



Erik Stevenson

From: Brad Silverberg
To: paulma
Subject: FW: DMTF and what to do with it...
Date: Friday, January 28, 1994 5:36PM

what a fucking mess.

From: John Ludwig
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: FW: DMTF and what to do with it...
Date: Friday, January 28, 1994 4:39PM

From: Jim Allchin
To: johnlu
Subject: FW: DMTF and what to do with it...
Date: Thursday, January 27, 1994 3:55PM

I thought you should see this. All I can say is "simply amazing..."
Below Dan is answering my questions to him on this mess.

If you have thoughts, I could use your help.

thanks,
jim

From: Dan Shelly
To: Jim Allchin; Jonathan Roberts; Richard Tong
Cc: Bob Muglia; David Thompson (NT)
Subject: RE: DMTF and what to do with it...
Date: Monday, January 24, 1994 5:52PM

Answers embedded below. I was supposed to meet with IBM this Friday to discuss our distribution of source code to the DMTF. I backed out based on the fact that our lawyers are still looking this over and it could take a *LONG* time for them to approve.

| What a fucking mess.

>> A clear analysis of the situation

| 0. Is there anything in writing?

>> The DMTF bylaws upon which this is all based are not clear. The original intent of the DMTF was to deliver an object level implementation. Nowhere have we committed in *writing* to deliver source code, however, if we don't Intel has already stated that they will. Evidentially the verbal agreement for the last 1.5 years has been that all work done by DMTF will be shared.

| 1. What protocol is being used to gather up the Novell stuff?

>> The idea of the spec is that it is protocol independent, runs on top of whatever you use. In Novell's case that could be either IPX/SPX or TCP/IP

| Having the DMI client interfaces might even be good on OS/2, etc.

>> OS/2 clients with DMI interfaces would be easily manageable from Netware.

2. Are *we* getting any source code from anyone? I don't see people lining up to give us code. And you can guess how I feel about giving them code.

>> We would get the OS/2 service layer code without encumbrance (per Ken Edwards, IBM). Hardly a stellar trade for providing access to our install base of clients. SunNet will also provide a UNIX implementation only after DMI is adopted as a COSE standard (supposedly very soon).

The implementation of the DMI layer will pick up information from random places and it could change with new versions of the system so I'm not interested in getting into some support problems with Novell and IBM shipping some DMI code that doesn't work on the next release. This is a rat hole.

>> It get worse. It's obvious that what IBM and Novell want to do is "add functionality" hence their request for unencumbered source code. Based on what I was hearing and past performance of these 2, their implementation would work with our OS's but then add extra functionality for OS/2, AIX, Dr-DOS, etc. My analysis is that we would shortly be positioned as "less manageable" and IBM/Novell could legally charge a license fee for their implementation.

3. I drove the review with johnlu where we got the DMI stuff to just be a compatibility thing on top of PnP, etc. Hans, et. al must deliver a DMI layer that ships with Hermes (it may ship later, but it's in the Hermes box or some resource dumping kit).

>> My understanding is that the DMI layer won't be in ver. 1 of Hermes, but afterwards made available on CIS and then incorporated into version 2.

We need to do this for win/wfw, winnt, and | chicago. It's very, very low on the priority list, however.

>> low in priority list means off the list till Hermes ships. Intel has committed an engineer to write the Chicago service layer since we said we had no resources right now.

However, they do have a good chunk of this work done | thought. I don't know about any testing however.

>> Intel delivered MS-DOS, Hans delivered Windows and Windows NT service layers for the DMI developer's conference in November. We tested only in that numerous clients all were viewable from DMI enabled consoles.

4. What pisses me off the most is that they didn't define the protocol - the most key thing in my opinion. Who cares what the upper level apis are on the client? There shouldn't have been any apis there. Instead we should have pushed a single management protocol coming out of all our clients. Given the path we're on, it's Novell's protocol that will become the standard.

>> Should IBM & Novell settle on a single supported implementation for

which we then have no further source code rights, I fear you are correct. Longer term it also threatens our PnP initiative as well. We could be viewed in the same light as IBM of the 70's. (i.e. we own the market share so you have to follow our standards) We have set ourselves up for a real downside risk here.

What this does is raise the priority for us to figure out what the plan for this protocol really should be. We need to involve daveth in this. I know there is no bandwidth now, but we will have to address this with someone thinking the issues through as soon as daytona ships.

>> It is clear that we need this, and it will have to be consistent for all of our clients.

>> Suggestions for how we proceed.

Based on the above, it is clear that we do not want to keep running straight at this brick wall but we are publicly committed to this. There are really 4 options that we could take at this point.

1. The "open" option. Work with SunNet to have DMI approved as an "open" standard by Xopen (not COSE) and then put our service layer code out in the public domain. There would soon be 136 implementations, each slightly different. We wear white hats and never put into our OS till the implementation is finalized. A long, long time from now.
2. The "cooperative" option. We provide a license for our implementation to all 8 members of DMTF with the source *BUT* Microsoft retains rights to all future development based on this code, and royalty rights for any secondary license agreements. (IBM would hate this, but we would still be noted as cooperative in the press) Service layer object itself could still be distributed for free.
3. The "cautious" option. We will provide management objects only (not source) for each platform. Microsoft would maintain full source control to ensure customers would have no compatibility problems with future changes of our operating systems. Licensing of this service layer agent would not be an issue since it would be available for free on CIS, the internet, and elsewhere.
4. The "fuck you" option. We pull out of DMTF for whatever reason. (absolute worst idea, both the marketplace and the press really like DMI)

Of these options I would suggest that we opt for #2. It will forestall IBM/Novell the longest and allow us time to adopt and evangelize a consistent protocol-based solution across all of our clients. It is also easiest to defend to the press. Any other option, and Intel will simply do the port for IBM/Novell.

-Dan

sigh,
jim

From: Richard Tong
To: Dan Shelly; Jim Allchin
Subject: DMTF and what to do with it...
Date: Monday, January 17, 1994 5:34PM

Message-Id: <9401180143.AA11284@itgmsm>
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

I've been chatting dansh about the DMTF meeting he just went to. We need a little guidance on this issue since neither Dan nor I understand all the issues here and I think there are some commitments we want to get out of.

Net, net, here is what dansh says happened at the Friday.

- 1) Novell will put DMI client interfaces into NetWare and DR-DOS
- 2) IBM will put DMI client interfaces into OS/2 2.2
- 3) Novell will write an NLM that will gather up CMI client information and probably pump it into some portion of NMS to be viewed and browsed.
- 4) IBM and Novell expect us to give them the source code to put DMI client interfaces into Windows 3.x and Windows for Workgroups 3.x and Windows NT "without encumbrances"
- 5) The DMTF as a whole think we are going to put DMI client interfaces

into

Chicago, but we are not going to do this (per a Chicago decision that Johnlu

made; hansw was going to layer DMI on top of the PNP registry APIs, but this

was whacked in some Chicago review as dansh understands it.)

While #1, #2 and #3 are fine and we can't do much to stop it, dansh and I think that #4 is unacceptable (this commitment on #4 was made by you know who). I don't want to do it and we have two weeks to figure how to gracefully say, we don't remember #4.

Finally, #5 is going to piss some of the people on the current DMTF off which we will have to manage.

Shall we get together sometime to discuss or did we misunderstand this whole situation?

Rich