From: Sanjay Parthasarathy
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 1996 8:47 PM
To: Paul Maritz (Exchange)
Cc: Brad Silverberg; Hank Vigil; Jeff Thiel; Rob Price; Tom Johnston
Subject: RE: intel

We had a meeting up here in redmond last thurs (just sent mail that summarized this mtg). Tomj, rob price and jeff thiel met with cox, ps kohli and their architects. Here's my take on frank's mail (tom, rob, jeff - feel free to comment):
1. We pushed back on their request to set up a formal consortium/group that would promote the joint specs and ensure interoperability. they want to charge membership fees and have a formal structure.
2. We have maintained that having netscape in the top 6 is counterproductive to the process and fraught with danger for us. they have held out the opposite.
3. IAL's belief is that there should be a common security API across platforms and a single implementation on Intel architecture. Their view is that the same API should be available on Windows, Mac and UNIX, and that IE and Navigator should use and support the same security API implementation on Windows. We pushed back on the implementation part. We will publish the APIs.
4. Also there is the ps kohli and craig kinnie factor. these two guys just dont seem interested in compromise or rational behavior.

We will call george cox on monday to get read on this. he is a straight shooter and hs a good personal relationship with tomj.

sanjayp.

From: Paul Maritz
To: Sanjay Parthasarathy
Cc: Hank Vigil; Brad Silverberg
Subject: FW:
Date: Sunday, March 31, 1996 6:56PM

??

From: Frank Gill[SMTP:Frank_Gill@ccm.jf.intel.com]
Sent: Friday, March 29, 1996 3:52 PM
To: Paul Maritz (Exchange)
Subject: Re:

Text item:

Paul, forgive me for slow response on this as i was out on vacation. However, i
did send on to my security team while on vacation and have gotten spun up to

speed this week. It sounds like things have actually gotten worse since your

mail. Your folks less willing to work along the model you describe below and my
folks continue to believe that unless netscape is involved pretty early on there
will be an alternative approach in the market. Lets resolve this when we talk on
tues. frank

>Frank,
>
Since our last meeting in Redmond, Sanjay has spoken with Craig Kinnie
>on the security front, and a
>second meeting between the architects on both sides has happened (3/7).

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
933

>Here's where I believe we stand today:
>
>1. Joint architecture
>
>Looks like this is a go on both sides. We will move forward on
>developing a single architecture with Intel. Architects will next meet
>
>on 3/19. It would be good for us to have a jointly agreed upon
>architecture by 4/15.
>
>2. Process
>
>There is general agreement on both sides to use an USB-like process
>i.e. MS and Intel initially agree on an architecture, bring in an
>additional 6 companies to cement architecture and then open it up to a
>larger group, around 20, for final comments. Microsoft may want to
>take the architecture to the IETF or W3C in parallel with the 20
>company phase but we would like to discuss further with Intel before
>doing so.
>
>Intel proposed the following 6 companies in the first review loop -
>CyberCash, Verisign, Netscape, JavaSoft, AT&T, Cyperpunks. While I am
>OK with JavaSoft, I have a problem with Netscape and AT&T in
>the initial group of six. I fear that they would not be constructive.
>Microsoft proposed FDC/Nabanco, Verisign, Boulder Software (Phil
>Zimmerman, Mr. PGP), DEC, Oracle, Atalla/Tandem and HP.
>Next step is to finalize the list of 6. Sanjay owns it on our end.
>
>If we are in agreement on the process and Netscape, I'd like to give my
>
>guys the green light to make this happen quickly.

Thanks for the help, Paul
>
>
>
>
>

Text item: External Message Header

The following mail header is for administrative use
and may be ignored unless there are problems.

IF THERE ARE PROBLEMS SAVE THESE HEADERS.

Encoding: 46 TEXT
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version
4.0.837.3
Date: Tue, 19 Mar 1996 18:38:17 -0800
Subject:
To: "'Frank Gill (Intel)'" <Frank_Gill@ccm2.hf.intel.com>
From: "Paul Maritz (Exchange)" <paulma@EXCHANGE.MICROSOFT.com>
Message-ID:
<c=US%a=_%p=Microsoft%l=ROADKILL-960320023817Z-2959@yuri.microsoft.c
om>
Received: by yuri.microsoft.com with Microsoft Exchange (IMC 4.0.837.3)
id <01BB15C3.3F05C790@yuri.microsoft.com>; Tue, 19 Mar 1996 18:38:20
-0800
Received: from yuri.microsoft.com (exchange.microsoft.com [131.107.243.48])
by o
rmail.intel.com (8.7.4/8.7.3) with SMTP id SAA29003 for
<Frank_Gill@ccm2.hf.inte
l.com>; Tue, 19 Mar 1996 18:42:38 -0800 (PST)
Received: from ormail.intel.com by relay.hf.intel.com with smtp
(Smail3.1.28.1 #2) id m0tzDrC-000qDUC; Tue, 19 Mar 96 18:42 PST

From: Tom Johnston
Sent: Monday, April 01, 1996 5:34 PM
To: Paul Maritz (Exchange); Sanjay Parthasarathy
Cc: Brad Silverberg; Hank Vigil; Jeff Thiel; Rob Price; Marshall Brumer
Subject: RE: intel

Just got off the phone with George Cox.

IAL mgmt (McGee, Kinney, Gill) are disappointed in how we are going to take this to the industry. They want to see one API across all players (both IE and NN) with single implementations (or at worst a reference implementation). Kinney believes he had agreement with Sanjay on this and the evangelization process both before and after a spec was done, and will raise it in his call tomorrow with Sanjay. Gill will also raise this with PaulMa. George characterized the issue is significant, but not yet a deal-breaker.

They don't believe IE has the distribution weight to carry a security architecture; they want whatever is done to be supported by NN and IE.

His points:
- It's not enough to take data formats and protocols and make them common across the industry, the API's have to be common as well.
- Specifically, IAL wants one API across IE/Windows and Netscape Navigator. They are concerned that if the API is IE only (and not NN), then a competing architecture will emerge.
- They aren't willing to hold off on evangelization models, etc. while we dive down and figure out more information on the technical side; they want a schedule to hold people to.

Quick summary common points & differences:
- Both MS & IAL want to work together to design an architecture (data formats, protocols, API's), evangelize it to the industry, and ship it in IE (and later in Windows).
- Both MS & IAL agree that the data formats and protocols should be common, and broadly evangelized. (our view is that a 2->6->20 process with these would be nothing more than a fast track for the IETF, W3C or other standards bodies)
- MS & IAL differ over API evangelization. MS view is that API's are part of the platform, and should be broadly evangelized, but are a basis for competition. Platform competitors will not settle on a single API. IAL view is that for security, there should be a single API. They want an open API with reference code available to all platform vendors.
- MS & IAL differ over role of a 2->6->20 process. We view it as a method for gaining feedback on a spec. IAL views it as a formal group, with dues and more.

While we want to resolve this issue quickly (so that we can both make technical progress and announce ActiveSecurity as soon as possible), we're walking a tightrope here. They're not talking about walking, but the implied threat is that if they can't work with us they way they want to, they will go work on PC Security Forum with JavaSoft, AT&T and Netscape.

From: Sanjay Parthasarathy
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 1996 8:46 PM
To: Paul Maritz (Exchange)
Cc: Brad Silverberg; Hank Vigil; Jeff Thiel; Rob Price; Tom Johnston
Subject: RE: intel

We had a meeting up here in redmond last thurs (just sent mail that summarized this mtg). Tomj, rob price and jeff thiel met with cox, ps kohli and their architects. Here's my take on frank's mail (tom, rob, jeff - feel free to comment):
1. We pushed back on their request to set up a formal consortium/group that would promote the joint specs and ensure interoperability. they want to charge membership fees and have a formal structure.
2. We have maintained that having netscape in the top 6 is counterproductive to the process and fraught with danger for us. they have held out the opposite.
3. IAL's belief is that there should be a common security API across platforms and a single implementation on Intel architecture. Their view is that the same API should be available on Windows, Mac and UNIX, and that IE and Navigator should use and support the same security API implementation on Windows. We pushed back on the implementation part. We will publish the APIs.
4. Also there is the ps kohli and craig kinnie factor. these two guys just dont seem interested in compromise or rational behavior.

We will call george cox on monday to get read on this. he is a straight shooter and hs a good personal relationship with tomj.

sanjayp.

From: Paul Maritz
To: Sanjay Parthasarathy
Cc: Hank Vigil; Brad Silverberg
Subject: FW:
Date: Sunday, March 31, 1996 6:56PM

??

From: Frank Gill[SMTP:Frank_Gill@ccm.jf.intel.com]
Sent: Friday, March 29, 1996 3:52 PM
To: Paul Maritz (Exchange)
Subject: Re:

Text item:

Paul, forgive me for slow response on this as i was out on vacation.
However, i
did send on to my security team while on vacation and have gotten spun up to

speed this week. It sounds like things have actually gotten worse since your

mail. Your folks less willing to work along the model you describe below and
my
folks continue to believe that unless netscape is involved pretty early on
there
will be an alternative approach in the market. Lets resolve this when we
talk on
tues. frank

>Frank,
>
Since our last meeting in Redmond, Sanjay has spoken with Craig Kinnie
>on the security front, and a
>second meeting between the architects on both sides has happened (3/7).

>Here's where I believe we stand today:
>
>1. Joint architecture
>
>Looks like this is a go on both sides. We will move forward on
>developing a single architecture with Intel. Architects will next meet
>
>on 3/19. It would be good for us to have a jointly agreed upon
>architecture by 4/15.
>
>2. Process
>
>There is general agreement on both sides to use an USB-like process
>i.e. MS and Intel initially agree on an architecture, bring in an
>additional 6 companies to cement architecture and then open it up to a
>larger group, around 20, for final comments. Microsoft may want to
>take the architecture to the IETF or W3C in parallel with the 20
>company phase but we would like to discuss further with Intel before
>doing so.
>
>Intel proposed the following 6 companies in the first review loop -
>CyberCash, Verisign, Netscape, JavaSoft, AT&T, Cyperpunks. While I am
>OK with JavaSoft, I have a problem with Netscape and AT&T in
>the initial group of six. I fear that they would not be constructive.
>Microsoft proposed FDC/Nabanco, Verisign, Boulder Software (Phil
>Zimmerman, Mr. PGP), DEC, Oracle, Atalla/Tandem and HP.
>Next step is to finalize the list of 6. Sanjay owns it on our end.
>
>If we are in agreement on the process and Netscape, I'd like to give my
>
>guys the green light to make this happen quickly.

Thanks for the help, Paul
>
>
>
>
>

Text item: External Message Header

The following mail header is for administrative use
and may be ignored unless there are problems.

IF THERE ARE PROBLEMS SAVE THESE HEADERS.

Encoding: 46 TEXT
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version
4.0.837.3
Date: Tue, 19 Mar 1996 18:38:17 -0800
Subject:
To: "'Frank Gill (Intel)'" <Frank_Gill@ccm2.hf.intel.com>
From: "Paul Maritz (Exchange)" <paulma@EXCHANGE.MICROSOFT.com>
Message-ID:
<c=US%a=_%p=Microsoft%l=ROADKILL-960320023817Z-2959@yuri.microsoft.c
om>
Received: by yuri.microsoft.com with Microsoft Exchange (IMC 4.0.837.3)
id <01BB15C3.3F05C790@yuri.microsoft.com>; Tue, 19 Mar 1996 18:38:20
-0800
Received: from yuri.microsoft.com (exchange.microsoft.com [131.107.243.48])
by o
rmail.intel.com (8.7.4/8.7.3) with SMTP id SAA29003 for
<Frank_Gill@ccm2.hf.inte
l.com>; Tue, 19 Mar 1996 18:42:38 -0800 (PST)
Received: from ormail.intel.com by relay.hf.intel.com with smtp
(Smail3.1.28.1 #2) id m0tzDrC-000qDUC; Tue, 19 Mar 96 18:42 PST

MS98 0172033
CONFIDENTIAL