From: Charles Fitzgerald
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 4:21 PM
To: Michael Toutonghi; Kory Srock; Russ Arun
Subject: FW: distributing the new Java VM

progress.

—Original Message—
From: Tod Nielsen
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 4:00 PM
To: Charles Fitzgerald
Subject: FW: distributing the new Java VM

—Original Message—
From: David Cole
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 3:54 PM
To: Paul Maritz; Tod Nielsen
Cc: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

then the issue should be closed. If are competing with Javasoft on Java, then the answer is clear. Don't bottleneck it up behind IE. I'll have the Java team work with jim's guys to execute on VM redistribution.

—Original Message—
From: Paul Maritz
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 2:31 PM
To: David Cole; Tod Nielsen
Cc: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

We are competing with Javasoft on Java. By this I mean that if someone is writing apps in Java, we want them to use MS Java and to call Windows. What Todn is saying is that we can't say that this is only possible on new versions of Windows, and old versions, you have to ensure that customer first installs IE.

—Original Message—
From: David Cole
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 12:30 PM
To: Tod Nielsen; Paul Maritz
Cc: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

We just need to decide what our business is wrt to Java. Are we trying to compete with JavaSoft on Java? If yes, then we must allow distribution. If not, then we say the VM is just a feature of the browser and new Windows releases.

Tod should put together a specific list of the fallout. The corp side might be worse than ISVs, take the CIBC situation as an example. We sold em on doing Java with our VM, but they don't want IE4. We would either need to give them an os service pack with Java in it, or say they must install IE4, or go use Suns or IBMs stuff.

—Original Message—
From: Tod Nielsen
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 11:46 AM
To: Paul Maritz; David Cole
Cc: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

Yes, this would push off many ISVs (I'm right now putting together the specific list of who will switch camps if we don't allow redistribution).

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
987

Even if we allowed these ISVs to redistribute all of IE4 as their "run time", we would lose a lot of ISVs because of the fact that IE3 and IE4 can not co-exist on a users system. The side effect of automatically making a significant browser upgrade doesn't sit well with ISVs, and especially the corporates.

If we maintain the hard line and say there is no redistribution, we definitely open the door to Sun and allow them to get these developers to target their VM and APIs. To counter act this, we will have to get share of IE 4 unbelieveably high and our java vm will have to be *significantly* better than Suns. If we maintain the hard line and both of these things don't happen, Java developers will make the move to Sun's camp.

- Tod

—Original Message—
From: Paul Maritz
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 11:18 AM
To: David Cole
Cc: Tod Nielsen; Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

Just to make sure I understand, this means that ISV could not distribute it. If so, we looked at this before, and decided that there where couple of key ISVs to whom this had been "committed" that we did not want to push off our VM - Todn, please confirm (one more time).

—Original Message—
From: David Cole
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 9:28 AM
To: Paul Maritz
Cc: Tod Nielsen; Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

I agree with Jim that this propogates the mess, it's not what we all want. Let's take a step back for a second: I am not in the Java development business, Jim isn't either. We are taking this pain so we can be in the Java business.

It's risky and we'd take shit for it with ISVs, but we should consider just saying our VM comes with IE4, plus it comes with Windows, we could decide on providing a service pack too, but that's quite a bit of work as jim knows. I wonder how much we'd really lose by take this stand.

—Original Message—
From: David Cole
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 9:16 AM
To: Jim Allchin (Exchange); Moshe Dunie
Cc: Tod Nielsen; Paul Gross; John Ludwig; Paul Maritz; Charles Fitzgerald; Michael Toutonghi
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

Yes I hate it too. We should figure out a better way to get updated components distributed, quarterly update packages for the OS perhaps which can be installed over the net with patches might help solve it. There is really no reliable and frequent ship bus to get these extra components on, if there were, we could just point everybody at those.

The same issue exists with Ncompass, they need the new crypto DLLs so those ActiveX controls works again with Netscapes browser. Remember, the certs all expired at the end of June. The package should get delivered for that too.

—Original Message—
From: Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 1997 9:02 AM
To: David Cole; Moshe Dunie
Cc: Tod Nielsen; Paul Gross; John Ludwig; Paul Maritz; Charles Fitzgerald; Michael Toutonghi
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

This is such a mess. It's yet another deliverable. Another thing to test during system upgrades. Another separate release cycle. Another separate release that must be

QFE'ed. I assume once we start this it means that every time we rev the VM that another update of the security DLLs must be tested, packaged, etc.

I understand the feedback below. I give up. We should never have promised this.

Moshe, please have them package up the security DLLs and provide it to the VM group.

jim

---Original Message---
From: David Cole
Sent: Monday, August 04, 1997 11:13 PM
To: Moshe Dunie; Jim Allchin (Exchange)
Cc: Tod Nielsen; Paul Gross; John Ludwig; Paul Maritz; Charles Fitzgerald; Michael Toutonghi
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

I think given this, the best course is to package up the crypto DLLs for distribution with the Java VM. If we don't do this, then I think we just bail and say there is no JavaVM other than what comes with full IE4. That will be painful since we've promised ISVs they can distribute the VM.

What needs to happen to get closure on this?

---Original Message---
From: Tod Nielsen
Sent: Friday, August 01, 1997 5:07 PM
To: David Cole; John Ludwig; Paul Gross
Subject: RE: distributing the new Java VM

Based on the initial feedback we have gotten, this would be a major cramp in any ISVs adopting or targeting our stuff.

Common comments included:

- "Whatever run time we distribute can't hose the user's existing configuration. Upgrading users to IE4 as a side effect is not acceptable."
- "Any run time we have to distribute had better be as small as possible"
- "Figuring out what we can and can't redistribute is a pain in the butt. Whatever plan you come up with, it better be crystal clear on exactly what we can distribute or we will not adopt it"

In the end, this would cause us a huge pain that is not worth it. If this is our only alternative, we could probably incent folks and get some ISVs to support this, but their would be many casualties.

I don't have much data from the corporate world, but the 2 folks I spoke with said this would absolutely prevent them from using this r-t until the corporation standardized on IE4.

Given all of this, and given the fact that I don't believe we will have a miraculous, instantaneous adoption of IE4, I recommend the following:

- we should get Allchin to change his tune with the crypto redistribution
- we need one run time that includes all of the system services we want to make available for redistribution
- we have to make sure we do not upgrade users to IE4 as a side effect. Maybe upgrading folks to IE4 can be an option on installation, but the user should be able to decide to run IE3 as their browser, and still run an application that targets this new r-t

Let me know if you need more info, or want to discuss further.

---Original Message---
From: David Cole
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 1997 10:32 AM
To: Tod Nielsen; Cornelius Willis

Cc: John Ludwig; Chris Jones; Michael Toutonghi; Charles Fitzgerald; Rick Waddell
Subject: distributing the new Java VM

This issue is still not settled. Before I left on vacation, I thought it was resolved that we'd somehow pursuade the crypto team to allow redistribution of their DLLs which are required by the new VM. I sent mail to jimall on this with the "notify when he reads" flag set. He never read the mail, but people tell me he's said no way.

Now the current plan is to require ISVs to ship an IE4 run-time, which includes all the core files and APIs of IE4, but IE4 won't install itself as the default browser or show up in the UI. This is probably around 9 megs instead of the 4-5 of just the JavaVM. It's a nice solution for us since it allows us to deliver a quality package which has been tested together and can be easily upgraded in the future. (although we don't have a test plan yet for the runtime) Side effect is that IE3 users will get automagically upgraded to IE4 since IE3 and IE4 can't co-exist at this time.

Question for DRG: Will this fly with ISVs, or will it send them off to use Sun's offering instead. We need a considered answer to this question. I would like to go for the IE4 runtime solution, but don't want to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

thanks,
David