EXHIBIT 119
Balaji, have these been tested in WinXP? If not, please do so now and reply to this group with the results. I tested on Win98 and it worked.

We should never send out any new type of distribution unit without testing it on both WinXP and Win98.

Also, Balaji - in the typical progression of writing the inf file to the local drive we would have:

[FileVersion]
signature="$CHICAGO$"
AdvancedINF=2.0

[DefaultInstall]
CopyFiles=INFPFile

[INFPFile]
thin.inf,..,34

[DestinationDir]
INFPFile=17

...and your thin.cab has only:

[iVersion]
signature="$CHICAGO$"
AdvancedINF=2.0

[DefaultInstall]
CopyFiles=INFPFile
DeleteDelIeqEntries

[DestinationDir]
INFPFile=17

...the CopyFiles command is not carried out in the code but since it worked for me it doesn't matter on WinX - not sure of the impact on Win98. I didn't notice that one's missing yesterday. Perhaps we've been doing that for a lot of distribution - let me know if that's the case. If it works the benefit would seem to be no INF code left behind on the machine after we remove the Add/Remove entry.

These are going out now. I have not tested myself, so I am trusting you guys that we are not killing users accidentally or popping any weird windows in win98 or anything like that. If Add/Remove entries were really increasing our user opt out rates, (and I think they were) this should cause our rate of growth to increase pretty significantly. like dropping sandbags off a hot air balloon.

Balaji Devarejaan wrote:

hi Rod,
here is the link to remove add/remove b) and twintex:

http://download.ebetterinternet.com/download/cask/E2 (MARC.b)/ unadd.cab
Re: Add to remove - add/remove

http://download.betterinternet.com/SockLoad.cabs/TT_MEPF/TT_unadd.cab

thanks
- bjo