From: Iain Hackett
Sent: Sunday, December 21, 1997 12:17 PM
To: George Moore; Steven Guggenheimer; Paul Maritz; Craig Mundie; Hank Vigil; 'goldman@corp.webtv.net'; Paul Mitchell
Cc: 'djz@corp.WebTV.net'; Tom Gershaw; Bill Veghte
Subject: RE: Intel Content Standards Meeting - brief notes

Thoughts from the meeting

- I too believe that we are ahead on the implementation, especially given Intel's apparent about face on certain protocol "disagreements" as enumerated by George.
- We could certainly continue with our own Common Content Framework, independently secure the support of content providers and announce our own industry initiative. Given recent press surrounding this and other Intel announcements, we would benefit greatly from a <joint> initiative (insert appropriate term here), so I support joining the group, with the following caveat. From a technical standpoint, we are actually very close in our proposals. The devil will be in the details. We need to ensure that we are firmly in the drivers seat in this group to ensure that we don't get derailed by having to concede on implementations details that would impact our ability to ship clients that support the standard. Intel seemed to be the only other party at the table that had a strong position on these levels of details due to their Intercast client business. As George says, we should push for them to get out of the Windows client business. This should also serve to cement our overall control of these details, while still positioning this group as an open industry effort.

Iain Hackett
iainh@microsoft.com
(425) 703-1896

-----Original Message-----
From: **George Moore**
Sent: Sunday, December 21, 1997 10:17 AM
To: Steven Guggenheimer; Paul Maritz; Craig Mundie; Hank Vigil; 'goldman@corp.webtv.net'; Paul Mitchell
Cc: Iain Hackett; 'djz@corp.WebTV.net'; Tom Gershaw; Bill Veghte
Subject: RE: Intel Content Standards Meeting - brief notes

To expand on some of Steve's comments:

It looks like Mike Richmond's team has decided to throw away most of the closed, non-standards-based code in the Intercast protocol stack. They claim to want to adopt large swaths of our on-air protocols and push it through the IETF, W3C, ATSC, and DVB standards bodies. This includes:

- Our approach to UDP/IP over NABTS, currently in final review by the IETF
- Our implementation of a Broadcast FTP (BFTP) layer for file transfer on top of UDP/IP
- Our use of Session Description Protocol (SDP) on top of BFTP, currently in the RFC phase of IETF review
- Our use of TV Crossover Links, currently ratified as EIA-746 by the closed-caption standards body

There is very little left of the original Intercast on-air protocol -- it has morphed to ours.

Therefore, it doesn't make sense for Intel to be competing with us on Windows-based clients. Especially since what they are providing is A) a subset of our deliverables in Windows 98 and B) does not have an IP license from Gemstar for Intel's EPG. Assuming that Intel is providing indemnification to OEMs who license their code, they are exposed to future litigation from Gemstar.

We should push Intel hard in Tuesday's business meeting to get out of the Windows client business and cede that control to us.

Also, it was clear by some of the basic questions that the NCI folks and others were asking about SDP and other similar protocols that they have very little exposure to this. I am 99% certain that they have no working code in many of these areas.

-GeorgeM

-----Original Message-----
From: Steven Guggenheimer
Sent: Friday, December 19, 1997 5:56 PM
To: Paul Maritz; Craig Mundie; Hank Vigil; 'goldman@corp.webtv.net'; Paul Mitchell
Cc: George Moore; Iain Hackett; 'djz@corp.WebTV.net'; Tom Gershaw
Subject: Intel Content Standards Meeting - brief notes
Importance: High

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
939

Notes from meeting held Friday at Intel

Overview

- This group is being formed to create a common content spec, dealing with the content creation layer and data delivery layer. Not presentation, API and application layers.
- The idea is to create a unified spec for creating enhancements for TV programs using data, and how to deliver data over VBI. The spec is pretty generic stuff that everyone can probably agree too. Once created the idea is to submit to standards bodies as appropriate and help drive through

Basics

- The content creators care primarily about a unified effort for the content spec, they don't seem to have any external biases towards Intel.
- For the most part everyone seems pretty signed up to use our stuff as the starting point from a technology perspective. My take from this is that we are the farthest along with any real open implementation that everyone else can leverage.
- Once people agree if they are in or out they want to draw up a multi partly legal agreement/NDA to formalize the group and the project, including scope of the work

Thoughts

- We have the only real code to draw from, both Intel and NCI would be happy to have it as a starting point
- We don't really need this group to do what we need, we could go work with the content folks independently and do the same framework we'll end up with this group faster....but it would be a good thing to do this as part of an overall industry initiative
- There is as much work to do on how to handle the PR/mktg side as the technical side to make this a win for us
- There is no reason to join this group, if Intel doesn't turn over Intercast (at least on Windows) so we are not competing for client. *On the ride to the airport one of Mike's folks asked what we thought. I said on the technical side we were fine but we needed to understand the Intercast client strategy. We see no reason to compete for Windows based TV clients, it's like Intel making a competing web browser.*

Next Steps for us

- Paul and Craig to meet with Mike next week, determine client issues, how to pull the business side together
- There is a tentative group meeting scheduled for the 7th at CES, with the idea to formalize and announce at NATPE. Based on the meeting next week and other CES events if we want to move this announcement up, we'll have to drive the week of CES before this meeting
- Get legal involved on the NDA/contract once we get a copy

Others that were there please feel free to add more

Attendees
Mike Richmond - Intel, project owner for this effort
Drew Cohen - Intel content
Wayne Carr- Intel Broadcast
Kent Stober - International Programs for Intel
Dave Johnson - PBS wants common content (phone)
Ralph - Time Warner Cable - Pegasus director owns RFQ for set top box, part of Open Cable (phone)
Ethan Beard - MTV Interactive wants common content (phone)
Ralph ?? - Cable Labs (phone)
Larry Tamor, Mark Vickers - NCI content programming
John Toelner, Josh Crandle, Rich Nocht - DirecTV
Art Holland - Disney/ABC
Miguel Garcia- CNN Interactive content producer
Peg Murphy - NBC Interactve (phone)
George Moore, Iain Hackett, Steve Guggenheimer, Dan Zigmond - Microsoft

Cheers
Steve "Gugg" Guggenheimer
Digital TV Marketing
stevengu@microsoft.com