From: billg [billg@OXYGEN.ITG.microsoft.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 21, 1995 10:22 PM
To: bradsi; carls; johnlu; paulma
Subject: RE: Intel & NSP

We have to find a way to restructure the way Intel does its work.

Andy is very open minded to this.

I know its painful but I dont think its best to throw up our hands about how tough Intel is to work with. We should be very specific about:

a. Efforts of theirs we want them to drop altogether and why
b. Efforts of ours where if they do it under the correct IP regime we are willing to have them involved.

For example why should they continue with 3DR when we are covering that with reality labs? Why shouldnt they be helpful in getting NT stronger in the multimedia area?

Basicly they started up when we didnt pay much attention to these areas. Now we pay a lot of attention to these areas. To the degree they want to grow the industry they need to get aligned with us and tell us whatif anything is wrong with our plans and what they can help with.

I am willing to put time into this because I think putting the effort in now will save us a significant amount of pain in the future. I am not saying we will avoid all pain but a lot. Intel has to accept that when we have a solution we like that is decent that that is the solution that wins. Unfortunately our wide open Vxd architecture is causing us immense problems and its just going to get worse in general.

From: paulma[SMTP:paulma]
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 1995 4:42 PM
To: johnlu; bradsi; carls
Cc: billg
Subject: Intel & NSP

I wish there was some way to directly make money off the Intelrelationship... the amount of time they consume!

Whittier called me to let me know that he was concerned that we had"taken the wrong impression away from the meeting on 5/9", and that we should know that they are willing to do "anything" if we can just find a way to bless their current NSP iSPOX work as the "interim way" to do multimedia (I presume this really means audio).

I went through the discussion again with Ron why we have a structural problem in our relationship (them having 200+ s/w engineers under adifferent management chain, with different objectives, working on system software is a recipe for frustration). I said that what I wanted to do was have Johnlu sit down with Kinnie's person, do a reset, lay out the area's where we can easily agree, and then we would commit to staying aligned within those area's. And then on the other area's, we would have to agree to live with not being aligned.

This did not satisfy him. He said "we have to find a way to get intoalignment on the iSPOX software" - if the price of that was that he had to move 50 engineers to MS to work on future MM architecture then he would do so. That we should realize their highest priority is to grow the market and they will do what it takes for that. He then also asked if the lack of disclosure on P55C is what is causing to shy awat from NSP. He said that we should not be concerned about that because it was just a case of adding a few "SIMD" instructions

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
276

to the Pentium.

It is clear that their strategy is to get as widespread useage aspossible of their DSP algorithms via the NSP software layer, and then accelerate it via the "few SIMD" instructions in the P55C (which they have been careful not to give us or others IP protection on).

It is clear that we have something they are willing to "give" for. But I fear that:
- we have a baroque enough mess already in our MM plumbing without having to stitch iSPOX in,
- and given other dynamics this may not be the right time to help Intel start to make the x86 instruction set more proprietary.

Thoughts?

MS98 0168792
CONFIDENTIAL