From: Marshall Goldberg
Sent: Saturday, December 06, 1997 6:24 AM
To: Travis Howland; Mark Ryland
Cc: Developer Relations Staff; Platform SDK Core Team
Subject: FW: using IE4 technology

I found the message that defines our position on DLL redistribution outside of IE4.

—Original Message—
From: David Cole
Sent: Monday, August 11, 1997 10:48 PM
To: Jon DeVaan; John Ludwig; David Vaskevitch; Bob Muglia (Exchange); Paul Gross; Brad Chase
Cc: Paul Maritz; Chris Jones; Jeff Henshaw
Subject: using IE4 technology

I want to clarify the current plan we are on for people distributing IE4 technology since there is some confusion about what we will do. In a nut shell, we are requiring that ISVs, internal and external, distribute and install IE4 (minimum install, which is browser only) with their apps to get IE4 services. This includes the DHTML control, help, wininet, comctrl, etc, etc.

The one blanket exception to this is that we will allow standalone distribution of the JavaVM for strategic reasons. Also, the IEAK is still available for corps and ISPs to customize, deploy, and manage IE. Nothing changes there.

Why?

First, it's time to put an end to this nightmare DLL situation we've created. All the IE4 components have been tested together, we can't afford to deal with the testing of all the various DLL combinations. Across our products, we should only allow component distribution for very strategically important missions. (like the JavaVM) The fact that a bunch of IE4 components are system DLLs adds to the need to keep them together in a package. Reducing TCO is paramount.

Second, my top priority is IE4 market share as measured by browser usage. Spending a pile of time making it easy for people to redistribute just parts of IE is not an effective use of the IE team's time, it doesn't increase browser share, and it creates serious TCO and testing headaches later. Getting distribution of minimal install IE4 is also a plus for market share.

Third, IE3 and IE4 can't exist on the same machine, so notions of a runtime version of IE4 just don't work. It sets the wrong expectation with customers. We need to swallow the fact that distribution of IE4, which means an upgrade of IE3 if it's there, is part of the deal with using IE4 components and we just need to make it work.

This does not mean that customers are forced to use IE4 if they want our other products, they can still run whatever browser they want. If your corp customers need some custom setup control over where IE puts it's icon, or doesn't, please make those requirements clear to me. We are open minded about adding this kind of customization so corp accounts can have things their way. Time is limited, so speak up asap. We will have setup setup flags for the IE minimal redistribution to make setup totally silent (no setup dialogs, no config to go through). Setup will be made to NOT add an IE icon on the desktop (and probably no startmenu group) if one wasn't there before. IE4's setup is launchable by a parent app, so that anyone who distributes an app with HTML can easily just pick us up and alleviate any and all burden on the enduer's part for getting these bits installed. I would like the default setup action to get IE4 installed normally, icon and all. We need to set the expectation that it's just part of every app. Explicit action by the end user or admin deploying the product is needed to get the thing installed in a custom way.

If you have any questions, please ask. ok to forward this to your teams so they can digest and deal with the ramifications. and please let me know of any custom setup issues your corp customers will need.

thanks,
David

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
681