



Interview of Helen Bradley

Interviewed by:
Marguerite Gong Hancock

Recorded: May 13, 2015
Sunnyvale, California

CHM Reference number: X7503.2015

© 2015 Computer History Museum

Hancock: Thank you, Helen, so much for agreeing to contribute to our NetApp project. I want to go back to when you first came to NetApp. What was the genesis of your decision to join NetApp and how did you decide on your first priorities in that key role that you joined as?

Bradley: Well, I joined NetApp in 1995 and NetApp was about at the-- if you look at organizational behavior and organizational development you can talk about stages of storming, forming, norming and performing. So I joined at I would call it the end of storming, I was solidly there during forming, and I was there at the beginning of norming. So as far as why I joined NetApp, I actually didn't want to join NetApp. But NetApp is actually very persuasive. I was off working on ideas for a startup and several people who knew me from other places really were just very persistent about talking to me, and they made a decision to hire me incredibly fast and I liked them. I mean it was a really appealing group of engineers.

I liked the technology; I'd known about the technology for actually a long time. I had been watching NetApp since they were forming. At the time NetApp was forming, I was vice president of operating systems and networking at Sun, so I had been watching them since they got off the ground. I was very impressed with what they were doing. As far as when I started, it was an interesting, eclectic group of people and they were a lot of fun. It was right before they were going IPO, so it was a really exciting time.

But they had always been working on one project at a time so just starting to do things like have priorities for multiple things that were going on at the same was kind of a big deal; it was new. As a group, they were small, they were only 16 people when I joined in engineering, and James had done just an amazing job actually starting to put just good engineering fundamentals together and good engineering methodology together, so it was actually a really good place to start.

Hancock: You brought this expertise and experience from Sun and you were joining this new startup and you were forming a team and creating priorities. Can you say more about what you did in that first year during that time of meteoric growth for the company?

Bradley: Well, in the first year it was becoming apparent that we were going to be able to grow and double our size every year so, it was largely about hiring. So I set out hiring and I really had never thought a lot about culture. I think I just assumed that really cool people, really bright people came together, they had interesting work to do, you threw a beer bust and it all worked.

Maybe it does for some people but it did not work for me. So first I failed and I had an organization that really hated each other. The engineers were arguing with each other; they weren't getting along with each other. We weren't doing a good job hiring. People didn't really want to work for us. I interviewed women and they just looked repelled at the thought of joining my team. So this caused me to really step back and think a lot about what I was doing and how the hell was I going to build a team that was going to actually double every year.

Being a good performance person, I stepped back and did a model of the organization and what did I want that organization to look like in four years and how big was it going to be and how we were going to

get there, how were we going to have some sort of a culture that would work where people really could have interesting ideas and have fun and enjoy their job. I came away with really two ideas about what I needed to do. I needed people who were serious team players and I needed people who were going to be able to adapt to change, because we were going to have a whole lot of change. So we didn't lower our requirements for hiring people who were excellent in their respective areas.

We still kept those criteria, but everyone we interviewed had to have shown the ability to be a team player and someplace in their life to be able to deal with change well; that was just the starting point. I also tended to start hiring more senior people at that point, senior engineers, senior managers, and I tried to look for people who had been through hyper growth in other companies, people who brought with them some views about how that happens. I was looking for the people who would become the leaders at NetApp -- the people that would be able to lead and influence other engineers as they came along. So that was kind of the first step, and it was actually remarkable what a change that immediately made in the organization. We also did improve how we hired so I think a lot of companies, in Silicon Valley particularly, don't really interview well. I learned a lot about interviewing when I worked as a young engineer at Bell Labs, so I applied what I had learned there and we really improved our interview process. We tried to balance assessing and selling and we were good at it; we became very good at it.

I started managing the hiring process more like a sales function so everything I had always learned about how sales manages the organization, I managed hiring like that. I also found the best of breed with recruiters in the area, the area meaning the technology, not so much just Silicon Valley, and I developed close partnerships with those people so they were part of the team; they were part of what made us a success.

Hancock: Such important—

Bradley: If you're looking for other people, particularly people who've left here that you think would be interesting, there's a lot of people who are like--

Hancock: You had mentioned some important insights and techniques that you used for this time of tremendous growth. Now in Silicon Valley a lot of people talk about unicorns and times of hyper growth. From your experience at NetApp, or even other organizations, do you have other sort of lessons or recommendations for senior leaders who are trying to help navigate times of hyper growth?

Bradley: Well, I think one of the things that helped me a lot-- I did rely on my own experience but the thing that just was tremendously valuable to me is looking at other companies that had gone through hyper growth. I stalked their employees. <laughs> I sat down with more employees from-- the two companies I really looked at a lot were Sun and Tandem and I sat down with employees who had been there at different stages and asked them, "So what was happening when you were at this size and what was going wrong when you were at this size? What was going right when you were at this size?" I got just incredibly valuable feedback from doing that and that helped me kind of have a guide through the whole growth of NetApp. I was able to in some ways use it as a yardstick of how I'm doing. Am I doing as well

as those companies or am I falling behind, and it allowed me to actually find some of the roadblocks before we hit them.

Hancock: Could you give a couple of examples?

Bradley: Oh, this was a long time ago. I'm not sure I remember the exact kind of things but most of them had to do with how products come together. At what stages do the processes that you have just kind of blow up and what was the next step in terms of how they evolved those processes? What was the management team like at different stages and what did they do well. I mean you can follow people back to—

Take someone like Eric Schmidt. We all think of him as far as running Google. But if you talk to people that were in his group at Sun when he was a first-level manager you get some really great lessons learned as far as what's an interesting role model for a great first-level manager, Bernie Lacroute from Sun. He was vice president of engineering at Sun during about the same stage that I was at NetApp. I paid a lot of attention to what kind of things he did, what did the engineers like about him, how did they view that he had solved problems. From Tandem I think we got a different perspective because in their early years they had more of an enterprise customer, a customer who quality was really a number-one item, so talking to them you get more of a sense of how to build process that evolves for quality. Also I think Tandem was just one of the companies in the valley that really did a lot as far as changing the dynamics of what it's like to be an engineer and what are managers like and just what a culture is like.

Hancock: This time in the valley in the early to mid '90s was a time of tremendous not only growth but really sort of a sea change in the kind of technologies that were evolving and the companies that were there. To what extent do you think it made a difference that NetApp was in Silicon Valley as part of its DNA or a part of how it evolved related to the valley or do you think that's--

Bradley: Well—

Hancock: --would make a difference?

Bradley: Our particular company wasn't so much in the dot com stuff that was happening. We did a little bit with NetCash, but we were more evolving from some other technologies that had started up in the '80s. I think where it made a huge difference though was hiring. It was one of the hardest times I've seen in my career as far as finding people 'cause there was just this explosive growth in the valley and so many companies hiring and compensation plans were just totally out of control. So it was very difficult that way.

As far as it being in the DNA and being in Silicon Valley and the ecosystem that supports it, I can't imagine hiring and building an organization any-- building NetApp's organization at least anyplace other than here. I don't know how that would have happened. Our growth was really fueled by other companies

that were declining, so we hired from Auspex and we hired from Sun and we hired from Tandem and we hired from SGI. We just had an amazing set of people that we were able to attract. I mean everybody that we attracted I would look at them and we'd be in the middle of a project and I'd say, "How did we ever think we were going to get this project done without you?"

So I don't know that you could have gotten that anyplace else. Now there is one area that I don't think it helped us being in Silicon Valley at all. One of the big things that we did, one of the innovative things that we did, was a multi-protocol approach so we started supporting CIFS from-- which is a Windows protocol. Hiring people for CIFS was really hard. Hiring people from the Windows world was very hard and even if you found them here they didn't want to work in a Unix-like culture. So NFS is very Unix so you have these two cultures that actually don't blend very well at all; they really clash. I mean it's not saying one is better than the other at all, but just simple things like how do you write code, what are standards that you value for writing code, totally different.

I think what helped us was the Tandem people kind of married the two. Since they weren't so Unix I was able to find people from Tandem who understood the Windows environment; they understood the Unix environment; and they could peacefully cope but that was a very difficult product for us to do. And it wasn't just engineering, even support and sales. Windows was not in the DNA and I don't think it was really in the ecosystem here either.

Hancock: This challenge of bringing together diverse people is a theme that I've been hearing about NetApp, diverse, eclectic; there have been different adjectives. How do you view this? You've characterized as all bright but then how do you bring them together as a team and a team that tackled not only one project but a series of projects over time?

Bradley: Well, actually I think the worst thing in the world would be to have a team that everybody was alike, that everybody thought alike, that everybody looked alike. I don't think I could build a world-class engineering team like that because part of being great is having ideas that are different. You don't become great if you think like everybody else; that's a good way of becoming a follower. So NetApp was a place that you could have blue hair; you could spend your entire day on rollerblades at Net App; you could be a woman in engineering; you could be a parent that needs to get home for a six o'clock meeting-- I mean for a six o'clock-- you could be a parent that can't be at a six o'clock meeting because of a child. NetApp embraced differences. That's something that we thought was great.

Hancock: This gets to the values of the company. Now they've been kind of captured in seven core values. Can you give an example of a time when one or several of those values made a real material difference?

Bradley: Well, yes, I can. <laughs> <inaudible> I think a lot of it came together as far as getting products out and we could get products out really fast and we could maneuver as a company. So I remember one

product that I was just a few weeks away from FCS and Tom comes in and says he's not going to be able to sell it. He needs the new drives that are coming out; he's just not going to be able to sell it.

This is not what the VP of engineering wants to hear and so I told Tom, "Well, we're testing those drives that you want, but we're finding data corruption issues with it; that's not <laughs> what the VP of sales wants to hear. So the problem Tom was having though is our competitors weren't finding bugs in the drives; our competitors were telling the customers they were ready to come out with them and the customers were telling Tom they weren't going to accept a new system with this so you come down to there's no good answer.

It's not like one of you is right and the only thing to do is for everybody to pull together and just try and do something that's impossible. So this was like April and I was supposed to FCS in May. I have no idea how I'm going to do this. Of course, look at it from Tom's perspective. Tom's going into first quarter. He has no idea what he's going to sell and Dan's not going to let him off the hook as far as meeting his sales numbers.

So I have to go back and figure out what's wrong with it, which I did. And I was able to work with the vendor. I was able to get the vendor to turn on a dime, and we were tiny so that was a big deal. And the vendor had to actually go through multiple iterations. We were able to get through agency testing, and we were able to get it done with... We slipped a month but that's pretty good considering we had no idea.

Okay, that doesn't end the story 'cause Tom now-- this is the middle of June-- he's got six weeks to sell this product. He has to get an entire sales force to get excited about the product, understand it, get it out to customers and meet his numbers, which he did. So I think that's a good example of how we could pull together as a team and just do stuff that was-- it just seemed impossible. It seemed like there's no way if you thought about it you could do it.

And people talk about we argue well and how we argue and stuff like that and-- I don't know-- I guess when I hear some of those things it sounds to me like it was all-- I don't know-- I just get this picture of it was all very polite and maybe we were sitting, chatting over tea about problems. We had heated discussions. I mean this was the whole business that could go down the drain, but we were able to actually get problems out on the table, figure out how we were going to deal with it and go forward, and I think that starts getting embodied when you step back after the forming years into values.

Hancock: I think those values is an amazing example I would like to pursue.

Bradley: It was amazing being part of it. <laughs>

Hancock: You were sort of Alice in Wonderland, right, where you kind of imagined how many impossible things before breakfast. I'm thinking of this timeline, and what you said happened and it's mind boggling. There's something very powerful at work. It's the people; it's the relationships and the values. The values

sometimes come across as sort of generic. Everybody has values of integrity or teamwork or something. Was there some kind of a more detailed level of stories that were told that were part of the lore or phrases that people referred to that made those values come to life that were part of the culture of the insiders?

Bradley: Compared to other companies, I think we had less phrases. The one phrase that really stands out to me is really from engineering and it was there before me and that was “How hard can it be?” So we would have some mission impossible thing that we had to do and I remember Brian Ehrmantraut on my staff would just laugh and say, “How hard can it be?” And that became kind of our motto.

Hancock: Let’s talk about the innovation and some of the products. During the time that you were with NetApp, what do you consider some of NetApp’s most important products or innovations?

Bradley: Well, the multi—

Hancock: What’s behind it?

Bradley: The multi-protocol product was really quite important for us. It was difficult to do and it was very innovative. Nobody had brought these two worlds together in the past. It really changed I think what we could do going out and selling ourselves. We weren’t just fast, simple and reliable anymore; we also had something that nobody else could do. So Sun couldn’t do this, and Auspex couldn’t do this and all the customers at the time they had Unix work stations and they had PCs and they wanted to be able to get files and share files so that was huge for us.

Hancock: For people who are not familiar with technology or applications or what customers were doing at the time, could you put some context of what was new about that product; why did it make such a difference to its users?

Bradley: Well, people had been using NFS as a protocol, so if you were on a work station and you had multiple work stations and you wanted to access files you used the NFS protocol to get files off of our filer. People in the PC world they had a protocol for Microsoft which was called CIFS and they would use that for accessing files in a PC world. And what we did was if you had a filer now you could use CIFS from a PC or you could use NFS from a Unix work station or a Unix server, and you could access files and you could share files, It was the same file.

Hancock: That key change is great. After you were there, I understand that the product mix changed and evolved. From the leader of the organization, what were the hints that enabled you to know which direction to go? It’s one of the big challenges for companies when they’re trying to evolve and be innovative as--

Bradley: Well—

Hancock: --to which directions to go?

Bradley: A lot of things that we were doing if you-- Christensen's book, "Innovator's Dilemma," came out after everything happened really at NetApp and if you read that you would say that everything I'm going to talk about was just inevitable anyway, so I think the big thing for us that changed was thinking about ourselves moving up into larger systems versus down into smaller systems.

So when I interviewed at NetApp, NetApp was very much midrange. That's kind of where they were and they were really thinking about going down to lower-end kind of servers. I was coming from Sun so I had been working with multiprocessors and Sun was moving up into larger and larger systems, so I saw the need for larger systems, but that really wasn't where they saw their market at that time. After joining I looked at their low-end system and they really did have a nice design for a low-end server. It had great packaging and hardware and it really was kind of a nice product, but the problem with that that I saw was if I put engineering dollars into completing that product it was an opportunity that would be lost in another area. I wouldn't have had enough money to then go and hire people in the system software area, which was our core competence.

So, we made a decision to cancel that product and start doing things in another space. I know James was one of the first people who really started seeing things moving into larger systems. James and I gave a presentation to the board and they didn't get it. They really didn't get it and the more we explained it the more they didn't get it. So I don't think we did a very good job convincing them. Steve Kleiman joined, and he started working on designs for HA and mirroring. And we did some very clever things with that product that allowed customers to even think about the whole area of failover differently than they had with other companies.

So that got us into having functionality that was comparable to what larger guys had but it was also functionality that was done differently than larger guys had done, larger guys like Sun. Our product actually more customers would be interested in it. High availability was something I had been involved with at other companies and it was kind of a problematic area at the time because there were very few companies that really bought it, yet everybody wanted it. So the ROI on it for other companies wasn't very good, whereas our design was done in a way that a lot of people would want to use it, not just people who needed a hot spare for failover. It was something that you could failover to another system and you could have been using that system before; it didn't have to be one that was just dedicated to that. So that was kind of a game changer for us.

The other thing was really more of an accident. One of the things that we discovered was that we could have this interesting model, kind of a waterfall model, for our processors, so we could take our high end--

when we came out with a new high end use the high end as the midrange and the midrange as the low end, and we would do some changes to it; we would make some changes to decrease the cost. We could get these out pretty rapidly so the first time we did this it was kind of an accident like I said and we got a product out in six weeks so this became a very powerful model for us to use. We had a very small engineer-- a small hardware and mechanical organization so having something that gave you a number of processors that fit into different ranges of customers made us look big compared to our competitors.

Hancock: That's a really powerful idea you just talked about. Sometimes in retrospect when we make decisions to allocate resources or evolve the business model, it looks very tidy or almost inevitable but you just talked about something that's just really different. That's discovering along the way, serendipity, accident. How did that feel at the time and how were you able to recognize it and then run with it either from that example or another one where this idea of discovering?

Bradley: Well, let's take that example. If I remember, we were at an offsite and Dan's staff had an offsite and a few of us were discussing the possibility of this. I think Dave was there and Dan was there and James was there and we were just kind of batting this idea around. I came back and one of the managers in my organization, Varun Mehta, who's now a founder of Nimble, I talked to Varun about this and he was like "Oh, yeah, I could do this" and Varun took a team and he went off and said, "How hard can it be?" <laughs> and he put it together. So part of it comes back to our culture; we just had this culture of how hard can it be and would go off and do things that seemed impossible.

One of the things that probably was crazy when you look back at it is we would utilize some very young engineers who were joining and they stepped up to the challenge, there was a-- for testing that. This was in December and it was over Christmas break and the QA guy --- he was away getting married -- so we had a young engineer from Berkeley who stepped up to the challenge. He took on QA in this product. He followed what had been done before and he did a super job. So we had people who would really step up to challenges.

Hancock: That idea of stepping up to challenges and then in some cases growing with the company as the challenges grew. And then also you've given some examples of people who have subsequently left the company and taken on roles other places. Give some examples of how that sort of trajectory impacted people over the profession if that makes sense.

Bradley: Yeah. I think in Silicon Valley you could ding companies for not having training. Very few companies-- they're usually too small to have a lot of training. People learn from the experiences they gain at each company and from the people, and I think when you-- when people talk about the DNA of Silicon Valley it comes from that. You learn from the company you're at and you take that to the next company and you try and do it better. So the DNA at any one company comes from a variety of places. I look at myself and there's things that I learned from a woman who was in Silicon Valley in the '50s and '60s doing military kind of stuff; I learned a lot about manufacturing from her.

Hancock: That's really interesting. I'd like to hear a little bit more about your views on the DNA of Silicon Valley and the role of women. This is a topic that's been of intense interest recently but it's a topic that's really been important for a much longer period than the current focus. Let's review how women have had roles in the valley and how that's evolved over time.

Bradley: Well, I think Silicon Valley really benefited by the number of women who went into computer science in the '70s and '80s. What a lot of people don't realize is by 1985 the number of CS degrees going to women had come close to 40 percent, was huge. Unfortunately, after that there was also a huge decline to-- back down to being in the teens. By the '90s there were actually a large number of women in the valley and some of the most experienced people were women. So NetApp benefited by this and NetApp actually had a lot of senior women in the company. We had a board member, Carol Bartz, who was at NetApp, we had two women on Dan's staff, the executive engineering team was 40 percent women, and if you look at every functional organization there were senior women in it.

What I was finding at the time though was that I had a very hard time hiring young women. I would do college recruiting and I would come back with none and I recruited everywhere at the time. I would go to baby showers recruiting and I would come back with none. I just could not find young women for NetApp, and I didn't realize it at the time but what I was seeing was this massive drop in the pipeline of women going into computers and going into computer science. I think it's interesting to think about if that hadn't happened how would Silicon Valley be different. I think if that hadn't happened you would have had this continual line of women going into computing; you would have had women growing in companies; you would have had a lot more companies like NetApp that had women in very senior roles. There would have been role models for women. So I have to think that had that not happened, even if you did have conscious and unconscious bias, it probably wouldn't be as harmful as it is today.

Hancock: When you think about NetApp and the impact that it's had and the kind of role models that have come and lessons what do you think are some essential parts of that legacy that were born during the time that you were there?

Bradley: I'm not sure I understand.

Hancock: Okay. I guess we'll pull back further and look at other lessons from NetApp or how it's had lasting impact on the valley.

Bradley: Well, the lasting impact is clearly the people who've come out of NetApp. I think NetApp really tried to take the best of, they tried to take best practices that many people had seen at different companies, and we really tried to make it better. We tried to take best of breed and make it even better, and I hope that everybody who was at NetApp who's at other places are looking at NetApp and asking, "How can we make it better? How can we make Silicon Valley a better place to be?"

Hancock: There's a power in asking the right questions and today you've talked about a lot of important questions that were on your mind as you came to the company and questions that you think others

should be asking themselves. If you were to advise some young entrepreneurs as they're starting their company and at time of growth, are there questions you would recommend that are top of line for them?

Bradley: Hmm. So much is about the people and so much of the focus with entrepreneurs is about the technology, so I think you really do have to stop and think about the team that you're creating. In the long run the technology goes away, and what you're really creating is a piece of Silicon Valley that's a culture. So I think you have to think about your culture and what do you want that culture to be. Do you want that culture to be something where everybody has to think alike. These days there's a lot written about programmers with some of the young companies and is that the model that you really want in your culture? Do you want a culture where the values are everybody being alike and the likeness of everybody versus having people who think differently, having the person that's going to say, "Hey, let's do it another way than we've ever thought of before." I think that's actually the place where Silicon Valley can actually be very vulnerable right now. I see small companies that seem like they're priding themselves on everybody being alike and I think it's the diversity of Silicon Valley that has really made us great.

Hancock: This idea of strength, how it contributed to enduring sustainability of the valley and weaknesses is really important. I wonder if you might comment some more on what you see as pillars of strength that can go forward and also potentially some other areas of vulnerability for the valley.

Bradley: Well, when I look at Silicon Valley, I think the strength of Silicon Valley is it's kind of a cauldron of creative destruction, and that really creates a very unique environment. It creates VCs who are always willing to have a money supply for the next new idea. It creates companies that are willing to take amazing risk and that have attitudes of you either need to grow or die; you can't stay in place. I think it creates employees who are willing to go along for that risk and who are willing to change companies, who are-- who want an adventure and not just a job.

But part of what fuels creative destruction is diversity of ideas. I don't think you can actually be an organization, be a company, and not value thinking out of the box, not value differing ideas and survive. I think that's a good formula for being a follower and not a leader. So I get very concerned about some of the gender issues in Silicon Valley right now. I'm concerned about them in terms of women but I'm also concerned about them in terms of Silicon Valley. Are the gender issues that we're seeing right now just the canary in the coal mine? If a company doesn't really value differences; if they find it okay to create cultures that aren't inclusive for people who are female, people who are racially different, people who have different ethnicities. If they don't value creating cultures like that, what are they creating? Are they creating companies where everybody just thinks the same, where they don't encourage people to have differing views.

Hancock: I'd like to return to your role in building your own part of the organization and ask for some of the techniques, some of the tools, what you actually did to create that kind of culture that not only tolerated but invited diversity of ideas and the best of breed. What were the toolkit that you could say, "These are some specific things that I did or I could share with somebody else who has a similar kind of challenge?"

Bradley: Well, these get very tactical. <laughs>

Hancock: This is interesting.

Bradley: These get really, really tactical and some of them people might find amusing. So “Games Mother Never Taught You,” old book from the ‘70’s teaches you in business that where you sit is very important. Well, I actually used that in terms of integrating people at NetApp. I paid a lot of attention to which people I wanted to sit next to each other based on that part of the technology needed to evolve. Those two people brought technology to the table and they needed to be talking to each other. I always look at my job as programming with people. So I don’t actually write the code but I hire the people; I put them in place; I get them implementing the strategy.

So we also put in place things that really got people to be able to come in to NetApp and learn who individuals were, integrate with other people. The types of things that we did were just something like a weekly status kind of newsletter that allowed people to see what the names were of other people and what were they doing. So that was regular on a weekly basis. We had engineering talks that we started up. The motivation for that was I found that beer busts weren’t too effective ‘cause people didn’t have anything to talk to each other about. So I started doing a weekly beer bust that followed technical talks and it got people up, talking, having to present, saying things. It allowed people to discover who was in the engineering organization; and it gave everybody something to talk about at the beer busts so that kind of solved my problem there.

The other thing that I think’s very important is saying thank you to people. It’s very competitive coming into an organization like NetApp. We had the best of the best and the best of the best when one of them is new they’re competing against these other people that they really value and they value their opinion, and they don’t want to look like the loser. So it’s important to say thank you to people at that stage so that they know they’re doing okay and we did things that were not necessarily a lot of money. We would give people a shirt. It cost \$25! And a really nice thank-you letter for why we were giving them that and it would be signed by my staff and it might be signed by all of Dan’s staff and it said thank you. It was just a nice way of saying thank you. A person puts the shirt on, they walk around, and everybody says, “Where’d you get the shirt?” and they get to say, “Well, I got it because we did blah blah blah.” So, it was actually small things like that that we started doing so people felt good.

Hancock: I wish I had all afternoon to talk with you. This idea of small things leading to big things is a really powerful notion and your idea of programming with people. Just to extend that metaphor a little bit more, as you were thinking about the code and it being elegant. Of the people, the organization that you brought together and what you did during that time, what are you most personally proud of of what you achieved during that time with your team and for NetApp?

Bradley: I think I’m actually most proud of the team that came together. There was a professor at Harvard, Margo Seltzer, who’s a very well-known professor and she had described the organization as having the most neurons firing, and they’re really nice! So that made me very proud of the organization. It

was a great team, we got great products out for our customers, and we made money for our shareholders.

It was a really exciting time and I'm still very proud of the team. I've seen people go on to other things. I just saw on LinkedIn this morning that one of the engineers is CTO for one of our competitors and it makes me really proud; I hired him out of college. So I'm happy to see what people have gone on to achieve.

Hancock: Great. Congratulations and thank you so much for taking time to share your insights.

END OF INTERVIEW