



Script Diagnostic

Prepared by: Signal over Noise

Client: [REDACTED]

Title: Technical Support
Problems

Date: [REDACTED]

Talk type: Internal performance update / operational recommendation

Review focus: core message, structure, opening, flow and transitions, proof placement, audience fit, language for the ear, closing / ask

Executive Summary

This is a solid analytical draft with a clear underlying finding: support performance has improved overall, but APAC Enterprise remains the key bottleneck because of evening staffing limits and after-hours Tier 2 handoff delays. The data is useful, the recommendation is reasonable, and the tone is careful. The problem: the script explains too much before it decides. Right now, it reads like a cautious report. For management, it needs to become a sharper decision-support presentation.

Biggest risk if delivered as-is

The audience may understand the information but underreact to the decision. The draft repeatedly says performance is improving, which is true, but that softens the urgency before the APAC Enterprise bottleneck is fully established. Management could leave thinking, 'The situation is better, keep monitoring,' when the real message should be, 'The broad process change helped, but the remaining problem is concentrated enough that it now needs targeted management action.' That is the risk: the talk reports the problem instead of forcing the decision.

Quick win

Replace every version of 'So the conclusion of this slide is...!' with a stronger section-closing line that carries the argument forward. Current style: 'So the conclusion here is that our support operation is improving at top level, but it is still carrying too much backlog and too much case age to say the problem is solved.' Sharper version: 'The headline is this: the system is improving, but the remaining backlog is now concentrated enough to require targeted action.' This one move immediately makes the speaker sound more executive, less like they are narrating a report.

Recommended Core Message

Support performance has improved, but the remaining risk is concentrated in APAC Enterprise. Management should treat this as a targeted coverage and escalation problem, not a general support performance problem.

Recommended Message Structure

Recommended section order: 1) Headline: Overall support improved, but the risk has concentrated 2) Why the averages are misleading: SLA, CSAT, resolution time, and backlog show progress but hide segment-level pressure 3) The bottleneck: APAC Enterprise is disproportionate to its volume 4) Why it is happening: evening coverage + Tier 2 dependency + handoff delay 5) Business consequence: retention risk, cross-functional drag, morale pressure 6) Recommendation: fix APAC evening coverage, escalation flow, and priority model 7) Decision / next step: authorize a focused support design review with owners and timing

Area	What I noticed	Why it matters	Fix direction
Core message	The core message is present, but not yet dominant enough	The script says the key point in the introduction but the next few slides soften the message with too much general explanation	Make the APAC Enterprise bottleneck the controlling idea from the beginning
Structure	The structure is coherent but too report-like	The audience has to wait until Slide 7 to hear the most important imbalance	Use a decision-led structure: Overall improvement → Hidden concentration → APAC Enterprise bottleneck → Causes → Business risk → Recommendation → Next step
Opening	The opening is polite and clear, but spends too much time on general setup	The strongest line is the actual conclusion, which should be the opening thesis	Lead with direct thesis: 'Support performance has improved, but the remaining problem is concentrated in APAC Enterprise'
Flow / transitions	The draft uses repeated slide-closing summaries: 'So the conclusion...'	After several slides it becomes predictable and heavy	Replace with question-led transitions that move the logic forward
Support / proof	The script has good proof with specific metrics	The most persuasive proof (APAC Enterprise disproportion) appears late	Use data in clearer hierarchy: Progress proof → Remaining pressure proof → Bottleneck proof → Cause proof
Business model / GTM	The business impact section is logical but general	The retention-risk claim needs concrete support	Add one example: one account risk, one internal escalation

			pattern, or one blocking workflow
Language	The language is understandable, but many sentences sound translated or overqualified	Softening language like 'I think,' 'maybe,' 'probably' makes speaker sound less certain	Keep appropriate caution around causality, but remove unnecessary uncertainty around recommendations
Closing / ask	The closing summarizes accurately but doesn't fully convert into a clear management ask	It needs a sharper action	End with: Summary + decision ask with owner, timeline, and expected output

High-leverage improvements

- **Lead with the decision — Problem observed:** The recommendation comes late and softly. **Recommended change:** Put the recommended action in the opening and repeat it in the close. **Why it matters:** Management needs to know what decision the presentation supports.
- **Move the APAC imbalance earlier — Problem observed:** The strongest proof appears too late. **Recommended change:** Introduce the 33% backlog / 11% volume / 39% SLA miss imbalance immediately after the overall metrics. **Why it matters:** This is the fact that makes the presentation worth management attention.
- **Reduce background — Problem observed:** Slides 1–3 spend too much time orienting the audience before the central issue. **Recommended change:** Combine background and purpose into one short setup. **Why it matters:** The audience likely does not need a long explanation of how support works. They need the operational implication.
- **Replace repeated slide conclusions with stronger transitions — Problem observed:** “So the conclusion...” becomes repetitive. **Recommended change:** Use forward-moving transitions. **Why it matters:** Good transitions make the argument feel inevitable, not merely organized.
- **Strengthen the business consequence — Problem observed:** The business impact section is logical but general. **Recommended change:** Add one concrete example, if available: one enterprise account delay, one escalation pattern, one type of blocking workflow. **Why it matters:** The retention-risk claim becomes more credible when attached to a visible case.

- **Remove apologetic language — Problem observed:** The speaker weakens useful recommendations by calling them “not very exciting” and “probably practical.”
Recommended change: Present the recommendations as targeted, evidence-based, and operationally realistic. **Why it matters:** Practical does not mean weak. In this talk, practical is the point.
- **Tighten spoken English — Problem observed:** Some language sounds like written translation rather than natural speech. **Recommended change:** Shorten sentences, use active verbs, and replace unnatural phrases. **Why it matters:** Clearer language will make the speaker sound more credible and confident.

Presentation Sections

Section	Current job	What is weak/unclear	Recommended fix	Priority
Opening	Introduces topic and thesis	Good thesis, but too much setup before it	Start with the thesis and recommendation	P0
Problem / cost	Lists speed, backlog, escalation, communication	Good overview, but broad	Use as setup for why APAC is the focus	P1
Current options	Shows overall performance	Strong data, but implication could be sharper	Frame as 'improved but not normalized'	P1
Solution	Identifies main bottleneck	Best slide, arrives late	Move earlier / make central	P0
Traction	Explains customer and business risk	Useful but needs one concrete example	Add account/workflow/escalation example	P1
Customer learning	Gives recommendations	Good, but too tentative	Turn into formal recommendation	P0
Business model / GTM	Explains support environment	Useful but longer than needed	Compress into 2-3 sentences	P1
Competition / roadmap	Explains why review is happening	Some repetition with intro/background	Combine with background	P1
Ask / close	Summarizes accurately	Needs stronger ask	End with decision, owner, timing	P0

Section	Current job	What is weak/unclear	Recommended fix	Priority
Routing change	Explains trend improvement	Good caution on correlation	Keep, but shorten	P2

Revision Plan

P0 fixes before the next draft: Rewrite the opening around the core recommendation. Move the APAC Enterprise bottleneck earlier. Add a clear decision ask in the closing. P1 improvements after structure is stable: Combine background and purpose. Replace repeated 'So the conclusion...' lines with real transitions. Remove softening language that weakens the recommendation. Strengthen the business impact section with one concrete example. P2 polish: Tighten unnatural spoken English. Shorten long sentences. Read aloud and cut any sentence that takes too much breath.

Recommended next step

Best next step: rewrite pass. This script does not need a total rebuild. The argument is already there. The next move is to restructure the first half, sharpen the recommendation, and clean the language for spoken delivery. Do this next: Rewrite Slide 1 using the direct thesis opening. Move Slide 7's APAC Enterprise imbalance immediately after the overall metrics. Combine Slides 2 and 3. Turn Slide 9 into a formal recommendation slide. Rewrite the close as a decision ask, not a summary.

Best next step: rewrite pass. This script does not need a total rebuild. The argument is already there. The next move is to restructure the first half, sharpen the recommendation, and clean the language for spoken delivery. Do this next: Rewrite Slide 1 using the direct thesis opening. Move Slide 7's APAC Enterprise imbalance immediately after the overall metrics. Combine Slides 2 and 3. Turn Slide 9 into a formal recommendation slide. Rewrite the close as a decision ask, not a summary.