Cc: johnlu
Subject: Re: winHEC
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 92 08:36:56 PST

good point — i will bring it up with paul.

19
From bradsi Mon Feb 10 08:37:59 1992
To: ericr
Subject: Novell projects review
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 92 08:37:59 PST

>From jimall Mon Feb 10 08:18:48 1992
To: aaronco bobmu bradsi daveth johnlu paulle paulma steven
Cc: anthonys tonya
Subject: Novell projects review
Date: Mon Feb 10 08:16:56 PDT 1992

In \\worf\scratch\jimall\winword\devproj1.doc

are drafts of the first 5 development projects with Novell.

1. Lamborghini - Netware client side for non-protect mode
2. Cobra - Netware client side for protect mode (Windows-based)
3. Pantera - Netware client side for Windows NT
4. Formula - Connection to Novell directory system from Cairo
5. TransAm - Netware support for RPC (naming, security, and transport)

Phrases such as "Licensed Work", "Beta Test Materials", and "Resource Materials"
are rigorously defined in the SOA. Basically, Licensed Work says both parties
have full rights. Beta Test Materials means information that follows
a standard beta test agreement. Resource Materials means information
that is used during the development process. Extremely limited rights
apply to things in this category.

Please review your respective sections. We want to send this
out on Wednesday. Please send comments to tonya since I will
be gone until Wednesday. I will review changes with Tony
before we send them out.

thanks,
jim

20
From bradsi Mon Feb 10 08:38:33 1992
To: jimall
Subject: Re: FW: EMAIL auto_notify
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 92 08:38:33 PST

john's in town today after all, but i did sent to ericr anyways.

21
From bradsi Mon Feb 10 08:39:00 1992
To: philipg
Subject: Re: Our discussion
Date: Mon, 10 feb 92 08:38:59 PST

10:30 or 11?

22
From bradsi Mon Feb 10 08:47:58 1992
To: davidma sharonh
Subject: Re: Formal Request for Interview
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 92 08:47:57 PST

go for it, dud! make the cat test effort the best in the company!

23
From bradsi Mon Feb 10 08.51:11 1992

To: davidcol
Subject: Re: message
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 92 08:51:10 PST

what the guy is supposed to do is feel uncomfortable, and when he has
bugs, suspect that the problem is dr-dos and then go out to buy
ms-dos. or decide to not take the risk for the other machines he has
to buy for in the office.

Privileged material redacted

Privileged material redacted

25
From bradsi Mon Feb 10 10:50:05 1992
To: steveb
Subject: Re: the message
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 92 10:50:05 PST

i am saying that we should either:

a) let it do whatever it does, as is the case with win 3.0. if a
user with dr-dos calls, we tell them we only support ms-dos and they
should call their vendor.

or

b) put a kind gentle message in setup. like an incompatible tsr
message. but not everytime the user starts windows. if a user
calls pss, treat like (a).

A kind gentle message in setup would probably not offend anyone and
probably won't get the press up in arms, but I wonder if it serves as.
much of a warning. *Priv. material redacted.*

With a TSR, the solution is to just remove it. With DR-DOS, or any
others, I doubt the user is in a position of changing. He will no
doubt continue to install. When he finds problems, he will call PSS,
with or without a message. I think our biggest exposure is PSS. We
will get a lot of calls from Dr DOS users. Perhaps a message in the
phone system for Windows. It would say something like "if you are
not using MS-DOS or an OEM version of MS-DOS, then press ##". Then
we give them the message.

i admit i'm gun shy on this, especially with stewart's irritated mail
to me.

the most sensible thing from a development standpoint is to continue
to build dependencies on msdos into windows.

26
From bradsi Mon Feb 10 10:52:28 1992 ·
To: karlst
Cc: davidcol
Subject: Re: the new message
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 92 10:52:27 PST

i'm in the process and we're getting close.

27
From bradsi Mon Feb 10 10:55:33 1992
To: davidcol
Subject: ** NetWare/Winball Status **