From: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 1997 12:51 PM
To: David Cole
Cc: Moshe Dunie; Paul Maritz; Charles Fitzgerald; Michael Toutonghi; John Ludwig
Subject: RE: new Java VM and crypto DLLs

David just sent me a follow up to this piece of mail asking me what I hadn't responded. I'm sorry, but I thought this was closed since I talked with johnlu about it last week (or so ago). He independently agreed with my plan.

After I did a security review it was clear the security team is drowning with all the individual requests for deliverables. They came to me with a plan for a new "security pack" that they would package and provide to everyone -- a new SKU that would have it's own delivery cycle with associated fixes, localization, etc. The idea was that everyone who wanted security would then include the security pack. They claimed that given that they couldn't shut down the requests that this was the only way they could manage the situation. I said no to this proposal.

I approved them shipping in IE, NT service packs, NT releases, and IIS. They have too many masters -- with too much chance for confusion of DLLs, upgrade problems, etc. In my opinion, we would have to up the headcount in order to deal with anything more. I was unwilling to do this.

Personally, I think (a) below is a very bad idea strategically. But, I guess that's immaterial.

Paul, you may choose to override me, but it just adds complexity in an area where we need simplicity.

jim

---Original Message---
From: David Cole
Sent: Friday, July 11, 1997 4:13 PM
To: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Cc: Moshe Dunie; Paul Maritz; Charles Fitzgerald; Michael Toutonghi
Subject: new Java VM and crypto DLLs
Importance: High

there is a conflict on this heading your way.

a) we've agreed that we must allow ISVs to redistribute the Java VM standlone, without IE. ISVs that do this are bound into Windows because that's the only place the VM works, and it keeps them away from Suns APIs. technically speaking, I didn't want this since I wanted more IE distribution, but paulma agreed that standlone distribution must happen.

b) the new Java VM depends on the new crypto DLLs for it's capabilities based security, thus those DLLs must ship with the new Java VM.

c) the crypto team says no-can-do, they've only been approved by jimall to be distributed with Windows NT and IE4.

Action Item: => jimall needs to say ok to let the crypto DLLs get shipped with the Java VM. The Java VM SDK is all packaged up and ready to ship as of today. Testing coverage is reasonable, but not great yet. We need to do a better testing job for final, but it's had enough coverage for beta SDK. (Secondary issue is that the crypto team doesn't test this stuff on Win95 at all. the IE team does config testing, but not fucntional testing. that must get fixed of course.)

Seems odd this must happen at the Sr. VP level, but apparently it does. jim?

thanks,
David

MSS 0053914
CONFIDENTIAL

MS7 028280
CONFIDENTIAL