIDENTIAL

> 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????

CONFIDENTIAL

Non-responsive Material Redacted