From: Yusuf Mehdi
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 1998 8:24 PM
To: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Cc: Brad Chase
Subject: RE: new org

Thanks for the mail and guidance. See >>

-----Original Message-----
From: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 1998 6:12 PM
To: Yusuf Mehdi
Cc: Brad Chase
Subject: new org

Obviously, Brad is going to provide your direction, but I wanted you to know some of the key things that are on my mind dealing with the client.

1. I am very concerned over how IE is presented in win98 (and NT5). Even the simple things like the About Box makes it appear separate. I think it is critical that someone does a thorough walk-through looking for places in the UI that can be corrected (hopefully just text) easily BEFORE win98 ships. Furthermore, our IE web site needs a sweep (I mentioned this to Brad) where we ensure it is clear the IE is just a capability of Windows (and that it is available x-platform also).

>>Agreed. brad setup a review of win98 with me, billv and someone from legal staff and we will ensure IE is properly presented.

On the website I am making good progress reviewing the language of ie as a feature of windows with the webteam. (we don't refer to it as a product or even browser, it is browsing software). The trickier issue is dealing with the other perception issues such as: Do we keep the IE website elevated as it is today under the www.microsoft.com/ie tree or do we take the more aggressive step and put it completely under the ms.com/windows tree? This type of change as well as things like where and when we use the "e" logo are something we should gain quick agreement so that we can move forward effectively. I am going to propose some process and guidelines for the team that you and bradc can buyoff on soon, but if you have strong opinions about any of these now let me know.

2. The issue in #1 extends to many other branded (or heavily marketed) things. What do we want to happen with DirectX? What about Chrome (I know it's not branded yet, but unless someone gets on top of it, I expect someone will push for it)? What about netmeeting? Netshow? Windows Update? and on and on. I am not saying we should get rid of any of them (actually we should get rid of some of them), but we need to get our messages straight about what is a feature, what is a product, etc. We should think hard about the "workstation" name as well.

>>Agreed as well. Off the top of my head, DirectX, Netshow, Windows Update are all no-brainer features of the OS and we should brand as such. NetMeeting is a candidate but one I would think more about. I really don't understand Chrome or the business model to have an opinion on it yet. I will put together a more thoughtful analyses and recommendation, but net I hope to dramatically reduce the number of OS related features and so-called products that are non-strategic but have some amt of end user marketing resources.

3. I can't tell you how important it is to make the switch to NTW (aka higher priced system). We need some great thinking about how to drive this to happen. We should be trying to make it happen EVERY month -- we can't wait for NT5. Moreover, I need marketing to be hardcore about yelling about keeping value in the new operating systems and not continually moving stuff back to installed systems.

>>Yes. I think there are lots of creative things we might do to ramp up the run rate of NT and will give this a lot of thought.

4. There is a bunch of blocking and tackling that needs to be done (e.g., thorough review of the launch of win98 and NT5), but I'm not going to outline those here.

GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT 378

I look forward to working with you.

>>Thanks. I can't tell you how excited I am at the opportunity to work on this business and meet and break the goals you outlined today and in the 3yr plan. I hope to sort through the org issues as quickly and as painlessly as possible so that the new team can get rolling. I look forward to working with you too.

jim