

**VF R&D Leaders – Failing to Program Demo -  
Dev Unauthorized & Unsupported – Failure, blaming "Technology too Young"**

**3/12/07 Vodafone R&D Leader1:** Razz – In your opinion are there any bottlenecks on our side which would speed things?

**3/12/07, 12:24 Razz Van:** David (*Vodafone R&D Leader1*), if for example you were to try to program the entire solution...then unless there is a thorough understanding, considering the level of abstraction, technical glitches could surface. Within this scope, I have personally programmed a demo of the solution, to an extent where there is a proof of concept for a number of the proposed applications, projecting that all aspects of the claims of the solutions are technically feasible and programmable.

**3/12/07, 15:59 Vodafone R&D Leader2 (cc Vodafone R&D Leader1):** Dear Razz, I understand it is taking too long to us; we have been elaborating a reference implementation to use for the assessment (as a reference point), according our technical experts it has been a difficult task since they claim it is in a very initial stage.

**Key Points:**

**Due Diligence Declared Objective:** "set up a trial"

**Information Provided at DD Start** (i.e., 1/ 5/07): "demo - available for evaluation at your request."

**Proof of Concept Evaluation i.e., "set up a trial": Never Occurred**

**Problem:**

- Why is VF R&D UK Leader asking "me" to suggest a possible problem with "their" side?
- What is the probability that only hours after I estimated a possible fault in the DD process in the reply-message only to VF R&D Leader1 (UK) – the VF R&D Leader2 (Spain) replies, invoking what I had suggested 3 hours earlier – but not as a Due Diligence procedural shortcoming, but rather as a *failure attributed to the innovation/technology, by the VF R&D Technical Experts?*

**Conclusion:** What is the motivation when people don't look at what you have working as per the declared objective, they try to implement what you have without asking for permission or support, then declare "failure" as a result of your innovation, in effect, invalidating what you have without any effort to evaluate it?...In theory, anyone can say – "I've tried to do it...it didn't work...it must be because your solution is lacking. Therefore, no solution, no proof of concept, no invention." - This could be said and done by anyone, without actually even having to "lift a finger".

*However – can there be a rational explanation to this?*