

require MS to get source code from other app developers for their "working models"

This probably does not have to be source code, although it complicates the probl

Some of these can and should be done in parallel.

- a) Create an SGA logfile to C-code file translator.
This will take the SGA logfile ASCII text and create C calls in a compileable file.
- b) Generate SGA logfiles for the apps using scenarios described above.

One point we settled during the meeting is that you could easily append these lo
Since this particular activity is necessary in ALL scenarios, we should begin it

- c) Run the logfiles through the tool created in a) to create an initial cut of a C file for the app.
- d) Analyze the file created in c) for ways to reduce file size.
 - 1) strings - replace strings in the data file with a single string and point all text_out string pointers to this single string.
 - 2) repeated blocks - inspect the code to find repeated blocks of calls that can be cut out and put into a loop.
 - 3) other potential items - ?
- e) Run SGA on the new app to create a text file to ship to those vendors that want to know what is being called within the benchmark.

CONCLUSION

We must begin to work within MS to determine which apps are to be used in our scenarios.

My original mail proposes a list of apps, including MS apps as well as some outs

NathanFrom nathanm Fri Jan 31 18:20:36 1992
To: karenh rashid
Record-folder: D:\NATHANM\FOLDERS\WSENT.FLD
Subject: FW: IBM, Apple, and Digital Video
Date: Fri Jan 31 18:20:42 PDT 1992
Mail-Flags: 0000

>From robg Fri Jan 31 18:18:22 1992
To: nathanm
Subject: IBM, Apple, and Digital Video
Date: Fri Jan 31 18:17:37 1992

>From robg Fri Jan 31 18:08:44 1992
To: billyg mikemap paulma steveb
Subject: IBM, Apple, and Digital Video
Cc: bradsi jonl robg tonya
Date: Fri Jan 31 18:08:34 1992

MS 5024776
CONFIDENTIAL

Plaintiff's Exhibit

7644

Comes V. Microsoft

Some very interesting opportunities have come up for us in the last few days. If we coordinate our act internally and play things right externally, I believe we will end up with a very good outcome for Microsoft. Best case we could end up driving a pretty significant wedge between IBM and Apple (at least in the multimedia area).

Background (including recent developments):

-- Many people within IBM are unhappy with the IBM/Apple deal, especially in the multimedia area. They believe that Apple is fleecing them by doing all of what were supposed to be the Kaleida activities as just apple things (e.g. Sculley's PDA speech). When I talked with Mike Braun at others at Demo '91 they were more optimistic about IBM being at least rational regarding Windows than they have been in over a year, and it seemed that resentment towards apple was at least one component of this. In particular Braun now believes he may be allowed to ship Windows-only PS/2s, endorse the Multimedia PC, ship Windows versions of IBM's multimedia titles, etc.

-- We have told Apple that if they give us "Quicktime video" for free or close (e.g. a one-time small flat fee) we would consider promoting it as a Windows standard (probably in addition to the AVI video format). However as I understand what Sculley told Bill (which is consistent with what apple guys are telling me privately) Apple wants to make quicktime video format a "standard" in a way that will either (1) permanently advantage the Mac or (b) provide Apple a revenue stream on Windows. As a result MS has made no commitment to supporting Quicktime video from a SYSTEMS perspective.

-- IBM has what looks to be a very good motion video compressor/decompressor technology that they call "PhotoImage" or "Ultimage." They showed it at Comdex running under OS/2 and it looked quite good. Braun and co would love to work with us to make it the standard and they think it would be interpreted as a major olive branch for MS to take an IBM piece of technology. At Demo this week I explained pretty candidly to Mike that we would consider taking and promoting PhotoImage if it was really good and if the deal was unencumbered (free or small flat fee). Braun thought this would be great. We said we'd follow up by me visiting Boca sometime in February to do a joint technology disclosure. I then had a brief conversation with Carberry who said he wanted to be at the meeting as well.

Today's developments:

Braun has already called 3 times today (from Boca). In addition to getting info about Windows and MPC market success he wants to pursue this codec issue. In the first call Mike said that Sculley told IBM (Cannavino I think) that MS has already decided to standardize on Quicktime. I explained no this is just an apps thing, we really have a slot on our systems dance card open for the right technology and the right business terms.

Mike said that he figured sculley either didn't understand or was overselling. Then Mike called back a few hours later to say that Carberry talked to MikeMap (at demo presumably) and that Carberry also had the impression that MS had made a company-wide commitment to Quicktime. I need to call back Mike Braun and tell him. MikeMap is this just a misunderstanding on Carberry's part, or am I missing

something?

It's too early to recommend an outcome other than that we use the decision of which software motion video codec to support under Windows to strengthen either our relationship with Apple or our relationship with IBM; which one will depend on technical, business, and geopolitical considerations.

In order to get to the best outcome I recommend two parallel prongs of negotiation (with both apple on the quicktime video format and with IBM on PhotoImage). Given how much things will vibrate it probably makes sense to have one focal point within MS in both areas although there are a number of strategic and technical considerations before a final decision can be reached. Mike/Bill are you comfortable with me and my group playing that role on this topic?

Rob
From nathanm Fri Jan 31 18:21:33 1992
To: kevinsch
Cc: sharleac
Record-folder: D:\NATHANM\FOLDERS\WSENT.FLD
Subject: RE: CHI '92 Advance Programs
Date: Fri Jan 31 18:21:53 PDT 1992
Mail-Flags: 0000

Could you send me one via I/O mail?

Nathan

>From kevinsch Fri Jan 31 11:05:42 1992
>To: brunoa cynthiae jim kurte marydi nathanm paulg robb royl tandyt
>Subject: CHI '92 Advance Programs

Date: Fri Jan 31 11:04:29 PDT 1992

I have a box full of them, sitting outside my door. It promises to be a very exciting, and in some ways controversial, conference.

Fael free to come by 5/2172 and pick up as many as you want. Also, please forward this mail on to anyone else you think may be interested.

Kevin Schofield
Chair, CHI '92 AV Committee
From nathanm Fri Jan 31 22:13:06 1992
To: mackm bobmu bradsi robs paulma robg gregs bens
Cc: billg aarong rashid karenh jonl peterhey steveb camerom
Record-folder: D:\NATHANM\FOLDERS\WSENT.FLD
Subject: PC Hardware Definitions
Date: Fri Jan 31 22:58:42 PDT 1992
Mail-Flags: 0000

I wanted to follow up from the meeting we had the other day about extending the
The basic idea is that the old IBM PC standard with BIOS, 8259 interrupt control
Here are some of the points from the meeting:

1. We need to compile a list of the minimal hardware requirements for each of o