

Internal Memorandum

To: Dick Williams, Pete DiCorti, Joe Taglia
Copy: Toby Corey, Dave Valentino, Tim Peart, John Morley
From: Jody Clifton
Date: November 19, 1991
Subj: Followup on Technical Support Overload Problem

This is what is happening to date regarding the Technical Support Overload problem:

1. We hired a company called American Transtech in Florida to take messages for Technical Support by having the 8th line rollover to this number in Florida when all the lines were busy. They started this on Thursday afternoon. I am getting complaints from customers about have the answering service take messages. I get anywhere from 3-5 a day in addition to the other irate individuals I already receive. What they are complaining about mainly is not that someone is taking a message, but that they are told that no one will return their call for 3-4 days. As a result of having this service, we now have 627 messages and no one to call them back. Novell's support group has dwindled down to 4 people as they are busy and they can spare no more, and I have 3 people in training with one starting callbacks today. I warned you that this would more than likely occur. I think we need to seriously look at this volume and make a decision to either remove half or all of my staff and just have them perform callbacks only. If I were to remove half my staff for callbacks, then I would busy out 4 of the 8 lines coming in, in order to keep hold time to a minimum. Please see below the attached memorandum from Sue Nagotte regarding statistics of the backlog. John King who is our Account Manager will be here tomorrow meeting with John Morley. I spoke with him today and he will bring figures with what he would charge us in order to provide 3rd party support as they currently do that service for Hewlett-Packard.
2. As of Monday of this week, we now have one 9600-baud modem connection to the SRS database in Provo. We are now entering in all the callbacks and faxes that Provo can handle directly into the database. We were told that we could send no more than 125 faxes and/or callbacks a day. I am not sure how much longer this arrangement will continue. I talked with Paul Creer today and he wanted to discontinue this at the end of this month. I explained the situation and he said we would review it again next week. Pete, have you spoken to Mary Burnside in this regard?

NO116342



PC001955

Plaintiff's Exhibit

5415

Comes V. Microsoft

MS-CCP-MDL 5009887

MS-CCPMDL 000005009887

Page 2.

3. I did receive a price quote from Computer Hand Holding. The price was high and rather shocking, it was approximately \$130,000 a month for 500 calls a day. Since then, I was told of three other companies that handle third party support. One is called Sonnet and they are located in Los Angeles, the second one is called Prime and they are located in Boston, and the third is called 900 service and they are in Beaverton, Oregon. Unfortunately, as of today, I do not have price quotes from these other vendors.
4. I do not have the support assessment report from Glen Ford at SSPA. I should have this document by Friday at the very latest. His recommendations are going to be that we hire additional staff, implement tiered support by restructuring the department, and get a call tracking and help desk database as soon as possible. For a fee, which he will quote when I get the report, he will help me in accomplishing these things.
5. When I spoke to Paul Creer today, he explained how they were structured and it is basically as follows:

For every 10 Technical Support Analysts (sometimes more people are involved), they have a Team Leader who makes approximately 5% more than the Analysts. This Team Leader is responsible for annual reviews and the day-to-day management. These Team Leaders then report to a Supervisor who then reports to a Manager. Paul Creer manages the Technical Support Department and he has 6 Supervisors and Team Leaders and another 120 Technical Support Analysts.

He suggested that I get in touch with Joanne Nelson and talk to her about restructuring the department. Novell will provide her with all the necessary job descriptions, grade levels, and rate of pay. Once I have everything from Joanne Nelson, I will put my proposal before management for their approval. I will continue to work closely with Paul Creer and Richard King in this regard.

Since we have a growing number of callbacks now as a result of American Transtech, I suggest that I be allowed to busy out at least 4 of my incoming lines and let me assign at least 4-6 people of my current 13 incoming agents to do callbacks. Otherwise, since we now have sufficient data as to the size of the problem, we turn off our service with American Transtech and allow me to hire a third party organization and/or additional headcount to help answer these callbacks. These people do not need connection to the ACD so, they could sit anywhere. Please let me know what direction you wish me to pursue or both.

We need to solve this problem as soon as possible. We are losing a large market share and right now we are Microsoft's biggest endorser. Majority of all the irate individuals I speak with say that they are going back to Microsoft because at least they provide support.

RB116343

PC001956

MS-CCP-MDL 5009888

MS-CCPMDL 000005009888

Page 3.

Please let me know if you have any further questions. I can be reached at 6584.

80116394

PC001957

MS-CCP-MDL 5009889

MS-CCPMDL 000005009889

RELEASE OF DR DOS LANPacks - Post Mortem

1. Simultaneous release of too many products led to fragmented effort - B.U.S. (Win 3.1), April Revision DR DOS 6.0, DR Multiuser DOS 5.1 (US and UK product variants), DR DOS LANPacks. All of the above were launched in international language variants during April '92.
2. Extreme pressure to release DR DOS LANPack in Q2 produced foreshortened developed program and the cutting of important corners - limited QA - effectively no Beta program - no written formalised specification.
3. New structures ie. Berryessa being main manufacturing facility and new organisation produced a confusion over areas of responsibilities. This in turn not only led to duplication of effort, but also to time delays and general confusion.
4. Product sign off from EDC was haphazard, due to time pressures. DR DOS LANPacks escaped into manufacturing rather than being released. This meant that amendments and corrections to master disks were made outside of EDC, some of these changes were authorised others not.
5. Early product testing focused on "does it work" ie. compatibility as opposed to "does it work well, can it do this?" usability. The latter possibly more extensive approach identified major bugs (EMM386.SYS) at a very late stage.
6. B.O.M.s were late into MAXIM, this meant that the turnkey supplier did not know what to do or when he could start.
7. Unclear understanding by regional sales managers of order processing, despite numerous memos telling them what and how their distributors should order.
8. Confusion at Order Processing in Berryessa on when the product was to ship, meant that some orders were turned away.
7. First Article Sign Off became an extension to QA.
8. Not recognised outside EDC that DR DOS LANPacks was a new product as opposed to a revision.
9. Input and feedback from US Technical Support was not recognised.
10. No recognised single point of contact between Development and Manufacturing.

Lessons to be learned

1. Agree and formalise a written and achievable timetable of events.
2. Commercial realities must be heeded, but so must engineering/development realities.

A0308482

MS-CCP-MDL 5009890

MS-CCPMDL 000005009890

3. Ownership of a new product launch should be a well defined and recognised team. Changes to the product specification (doc or software) must be ratified by this team.
4. Release of master to manufacturing can only take place following formal sign off by new product team. Once released no changes to disks, software or documentation can take place. There should be an agreed minimum of 10 working days between Engineering Release and First Customer Shipment.
5. Responsibility for product components must be by a responsible person i.e within the PIP Team, not by a resource available somewhere in the organisation.
6. Technical Support (Product Champion) must be brought earlier and formally into the new product development program.
7. Beta programs must be orchestrated and managed. ✓
8. Formal specification in terms of both features and quality must be signed off before commencing development.
9. Product components should be handed to Manufacturing via the Program Manager, and not diverse or scattered resources.
10. The Program Manager should be the focal point for coordinating Engineering Release to Manufacturing, the program Manager must be based close to the Development Facility and be involved fully in the PIP Meetings.
11. Engineering Release should only happen after all PIP Team members have formally signed off the product.
12. PIP (^{Product in Progress} Product in Progress) Team members should include :
Product Manager, Engineering-Software Manager, Internationalization Manager,
Program Manager, Technical Services Manager, QA Manager and Documentation Manager *Support Manager*

rg0131.sam

80308483

MS-CCP-MDL 5009891

MS-CCPMDL 000005009891