From: Sanjay Parthasarathy (Xenix)
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 1996 11:53 AM
To: Brad Silverberg; Hank Vigil; Paul Maritz (Exchange)
Cc: Allan Cooper (Xenix); Marshall Brumer, Pradyumna Misra (Xenix); Rob Price; Tom Johnston
Subject: Intel call with Kinnie 3/26

Had my weekly telephone call with Craig Kinnie. Frank Gill got the mail from PaulMa but Netscape involvement is still an issue. Kinnie and troops still hold out hope that we will agree to Netscape in top 6 cos.
Paul I think we need to get you and Frank to close on not having Netscape - please expect mail or a call from him. Next meeting between architects is this Thursday in Redmond.

Key issues from today's call:

1. Interoperability

- Kinnie's stated goal is to have a single implementation of the security architecture, on the Intel platform, adopted by the industry
- He wanted to know whether we would post a reference implementation in addition to publishing APIs to make this happen. Or whether Intel could do this.
- He pushed on a forum to help test and validate implementations (pseudo compliance testing was the way he put it) of the security architecture. I said that the WWW has its own method of testing - people put up server and client implementations and then bang away at each other until they work together. I told him I did not want a formal forum to take on this responsibility
- Kinnie was under the mistaken impression that we'd implement all security technology from day 1 in the OS. I told him that we'd implement security in IE and IIS first before the OS folks swept it into their releases.

2. Spec
- We are going to have to shoot for an overall architecture by 4/15 and which portions of this MS and Intel focus on to write up the specs
- Talked about the process of getting the specs out. I did not want to wait until the entire arch was documented rather publish a 'critical mass' and then publish regular updates. He agreed. It will be important to define the initial 'critical mass' on Thursday.
- On content protection, Intel are not ready with a fully baked architecture plus their content relationship guys are very skittish on publishing without getting Hollywood et al bought in. We may need to make content protection on of the incremental specs published after the initial critical mass. I pushed him to separate the technology from the relationship angle and get us a spec quickly which he said he would.

3. Visibility of spec
- Kinnie wants to form a group with membership and dues to help promote the architecture and participate in events.
- I told him this was overhead and we could accomplish this by using MS, Intel and our partner's individual resources.
- He agreed that a formal group with dues was one way to accomplish the goal of widely publicizing the spec and we could do it in other ways. For Thursday we need to come up with crisp alternative ways that will help intel be comfortable but at the same time does away with the notion of formal membership and dues.

sanjayp.

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
932

MS98 0172028
CONFIDENTIAL