

From bradsi Sun Jan 12 11:05:06 1992
To: davidcool richt
Subject: Re: fulling implementing ms-dos presence detection
Date: Sun, 12 Jan 92 11:05:05 PST

right. i want to get permission from that guy on cis who sent the mail (did I send you a copy or was it bradc?) complaining about all the problems he's had with drcdos and that we'd do our customers a big service if we were more vocal/active about it, to pass his letter on to the press.

>From davidcool Sat Jan 11 17:21:15 1992
To: bradsi richt
Subject: fulling implementing ms-dos presence detection
Date: Sat Jan 11 17:20:50 1992

I am still not clear on a few things here:

- when we implement the full message and all the switches. I think we will go ahead and implement the switches as soon as possible. I recommend we add the full message for the first release in Feb. Don't have an exact date, but I imaging this means a regression release with this in it will make it to CIS first half of Feb.
- how do we go about disclosing this to the world. There's of course the press and then there's our beta crowd. I've been monitoring the forums and so far there's been no big issue pop up to respond to in this regard. I don't think it would be smart to drop this on people and take the pain. I'd rather react to the first person who figures it out. What do you guys think? Richt, what did you determine with the PR group on this.

>From bradsi Tue Jan 7 08:37:24 1992
To: davidcool
Subject: fulling implementing ms-dos presence detection
Date: Tue, 07 Jan 92 08:35:24 PST

>From w-clairl Mon Jan 6 15:31:21 1992
To: bradsi
Subject: fulling implementing ms-dos presence detection
Cc: lizsi martyta richt w-delonl
Date: Mon Jan 6 15:26:47 1992

This is the feature that sends the user a warning that Windows 3.1 is not running on MS DOS (or PC DOS I presume) and therefore there may be incompatibility....right?

I think its better that our beta test editors know about this in time for their first look articles, and in time to allow us to position this with them. We met with Richt on Friday and are agreed to go out to see our core technical trades and receivers again this month. We can mention this as part of the changes in Beta 3 and talk about why we felt this was the best thing for our users. It must be positioned this way—not some kind of technical wizardry that will prevent Win 3.1 from running on DOS clones, but that as responsible software vendors we have to alert our customers to problems that they might experience that we have NO control over.

I think it's managable and I reiterate that it's better to tell our beta testers and position properly than have them "discover" it on their own.

The big question is what happens when this leaks to PC Week, as it will. We might consider telling Paul Sherer "off the record" in one of your conversations some of the things in beta 3 and mention this as one thing that will be in there. It's riskier but at least this might be one way to difuse the situatioe with him.

I am not as concerned about Infoworld. Stuart Johnston is pretty controllable. Other opinions, team?

Calire

EXHIBIT
120

MS 5049568
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1150709
CONFIDENTIAL