From: Ben Slivka
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 1996 8:50 AM
To: John Ludwig; Lin Shaw
Subject: FW: No standalone browser possible for IE4; IE4 Trident-friendly?

thoughts?

—Original Message—
From: Larry Sullivan
Sent: Monday, October 28, 1996 1:00 PM
To: Ben Slivka; Philip Bogle; Chris Jones (Exchange); Robert Welland
Cc: Brad Schick; Scott Isaacs; Hadi Partovi; Steven Guggenheimer
Subject: RE: No standalone browser possible for IE4; IE4 Trident-friendly?

We have been through a number of iterations on this issue. Hadip and Stevengu have also waded in on the side of a stand alone product. I think we need a decision on this ASAP. Johnlu seemed to think that a stand alone product was not a necessity but many of us disagreed and he seemed to leave this up to lins and the leads to decide. I haven't heard anything further but almost every checkin into shdocvw shell32 and explorer.exe makes the shell/browser integration tighter and I fear every day we put off a final decision will make splitting the code more time consuming and difficult. For instance when you install IE4 now you no longer have access to your Win95 style toolbar when exploring local/network drive.

Larry...

From: Robert Welland
Sent: Monday, October 28, 1996 7:40 AM
To: Ben Slivka; Philip Bogle; Chris Jones (Exchange)
Cc: Brad Schick; Larry Sullivan; Scott Isaacs
Subject: RE: No standalone browser possible for IE4; IE4 Trident-friendly?

This whole issue really concerns me - what happens if customers "get cautious" about the IE4 shell. If Windows95 tells us anything, it is that we cannot predict the adoption rate of new technology - regardless of how cool it is. If we tie our best browser features to a new shell we could get screwed by a cautious customer base. I feel that we must have a stand-alone browser strategy.

Bob Welland

—Original Message—
From: Ben Slivka
Sent: Sunday, October 27, 1996 12:10 PM
To: Philip Bogle; Chris Jones (Exchange); Robert Welland
Cc: Brad Schick; Larry Sullivan; Scott Isaacs
Subject: RE: No standalone browser possible for IE4; IE4 Trident-friendly?

how does the decision to put trident into IE 4 affect the work below?

—Original Message—
From: Philip Bogle
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 1996 3:42 PM
To: Ben Slivka; Chris Jones (Exchange); Robert Welland
Cc: Brad Schick; Larry Sullivan; Scott Isaacs
Subject: No standalone browser possible for IE4; IE4 Trident-friendly?

We received no e-mail response from Lin as to whether IE4 can be shipped as a stand-alone browser.

Larry and I talked to her in person and found that the answer is no-- If you take IE4, you have to take a new SHELL32 and the ActiveDesktop UI. We could build our own browser shell, a la AOL or MSN, but we currently have no plans to do so.

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT 45

MS7 035410
CONFIDENTIAL

MSS 0049039
CONFIDENTIAL

ATTORNEYS ONLY

Therefore, any slippage in the schedule for an IE4 desktop translates into a slip for the browser as a whole. IE4 is supposed to be code complete in a week (Oct. 22), but some important features like WebBar aren't even turned on yet, and no real data is being broadcast to the ActiveDesktop, so a slip seems highly likely.

An interesting question is whether Trident can still be hosted in the IE4 code base, given that the new shell and the new MSHTML have new interdependencies that prevent them from interoperating with older versions.

For these reasons, as well as the fact that we can't be sure that IE4 will be stable in the IE3.5 timeframe, I would vote for building our hypothetical IE 3.5 off the IE3a code base.

I would also be pleased if IE4 could ship with the Trident code base. Otherwise we'll have to duplicate effort in the IE3A and IE4 trees, only to throw it all away for IE5.

-phil

>——Original Message——
>From: Philip Bogle
>Sent: Monday, October 14, 1996 1:57 PM
>To: Lin Shaw; Robert Welland
>Cc: Ben Slivka; Chris Jones; Brad Schick; Larry Sullivan
>Subject: IE 3.5 (?); can we produce a stand-alone browser using the IE4 tree?
>
>After further discussions with Bob and BenS, it sounds like we might want
>consider is an "IE 3.5" release with the following features:
>
>(1) Debugging support for Javascript and VBScript
>(2) Scripting compatibility improvements
>(3) Low-risk UI improvements
> (e.g. autocomplete, animated buttons using the image attributes on the
>input tag, etc.)
>
>The debugging features, which Netscape lacks, will help win developer
>mindshare, which in itself will improve compatibility, since developers will
>test against us.
>
>The UI tweaks will keep people excited about IE (I personally love
>autocomplete) and maintain the momentum IE has established while waiting for
>Nashville to be complete.
>
>One important question: We are currently unsure whether it is possible to
>create a standalone browser using the IE4 tree– Lin, is this possible, or
>would we need to go back to the IE3A sources? I have only a limited
>understanding of the recent shell changes, but it seems some SHDOCVW and
>Explorer functionality were merged, which might make it difficult to produce
>a standalone browser
>
>-phil
>
>——Original Message——
>From: Philip Bogle
>Sent: Monday, October 14, 1996 11:52 AM
>To: Lin Shaw
>Cc: Brad Schick; Larry Sullivan; Robert Welland; John Cordell
>Subject: Why tie IE4 browser to Nashville desktop?
>

MS7 035411
CONFIDENTIAL

MSS 0049040
CONFIDENTIAL

ATTORNEYS ONLY

>My understanding is that if users want to take advantage of the new browser
>features of IE4, they also have to use the Nashville desktop. An
>alternative plan would be to offer a stand-alone IE4 browser, with the web
>desktop as a separate option, possibly something that we charge for.
>
>I would argue that the second option is preferable, for reasons I outline
>below. If I'm misinformed regarding our plans, please let me know. (Also,
>is there any technical reason why we can't offer a standalone browser rather
>than an entire desktop package?)
>
>(1) Fewer schedule risks: Even if the Nashville desktop schedule slips, the
>browser itself can continue to ship and remain competitive in features with
>Netscape. This is in accord with our new goal to ship frequently and avoid
>getting all "constipated" by bundling too many features into one box. (I have
>heard a number of developer comments regarding the unrealistic nature of the
>current schedule.)
>
>My particular interest in this area is that we have a number of key scripting
>and debugging features that we will soon have ready, and it would be
>unfortunate if these were delayed waiting on (from my perspective) unrelated
>desktop features.
>
>(2) Fewer performance and stability risks: users may like the features of
>our browser, but not enough to tolerate greater instability and lower
>performance in the shell-- the worlds most stable browser today is still
>pretty flaky by shell standards. If we want to maximize the market for our
>browser, I don't see what we gain by forcing them to use a desktop they don't
>want.
>
>At least at the moment, I find the web-enabled Explorer close to unbearable
>to use.
>
>(3) Greater Corporate Acceptance: Corporations are leery of retraining
>users for new UIs, even if they are arguably superior to the old ones. This
>is especially true if the new UI comes for free, is a major shell upgrade,
>and does not provide customer support by virtue of being free.
>
>(4) Chance for profit: as many have mentioned, we can actually make some
>money selling a web desktop. By our pledge not to charge for IE, we can't
>make any money on the browser.
>
>Thanks for your comments,
>-phil
>

MS7 035412
CONFIDENTIAL

MSS 0049041
CONFIDENTIAL

ATTORNEYS ONLY