

1 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  
 DONN P. PICKETT (SBN 72257)  
 2 GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (SBN 157468)  
 HOLLY A. HOUSE (SBN 136045)  
 3 ZACHARY J. ALINDER (SBN 209009)  
 BREE HANN (SBN 215695)  
 4 Three Embarcadero Center  
 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067  
 5 Telephone: 415.393.2000  
 Facsimile: 415.393.2286  
 6 donn.pickett@bingham.com  
 geoff.howard@bingham.com  
 7 holly.house@bingham.com  
 zachary.alinder@bingham.com  
 8 bree.hann@bingham.com

9 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
 DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
 333 Main Street  
 10 Armonk, NY 10504  
 Telephone: 914.749.8200  
 11 dboies@bsfllp.com  
 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (SBN 144177)  
 12 1999 Harrison St., Suite 900  
 Oakland, CA 94612  
 13 Telephone: 510.874.1000  
 sholtzman@bsfllp.com

14 DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)  
 15 JENNIFER GLOSS (SBN 154227)  
 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7  
 16 Redwood City, CA 94070  
 Telephone: 650.506.4846  
 17 Facsimile: 650.506.7114  
 dorian.daley@oracle.com  
 18 jennifer.gloss@oracle.com

19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
 Oracle USA, Inc., *et al.*

20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 21 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 22 OAKLAND DIVISION

23 ORACLE USA, INC., *et al.*,  
 Plaintiffs,  
 24 v.  
 25 SAP AG, *et al.*,  
 26 Defendants.

No. 07-CV-01658 PJH (EDL)  
**DECLARATION OF PAUL PINTO  
 IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'  
 OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'  
 MOTION TO EXCLUDE  
 TESTIMONY OF PAUL PINTO**

Date: September 30, 2010  
 Time: 2:30 p.m.  
 Place: Courtroom 3  
 Judge: Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton

A/73495331.2/2021039-0000324170

Case No. 07-CV-01658 PJH (EDL)

DECLARATION OF PAUL PINTO ISO OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE  
 TESTIMONY OF PAUL PINTO

1 I, Paul Pinto, declare as follows:

2 1. I am over the age of 18 and competent to testify to the facts stated in this  
3 declaration. I submit this Declaration in support of the Opposition to the Motion filed on August  
4 19, 2010 (“the Motion”) by Defendants SAG AG, SAP America, Inc., and TomorrowNow, Inc.  
5 (“Defendants”) to Exclude Expert Testimony of Paul C. Pinto. I make the following statements  
6 based on my personal knowledge and expertise and, if called as a witness, would testify  
7 competently to them.

8 2. I am the co-founder and managing partner of Sylvan VI, Inc., an advisory  
9 services firm that provides management consulting services to clients contemplating the  
10 selection of a packaged software product or engaging an external service provider to custom  
11 develop software.

12 **I. BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE**

13 3. Prior to founding Sylvan VI, I served as a Senior Executive with Infor  
14 Global Software and Epicor Software, both of which publish software products that directly  
15 compete with Oracle and SAP. In these roles, I was responsible for running the Software  
16 Product Implementation and Managed Services business lines, which focused on implementing,  
17 upgrading, customizing, and supporting a variety of ERP and Financial Management software  
18 products.

19 4. Prior to my employment with Epicor, I served as a Senior Vice President  
20 for NIIT Technologies (one of the largest India-based systems integration firms). In this role, I  
21 was responsible for the day-to-day operations of the U.S. business entity, along with overseeing  
22 the sales, estimating, and product development functions for a number of India-based software  
23 development centers.

24 5. In all, I have over 24 years of experience in the software development  
25 field. I have significant experience in developing software development cost estimates, and have  
26 personally been involved in over 100 estimating efforts including at least 50 using function point  
27 analysis, and at least 50 using COCOMO.

1 **II. RETENTION AND ASSIGNMENT**

2 6. The law firm Bingham McCutchen, on behalf of Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle  
3 International Corporation, and Siebel Systems Inc. (collectively referred to herein as “Oracle” or  
4 “Plaintiffs”), engaged my expert services to estimate the amount Defendants would have spent to  
5 independently develop certain of the software products at issue in the case.

6 **III. COCOMO EQUATIONS**

7 7. In the Motion, Defendants reference a portion of my deposition in this  
8 matter in which Defendants asked about certain equations related to the COCOMO model.  
9 These equations underlie the applications that run the COCOMO model, meaning they are not  
10 visible to the user. As a result, someone who uses COCOMO in a practical setting does not need  
11 to memorize these equations, nor would he or she even see them.

12 8. I used these very same equations in the spreadsheet I designed to run the  
13 COCOMO model used in my report, however I applied the equations in a practical and usable  
14 format, as opposed to the theoretical format in which they reside in academic texts.

15 **IV. BACKFIRING**

16 9. Backfiring is an objective method of estimating a software product’s  
17 functional size, by counting the number of lines of source code and applying a series of  
18 conversion tables that have been developed based on data points that were derived from  
19 thousands of software development efforts. This allows the user to objectively develop a cost  
20 estimate using function point analysis. Numerous organizations publish conversion tables so that  
21 estimators can make these estimations.

22 10. In this matter, because I had in my possession the actual software at issue,  
23 and could therefore count the actual lines of code, backfiring provided an objective, repeatable,  
24 and reliable means of estimating the functional size of the software products in question.

25 11. The experience, skill and expertise of the estimator determines the  
26 accuracy of any estimate of the cost of developing a piece of software. While the Capers Jones  
27 article on backfiring (which was produced with my Report as ORCLX-PIN-000019) states that  
28 accuracy can be plus or minus 25%, in my experience the backfiring methodology, as I applied it

1 here, is much more accurate, and thus has a considerably tighter accuracy range. Further, given  
2 the conservative nature of the overall approach I used in this case, the amounts I calculated  
3 would, if anything, understate the costs, and so any inherent inaccuracy -- by design -- goes in  
4 Defendants favor.

5 **V. THE EXTRAPOLATION TECHNIQUE USED IN MY EXPERT REPORT**

6 12. Due to time restraints, it was not possible to access the source code for  
7 J.D. Edwards World and Siebel software, and so alternatives to the full 10-step methodology had  
8 to be employed for those two software product families. The extrapolation technique I used to  
9 estimate the amount Defendants would have spent to develop the J.D. Edwards World and Siebel  
10 software products is a technique that professionals in my field often use, especially where a  
11 known, reasonable analog exists. I have personally used this method many times in my career  
12 and found it to be accurate and reliable. I, and the companies for which I have worked, have  
13 submitted bids relying upon estimates calculated using extrapolation. There are direct business  
14 results if the estimates are inaccurate. If the estimate (and thus the bid) is too low, we lose  
15 money on the project. Too high, and we fail to win the bid.

16 13. Extrapolation based upon a table comparison, such as the type I performed  
17 in connection with the Siebel software, is a commonly used, accurate and reliable method of  
18 estimating the amount it will cost to develop a piece of software.

19 14. Attached as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of an article that was  
20 presented by Jingzhou Li & Guenther Ruhe on May 20, 2007 at the International Conference on  
21 Software Engineering, entitled Decision Support Analysis for Software Effort Estimation by  
22 Analogy. A true and correct copy of a similar article by Murali Chemuturi entitled Analogy  
23 Based Software Estimation is attached as Exhibit B. This article was produced as ORCLX-PIN-  
24 000110 as one of the supporting materials to my November 16, 2009 Report, and is also  
25 available at <http://www.chemuturi.com/Analogy%20based%20Software%20Estimation.pdf>.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America  
2 that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on September 9th,  
3 2010 at Alpharetta, Georgia.

4 

5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 Paul C. Pinto  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28