

From martyta Tue May 12 10:22:29 1992  
To: billg bradsi jeffr jonl paulma steveb  
Cc: collinsh martyta w-clairl w-pamed  
Subject: RE: Windows vs Os/2  
Date: Wed May 13 09:22:43 PDT 1992  
Status: RO

We should set up a review meeting with bill to go over the aggressive program that we have been executing on in the last three months and get his feedback on what else we can do.

Prior to that meeting, we should have claire and collins send billg an email summary of the coverage and the expectation for things to come. That summary should go to bill today or tomorrow if possible.

We have been very aggressive with review editors and FUDing OS/2 both prior to and immediately after the Windows 3.1 launch. For the general press who have been seeded with 8 meg systems from IBM, the results are acceptable. Many publications, such as PC Magazine PC Computing and PC World, have given 3.1 glowing stories and much more prominent coverage than OS/2.

I will work to set up the meeting as soon as possible.

>From billg Mon May 11 18:14:52 1992  
To: steveb, jeffr, martyta, paulma, bradsi, jonl  
Subject: Windows vs Os/2

Date: Mon, 11 May 92 18:13:52 PDT

Perhaps I am missing something but I am getting the impression we are really asleep on this Os/2 thing. Maybe its like the meeting I went to where everyone said we cant comment on Os/2 and compare it to Windows just before the Windows launch. The net results is that we are being beaten badly in the press - yes people say some things about win 3.1 (and some bad things) but they say Os/2 is better. The wall street journal said it (mossberg). The New York time not only said it but they said the analysts are in agreement that Os/2 is a more bug free easier to use superior product. The best we manage is that we might be a better marketing company.

I think its just a failure. OS/2 is not as reliable. OS/2 is not easy to us for anyone who uses windows applications. We are incapable of doing the job right it appears and we have to change what we are doing.

The total lack of any mail, or memo on this topic is disturbing. The impact of this PR is incredible. We are losing accounts to Os/2 that we would not have lost if the PR was accurate. I havent seen anything about bugs in Os/2. I dont know of any efforts on our part to fix the problem. Unchallenged PR like this will cause the reviewers to find a way to be consistent with our losing.

Find me the person who said Os/2 is a product not ready for widespread use and a bad product for a windows user.

If there is any confusion about the importance of our competition with Os/2 it should go away. This is our most important competitive battle. We should be smarter and more willing to put resources onto this than anything else.

I can't seem to raise anyones attention to this. When I went to that meeting people were saying "os/2 is a dead issue and microsoft shouldnt continue to talk about it". I am not advocating brute force - I can do that by myself- the reason we have marketing and PR people is to figure out a smart way to do these things.

MS 5033196  
CONFIDENTIAL