From: Bill Veghte
Sent: Sunday, February 15, 1998 10:44 PM
To: Jim Allchin (Exchange); Moshe Dunie; Paul Maritz
Subject: FW: Memphis Product Registration

-----Original Message-----
From: **Steve Bush**
Sent: Sunday, February 15, 1998 10:09 PM
To: Joachim Kempin; Sanjay Parthasarathy; Bill Veghte; Autumn Neault (Womack); Kurt Kolb; Sherri Kennamer; Angus Cunningham
Cc: Edward Jung; Rodney Vieira
Subject: RE: Memphis Product Registration

Kurt, can you drive a meeting this week with Joachim to go over the technical and business issues? We should all be speaking on the same page even though IQ has agreed to post to our servers.

-----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,

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
762

-----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.

MS7 005303
CONFIDENTIAL

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