## DOJ - Legal

From:             bradsi
To:                russs
Cc:               billg; paulma
Subject:      RE: proposed IShellBrowser solution for Marvel
Date:         Wednesday, October 05, 1994 3:28PM

I think we should do (1) -- make the extensions public.

I am afraid that when we tell ISV's, there will be a firestorm of protest. I heard today that the Outside-In people (SCC), from whom we've licensed our viewers, are building their business based on shell extensions. In addition, we know that Stac is doing the same (oh great, another war with Stac. Other ISV's using the extensions are WordPerfect, Lotus, Symantec, and Oracle.

These companies will not be bashful about expressing their displeasure. It will play out, I predict, on page one of the weeklies, lead to calls for the DOJ to investigate, etc.

We have not yet figured out how to really take them out, as the shell needs them itself. We can't just not document, because (a) the doc is already out, and (b) they will just get reverse engineered.

I wish we would just bite the bullet and say either: (a) we'll support in the future, and add the necessary resources to make it happen. or (b) tell isv's that we will break them in a future release.

----------
From: russs
To: billg
Cc: bradsi; brianmac; gaffer?nathanm; jeffli; paulma
Subject: proposed IShellBrowser solution for Marvel
Date: October 05, 1994 2:40PM

We have fully researched the impact of IShellBrowser change on Marvel. The

bottom line is that there is only 1 solution that doesn't cause huge risk to

the Marvel project: using the Chicago implementation of IShellBrowser. The

other options, port from Ren or Capone or write our own, will require significant code and test. In any case we would not have an alternative for

M7, and it is quite possible that we would not be stable for M8, meaning that Marvel would not make Chicago. See the memo below for an explanation of the alternatives and estimates.

The only option that gives Marvel acceptable risk is to use the Chicago implementation of IShellBrowser. There are 3 possibilities here:
1) Overturn the decision not to publish it and allow Marvel to use it.
2) Don't publish it, but allow Marvel to use it in the Chicago code base.
3) Create a private version of it for Marvel and ship it separately in Chicago.

Assuming that you do not want to do 1 or 2, that leaves us with 3. To implement 3 the Chicago team would maintain a private version of explorer.exe (or subset) for the marvel group and include it in the Chicago

box (presumably they could fork this at the last minute and all they would need to do is change a byte and change the name to marvshell.exe). The Marvel team is very comfortable with this solution because (obviously) this

is the code base we are testing against now and it works.

Since explorer.exe is 190K retail today there is a significant disk hit with
this solution. The 1 Marvel disk is completely full, so this will mean an additional space or squeezing this into Chicago disks. The Chicago team can
strip out the unnecessary stuff from explorer.exe that Marvel doesn't require, but that is additional work and test, and therefore some risk. As

long as this done by the Chicago team it is acceptable risk, since it is their code. In any case it makes sense for the Chicago team to maintain the
private version and strip it (if so decided). It would be crazy to try to have the Marvel team maintain a private version of code that the Chicago team wrote and maintains, especially at this late date.

This solution may sound like lunacy, but that should give us some pause for

the approach that we are taking. There will be 3 code bases (Chicago Explorer.exe, private Marvel version of same, Capone's version) of the same

function that need to be shipped in the Windows 95 box. This is a lot of work, potential for scew ups and disk space.

RussS

----------

From: Sean Nolan
To: russs
Subject: IShellBrowserJunk
Date: Wednesday, October 05, 1994 1:47PM

The Explorer EXE is currently 190K retail.
--- S

< <File Attachment: nobrowse.doc> >