From: Raja Abburi
Sent: Monday, February 16, 1998 10:12 AM
To: Bill Veghte; Ed Stubbs
Subject: RE: Memphis Product Registration

Importance: High

In the current path, about 30% of new computers will have **2** registrations... Machines from Compaq and HP. They do NOT want data going through Microsoft. Also, they want a mechanism to send updates back.

I don't know how much leverage we have in "holding the line", but we are currently NOT on a path to what Bill expects. Since he is expecting You to ensure this, someone from our group need to follow up with OEM sales to make sure this doesn't happen.

-----Original Message-----
From: Bill Veghte
Sent: Monday, February 16, 1998 10:06 AM
To: Raja Abburi; Ed Stubbs
Subject: FW: Memphis Product Registration

-----Original Message-----
From: **Bill Veghte**
Sent: Monday, February 16, 1998 9:57 AM
To: 'Bill Gates'
Cc: Moshe Dunie
Subject: RE: Memphis Product Registration

Understood and agreed....
People understand and are no longer challenging 1 registration. The key question that remains is whether the data out of the single registration flows into MS servers first or into OEM servers (IQ acting as agent for OEMs) and then to MS. As you see from the thread, there is not agreement on this yet. SteveBu is concerned about whether we want IQ participating in the process and whether they can handle the data in from the OEMs. OEMs are concerned because the data goes to MS first. My personal opinion is if Joachim and company can hold the line, having the data coming into MS first is better. If we cannot, then letting the data go thru IQ and then to MS is fine as long as IQ has competition (eg. Softbank) so we define the parameters.

-----Original Message-----
From: **Bill Gates**
Sent: Monday, February 16, 1998 9:11 AM
To: Bill Veghte
Cc: Moshe Dunie
Subject: FW: Memphis Product Registration

This area is important - we do NOT want 2 registrations.

GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT 313

-----Original Message-----
From: Steve Ballmer
Sent: Monday, February 16, 1998 8:46 AM
To: Joachim Kempin
Cc: Sanjay Parthasarathy; Bill Gates; Steve Bush
Subject: FW: Memphis Product Registration

Please meet and resolve this week with sanjayp if there are differences in view please air for bill and me I am on vacation so bill may need to weigh in I do not understand why the ms choice is so much worse than the vendor choice for the oem or why involving the vendor is Os hard for MS this is a big customer sat issue for the oem and a big startegic imperative for MS so we may need to put in more energy than planned

-----Original Message-----
From: **Joachim Kempin**
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 1998 7:21 AM
To: Bill Gates; Steve Bush; Brad Chase; Laura Jennings; Sanjay Parthasarathy; Bill Veghte; John Ludwig
Cc: Steve Ballmer; Pete Higgins; Edward Jung; Eric Rudder; Sherri Kennamer; Angus Cunningham; Autumn Neault (Womack); Rodney Vieira
Subject: RE: Memphis Product Registration

I do not believe the mail below reflects the facts. So I do not understand why a prevents b. We can easily spec this out so that the outside vendor does promote our services. Nothing prevents us from doing so. The reason why we are doing this is very simple:
Increase registration, make it easier for customers to register with us and the OEM in one process and not look heavy handed.
I need to understand why we need to own the transportation process- sounds like heavy lifting without reasons, but I am flexible. I will be back next week- let's talk then.

-----Original Message-----
From: **Bill Gates**
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 1998 1:22 AM
To: Steve Bush; Brad Chase; Laura Jennings; Sanjay Parthasarathy; Joachim Kempin; Bill Veghte; John Ludwig
Cc: Steve Ballmer; Pete Higgins; Edward Jung; Eric Rudder; Sherri Kennamer; Angus Cunningham; Autumn Neault (Womack); Rodney Vieira
Subject: RE: Memphis Product Registration

I agree with this.

Joachim - can we hold the line on this - its important,

-----Original Message-----
From: Steve Bush
Sent: Monday, February 09, 1998 9:20 PM
To: Brad Chase; Laura Jennings; Sanjay Parthasarathy; Joachim Kempin; Bill Veghte; John Ludwig; Bill Gates
Cc: Steve Ballmer; Pete Higgins; Edward Jung; Eric Rudder; Sherri Kennamer; Angus Cunningham; Autumn Neault (Womack); Rodney Vieira
Subject: Memphis Product Registration
Importance: High

Issue:
OEM's want to replace the Memphis product registration process with a third party (IntelliQuest) Windows product registration process.
Problem:
Replacing the Windows product registration mechanism lets OEM's own the process and prevents Microsoft from building into the registration process future valued added Windows Services. In sum, it lets OEM's interject themselves into the first boot customer experience and offer customers valued added services before a Microsoft proposition of similar services.

Recommendation:
OEM's be allowed to define the client UI portion of product registration. However, they must submit the product registration information to a Microsoft product registration server using the Microsoft registration transport. It's strategically very important that Microsoft owns the transport so that it can build upon this client-server interaction.

Call to Action:
I only have a very limited amount of bandwidth to dedicate to advocating and designing a Microsoft registration process that is OEM compatible. From a strategic standpoint, it's critical that we own the registration process as it's our future vehicle for signing users up for Windows Services. I see no technical issues to Microsoft hosting the product registration servers. It's merely a matter of trading off OEM concerns against the strategic value of owning product registration.

Part of the problem is that the overall business ownership of product registration is unclear. Several groups have a vested interest in this process working flawlessly: customer database marketing, OEM, support, product groups, etc. Who trades off OEM concerns against the strategic important of owning the Windows product registration process.

Background:
The product registration process in Memphis is strategically very important. It is the customer's first impression of Microsoft and a strategic client-server interaction that will be the platform upon which we build for future Windows Services (HotMail, Windows Passport, Licensing, etc.).

Unfortunately, OEM's are unhappy with our current implementation and want a third party IntelliQuest (IQ) to perform their product registration (IQ will replicate product registrations to us). While I agree that OEM's should be able to influence the product registration UI, I'm strongly against the OEM's posting product registrations to IntelliQuest instead of a Microsoft product registration server. This would allow the OEM's to offer competing Windows services and use product registration to sign users up for these services. The problem is that if OEM's own the registration process we would be unable to build value added services into the registration process (ID issuing, Windows Passport, HotMail accounts, licensing, etc.).

I've been a big advocate of OEM's defining the client UI and using the Microsoft backend registration

servers to accept registrations. This approach allows Microsoft to build value added services into the process since we're accepting the product registrations. The Microsoft.com team who runs these servers would instantaneously replicate the OEM product registrations to the IQ registration servers. The risk of this approach is that Microsoft.com is a mission critical portion of the OEM registration process and must deliver product registrations with no down time. SanjayP and the microsoft.com team have committed to this service level. This decision is very unpopular with OEM's as it makes them dependent upon Microsoft for their registration process.

Thx.

Steve