

From: doughe Sat Sep 25 21:53:56 1993  
X-MSMail-Message-ID: 30CEBA9A  
X-MSMail-Conversation-ID: 7B2B1EBD  
X-MSMail-Parent-message-ID: 7B2B1EBD  
X-MSMail-WiseRemark: Microsoft Mail -- 3.0.729  
From: Doug Henrich <doughe@microsoft.com>  
To: jonl  
Date: Sat, 25 Sep 93 21:51:08 PDT  
Subject: FW: capone and Chicago

-----  
From: Doug Henrich  
To: Brad Silverberg; Dennis Adler; David Cole  
Cc: Doug Henrich  
Subject: FW: capone and Chicago  
Date: Saturday, September 25, 1993 3:49PM

I am not sure what your thinking is about publishing the the interfaces/APIs that Capone uses, but I know Lotus will make a big deal of this. (Manzi has already mentioned it to Billg). And I am afraid that the press will have another field day with this.

-----  
From: H.K. Ken Ong  
To: Tom Evslin  
Cc: Doug Henrich; John Ludwig; John Purrier; Jonathan Lazarus; Paul Maritz; Steven Sinofsky  
Subject: RE: capone and Chicago  
Date: Friday, September 24, 1993 12:44PM

Message-Id: <9309241946.AA19857@itqmsm>  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

We're on the same wavelength: "by the book" meant we continue to make sure we let Chicago know we're using which calls. It's up to Chico to decide whether they publish the calls.

-----  
From: tomev  
To: kenong  
Cc: doughe; johnlu; johnpur; jonl; paulma; stevesi  
Subject: RE: capone and Chicago  
Date: Friday, September 24, 1993 12:14PM

What do you mean "play by the book"? The APIs may, in your judgement, be fit for public consumption. However, there is no current plan to make them public. It is, and should be, the decision of the Chicago team on whether they make these public. WGD's obligation is to not use any interfaces that Chicago isn't aware that we're using and I believe we're doing that.

-----  
From: kenong  
To: doughe; johnlu; jonl; paulma; tomev  
Cc: johnpur; stevesi  
Subject: RE: capone and Chicago  
Date: Friday, September 24, 1993 11:48AM

MS 5043511  
CONFIDENTIAL

Today, we're not using any Chicago API's which aren't fit for public consumption. It's just a question of whether Chicago chooses to publish

MS5043511

those calls. We agree that we shouldn't break this unless we have to.

How about this: The directive to the Capone & Chicago teams should be to continue to play by the book. If this becomes too onerous, we (Capone team)

will let TomEv know before invalidating this assumption. Until then, you can assume we're kosher (but you shouldn't assume that we'll be able to stay

kosher forever).

-----  
From: Doug Henrich  
To: johnlu; jonl; paulma; tomev  
Cc: kenong; stevesi  
Subject: RE: capone and Chicago  
Date: Friday, September 24, 1993 10:45AM

I think this is problematic from a PR and ISV issue. We have always told the development and press community that capone would be included with future version of windows, but we would use mapi and be replaceable. We have tried to be hard core about this explaining that it does not make sense to build competing mail products, but of course every existing mail vendor will, and will try to differentiate themselves from our offering..

Several big and small email vendors will be upset, and this will play out as an unfair advangate issue with the press. I think we want to avoid this.

-----  
From: Tom Evslin  
To: John Ludwig; Doug Henrich; Jonathan Lazarus; Paul Maritz  
Cc: H.K. Ken Ong; Steven Sinofsky  
Subject: capone and Chicago  
Date: Thursday, September 23, 1993 6:46PM

Message-Id: <9309240147.AA07388@itgmsm>  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

Discussed this with BillG today. Since capone is quite literally part of Chicago, like any other system component, it can use internal interfaces to communicate with other system components. In accord with good programming practice, explicit dependencies on interfaces which may change in the future should be kept to a minimum.

MS 5043512  
CONFIDENTIAL

MS5043512