From: Rob Price
Sent: Monday, April 01, 1996 8:10 PM
To: Paul Maritz (Exchange); Brad Silverberg; Hank Vigil; Jeff Thiel; Tom Johnston; Sanjay Parthasarathy
Subject: FW: intel and security

Sorry for the length -- the issues here are getting a bit complicated but it's worth getting them out on the table.

There has been a bit of a misunderstanding due to different definitions of the same words, which we started to clear up in our last meeting, and which concerns two things: what exactly we think is the framework for this 2/6/20 process, and what technologies or joint work will be subject to that process.

The good news is that we now agree that there will be some body of work that MS and Intel do together toward getting an implementation working and shipping in MS products which will not necessarily go through the external process we define.

I. The 2/6/20 process

At the last meeting, the Intel folks laid out for the first time and in great detail their ideas about the mechanics of the proposed "PC Security Group". It included an organization with two committees and a significant support staff, headcount to write and publish reference implementations, conduct developer evangelism events and have a trade show presence, hold multiple review cycles and meetings for each technical area, host a big web site, etc. It repeats much of the most painful elements from Desktop Management Task Force (DMTF), PCWG (Personal Conferencing Working Group -- Intel's failed attempt to compete with ITU-T on international telephony standards), and our PnP experience. Some of the same folks from IAL involved in those efforts appear to have been involved here in reapplying those models. I was aghast, subjecting our work to such a machine would bury us resource-wise. Naturally Intel offered to fund all the overhead but in my experience creating this much equity in a separate group wrests control out of anyones' hands and is very difficult to tear down later.

We made it clear that we had understood the role of the 6, then 20, companies to be one of reviewers to our technical works and were not pleased at the prospect of creating a bureaucracy on this scale. We tried to get back to our fundamental goals in working together to enable functionality on the PC, but Intel in general and Kinnie in particular seem pretty focused on creating artificial intermediate goals such as press exposure, holding of meetings, announcements, etc without the further end foremost in mind.

We can borrow some elements from the USB model but the analogy is imperfect since we don't have multiple hw products to do interop testing on. We will instead need to combine the best parts of the USB process, Gelsinger's LOI or MOU with JohnLu, and our PnP cooperation, to name a few.

II. "Standardizing" protocols or APIs?

Perhaps the most contentious discussions were about the scope of our work with external parties. We asserted that we need to standardize on those elements required for *interoperability* across multiple vendors' products, i.e. data formats and wire protocols. Our *implementation* of those standards, including a suitably Win32-like API, is what we'd like to develop in cooperation with Intel and ship.

Intel, in contrast, has more ambitious goals to actually put these APIs through the third-party process (which to them is less like a review and more like a shared authorship and includes publishing reference code for the APIs themselves, not just the lower-level stuff). Their stated goal is that MS and NetScape have the same security APIs at the end of the day, which just doesn't seem realistic from where we sit. I have not seen any precedent for attempts to standardize API's across multiple vendors' competing platform products, since this is precisely what differentiates them, and didn't believe that it was our intent to put our *API's* through that process. This is also what makes having NetScape in the smaller group a bigger concern.

So what are we trying to drive some level of industry support and consensus around? If it's a common API, then we need Intel to be willing to bet on Microsoft's Internet strategy to succeed, and drop the expectation that NetScape will be an equal or early partner in design and implementation. If it's some formats and protocols, then this group competes with the IETF so we had better position it as a 'fast track' group that reviews stuff and then submits it to the IETF for final approval, but even there we are on shaky ground. If it's shipping products in the marketplace, then we can do that but we also want to pick partners whose business interests are better aligned with ours.

Paul, should we schedule a review to discuss before your call with Frank Gill?

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

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT 934
MS98 0172034
CONFIDENTIAL

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