

EXHIBIT 26

Re: CDT problems

Subject: Re: CDT problems

From: "Chris Dowhan" <chris@direct-revenue.com>

Date: Sun, 22 Aug 2004 15:19:54 -0400 (EDT)

To: "Rodney Hook" <rod@direct-revenue.com>

CC: chris@direct-revenue.com, dan@direct-revenue.com, josh@direct-revenue.com, "Alan" <alan@direct-revenue.com>

OK, but that #2 part will add even more time since we should add Zeev to the list of people in the critical path. Zeev is the only one who has worked on the "InstID secret file" code so he will be the best to rework the pre-installer, and considering how slow and painful coordinating with him has been I want to be ready for a lot of iterating/testing.

Another consideration: we should make the pre-installer tell us about the old InstID even in the cases where we don't want to use it. Without this (or the MachineID effort that has been adrift at sea for 4 months) we still can't tell whether we see one desktop churned 1000 times by wiping out our registry keys completely (and recovering outside of the poller/stubby channel), or 1000 different brand new desktops we have never seen before.

1. We add the 5 lines of code to suppress new installs for machines running a poller or stubby.
2. We create a way for the preinstaller.exe to nuke the secret InstID file as well as any InstIDs in the registry when the Install is a Distribution Partner. That way the install would create a new user number. This would not run on poller or stubby recoveries.

This means a shooter has to get really good at finding poller and stubby and get rid of them both before we will pay a CPA for that desktop again.

Chris Dowhan wrote:

I agree with you Rod but want to clarify one item:

We can use those 5 lines of code to suppress new installs for machines that are in the death spiral - machines that specifically have a poller or a stub installer and would be recoverable without CDT so we choose not to pay on these.

Once we do the above, it sounds like you will have to change all reporting so that the "NEW CHECKINS" are not just triggered from the presence of a new InstID. How will you differentiate between a checkin from a machine that had no ad client, no poller, no stubbie, BUT has the instID file and gets recovered by CDT with an existing InstID so it's first checkin (i.e. CPA-payable) looks identical to the 100th checkin from a machine that was never shot (NOT CPA-payable)?

CDT brings in around 25% of our users everyday so I think its important we arrive somewhere quickly that will make them happy. I dont think CDT is intentionally shooting us, but I do think that the environments that they are dropping us into is very hostile for some reason. I've done a few hours of research on this over the last week or so as well. Sathish demonstrates in his QA below some of the Flopping thats going

on, and how the InstID now gets preserved every time a desktop is recovered.

I think the confusion lies (as always) with users getting shot and whether we should pay for a desktop the second, third, forth, fifth, twentieth time that CDT installs them. Currently we are only paying the first time on CPA deals.

A Simple tech fix on our end is to stop installing an adclient on machines where we have a poller or stub there, even if the adclient is currently corrupt and dead. CDT is re-instantiating twaintec on non-virgin machines where there is a poller hanging out in the background. Since we currently don't pay them for users in a death spiral, they won't ever see twaintec comes back to life as a result of their install. I think this can be done in around 1 day of focus/priority between brady/balaji/sathis/chris and then a re-deploy of thinstaller server. probably 5 lines of code but it takes that long to get everybody to hold hands and think about it and test it long enough for it to go live.

Here's some rough percentages. If they find 1000 machines with no twaintec there they will run the thinstaller.
75% will have BI or MXTarget Alive and well and we will install nothing
5% have pollers running and the adclient is dead. we install twaintec with their DistID (CPA don't get paid) (CPD DO get paid)
5% will have some kind of breakage in network or thinstaller or adclient install
15% will install new twaintec fresh desktops (they get paid for these)
(15% of these will be killed in first 24 hours)

Here's a typical scenario that I see happening with BDL74125 (one of the numerous CDT DistIDs)

1. They acquire a fresh virgin desktop for us, our thinstaller installs twaintec and we count it and they get paid
 2. 16% of these virgin desktops are shot/recovered by poller and flop to mxtarget footprint within first 24 hours
 3. mxtarget is shot as well and our poller hangs out for 24 hours in the background waiting for its daily timer to pass.
 4. CDT sees there is no twaintec there, runs our thinstaller, we see no live adclient there and we reinstantiate twaintec like they asked. (they are not getting paid for these)
 5. This twaintec gets shot again
 6. poller recovers it to mxtarget
 7. mxtarget gets shot.
 8. CDT installs twaintec
 9. twaintec gets shot.
 10. poller installs mxtarget...
- etc.etc.etc Death spiral.

Before Twaintec version 0.1.4.30, they would have been paid every time they brought one of their dead users back to life. So they could install twaintec, shoot twaintec, shoot mxtarget, and reinstall twaintec as many times as they wanted and get paid every time this happened. we started sending out twaintec 0.1.4.30 on 7/22/2004. That would be the approximate day that the discrepancy I just described would have started. I don't have copies of the numbers they sent, but I think the printout I saw showed discrepancies starting in late july..... I'm sure the before 07/22 we paid them 20+ times for the same users in some cases.

Rod

Sathish Dhinakaran wrote:

hi all,

I tested the CDT bundle today (08.20/04) on 3 different scenarios on 3 different machines.

THEY TRIED TO install us 6 times. they were actually able to install us 4(fresh, installed and removed mxtarget, with poller without addlient and stale mxtarget)different times, exceptions on this being (real mxtarget bundle with poller & . on 2 occasions they did not try to bring us down as

Twaintec was sitting there on the registry(a live and a stale one). , some cases where i had our addlients installed and removed they install us with the same InstallID. I have added a brief summary of the tests that i did.

PLEASE DO LET ME KNOW IF U ALL WANT MORE INFORMATION ON THIS. all rite have a happy weekend

thanks,
sathish

Summary of tests:

Test 1: on a good clean machine as a fresh install 3:30pm
(10.200.3.47),
our stuff works properly

test 2: installed twaintec(whole bundle) with BDL14192 before
installing
CDT 4:05pm (10.200.3.48), they do not install us.

Test 3 : Installed Mxtarget(whole bundle) before installing CDT 4:48PM
(10.200.3.49), they try to get us down. since Mxtarget is already
there,
we do not install twaintec.

Test 4: Installed Mxtarget, removed Mxtarget(whole bundle) then
installed
CDT (10.200.3.50)5:19PM. they install twaintec with their other bundle
with the same Install id that mxtarget had previously installed.

Test 5: our old machine which runs mxtarget already, deleted the poller

>from the run list (10.200.3.28)at 5:41PM, they are not able to install
| us

Re: CDT problems

as mxtarget is already there. he tries to install us.

Test 6: run CDT just with poller (10.200.3.51) 6:14pm - installed twaintec, removed twaintec, installed mxtarget and removed mxtarget. they bring us down with the same Inst ID that twaintec and mxtarget had before.

Test 7: Stale key of Twaintec (10.200.4.66) Ran CDT at 6:37PM. they do not try to bring them down

Test 8: Stale key of MxTarget(10.200.4.67) 6:52 PM, they bring us down with all the bundles.