From jek Thu Oct 3 19:01:30 1996
To: eric.schmidt
Subject: Native Method/Microsoft.
Content-Length: 11791
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Multipart/Mixed;
        boundary="-LA F2155418363R-12A-857443456=:16332NCE.IlHAFeR"
X-Lines: 238
Status: RO
X-Status: $$$$
X-UID: 0000000229

---LA_F2155418363R-12A-857443456=:16332NCE.IlHAFeR
Content-Type: Text/plain;
        charset=X-us-ascii;
        name="text"
Content-Description: text

Eric,

 I looked into complaints you have heard and relayed from Microsoft on
how we ignore them, surprise them etc. In particular, they complained about
the JRI design, a design that did not go their way.   We
conducted a fabulous process and came to the right decision. They just don't
like it.

Below, a note I sent to Alan which describes this.

Jon

Alan,

You asked for information on the JRI design process which Microsoft has
complained about.

I looked into it. It's unimpeachable. The only legitimate complaint is
that in the end we did not agree with Microsoft.

Here is what we did:

        1. Started a newgroup to discuss the topic.
        2. Started the discussion off with a primer on the issue
        3. Solicited opinions
        4. Got input from Microsoft, IBM, Apple, Intel,
           Netscape, ILOG, other parts of Sun.

        Everyone wrote toughtful, civil, carefully-considered analysis.
Some
        are quite long with examples.

    5. Asked for final input. Got none.
    6. Declared that we were going to take the advice and decide
    7. Informed everyone that the decision was pending -- when and where it
       would be posted (I personally called Mugglia and Apple)
    8. Posted a complete description of the spec with background and
rationale.

You can look at this yourself. If you do, you will find that the Microsoft
proposal
was seriously considered but in the end rejected for legitimate technical
reasons.
You will find that IBM, Apple, and SMLI, all reached this conclusion without
any help from us.

To read this yourself:

        NNTPSERVER percolator, newsgroup 'fp.java-nativemethod'
        http://cafedead/~sl/nmi-960910

The first is the discussion I talked about. The second is the decision with
rationale, background, etc. It makes fine reading. I enjoyed it.

I believe we did a sterling job of including licensees, communicating
with them, and conducting a level headed, un-emotional technical forum. And
we made
the right decision.

Attached a message from Scott Rautmann that describes this and other topics we
are talking to Microsoft on. The current status on all of them is that they
have
disengaged.

I will be talking with John Ludwig tomorrow. I will ask him to review these
two
documents and tell me what he would have preferred to see as a process.

Jon

---LA_F2155418363R-12A-857443456=:16332NCE.I1HAFeR
Content-Type: Application/X-sun-sun-deskset-message;
        conversions="X-uuencode";
        name="sun-deskset-message"
Content-Description: sun-deskset-message

begin 600 sun-deskset-message
M1G)O;2!K9VA =V]M8F%T(%=E9"·!/8W0@(#(@,3 Z,3<Z-# @,3DY-8I29710
M<FXM4&%T:#H/&MG:$!W;VUB8700^·E)E8V5I=F5D.B!F<F]M(':O;6)A=·YE
M;F<N<N<W5N+F-O;2!B>2!B:&]R=·YE;F<N<n<W5N+F-0;2 H4TU)+3@N-B]334DM
M4U92-·D··6ED(SM!03 T-#,W.R.R!7960L(#(0@3V-T(#$Y.38@,3 Z,3<Z,SD
M+3 W,# ·4F5C96EV960Z(&9R;VT@>F5B861E92YE;F<N<n<W5N+F-O;2!B>2!W

                                                        CONFIDENTIAL

SUN V. MSFT
                                                        CGT-20384 RMW (PVT) ENE
                                                        SUN 06 020803