Non-Responsive Material
Redacted

From bradsi Mon Feb 10 10:39:55 1992
To: davidcol greglo russs terrib
Cc: billp
Subject: RE: Novell license
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 92 10:39:53 PST

i agree most strongly the need for novell to test their drivers before they release them. this has been a big problem with win 3.0, where they released new drivers that simply did not work with windows. so we would have to tell people to not use the "current" one and had a list of versions that "worked". obviously, this is very bad and we need some assurance from novell that things will work in the future; and further, given past history, we cannot agree to automatically install the latest version.

>From terrib Mon Feb 10 08:56:19 1992
To: davidcol greglo russs
Cc: billp bradsi
Subject: RE: Novell license
Date: Mon Feb 10 08:55:34 PDT 1992

> 1) The NCTs are supposed to be submitted as part of the agreed upon test plan. I think this generally means they should be frozen as part of the test plan. If we improve them as we go along we can certainly share that with Novell, but if there was ever a dispute then the NCTs submitted as part of the test plan would be reverted to.
>
> => i just don't feel comfortable with agreeing the quality level is defined by a setup tests which are suppose to be done at feature complete time. Reality says there will be holes we need to fill post fc time. focusing entirely on the NCTs might pimp quality come ship time. IE there's a bug, but novell says "hey the NCTs pass".

Major omission here is that the NCT's themselves only test basic network functionality. Although we have done quite a bit with tests for Novell specific functionality for 3.1, we can't write tests for drivers we haven't seen, nor can we guarantee the bandwidth to write tests specific to Novell. I believe this area was intended to be covered by the wording which specifies that Novell must submit a test plan to us, but since the contract doesn't seem to give us the ability to dispute their proposed test plan, there seems to be a major hole here.

> 2) You are worried about the 5 day freeze period, but so is Novell. They remeber win 3.0 when even though we said we were not changing any code relevant to their drivers we made some change which caused them to crash and they had to scramble for a fix. They demanded a period AFTER we freeze to prevent this from happening again. We can try to go back to the mat on this again, but honestly it is very late in the process to do that. If you wanted to protest this you should have spoken earlier. It will be tough to get changed now without throwing off the contract.
>
> => fine, I will just lie to them if this is the case. We'll give them a build we think is final, then if bugs need to be fixed, we'll fix them and not tell Novell. Russ, you asked for my feedback since we'll have to live with this license. Change wording to golden master instead of final. If you don't want my feedback, don't ask. Sticking to the letter of this section is not doable in real life.

Minor point... Novell did not scramble for a fix, we did. We provided fixed code and gave them the ability to distribute.

4)As far as Novell testing their components outside of the Win 3.x development process, we certainly hope they do that, but I don't see how we can tell them what they have to test, etc. for their own products, being sold via their own distribution, with their own name and not in a Windows or MS box. For anything WE distributed, I agree with you, but are you saying something more?

=> I guess this was overlooked. Novell consistently releases code which has lots and lots of bugs in it. They released shells and other components after we shipped Win 3.0, which didn't work with Win 3.0!! We should make them run the HCTs on EVERY release of the shell, and Windows components that they release to the public, whether these ship in the WIndows box or not. Maybe this can be done outside of the contract. BUT, there's a sectio nin the contract which says our setup program is suppose to not stomp on newer components which Novell may release. These "new" components are likely buggier than the ones we will ship with WIndows, so I think it IS reasonable to put something like this in this license.

This should be the intent of the compatibility program with respect to Network drivers. I agree 100% with David that we must put in place a method or program that Novell agrees to for testing and verifying their components post ship.

Non-Responsive Material
Redacted

Non-Responsive Material
Redacted