

we never call him back.

I have no idea what the facts are but someone should definitely contact Jonathon and find out what he has done and any complaints he might have. Maybe he has done something interesting.

The reason I copy both Mike and Brad directly is that I am not sure if the windows-networking or Lan man groups know Jonathon best. All of this could be random but please do call.

8

From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:21:01 1991

To: davidcol

Subject: commdlg.dll sources

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:21:00 PDT

I hate this kind of shit. We were going to give it to them anyways. Now the thing got escalated and it will look like we gave it to them because they screamed, which will just encourage them.

> From dougk Mon Jul 15 09:25:08 1991

To: davidcol steveh

Subject: commdlg.dll sources

Cc: billg bradsi brucery steveh

Date: Mon Jul 15 09:24:23 1991

Apps is not suppose to look at Windows source since external ISVs don't get the opportunity. We make exceptions for both external ISVs and MS apps when it's time critical for them.

This is pure and utter BULLSHIT! As BillG said at the latest Apps Division meeting, the "Chinese wall" is a figment of the media. Systems and Apps are supposed to work together. We have a number of outstanding COMMDLG bugs (more than half of Barney's total outstanding bugs). If being able to look at the sources can help resolve them, WHY WON'T YOU LET US DO IT??

If you're so concerned about fairness, let the ISV's look too. What are you afraid of? That someone else is going to come out with a competing COMMDLG? Get real! It's in the interest of all of us, Systems, Apps, AND external ISV's to get a working commdlg package as soon as possible.

For that matter, I think that Apps should be able to look at any Windows source. As a practical matter, we do, whether you like it or not. And as a result, we've been able to track down a number of bugs, both in our code and in Windows code, saving everyone a hell of a lot of time, and making both products better. Again, if it's really fairness you're concerned

EXH 43 DATE 2/13/02
WITNESS Silverberg
MARY W. MILLER

MS 5062504
CONFIDENTIAL

| about, make the Windows source available to ISV's too. Having looked at
| a bunch of Windows source, I've always wondered whether the real reason you
| don't want people to see it is because you're embarrassed by the quality of
| it.

| So let's get reasonable here. Give us the ability to look at commdlg
| sources; we'll help you find and fix bugs, and we'll all be better off.

| Doug

9

From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:22:36 1991

To: davidcol dougk steveh

Cc: billg brucery steveh

Subject: Re: commdlg.dll sources

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:22:32 PDT

Relax. We had already decided to give you r/o access to commdlg
source.

| > From dougk Mon Jul 15 09:25:08 1991

| To: davidcol steveh

| Subject: commdlg.dll sources

| Cc: billg bradsi brucery steveh

| Date: Mon Jul 15 09:24:23 1991

| Apps is not suppose to look at Windows source since external
| ISVs don't get the opportunity. We make exceptions for
| both external ISVs and MS apps when it's time critical
| for them.

| This is pure and utter BULLSHIT! As BillG said at the latest Apps Division
| meeting, the "Chinese wall" is a figment of the media. Systems and Apps are
| supposed to work together. We have a number of outstanding COMMDLG bugs (more
| than half of Barney's total outstanding bugs). If being able to look at the
| sources can help resolve them, WHY WON'T YOU LET US DO IT??

| If you're so concerned about fairness, let the ISV's look too. What are you
| afraid of? That someone else is going to come out with a competing COMMDLG?
| Get real! It's in the interest of all of us, Systems, Apps, AND external
| ISV's to get a working commdlg package as soon as possible.

| For that matter, I think that Apps should be able to look at any Windows
| source. As a practical matter, we do, whether you like it or not. And as
| a result, we've been able to track down a number of bugs, both in our code
| and in Windows code, saving everyone a hell of a lot of time, and making
| both products better. Again, if it's really fairness you're concerned
| about, make the Windows source available to ISV's too. Having looked at

MS 5062505
CONFIDENTIAL

| a bunch of Windows source, I've always wondered whether the real reason you
| don't want people to see it is because you're embarrassed by the quality of
| it.

| So let's get reasonable here. Give us the ability to look at commdlg
| sources; we'll help you find and fix bugs, and we'll all be better off.

| Doug

#####

10

From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:23:28 1991

To: davidw

Subject: Re: enh performance

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:23:27 PDT

thanks.

#####

11

From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:25:47 1991

To: nathanm

Cc: cathy

Subject: Re: Rick Rashid on thursday

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:25:45 PDT

great. sure, I'm available.

#####

12

From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:29:08 1991

To: philba

Cc: brad richt

Subject: BAMBI Functionality Test Definition

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:28:40 PDT

what if we said bambi only worked with dos5? that would greatly
reduce the testing effort. if past experience is a guide, when
testing tries to cover all the dos versions, they do a shallow job
and it consumes lots of resource. I'm willing to say bambi only
works on dos5, if bambi can detect version number and refuse to
install if not dos5 (or great) (with an override switch).

| >From a-lawren Mon Jul 15 10:13:10 1991

| To: dosdev dostech

MS 5062506 -
CONFIDENTIAL

Cc: a-lawren chriss richsa
Subject: BAMBI Functionality Test Defintion
Date: Mon Jul 15 09:12:09 PDT 1991

BAMBI Functionality Test Defintion
Lawrence Norman (a-lawren)

BAMBI Functionality Testing has not up to this point been defined.

File Operations (Open, Save, Delete), need to be exercised intensely under a number of different configurations and senarios to insure file integrety. Lost Clusters, Cross Linked files, Corrupted Files as well as Trashed Hard Disks have been the results from BAMBI misbehaving.

Below is a list of identified areas that need to be investigated by Testing. If there are some configurations or senerios that you can think of that will potentially give BAMBI some trouble please send me mail back and I will add it to the list.

Configuration Tests :

- DOS 5.0 and UMB.
- Double Buffering.
- Different Versions of DOS: DR DOS, DOS 3.xx, DOS 4.xx, DOS 5.0x Compaq DOS, etc..
- XMS support
- Test changing Bambi parameters "on the fly", turning caching off in the middle of a File Operation, turning on again with different parameters. etc..

Hardware:

- Different Drive Types (MFM, IDE, SCSI).
- Different Disk Drive sizes.
- Different controllers on the same Hard Disk.
- KeyBoard interactions /various interrupts.
- KeyBoard "Pop-Up" TSR's.
- Physical Errors on Disk Drive.
- Logical Partions: Funny Partition sizes, Compaq DOS & Large Partitions.
- Number of Disk Drives.
- Removable Drives Bernolli and the utilites that come with these Drives.
- Forcing cache to CD RAM and Network (should fail).
- Western Digital Controlers and FastDisk.

Software:

- Disk Software "DM Driver" (which has cylinders greater than 1024).
- "Stacker" and other Disk Compression schemes.
- Caching with Swap Drive Partition in place.
- PC Kwik and other Caches already installed (Doesn't BAMBI detect).
- Disk Manager w/ BAMBI (Device Driver, gives whole 600MB instead of only 400MB which is a DOS limitation).

MS 5062507
CONFIDENTIAL

- Caching RAM Drives.
- Command Line User Interface with BAMBI, different variations.
- Support for floppy Disk caching.
- Substitute Drives.
- Interlink the new DOS file transfer.
- Disk Compation Utilites: Speed Disk, etc... Do they work??
- Damage to files During Power Down, compare with results with No Cache, PC Kwik, OS/2.
- DOS automated tests that is Disk intensive and perhaps give us performance data as well.

Windows:

- Interaction between Windows (How it takes and gives back extended memory).
- Old smart Drive bugs should be regressed with BAMBI.
- SmartDrive and BAMBI compatability.
- Windows Automated tests that are disk intensive and gives performance data.
- Windows Setup.
- Setting up an older version of windows with BAMBI in place.
- Different windows mode (Standard & Enhanced).
- Multiple DOS VM's on the same disk doing a lot of file operations.

Thanks,
Lawrence.

#####

13

From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:50:12 1991
To: chrisp
Subject: Re: King Kahn
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:50:11 PDT

just mail to Philippe Kahn. I don't have his user number,
and you don't need it if the name is unique.

#####

14

From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:54:39 1991
To: o-anton
Subject: Re:
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:54:38 PDT

no access to the m-n. can you fax me? 206/883-8101.
haven't seen softletter. can get a copy, though if you
have soft copy, please send.

MS 5062508
CONFIDENTIAL

how's going?

#####

15

From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:55:43 1991

To: russs

Cc: richab

Subject: RE: catchings/van name

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:55:40 PDT

OK. Be their buddy. Get their impressions of 3.1; if they are not beta testers we should show it to them and get them on track.

#####

16

From bradsi Mon Jul 15 10:56:33 1991

To: davidcol

Subject: new shortcut keys

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 91 10:56:31 PDT

your reply got garbled.

> From davidcol Mon Jul 15 10:49:45 1991

To: bradsi tandyt

Subject: new shortcut keys

Date: Mon Jul 15 10:49:26 1991

Lisa never comitted to get this into Windows 3.1. I just looked at the meeting minutes and they said Lisa would look into the work and issues involved to see what she could do to get them in. As indicated in my previous email, there is much more work here than just changing the applets. The feature set for Win 3.1 is closed since we need to get this product shipped.

When I casually spoke with chrisgr and you on this months ago (it came up while we were talking about help) I said I didn't want to do this for Win 3.1 for the same o a nasty confrontation, but I don't know how else to respond to this request given where we are in the project.

MS 5062509
CONFIDENTIAL