

2

Jan 22, 1969

5b. GE plan as presented by Dix - Hamontaigne

w/ clarifications:

- 1) ~~MIT dev~~ ^{Mullis (MIT + GE)} get free use of machine
- 2) GE must have 1/2 of useable machine to offer customers at GE price
- 3) MIT users get to use machine at MIT prices ~ cost
- 4) MIT + Mullis dev. have ~~up to~~ 1/2 machine
and ^{unused} excess of GE portion on a 2nd priority basis
- 5) ^{similarly} GE has 2nd priority rights to MIT help
- 6) MIT only pays for machine time which it uses
- 7) MIT includes NE coll via IPC
- 8) GE ^{MIT jointly} sets policy, choice of op sup, hours, ~~insurance for~~
~~underwriting~~

Suggest that GE offer an educ price to univ. on its service

①

W. Klingen

Jan 22, 1969

1. Assume GE in service B. w/ at least DOD, ARPA, BTL w/ GE prices
2. " MIT wants to interface to MIT w/ MIT prices ~ cost
3. Any combined operation of a machine is temporary and when load warrants will be divided into 2 ~~one~~ systems
4. Assume that both services will be available by end of 3Q.
5. Acceptable solutions lie between 2 extremes

a. Dev. Machine upgraded by Oct. 1 to full machine (incl clock ^{incl clock} GIOCB)

GE operates augmented dev machine as GE service

MIT " present serv. " " MIT service

MIT-GE staff cooperate freely in keeping machines going but resp. ~~responsible~~ for each machine rests on resp. staffs

? Does MIT or GE pay for dev. mach for 9 mo. to Oct. 1
or is it a split cost or is it as now

~~MS~~ Problems: no backing hardware; GE must get operations staff; software exp.

Advantages: simplicity of policy setting; prepared for success

→ Multis dev. resource usage is viewed as a cost to be shared by MIT-GE on an even basis

Multis maintenance resource usage charged as overhead on respective mach