From jek Thu Oct 3 19:01:30 1996
To: eric.schmidt
Subject: Native Method/Microsoft.
Content-Length: 11791
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Multipart/Mixed;
boundary="-LA F2155418363R-12A-857443456=:16332NCE.IlHAFeR"
X-Lines: 238
Status: RO
X-Status: $$$$
X-UID: 0000000229

---LA_F2155418363R-12A-857443456=:16332NCE.IlHAFeR
Content-Type: Text/plain;
charset=X-us-ascii;
name="text"
Content-Description: text

Eric,

I looked into complaints you have heard and relayed from Microsoft on how we ignore them, surprise them etc. In particular, they complained about the JRI design, a design that did not go their way. We conducted a fabulous process and came to the right decision. They just don't like it.

Below, a note I sent to Alan which describes this.

Jon

Alan,

You asked for information on the JRI design process which Microsoft has complained about.

I looked into it. It's unimpeachable. The only legitimate complaint is that in the end we did not agree with Microsoft.

Here is what we did:

1. Started a newgroup to discuss the topic.
2. Started the discussion off with a primer on the issue
3. Solicited opinions
4. Got input from Microsoft, IBM, Apple, Intel, Netscape, ILOG, other parts of Sun.

Everyone wrote toughtful, civil, carefully-considered analysis. Some are quite long with examples.

GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT 1357

CONFIDENTIAL

SUN V. MSFT
C97-20884 RMW (PVT) ENE
SUN 06 020802

5. Asked for final input. Got none.
6. Declared that we were going to take the advice and decide
7. Informed everyone that the decision was pending -- when and where it would be posted (I personally called Mugglia and Apple)
8. Posted a complete description of the spec with background and rationale.

You can look at this yourself. If you do, you will find that the Microsoft proposal
was seriously considered but in the end rejected for legitimate technical reasons.
You will find that IBM, Apple, and SMLI, all reached this conclusion without any help from us.

To read this yourself:

NNTPSERVER percolator, newsgroup 'fp.java-nativemethod'
http://cafedead/~sl/nmi-960910

The first is the discussion I talked about. The second is the decision with rationale, background, etc. It makes fine reading. I enjoyed it.

I believe we did a sterling job of including licensees, communicating with them, and conducting a level headed, un-emotional technical forum. And we made
the right decision.

Attached a message from Scott Rautmann that describes this and other topics we are talking to Microsoft on. The current status on all of them is that they have
disengaged.

I will be talking with John Ludwig tomorrow. I will ask him to review these two
documents and tell me what he would have preferred to see as a process.

Jon

---LA_F2155418363R-12A-857443456=:16332NCE.IlHAFeR
Content-Type: Application/X-sun-sun-deskset-message;
conversions="X-uuencode";
name="sun-deskset-message"
Content-Description: sun-deskset-message

begin 600 sun-deskset-message
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
CONFIDENTIAL

SUN V. MSFT
C97-20884 RMW (PVT) ENE
SUN 06 020803