

**From:** Michael Wallent  
**Sent:** Friday, June 06, 2003 5:02 PM  
**To:** Jim Allchin  
**Subject:** RE: Here is the final draft of the email I will send at the end of today

this is a planned change that we've been working on for three months and is ongoing. its the change we talked about w/bill, and will be code complete by 3 august. this is the visual/element/presenter performance redesign. I think of this as a redesign of a particular area rather than a rearchitecture.

do you want more info on this when we meet monday?

(I would not consider this risky at the level of wirfs at all - our partners are well bought in, support the change, and are driving it).

- Michael

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jim Allchin  
**Sent:** Friday, June 06, 2003 3:55 PM  
**To:** Michael Wallent  
**Subject:** FW: Here is the final draft of the email I will send at the end of today  
See below and tell me what avalon rearchitecture he is talking about....

thanks,  
jim

---

**From:** Steven Sinofsky  
**Sent:** Friday, June 06, 2003 2:30 PM  
**To:** Brian Valentine; Longhorn SLT; Jim Allchin; Jack Mayo; Iain McDonald  
**Subject:** RE: Here is the final draft of the email I will send at the end of today

I wanted to provide some additional follow up based on the conversation we had this morning at the SLTT. I think some tangible issues got raised and I think there was some level of concern with most folks in the room or at the very least a recognition that there are issues that remain.

I feel very bad that folks think I stand between this mail and sending it out. In all honesty, I am totally in the middle of a very awkward situation. I am being held to a plan that is based on delivering a specific set of innovations and I strongly believe that implicit in this message to the team is a significant reduction in our ability to deliver on very specific technical goals. ChrisJo outlined some of these in his mail on driving towards a decision on the server plans and WinFS, but I sense this in other places as well (for example, Outlook should be a client of a new grid control in the shell; WSS "12" integration and the shell, etc.) By moving forward with a plan that makes implicit tradeoffs in features relative to this "innovation bar" but not acknowledging these tradeoffs, it puts the burden on me to be the bringer of doom and gloom. I don't like that and really opt for much more clarity in outlining the decisions that are being made, explicitly as well as implicitly.

We've all done this many times. We all know what happens when we tell the team to drive to a date. While we can put a process in place to escalate disconnects or force teams to work together, I think this is a confrontational approach to delivering on the synergies and it makes the default "ship on schedule" rather than "longhorn wave" which has been the marching orders I have been working under.

Plaintiff's Exhibit

7224

Comes V. Microsoft

MS-CC-RN 000001063417  
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

For this mail, I am incredibly appreciative of the change in tone regarding the server and client code bases staying together. Realistically, they will be in sync for no more than about 2/3rds of the schedule (starting today, for the next 24 months, followed by at least 12 months of divergence). This is something we need to be up front about. It might be an enormous gain in efficiency, but the in sync aspects from my "consumer of the platform" are not as high as the label "in sync".

I am also super appreciative of the focus on the near term milestones. I would love to see exit criteria for these milestones that reflect the innovation needs, not just the dates. But that is not for this mail.

The "implicit" decisions I think that are in this mail:

We've picked a number of dates. None of them will be sooner than the dates we picked.

We've decided that getting a release of the client done is now date driven. We feel we have enough of a critical mass of innovation features along the trajectory Bill has put the project. We believe competing with NCS requires us to get this release done as soon as practical and what we have can accomplish that goal.

We've decided that we're going to make a best effort at keeping client and server in sync. But realistically this means server will ship at least 12 months after client. No one is saying less than that now.

Because the client is now date driven, the milestones for the PDC Fall and the Beta in Spring are locked and loaded. This is the primary focus of the team and we should expect behavior that suggests the team is serious about these dates. There are many examples of places where this changes the character of the work—I AM NOT SAYING I THINK THIS IS BAD—and we need to be up front and explicit with folks, particularly Bill, about this. **Avalon is not being rearchitected**, Shell is not going to be managed code, WinFS is going to need to focus massively on delivering for the Shell and Outlook on the client, etc.

The schedule has no room to add things. In seeing the feedback from the M5 reviews, it is clear that M6 is fully scheduled just on things the teams already know about. The awesome breakthrough basics work is still a big work item, just for example. There is plenty of room to polish, but this will be around "local mins" and not around fundamental shifts. There are lots of cuts that will still happen.

Basically for Office, I am concerned about our ability to deliver on the client wave but I also think this is manageable. It is a lot of work with a high degree of uncertainty but we have the risk contained as best we can. We're 100% there.

On the server, I just feel that this plan requires a couple of things:

Flawless execution on the client plan. Less than that widens the delta between client and server—it is not a one for one slip as per numerous conversations with folks.

Somehow finding a way that WinFS is done for the client the same day it is done for the server—managing a code fork for WinFS seems unwieldy and seems that we'll be forced to revise the client code that talks to WinFS if we truly do fork.

And of course actually doing the work to come up with the plan for the server.

This puts Office in an incredible awkward position around syncing with the server.

#1 for us is that we all believe that having Office for Longhorn client is what matters most to the company. We think that there is so little room in the LH schedule that if we miss by just a month we're going to miss the consumer holiday season and then we'll have no business apps and no consumer push.

Our central value proposition to customers is around collaboration which is about innovation on the client and on the server/services. It is a differentiator with NCS. It is what our enterprise customers want. It is how we deliver SA value, etc. There is no Office without new server stuff—our big bets are all on the server (BI, Document Lifecycle, Collaboration, Communication).

If you assume the very best and flawless case for everything this plan has Office12 (client and server) releasing 3 years after Office 2003. We simply feel this is too long for our software assurance customers. And since this is a very best case we're really pushing our luck.

Unilaterally I would propose that we just sync our release with the client and add features to our existing Windows 2003 code. This has the advantages:

We ship new apps for LH client

We are an easy update for existing customers of Windows 2003/WSS, SPS, RTC, etc.

We have a containable and bounded schedule.

We actually have a wave of products—Longhorn Client, Office, New Apps from Office (like our graphics app that will use Avalon), potential synergy around tools if we can figure out managed code, new Portal Server, new BI Server, new RTC server, etc.

Now this has the disadvantages that (some examples):

Our Windows server will continue to innovate without deliberate connection to the IW space.

Deployment and management of Win32 apps is something we might be improving on the server.

WinFS is a bet that we believe will span client and server.

The first two I feel I can propose ways to address. We can easily have 25% of our WSS team dedicated to building the features that will work only on LH Server. We can easily develop deployment and management scenarios that only work for customers with LH Server. This is all customer focused goodness. We did this for our similar initiatives for Office 2000 (TCO required 2000 Server, OWS—the original WSS—required 2000 server). I can control these and would sign in blood my commitment.

I cannot however unilaterally make a decision about WinFS on the server. This makes me a spoiler. However, my intuition is that the combination of decisions implicit and explicit around the client are actually conspiring to the point where we should say that WinFS is a client feature for the LH wave and be sure to get it right for the client. But that is your call. By August we are going to make this call unilaterally—either way. But I am hoping that folks can make a practical decision sooner and not just keep saying "wait and see" since the further along we get the less realistic it is.

Realize I am not making a statement about WinFS abilities or the team, but rather trying to control the variables around WinFS so that it can come together. The conceptual issues around WinFS on the client are significant—will replication work? Will security work? What's the API? are all very real to me. I would love to reduce the risk to the project by allowing focus. I know folks think client and server are the same code and it all just works—from the Office perspective the magic of client and server being the same has not been something we have seen a lot of.

OK, I'm done now. I leave it in your hands. I've spoken my part.

---

**From:** Brian Valentine

**Sent:** Friday, June 06, 2003 6:41 AM

**To:** Longhorn SLT; Jim Allchin; Jack Mayo; Iain McDonald

**Subject:** Here is the final draft of the email I will send at the end of today

So last chance to comment. Goes to Windows Project Status alias. I added some stuff up front to thank people, remind them of where we have come from, etc.

-----

Now that we had a chance to settle down some from the RTM and launch of the Windows Server 2003 and we have completed the first round of high level reviews for the next wave of Windows products (a.k.a. Longhorn - in case you have been hibernating all winter) I want to let everyone know where we stand on that thinking. Before I get too deep into the next wave, I want to first thank the Windows Division and all of internal partners for yet another great release. With the delivery of Windows Server 2003 we have officially, and I might add - very successfully - completed the Whistler wave of products. WOW - what a wave built by a great team! Just think back of the progress we have made: we finally established the NT kernel as the one code base across the desktop and server, XP is VERY cool and introduced new experiences and Windows Server 2003 is an awesome hit in the IT shops. I am not kidding on what a hit the server is becoming, every, and I mean every, customer I talk to loves it!

Of course, completing the Whistler wave was not without some pain. We split the desktop and server trees and we know how difficult that was to keep them in sync. Our engineering processes and how we plan, architect, design, build, test and service our products still need lots of work to scale up to the size of teams it takes to deliver these products - its still way to hard to on everyone. Security has moved to the forefront of everything we do. Even though we have established Windows even stronger in the industry with the Whistler wave, the competition has not sit still either, Linux has also made progress and IBM is not sitting still with WebSphere, Novell is still out there and Sun still runs many of our customers line of business applications. In light of this, it's time to really kick off the next wave of Windows.

Our goal is that with the Longhorn wave is to start the next major innovation wave of Windows that will take us long into the future. The way to think about this is that the Whistler wave completed the wave of Windows that started with Win95 and NT. It's time to start retooling the platform to enable whole new scenarios and to change existing scenarios to be much better, easier and simpler for our users. We have to keep innovation at the forefront of what we do in this wave if we are going to continue to win customers with the best products that have the highest value. One note here; when I say innovation, I don't mean just cool new UI, I mean innovation in everything we do, yes even the basics around quality, reliability, manageability, scalability, componentization, application migration and compatibility, engineering process, servicing our products and customers, customer connection and satisfaction, et al.

I know there has been some confusion about our schedule and plans for the Longhorn release. This always exists when we kick off a new wave as significant as Longhorn. While we have made great progress on the Longhorn client, issues remained with the schedule, the role of the server, and clear communication overall.

Over the last couple of weeks a number of people in the management team have been working to review & rationalize the Longhorn plan and our overall release timeline for the next year. This work culminated in a review held last week with BillG, SteveB & the Senior Leadership Team (SLT), and this mail details some of the decisions made through those reviews. Following this mail, WPoole will send a mail with Client specific details & Billy will send a mail with Server specific details.

#### **Our Overall Priorities**

We have two priorities over the next 12 months:

1) **Servicing Our Customers**

Critical Fixes - QFE, security, Watson

Windows Server 2003 SP1 in Q4 - which includes AMD64 support

Windows XP SP2 in mid-2004

Work with our customers to deploy XP and Windows Server 2003. There are still too many customers out there not running the latest Windows and therefore aren't experiencing all the great work and features of those products.

**2) Deliver Longhorn Client Beta 1**

Complete the combined Longhorn Client & Server plan  
Deliver Longhorn Design Preview for the PDC in October  
Deliver Longhorn Client Beta 1 in April 2004

These are not either/or priorities - we must and will execute on both of these objectives. To ensure we have clear focus across all the teams, we have specifically cut back other major releases we had considered to focus on delivery of the above priorities.

**Shipping Longhorn**

As you are all aware, we have done extensive planning around the Longhorn Client release, and we are working on M5 now. In the meeting with the SLT, we made the decision to deliver both server & client versions of Longhorn out of a single code base. The timeline looks roughly like this: the client release is targeted at August 2005 (to deliver for the holiday 2005 season), with the Server to be released as soon as possible after that date, and Service Pack 1 of client will be released with Server out of the same code base. We want to keep the code bases in sync as long as possible and keep the unnatural acts we had to go through in the Whistler wave to a minimum. We cannot ship the client and the server as we all know it takes much more time for the server, we have just released the current server and need to give our customers time to deploy it.

As part of the Longhorn Wave, the Office and MSN teams will be working on releases that are optimized for Longhorn and take advantage of the Longhorn platform. Both of these teams are still very early in their planning process and we need to continue to partner with them and ensure that the Longhorn platform meets their needs. As a company, we are taking a very serious and strong focus with the Longhorn wave to not only deliver a great Windows platform but to also bring that new innovation out with all of the Microsoft applications and tools.

The Longhorn Client vision remains very much what it has been up to now:

**Amazing Experiences in Communications, Mobility, Entertainment** - Software and Services for Media and Gaming, Everyday Information - Searching & Reading, Communication and Collaboration, and Fundamentals

**Breakthrough Managed Platform** - LAPI for Presentation & Media, Communication & RTC, WinFS, Security, Friction Free Apps, Fundamentals

**Customer Satisfaction** - Nailing the Basics for all customers, Connecting and Closing the loop with customers in new ways

**Partnerships** - Great solutions for customers with the Windows Server, Office, & MSN.

Planning a Longhorn Server that drives synergies requires answering new questions. The key to delivery will be focusing on the delta between client & servers release being as short as possible & managing core parts of the system to not change in that delta period. With the help and support of many of you, Billy and team are signed up to get a plan in place by 8/30.

The vision for the server release is focused on three things:

**Simplicity in Operations and Deployment** (a key part of client fundamentals as well) -

Componentization, Imaging & Updating, Monitoring & Diagnosing, Scripting, Connecting & closing the loop with customers make Windows Server the lowest TCO server

**Best Server for Office 12 and Longhorn Client** - Communication & Collaboration Experiences get much better when a Windows Server is added

**Distributed application platform** - The most productive platform for designing/developing & deploying/operating managed app/web services

Even though the two lists above are short, and the devil is in the details, those of you that have been involved in the planning so far know how much innovation is contained in the above. We are really breaking new ground in many areas and finally embarking on cleaning up a lot of the areas that are overdue for this new architecture. I am really excited to hear the thinking and see the work we have done so far. Longhorn will truly be a product line that innovative and will bring the world many great new scenarios to the PC industry.

While it is our ambition to release the Client in August 2005 and the Server as quickly as possible afterwards, there are still a number of issues that we need to address over the coming months.

**WinFS.** The WinFS team has made great strides over the past several weeks, and now has a plan that converges to ship by August 2005 for the client scenarios. At the same time, we all recognize the WinFS plan is ambitious and it is clear that the team will run into issues in implementation. In particular, we are still working to understand what (if anything) can be done with WinFS for the Longhorn Server. We will continue to track WinFS progress, with our next WinFS checkpoint in late June, and if there are changes that impact the schedule we will let you know.

**Longhorn Server.** Because it is our ambition to deliver the Longhorn Client and Server out of a single code base, there are some must have Longhorn Server features that will impact teams working on Longhorn. While it is our expectation that we will be able to deliver Longhorn on schedule, there may be areas where, again, we will have to adjust either features or schedule to deliver on the Server. We should have a clear understanding of these areas by the 8/30 checkpoint. This means there is no server deliverable for the PDC and at this time there will not be a server release for Beta 1.

Under any plan, it is obvious there is the need for another Development Milestone - M7. M7 will go from the PDC in October to late January, and Longhorn Client Beta 1 will now be in April 2004. JoePe & IainMc will send a mail detailing the updated plan, as well as milestones with entry and exit criteria.

#### **Release Roadmap**

At this point, our release roadmap looks as follows. Our top objectives are to deliver Windows 2003 Server SP 1 & Longhorn Client Beta 1, and we will adjust other releases as necessary to hit these dates.

- > 10/2003 - Longhorn Design Preview Build for PDC (owners: JoePe, JackMayo)
- > 12/2003 - Windows 2003 Server SP 1 & Windows AMD64 (owner: ClydeR)
- > 4/2004 - Longhorn Client Beta 1 (owners: JoePe, JackMayo)
- > 6/2004 - Windows XP SP 2 (owner: MakA)

#### **Next Steps**

Our next steps as a leadership team are:

Update the Longhorn schedule with M7 and the new Longhorn Beta date. This schedule will include milestone checkpoints for change management and adjustment, as well as a monthly communication on Longhorn project status. (JoePe, IainMc, ChuckC by 6/20)

Complete Server planning & update schedule. (BillV, JoePe, IainMc, ChuckC, KyrilF, JJamison by 8/30)

Drive to Longhorn Design Preview & Windows 2003 Server SP 1. (all)

#### **What Each of You Can Do**

I recognize that there is a ton of variability across the teams, and so I expect your manager to follow up with specific priorities for each group. At a high level, they are:

- Continue to fix critical customer issues - security, QFE, Watson
- Address bugs and issues for Windows 2003 Server SP 1 & Windows AMD64
- Complete your Longhorn plans (client and server) & deliver for Longhorn M5

As I have said for the last 4+ years I have been part of Windows, the Windows Division is a great division made up of great people that build great products. I am very proud of everything we have done and I am super excited about the Longhorn wave. Everyday I see great new thinking that will allow us to continue to win of customers by giving them the best products out there. Thanks to all of you for all the hard work and let's keep focusing on what matters and ignore what doesn't.

If you have suggestions, comments, or feedback for me or the leadership team, please let me know.

Thanks,  
Brian