Erik Stevenson (LCA)

From: Jonathan Roberts
Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 1997 7:21 AM
To: Megan Bliss; Moshe Dunie; Carl Stork; Jim Allchin (Exchange); Bill Veghte
Cc: Jeff M. Johnson; Adam Taylor; Phil Holden
Subject: RE: RE: Closure on Memphis action items from 3YO and Billg Memphis review

We should probably call this discussion closed. As I understand the action items from the Paulma meeting, that meeting will reconvene in a month or so and re-examine the issue. As Moshe mentions, the POR is to ship with IE. If it is apparent we will miss a December 1 ship, which is Joachim's cut off for Spring machines, we have to make a trade-off decision between IE integration and hardware support. I suspect Billg will have to make that call since the implications are so massive.

I also want to extend my commitment to the dev group to try to help prioritize Memphis support. I believe our current path where it is the third or fourth priority is off strategy. Jeff Johnson is helping me dive into the numbers and see what the market is really doing. I am also very sympathetic to the frustration you guys feel regarding this dependency and I hate being the naysayer, but like Megan, I think there are substantial consequences if we de-couple the two projects.

Thanks,

Jonathan

—Original Message—
From: **Megan Bliss**
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 1997 10:16 PM
To: Moshe Dunie; Carl Stork; Jonathan Roberts; Jim Allchin (Exchange); Bill Veghte
Cc: Jeff M. Johnson; Adam Taylor; Phil Holden
Subject: RE: Closure on Memphis action items from 3YO and Billg Memphis review

I understand the need to ship on the spring 98 machines. However, what will then be the plan to ship IE 4.0 out with Windows? I thought our #1 strategic imperative was to get IE share (they've been stalled and their best hope is tying tight to Windows, esp. on OEM machines). That is, unless I've woken up in an alternate state and now work for Netscape ☺.

It's clear that the IE integration problems are hard, but aren't we going to have to do the work anyway? I'm not a big fan of the plans where we just shove IE 4.0 (with IPTD's limited testing; certainly no integration testing) onto OEM machines (95 or Memphis) and into retail boxes.

And given that (retail) consumers are saying the #1 reason they'd buy Memphis is because of the web integration, what makes us think that the product we'd ship on 7/31 will be compelling (again, in retail; I understand there is goodness on new machines).

I know this isn't a popular viewpoint, but I get the strong impression that we're shying away from IE 4.0 because it is a hard problem. That's all the more reason in my mind to go do the work. Customers are expecting it and their experience will be miserable if we don't. Plus, I strongly believe that we can't afford to not be on the spring 98 machines *with IE 4.0* (that is a well tested/integrated version of IE 4.0). Otherwise, that's 30+M sockets for Netscape to party all over.

My two cents anyway...

—Original Message—
From: **Moshe Dunie**
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 1997 5:06 PM

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
56

To: Carl Stork; Jonathan Roberts; Megan Bliss; Jim Allchin (Exchange); Bill Veghte
Cc: Jeff M. Johnson; Adam Taylor; Phil Holden
Subject: RE: Closure on Memphis action items from 3YO and Billg Memphis review

Please don't forward

Jonathan,

The plan that Carl outlines below is the plan I approved. We agreed with Paulma and Joachim that at the time we ship the Beta, we may decide to drive to 7/31 RTM without IE, if it looks we may miss the spring 98 PCs. In such case we will execute on the schedule below. As you can see to have this option, this has to be a beta test by end users. Feel free to come and discuss this with me.

If at the time we ship Beta 1, we get the team totally focused on making a memphis release based on old shell, the team will drive toward the following schedule:

4/3 - WinHEC build, also represents RC1 for Beta 1
4/18 - Beta 1
6 /1 - Beta 2
7/1 - RC1
7/31 - RTM

There is some risk in that schedule, but if 7/31 is OEM only followed by retail that supports also win3.1 three months later (10/97) the confidence level of Carls' team is quite high.

Thanks.....Moshe

---Original Message---
From: **Carl Stork**
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 1997 4:03 PM
To: Jonathan Roberts; Moshe Dunie; Megan Bliss; Jim Allchin (Exchange); Bill Veghte
Cc: Jeff M. Johnson; Adam Taylor; Phil Holden
Subject: RE: Closure on Memphis action items from 3YO and Billg Memphis review

The release at WinHEC is being called a Developer Release, the same terminology we used in December.

We are planning to move on to release a Beta release fairly soon thereafter. The beta release will go to end users and will be used to test upgrade, apps, etc. The IE4 shell is available via the display control panel but it is not set by default.

---Original Message---
From: **Jonathan Roberts**
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 1997 3:47 PM
To: Moshe Dunie; Carl Stork; Megan Bliss; Jim Allchin (Exchange); Bill Veghte
Cc: Jeff M. Johnson; Adam Taylor; Phil Holden
Subject: RE: Closure on Memphis action items from 3YO and Billg Memphis review

Philh needs to create a press response that covers:
1) dev release without IE. I still don't think we should call it a beta. Without IE it is not code complete, therefore it is not a beta. We can call it anything but a beta.
2) A statement about 3.1 support, since that won't be in the next release and we are already being asked about it.

Carl, can you confirm what we are calling the next release?

Thanks,

Jonathan

-----Original Message-----
From: **Moshe Dunie**
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 1997 1:35 PM
To: Carl Stork; Megan Bliss; Jim Allchin (Exchange); Jonathan Roberts; Bill Veghte
Cc: Jeff M. Johnson; Adam Taylor
Subject: RE: Closure on Memphis action items from 3YO and Billg Memphis review

It has been decided to ship Beta 1 with the old shell. Will decide at that point based on IE4 schedule whether Memphis will be based on IE shell. A key factor is that we don't want to miss the spring 98 PC season. Externally though we cannot disclose the possibility of shipping Memphis without IE4. Plan of record is still to have IE4.

-----Original Message-----
From: **Carl Stork**
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 1997 12:06 PM
To: Megan Bliss; Jim Allchin (Exchange); Jonathan Roberts; Bill Veghte; Moshe Dunie
Cc: Jeff M. Johnson; Adam Taylor
Subject: RE: Closure on Memphis action items from 3YO and Billg Memphis review

The assumption about the date is missing <g>

We do not have closure on the issues below at present. 16 Mb will be a challenge for acceptable perf with IE4 & other apps. IE4 is not being developed as joined to Memphis at the hip - at present Memphis is an afterthought. It is not one of the four main test platforms for IE4. We are being encouraged by the IE4 team to release a Memphis Beta 1 with the old shell.

We need to rethink the plans & make sure we have a plan that makes sense. Today I would not tell anyone that it is possible to ship an integrated IE4/Memphis product in 1997.

-----Original Message-----
From: **Megan Bliss**
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 1997 11:43 AM
To: Jim Allchin (Exchange); Carl Stork; Jonathan Roberts; Bill Veghte; Moshe Dunie
Cc: Jeff M. Johnson; Adam Taylor
Subject: Closure on Memphis action items from 3YO and Billg Memphis review
Importance: High

From the 3YO, and the subsequent BillG Memphis review, these are the things that we agreed upon. I want to make sure that they still hold true.

1) The Memphis minimum system configuration is 486, 16Mb.
2) We will be doing a Win3.1 upgrade.
3) IE 4 and Memphis are joined at the hip.

It is important to get closure on these issues so that we can start to effectively communicate what to expect with this release to the various involved parties (internally, the field, etc.) For instance, we have yet to see a plan for the Win3.1 upgrade.

I am also concerned that we haven't come to any closure about the proposed additional features that were brought up at the Billg Memphis review.

Please correct me if these are not plan of record. Our teams are marching with these assumptions.

Thanks,
Megan

TXAG 0009637
CONFIDENTIAL