From: David D'Souza
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 1998 5:57 PM
To: Jim Allchin (Exchange); Hadi Partovi; Diane D'Arcangelo (LCA); David Heiner (LCA)
Subject: RE: ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED: felten

Just tried another hit at this. We profiled IE4 shdocvw when used in the context of opening My computer (with webview enabled as is the default). And we profiled IE4 shdocvw when used in the context of browing home.microsoft.com.

The functions which were in common across both scenarios	1061.
Functions called specific to opening My Computer	152
Functions called specific to browsing home.ms.com	690

Clearly the integration is good. There is a HUGE amount of sharing and commonality here.

One thing we did was browse home.microsoft.com in this quick test. We could have chosen a less complex site and gotten the browsing specific numbers a bit smaller. I just used function level profiling for this because it was easiest. BBT is more cumbersome to setup for the old code base and may not be as helpful with what we are trying to show.

Is this useful as is? Should we change scenarios slightly?

We have a full excel spread sheet which details the 1903 functions called in both scenarios and exactly which ones are common and which are specific. Arguably, based on Felton's testimony, this list could be used to "separate" shdocvw into two parts: Shared+shell and browser specific. So this may not be useful.

—Original Message—
From: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 1998 7:41 AM
To: Hadi Partovi; David D'Souza; Diane D'Arcangelo (LCA); David Heiner (LCA)
Subject: ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED: felten

Felten claims that including "web browsing" is "technically efficient". para #67. He says it takes up "disk space and memory, and increases the complexity of the user interface by cluttering it with unwanted icons, menu items, and programs." He then goes on to say if we had designed win98 without web browsing the version would be "significantly smaller than the version Microsoft actually released".

We should calculate the number of bytes that Felten's program removes from the system. And we should calculate the number of bytes his program ADDs to the system (his new DLL and his changes to our code). I would like to know how "efficient" he is.

Then we should point out the size of Nav 4.06 (8 MB) I think. Who's inefficient?

thanks,
jim

MS98 0221067
CONFIDENTIAL

GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
1619