From pcmgatel!brianv Wed Sep 23 14:15:27 1992
From: brianv
To: brianv, cameronm, doughe, johnlu, rsegal
Cc: cameronm, danielp, jerryp, johntip, jonl, lauraj, maxb, nickh, paulma
Subject: RE: documenting wfw calls
Date: Wed, 23 Sep 92 14:11:00 PDT
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0
Status: RO

Alls I can say is holy API batman... I'm not kidding... we are talking
about litterally 500-800 apis here, no joke... all of layers, all of mapi
0, etc and there is virtually no documentation on these right now. It means
it will be literally many many man months to get this done and all with no
resources allocated to do this.

Paulma, is this what we really want to ? It will not be a whitepaper, but a
very large whitebook...

> From: Cameron Myhrvold
> To: brianv; doughe; johnlu; rsegal
> Cc: cameronm; danielp; jerryp; johntip; jonl; lauraj; maxb; nickh; paulma
> Subject: RE: documenting wfw calls
> Date: Wednesday, September 23, 1992 01:26pm
>
> To answer your "global question" we unfortunately cannot hide behind
> the "It's not an app, it's part of the
> system" defense for Bullet and Bandit. Schulman took apart all of the
> Windows shell apps in his book. We
> WILL be specifically tried for these interfaces. Ideally we should
> document everything the Bullet and Bandit
> themselves use.
>
> Now this may sound horrible, but:
>
> 1.) We'll document, but we WILL NOT encourage, and in fact, we'll
> aggressively discourage any use of these
>   interfacesby ISVs (and won't be talking about them); and,
>
> 2.) Remember we are not going to stick this doc into a book or even an
> SDK box. It will be written up as a
> whitepaper and "inserted" into the MSDN CD-ROM containing hundreds of
> Meg of other tech notes. It will be
> very "low profile", but it will provide enough "air-cover" for us to
> say they are documented.
>
> This is what I'm afraid we need to do. Paul?
>
> Cam

>> From pcmgatel!brianv Wed Sep 23 11:04:32 1992
>> From: brianv
>> To: cameronm, doughe, johnlu, rsegal
>> Cc: danielp, lauraj, jerryp, johntip, maxb, nickh
>> Subject: RE: documenting wfw calls
>> X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

>> Here is mail I sent on this eariler... I have not heard any
answer
back yet
>>   from Rick. I told Rick he should work with JerryP on mail and
JohnTip on

sch+, but I think there is a global question that needs to get answered first and that is just what exactly are we going to doc ? There are 100s of layers calls, 100s of mapi0 calls, etc etc and I think it is a real waste of time to spend the huge #s of man hours will take to doc these. So what is the answer, I took a stab at it below but heard nothing back....

Here is the mail I sent eariler:

From: Brian Valentine
To: rsegal; mikesart; nickh; toddw
Cc: doughe; jonkauf; suzanf
Subject: RE: Hidden hooks for Beyond

I want us to be very very clear here on what is going on, else we are going to dig ourselves a hole and be screwed for the future. What I understand as to what we are doing as far as the white paper is doc'ing undocumented apis that apps may be using. Well since mail and sch+ are in the OS, they are not apps. So I don't see any reason to doc anything. Word, excel, PPT, project, et al just use simple mapi to add the send on their menu, they dont use anything else.

can see a nice well organized white paper that talks about using simple mapi and how to mail enable apps, etc etc, but I dont see it doc'ing ANY store, address book, etc apis.

Granted there are litterally 1000s of apis that deal with the mmf file, that deal with address book, etc etc, but we SHOULD NOT publish these. Nobody is using them except for mail and sch+. We dont publish ALL the internal windows apis or data file formats, just the ones that apps have used. So we need to make sure that we are in line on exactly what rick's paper is going to be.

Just talk about simple mapi and capi is all we should do.

comments ?

From: Cameron Myhrvold
To: brianv; doughe; johnlu; rsegal
Cc: jerryp; johntip; maxb; nickh
Subject: RE: documenting wfw calls
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 1992 09:42am

Paulma thinks we have to document the Bullet and Bandit stuff and Danielp has committed. I do not know timeframes, but clearly there is big exposure with guys like Andrew Sculman running around. If we do not do this expeditiously we lose the value of doing it at all.

Brian, Rick, when do we think this will be completed?

Cam