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- A competitor has recognized a customer need that a company is not addressing
RECOMMENDATION

- Dedicated resources for innovation
- Focus on the future
- Be proactive not reactive
INTRODUCTION TO BLACKBERRY

- Founded in 1996 in Waterloo, Ontario
- Dropped out of University of Waterloo
- Originally created an interactive pager
- Number one market share between 2006-2009
WHAT DOES CELL PHONE INDUSTRY LOOK LIKE?

- Smaller is better
- Life of the PalmPilot
- Have you ever heard of a pager?!
HOW BLACKBERRY DISRUPTED THE INDUSTRY

- Recognized the needs of their customers
  - Email everywhere
  - Secure company data
  - BBM (emoji)
HOW DID CELL PHONE INDUSTRY REACT?

Apple i-Phone Launched

- APPS inclusive
- Infrastructure in place for i-Tunes
- Single device for consumer needs!

Application Stores

- Coding and Software Development was the new “must have”

Very attractive market!

- Samsung/ Motorolla/ LG
Disrupted by strong competition

Apple’s eco-system = easy transition for consumers to purchase new Apps
WHAT DISRUPTED BLACKBERRY?

- Scanning the environment for end consumer preferences
  - Target customer not addressed (end consumer preferences)
- Focused on business customers vs end consumer wants Data compression for network bandwidth
- Importance of security
  - Over engineered product
WHAT DISRUPTED BLACKBERRY?

- Complacency
  - Riding out the Success
  - Management Focus (distraction – NHL Hockey acquisition)
- When work places stop using
- 2 Devices in customers hands = not meeting needs
DECISION CRITERIA

- Addresses new consumer preferences
- Time to market
- Cost
- Aligns with core competency
ALTERNATIVES TO DISRUPTION

1. Open platform to 3rd party development
2. Buy Android platform
3. Dedicate sufficient internal resources to innovation
OPEN PLATFORM TO 3RD PARTY DEVELOPMENT

Pros:
- We get app development immediately
- Low cost

Con:
- Lose control of aspects of the platform
- We lose a core competency
BUY ANDROID

Pros:
- Head start

Con:
- Time to market
- We lose a core competency
- Too costly (est. 100 million)
DEDICATE SUFFICIENT INTERNAL RESOURCES TO INNOVATION

Pros:
- Maintain your competitive advantage
- Innovative ideas come from within

Con:
- Innovation and future trends can be hard to identify
- Management preferences might shift
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Customer Preferences</th>
<th>Time to Market</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Aligns with core competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open platform to 3rd party developers</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy Android</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make innovation a priority</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Starting in 2000, we are dedicating 20-30% profits to R&D to keep our competitive advantage.

Management makes innovation a core competency and a company value.