Rick Curtis   **609-258-5621**
51 Stanworth Lane   **rcurtis@princeton.edu**
Princeton, NJ 08540   **www.princeton.edu/~rcurtis/**

Consumer Response Center
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 2058

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as formal complaint to the Federal Trade Commission on the deceptive and possibly unfair advertising practices of the Macromedia Corporation regarding the sale and advertisement of their product Drumbeat 2000.

Macromedia acquired Drumbeat 2000 from Elemental Software in August on 1999 and hired many of the original Drumbeat program team. Macromedia began selling Drumbeat under their logo in September of 1999. During the summer of 1999 Macromedia made a number of public statements about the acquisition of Drumbeat. These statements were displayed on the Macromedia Web site as "The Elemental Acquisition FAQ" starting in August 1999. These statements (see Exhibit 1) specifically suggested to customers that a new, expanded edition of Drumbeat would be developed. These pages continued to be published on Macromedia's Web Site through April 24, 2000. This timing of August 1999 through April 2000 is of critical importance.

Secondly, the way in which Drumbeat was marketed informed customers that the product would work with "Windows NT 4 and higher." The Drumbeat User's Guide specifically states on page 12 that the product will work with "Windows NT 4 and higher." (Exhibit 2 - Drumbeat Users' Manual page 12). This language is in common use in the software industry and indicates that the product would work with Windows NT 4.0 and future versions of the Windows operating system, in this case Windows 2000. For an individual who purchased the program, reading this indicated that they had made a good investment; the company intended to provide a product that would run under at least the next version of the Windows operating system. As will become evident, this was not to be the case. This is a piece of information that Macromedia has distributed in their manuals from August 1999 through the present.

In September, Macromedia released Service Pack 2 for Drumbeat, a software patch to fix certain problems and add some new features, which had been developed by the Elemental Software team. It added a few new features as well as introduced some new bugs in the program. Since then Drumbeat users have waited patiently for Service Pack 3 to solve the problems created by the bugs. Hundreds if not thousands of requests have been submitted to the company asking for these bugs to be fixed.

In December of 1999 a number of customers raised questions about incompatibilities between Drumbeat 2000 and Windows 2000 Beta release 2. Macromedia responded that Drumbeat was not supported to operate under the Windows 2000 Beta 2. Many users believed (since

Macromedia did not state otherwise) that this was a problem with the beta version of Windows 2000 not a problem with Drumbeat. Customers assumed that when the final version of Windows 2000 was released, Drumbeat would run on Windows 2000. However, as will be clear from the timeline below, Macromedia knew that Drumbeat was not going to be compatible with Windows 2000 and the company had already decided that it would not build a software patch that would make it compatible. This information was hidden from consumers until April 2000.

Upon the release of the final version Windows 2000 on February 17, 2000, Drumbeat users learned that Drumbeat would not run on the release version of Windows 2000 (see Exhibit 3). When questioned about this on the various Drumbeat newsgroups at the time, Macromedia staff admitted that hat the incompatibility was a problem with Drumbeat not with Windows 2000. When questioned about whether the company would release a Windows 2000 patch, the response from Macromedia Technical Support was "yes we are." Please see Exhibit 3 for a number of email messages some of which confirm that a patch for Windows 2000 will be coming (while others are vague and elusive).

Upon the release of the final version Windows 2000 on February 17, 2000, Drumbeat users learned from Macromedia staff that Drumbeat would not run on Windows 2000 (see Exhibit 3). When questioned about this on the various Drumbeat newsgroups at the time, Macromedia staff admitted that the incompatibility was a problem with Drumbeat not with Windows 2000 as is shown in these email messages from Jeff Von Ward from Macromedia Technical Support on the Macromedia Drumbeat Newsgroup.

Subject: Re: Drumbeat on Windows 2000 is trouble.
Date: 02/14/2000
Author: Leif <leif@intellocity.com>

  > DB and Win2000 don't go well together at this point. Patch is awaited. Has Macromedia acknowledged this yet??

Subject: Re: Drumbeat on Windows 2000 is trouble.
Date: 02/14/2000
Author: Jeff Von Ward <supportinfo@macromedia.com>

 Leif:

  Yes, we have. Until there is a patch, we do not recommend using Drumbeat with Windows 2000.

When specifically questioned about the Windows 2000 incompatibility problem Jeff Von Ward from Macromedia Technical Support made the following public statement on the Macromedia Drumbeat Newsgroup:

Subject: Re: Windows 2000 & Feb 17

Date: 02/15/2000
Author: Jeff Von Ward <supportinfo@macromedia.com>

 Leif:

No, we see it as a Drumbeat 2000 problem requiring a Drumbeat patch; this won't happen right away, though; these things do take time and your patience is appreciated. I think this is the third time I've answered this question for you, by the way, so let me know if I'm not addressing it in some way that you're expecting it to be addressed. (Obviously we all want to see a patch and as soon as possible!)

Certainly any reasonable person would interpret this statement as confirming Macromedia's intention to create a Drumbeat 2000 patch that would allow the program to operate under Windows 2000. In point of fact, the company had already decided much earlier that it was not going to create a Windows 2000 patch and consciously did not reveal that information when it was specifically asked about it. Windows 2000 compatibility is a critical buying factor for many users. Macromedia employees did not simply withhold information, they answered in a way that told users that a patch was forthcoming thereby preventing purchasers from making an accurate buying decision.

On April 5 of this year, Macromedia announced that Drumbeat would be discontinued in June 2000 and that a new product, Dreamweaver UltraDev, based on the Dreamweaver architecture, would be released as a replacement. As part of the replacement program, current Drumbeat users would be offered a special upgrade price. This demonstrates the connection that the company was building in the minds of Drumbeat users between Drumbeat and the new product. This announcement generated both excitement and a great deal of concern among Drumbeat users. You can read a sampling of hundreds of comments from Drumbeat users in the Appendix of Exhibit 5. Drumbeat customers expressed shocked at the cancellation of the product, a feeling of being cheated by the company, and literally begged the company to provide a Windows 2000 patch. Some even talked about class action suits against Macromedia. Many Drumbeat users had spent months learning the program and developing Web sites with Drumbeat technology, based on the assumption that Drumbeat would be part of the Macromedia family of programs for an extended period of time as was stated in "The Elemental Acquisition FAQ" (Exhibit 1) - "the next generation of Drumbeat 2000 will contain a greater integration between Drumbeat and Macromedia's existing products."

Drumbeat users were concerned about whether the Web sites created with Drumbeat would be usable in the new product. Little information was forthcoming until May 2000from Macromedia about exactly what Dreamweaver UltraDev would do. It turns out that Dreamweaver UltraDev is not a typical upgrade to Drumbeat 2000 where the two programs are compatible; rather Dreamweaver UltraDev is a completely different product. Sites published from Drumbeat can be opened and modified in Dreamweaver UltraDev. However, because Drumbeat republishes the Web pages each time you make a change within Drumbeat any changes made outside of Drumbeat (by Dreamweaver UltraDev) would be lost. This is due to the fundamental architecture

change between the Drumbeat product and Dreamweaver UltraDev. This has been confirmed by a number of Macromedia employees (see Exhibit 6). Here is what a Peter Moser, a Beta tester of Dreamweaver UltraDev had to say about the difference between Drumbeat and Dreamweaver UltraDev and moving Drumbeat applications over to the new architecture. He states that moving Drumbeat projects over to UltraDev will ultimately involve a complete rewriting of the Drumbeat application, an immense task for many Web sites and for developers who have built dozens of sites in Drumbeat. Peter's remarks are confirmed by two Macromedia employees John Dowdell and Matt Brown on the Macromedia UltraDev Newsgroup:

Subject: UltraDev Conclusions
Date: Fri, 12 May 2000 14:42:19 -0500
From: "Peter Moser" <peter@studiogp.com>
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev

Preamble: I'm sure that following this post, my contacts at Macromedia will
not be very happy with me. I regret that. Macromedia was very gracious in
allowing us to beta test UltraDev and we are certainly grateful for the
opportunity. I will be using UltraDev, but not for the role I had hoped.
There's always version 2 to look forward to. I hope that the folks at
Macromedia take this as honest feedback about the product and utilize it to
make it even better.

After getting to work with UltraDev for the past few weeks, I find that I
will be reverting to a development methodology I had hoped to abandon.
Having gained strong Drumbeat experience over the past 14 months and using
Visual InterDev (v1 and v6) for numerous projects over the past 3 years,
Drumbeat became my primary development web app development tool because of
the power and time-savings it offered. Prior to Drumbeat, my project cycles
consisted of using Dreamweaver to develop a site's look and feel and to
build the foundational elements of the site. The resulting files were then
incorporated into InterDev projects where database code was developed. A
very workable process, but not as smooth as I would have liked. After
getting hold of Drumbeat and becoming familiar with its development model, I
found out that:

  - On average, comparable apps took 40% less time to put together in
Drumbeat.
  - I was able to quickly put together a pretty stout library of customized
SmartElements and Contracts that equated to an even larger time savings.
  - I garnered more work because I could deliver the product in less time,
and therefore at less cost to the client.
  - While not a perfect tool, its strengths far outweighed it's weaknesses.

I had some trepidation about UltraDev after hearing that it would be based
on the Dreamweaver architecture while at the same time being pretty excited

because Dreamweaver is an indispensable tool for quite a bit of the work I do. Over the past few weeks, I put UltraDev to work in honest attempts to (1) migrate existing Drumbeat projects to UltraDev and (2) develop new projects in UltraDev. This is what I have concluded:

  - 'Migrating' Drumbeat projects will basically involve a complete rewrite of the app.
  - UltraDev will be useful for putting together project prototypes requiring database functionality, but it offers no advantages to me as a primary project development tool over Drumbeat or Visual InterDev.
  - The extensibility model of UltraDev is incredibly complex and will require far more time and effort than is economically feasible for me to undertake to replace the customized Drumbeat library I have developed.
  - UltraDev will replace Dreamweaver as the 'look and feel' tool for project development, however, Visual InterDev will again become my primary application development environment.
  - UltraDev's current database capabilities will provide existing Dreamweaver designers with some very nice functionality, but they are far too simplistic for me to use in extensive web apps.
  - ** The extensibility architecture of UltraDev is very deep and complex. As a result, over time, UltraDev has the distinct possibility of becoming an incredibly powerful web application development tool.**

In the big picture, it's the last item that is the most important. For me, at this time, UltraDev does not deliver for me the level of functionality I need to give my clients what they need and pay me for. As a replacement for Dreamweaver, UltraDev delivers a familiar toolset while allowing me to get basic database functionality into my work. As a replacement for Drumbeat, well it simply isn't. As a tool that has the serious potential to become my primary development environment, I have no doubt about that.

Peter M. Moser
Studio GP

Subject: Re: UltraDev Conclusions
Date Fri, 12 May 2000 15:42:03 -0700
From: John Dowdell <supportinfo@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1

Generally it's true that next month's release of Dreamweaver UltraDev won't immediately do all the things that Elemental Drumbeat did. I do think you'll find that the rate of growth (and the extent of growth) will be far more significant than before.

It's definitely your call, though... it's good to evaluate the various
technologies and see how they match up against a particular job you take
on.

> 'Migrating' Drumbeat projects will basically involve a complete rewrite
> of the app.

That's true... Dreamweaver UltraDev won't convert existing ASP pages
into its own smart elements. You'll certainly be able to edit these
pages at the HTML level, and I believe you'll be able to add most types
of new smart elements, but Drumbeat's own private editing structures
won't be mirrored in the new architecture, that's true.

Subject: Re: LATEST DRUMBEAT & WINDOWS 2000 NEWS & More from MM
Date: Sat, 06 May 2000 11:09:21 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8

> I think what you're doing is great, this world needs more people like you.
> So we'll transition to UltraDev from DB, but what do you think of the fact
> we will not be able to import drumbeat projects directly, only the resulting
> ASP/HTML code? Isn't there something we can do about that?

No. There is no possibility of a converter given the current schedule
and resources available to the team. We did look at that and made a
decision not to proceed with that early on in the development process.
The solution is to recode pages as needed and to create all new pages in
UD or stick with DB.

This shift in architecture is compounded by the fact that a number of the features in Drumbeat are
not duplicated in Dreamweaver UltraDev. As announced by Macromedia, Dreamweaver
UltraDev will not initially include a number of the E-commerce features found in Drumbeat E-
commerce edition. What this means to Drumbeat users is that many users will have to continue
to maintain E-commerce and other Drumbeat-built sites with Drumbeat for an extended period of
time until 1) Dreamweaver UltraDev has the same features as Drumbeat and 2) until we have
time to completely port our Drumbeat-built applications over to the new program. This problem
is further exacerbated by the fact that Drumbeat 2000 will not run under Windows 2000. So
thousands of Drumbeat developers are suddenly caught in a situation where they must maintain
their sites on Drumbeat for months if not a year or more, and they can't do it on a PC running
Windows 2000. Macromedia was aware of this situation months ahead of time and chose not to

inform customers of these facts. It allowed customers to continue to purchase the product without adequate knowledge upon which to base their buying decision.

With the new product schedule to be released in June it is clear that Macromedia decided to discontinue Drumbeat long before April 5. I expect that a review of Macromedia's records would set the date in mid-fall. The email responses in Exhibit 4 directly from Macromedia employees clearly indicate that the company decided to stop development on Drumbeat 2000 and to solely work on Dreamweaver UltraDev sometime in early fall of 1999. Here are a sample of those responses:

Matt Brown mbrown@macromedia.com
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
 References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8

Marc Garrett wrote:
>
> Matt,
>
> I'm sorry I throw out my back issues of some of those magazines because, if
> I recall correctly, the ads in question began running November 1999.
> Counting back five months seems to put you guys squarely in the camp of
> buying Drumbeat knowing that you would kill it off.

When we do an add for one app doesn't have much to do with when we run
an add for another app. We knew soon enough after we acquired Elemental
that we would not continuing development or marketing that spending any
advertising budget would have been a bad decision.

Subject: Re: UltraDev Conclusions
Date: Fri, 12 May 2000 19:49:29 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3

Bian Hogue wrote:
[snip]
> The requirements should have been to port all of DB functionality into
> UD, in the _first_ pass. The coding requirement are already known.[snip]
> That was
> not the original intent. So if MM started this back last fall (like
> September), and will ship in June, that seems like 9 months.

You are correct on the time estimate, but, respectfully, you make the

assumption that we had a requirement of having all the DB functionality
in UD and that is not the case. Our mandate was to use the technology
from Elemental to create a product to integrate web design and dynamic
content in an application that we could upgrade and develop further than
we could Drumbeat. We did that and the results are excellent. In the
future we will continue to develop UltraDev but it will always be it's
own application, not a feature for feature duplicate of Drumbeat.

The issue that Macromedia had decided sometime in 1999 not to develop a Windows 2000 patch
was also confirmed in my April 21 2000 telephone conversation with Macromedia Vice
President Beth Davis when she said that the program team examined Windows 2000 and
determined that it would "take a team of programmers months to create a Windows 2000 patch
so we decided not to do it." (see Exhibit 3). While I don't disagree with Macromedia's decision
on how to allocate their programming resources, the company maintained a policy of both
misinformation and obfuscation about their product for months between the decision to
discontinue Drumbeat and now. This practice of deception continued until April 5, 2000 when
Macromedia announced the new Dreamweaver UltraDev product was going to replace Drumbeat
2000. It was only at this point that Macromedia acknowledged that Windows 2000 support would
never be available for Drumbeat. Even so, their Web Site continued to display this false and
misleading information until April 24 (see Exhibit 1). It was only through my letter to the
Macromedia President (see Exhibit 5) and my phone conversations with Macromedia employees
that the false information was removed.

Another interesting note is that several Drumbeat users have developed some simple patches to
allow the program to work under Windows 2000. It seems strange that a company that posted
1999 fourth quarter revenues of $89,282,000 couldn't put any time into solving this problem for
their customers.

I think as you read through the messages from Macromedia employees to concerned customers
you will see a general pattern of disdain from the Macromedia staff. This is a company that
hasn't made the least attempt to do the right thing for Drumbeat customers. It does not bode well
for how customers are to be treated in the future. This reply from Matt Brown at Macromedia is
particularly telling, it shows that the company **was aware** of the disruptive nature the change in
architecture would have on Drumbeat customers. The Macromedia response, sorry but
supporting Drumbeat will interfere with our profit margins.

Subject: Re: Why wouldn't this work for everybody?
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 12:36:05 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3

Reed Sprung wrote:
>

> Comments below:
>
> [snip]
> In other words, no. We don't care if DB users would benefit from a revised
> agreement with Unify. We care about our main product line. If this
> adversely affects a small percentage of our clients, who cares? It would be
> very easy for us to rectify this, but after all, there's only 10,000 of them
> and half of those will update to UD anyway. If we leave some destruction in
> our wake, so what? It's not our responsibility, they're only customers.
> Lets worry about our focus here. We'll just keep denying that there is any
> negative impact on Drumbeat users. They'll eventually just go away.

We are making these decisions to produce better software for the
majority of our users. We don't like the fact that people are going to
be disrupted, but we cannot help that that is going to be the case. We
have all been in the same boat and the answer is never easy. We know how
you feel, but in the end no matter what we do or how we do it we are
going to have some users that move to UD and some that do not. Of those
that do not, they will keep DB or move to products that suit them
better. I know I for one, would rather have people getting on with their
work than hoping against hope that there is going to be a resolution
that keeps DB alive in some way. It will not happen.

Our responsibility is to you as a user and to the Dreamweaver users and
to the users that are going to come in the future is to focus on the
best application we can build. That is UltraDev. There is no way we or
anyone else can possibly imagine that there is no negative impact on DB
users. Change is always disruptive.

Subject: Re: UltraDev Conclusions
Date: Mon, 15 May 2000 00:03:43 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10 , 11 , 12

> Second, why couldn't MM run DB and UD in parallel? Jim Grimble and
> possibly Tom Muck ask the same question. None of us is suggesting a DB
> version 4. Per a prior post today, I suggest that MM could have
> contracted out this short term maintenance.

We are not going to spend any resources that are not directly for
UltraDev. If we could contract a DB maintenance team we could as well be
using them for features on UD. Anyway, what maintenance needs to be
done? DB works fine except for Win2k and there seem to be two separate

solutions posted here.

> First, MM will retain a higher percentage of existing customers. One
> the big pushes in marketing today is to retain customers, because it
> costs five times as much to get a replacement customer.

That of course would be good.

>Second, this
> philosophy has the added advantage that large corporate decision
> makers are more likely to use MM, if they perceive that MM will not
> abandon them ...

No. Not correct. No corporate decision makers bought DB. For them, the
only thing that counts is our support of DW and UD. Anything else is a
waste of time for them. I know, we asked them.

> I suggest that MM's current
> plan does NOT have DB and UD in parallel at all. For example, when was
> the last internal MM maintenance done on DB?

Months ago. Again once the plan to do UD was done, any effort at all on
DB was effort not spent on UD and we aren't going to do that.

> If any of these comments change MM's actions in the next few months
> great. I doubt that will happen. I reach this conclusion from MM's
> feedback (like yours). This is not the first time that MM said this is
> what we are doing and we will not change our plan. If that is not an
> accurate statement, then it is what I hear MM saying. I suggest that I
> am not the only one hearing that.

That is exactly what we have said from the beginning. We are going to
build UD and we are going to stop selling DB. We plan carefully at MM
and we always execute our plans. We are willing to listen to advice on
how to improve UD in upcoming versions and we might be able to
incorporate that in the UD plan. But any advice on DB is just something
we can sympathize and listen to.

> My real hope is that MM takes the suggestions to heart for the next
> time MM wants to 'replace' a product. If MM had taken feedback like
> this to heart from prior incidents, then we would (all) not need to
> suffer so much. Why can't we learn from the past? Why can't we borrow
> someone else's good idea (like IBM's)?

We really understand this is frustrating, but we have been down the

paths before. MM is over 10 years old and we have canceled products in a
number of ways and the response is always the same regardless of the
approach. It just doesn't help to phase products in. The best way is
what we are doing now, fair notice and pour every penny and body into
the new product. No secrets here that is exactly what we planned and
what we are going to do. The trick is get involved in the plan for UD
over time.

After reviewing the Federal Trade Commission practices I have found the following descriptions
that seem to fit the current situation.

> In interpreting Section 5 of the Act, the Commission has determined that a
> representation, omission, or practice is *deceptive* if it is likely to:[1]
>
> - mislead consumers; and
>
> - affect consumers' behavior or decisions about the product or service.
>
> In addition, an act or practice is *unfair* if the injury it causes, or is likely to
> cause, is:
>
> - substantial;
>
> - not outweighed by other benefits; and
>
> - not reasonably avoidable.

Under these guidelines Macromedia has done the following:

1. Falsely advertised the product in a way that led customers to believe that it would operate
   under Windows 2000.
2. Falsely advertised the product in a way to make customers believe that it was being
   developed into a more substantial product.
3. Withheld critical information from customers about their plans for producing a Windows
   2000 compliant version.
4. Failed to provide adequate notice to customers that the product that they were purchasing
   was being discontinued.
5. Has systematically and over an extended period of time misled customers.

It is clear that Macromedia's practices misled customers, affected their buying decisions, has
created a substantial hardship and significant monetary loss for some customers, and was
reasonably avoidable by the company. Macromedia continued to sell a product that it knew it was
going to discontinue without providing customers with the proper information to make an
informed decision about purchasing the product. Buyers based their decisions on a number of
factors including information in the user's manual, the company's portrayal of how they would

---

[1] http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/conline/pubs/buspubs/ruleroad.htm

continue to develop the product on their Web Site. From my reading of this it seems clear that much of Macromedia's approach has been deceptive as defined by the FTC and may even be considered as unfair. Here's what one Drumbeat customer reported:

> *I am a developer who just put in my resignation at my full time job and planned to do freelance Drumbeat development. After a great deal of planning, I was slated to "go live" with my new business on June 3rd. Only days after making this life altering decision, I found out about Macromedia's plans to discontinue Drumbeat. This has been an upsetting development and I have been left with few options. I can continue to develop with Drumbeat but using soon to be outdated software is a great disservice to my customers. It could also lead to great losses if I have to redevelop sites at my own cost just to update a few items. On the other hand, I could take the time to learn UltraDev (which I feel is by no means an upgrade to Drumbeat 2000) and cut my losses with the countless hours spent learning Drumbeat. This option would mean waiting until UltraDev is released (June, July, who really knows?), spending several months learning the product, and then I would finally be able to sell my services. I would not be able to "go live" until at least November. Financially, this is not even an option.*

> *When I first considered starting my own business, I was only slightly apprehensive and very excited. I had decided initially to choose all Macromedia products because of their quality and Macromedia's excellent reputation. Now their thoughtless decisions, clearly motivated by financial gain, have turned my dream into a nightmare. I looked to Macromedia as a company I could trust and am still shocked by the lies they have fed the development community. They need a hard lesson in respect for their customers. It seems like large companies always end up forgetting just how they got where they are. They wouldn't even exist if it wasn't for us, the customer.*

> *Macromedia's actions have really made me consider how I will run my business. After dealing with this much frustration, I understand the requirements my customers will have. I must be honest, fair, and respectful of their needs. In other words, everything that Macromedia no longer is...*

The number of Drumbeat customers who have been affected by this or who have complained is staggering. Some are listed in my letter to the Macromedia President as well as many of their comments. Hundreds of other users have posted complaints on the Macromedia Newsgroups for Drumbeat, Drumbeat E-Commerce, and UltraDev. There were simply far too many complaints for me to include them all in these letter. There are also many other Drumbeat customers who do not use these online resources who have also been adversely affected. It is estimated that there are about 10,000 Drumbeat users.

I would appreciate your assistance in filing this complaint and in informing me what additional action customers can take with the company regarding refunds or compensation. I can be reached at the address above. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Rick Curtis

Enclosed:

Letter to Rob Burgess
Macromedia's Response from Beth Davis
My Response to Beth Davis
Drumbeat Web Pages (before April 24)
Drumbeat Web Pages (after April 24)

Exhibit 3 – Macromedia Responses to questions about a Windows 2000 Patch

Subject: DB in Win 2K Date: 12/18/1999 Author: Michael K Lewis <mlewis@designerbytes.com>   Anyone found a fix for the anomolies with DB2000 in Win2000?

Subject:
Re: DB in Win 2K
Date: 12/19/1999
Author: Kevin Beckwith <kbms@bigpond.net.au>
 	
  Nope. Seeing as Win2K has now gone RTM I am hoping that there will be a fix very, very, very soon...
 	
  Kevin

Subject: Re: Drumbeat on Windows 2000 is trouble. Date: 02/14/2000 Author: Leif <leif@intellocity.com>   > DB and Win2000 don't go well together at this point. Patch is awaited.   Has Macromedia acknowledged this yet??

Subject: Re: Drumbeat on Windows 2000 is trouble.
Date: 02/14/2000
Author: Jeff Von Ward <supportinfo@macromedia.com>

 Leif:

 Yes, we have. Until there is a patch, we do not recommend using
 Drumbeat with Windows 2000.

Subject:
Re: Drumbeat on Windows 2000 is trouble.
Date: 02/15/2000
Author: Kevin Morgan <Kevin@mist.co.uk>

 Jeff,

 Kind of begs the question "When can we expect a patch?". I don't expect a specific date, but how about "within a month, within two months, or Q3 this year",
 etc.

 Thanks,

 Kev

Subject:
Re: Drumbeat on Windows 2000 is trouble.
Date: 02/15/2000
Author: Jeff Von Ward <supportinfo@macromedia.com>

 Kevin:

 There has been no announcement on when (or even if) this will appear; I, like you and many other Drumbeat users, would like to see it sooner rather than
 later. I'll continue to do all I can here to make that happen. Was that vague enough for you? :-)

Subject:
Re: Drumbeat on Windows 2000 is trouble.
Date: 02/15/2000
Author: Leif <leif@intellocity.com>

 Jeff:

 Does Macromedia think this is a Windows 2000 problem, or put another way, is Macromedia waiting for a Windows 2000 patch that will enable Drumbeat

to run on Windows 2000?

Thanks,

L.

Subject:
Re: Drumbeat on Windows 2000 is trouble.
Date: 02/15/2000
Author: Jeff Von Ward <supportinfo@macromedia.com>

Leif:

I answered this question below; we think it is a Drumbeat 2000
problem. See my other reply for more detail.

Also we have this technote (which will need to be updated on the 17th):

http://209.67.164.102/technotes/TechNote.asp?DBTN_Action=Find('KBID','2276')

Subject:
Windows 2000 & Feb 17
Date: 02/15/2000
Author: Leif <leif@intellocity.com>

What is Macromedia's position on the incompatibility of Drumbeat and Windows 2000?

Is our company waiting for a Drumbeat 2000 patch from Macromedia or does Macromedia see
this as a Microsoft Windows 2000 problem requiring a
Windows 2000 patch from Microsoft?

Regards,

Leif

Subject:
Re: Windows 2000 & Feb 17
Date: 02/15/2000
Author: Jeff Von Ward <supportinfo@macromedia.com>

Leif:

No, we see it as a Drumbeat 2000 problem requiring a Drumbeat patch; this won't happen right
away, though; these things do take time and your patience
is appreciated. I think this is the third time I've answered this question for you, by the way, so

let me know if I'm not addressing it in some way that you're
  expecting it to be addressed. (Obviously we all want to see a patch and as soon as possible!)

  Also, not that it helps any, but Drumbeat isn't the only program that is incompatible with
Windows 2000. AutoCad, Lotus Notes 5 and others I hear need to
  be patched as well.

  For a list of compatible programs, you can visit Microsoft's website:

  http://www.microsoft.com/windows/professional/deploy/compatible

Subject:
Re: win2k is out.. not so the patch for db
Date: 02/16/2000
Author: Jeff Von Ward <supportinfo@macromedia.com>

  Nice Tea:

  If you must use Windows 2000 on your development machine, you'll need to switch to Visual
Interdev for the time being; no announcement has been made
  about when (or if) a Drumbeat 2000 patch will be made
  available.

  On Wed, 16 Feb 2000 19:04:28 +0100, NiceTea <chill_nice@hotmail.com>
  wrote:

  >We are changing our systems to win2k. Of course we would need the
  >patch now for drumbeat. Can we expect something to happen or do we
  >have to switch to visual interdev?

  Best,
  Jeff

  Jeff Von Ward

  Macromedia Technical Support

Subject:
Re: Any news on Win2k version ?
Date: 03/27/2000
Author: Jeff Von Ward <supportinfo@macromedia.com>

  Daniel:

We have no further news on the topic yet.

From what I've seen on the newsgroups, the people who have used it successfully are either a) only publishing to a server with IIS 5 but authoring on another
machine without Windows 2000 installed or b) working with an earlier beta of the OS.

On Mon, 27 Mar 2000 10:30:28 +0200, Serial # 19781010
<demcom@christianstad.com> wrote:

>Has anyone heard anything about an upgrade for Drumbeat 2000 ?
>
>I read some has gotten it to work with Win2k, but most have
>experienced problems.
>

Best,
Jeff

Jeff Von Ward

Macromedia Technical Support

Exhibit 4 – Macromedia responses that indicate that the decision to discontinue Drumbeat 2000 was made in early fall 1999

Re: LATEST DRUMBEAT & WINDOWS 2000 NEWS & More from MM
Date: Sat, 06 May 2000 11:16:14 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev, macromedia.drumbeat, macromedia.drumbeat.ecommerce
References:
        1

We are talking to Unify to get an idea of what they are going to do with
the Vision Studio and eWave Studio. Unify does have the right and
ability to produce a patch for their products. If there is a way for
them to make that patch available for NON-UNIFY DB users and if it
worked on the regular version of DB, there might be a way to make it
possible for Unify to distribute such a patch. It would though, be at
the discretion of Unify and would not be tested by or distributed by or
supported by Macromedia.

When the engineering assessment was made of the Win2k problems, the time
estimate was made by looking at the areas of the program that the
engineers would have to check to isolate any issues. They added in the

time it would take to QA the new builds, QA the patch, distribute the patch, provide support for the patch and manage the release. That estimate was balanced against the development cycle for UltraDev.

We stand by that estimate.

The actual time to produce a patch of course might have been more or less than the estimate once the actual problems were isolated.

Since the decision was made based on that estimate, there was no specific set of bugs or lines of code that we know needs to be fixed so there is no information to release to anyone to make fixes either internally at MM, to Unify or through a third party.

After acquiring Elemental the decision was made to discontinue DB. We created a marketing plan and customer service plan reflecting that. We set a date for discontinuing DB. We set a date to announce that we were discontinuing Drumbeat and we set a date for announcing UltraDev and shipping it. Pulling the resources to produce a fix or even research the details of a fix after the initial time estimates were made, would have put that schedule at risk and we were not and are not going to do that.

On the other hand if a bright programmer figures out a fix for DB and distributes that here to the members of the newsgroup that is great and we hope it is a good fix.

If Unify does produce a patch and that works on regular DB and we do determine that they can distribute it to non-Unify users, then that is great too. We are pursuing that, but according to the note Rick published that might be in the September time frame or it might be earlier.

In short, if you are using or looking at moving to Win2k, try the fix that has been talked about. If any other options come up, then we'll post them here.

> if we find that UD is really a downgrade

> from DB, we can then voice our opinion not just loud and clear, but with
> EVIDENCE! and i doubt by then that MM will completely ignore us. either they
> will have to keep DB alive for longer than they planned or even completely
> revive it, or they would have to improve UD significantly to stand up to our
> demands. whatever happens, we must have the final release in hand to give MM
> the necessary feedback.

We will be working on UD for some time to come and you will see regular
upgrades and added functionality over time.

OTOH, there is no set of circumstances which will force Macromedia to
revive DB in any way. The product has been retired and the resources
have been folded into UltraDev and other projects in Macromedia. There
is no marketing team, no QA team, no engineering team and after December
31 no support team. The only way to get DB after that will be through
Unify and that comes with some strings like needing to buy their server.

From:
Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3

Bian Hogue wrote:
[snip]
> The requirements should have been to port all of DB functionality into
> UD, in the _first_ pass. The coding requirement are already known.[snip]
> That was
> not the original intent. So if MM started this back last fall (like
> September), and will ship in June, that seems like 9 months.

You are correct on the time estimate, but, respectfully, you make the
assumption that we had a requirement of having all the DB functionality
in UD and that is not the case. Our mandate was to use the technology
from Elemental to create a product to integrate web design and dynamic
content in an application that we could upgrade and develop further than
we could Drumbeat. We did that and the results are excellent. In the
future we will continue to develop UltraDev but it will always be it's
own application, not a feature for feature duplicate of Drumbeat.

I am not trying to be harsh here, but you need to manage your
expectations. When the 30-day evaluation version is ready, I urge you to
take a look and see if it fits your needs. If it doesn't then you need

to look at other options. Waiting for a future version of UltraDev that
might not take you any nearer to Drumbeat would be a bad decision.

> So I _hope_ that Peter's assessment is wrong. However, it appears that
> you do agree with his assessment.

It is a very valid set of opinions and underlines that we are creating a
different application than DB. An app based on an advanced extensibility
architecture and absolute control of your code, not wizard driven site
creation.

Subject: Re: I don't quite understand the fuss
Date: Mon, 17 Apr 2000 15:39:51 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5

Adam Frank wrote:
>
> Matt,
>
> Is this the best you can do for us? Protect us from bad language?

You are welcome to post anything here you like related to the products.
We discourage unprofessional language.

> What about
> our lost investment in time and money? Recently you wrote me and said that
> you "understood my points but that doesn't make me right." For heaven sakes
> man, look what so many people are writing about MM in this forum. "Deceptive
> practices", "False advertising"... Can all these people be wrong?

There are some people here that agree with you and some that do not. I
do understand your points, glad you are making them, but I do not agree
and neither does Macromedia. There was nothing deceptive and no false
advertising.

> Do you
> REALLY believe the corporate "yes man" responses we are getting are going to
> improve your companies reputation or repair the trust that MM has so badly
> damaged?

No, they are not going to make you feel any better about Macromedia. I
don't expect them to. I am telling you the truth though and I do
"REALLY" believe that we are doing the right thing.

If you have questions I can answer, I will. Otherwise all I can do is
repeat the same information in the FAQ.

Subject: Re: If Drumbeat never existed.....
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 08:12:46 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

Marc Garrett wrote:
>
> At least in my
> issues of PCWeek, Interactive Week, and WebTechniques Drumbeat was not even
> mentioned in the mm family of products across the bottom of the page. And
> this was months before the UD announcement.

Which was 5 months after the decision to discontinue Drumbeat.

Building software is not a process of building something cool and
marketing the heck out of it. It only works that way in the Mickey Roony
movies. We had a long history to look at with Elemental and have 11
years of our own experience to look at. Also many of us come from other
companies and can draw from that. We have many people from Apple, Adobe,
Microsoft, Borland... I was even at Ashton Tate... (want to talk
discontinued products???)

Anyway, point is we know what we can sell and will sell before we start
marketing at all. Those predictions are sometimes not perfect but they
are never off by THAT much.. Cool products don't always win and there
was no way Drumbeat was going to succeed in it's incarnation. Now that
technology is being incorporated in Dreamweaver as UltraDev and that is
going to be a big success.

Subject: Re: If Drumbeat never existed.....
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 08:24:06 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia

Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

Joseph Scavitto wrote:
[snip]
> Also the statment "mm did NOT market it as it marketed its other
> products" from Marc I agree with.

Of course. We had decided to discontinue the product at that point so
why should we have spent money on marketing when we could use that money
for UD development. Again, the Dreamweaver Family of products is the
ONLY focus in the group.

Subject: Re: If Drumbeat never existed.....
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 11:24:55 -0400
From: "Tom Muck" <tommuck@basic-drumbeat.com>
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7

Matt Brown wrote in message <38FF1E6E.6B9977F7@macromedia.com>...
><snip>
>
>Which was 5 months after the decision to discontinue Drumbeat.
>

Yes! And this is exactly when you should have informed the buyers of
Drumbeat, and also when the supposed "Drumbeat wishlist" that was advertised
by CS people right up until a few days before the announcement of UltraDev
should have been discontinued. Write to a wishlist for a dead product???
That makes a lot of sense.

Five months is a long time to spend working on a product that has no future.
That could have been time and money spent using a product that has a future,
whether it's Dreamweaver or something else. I could have been fluent in a
product that has a future instead of one that's dead in the water.

Tom

Subject: Re: If Drumbeat never existed.....
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 08:30:18 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8

Tom Muck wrote:
> Write to a wishlist for a dead product???
> That makes a lot of sense.

Those wishlist items were filtered for suggestions to add to UltraDev.
That was an important source of development information for the UD team

> Five months is a long time to spend working on a product that has no future.
> That could have been time and money spent using a product that has a future,
> whether it's Dreamweaver or something else. I could have been fluent in a
> product that has a future instead of one that's dead in the water.

Five months is also a long time to get value out of a product. You have
sites up and built with the product that you might not have without it.
We are not going to broadcast what we are going to do months in advance
of doing it. We are a business and telling our competitors what we are
doing is not that smart. They don't see fit to tell us of course.

Subject: Re: If Drumbeat never existed.....
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 13:56:04 -0500
From: "Marc Garrett" <marcgarrett@starpower.net>
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7

Matt,

I'm sorry I throw out my back issues of some of those magazines because, if
I recall correctly, the ads in question began running November 1999.
Counting back five months seems to put you guys squarely in the camp of
buying Drumbeat knowing that you would kill it off.

Regards,

Marc Garrett

Marc Garrett wrote:
>
> Matt,
>
> I'm sorry I throw out my back issues of some of those magazines because, if
> I recall correctly, the ads in question began running November 1999.
> Counting back five months seems to put you guys squarely in the camp of
> buying Drumbeat knowing that you would kill it off.

When we do an add for one app doesn't have much to do with when we run
an add for another app. We knew soon enough after we acquired Elemental
that we would not continuing development or marketing that spending any
advertising budget would have been a bad decision.

In response to the letter from Rick Curtis,

Thank you for taking the time to write to us on your concerns as a
Drumbeat customer about UltraDev.

I, along with many of us at Macromedia, have been personally reading the
newsgroups and we are taking the concerns presented by you and the other
Drumbeat customers very seriously. For the past several months, many
teams at Macromedia have been working with Drumbeat customers and with
third parties to develop documentation, training materials, extensions
and functionality for UltraDev to ensure an easy and successful
transition from Drumbeat to UltraDev. From the very beginning, UltraDev

was conceived with the Drumbeat developer in mind. Specifically, we are working to:

* Combine the best of the visual design environment and Roundtrip HTML in Dreamweaver and the server-scripting environment of Drumbeat to give you a powerful, robust product that will help you quickly build Web sites that connect to databases.
* Help developers make the transition to a new environment by offering specific documentation to help Drumbeat users convert sites and working habits to the new product including a special section of the UltraDev Users Guide dedicated to applying your Drumbeat experience to the new design environment.
* Provide a free 3-hour online training workshop to help you get up to speed quickly and at your convenience.
* Develop a Macromedia authorized training program for even more in-depth training.
* Provide a Dreamweaver UltraDev training video.
* Offer a discounted upgrade price of only $99 for all Drumbeat customers and a free upgrade to UltraDev for Drumbeat customers who purchased after April 3, 2000.
* Address the concerns presented by Drumbeat 2000 ecommerce customers by announcing our plans to provide important ecommerce extensions to UltraDev as free downloads that will be available immediately after Drumbeat is released. The first of these is a shopping cart extension described below.
* Work directly with partners in the various areas of ecommerce to develop a wide range of e-commerce options that can be downloaded from the Macromedia Exchange.
* Offer integration with products like Macromedia Fireworks, Flash and Director.
* Deliver on the commitment to support additional application servers and databases beyond the ASP, and JSP for IBM WebSphere that Drumbeat supported.

The product development evolution
One of the biggest questions on the minds of the Drumbeat community is why Macromedia decided to develop UltraDev on top of Dreamweaver rather than continue to develop Drumbeat.

During the talks before Macromedia and Elemental agreed to the acquisition, we found that the both companies shared a common goal of enabling developers to quickly build web sites that connect to databases. The development team at Elemental had already identified customer requirements to deliver a product with great table editing, an open architecture with which it was easy to integrate, and offered

developers access to the code, known as Roundtrip HTML(tm). The Drumbeat
architecture, based on a proprietary file format, could not support
access to the code, easy extensibility and preserve the underlying HTML
in a visual design environment. In order to successfully compete in the
future, Elemental determined they would have to completely re-write the
Drumbeat engine, a project that alone would take several man-years of
engineering.

After Elemental and Macromedia joined, the Drumbeat product team started
defining the product that would be the next generation of Drumbeat. We
met with Drumbeat customers, Dreamweaver customers, and other web
application developers who were either hand-coding their applications or
using a proprietary tool from Microsoft of Allaire. Those developers
all had the same requirements:
* Complete access to the source code and the ability for developers to
add hand-coded scripts. For many customers, a product that didn't offer
access to and preservation of the code would not be acceptable.
* An easily extensible architecture that can be customized from one
customer project to the next, and
* An architecture that could be easily extended to support different
application servers. In order for a web application development
solution to succeed, it must be possible for customers and partners to
add server models. Drumbeat provided great support for ASP, but other
application servers were growing in popularity.

At that point, realizing that the Drumbeat architecture could not
support the basic customer needs, the Drumbeat team made a decision to
extend the Dreamweaver platform with the application server
functionality found in Drumbeat versus continuing to develop on the
Drumbeat code base. In the words of Julie Thompson who has been with
Drumbeat since the first version of the product, " All of us from
Elemental have always wanted to make Drumbeat a more flexible design
environment like Dreamweaver and once we joined Macromedia we finally
had that chance."

The new product does not attempt to create a feature for feature match
of Drumbeat. Rather we have picked the strengths of both Dreamweaver
and Drumbeat to create a product that best meets the needs of
professional developers. In particular, UltraDev will offer things
Drumbeat developers can uniquely appreciate:
* Support for ASP, vendor-neutral JSP and ColdFusion in one single
product (no need to buy separate versions)
* A Mac OS version
* The ability to easily add server scripts and server-side behaviors to
a web site

* A visual design environment to create pages that display, navigate and update database data
* Easy connection to any ODBC, JDBC or ADO relational database
* Support for flow based HTML
* Textbook server scripts. No more include files to uploaded to the server
* Roundtrip HTML(tm), and a full copy of HomeSite (Windows) or integrated BBEdit Eval (Mac)
* A fully-documented, easy to use JavaScript API for extending the product
* An extensions exchange, where customers can easily download and share extensions to the product
* A menu system that can be completely customized using XML

Ongoing product support for Drumbeat 2000
Since acquiring Elemental Software, and throughout our roll out of UltraDev, Macromedia has tried to support the Drumbeat developer community. We have created active support resources and newsgroups, training materials, Drumbeat showcases in the customer gallery and all the traditional Macromedia product support vehicles. In fact, many Drumbeat customers consulted and advised Macromedia as we were developing this new product, either directly, or through the feature wish-lists.

Moving forward, developers can continue to use Drumbeat to maintain existing sites or even create new ones after Macromedia ships UltraDev. Existing Drumbeat customers can expect continued technical support from Macromedia through the end of the year 2000. The Drumbeat newsgroup and other Drumbeat support resources will be actively maintained.

Support for Windows 2000
More than a year after Elemental and Macromedia completed development and shipped Drumbeat 2000, Microsoft released a new version of Windows, Windows 2000. Once Macromedia had a chance to work with Windows 2000, we uncovered conflicts between Drumbeat 2000 and Windows 2000. Technical investigation showed that resolving the conflict would take a team of engineers several months to complete, creating a difficult decision for us. To support Windows 2000 would have dramatically impacted our ability to create a new and vastly better product for our users. We believe the development community will be better served with the engineering team working to make the next generation application development platform as good as it can be, so the team is ensuring UltraDev will be compatible with Windows 2000, and at this time we do not have plans to re-engineer Drumbeat to provide Windows 2000 support.

Ecommerce
While we do not have plans to ship a separate ecommerce edition of
UltraDev, we expect that many customers will use UltraDev to create
thriving ecommerce applications. In particular, Macromedia is working
with Drumbeat developers to create a shopping cart extension that will
be available for free within a month of the UltraDev product release.
The shopping cart will support ASP, JSP and ColdFusion servers, and will
allow developers to add shopping cart functionality to their sites. It
will allow customers to adjust quantities and add and subtract items
from the shopping cart and pass shopping cart information to a database
or other back end system.   In addition we will be working with partners
in the various areas of ecommerce to come up with a number of options
for developers to choose from. With Drumbeat, developers were limited
to UPS and CyberCash for order processing. By working with partners we
plan to open up a much greater variety of options for shipping, order
processing, credit card validation, and other ecommerce functionality
that will work for our developers all over the world.

What should Drumbeat developers do until UltraDev ships in June?
Until UltraDev is available, we suggest you continue to work with
Drumbeat. When UltraDev ships, there will be a free 30-day evaluation
version available so customers can decide how the new product meets
their needs. Considering that UltraDev answers the top requests from
Drumbeat customers, we expect than many developers will find the
transition manageable and rewarding. Since the same engineers that
created Drumbeat created UltraDev, we think you will find it is truly
the next generation of Drumbeat. It will include all the robust
application development features that you are looking for, plus the
control of Roundtrip HTML(tm) and the flexibility of a JavaScript based
API for customization.

Macromedia communication
It is our desire to create great products that support web developer's
needs in the long term, and Macromedia has had to make some difficult
decisions that affect the lives and businesses of our customers in doing
this. We need to communicate that information in the best possible way
to our developers, and we apologize that we didn't provide enough
detailed information to help you and Drumbeat customers effectively
assess how that announcement would affect your business. We are
increasing our effort to help give Drumbeat customers the information
they need. We plan to make more information available prior to the
shipment of UltraDev, including posting a new web site with screen
shots, a feature tour and all the details on pricing and upgrade
information within a month. In the meanwhile, we will continue to
participate actively in the newsgroup and address your questions there

as best we can. Thank you for your continued patience and support.

Best regards,
Beth Davis
VP of Product Marketing

Exhibit 6 – Drumbeat Customers try to get product support from Macromedia

Subject: Re: Two cents, (is: DB on Win2k)
Date: Mon, 17 Apr 2000 20:25:08 +0100
From: John Dowdell <supportinfo@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7

Sorry, but as previously discussed here, there's no plan to invest
engineering resources in updating old software for new OS which break
it. If you'll be migrating your machine forward, then it's usually
advisable to update the entire system rather than just parts of it.

Jd

Subject: Re: Continue or sell Drumbeat
Date: Tue, 18 Apr 2000 05:49:23 -0700
From "Julie Thompson" <juliet@macromedia.com>
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

If more people had felt the way you do Drumbeat might have lived on.
Unfortunately, most Macromedia customers didn't purchase or use Drumbeat.
We did research to figure out how it could appeal to more customers - the
results were unanimous - make it more like Dreamweaver.

"Tom Muck" <tommuck@basic-drumbeat.com> wrote in message
news:8dg7lf$m1u$1@misc.macromedia.com...
> Is there a particular reason why Drumbeat cannot be made available as open
> source or license the technology to a third party? It seems a shame to
let
> a superior technology disappear for NO reason--surely there's a reason.
> It's just like the stories you hear about the car companies burying the
> technology for the 100mpg car. I just don't get it. You have a product
> that is clearly the best thing on the market, and yet you discontinue it.

> Where's the logic in that?
>
> tom

> Thank you for taking interest, but you really need to read my correspondence
> with your company. My expectations of the product was that it would be
> supported by it's manufacturer beyond 7 months.

That is the case, but that was not anything we warranted to you. I
repeat, we never once in any communication said that the product was
going to continue to be sold indefinitely. We have to do what is best
for our customers and that is to provide excellent tools in a timely
manner. That could not be done with DB, so it needs to be retired in
favor of UltraDev.

> There was no way I could no
> that the product didn't do what I expected because MM intentionally withheld
> information from me and people like me. I discovered the product did not
> meet my specifications 40 days after I bought it.

The box listed the features of the product and listed the system
requirements. If you had other requirements that were not listed you
can't call us deceitful for not providing them. You bought the product
50 days ago and have another two months before the product stops being
sold. You have an additional six months before support is suspended.
That is a lot of time to recoup your investment in DB.

> You people made sure I
> would not know it didn't meet my specs and I proceeded to invest 40 days of
> development into it. If I returned the product after that, who would
> compensate me for my loss of a month? No sir, my loss is directly caused by
> MM's deceptive business practices. [snip]
> If it sounds like "bait and switch", it should. As far as offering me
> paths and replacements and "competitive" upgrades, I repeat:
>
> Macromedia intentionally deceived me, I didn't get what I paid for and now
> they want me to pay more!
>

> You know this is wrong. Stand up for your customers. You are now selling DB
> with a free upgrade to Ultra-DEV. Extend that to people like myself. After
> all, if you are offering it now, you are all but admitting that DB isn't
> worth as much as it was 40 days ago. You knew it then and you kept it a
> secret from us. It's not too late to fix this. Help us.

Adam, I do not agree with your assessment. You bought a functional
product that did what it said it would do and continues to do. You will
have had it for eight months before the product's support is ended. The
software will continue to work for the foreseeable future after that
doing the things you bought it to do. We are providing you a way to step
into a new product if you chose to for a great price. That is very fair.

Subject: Re: I don't quite understand the fuss
Date: Mon, 17 Apr 2000 15:39:51 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5

Adam Frank wrote:
>
> Matt,
>
> Is this the best you can do for us? Protect us from bad language?

You are welcome to post anything here you like related to the products.
We discourage unprofessional language.

> What about
> our lost investment in time and money? Recently you wrote me and said that
> you "understood my points but that doesn't make me right." For heaven sakes
> man, look what so many people are writing about MM in this forum. "Deceptive
> practices", "False advertising"... Can all these people be wrong?

There are some people here that agree with you and some that do not. I
do understand your points, glad you are making them, but I do not agree
and neither does Macromedia. There was nothing deceptive and no false
advertising.

> Do you
> REALLY believe the corporate "yes man" responses we are getting are going to
> improve your companies reputation or repair the trust that MM has so badly
> damaged?

No, they are not going to make you feel any better about Macromedia. I
don't expect them to. I am telling you the truth though and I do
"REALLY" believe that we are doing the right thing.

If you have questions I can answer, I will. Otherwise all I can do is
repeat the same information in the FAQ.

Subject: Re: Continue or sell Drumbeat
Date: Mon, 17 Apr 2000 15:55:01 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5

Adam Frank wrote:
> 40 days ago that wasn't the case! You know that no one told people like
> myself that DB was going to be made available with UD for free.
[snip]

The value of DB has not changed as we have not changed the price.
Providing a free upgrade to UltraDev is consistent with Macromedia
releases in the past and consistent with other software companies. We do
not extend free upgrades before the announcement (sneak peek in this
case). We will provide a very aggressive upgrade price for you if you
chose to upgrade to UltraDev. If the product did not meet your needs in
the first 30 days we have a return program.

> You knew I was going to be in this situation and you didn't
> tell me. THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT IS UNFAIR!
>   Why do you guys keep changing your tune from post to post!
[snip]

We don't change the tune of our posts at all. If you bought before 4/5
you got an application that did and continues to do what we said it
would do. If you bought after 4/5 then you get that same application and
a free upgrade to UltraDev. We do that in all cases for people buying
software after an announcement or a sneak peek. That was in the FAQ I
believe. If you can point out where we changed our tune I can be sure to
correct that.

Subject: Re: Continue or sell Drumbeat
Date: Mon, 17 Apr 2000 16:53:10 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia

Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

Tom Muck wrote:
>
> Is there a particular reason why Drumbeat cannot be made available as open
> source or license the technology to a third party? It seems a shame to let
> a superior technology disappear for NO reason--surely there's a reason.
> It's just like the stories you hear about the car companies burying the
> technology for the 100mpg car. I just don't get it. You have a product
> that is clearly the best thing on the market, and yet you discontinue it.
> Where's the logic in that?

It is not a money making application for us. We need to build a
marketing organization and engineering organization and that is
impossible for the returns that could ever be expected. Macromedia does
not release source code and neither does any other major software
vendor. You can imagine that we do not want any technology we own to
directly or indirectly aid our competitors in any way.

Subject: Re: If Drumbeat never existed.....
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 08:30:18 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8

Tom Muck wrote:
> Write to a wishlist for a dead product???
> That makes a lot of sense.

Those wishlist items were filtered for suggestions to add to UltraDev.
That was an important source of development information for the UD team

> Five months is a long time to spend working on a product that has no future.
> That could have been time and money spent using a product that has a future,
> whether it's Dreamweaver or something else. I could have been fluent in a
> product that has a future instead of one that's dead in the water.

Five months is also a long time to get value out of a product. You have
sites up and built with the product that you might not have without it.
We are not going to broadcast what we are going to do months in advance
of doing it. We are a business and telling our competitors what we are
doing is not that smart. They don't see fit to tell us of course.

Subject Re: Why wouldn't this work for everybody?
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 09:31:33 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1

Reed Sprung wrote:

[snip]
> The solution should be obvious. When the licensing agreement between MM and
> Unify was originally negotiated, DB was MM's only product for this type of
> development. With UD, this will no longer be the case. MM believes DB can
> not compete with UD. Why not let Unify sell their DB based products on a
> stand alone basis?

Because it confuses Macromedia message to our customers, our partners
and our stockholders. We have ONE product family and that is UltraDev
and Dreamweaver. We are not offering partners or developers access to
Drumbeat code and will not enter into any more contracts of any nature
involving DB. We turn down all partners that want to extend Drumbeat and
move them into developing for UltraDev. I might add that not one
partner, when they were shown UltraDev, even wanted to continue
discussions on Drumbeat so this is the correct path for our partners as
well as us.

Any action that involves any fix or addition to Drumbeat de-focuses us
from the Dreamweaver Family of products even if that is through a
partner. If Unify were to update the code that would be for their
product and would not be distributed by Macromedia. We will not market
or support Drumbeat any longer than we plan to do now. DB will be sold
until UltraDev ships and then will be discontinued. Drumbeat support
will continue till December 31, then support for DB terminates.

Subject: Re: Why wouldn't this work for everybody?
Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2000 12:36:05 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3

Reed Sprung wrote:
>
> Comments below:
>

> [snip]
> In other words, no. We don't care if DB users would benefit from a revised
> agreement with Unify. We care about our main product line. If this
> adversely affects a small percentage of our clients, who cares? It would be
> very easy for us to rectify this, but after all, there's only 10,000 of them
> and half of those will update to UD anyway. If we leave some destruction in
> our wake, so what? It's not our responsibility, they're only customers.
> Lets worry about our focus here. We'll just keep denying that there is any
> negative impact on Drumbeat users. They'll eventually just go away.

We are making these decisions to produce better software for the
majority of our users. We don't like the fact that people are going to
be disrupted, but we cannot help that that is going to be the case. We
have all been in the same boat and the answer is never easy. We know how
you feel, but in the end no matter what we do or how we do it we are
going to have some users that move to UD and some that do not. Of those
that do not, they will keep DB or move to products that suit them
better. I know I for one, would rather have people getting on with their
work than hoping against hope that there is going to be a resolution
that keeps DB alive in some way. It will not happen.

Our responsibility is to you as a user and to the Dreamweaver users and
to the users that are going to come in the future is to focus on the
best application we can build. That is UltraDev. There is no way we or
anyone else can possibly imagine that there is no negative impact on DB
users. Change is always disruptive. In this case though we are sure that
it is going to yield better solutions for more customers. It isn't a
case of abandoning you no matter how much you want to feel that way. If
we didn't care we wouldn't be here answering you and we wouldn't have
made the sneak peek of the product so far before release.

As for eventually going away, I don't believe that. I think that in six
months, we are all going to be posting about the new extensions we
created or downloaded or the press or the user group we just saw for
UD... and I am pretty confident that I am going to see you there with
us.

Subject: Re: UltraDev Conclusions
Date: Sat, 13 May 2000 18:53:51 -0700
From: Jerry <jerrywh@nwlink.com>
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

Yes Matt, we are all learning what upgrade and replacement mean to
macromedia. Oh, and we are just thrilled about Macromedia's definitions.

Jerry Hole

Matt Brown wrote:

> They will not be addressed for the first release. Those are great
> comments and we can look at addressing some of them in future releases
> but not for this release. Also replacement does not necessarily mean
> "has the same feature set". UD is a replacement for DB and will be the
> only one of the two products that continues to ship after next month.

Some of us agree, but we've tried so hard to convince MM that they've made a huge mistake, but it's like talking to a wall. They don't realize how incredibly foolish this decision is. I like UltraDev and I plan to write a lot of stuff for it to help ease the burden on Drumbeat users, but it would be so much easier if they would just keep both programs alive.

tom

Hi Tom,

It is clear from all these posts that UD and DB are two different animals.
The issue is not to say one is better or worse than the other but to
recognise their strengths and weaknesses.

Consequently I am at a loss as to why they are not being supported in
parallel to ease the longer term transition.

Regards.

Jim

Tom Muck <tommuck@basic-drumbeat.com> wrote in message
news:8fl601arr1@misc.macromedia.com...
Some of us agree, but we've tried so hard to convince MM that they've made a
huge mistake, but it's like talking to a wall. They don't realize how
incredibly foolish this decision is. I like UltraDev and I plan to write a
lot of stuff for it to help ease the burden on Drumbeat users, but it would
be so much easier if they would just keep both programs alive.

tom
"Brian Hogue" <bhogue@cyburban.com> wrote in message
news:391E1A8C.1CBA9A1C@cyburban.com...
Jerry -
Thanks for agreeing with me. I am starting to wonder if I am the only way
with these issues. I understand the DW people must be wondering why we are
all complaining. What happened to the DB users?
If I am the only one, then MM is doing the right thing. If there are enough
other people, we should follow Rick's example and try to get MM to work with
us.
-brian

Subject: Re: UltraDev Conclusions
Date: Sun, 14 May 2000 20:54:22 -0400
From: Brian Hogue <bhogue@cyburban.com>
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10 , 11

I forgot to include this idea in the last post. Sorry.

As I understand it, MM did not have the resources for both DB and UD. Why couldn't they
contract the maintenance of DB2K out? I
am not suggesting new features. I am suggesting the infamous Win2K patch and any other big
(maintenance) issues. I am sure there
are good DLL/C contractors looking for a project that lasts a few months.

I believe that MM was worried about disclosing their source code. The normal contract (in these
cases) stipulate that the contractor(s)
cannot reveal/discuss that code with anyone else ... that the pre-existing code and any code
developed/maintained is the property of
MM.

I do not have the DLL nor C skills to do this. I am NOT proposing myself.

Since this is all fairly obvious, I missed something. What is that?

Thanks in advance.

-brian

Subject: Re: UltraDev Conclusions
Date: Mon, 15 May 2000 00:33:00 -0400
From: Brian Hogue <bhogue@cyburban.com>
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev

References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10 , 11

Matt -

If you checked my recent posts, then you will see that I am not asking MM to put UD developers on to DB. Nor am I asking for DB
version 4.

I am attempting to make two points.

First, MM uses certain terms, like 'replacement'. Unfortunately, MM definition of these terms does not match the definition that most
DB users use. It comes across as a spin management. This is sure to keep the fires going. It is important to note that I used the plural
(terms). Also, I am not the only person with this issue.

Second, why couldn't MM run DB and UD in parallel? Jim Grimble and possibly Tom Muck ask the same question. None of us is
suggesting a DB version 4. Per a prior post today, I suggest that MM could have contracted out this short term maintenance. The
biggest reason for doing this is to allow DB users a way to phase into UD. Other posts indicate that UD version 1 is not acceptable to
some DB developers. They are waiting for UD version 2. In the meantime, MM could set up a limited support of DB. Something like
1) a statement that DB will not have any new features 2) DB maintenance will be a skeleton crew .. do not expect fast turn around ...
maybe the big maintenance issues _might_ be resolved, like Win2K patch and 3) when UD version 2 ships that maintenance crew
goes away. As I have suggested in other posts, IBM does this. I believe that CA does this. If they can do this, I suggest that MM could
too.

Would there be bad feelings? Absolutely. I suggest this path would have a lot less.

There is a philosophical difference in this approach Vs MM's current path. These suggestions are an attempt to make the transition an
evolutionary change, instead of a revolutionary change. Essentially, MM should make the best effort possible to make the conversion
from DB to UD as difficult as the switch from DW3 to DW4. I suggest that going that extra mile will pay back in the long run, for two
reasons.

First, MM will retain a higher percentage of existing customers. One the big pushes in marketing today is to retain customers, because
it costs five times as much to get a replacement customer. Second, this philosophy has the added

advantage that large corporate

decision makers are more likely to use MM, if they perceive that MM will not abandon them ... that MM will help them keep the costs

down on moving their existing applications to a new platform. If you think about it, this is the real reason for IBM's actions.

You say <<Macromedia has canceled products before, so we know what to expect.>>. Perhaps there is a better way to handle the

situation. I suggest there is a third path. I suggest that this third path is less painful for everyone, including MMers like yourself who

have to deal with posts like this.

There will be people who convert at the first chance. Some will wait until they have to go. If the two products are in parallel for a

longer time AND you have warned the users, you allow the users more flexibility in when to change. The plan would be to induce the

vast majority of customers to move by the time absolutely no more work is done on DB. With so fewer users, there should be less

complaints (because most people will have moved on). I suggest that MM's current plan does NOT have DB and UD in parallel at all.

For example, when was the last internal MM maintenance done on DB?

If any of these comments change MM's actions in the next few months great. I doubt that will happen. I reach this conclusion from

MM's feedback (like yours). This is not the first time that MM said this is what we are doing and we will not change our plan. If that

is not an accurate statement, then it is what I hear MM saying. I suggest that I am not the only one hearing that. If that is not the

message that MM wants to send out, then maybe MM needs to review how it sends these messages (both words and actions).

My real hope is that MM takes the suggestions to heart for the next time MM wants to 'replace' a product. If MM had taken feedback

like this to heart from prior incidents, then we would (all) not need to suffer so much. Why can't we learn from the past? Why can't

we borrow someone else's good idea (like IBM's)?

Also, when I made that comment about 'screaming into the wind', I did not expect any feedback from MM. I wanted to find if I was

the only DB user that felt this way. Jim and Tom were nice enough to answer that. Given that AND I do not expect MM actions to

change in the short term, there is no need to reply to this. The best reply would be implementing these ideas (or similar suggestions

from other users).

Thanks for reading this.

-brian

Subject: Re: UltraDev Conclusions
Date: Mon, 15 May 2000 13:51:31 +0800
From: "dave2986" <dave2986@yahoo.com>
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10 , 11 , 12 , 13

I think there is more to it then that....first of all would be to fix the
little bugs which was introduced in sp2. Most noteably, the connect n
reconnect with sql server, n stored procedures....MM may have a good excuse
in not supporting win2k...especially since they regard it as a new product
not an upgrade to nt4...the rest of the world refers to it as nt5..and
microsoft says its built on the nt technology...whatever....At least IBM is
willing to support legacy product until there is almost no bugs...that
speaks volumes regarding IBM commitment to customer satisfaction......Please
MM, just fix a few things....we still like db2k, even if you regard it as an
orphan
ld......:-(

cat-I remembered the nose...;-)

Subject: Re: UltraDev Conclusions
Date: Mon, 15 May 2000 00:03:43 -0700
From: Matt Brown <mbrown@macromedia.com>
Organization: Macromedia
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10 , 11 , 12

> Second, why couldn't MM run DB and UD in parallel? Jim Grimble and
> possibly Tom Muck ask the same question. None of us is suggesting a DB
> version 4. Per a prior post today, I suggest that MM could have
> contracted out this short term maintenance.

We are not going to spend any resources that are not directly for
UltraDev. If we could contract a DB maintenance team we could as well be
using them for features on UD. Anyway, what maintenance needs to be
done? DB works fine except for Win2k and there seem to be two separate
solutions posted here.

> First, MM will retain a higher percentage of existing customers. One

> the big pushes in marketing today is to retain customers, because it
> costs five times as much to get a replacement customer.

That of course would be good.

>Second, this
> philosophy has the added advantage that large corporate decision
> makers are more likely to use MM, if they perceive that MM will not
> abandon them ...

No. Not correct. No corporate decision makers bought DB. For them, the
only thing that counts is our support of DW and UD. Anything else is a
waste of time for them. I know, we asked them.

> I suggest that MM's current
> plan does NOT have DB and UD in parallel at all. For example, when was
> the last internal MM maintenance done on DB?

Months ago. Again once the plan to do UD was done, any effort at all on
DB was effort not spent on UD and we aren't going to do that.

> If any of these comments change MM's actions in the next few months
> great. I doubt that will happen. I reach this conclusion from MM's
> feedback (like yours). This is not the first time that MM said this is
> what we are doing and we will not change our plan. If that is not an
> accurate statement, then it is what I hear MM saying. I suggest that I
> am not the only one hearing that.

That is exactly what we have said from the beginning. We are going to
build UD and we are going to stop selling DB. We plan carefully at MM
and we always execute our plans. We are willing to listen to advice on
how to improve UD in upcoming versions and we might be able to
incorporate that in the UD plan. But any advice on DB is just something
we can sympathize and listen to.

> My real hope is that MM takes the suggestions to heart for the next
> time MM wants to 'replace' a product. If MM had taken feedback like
> this to heart from prior incidents, then we would (all) not need to
> suffer so much. Why can't we learn from the past? Why can't we borrow
> someone else's good idea (like IBM's)?

We really understand this is frustrating, but we have been down the
paths before. MM is over 10 years old and we have canceled products in a
number of ways and the response is always the same regardless of the
approach. It just doesn't help to phase products in. The best way is

what we are doing now, fair notice and pour every penny and body into
the new product. No secrets here that is exactly what we planned and
what we are going to do. The trick is get involved in the plan for UD
over time.

Subject: Re: UltraDev Conclusions
Date: Mon, 15 May 2000 03:02:12 -0400
From: "cat in a hat" <someone@somewhere.com>
Newsgroups: macromedia.ultradev
References: 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , 10 , 11 , 12 , 13 , 14

oh, now we are talking about bugs! that's why contracts are not enough! but
maybe that's why MM doesn't want to do teh support - they dont' want to be
bothered to fix any bugs. they may have gotten plenty of new bugs in UD
beta!

in that case, MM should simply make DB open source so that those who are
willing to tackle teh code can fix the bugs for it. what's the difference to
MM between opening it up and throwing it out? if UD is THE product then MM
has nothing to fear. give it to the people and they will treat you like god
for the rest of their web-dev careers!

perhaps we should first lobby some kind of tax benefits for MM to open up
throw-away codes. w/o financial benefits MM is not likely to do anything
simply because users want it.

THIS POSTING IS FROM DRUMLIST

THESE ARE FROM DRUMLIST

According to Julie from MM - those that are on the Beta test can now talk
openly about their experiences.

I'm sorry to say that I havn't really had a chance to put it through it's
paces...but here's what I can gather from my short Beta testing

1. It is basically, DreamWeaver Plus / DreamWeaver 5.
2. It is not the Killer App we hoped it would be. Yet.
3. It will be fairly tough converting most complex DrumBeat sites.
4. Most of the DreamWeaver community seem happy with it.
5. Most of the DrumBeat community seem less than happy with it.

Although we cannot distribute or show the Beta - we can answer questions,
although I am not really the person to start bombarding.

Also, I don't think Brooks want's this to turn into a massive thread.

It's safe to say that there is plenty of life in DrumBeat yet - I think it will take a while for UltraDev to get up to speed.

SS

Whats the Code it generates Like??

> so-so

Are the template functions any good??

> er, no

What are the main contracts that are supported??

> it's a lot more 'open' than DB for your own code. This is quite a good thing but the things you take for granted now suddenly appear to be a massive pain in the backside. I'm sure some of the others will tell you their experiences - I don't want to say too much, as I'm not really a heavy user - just a casual browser and therefore am probably not doing it justice. \

Well, I second Jim. What's coming from Spencer and Jim is a lot different than what's on the MM site. If there's no ecommerce tools now, then anything on the site about ecommerce is pure spin - or to use the MS term, vaporware. It's no different than when Macromedia welcomed us into the fold. If they can't show it to me, I don't believe it anymore.

Brent Ozar
Systems Design
Telman Software