

EXHIBIT 81

Subject: Re: [Fwd: Transponder Change log 2004/02/06]
From: Joshua Abram <joshua@direct-revenue.com>
Date: Mon, 09 Feb 2004 09:46:57 -0500
To: chris@direct-revenue.com
CC: Rodney Hook <rod@direct-revenue.com>, alan@direct-revenue.com

Guys-

Our goal is simply to be able to pay people over time in a way that reflects the longevity of their particular distribution.

As we expand the number of distribution partners---and reach further into the bowels of the Internet to do so---we're going to have people trying to scam us at every turn. Indeed, some people probably already are. We need a way to pay that reflects the efficacy of distribution over time.

Having said that, exactly how we do this is open for discussion.

Let's talk.

Best,
J

Chris Dowhan wrote:

Not sure how much has been nailed down about this so I'm going to try and flesh it out here:

Josh, tell me if this is wrong:

The goal is to pay the \$0.002/user/day that they checkin *after* a 2 month window from when we acquire them.

Rod, this sounds like we would have to do some ugly database queries: The billing cycle is tentatively Saturday morning at 12:01am to Friday evening at 12:00pm so that we can crunch numbers all weekend if necessary and have a bill (for us to pay them) every Monday. Basically we would need to check the birthdate of every InstID for every day of checkins for their DistIDs (Mindset and anyone else with a rev share deal like this), and put them in 2 groups: >2 months, <2 months, then multiply.

Assuming that we must have the ability to rev-share like this to get better relationships with distribution partners, will it be much harder to also check the field of "original DistID" that we are now collecting? Will this be accurate for users who go from MSIS9112 to CDT19125 or some other DistID and then back to MSIS9112? Do we save "First DistID" and "last Known DistID"?

Rod, can you think of any other pay-schemes that are comparable in nature to this but easier on the database, and more scalable? Would eliminating the 2 month lag while paying less up front (same total payout over time) make the calculations easier?

Josh, is there any flexibility in the structure of these deals or do we simply need to make it happen technically?

another shift of 10,249 from CDT19125 to MSIS9112.

Its really not fair if we start paying mindset a rev share on this

DR181934
CONFIDENTIAL

stuff. they are stepping on other peoples users, and not adding us any value by doing so.
 Pretty sure we don't pay a rev share to CDT so any shifts like this only cause us to pay mindset big rev share for no reason.

Rod

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Transponder Change log 2004/02/06

Date: Sat, 7 Feb 2004 06:53:32 -0500

From: bsd_admin@w9.vx2.cc

To: aash@stdio.com, rod@disk11.com

OLD_DIST_ID	NEW_DIST_ID	CNT
CDT19125	MSIS9112	10249
MSV7001	MSV4101	1439
MSIS9112	CDT19125	1406
MSII9112	CDT19125	1060
NOSTALG7001	FON19113	680
GEN7001	GEN4101	637
CDT19125	MSII9112	603
TRAF7001	SYND4101	507
FIX19105	FON14152	358
MSV4101	MSV7001	352
BDL19122	MSIH9112	339
FON19106	FON14152	323
FIX19105	FON19106	315
FON14152	MSIT9112	290
GEN4101	GEN7001	283
FON19106	FIX19105	281
BDL19122	CDT19125	280
FON14152	MSIS9112	280
MESH7001	MESH4101	267
BDL19117	BDLE4012	262
MSIB9112	BDLE4012	254
MSV4101	MSIS9112	250
BDL19122	FON14152	248
TRAF7002	SYND4101	246
CDT19125	FON14152	231
CDT19125	BDLE4012	227
BDL19122	VAL94006	225
FON14152	FIX19105	218
FON14152	FON19106	213
MSI79112	FON14152	212
NEON7001	NEON4101	195
BLANK	MUSCTY6002	185
FON19106	MSIK9112	177
FIX19105	CDT19125	172
MSII9112	MSIS9112	165
SYND4101	MSIS9112	163
FON14152	MSI79112	149
FIX19105	MSIK9112	146
MSI99112	CDT19125	146
MSI69112	CDT19125	134
CDT19125	MSI69112	131
FON19106	MSI69112	130
MSI69112	FON14152	129
FON19106	CDT19125	128
MSIH9112	CDT19125	118
BDL19122	MSIT9112	116
CDT19125	MSI99112	115
LEC7001	BDL19122	111
BDL14151	MSIS9112	107

DR181935
 CONFIDENTIAL

Re: [Fwd: Transponder Change log 2004/02/06]

NOSTALG7001	MESH4101	106
-------------	----------	-----

DR181936
CONFIDENTIAL