From: Brian Gluth
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 1998 12:04 PM
To: Brian Hall; Bill Koszewski
Cc: Mike Nichols; Kumar Mehta; Lora Shiner
Subject: RE: ISP desires for IE5

we've done this before for part #2

That's where the five S's came from - a survey I did back in December.

ISPs want :
1) No **Support** calls (make the product **simple**, solid, supportable and Consistency (Javscript, etc, among all our browser versions (win16, Win32, Mac))
2) Small **Size**. (get it under 6MB if possible, AOL in particular hates large downloads for their 11million users)
3) **Sim-Ship**. Get all our versions out on a single IEAK disc. Reduce mixed versioning of browsers.
4) (**Speed** for ISP and Customer) Faster browser for customer - better experience - better relations then for ISP and customer

Also, I've included some info from our ISP focus groups - you might want to touch base with Kumar and Lora - we were all sitting in some or all of the sessions taking notes)

-----Original Message-----
From: Brian Gluth < briangl@microsoft.com < <mailto:briangl@microsoft.com>>>
To: Bill Koszewski < billk@MICROSOFT.com < <mailto:billk@MICROSOFT.com>>>
Cc: Brian Gluth < briangl@microsoft.com < <mailto:briangl@microsoft.com>>>; Jose M. Alvarez < jalvarez@microsoft.com < <mailto:jalvarez@microsoft.com>>>
Date: Wednesday, February 18, 1998 7:08 PM
Subject: RE: Quick topline report of focus groups

Focus Groups
NSCP Depth/Breadth ISPs and Their Thoughts on Internet Explorer:
==========

Topline:
While many held an anti-msft stance, they all realize that business is business and the product is ultimately a customer and a business choice.

- If a new version of IE is faster, simpler and easier to support than Nav3, they'd consider switching to shipping IE - but;
- None of the ISPs want to touch their existing base - that would generate calls in their eyes. If a customer wishes to switch, then they can but the ISP doesn't want to suggest it unless one is giving the . Nav3 was the predominate browser these NSCP ISPs liked the best - smaller and easier to support than any of the 4.0 browsers (NSCP or MSFT). And of those that were shipping IE, many were shipping IE3 for the same reasons.

Comments:

- Want a "browser-light" version. Less to go wrong. Version 4.0 of browsers were slow, fat, bloated and too hard to support. (They didn't want more features - just more stable) Browsers are getting to big. Looking at other browsers like "Opera".

- Turn off the Active Desktop. Didn't like that a browser introduced UI changes - they didn't want to be in the business of training poepl how to use the UI when it is really a part of the OS. . .

GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT 375
MS98 0125616
CONFIDENTIAL

- Reliability. Reliability, Reliability. No bugs.
- See no real advantage in having all the base on one browser. A call is a call if both browsers are considered equal (Nav3 and IE3) to support. Same with comparing IE4 to Nav4. Both equal to support. If really less to support, will be more likely try to consolidate to one brand.
- We never ship a first release (#.0) version of a browser - always what for the first or second point release (perception is that the bugs are fixed)
- Hate Channels - makes our service look slow.
- Why not have on installation process for both service and email? Integration would help.
- Source code only interesting if we can customize the dialer in more detail.

Steps we can take now:

- Advertise. While most top accounts know of the IEAK because of our 1:1 efforts, all those who are not part of any developer programs, which was many, obtain their info from either their engineers or the web. Websites mentioned were CNET, ZDNet, Boardwatch and News.com (a CNET site). Advertise on these sites and link directly to the IEAK area -
- Name the IEAK something else. Come up with a "real" name for the IEAK. Names like Java and even Mission Control provide more recognizeable and meaningful names/perrceptions.
- Features on our and other tech sites. Educate people on what's "Better than the Source - Internet Explorer Admin Kit"
- Turn off the Active Desktop during install ("off" as default)

Futures/Wish list

- ISPs want to an easy way to control the configuration of the browser.
  - Including the logo (branding)
  - Lock down settings: Prevent people from changing the settings
  - Remove prepopulated links. Hate the default settings/bookmarks that come with the browser
  - One setup for both mail and connectivity. Not two separate setups.
  - Better connectivity needed. The browser should generate NO CALLS for technical support. In order of support calls:
    - #1 dialer,
    - #2 Setup of email/browser
    - #3 Uninstall
    - #4 UI
  - Better error messages to help when a customer calls in.
- Smaller for download - period. That's what the internet is for..... "we're not in the business to press CDs"
- Provide a super small 'core' browser and then if customer wants add-ons, then can go back to the web to download add-ons or a new more feature rich browser without trashing the current settings, profiles, etc.
- Multiple email accounts under one-family (multi-profiles)
- Fix Javascript errors. Want everything to run the same on all browsers on all platforms. Standardize/conform.
- Support Java consistently
- Hot key to take away tool bars.
- See pushs go away (taxing on network)
- (Turn off search engines - we (ISPs) sometimes have our own deals with search engines.)