UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

PLAINTIFF,

V. : C.A. NO. 98-1232

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

DEFENDANT.

STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL.,

PLAINTIFFS,

V. : C.A. NO. 98-1223

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

DEFENDANT.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

COUNTERCLAIM-PLAINTIFF, :

V.

DENNIS C. VACCO, ET AL.,

COUNTERCLAIM-DEFENDANTS.: JANUARY 13, 1999

VOLUME 37-B

TRANSCRIBED DEPOSITION EXCERPTS

COURT REPORTER:

DAVID A. KASDAN, RMR

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC.

507 C STREET, N.E.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003

(202) 546-6666

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 507 C STREET, N.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002 EXCEPT Parlound: F. GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT

1
1

# 

# 

# 

### 

### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

(DEPOSITION EXCERPTS OF JOE BELFIORE.)

Q. LET ME ASK YOU--GO BACK--AND AGAIN, AS
I GO THROUGH SOME OF THESE, IF I DON'T
CHARACTERIZE THEM EXACTLY RIGHT OR YOU SORT OF
NEED TO FIX MY DESCRIPTION, PLEASE DO THAT
BECAUSE WE NEED TO HAVE A GOOD JOINT
UNDERSTANDING OF THEM BEFORE WE GO ON.

THE ONE I MENTIONED RIGHT BEFORE WE TOOK THE BREAK WAS THE CHANGE TO THE WEB VIEW THAT WOULD GIVE YOU MORE INFORMATION, MORE ATTRACTIVE OR MORE DETAILED INFORMATION ABOUT FILES OR FOLDERS AS YOU OPEN THEM.

DO YOU RECALL THAT?

- A. YES.
- Q. AND I BELIEVE YOU SAID THAT WAS NOT SOMETHING THAT YOU ANTICIPATED WOULD BE IN THE IE 5; IS THAT RIGHT?
  - A. YES.
- Q. DO YOU EXPECT THAT THAT PARTICULAR

  IMPROVEMENT WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE SEPARATE FROM
  WINDOWS 98 IN ANY WAY?
  - A. NO.
- Q. AND FOR THAT--LET ME TRY AGAIN. LET ME SEE IF THIS WORKS.

WHY ISN'T THAT SOMETHING THAT YOU WOULD

WANT TO MAKE AVAILABLE TO USERS THROUGH, YOU KNOW, IE 4.0 OR SOMETHING, FOR EXAMPLE, OR THROUGH IE 5 SEPARATE FROM WINDOWS 98?

A. OKAY. A PIECE OF CUSTOMER FEEDBACK
THAT WE'VE HEARD ABOUT DOWNLOADING IE COMPONENTS
FROM THE WEB IS THAT DOWNLOADING IE COMPONENTS
TODAY TAKES TOO LONG, IT'S TOO BIG, THERE'S TOO
MUCH STUFF.

SO ONE OF THE PRINCIPLES, TRYING TO MAKE IE 5 MEET CUSTOMER EXPECTATIONS AND BE EASIER FOR CUSTOMERS TO INSTALL, IS TO MAKE IT SMALLER AND INCLUDE LESS STUFF.

SO ONE REASON TO NOT INCLUDE MANY OF THESE THINGS IS THAT IT WILL MAKE IE BIGGER FOR THE DOWNLOAD.

- Q. BEFORE WE GO INTO THAT, TELL ME A
  LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THE FEEDBACK THAT HAS
  SUGGESTED THAT DOWNLOADING IE IS--IT'S TOO BIG
  AND DOWNLOADING IS NOT A GOOD THING.
- A. THERE'S TONS OF FEEDBACK THAT SUGGEST
  THAT DOWNLOADING IE TAKES TOO LONG, IS TOO HARD.
  YOU CAN GO READ PRETTY MUCH ANY PRESS REVIEWS,
  JUST GO TALK TO ANY PEOPLE OR EXPERIENCE IT
  YOURSELF AND YOU'LL FIND THAT THE NUMBER OF HOURS
  THAT IT TAKES TO DOWNLOAD THESE COMPONENTS OVER

THE PHONE LINE IS INCREDIBLY DISCOURAGING TO PEOPLE, OFTEN FAILS, AND THE RESULT IS THAT PEOPLE DON'T GET AN IMPROVED USER EXPERIENCE AT ALL.

SO, IN ORDER TO DELIVER BENEFIT FOR CUSTOMERS, WE HAVE TO MAKE IT EASIER.

- Q. IS THAT PHENOMENON YOU'VE DESCRIBED,

  JUST HOW DIFFICULT AND DISCOURAGING THE DOWNLOAD

  IS FROM WHAT YOU HAVE BOTH READ AND HEAR FROM

  FEEDBACK DIRECTLY, IS THAT SOMETHING THAT APPLIES

  TO THE LATEST VERSION IN NETSCAPE'S COMMUNICATOR

  AS WELL AS TO IE?
  - A. YES.
  - Q. IT'S PRETTY BIG, TOO, I TAKE IT?
  - A. YES.
- Q. IN TERMS OF THE FEEDBACK OR THE INFORMATION BEHIND WHAT YOU'VE JUST DESCRIBED, ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY SORT OF NUMBERS THAT REFLECT WHAT YOU'VE TALKED ABOUT? FOR EXAMPLE, THE PERCENTAGES OF PEOPLE WHO TRIED TO DOWNLOAD WHERE IT FLAT-OUT FAILED, FOR EXAMPLE, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?
  - A. NO.
- Q. HAS THERE BEEN ANY THOUGHT OR
  CONSIDERATION TO MAKING--WE'LL DO IT ONE BY ONE

	1
	_
	2
	3
	~
	4
	E
	6
	7
	•
	٤
	9
1	(
_	
1	J
1	_
_	4
1	3
1	4
1	_
1	_
1	•
1	-
_	•
1	8
1	2
_	,
2	(
2	1
۷.	-1
2	2
_	
2	3
2	4

FOR NOW--THIS FEATURE WE WERE JUST TALKING ABOUT,
THE MORE ATTRACTIVE DETAILED WEB VIEW FOR

FOLDERS, AVAILABLE IN IE 5 OR FUTURE VERSIONS OF
IE IN FORMS OTHER THAN DOWNLOAD; FOR EXAMPLE,
WHEN IT'S DELIVERED--WHEN IE IS REDISTRIBUTED BY
AN INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDER OR IF IT'S
DISTRIBUTED AT RETAIL ON A DISK OR SOME
NONDOWNLOAD METHOD THAT WOULDN'T HAVE THIS
PROBLEM?

A. NO.

MR. AESCHBACHER: OBJECTION. ASKED AND ANSWERED.

#### BY MR. MALONE:

- Q. AND AGAIN, WHY WOULDN'T MAKING IT

  AVAILABLE IN THAT WAY WHERE YOU WOULDN'T HAVE

  THIS DOWNLOAD ISSUE, WHY WOULDN'T THAT BE

  SOMETHING YOU WOULD WANT TO OFFER?
- A. WE--IT WOULD MAKE SENSE FOR US TO

  DEFINE A SET OF COMPONENTS THAT WE WOULD CALL IE

  IN A CONSISTENT WAY SO PEOPLE WOULD KNOW WHAT

  THEY WERE GOING TO GET REGARDLESS OF THE MEANS IN
  WHICH IT WAS DISTRIBUTED.
- Q. HAS THAT BEEN THE CASE UP TO NOW WITH IE 3 AND IE 4, FOR EXAMPLE?
  - A. YES.

(EXCERPT.)

AFTER IE 4 SHIPPED.

MR. AESCHBACHER: OBJECTION. VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS.

#### BY MR. MALONE:

Q. AND WHEN IT'S BEEN THE CASE FOR IE 3

AND IE 4, CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHAT YOU MEAN IN

WHAT--AND AGAIN, I FORGET YOUR EXACT WORDS OF HOW

YOU DESCRIBED IT.

MR. AESCHBACHER: SAME OBJECTION.

THE WITNESS: IT'S JUST A SIMPLE

CONCEPT, THAT IF PEOPLE READ ABOUT SOMETHING

CALLED IE SET OF FEATURES OR FUNCTIONS AND THEY

GO TO A PARTICULAR DISTRIBUTION CHANNEL TO GET

IT, THEIR EXPERIENCE IN GETTING THOSE FEATURES

AND FUNCTIONS WOULD BE CONSISTENT; THAT IS, USER

BENEFITS, IT'S BETTER FOR THEM.

Q. LET ME GO BACK TO ANOTHER ONE OF THE THINGS THAT YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU OR YOUR TEAM HAD CONTINUED TO WORK ON FOR WINDOWS 98

AND THE SECOND ONE I WANT TO ASK YOU

ABOUT HAD TO DO WITH THE, I BELIEVE YOU

SAID--AGAIN, CORRECT ME IF I DON'T SAY IT THE WAY

YOU DID--THE ADDRESS BAR IN BOTH THE BROWSER

WINDOW AND IN THE TASK BAR ITSELF. IS THAT ONE

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
]	.0
]	.1
1	<b>2</b>
1	L3
1	L 4
-	L5
:	L6
:	١7
:	L 8
:	19
:	20
:	21
:	22
:	23
:	24

#### YOU MENTIONED?

- A. YES.
- Q. AND I THINK THERE YOU SAID THAT SOME ADJUSTMENTS HAD BEEN MADE TO THE CODE THAT AFFECTS HOW IT WORKS.
  - A. YES.
- Q. IS THAT SOMETHING THAT WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE IN ANY WAY, TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, SEPARATELY FROM WINDOWS 98?
- A. THOSE ADJUSTMENTS WOULD PROBABLY BE A PART OF IE 5.
- Q. AND WHY WILL THOSE BE PART OF IE 5 AND OTHER THINGS HERE WON'T?
- A. IN THAT PARTICULAR CASE, THE CODE THAT
  WE ADJUSTED IS PART OF THE--IS CLEARLY A PART OF
  THE USER'S BROWSING EXPERIENCE. SO IT WOULD MAKE
  SENSE FOR THOSE ENHANCEMENTS TO BE INCLUDED IN
  IE 5.
- Q. WHEN YOU MAKE THAT DISTINCTION, YOU SAID THE CODE IS PART OF THE USER'S BROWSING EXPERIENCE, WHAT GENERALLY DO YOU MEAN THERE?
- A. GENERALLY, I MEAN THE CODE THAT

  IMPLEMENTS THE WINDOW THROUGH WHICH A USER CAN

  BROWSE THE WEB OR BROWSE THEIR HARD DISK OR

  WHATEVER.

1	Q. I THINK THE NEXT THING YOU MENTIONED
2	WAS SOME CHANGES OR SOME FIXES TO THE WAY THE
3	START MENU OPERATES.
4	IS THAT SOMETHING THAT, TO YOUR
5	KNOWLEDGE, WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE SEPARATELY FROM
6	WINDOWS 98 AT ANY POINT?
7	A. PROBABLY NOT.
8	Q. AND WHY NOT IN THE SENSE OF WHAT'S
9	DIFFERENT?
10	A. GOING BACK TO THE TWO PRINCIPLES I
11	MENTIONED EARLIER. ONE IS TO KEEP THE SIZE OF A
12	FUTURE IE 5 SMALL, AND THE OTHER PRINCIPLE OF
13	CODE THAT DIRECTLY RELATES TO THE USER'S BROWSING
14	EXPERIENCE. THIS WOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN
15	THOSEIN THE CATEGORY OF THINGS THAT WOULD BE
16	LIKELY INCLUDED.
17	Q. OKAY. SO, THIS WOULD BOTH MAKE AN IE
18	BIGGER IF YOU INCLUDED IT IN THERE?
19	A. IT PROBABLY WOULD. BUT THAT WOULD
20	DEPEND ON HOW YOU IMPLEMENTED IT.
21	Q. AND ON THE SECOND THING, THIS ISN'T
22	PART OFWELL, I DON'T WANT TO MISCHARACTERIZE.
23	HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE SECOND
24	FACTOR?
25	A. I'LL CONTRAST IT WITH THE ADDRESS BAR

-
1
ㅗ
_

### 

# 

# 

### 

# 

## 

# 

### 

### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

EXAMPLE.

- Q. YEAH.
- A. WHERE THE ADDRESS BAR EXAMPLE IS A

  PART--THE ADDRESS BAR CODE IS PART OF THE CODE

  THAT WOULD BE REVISED TO REVISE THE GENERAL USER

  EXPERIENCE OF BROWSING.

AND IN FACT, THE FUNCTIONALITY ENHANCEMENT RELATES TO BROWSING.

IN THE START MENU CASE, THE CODE MAY OR MAY NOT BE PART OF THAT; AND, IN FACT, IF YOU'RE TRYING TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF CODE DOWNLOADED, YOUR OBJECTIVE WOULD BE TO MAKE IT NOT BE, AND IT DOES NOT RELATE TO THE SPECIFIC ACT OF USING A WINDOW TO BROWSE AROUND YOUR HARD DISK OR BROWSE THE WEB.

#### O. I SEE. OKAY.

LET ME GO BACK FOR ONE SECOND. I DON'T THINK I ASKED YOU. WHEN WE WERE TALKING ABOUT THE CHANGES TO THE ADDRESS BARS, WHERE ARE THOSE CHANGES MADE, OR WHAT--ARE THERE, AGAIN, SPECIFIC DLL'S OR FILES THAT THOSE STEM FROM OR THE CHANGES ARE MADE IN?

A. YES. I BELIEVE THEY'RE IN SHDOCVW,

ALTHOUGH I COULD BE INCORRECT. I'M FAIRLY SURE

I'M CORRECT.

### 

#### 

#### 

### 

#### 

# 

### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

\_\_\_

(EXCERPT.)

Q. YOU HAD ALSO DESCRIBED SOMETHING YOU REFERRED TO A COUPLE OF TIMES, THE "MY DOCUMENTS" FOLDER AND CHANGES IN WINDOWS 98 WHERE IT ACTUALLY CREATES THE FOLDER AND, I THINK YOU SAID, MAKES IT EASIER TO GET TO.

AND YOU DESCRIBED SOME ADDITIONAL

ACCESS POINTS, I GUESS, IF WE GET INTO THE "MY

DOCUMENTS" FOLDER; IS THAT RIGHT?

- A. UH-HUH.
- Q. I'M SORRY, COULD YOU JUST SAY YES JUST FOR THE COURT REPORTER.
  - A. I'M SORRY. YES.
  - O. THAT'S ALL RIGHT.

MR. AESCHBACHER: LET THE RECORD SHOW

MR. MALONE'S DIRECTING THE WITNESS TO SAY "YES."

BY MR. MALONE:

- Q. IN THE CHANGES YOU DESCRIBED IN THE "MY DOCUMENTS" FOLDER, ARE THOSE CHANGES YOU ANTICIPATE WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE SEPARATELY FROM WINDOWS 98 IN THE FUTURE?
- A. IN GENERAL, NO, ALTHOUGH SOME OF THE SPECIFIC ACCESS POINTS MAY RELATE TO BROWSING, AND THOSE WE MAY.
  - Q. AND CAN YOU TELL ME WHEN--WHICH

SPECIFIC ONES OR WHICH SPECIFIC ACCESS POINTS MAY RELATE TO BROWSING.

MR. AESCHBACHER: CALLS FOR SPECULATION. VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS.

THE WITNESS: ACCESS VIA THE START

MENU. AND IF WE WERE TO DECIDE TO INCLUDE DIRECT

ACCESS, VIA THE BROWSING WINDOW.

#### BY MR. MALONE:

Q. AND IN THE FIRST ONE, ACCESS VIA THE START MENU, WHY OR IN WHAT SENSE MIGHT THAT RELATE TO BROWSING?

MR. AESCHBACHER: VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS.
GO AHEAD.

THE WITNESS: IN THIS CASE, IT

IS--WELL, IT'S A MEANS FOR THE USER TO GET TO A

PARTICULAR SET OF STUFF. AND TO THE EXTENT THAT

IT CAN BE DONE WITHOUT IMPLYING A CONCEPTUAL COST

OR A DOWNLOAD SIZE, COST MIGHT BE SOMETHING THAT

WE WOULD TRY TO DO. LIKE IN THAT PARTICULAR

EXAMPLE, IT'S VERY LIGHT WEIGHT AND IT JUST MIGHT

FIT.

AGAIN, I SHOULD POINT OUT THAT THESE DECISIONS HAVEN'T BEEN MADE YET, SO I'M SPECULATING.

BY MR. MALONE:

5

Q. AND WHEN YOU DESCRIBED WHEN I'VE ASKED YOU, YOU KNOW, DO YOU EXPECT THIS WOULD OR WOULDN'T BE IN, YOU'VE BEEN BASING THAT ON YOUR CURRENT UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THE PLANS ARE FOR IE 5?

#### A. YES.

MR. AESCHBACHER: OBJECTION. MISSTATES
HIS TESTIMONY TO THE EXTENT THAT THERE HAVEN'T
BEEN PLANS MADE TO SOME OF THESE THINGS.

#### BY MR. MALONE:

- Q. ARE THERE SPECIFIC DLL'S OR FILES THAT

  CREATE OR GIVE RISE TO THE CHANGES YOU'VE

  DESCRIBED IN THE "MY DOCUMENTS" FOLDER AND ACCESS
  TO IT?
- A. THERE ARE, AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY ARE.
  - Q. DO YOU KNOW WHAT ANY OF THEM ARE?
- A. WELL, THIS FEATURE COULD HAVE BEEN
  IMPLEMENTED A NUMBER OF WAYS, AND I DON'T KNOW
  WHICH WAY WAS USED, SO I DON'T WANT TO SPECULATE
  ABOUT WHICH DLL'S MAY HAVE BEEN IMPACTED.

  (EXCERPT.)
- Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR, GENERALLY, WITH A
  FEATURE OR A UTILITY IN WINDOWS 95 AND WINDOWS 98
  CALLED THE ADD/REMOVE PROGRAMS UTILITY?

-
7
1

A. YES.

Q. IS THAT SOMETHING THAT IS IN BOTH WINDOWS 95 AND WINDOWS 98?

- A. YES.
- Q. CAN YOU TELL ME GENERALLY WHAT THE PURPOSE OF THAT UTILITY IS, AS YOU UNDERSTAND IT.

#### A. SURE.

THAT IS A PIECE OF USER INTERFACE THAT
PROVIDES A SINGLE COMMONPLACE FOR A USER TO GO TO
ADD APPLICATIONS TO THEIR PC OR TO REMOVE
APPLICATIONS FROM THEIR PC.

I SHOULD ADD, IT'S ACTUALLY BROADER
THAN THAT BECAUSE IT ALSO PROVIDES A MECHANISM
FOR USERS TO INSTALL OR UNINSTALL COMPONENTS OF
WINDOWS WHICH, IN MANY CASES, CONCEPTUAL USERS
THEY WANT TO GO TO ONE PLACE AND THEY LOOK AROUND
AND THEY FIND THE THING BY NAME THAT THEY'RE
LOOKING FOR, AND THEN THEY'LL SUCCEED AT THE
TASK.

- Q. SO, IT DOESN'T SO MUCH MATTER TO THEM HOW THE THING IS CHARACTERIZED?
- A. AS LONG AS THEY CAN GO AND FIND THE THING THAT THEY WANT TO ADD OR REMOVE, THEN THEY SUCCEEDED IN THE TASK AND OUR USER INTERFACE IS WORKING.

Q. AND GENERALLY, WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT A USER WANTING TO ADD OR REMOVE THINGS, WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY ADD OR REMOVE?

A. GENERALLY, I MEAN THAT A USER IS MAKING A TRADEOFF OF WHETHER SOME SET OF FUNCTIONALITY IS FUNCTIONALITY THEY WANT TO HAVE STORED ON THEIR PC HARD DISK OR NOT. SO, IN SOME EXAMPLE I MIGHT GO HERE BECAUSE I HAVE A FLOPPY DISK THAT WILL ENABLE ME TO INSTALL AN APPLICATION LIKE TURBOTAX OR QUICKEN OR SOMETHING. AND I GO THERE BECAUSE IT SAYS "ADD," AND I STICK THE FLOPPY DISK IN, AND THEN IT WILL RUN THE APPLICATION SETUP PROGRAM AND ADD THAT CODE TO MY HARD DISK.

SIMILARLY, IF I KNOW THAT MY HARD DISK
IS FULL AND I KNOW THAT THERE'S A BUNCH OF
PROGRAM CODE THAT I DON'T USE, FUNCTIONALITY IS
NOT USEFUL TO ME, THEN I CAN GO TO THIS PLACE AND
LOOK FOR THINGS THAT I DON'T USE IN ORDER TO FREE
UP SPACE ON MY HARD DISK.

Q. IN THE CASE OF INTERNET EXPLORER 4 IN WINDOWS 95, IS IT THE CASE THAT IF A USER INSTALLED IE 4 FROM A DISK OR DOWNLOADED IT IN SOME WAY, THAT AN ENTRY WOULD APPEAR--ONE OR MORE ENTRIES WOULD APPEAR IN THE ADD/REMOVE UTILITY FOR THE INTERNET EXPLORER?

A. YES.

- Q. WHAT ENTRIES, TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, WOULD APPEAR IN THE ADD/REMOVE UTILITY?
- A. I BELIEVE--I BELIEVE THERE ARE TWO, ONE OF WHICH IS INTERNET EXPLORER 4.0 AND ONE WHICH IS INTERNET EXPLORER 4.0 SETUP FILES, BUT WE MAY HAVE GOTTEN RID OF THE SECOND ONE.
- Q. DO YOU KNOW, GENERALLY, WAS IT THE CASE THAT--OKAY.

AND BEYOND SORT OF WHAT ENTRIES APPEAR
WHEN A USER INSTALLED IE 4 THE WAY YOU'VE JUST
DESCRIBED, WOULD IT THEN BE POSSIBLE USING THE
ADD/REMOVE UTILITY FOR THE USER TO EITHER DELETE
IE 4 IN ITS ENTIRETY OR TO DELETE ONLY A PORTION
OF IT?

- A. YES.
- Q. AND CAN YOU EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE TWO OPTIONS.
- A. SURE. THERE ARE A LOT OF

  DIFFERENT-THERE ARE A LOT OF DIFFERENT POSSIBLE

  CONFIGURATIONS, AND WE TRIED TO LOCALIZE THE USER

  INTERFACE FOR PEOPLE TO MOVE FROM ONE

  CONFIGURATION TO ANOTHER. SO I'LL GIVE YOU SOME

  EXAMPLES.
  - Q. UH-HUH, PLEASE.

A. ONE EXAMPLE WOULD BE IF I RAN THROUGH
THE IE INSTALLATION PROCESS AND THE FIRST TIME I
RAN THROUGH I CHOSE NOT TO INSTALL THE WINDOWS
DESKTOP UPDATE THAT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT BEFORE.
THEN I'M USING IE 4 AND I'M HAPPY AND THINGS ARE
GOING FINE, AND I SEE SOMEBODY ELSE'S PC THAT HAS
IT AND I THINK IT'S COOL, SO I DECIDE I WANT TO.

WELL, NOW I GO TO THE ADD/REMOVE PLACE AND CLICK ON A BUTTON, AND I HAVE AN OPTION TO ADD THAT PART TO IE.

THE REVERSE IS ALSO TRUE. IF I HAVE
INSTALLED THAT SET OF COMPONENTS, THEN I HAVE A
PLACE THAT I CAN GO TO. IF MAYBE MY PC'S NOT
FAST ENOUGH OR I DON'T HAVE ENOUGH MEMORY AND THE
BENEFIT IS NOT WORTH THE COST TO ME, I CAN REMOVE
IT.

- Q. WHEN YOU SAY "IT," REMOVE THE ACTIVE DESKTOP PORTION OR THE ENTIRE THING?
- A. I CAN REMOVE THE COMPONENTS THAT

  IMPLEMENT JUST--THE SAME COMPONENTS THAT I WOULD

  HAVE CHOSEN TO INSTALL WHERE I HAVE TO RUN THE

  INSTALL THE FIRST TIME.
  - Q. FOR THE ACTIVE DESKTOP?
  - A. WELL, THAT WHOLE SET.
  - Q. SO YOU HAVE THE SAME CHOICES?

### 

## 

## 

#### 

### 

### 

### 

### 

#### 

### 

### 

### 

#### 

#### 

### 

#### 

#### 

### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### A. SAME GRANULARITY.

FURTHERMORE, IF I HAD--LET'S TAKE

ANOTHER EXAMPLE. LET'S SAY THAT I HAVE BEEN

USING SOME APPLICATION THAT USES THE IE SERVICES

AND BEFORE I USED--BEFORE I EVER INSTALLED IE 4.

SO I'LL USE QUICKEN 98 AS AN EXAMPLE OF AN

APPLICATION, ALTHOUGH I DON'T THINK THE SCENARIO

I'M GOING TO CONSTRUCT WOULD ACTUALLY HAPPEN IN

QUICKEN 98. I'M USING AN APPLICATION THAT USES

THESE SERVICES, AND THEN I INSTALL THE IE 4 SET

OF SERVICES.

NOW, IT MAY BE THE CASE THAT SOME

APPLICATION VENDOR HAS USED THE SERVICES IN SUCH
A WAY THAT THE CHANGE TO IE 4 MAKES IT

INCOMPATIBLE OR NOT WORK CORRECTLY OR NOT BE AS
GOOD AN EXPERIENCE FOR ME. THAT SHOULDN'T

HAPPEN, BUT IT'S POSSIBLE THAT IT COULD HAPPEN.

IN THAT SITUATION, I HAVE A PLACE TO GO
SO I CAN REVERT MY SYSTEM BACK TO THE EARLIER
LEVEL OF FUNCTIONALITY AND GUARANTEE THAT MY
APPLICATION EXPERIENCE WILL WORK WELL.

THAT'S JUST--THAT'S A SET OF EXAMPLES OF WHY THAT FUNCTIONALITY EXISTS AND WHAT IT IS INTENDED TO SOLVE.

(EXCERPT.)

┸║	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Q.	IN	WINDOW	IS 98	3, AS	ri 8	CURR	ENTL:	Y EXIST	S
IN	RELEASE	E CA	radidn <i>k</i>	E ZI	ERO,	IS	THERE	ANY	ABILIT	Y
OF	A USER	то	UNINST	ALL	ALL	OR	PART	OF II	NTERNET	
EXE	LORER (	II SL	G THE	ADD,	/REMO	OVE	UTILI	TY?		

- A. I DON'T KNOW.
- Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY INFORMATION ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT THAT'S--THAT IS POSSIBLE?
  - A. I KNOW THAT SOME TIME AGO--

MR. AESCHBACHER: OBJECTION. VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS. CALLS FOR SPECULATION.

YOU CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: I KNOW THAT SOME TIME AGO
IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE, AND I DON'T KNOW WHETHER
THAT STATE HAS CHANGED OR NOT.

#### BY MR. MALONE:

- Q. AT WHAT POINT IN TIME ARE YOU REFERRING TO WHEN IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE, ROUGHLY?
  - A. A MONTH OR TWO AGO.
  - Q. AND HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT?
- A. I--IN TYPICAL FASHION. I GOT E-MAIL
  FROM SOME RANDOM PERSON WITH A BUNCH OF COMMENTS
  ABOUT WINDOWS 98 USER INTERFACE. AND ONE OF THE
  COMMENTS RELATED TO THE FACT THAT THERE WASN'T AN
  ENTRY IN THERE.
  - Q. WHEN YOU SAY A "RANDOM PERSON," YOU

1	MEAN SOMEONE WITHIN MICROSOFT?
2	A. NO. WHAT I MEANT WAS A PERSON THAT I
3	HAVE NO BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP WITH.
4	Q. A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC AT LARGE?
5	A. RIGHT.
6	Q. AND I'M SORRY.
7	A. THAT'S FINE.
8	Q. TELL ME WHAT THE SUBSTANCE OF THE
9	E-MAIL WAS, AGAIN.
10	A. IT WAS A WHOLE SET OF COMMENTS ABOUT
11	THE WINDOWS 95 USER INTERFACE. AND ONE OF THE
12	COMMENTS ADDRESSED THE FACT THAT THERE WAS NO
13	ENTRY IN THE ADD/REMOVE UTILITY.
14	Q. YOU SAID WINDOWS 95.
15	A. I'M SORRY. I MEANT WINDOWS 98.
16	Q. WHAT SPECIFICALLYWHAT DID THESE
17	COMMENTS SAY WAS NOT IN THE ADD/REMOVE UTILITY?
18	A. A MEANS OF REMOVING THE IE 4 LEVEL OF
19	COMPONENTS INCLUDING THE WINDOWS DESKTOP UPDATE.
20	Q. AND WHAT, IF ANYTHING, DID YOU DO BASED
21	ON OR IN RESPONSE TO THE E-MAIL?
22	A. I REPLIED TO THE PERSON AND EXPLAINED
23	TO HIM A WHOLE BUNCH OF THINGS ABOUT A WHOLE
24	BUNCH OF HIS COMMENTS.
25	AND I FORWARDED MAIL ON TO SOME PEOPLE

1	WITH THE LIST OF HIS COMMENTS IN CASE OTHER
2	PEOPLE WANTED TO ADDRESS THEM.
3	Q. DID YOUR REPLY DEAL WITH OR SAY
4	ANYTHING ABOUT THE ADD/REMOVE ISSUE THAT WE JUST
5	TALKED ABOUT?
6	A. I THINK THE E-MAIL THAT I CREATED DID
7	ADDRESS THAT. AND I CAN'T REMEMBER WHETHER I
8	SENT A SPECIFIC MESSAGE ABOUT IT OR WHETHER IT
9	WAS JUST PART OF A BROAD SET OF HERE'S A BUNCH OF
10	COMMENTS.
11	Q. AND IN WHATEVER FORM IT WAS, DO YOU
12	REMEMBER THE SUBSTANCE OF WHAT YOU SAID,
13	SUBSTANCE OF YOUR REPLY ABOUT THIS ADD/REMOVE
14	ISSUE?
15	MR. AESCHBACHER: REPLY TO THE PERSON
16	WHO SENT HIM THE E-MAIL?
17	MR. MALONE: YES.
18	THE WITNESS: OH, TO THE PERSON?
19	MR. MALONE: YES. MAYBE WE SHOULD GO
20	BACK TO THE QUESTION. THAT'S WHERE I WAS FOCUSED
21	FOR NOW.
22	BY MR. MALONE:
23	Q. IN TERMS OF YOUR REPLY TO THIS PERSON,
24	DID YOULET ME JUST REPEAT IT, MAKE SURE WE'RE
25	ON THE SAME WAVELENGTH HERE.
	II

IN THAT REPLY TO THE ACTUAL SENDER OF THE E-MAIL, DID YOU SAY ANYTHING ABOUT THE PART OF HIS COMMENTS THAT RELATED TO THE ADD/REMOVE UTILITY?

- A. I DON'T REMEMBER WHETHER I DID OR NOT.
- Q. AND THEN YOU ALSO SAID THAT YOU FORWARDED SOME PART OR ALL OF HIS MESSAGE TO OTHERS.

DID THAT PROCESS ADDRESS, AT LEAST IN PART, HIS COMMENTS-THIS PERSON'S COMMENTS ABOUT THE ADD/REMOVE UTILITY?

- A. I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU MEAN BY "ADDRESS" HIS COMMENTS.
- Q. DID YOU MENTION THIS WHEN YOU PASSED ON HIS COMMENTS OR DID WHATEVER YOU DID TO OTHERS WITHIN MICROSOFT? DID YOU SAY ANYTHING ABOUT THE ADD/REMOVE?
- A. I THINK I DID. ALTHOUGH I DON'T REMEMBER SPECIFICALLY WHETHER I DID OR DID NOT.
- Q. DO YOU REMEMBER WHO OR ROUGHLY WHO YOU SENT WHATEVER YOUR--WHATEVER IT WAS THAT YOU SENT THIS FORWARDING TO?
- A. PROBABLY TO BILL VEGHTE AND PEOPLE IN MY TEAM, POSSIBLY JOHN GRAY.
  - Q. WHO IS MR. VEGHTE?

A. BILL VEGHTE IS THE MANAGER OF THE OVERALL WINDOWS 98 PRODUCT IN RELEASING THAT VERSION OF THE OPERATING SYSTEM.

- O. AND MR. GRAY?
- A. JOHN GRAY IS A PROGRAM MANAGER ON BILL'S TEAM.
- Q. IS HE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY PARTICULAR AREA?
- A. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HIS EXACT AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY IS, BUT I KNOW HIM FROM WINDOWS 95, AND I KNOW THAT HE KNOWS A LOT OF THINGS ABOUT LOTS OF STUFF.
- Q. SOUNDS LIKE A GOOD PERSON TO SEND THINGS TO.

CAN YOU RECALL ANYTHING EVEN GENERALLY
ABOUT WHAT, IF ANYTHING, YOU MAY HAVE SAID TO
MR. VEGHTE OR MR. GRAY ABOUT THE COMMENT RELATING
TO THE ADD/REMOVE UTILITY ISSUE?

- A. THE THING THAT I REMEMBER IS THAT I MAY
  HAVE UNDERSCORED THAT THIS SHOULD BE SOMETHING
  THAT THOSE GUYS SHOULD TAKE A LOOK AT TO DECIDE
  WHETHER IT MADE SENSE FOR THEM TO DO IT OR NOT.
- Q. DID YOU--AT THAT POINT, DID YOU DO

  ANYTHING TO SEE WHETHER THIS PERSON'S COMMENT WAS

  ACCURATE?

1	(BRIEF INTERRUPTION.)
2	(QUESTION READ.)
3	THE WITNESS: I'M PRETTY SURE I LOOKED.
4	BY MR. MALONE:
5	Q. IN THE CURRENT
6	A. WHATEVER CURRENT BUILD THAT I HAD AT
7	THE TIME.
8	Q. DO YOU REMEMBER GENERALLY WHAT YOU
9	FOUND WHEN YOU LOOKED?
10	A. I'M PRETTY SURE THAT I SAW THAT HE WAS
11	CORRECT OR I WOULDN'T HAVE PASSED IT ON.
12	AND THIS WHOLE CONVERSATION CAME UP
13	BECAUSE I THOUGHT THAT I HAD LOOKED A WHILE AGO
14	AND SEEN THAT IT WASN'T THERE, AND THIS WAS THE
15	COMMENT THAT PROMPTED ME TO LOOK.
16	Q. AND WHEN YOU SAID A MOMENT AGO THAT
17	YOUGENERALLY WHAT YOU RECALL THAT YOU MAY HAVE
18	SAID TO MR. VEGHTE OR MR. GRAY, IF I HEARD YOU
19	RIGHT, YOU SAID SOMETHING YOU THOUGHT YOU
20	UNDERSCORED MAYBE THIS WAS SOMETHING THEY SHOULD
21	TAKE A LOOK AT; IS THAT RIGHT?
22	A. YES.
23	Q. DO YOU REMEMBERDID YOU SAY ANYTHING
24	ELSE MORE ABOUT THAT?
25	à î doni'ê demembed

	1	İ
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5 6	
	6	
	7	
	8	I
	9	
1	9 0 1	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1		
1	5 6	
-	_	ı
1	78	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	
2	_	

Q.	WHY WAS	IT YOUR	THOUGHT	THAT	THIS	WAS
SOMETHING	THAT MR	. VEGHTE	OR MR.	GRAY S	SHOULD	TAKE
A LOOK AT	, THIS A	DD/REMOVI	UTILIT	Y ISS	JE?	

- A. THE SCENARIO THAT I DESCRIBED BEFORE
  WHERE THERE'S A POSSIBILITY THAT AN APPLICATION
  MIGHT USE THE IE 3 LEVEL OF SERVICES IN SUCH A
  WAY THAT MIGHT MAKE IT INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE IE 4
  LEVEL--IT'S UNLIKELY, BUT IT'S POSSIBLE--THEN IT
  COULD BE A CUSTOMER SATISFACTION ISSUE FOR
  WINDOWS 98 TO GUARANTEE THAT CUSTOMERS HAVE A WAY
  TO RUN APPLICATIONS COMPATIBLY, PERIOD.
- Q. SO, IT WAS YOUR THOUGHT THAT SIMILAR TO THE WAY IT WORKED IN WINDOWS 95 IT MIGHT BE USEFUL IN THIS SCENARIO FOR CUSTOMERS TO BE ABLE TO TAKE STEPS USING THE ADD/REMOVE SO THAT THIS APPLICATION WOULD BE COMPATIBLE?
- A. IT'S WORTH THINKING ABOUT WHETHER
  THERE'S A CUSTOMER ISSUE HERE THAT NEEDS TO BE
  SOLVED.
- Q. DID YOU GET ANY KIND OF RESPONSE FROM MR. VEGHTE OR MR. GRAY?
  - A. I DON'T REMEMBER.
- Q. DO YOU REMEMBER EVEN GENERALLY HEARING ANYTHING MORE ABOUT THIS ISSUE FROM EITHER OF THEM?

1	A. NO.
2	Q. HAVE YOU SPOKEN ABOUT IT OR
3	COMMUNICATED ABOUT IT TO ANYBODY ELSE BESIDES
4	THEM SINCE THAT TIME?
5	A. I MIGHT HAVE SPOKEN TO RICK WADDELL
6	ABOUT THIS.
7	Q. CAN YOU SPELL HIS LAST NAME?
8	A. SURE. W-A-D-D-E-L-L.
9	Q. DO YOUWHAT DO YOU RECALL THAT YOU
10	MIGHT HAVE DONE OR MIGHT HAVE SAID WITH
11	MR. WADDELL?
12	A. I MIGHT HAVE ASKED RICK WHETHER WE HAVE
13	TESTED THIS SCENARIO OR NOT.
14	Q. AND THAT WOULD BE THE SCENARIO YOU
15	DESCRIBED JUST A MOMENT AGO OF POTENTIALLY
16	INCOMPATIBLE APPLICATIONS OR
17	A. POTENTIALLY INCOMPATIBLE APPLICATIONS
18	AND A REMEDY FOR A MEANS FOR FIXING THAT PROBLEM,
19	IF IT EXISTS.
20	Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY RECOLLECTION ABOUT WHAT
21	ELSE MAY HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN THIS COMMUNICATION?
22	ANY RESPONSE, FOR EXAMPLE?
23	A. NO. I DON'T EVEN REMEMBER WHAT HIS
24	ANSWER WAS.
25 25	(EXCERPT.)

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1.	3	
1	4	ı
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1.	9	
2	0	
2	1	
	2	
2	3	
2	4	

- Q. LET ME SHIFT GEARS A LITTLE BIT AND ASK WHETHER YOU OR YOUR GROUP OR YOUR TEAM ARE INVOLVED IN-HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN USER INTERFACE DESIGN OR DEVELOPMENT WORK FOR INTERNET EXPLORER. ANY VERSION FOR PLATFORMS OTHER THAN WIN 32 PLATFORM.
- A. NOT DIRECTLY, ALTHOUGH WE GOT ASKED
  QUESTIONS SOMETIMES SO THE GROUPS WHO ARE DOING
  THAT CAN TRY TO HAVE SIMILAR USER INTERFACES.
- Q. IN GENERAL, WHAT GROUPS OTHER THAN YOURSELF, WOULD BE DOING THAT USER INTERFACE DESIGN FOR CROSS-PLATFORM VERSIONS?
- A. IN THE MODEL I DESCRIBED WHERE THERE

  ARE TEAMS OF PEOPLE WHO WORK ON FEATURES, THERE'S

  A TEAM OF PEOPLE WHO WORK ON EACH

  PLATFORM-SPECIFIC VERSION, AND THOSE PEOPLE WOULD

  HAVE PEOPLE IN THEIR GROUP WHO WOULD WORRY ABOUT

  USER INTERFACE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT.
- Q. AND GENERALLY, WHAT KIND OF QUESTIONS WOULD PEOPLE IN THOSE GROUPS BE ASKING YOU OR YOUR GROUP?
- A. GENERALLY, IT WOULD BE, WHAT ARE YOU DOING?
  - O. HOPEFULLY, NOT SAID QUITE THAT WAY.
  - A. WELL, NOT IN A SARCASTIC SENSE, BUT

LITERALLY WHAT IS THE DESIGN THAT YOU ARE USING IN THE WINDOWS--WHATEVER THE WINDOWS VERSION IT IS, AND THEN, GENERALLY BEYOND THAT, ASKING FOR ADVICE. WELL, WHAT SHOULD WE DO, TYPICALLY.

Q. LET'S TAKE THIS ONE AT A TIME.

WHY IS IT THAT USER INTERFACE GROUPS OR PEOPLE FOR OTHER PLATFORMS WOULD ASK YOU WHAT YOU'RE DOING FOR THE IE INTERFACE FOR WINDOWS?

- A. BECAUSE WE TEND TO HAVE THE EXPERTISE

  AND HAVE BEEN WORKING ON THESE FEATURES AND HAVE

  TALKED TO MORE CUSTOMERS, AND WE ARE THE--WE'RE

  SORT OF THE POINT DRIVING THE EXPERIENCE FORWARD.
- Q. IS PART OF THAT--I THINK YOU MENTIONED SOMETHING ALONG THESE LINES A MINUTE AGO--IS PART OF THE REASONS FOR THESE DISCUSSIONS SO THAT THE USER INTERFACE FOR EACH DIFFERENT PLATFORM VERSION OF INTERNET EXPLORER CAN BE AS SIMILAR OR CONSISTENT AS POSSIBLE?
  - A. WHERE APPROPRIATE, YES.
- Q. AND WHY IS THAT A GOAL? WHY IS THAT SOMETHING THAT YOU TRY TO DO?
- A. WELL, THE REASON THAT WE HAVE OTHER
  PLATFORM VERSIONS OF INTERNET EXPLORER IN THE
  FIRST PLACE IS SO THAT WHEN COMPANIES ARE MAKING
  A DECISION ABOUT HOW THEY'RE GOING TO DEPLOY SOME

TYPE OF SOLUTION--FOR EXAMPLE, THEY'RE GOING TO IMPLEMENT A 401(K) APPLICATION, AND THEY'RE GOING TO DO IT IN A PARTICULAR WAY THAT WILL USE INTERNET TECHNOLOGIES--THEY HAVE AN OPTION TO CHOOSE INTERNET EXPLORER AS THEIR VIEWING SOLUTION, AND THEY WON'T RULE IT OUT BECAUSE SOME PEOPLE IN THEIR COMPANY HAVE NON-WINDOWS OPERATING SYSTEMS THAT THEY USE ON THEIR DESKTOPS.

SO IT FOLLOWS FROM THAT THAT CONSISTENCY MAKES SENSE.

- O. AND WHY IS THAT? WHY DOES THAT FOLLOW?
- A. IT MAKES IT EASIER FOR THE CORPORATION
  TO EVALUATE THE OVERALL IMPACT OF RULING OUT IE
  AS A SOLUTION. THEY CAN--IF THEY DO STUDIES ON
  THE AMOUNT OF TRAINING REQUIRED FOR A USER TO USE
  IT, THEN THAT STUDY WILL APPLY ACROSS THE BOARD.
  AND IF THEY'RE GOING TO SET UP TRAINING PROGRAMS
  FOR USERS, THEY CAN DO--THEY DON'T HAVE TO DO AS
  MUCH WORK TO CREATE DIFFERENT TRAINING PROGRAMS.
  IT'S JUST AN EFFICIENCY.
- Q. ARE THERE ALSO REASONS OUTSIDE OF THIS CORPORATE SETTING THAT YOU'VE JUST DESCRIBED WHY MICROSOFT WANTS DIFFERENT PLATFORMS OF INTERNET EXPLORER TO BE SIMILAR WHERE APPROPRIATE?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1

23

24

25

	A.	THERE	ARE	DIFF	ERENT	SCE	NARI(	OS 01	T	HE
SAME	TYPE	WHERE	THE	TYPE	OF S	CENAI	RIO :	is so	OME	ONE
IS GO	OING 3	ro crea	ATE A	SOL	MOITU	I AND	DEPI	LOY :	IT	AND
THEY	WANT	TO BE	ABLE	E TO I	MAKE	SURE	THA:	r TH	EY	CAN
DEPLO	TI YC	то тн	E BRO	ADES'	r sei	OF	PEOP	LE.	AN	D A
CORPO	ORATIO	ON IS A	A REA	LLY (	GOOD	EXAMI	PLE (	OF T	TAH	•
(EXC	ERPT.	)								

- Q. HAVE YOU OR YOUR GROUP MADE CHANGES IN THE PERFORMANCE OF ANY OF THE INTERFACE ITEMS FOR WHICH YOU'RE RESPONSIBLE, EITHER IMPROVEMENTS OR NONIMPROVEMENTS SINCE--FOR WINDOWS 98 SINCE IE 4 WAS SHIPPED?
  - A. YES.
  - Q. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THOSE HAVE BEEN.
- A. I CAN'T TELL YOU THE SPECIFICS OF WHAT
  THE CHANGES ARE, BUT I CAN GIVE YOU A SENSE FOR
  THE KINDS OF THINGS AND THE MAGNITUDE. THERE
  WERE ACTUALLY QUITE A FEW.

#### WHERE TO BEGIN?

WE DID A LOT OF WORK TO MAKE WEB VIEW
APPEAR FASTER SO THAT IF YOU WERE TO TAKE A
STOPWATCH AND TIME FROM THE MOMENT SOMEBODY
DOUBLE-CLICKS ON SOMETHING LIKE "MY COMPUTER" TO
THE TIME THAT THE BROWSING WINDOW TO THE WEB
CONTENTS IS TOTALLY LOADED, THAT IS FASTER IN

WINDOWS 98.

AND THE WAY WE ACHIEVE THAT PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT IS BY SOMEBODY GOING AND SPENDING A LOT OF TIME LOOKING THROUGH THE CODE AND FINDING WAYS TO MAKE IT RUN FASTER. SO I CAN'T--I CAN'T TELL YOU WHAT THAT IS. IT'S JUST A LOT OF WORK. YOU JUST GO, AND YOU CRANK THROUGH IT, AND YOU FIND WAYS TO MAKE IT FASTER.

AND THE THING ABOUT DOING PERFORMANCE
WORK ALSO THAT'S INTERESTING IS THAT YOU GET MOST
OF YOUR BENEFITS BY DOING A LOT OF LITTLE THINGS,
AND THEN THEY ADD UP. SO THAT'S ONE EXAMPLE.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE --

Q. BEFORE--I'M SORRY TO INTERRUPT YOU.

WHEN YOU DESCRIBE SOMEBODY METICULOUSLY GOING THROUGH THE CODE AND FINDING LITTLE WAYS TO MAKE IT FASTER, YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE SPECIFIC CODE FOR WHATEVER IT IS YOU'RE IMPROVING.

IN THIS CASE, IT WOULD BE APPEARANCE OF THE WEB VIEW INITIALLY?

### A. YES.

AND JUST TO BE SPECIFIC ABOUT THAT

CASE, THE APPEARANCE OF THE WEB VIEW--IT SOUNDS

LIKE A SIMPLE THING. YOU DOUBLE-CLICK THE ICON,

AND THIS WINDOW SHOWS UP.

BUT KEEP IN MIND THAT THAT MEANS
THAT--IT'S HOW FAST SHELL32 CAN ENUMERATE THE
CONTENTS OF THE HARD DISK, HOW FAST MSHTML CAN
DRAW THE HTML, HOW FAST THE TOOLBAR CAN LOAD WHAT
THE BUTTONS ARE AND PAINT THEM ON THE SCREEN, HOW
FAST THE SHDOCVW.DLL CAN KNOW WHAT CODE IT'S
GOING TO LOAD INTO ITS CONTEXT IN DISPLAY.

AND A WHOLE LOT OF STUFF HAPPENS FROM THE TIME THE ICON GETS CLICKED AND THE TIME THE WINDOW SHOWS UP. SO THAT'S ONE EXAMPLE.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE WOULD BE CLICKING ON THE START MENU AND SEEING THE MENU APPEAR AND SEEING THE ADDITIONAL MENUS APPEAR AS YOU MOUSE OVER ITEMS. THAT'S ANOTHER THING THAT WE MADE FASTER.

WHAT ELSE DID WE DO? SOME OF THE BEHAVIORS OF THE ACTIVE DESKTOP HAVE PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS, AND I DON'T REMEMBER WHAT ALL THE SPECIFICS OF THOSE ARE.

MORE SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO BROWSING,
THE MSHTML COMPONENTS, WHICH WILL RENDER SHELL
WEB VIEWS OR ORDINARY WEB PAGES FOR ORDINARY WEB
BROWSERS, RECEIVED SOME SIGNIFICANT PERFORMANCE
ENHANCEMENTS, AND I DON'T KNOW THE EXACT NATURE
OF THOSE.

I THINK THAT'S' A PRETTY GOOD LIST.

ONE OTHER THING IS THAT, AS I MENTIONED

BEFORE, THE ACTIVE DESKTOP IS IN THE RETAIL

VERSION OF WINDOWS 98 IS TURNED OFF BY DEFAULT.

AND THE MAIN REASON FOR THAT IS TO REDUCE THE

RESOURCE CONSUMPTION SO THAT THE OVERALL SYSTEM

PERFORMANCE WILL BE ENHANCED.

- Q. AND WHY--IS THAT PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT
  IN THE RETAIL CHANNEL OR THE RETAIL VERSION OF
  WINDOWS 98?
  - A. I DON'T UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION.
- Q. IS IT--WHAT I'M GETTING AT, IS THERE A
  CONCERN THAT PEOPLE WHO WOULD BUY THE RETAIL
  VERSION MIGHT HAVE MACHINES WITH LOWER
  CAPABILITIES, LESS MEMORY, OR LESS SPEED THAT
  WOULD PERHAPS NEED THIS--NEED LESS STRAIN BY
  HAVING THE ACTIVE DESKTOP TURNED OFF? IS THAT
  PART OF THE THINKING?
- A. SURE, THAT WOULD BE PART OF THE THINKING.
- Q. IS YOUR GROUP INVOLVED AT ALL IN SORT
  OF TESTING THE PERFORMANCE OF SPECIFIC
  APPLICATIONS VIS-A-VIS HOW THEY MIGHT BE AFFECTED
  BY THE VARIOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS YOU'RE
  MAKING IN YOUR CODE?

- A. I DON'T THINK ANYONE IN OUR GROUP IS
  TESTING OTHER APPLICATIONS. THERE'S A
  PERFORMANCE TESTING TEAM THAT I THINK IS COVERING
  ALL THAT STUFF, ALTHOUGH WE GET THE DATA.
- Q. HAVE YOU SEEN ANY DATA OR HEARD ABOUT
  ANY TESTING THAT'S BEEN DONE TO DETERMINE WHETHER
  OR NOT HAVING THE ACTIVE DESKTOP TURNED ON IN
  WINDOWS 98 WOULD BE, IN ANY WAY, AFFECT THE
  PERFORMANCE OF NETSCAPE NAVIGATOR OR COMMUNICATOR
  IF IT WERE ALSO LOADED ON THAT PC RUNNING WITH
  WINDOWS 98?
- A. I'M NOT AWARE OF ANY DATA AND WOULDN'T EXPECT THAT THERE IS ANY REASON WHY THE ACTIVE DESKTOP WOULD SPECIFICALLY ENHANCE THIS APPLICATION.
- Q. I DIDN'T MEAN TO LIMIT IT TO EXACTLY
  THAT. BUT WHATEVER EXTRA RESOURCES THE ACTIVE
  DESKTOP MADE TO THAT, DO YOU HAVE ANY--HAVE YOU
  HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT ANY TESTING THAT'S BEEN DONE
  TO SEE WHAT, IF ANY, EFFECT THAT EXTRA DRAIN ON
  RESOURCES MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE ON THE PERFORMANCE
  OF NAVIGATOR OR COMMUNICATOR?
- A. I THINK I JUST ANSWERED THIS. I DON'T KNOW OF ANY SPECIFIC DATA THAT RELATES

  SPECIFICALLY TO THOSE TWO APPLICATIONS.

1
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
22

23l

24

25

BUT IN GENERAL, AS I SAID EARLIER, THE ACTIVE DESKTOP BEING ABLE REQUIRES MORE RESOURCES AND WILL HAVE AN IMPACT, AN EQUAL IMPACT ON ALL OF THE OTHER APPLICATIONS RUNNING ON THE SYSTEM.

- Q. WHATEVER APPLICATION NEEDS THOSE RESOURCES?
  - A. RIGHT.
- Q. OKAY. DO YOU HAVE ANY SENSE OF WHAT THE EXTRA RESOURCES ARE THAT ARE REQUIRED WHEN THE ACTIVE DESKTOP IS ON?
  - A. IT'S BASICALLY MEMORY.
  - O. IS IT RAM, RANDOM ACCESS MEMORY?
  - A. YES.

### (EXCERPT.)

Q. FIRST OF ALL, LET ME JUST ASK YOU IN
THE TITLE OF THE HEADING SECTION, THE HEADING
ITSELF, AND THEN IN A NUMBER OF PLACES THROUGHOUT
THIS SECTION, IT REFERS TO THE BROWSER.

CAN TELL ME WHAT YOUR UNDERSTANDING IS
OF WHAT THAT MEANT OR WHAT THAT REFERRED TO HERE.

A. SURE. IN THIS CONTEXT THE WORD
"BROWSER" IS REFERRING TO A CODE ARCHITECTURE SET
OF FUNCTIONALITY. SO IF YOU--YOU HAVE TO CHANGE
YOUR THINKING HERE AND TRY TO THINK LIKE A
SOFTWARE ARCHITECT.

٦
_

O. OKAY. I'M READY.

A. AND WHEN WE DO GOOD SOFTWARE

ARCHITECTURE, WHAT WE'RE ABLE TO DO IS TO BREAK

WHAT IS A COMPLEX AND VERY FULL SET OF

FUNCTIONALITY INTO MEANINGFUL COMPONENTS, EACH OF

WHICH SORT OF CAN BE SELF-CONTAINED AND CAN

IMPLEMENT THE JOB THAT IT'S SUPPOSED TO DO IN A

VERY EFFICIENT WAY. AND IF YOU DO A REALLY GOOD

JOB OF THIS, THEN EACH OF THOSE SEPARATE

COMPONENTS ARE VERY USEFUL TO OTHER PARTIES THAT

WANT TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THEM.

ONE WAY TO THINK ABOUT IN ARCHITECTURE

AS IT EXISTS NOW, WHEN CHRISTIAN IS REFERRING TO

THE BROWSER CONTROL, HE'S REFERRING TO A

PARTICULAR POINT IN THIS LAYERING WHERE TODAY

APPLICATION WRITERS CAN ENCAPSULATE A WHOLE CHUNK

OF IE FUNCTIONALITY--A COMPONENT, IF YOU

WILL--AND MAKE IT APPEAR LIVE AND RUNNING INSIDE

THEIR APPLICATION.

WHAT HE'S DOING IS HE IS CONTRASTING A
TRIDENT PART OF THAT WITH A BROWSER,
QUOTE-UNQUOTE, PART OF THAT.

AND THE DISTINCTION THAT HE'S MAKING IS
THAT THE LOWER-LEVEL PART OF THIS SHOULD
EXCLUSIVELY HAVE FOCUS ON READING HTML CODE AND

RENDERING IT TO THE SCREEN AS WELL AS EXPOSING THIS THING CALLED AN OBJECT MODEL FOR THAT.

AND WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT THE OBJECT MODEL IS THE MECHANISM BY WHICH ANY THIRD-PARTY ELEMENT CAN MANIPULATE THAT HTML SO AS TO MAKE THINGS MOVE AROUND ON THE SCREEN OR TO RESPOND TO MOUSE CLICKS. THERE ARE TONS OF STUFF YOU CAN DO. THIS IS VERY FLEXIBLE.

SO WHAT HE'S TRYING TO DO IS DESCRIBE THAT ONE INTERESTING LAYER WOULD BE TO HAVE A CLEAR DISTINCTION BETWEEN THIS HTML RENDERING CHUNK AND A CHUNK THAT YOU MIGHT REFER TO AS A BROWSER CHUNK.

NOW, WHAT HE MEANS BY THIS IS THERE'S A WHOLE BUNCH OF CODE THAT RELATES TO THE ACT OF DISPLAYING A SERIES OF HTML PAGES. AND THAT CODE INCLUDES THINGS LIKE IF I GO FROM ONE HTML PAGE TO THE NEXT, A WAY TO REMEMBER WHAT THE OLD ONE WAS SO YOU COULD GO BACK.

AND THAT SOUNDS LIKE A SIMPLE THING,
BUT ACTUALLY IT'S NOT. AND PART OF THE REASON
IT'S NOT, IF YOU WERE TO THINK OF AN EXAMPLE, IF
YOU WERE TO GO TO AN HTML PAGE THAT HAD A FORM
WHERE YOU WERE GOING TO TYPE A BUNCH OF
INFORMATION IN AND THEN YOU WENT ON TO ANOTHER

HTML PAGE AND YOU WENT BACK TO THAT ONE, HOW DO YOU REMEMBER WHAT YOU'VE TYPED INTO THE FORM?

ALL RIGHT. SO THERE'S LOTS AND LOTS OF PLACES WHERE THAT WOULD GET COMPLICATED.

I'LL GIVE YOU ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF WHY
THAT'S COMPLICATED. IT'S ALSO COMPLICATED
BECAUSE SOME HTML PAGES REALLY WEREN'T JUST ONE
HTML PAGE. THERE'S A FEATURE OF HTML CALLED
FRAMES. AND WITH FRAMES AN HTML AUTHOR CAN SAY I
WANT TO SHOW THIS HTML PAGE AND THAT ONE THERE.
AND NOW YOU CAN NAVIGATE INTO EACH ONE OF THESE
SECTIONS AND HAVE A BACK-AND-FORTH KIND OF THING.

SO, WHAT HE'S REFERRING TO IS THAT HE WANTS TO IMPROVE OUR COMPONENTS SOFTWARE BY REFACTORING WHERE SOME OF THE FUNCTIONALITY LIVES. AND THIS MEANS WHICH PEOPLE WORK ON IT, WHICH SOURCECODE FILES IT'S IN, AND IT PROBABLY ALSO MEANS ULTIMATELY WHAT DLL FILES IT GETS COMPILED INTO.

AND HE'S DESCRIBING SOME OF THE BENEFITS OF REARRANGING THIS INTO A MORE RATIONAL ORGANIZATION.

Q. SO, THE LAST THING YOU MENTIONED IN THAT SERIES, WHAT DLL FILE VARIOUS THINGS GET COMPILED INTO--THAT'S SOMETHING THAT CAN BE

	ľ
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	╢
12	
13	
14	
15	,
16	5
17	7
18	3
19	
20	
21	ᅵ
22	2
23	3
24	1

CHANGED OR CAN BE DESIGNED WITH SPECIFIC GOALS IN MIND, FOR EXAMPLE, MAKING THE ORGANIZATION OF THE THINGS YOU'VE TALKED ABOUT MORE RATIONAL?

- A. YES.
- Q. AGAIN, JUST SO I UNDERSTAND, THE FIRST SENTENCE HERE REFERS TO THE BROWSER CONTROL,

  PAREN, SHDOCVW, WHICH IN THE DOCUMENT IS CAPITAL S-H, CAPITAL D-O-C, CAPITAL "VIEW."

AS HE USES THAT TERM, HERE, WHAT DOES

HE MEAN THAT--DOES HE MEAN THAT TO BE THE SAME

THING AS THE BROWSER? OR IS THAT THE SAME THING,

AS YOU UNDERSTAND IT?

MR. AESCHBACHER: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION.

THE WITNESS: WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THE BROWSER?

#### BY MR. MALONE:

Q. I'M INTERESTED IN YOUR UNDERSTANDING AT THE TIME YOU READ THIS.

IN SOME PLACES IN THIS SECTION, HE SAYS
THE BROWSER, CAPITALIZED B, AND IN THIS SENTENCE
HE SAYS THE BROWSER CONTROL (SHDOCVW).

WAS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT--WAS HE REFERRING TO THE SAME THING BY DIFFERENT NAMES, OR IS ONE A COMPONENT OR SUBSET OF THE OTHER?

A. MY UNDERSTANDING, READING THIS, IS THAT
WHEREVER HE HAS USED THE WORD "BROWSER" HERE,
HE'S IMPLYING A PACKAGE OF SOFTWARE COMPONENT
FUNCTIONALITY THAT INCLUDES THE LAYER I WAS
TALKING ABOUT OF NAVIGATION AND DISPLAYING OF
PIECES OF HTML TOGETHER. IT IS A SOFTWARE
COMPONENT MEANING OF THE WORD.

Q. ALL RIGHT. IN SEVERAL DIFFERENT PLACES
HE REFERS TO SOMETHING--AND LET ME JUST POINT OUT
WHAT EACH OF THEM--WHERE EACH OF THEM ARE AND
THEN JUST ASK YOU GENERALLY. THE LINE THAT'S ALL
BY ITSELF UNDERNEATH THE FIRST PARAGRAPH, IT
READS, "IN ADDITION, THERE ARE THINGS THAT THE
SEPARATION BETWEEN TRIDENT AND THE BROWSER MAKE
DIFFICULT."

#### DO YOU SEE THAT?

- A. UH-HUH.
- Q. AND THEN THE SECOND BULLET POINT UNDERNEATH THAT, HE REFERS TO MAKING IT DIFFICULT TO SEPARATE THE BROWSER FROM THE SHELL AND REV THEM SEPARATELY.

AND THEN DOWN IN THE VERY LAST SENTENCE
OF THIS SECTION, THE LAST LINE, HE REFERS TO AS
POSSIBLE WAYS TO DECOUPLE--D-E, HYPHEN,
COUPLE--SHELL AND BROWSER.

LOOKING AT THOSE THREE THINGS, WAS
THERE ANY CONSIDERATION UNDERWAY AT THE TIME HE
WROTE THIS THAT--AGAIN, BASED ON YOUR
UNDERSTANDING WHEN YOU GOT IT, THAT LED HIM TO
MAKE THE REFERENCES HERE THAT HE DID TO
SEPARATING AND DECOUPLING?

AND THEN WE CAN COME BACK AND TALK

ABOUT SPECIFICALLY THOSE, BUT WAS THERE

SOMETHING--WHAT WAS THE CONTEXT BEHIND HIS USE OF

THE PHRASES HERE, IF YOU KNOW?

A. I THINK THE MAIN CONTEXT THAT HE'S DESCRIBING IS AN ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION OF CREATING MEANINGFUL AND USEFUL BUNDLES OF TECHNOLOGY AND FUNCTION.

SO, TO GO BACK TO MY EXAMPLE, AT THE LOWEST LEVEL IT MAKES SENSE TO HAVE A SOFTWARE OBJECT THAT KNOWS HOW TO READ HTML AND DISPLAY IT ON THE SCREEN AND THAT'S IT--JUST STOP THERE.

ACTUALLY, IT MAKES SENSE TO HAVE ONE SOFTWARE COMPONENT THAT READS HTML AND ONE SOFTWARE COMPONENT THAT READS IT ON THE SCREEN, BUT THAT'S--TRIDENT DOES BOTH OF THOSE THINGS.

AT THE NEXT LEVEL IT MAKES SENSE TO

HAVE A SOFTWARE COMPONENT THAT KNOWS HOW TO KEEP

TRACK OF A SERIES OR SET OF HTML THINGS THAT ARE

BEING RENDERED. THAT'S HIS NOTION OF THE BROWSER.

SO, WHEN HE TALKS ABOUT BROWSER
FUNCTIONALITY, HE SAYS, INCLUDING NAVIGATION,
HISTORY, FAVORITES, OBJECT MODEL, ET CETERA.
THEN HE GOES ON TO SAY, "BUT NOT UI."

AND WHAT HE'S DESCRIBING HERE IS AN ARCHITECTURE WHERE YOU BUILD A SOFTWARE COMPONENT THAT KNOWS HOW TO DO FUNCTIONS BUT DOES NOT IMPLY ANY PARTICULAR WAY OF DRAWING PIXELS ON THE SCREEN; THAT IS, THE USER CONTROL OF THOSE FUNCTIONS.

WHAT THAT IMPLIES IS THAT SOME OTHER

PARTY--IN THIS CASE, HE USES THE TERM "SHELL" TO

DESCRIBE THE LAYER THAT WILL IMPLEMENT USER

INTERFACE--SOME OTHER PARTY CAN IMPLEMENT

WHATEVER USER INTERFACE THEY WANT.

SO, THERE ARE A COUPLE OF THINGS
IMPLIED BY THIS. ONE IS THAT TO THE EXTENT THAT
HE DECOUPLES SHELL AND BROWSER, MEANING UI STUFF
WITH NAVIGATION STUFF, HIS TEAM DOESN'T HAVE TO
WORRY ABOUT UI STUFF. IT'S NOT THEIR AREA OF
EXPERTISE, SO THEY CAN JUST IMPLEMENT
FUNCTIONALITY AND LET SOMEBODY WHO WANTS TO WORRY
ABOUT UI WORRY ABOUT UI.

ANOTHER THING THAT'S IMPLIED IN THIS IS

A MORE FLEXIBLE PIECE OF SOFTWARE ARCHITECTURE

THAT ENABLES THIRD PARTIES TO DO MORE EXPRESSIVE

AND VARIED THINGS.

SO, WHERE TODAY AN APPLICATION VENDOR
MIGHT USE OUR BROWSER CONTROL, THEY HAVE LESS
FLEXIBILITY IN TERMS OF DEFINING THE USER
INTERFACE TO THAT BROWSER CONTROL THAN THEY WOULD
IF THINGS WERE REARCHITECTED IN THIS WAY.
(EXCERPT.)

- Q. WITH RESPECT TO THE DECISION OR YOUR RECOMMENDATION THAT USERS BE GIVEN THE OPTION OF WHETHER OR NOT THEY WANT TO INSTALL THE WINDOWS USER UPDATE FEATURES OF THE INTERNET EXPLORER TECHNOLOGIES, WHAT WAS YOUR RATIONALE FOR SAYING THAT USERS SHOULD BE GIVEN THE OPTION OF WHETHER THEY WANT TO INSTALL THOSE COMPONENTS OR NOT?
- A. IT'S SIMPLE, AND IT'S BEEN A PRINCIPLE WE'VE USED FOR A LONG TIME.

IN PARTICULAR WITHIN CORPORATIONS,

CORPORATE MIS MANAGERS WHO DEPLOY SYSTEMS TO END

USERS FREQUENTLY REQUIRE AND ASK US FOR, AND

SOMETIMES INSIST ON, FLEXIBILITY IN THE WAY THEY

CAN ROLL THE SYSTEM OUT.

I'LL GIVE YOU AN ANALOGY. YOU MAY NOT

KNOW THIS, BUT WHEN YOU INSTALL WINDOWS 95, THERE
IS AN OPTION TO INSTALL IT AND HAVE PROGRAM
MANAGER AND FILE MANAGER BE YOUR USER INTERFACE.
AND THAT'S EXACTLY BASED ON THE SAME PREMISE.

AS WE WERE DEVELOPING A NEW USER
INTERFACE AND MAKING IT AVAILABLE TO PEOPLE, SOME
CORPORATE MIS MANAGERS--THIS IS REASONABLE--THEY
WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO DEPLOY SOME PARTS OF THE
TECHNOLOGY OR IN THE WINDOWS 95 CASE, A 32-BIT
OPERATING SYSTEM, AND THEY DON'T HAVE A TRAINING
SYSTEM YET TO TRAIN PEOPLE ON A NEW USER
INTERFACE. SO IT DOESN'T EVEN NECESSARILY MEAN
THAT THEY WON'T LIKE IT. THEY WOULD JUST LIKE TO
BE ABLE TO MANAGE THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE SYSTEM.

SO, IN IE 4'S CASE, IT'S ANOTHER

EXAMPLE OF THE SAME THING. IT'S A CHANGE IN THE

WAY THE USER INTERFACE WORKS.

SO, IT MAKES SENSE TO ENABLE CORPORATE
MIS MANAGERS TO MANAGE THEIR ROLLOUT OF THE NEW
SOFTWARE SO IF THEY WANT TO INSTITUTE A TRAINING
PROGRAM BEFORE THEY GIVE PEOPLE A USER INTERFACE,
IT'S POSSIBLE FOR THEM TO DO THAT.

AND THAT'S JUST ONE EXAMPLE OF A
SITUATION WHERE A USER MIGHT WANT TO CHOOSE TO
NOT INCLUDE THAT PARTICULAR PART OF THE CHANGE TO

THE SYSTEM.

Q. CONSUMER PURCHASERS OF INTERNET EXPLORER OR CONSUMER--STRIKE THAT.

CONSUMERS WHO INSTALL INTERNET

EXPLORER 4 ON THEIR COMPUTERS ALSO HAVE THE

OPTION OF NOT INSTALLING THE WINDOWS USER UPDATE;

IS THAT CORRECT?

- A. YES.
- Q. WHY ARE CONSUMERS PROVIDED WITH THAT
  OPTION? OR HOW IS IT A BENEFIT TO CONSUMERS TO
  BE PROVIDED WITH THAT OPTION?
- PARTICULAR, WITH THE SET OF TECHNOLOGIES THAT'S
  THE WINDOWS DESKTOP UPDATE, THERE'S A COST TO
  CHOOSING TO USE IT. IT REQUIRES MORE OF YOUR PC
  RESOURCES. THE ACTIVE DESKTOP IS MORE COMPLEX
  AND HAS MORE FUNCTIONALITY THAN THE OLD DESKTOP.
  SO IT'S CERTAINLY POSSIBLE THAT PEOPLE WOULD HAVE
  PC'S THAT DON'T QUITE HAVE THE HORSEPOWER TO BE
  ABLE TO RUN IT WELL, AND THEY NEED TO BE ABLE TO
  CHOOSE TO NOT INSTALL THAT. OR IF PEOPLE INSTALL
  IT AND DECIDE THAT IT MAKES THEIR PC SLOW DOWN A
  BIT, THEY NEED TO HAVE THE ABILITY TO REMOVE IT.
- Q. IS THERE ANY OTHER BENEFIT OR RATIONALE FOR PROVIDING CONSUMER USERS THE OPTION OF NOT

INSTALLING THE WINDOWS USER UPDATE OTHER THAN
RATIONALES THAT RELATE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF
THEIR SYSTEM OR THE SPEED WITH WHICH THEIR SYSTEM
WOULD WORK WITH THE USERS UPDATE?

- A. I THINK IN THE CONSUMERS' CASE, THERE'S A LOT OF REASONS WHY SOME PEOPLE MIGHT CHOOSE NOT TO USE IT. SOME OF THE TRAINING ISSUES THAT CORPORATIONS FACE CAN BE FACED BY CONSUMERS. IF YOU HAVE A FAMILY THAT USES A PC AND TWO OF THE PEOPLE--IT TOOK YOU A LONG TIME TO TEACH THEM HOW TO USE IT, YOU MIGHT NOT WANT THE USER INTERFACE TO CHANGE ON THEM. SO I THINK THERE'S A BROAD SPECTRUM OF REASONS THAT WOULD MAKE SENSE FOR PEOPLE TO NOT CHOOSE THAT FEATURE.
- Q. I THINK EARLIER IN THE DAY YOU

  TESTIFIED THAT THERE WERE A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT

  YOU LOOKED AT IN TRYING TO IMPROVE USER

  INTERFACE, AND ONE OF THOSE WAS TO MAKE THE USER

  INTERFACES MORE CUSTOMIZABLE.

IS THAT A FAIR CHARACTERIZATION OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

- A. YES.
- Q. WHY IS MAKING A USER INTERFACE CUSTOMIZABLE BENEFICIAL?
  - A. OH, THERE'S A TON OF REASONS.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
<ul><li>20</li><li>21</li><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>

25

FOR ONE, IN AN ABSTRACT SENSE, PEOPLE
TEND TO DEVELOP A RELATIONSHIP WITH THEIR PC, AND
THEY LIKE TO BE ABLE TO MAKE IT A COMFORTABLE
ENVIRONMENT IN THE SAME WAY THAT YOU WOULD LIKE
TO BE ABLE TO ARRANGE YOUR OFFICE FURNITURE THE
WAY YOU WOULD LIKE OR JUST (SIC) THE HEIGHT OF
YOUR CHAIR. PEOPLE LIKE TO MAKE THEIR PC
ENVIRONMENT FIT THE WAY THEY WORK.

AND IN PARTICULAR, WITH WINDOWS USERS,
THERE'S A VAST ARRAY OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF PEOPLE
WITH DIFFERENT NEEDS AND DIFFERENT WORK STYLES.
SO ONE WAY THAT WE CAN ADDRESS INDIVIDUAL
CUSTOMERS' NEEDS IS BY MAKING IT POSSIBLE FOR
CUSTOMERS TO TAILOR THE ENVIRONMENT TO THE WAY
THEY WORK.

IT MAKES THE PC FEEL MORE PERSONAL AND MAKES PEOPLE MORE PRODUCTIVE AND MORE EFFICIENT.

- Q. SO, USER INTERFACE ISN'T SOMETHING
  WHERE ONE PARTICULAR STYLE IS GOING TO BE OPTIMAL
  FOR ALL THE DIFFERENT USERS; IS THAT IT?
- A. THAT'S CORRECT.
  (EXCERPT.)
- Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY REQUESTS BY ANY OEM'S TO CUSTOMIZE THE WINDOWS 95 DESKTOP?
  - A. I DON'T RECALL ANY SPECIFIC REQUESTS,

	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1.	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

BUT I RECALL OEM'S FROM THE WINDOWS 95 TIME FRAME EXPRESSING A DESIRE THAT THE USER INTERFACE WOULD ALLOW THEM SOME ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY IN DIFFERENTIATING PC'S. AND PART OF THAT WAS OUR MOTIVATION IN DOING ACTIVE DESKTOP AND MAKING IT POSSIBLE FOR THEM TO ADD CONTENT TO THE DESKTOP.

AND I GATHER FROM YOUR PREVIOUS TESTIMONY THAT SUCH CUSTOMIZATION, IN YOUR OPINION, IS AN APPROPRIATE AND POSITIVE THING TO ALLOW FOR THE OEM'S TO DO; IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. AESCHBACHER: OBJECTION.

AMBIGUOUS.

THE WITNESS: I THINK THAT THE OEM'S ARE SHIPPING A PC, AND IT'S APPROPRIATE FOR THEM TO BE ABLE TO EXPRESS THE FEATURES OR THE DIFFERENTIATING CHARACTERISTICS OF THAT PC IN THEIR WINDOWS USER INTERFACE.

25