Bill Gates

From: Bill Gates
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 1995 9:42 AM
To: Carl Stork (carls); Paul Maritz (paulma)
Subject: FW: NSP

Here is mail I sent to Andy. He and I will talk on the phone in the next few days. Any furhter guidance is valuable although I think Carl's mail laid out the issues quite clearly.

We need so decent compromise here and its not clear to me what it is. Should we agree to work with this group on specific things to get them redirected?

Its a shame we have no input from them on Windows97.

From: Bill Gates
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 1995 9:34 AM
To: 'Andy Grove <netmail!Andy_Grove@ccm:hf.intel.com>'
Subject: NSP

I've learned some more about this. I am not emotionally involved in this particular debate but there is a significant problem here that is on a path to get a lot worse.

NSP means a lot of different things. What it means in terms of hardware and the processor being able to take over more and more functions in non-controversial. What is a problem is the incompatibility and overlap of systems software done under the label NSP. Actaully some of the software elements are Ok - we still seem to have a common view of TAPI, IrDA and APM. Each of these has to be improved so with our current relationship we will probably diverge on each of these. The ones that are a major problem for Windows95 and WindowsNT today are SPOX, Native aduio, DCI, 3DR, DMI, PCMCIA card services and Instant on. These are incompatible with where we are taking Windows and have many problems with Windows95.

When we talked I didn't realize that Kinnie was involved in NSP. In fact not only is he involved but he feels that he has personally championed all of the elements against resistance inside Intel and Microsoft and that he will overcome non-believers. He seems to feel that although Intel doesn't share what it is doing in system software with us that he feels like we are supposed to explain exactly what we are doing in advance.

Just recently we called to get a SPOX development kit and now Ron and Craig are thinking about whether to send us one or not. They first demanded we guarantee compatibility with SPOX before they would send us the kit.

ISVs are more confused about what to do by Intel's attacks on our Windows plans than they are by Apples.

Structurally its very hard to have our people working as best they can to advance PC software standards with a group of 200 people fully funded to basicly try to do the same thing in parallel with no guidance to coordinate with us at all. They don't share with us because of Intel's IP attitude. We tried shipping some Intel code relative to DCI and ended up in this Apple lawsuit that has been very damaging.

I don't understand why Intel funds a group that is against Windows95. Craig's group uses VxDs. Even if he fixes his stuff to run with Windows95 we don't have VxDs on Windows NT. Craigs attitude is he doesn't care about NT and our family strategy.

It turns out that the P6 slows down certain 16bit operations so it only runs Windows95 about 15% faster than an equivalent pentium. Windows NT gets the full benefit of the P6. It seems like Craig's not believing in Windows NT will be a major boon for AMD chips since they will run todays Windows 3.1 faster than any Intel chip.

The problem we have is that we have to sort of choose in software related issues which company will lead and which will follow. In chips its very clear. In software you have a group that won't allow us to lead and has all the prestide and profits of Intel to drive them forward.

If we picked someone neutral and asked them to comapre what we are doing in graphics and sound to Native Audio, 3dr DCI and your other work I have no doubt they would say our work is equal or better. However Craig and Ron don't believe they should give up on anything. Meanwhile we have told our group that they need to evolve Windows software including Windows NT.

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT 277
MS98 0169352
CONFIDENTIAL

We should talk on the phone more about this.

MS98 0169353
CONFIDENTIAL