From janineh Tue Mar 26 14:51:50 1991
To: andyhi sheriv
Cc: brads davidcol kayssaw tonya
Subject: RE: IBM questions about 3.1 code
Date: Tue Mar 26 14:49:46 1991

The only exception I would take with this is the DPMI code issue.
It has nothing to do with them being able to build a product.
It has to do with their desire to back this code into 3.0a.

It is true we know what files have been modified for DPMI client
support. What is also true is that SieveB was very, very
reluctant to send this to them. It is again also true that IBM
has not spent any time trying to find out where or what the code
should be. They aren't even looking in the right part of the
code.

It isn't my call as to whether or not we tell them. I just don't
see why we should help them when we didn't want to give it to
them in the first place. It is entirely independent of the
commitment we have to help them build the product.

>From sheriv Tue Mar 26 14:39:49 1991
|To: andyhi
|Cc: brads davidcol janineh kayssaw tonya
|Subject: RE: IBM questions about 3.1 code
|Date: Tue Mar 26 14:37:28 PDT 1991

Well, the intent of the contract was to license them a product that
would build. We not only over-committed ourselves on that, but are
now appearing reluctant to assist them with resources to get them
to a point where they can build product.

Both davidcol and bradsaid in the Ballmer/Reiswig meeting last
week that we'd provide the resources IBM needs to get the product
built. Period. I really think that it's a fairly
trivial effort to tell them how to locate the DPMI code (2 minutes!?)!

we should just do that and 2) set tim's expectations so that he
understands that he may have to spend a couple hours with them
initially to get them up and running on how to build the product,
but after that initial training experience, the requests will taper
off.

Janine, when I talked to you yesterday, I didn't realize that brad,
and davidol had made those commitments in the meeting. We should
stick by them, especially when it's a relatively small work effort.
Believe me, we get far more negative press at IBM from being this
resistant than you can imagine, and we should endeavor to at least appear
reactive to their requests. If they really become a support burden,
then we should revisit the issue, but we need to keep our
commitments for now.

>From andyhi Tue Mar 26 12:05:15 1991
|To: sheriv
|Cc: janineh
|Subject: IBM questions about 3.1 code
|Date: Tue Mar 26 12:02:39 PDT 1991
|
|I just got a second phone message from beth schreiber asking questions
|on how to locate the DPMI code in the 3.1 source drop of 3/15.
|
|What contractual obligation do we have to help them, and how do we want
|to respond?
|
|Janineh double-checked what we shipped, and the DPMI code is definitely
|in there.
|
|I don't want ibm boca to get the idea that we will help them at all on
|this, if we aren't obligated.
|
|Thanks
|Andy

From tonya Tue Mar 26 15:00:58 1991
|To: andyhi davidol
|Cc: bradsi sheriv
|Subject: RE: Reiswig mtg summary
|Date: Tue Mar 26 15:03:41 PDT 1991
|
|there is an internal debate going on within IBM, the s/w
guys want to give us the source and have us deal with the
headaches of maintaining it. the h/w guys want to keep the
source because this is a proprietary thing they want to
protect. we are trying to get source but may be a drawn
out debate.

>From andyhi Tue Mar 26 14:43:25 1991
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