Vendor Landscape: Collaboration Platforms

Stop! Collaborate and listen… to the rapidly changing collaboration marketplace!
Effective employee-to-employee collaboration is critical for knowledge-intensive organizations. Social tools, mobile access, and the rise of social workflow management are rapidly disrupting the collaboration market. Pick a vendor that best aligns with the needs of your teams!

This Research Is Designed For:

✓ IT leaders who need to understand the feature sets and major players in the fast-moving collaboration market landscape.

✓ IT managers involved in shortlisting, evaluating and selecting a full-featured platform for enterprise collaboration.

✓ Business unit managers who want to understand the capabilities of modern collaboration platforms and how they can enable superior team performance.

This Research Will Help You:

✓ Understand what’s new in the enterprise collaboration market, and how the ongoing convergence of traditional feature sets with social capabilities is enabling a new generation of collaboration solutions.

✓ Evaluate collaboration platform vendors and products for your enterprise needs.

✓ Determine which products are most appropriate for particular use cases and scenarios.
Executive Summary

Info-Tech evaluated eleven competitors in the collaboration market, including the following notable performers:

Champions:
• **SAP StreamWork**, a pioneer in the area of social workflow management – StreamWork is a robust solution focused on “getting work done” via the activity stream metaphor and social ideation tools.
• **Cisco WebEx Social**, for the second year running, Cisco places in the Champion quadrant with its rebranding of Quad. The platform provides an even blend of content, real-time and social collaboration features, all backed by Cisco’s strong vendor credentials.

Value Award:
• **Acquia**, based on the highly flexible Drupal open-source framework, Acquia allows companies to get up and running quickly with a variety of collaboration tools.

Trend Setter Award:
• **Citrix Podio**: an innovative solution that offers a wide breadth of social features, including workflow management.

---

**Info-Tech Insight**

**Social collaboration is here to stay, and it’s being beefed up by social workflow management.**

The activity stream is now the dominant way to consume information in most collaboration platforms. Forward-thinking vendors are incorporating tools for social workflow management into their products that are laser-focused on helping employees assign tasks, brainstorm, and complete deliverables.

**Collaboration platforms are now a hub for “getting work done”**.

Collaboration vendors are rapidly integrating their solutions with broader enterprise application portfolios. Many solutions allow application-generated content to appear in activity streams alongside user updates.

**SharePoint isn’t the only option for content management.**

The rise of cloud file sharing solutions like Box and Dropbox is disrupting SharePoint’s stranglehold on content management.
# Market Overview

## How it got here

- The enterprise collaboration market emerged from the need to provide employees with more effective ways to collaborate than with phone and e-mail. While e-mail is fine for quick messages between employees, it is an inefficient medium for carrying out medium to long-term project-based work.

- Collaboration vendors initially focused on developing better ways to collaborate around documents. Early platforms provided employees with tools for managing document workflows through versioning and library services. Microsoft SharePoint was an early favorite for document-centric collaboration.

- The ‘social revolution’ has now impacted the business world. As social collaboration becomes increasingly familiar, enterprise collaboration platforms have added or acquired social tools for their solutions. Further refinement of social tools and addition of real-time capabilities have made many platforms juggernauts.

## Where it’s going

- The integration of both social collaboration and file sharing tools into one common platform is the direction in which vendors are currently moving. Real-time collaboration, such as video conferencing and screen sharing, are becoming common methods for facilitating collaboration on projects.

- Social workflow management is an emerging feature set that we expect will quickly come to dominate the landscape. An outgrowth of the activity stream, social workflow management combines user and application generated content into a seamless experience focused on task and project-specific methods for “getting work done”. “Social for social’s sake” is about to disappear.

- Talent management and social collaboration platforms are complimentary systems, but have not yet been integrated into one solution. Social performance management and gamification will be added to existing platforms at a rapid pace in the coming years.

---

**Info-Tech Insight**

The collaboration landscape is rapidly evolving, and companies must continually evaluate currently deployed solutions against the innovative products being served up by major vendors in this space. If you don’t keep up on the tools, IT will be steamrolled by consumerization! The rise of social workflow management, application-generated content, gamification, and cloud file sharing is offering companies a variety of new options.
Collaboration Vendor selection / knock-out criteria: market share, mind share, and platform coverage

- Collaboration platforms are now introducing the ability to access and contribute to content via mobile devices for workforces on the go. Forward-thinking vendors are going for full-blown social workflow management. For this Vendor Landscape, Info-Tech focused on those vendors that offer broad capabilities across multiple platforms and that have a strong market presence and/or reputational presence among mid-large sized enterprises.

### Included in this Vendor Landscape:

- **Cisco WebEx Social (formerly Quad).** A highly interoperable solution with well-balanced features.
- **Citrix Podio.** With the acquisition of Podio in April 2012, Citrix has grown their offering of social collaboration tools.
- **Acquia (Drupal).** A commercial, open source company; Acquia provides an affordable option for social collaboration.
- **eXo Platform 3.5.** Headquartered in France, eXo is growing globally and provides a Java-based platform.
- **IBM Social Business.** A strong vendor with enterprise-level products, IBM has focused on the collaboration space.
- **Microsoft SharePoint 2010.** SharePoint is a commonly used solution for document collaboration; the recent acquisition of Yammer makes it a vendor to watch.
- **OpenText Social Communities.** With roots in ECM, OpenText provides a strong platform pairing social collaboration and content management.
- **Salesforce.com Chatter.** While best known for its CRM solution, Salesforce.com Chatter is focused on connecting people, improving processes, and building communities through social collaboration.
- **SAP StreamWork.** SAP provides a great solution for workflow management.
- **Socialtext.** Focused on the collaboration space, Socialtext provides an effective solution with many deployment options.
- **TIBCO tibbr.** Launched in January 2011, tibbr has strong emphasis on application-generated activity streams.
# Collaboration platform criteria & weighting factors

## The Table Stakes

### Product Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>The solution provides basic and advanced feature/functionality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td>The solution’s dashboard and reporting tools are intuitive and easy to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>The three year TCO of the solution is economical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>The delivery method of the solution aligns with what is expected within the space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vendor Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viability</td>
<td>Vendor is profitable, knowledgeable, and will be around for the long-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Vendor is committed to the space and has a future product and portfolio roadmap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Vendor offers global coverage and is able to sell and provide post-sales support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>Vendor channel strategy is appropriate and the channels themselves are strong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Criteria Weighting:

### Product

- **Features**: 50% (15% each for Usability, Affordability, Architecture)
- **Vendor**: 50% (30% for Viability, 30% for Strategy, 15% for Reach, 30% for Channel)

### Vendor

- **Viability**: 25%
- **Strategy**: 30%
- **Channel**: 15%
- **Reach**: 30%
The Zones of the Landscape

**Champions** receive high scores for most evaluation criteria and offer excellent value. They have a strong market presence and are usually the trend setters for the industry.

**Market Pillars** are established players with very strong vendor credentials, but with more average product scores.

**Innovators** have demonstrated innovative product strengths that act as their competitive advantage in appealing to niche segments of the market.

**Emerging Players** are newer vendors who are starting to gain a foothold in the marketplace. They balance product and vendor attributes, though score lower relative to market Champions.

For an explanation of how the Info-Tech Vendor Landscape is created, see Information Presentation – Vendor Landscape in the Appendix.
Balance individual strengths to find the best fit for your enterprise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Usability</th>
<th>Afford.</th>
<th>Arch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Exemplary" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Good" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Good" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrix</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Good" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquia (Drupal)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eXo</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM *</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenText</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesforce.com</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialtext</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIBCO</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Viability</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Channel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenText</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesforce.com</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inadequate" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- ![Exemplary](image) = Exemplary
- ![Good](image) = Good
- ![Adequate](image) = Adequate
- ![Inadequate](image) = Inadequate
- ![Poor](image) = Poor

For an explanation of how the Info-Tech Harvey Balls are calculated, see Information Presentation – Criteria Scores (Harvey Balls) in the Appendix.

* vendor declined to provide pricing and publically available pricing could not be found.
**What is a Value Score?**

The Value Score indexes each vendor’s product offering and business strength relative to their price point. It does not indicate vendor ranking.

Vendors that score high offer more bang-for-the-buck (e.g. features, usability, stability, etc.) than the average vendor, while the inverse is true for those that score lower.

Price-conscious enterprises may wish to give the Value Score more consideration than those who are more focused on specific vendor/product attributes.

For an explanation of how Price is determined, see Information Presentation – Price Evaluation in the Appendix.

For an explanation of how the Info-Tech Value Index is calculated, see Information Presentation – Value Index in the Appendix.
Table Stakes represent the minimum standard; without these, a product doesn’t even get reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>What it is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic real-time collaboration</td>
<td>Presence and the ability to collaborate through text-based chat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion forums</td>
<td>Threaded discussions are present in the platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee profiles</td>
<td>Basic employee profiles are present in the platform and can be populated with standard fields.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Does This Mean?

The products assessed in this Vendor Landscape™ meet, at the very least, the requirements outlined as Table Stakes. Many of the vendors go above and beyond the outlined Table Stakes, some even do so in multiple categories. This section aims to highlight the products’ capabilities in excess of the criteria listed here.

Info-Tech Insight

If Table Stakes are all you need from your collaboration platform, the only true differentiator for the organization is price. Otherwise, dig deeper to find the best price to value for your needs.
Advanced Features are the capabilities that allow for granular market differentiation

**Scoring Methodology**
Info-Tech scored each vendor’s features offering as a summation of their individual scores across the listed advanced features. Vendors were given 1 point for each feature the product inherently provided. Some categories were scored on a more granular scale with vendors receiving half points.

**Advanced Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>What we looked for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Management</strong></td>
<td>Content repositories with library management capabilities (i.e. versioning, check-in/check out).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Information Management</strong></td>
<td>Email and calendar integration, including ‘email to platform’ abilities and contact list integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real-time collaboration</strong></td>
<td>Ability to collaborate in real-time via audio and video. Ability to web conference or whiteboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community collaboration</strong></td>
<td>Ability to create and moderate team groups/micro-sites and collaborate using various methods (i.e. blogs, wikis, polls, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge repositories</strong></td>
<td>Wiki-like repositories, with editing, authorship, and moderation workflows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee profiles</strong></td>
<td>Employees share searchable information about themselves and have ability to follow others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity streams</strong></td>
<td>Feeds that include user-generated content, system generated content, and rich content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For an explanation of how Advanced Features are determined, see Information Presentation – Feature Ranks (Stop Lights) in the Appendix.
Advanced Features are the capabilities that allow for granular market differentiation (continued)

**Scoring Methodology**
Info-Tech scored each vendor’s features offering as a summation of their individual scores across the listed advanced features. Vendors were given 1 point for each feature the product inherently provided. Some categories were scored on a more granular scale with vendors receiving half points.

For an explanation of how Advanced Features are determined, see Information Presentation – Feature Ranks (Stop Lights) in the Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>What we looked for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-blogging</td>
<td>User generated micro-blogs or status updates that support rich content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social tagging</td>
<td>Tagging of content based on user generated and defined taxonomies. Includes sharable tags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workflow management</td>
<td>Social-driven project management. Includes task management, assignment, and ideation tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile capabilities</td>
<td>Includes HTML5 apps, native apps for smartphones/tablets, and geolocation abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and analytics</td>
<td>Ability for managers to drill down into portal and content activity, such as trends and influencers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform search capabilities</td>
<td>Search capabilities across profiles, communities, activity streams and tags.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each vendor offers a different feature set; concentrate on what your organization needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluated Features</th>
<th>Content Mgmt</th>
<th>PIM</th>
<th>Real-time</th>
<th>Comm. Collab.</th>
<th>KM</th>
<th>Profiles</th>
<th>Activity streams</th>
<th>Micro-blogs</th>
<th>Social tagging</th>
<th>Workflow</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquia (Drupal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eXo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenText</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesforce.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialtext</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIBCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- = Feature fully present
- = Feature partially present/pending
- = Feature unsatisfactory

For an explanation of how Advanced Features are determined, see [Information Presentation – Feature Ranks (Stop Lights)] in the Appendix.
StreamWork gives teams the tools to get work done with strong workflow management tools

**Champion**

- **Product:** SAP StreamWork
- **Employees:** 55,000+
- **Headquarters:** Walldorf, Germany
- **Website:** sapstreamwork.com
- **Founded:** 1972
- **Presence:** NYSE: SAP

**Overview**

- SAP is an enterprise application software vendor that has been in the ERP and CRM markets for decades.
- New to Info-Tech’s evaluation, StreamWork is a strong player in the social workflow management space.

**Strengths**

- StreamWork provides robust social workflow management tools with very strong project management capabilities.
- The product integrates well with other software (e.g. SharePoint, Evernote, Box, WebEx and Google Docs).
- It has a comprehensive list of out-of-the-box tools to customize pages (e.g. pro/con tables, maps, and polls).
- Developers can use the APIs to build even more integration with enterprise systems.
- Built in analytics tools are solid. The tools are very focused on delivering data-driven decisions.

**Challenges**

- Other than basic IM, there is little real-time communication functionality, which makes this less ideal as a stand-alone solution. If your company needs live audio/video, StreamWork will have to be paired with another solution like WebEx.
- StreamWork is one of SAP’s “best kept secrets” – the marketing footprint of the product is currently small.

**3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 8, between $250,000 and $500,000**

Pricing provided by vendor
SAP StreamWork shines on workflow management, but also offers a strong feature set across the board

**Vendor Landscape**

- **Leading Product**
  - Innovator
  - Champion
- **Emerging Player**
  - Market Pillar
  - Trailing Product

**Value Index**

83

3rd out of 11

**Product**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vendor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Via.</th>
<th>Strat.</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Chan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What we’re hearing**

"SAP StreamWork has helped us collaborate internally as well as with our customers."

Oliver Fielitz, Key Account Manager, All for One Midmarket AG
(source: sap.com)

"Apart from marrying systems of record and engagement, SAP StreamWork also marries collaborative workspaces and social networks. Think about it as a Wiki meets Facebook and Twitter. So, your workspace for a particular activity functions as a feed, where you can like, comment or message fellow members."

Rakesh Sharma, Editor, GetApp.com

**Value Index**

83

3rd out of 11

**Features**

- Content mgmt
- PIM
- Real-time
- Communication
- Repositories
- Profiles
- Activity streams
- Micro-blogs
- Social tags
- Workflow mgmt
- Mobile
- Reports
- Search

**Info-Tech Recommends:**

StreamWork’s social workflow management tools are the most robust of all vendors reviewed. The firm is a clear first-mover in pairing social tools with project management capabilities, and demonstrated an in-depth understanding of collaboration strategy that’s reflected in their product roadmap.
Cisco offers a best-of-breed collaboration platform with an attractive and easy-to-use interface

**Champion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product:</th>
<th>Cisco WebEx Social 3.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>63,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters:</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website:</td>
<td>cisco.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founded:</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence:</td>
<td>NASDAQ: CSCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview**

- Cisco WebEx Social was formerly Cisco Quad.
- Cisco takes a people-centric approach to collaboration, rather than document-centric. A single document can be distributed to multiple community groups and individuals at the same time.

**Strengths**

- Cisco WebEx Social offers robust employee profile pages, complete with the ability to search by expertise.
- The solution supports a wide variety of mobile devices, and includes HTML5 access and dedicated apps.
- Social tagging can take place on content and on employees, making it easier to locate the content or employees being sought after.
- Cisco’s unified post sharing model allows users to create and share a single instance of content across individuals and communities.

**Challenges**

- Social workflow management is not an inherent aspect of this collaboration platform; task management capabilities are presently lacking.
- Cisco is also an up-market vendor that is middle-of-the-road on price. This can be a limiting factor for SMBs looking for collaboration solutions.

---

3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 8, between $250,000 and $500,000

Pricing provided by vendor

---

$1M+
Cisco WebEx Social provides excellent tagging and search capabilities, but lacks in terms of workflow management.

**Vendor Landscape**

**Value Index**

58

5th out of 11

**Product**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vendor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Via.</th>
<th>Strat.</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Chan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What we’re hearing**

“The collaborative communities in Cisco WebEx Social let us warehouse our intellectual capital and encourage lawyers to share their know-how with colleagues. Doing things more efficiently provides better value for our clients.”

Peter Westerveld, CIO, Minter Ellison

“WebEx Social enables us to further expand our business model and the breadth of advanced services we offer clients looking for social business solutions. Improved customization capabilities benefit our clients and enable us as a partner to better integrate WebEx Social within our immersive Collaboration Portfolio offering.”

Simon Daykin, CTO, Logicalis

(Source: newsroom.cisco.com)

**Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content mgmt</th>
<th>PIM</th>
<th>Real-time</th>
<th>Commun. collab</th>
<th>Repositories</th>
<th>Profiles</th>
<th>Activity streams</th>
<th>Micro-blogs</th>
<th>Social tags</th>
<th>Workflow mgmt</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Info-Tech Recommends:**

Cisco is a solid solution for collaboration as it nails the majority of the advanced features evaluated. This collaboration platform is best suited for large organizations with distributed offices or for existing Cisco shops that seek a complimentary solution to Cisco’s unified communications portfolio, particularly WebEx for web conferencing.
IBM has increased investment in social technology and offers a solid solution for collaboration in the workplace

**Market Pillar**

- **Product:** IBM Social Business
- **Employees:** 433,362
- **Headquarters:** Armonk, NY
- **Website:** ibm.com
- **Founded:** 1911
- **Presence:** NYSE: IBM

**Overview**

- IBM Social Business includes IBM Connections (social tools), Lotus Quickr (content management), and Sametime (real-time communication).
- IBM has a strong strategy and focus for social technology.

**Strengths**

- IBM Connections has a modular approach. Organizations can decide which modules are most appropriate for their needs and deploy them accordingly. The modules automatically recognize each other, allowing work to travel across the components.
- This solution not only makes recommendations on items that users should focus on, but also supplies the reasoning behind the recommendations.
- New ideas that are built in the platform have a graduation option, turning the idea into a project to be worked on.
- Robust integration option for TemboSocial in order to enable social performance recognition within Connections.

**Challenges**

- IBM Connections does not provide a pre-defined taxonomy for tagging content.
- IBM is focused on providing an enterprise-level solution, small to mid-market organizations that are not already locked in with IBM may not achieve as much value from this offering.

The vendor declined to provide pricing, and publicly available pricing could not be found.

[$1 to $1M+](#)
IBM’s investment in social software has produced a solution that covers an extensive feature range. Mid-to-large enterprises, looking to cover all major collaboration areas, can realize most of their goals by going with the Social Business suite.
SharePoint 2010 remains a heavyweight best suited for back-end content management rather than social collaboration

**Market Pillar**

- **Product:** SharePoint 2010
- **Employees:** ~90,000
- **Headquarters:** Redmond, WA
- **Website:** [sharepoint.microsoft.com](http://sharepoint.microsoft.com)
- **Founded:** 1975
- **Presence:** NASDAQ: MSFT

**Overview**

- Microsoft SharePoint commands an impressive market share for content management: close to 80%. However, the product is weaker than most of its competitors in the social arena and must be paired with Lync for real-time communication.

**Strengths**

- SharePoint 2010 remains best-of-breed on the content management side – its library services functionality make it a strong choice for organizations primarily concerned with ECM.
- Seamless integration with other Microsoft solutions (notably Office 2010) makes it a natural fit for Microsoft shops.
- The platform is extensible through third-party applications.
- Deployment options include on-premise and SaaS (Office 365).

**Challenges**

- SharePoint Foundations is free, but most organizations will find they require the paid solution (SharePoint Server).
- The solution is dated in many critical areas: first-party mobile offerings are non-existent, social collaboration features are mediocre at best, and many firms are going for “lightweight” alternatives like Box and Dropbox.
- Native functionality may not satisfy certain organizations (e.g. those needing advanced social features).

**3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 8, between $250,000 and $500,000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pricing solicited from public sources
SharePoint 2010 is showing its age across a number of critical feature categories

**Vendor Landscape**

**Value Index**

58

5th out of 11

**Product**

**Vendor**

**What we’re hearing**

“SharePoint is a very broad tool that is quickly deployable for base needs.”
Dean Conners, Director of Information Technologies, Tubular Steel, Inc.

“SharePoint is not easy to setup and end users have a really tough time navigating it and learning to get the most value out of it. It’s tough to structure it intuitively, and requires a clear vision from the get-go.”
Lynnae Ruberg, Application Support Analyst

**Features**

**Info-Tech Recommends:**

SharePoint 2010 is best suited for back-end content archival and storage of templates and policies. Although it can be extended with solutions like Newsgator, native social and mobile functionality just doesn’t stand up to the competition. However, organizations should evaluate 2013 when released, as Info-Tech expects Microsoft to remedy a number of SharePoint’s more glaring current deficits.
Salesforce.com Chatter is great for making the workplace more social, especially for those in the SFDC ecosystem

**Market Pillar**

- **Product:** Chatter
- **Employees:** 4,750
- **Headquarters:** San Francisco, CA
- **Website:** [salesforce.com](http://salesforce.com)
- **Founded:** 1999
- **Presence:** NYSE: CRM

3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 9, between $500,000 and $1,000,000

**Overview**

- **Overview**
  - Launched in 2011, Salesforce.com Chatter offers additional functionality by providing user-friendly social tools on an interactive UI.
  - Chatter's platform integrates with a number of popular content repository solutions and other collaboration suites.

**Strengths**

- **Strengths**
  - Chatter offers the ability to add external partners and clients into enterprise groups, making it attractive for partner and customer collaboration.
  - Chatter's mobile app capabilities are quite strong.
  - Activity feed algorithm is based on interests and expertise, not just on what groups employees are a part of, enabling employees to connect to people and ideas.
  - Integrates with other collaboration tools, such as SharePoint.
  - Chatter is an excellent add-on to existing content-focused collaboration platforms.

**Challenges**

- **Challenges**
  - Chatter's built-in content management capabilities are very basic, so organizations must pair it with another collaboration platform, or a cloud storage service.
  - No structural knowledge repositories, such as wikis.
  - Other than IM, there are no embedded real-time communication systems (audio/video); however, this expected to happen sometime within 2012 or 2013.
Leverage Chatter as a lightweight and user-friendly solution in your existing Salesforce.com CRM or CSM environment

**Vendor Landscape**

- **Vendor**
  - Innovator
  - Champion
  - Emerging Player
  - Market Pillar

**Value Index**

- **12**
- 7th out of 11

**Product**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Use.</th>
<th>Afford.</th>
<th>Arch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vendor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Via.</th>
<th>Strat.</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Chan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What we’re hearing**

- “We replaced internal email blasts with announcements on Chatter.”
  - Nikon
  - (source: www.chatter.com)

- “What’s been most amazing about Chatter is how it leverages a secure platform with a trusted sharing model to enable continuous collaboration within the enterprise.”
  - Mitch Varhula, marketing consultant, Farmers Insurance
  - (source: www.salesforce.com)

**Features**

- Content mgmt
- PIM
- Real-time
- Communication
- Repositories
- Profiles
- Activity streams
- Microblogs
- Social tags
- Workflow mgmt
- Mobile
- Reports
- Search

**Info-Tech Recommends:**

Chatter’s user-friendly UI makes it an easy solution for employees familiar with commercial social media. The ability to define collaboration in an employee, partner, or customer context makes Chatter particularly useful for organizations interested in these use cases.
Socialtext’s strong feature set and range of deployment options provide maximum flexibility for SMBs

**Innovator**

- **Product:** Socialtext
- **Employees:** ~50
- **Headquarters:** Palo Alto, CA
- **Website:** socialtext.com
- **Founded:** 2002
- **Presence:** Private

**Overview**

- Socialtext was one of the first companies to bring Web 2.0 functionality to the enterprise through social tools.
- Strong best-of-breed option for organizations with specific internal social networking needs.

**Strengths**

- Deep social collaboration feature set – including social tagging, activity feeds, and advanced expertise search – make it easy for knowledge workers to network with one another.
- Integration with SharePoint 2007/2010 allows activity within SharePoint to automatically show up in activity feeds, and adds social options to this experience.
- Most diverse deployment options offered of all products evaluated (e.g. private cloud, public cloud, on-premise, out-of-the-box appliance).

**Challenges**

- Weak content management features compared to competing vendors – organizations that need library services are advised to look elsewhere (or to use Socialtext to complement existing content management systems, like SharePoint).
- Real-time collaboration features are primarily achieved through integrations rather than done natively.

3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 7, between $100,000 and $250,000

Pricing provided by vendor
Socialtext’s strong features and attractive price point make it perfect for SMBs needing to boost social collaboration

Vendor Landscape

Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vendor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Via.</th>
<th>Strat.</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Chan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we’re hearing

“One thing we liked about Socialtext is the learning curve is short, and anyone can do it. Socialtext helps us distribute knowledge faster. With Signals especially, people know what’s going on and good ideas get acted on fast. It helps us build our business faster because it’s now easier to work together.”

Dave Bell, Vice President, Consumer Marketing, Meredith Corporation

“People understand each other more, and they know what others are doing. This lets us respond more quickly to new opportunities.”

Tim EbySLPR General Manager, St. Louis Public Radio

(source: socialtext.com, case studies)

Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content mgmt</th>
<th>PIM</th>
<th>Real-time</th>
<th>Commun. collab</th>
<th>Repositories</th>
<th>Profiles</th>
<th>Activity streams</th>
<th>Micro-blogs</th>
<th>Social tags</th>
<th>Workflow mgmt</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90

2nd out of 11

Info-Tech Recommends:

Socialtext excels on most features, although Info-Tech was disappointed to see the company had not done more with social workflow management. Nevertheless, its good feature set, inexpensive price tag, and unparalleled range of deployment options make it worthy of consideration for pretty much any small to medium business.
OpenText has best-of-breed community management features with strong ECM integration

**Innovator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>OpenText Social Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>4410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters</td>
<td>Waterloo, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>opentext.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>NASDAQ: OTEX; TSX: OTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview**

- OpenText has been a long-time player in the Enterprise Content Management (ECM) and collaboration markets.
- Its Social Communities offers traditional and social tools, with a solid focus on the latter.

**Strengths**

- OpenText’s community management features are some of the best we’ve seen – team sites are very well developed.
- Social Workplace plays well with OpenText’s ECM offerings.
- OpenText has a strong analytics solution that allows users to view real-time usage rates within the context of the page.
- Content management is well supported by this solution. Versioning controls and access controls are present, and it has the ability to integrate with SharePoint 2007 and 2010.

**Challenges**

- In terms of real-time collaboration, OpenText only provides chat and presence. However, this solution is capable of integrating with other third-party vendors for additional real-time capabilities.
- OpenText Social Workplace does not have a solution for task management or social workflow management.

**3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 7, between $100,000 and $250,000**

- Pricing provided by vendor
Social Communities plays to OpenText’s content management strengths while adding a healthy dash of social

Organizations that want strong content management features with good back-end integration should look at OpenText, particularly if they also want social capabilities. The product was also one of the more attractively priced solutions that Info-Tech saw, making it a good fit for SMBs.

"OpenText made it possible to earn points and badges by sharing information, contributing to discussions, completing assignments, passing tests, or closing deals for their OpenText Pulse product. The results were more than promising."

Peep Laja, Marketing Architect, Markitekt
(Source: blog.kissmetrics.com)
Citrix’s acquisition of Podio has put them on the map in the collaboration platform market space

### Innovator

| Product: | Citrix Podio |
| Employees: | ~7000 |
| Headquarters: | Fort Lauderdale, FL |
| Website: | citrix.com |
| Founded: | 1989 |
| Presence: | NASDAQ: CTXS |

### Overview

- Citrix acquired Podio in April 2012. Podio was founded in 2009 and is a platform that enables social collaboration and workflow management.

### Strengths

- Every application has an email address, allowing users to email content into and out of the platform.
- Citrix Podio offers a simple interface for creating new apps or modifying existing apps. Any app that is created in Podio can be added to the Podio home screen for iPhone.
- In terms of workflow management, Podio provides task lists and notifications. It automatically removes files viewed in your inbox to prevent email overload.
- Podio has recently launched an iPad app, which includes access to many of Podio’s core features and apps.

### Challenges

- Currently, Podio does not integrate with SharePoint.
- Citrix Podio does not support full-text searching of documents and expertise search is not readily available. Instead it searches the metadata and content created on Podio around documents.
- Podio’s solution for real-time communication, GoToMeeting, must be licensed separately.

### 3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 8, between $250,000 and $500,000

- Pricing provided by vendor
Podio is a strong solution for workflow and project management; real-time features must be licensed separately.

Vendor Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovator</th>
<th>Champion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Vendor</td>
<td>Leading Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Player</td>
<td>Market Pillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailing Vendor</td>
<td>Trailing Product</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟥</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vendor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Via.</th>
<th>Strat.</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Chan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value Index

74

4th out of 11

What we’re hearing

“From the increased transparency made possible by Podio, we found Podio really improved our client relationships. Clients can now be involved in the work as it happens – they can follow it and contribute, so they feel more engaged and satisfied.”

Rikke Ulk, Founder and Chief Anthropologist, Antroplogerne.com
(source: Antroplogerne.com)

“I would really like to see Podio handle tickets so that we can ditch [our ticketing system] and use only Podio.”

Anonymous

Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content mgmt</th>
<th>PIM</th>
<th>Real-time</th>
<th>Commun.</th>
<th>Repositories</th>
<th>Profiles</th>
<th>Activity streams</th>
<th>Micro-blogs</th>
<th>Social tags</th>
<th>Workflow mgmt</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟥</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Info-Tech Recommends:

Citrix Podio is a solution that encourages people to work the way they want to work, with an extensive app store and the ability to custom create apps for workspaces. This cloud-based platform is a solid solution for highly mobile organizations. Real-time is elsewhere in the Citrix portfolio at additional cost.
TIBCO tibbr delivers high quality social tools, with a good emphasis on social workflow and ideation

**Emerging Player**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>TIBCO tibbr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>~2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>tibbr.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>NASDAQ: TIBX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview**

- Launched in January 2011, tibbr by TIBCO offers a variety of real-time, community, and social collaboration tools.
- tibbr also has integration with many popular enterprise apps, and can be deployed on the Cloud or on-premise.

**Strengths**

- tibbr offers deep support for app-generated content in activity feeds, enabling full contextual collaboration.
- Deep, pre-configured business and app integrations for SAP, Salesforce.com, Oracle, and Microsoft SharePoint.
- tibbr provides access to consumer social media apps and can invite partners and customers to join groups securely.
- Native mobile apps for all major phones, as well as a magazine style app for iPads. The desktop app is also very user-friendly.
- “Subjects” function offers an organized taxonomy of community groups and teams. Also has a useful corporate hierarchy tool.

**Challenges**

- Real-time capabilities must be licensed separately with Tibcast.
- Knowledge repositories are lacking, and search capabilities do not currently support full-text document search.

3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 8, between $250,000 and $500,000

Pricing provided by vendor
tibbr’s emphasis on app-generated content makes it a natural fit for those needing “in the flow” support.

Michael Neubarth, Founder & Director, eMatrix Media Communications
(source: www.comparz.com)

“tibbr’s big selling points are its enterprise application integration and customization capabilities. tibbr enables users to follow topics and “event streams” through a dashboard that draws data from different data sources – including CRM, ERP, RSS, and social media systems, such as Facebook and Twitter.”

Info-Tech Recommends:

The more enterprise apps that can be integrated into tibbr’s activity stream and workflow capabilities, the more value you will see from the platform. This makes it a good fit for larger companies that want to leverage app-generated content, such as that from middleware, and make their collaboration solution’s “one stop shops” for in-the-flow, contextual collaboration.
Drupal Commons by Acquia is a highly flexible solution that receives Info-Tech’s award for best overall value

**Emerging Player**

- **Product:** Drupal Commons
- **Employees:** 200+
- **Headquarters:** Burlington, MA
- **Website:** [drupal.org](http://drupal.org)
- **Founded:** 1999
- **Presence:** Private

**Overview**

- Drupal Commons provides an open source alternative to creating team (and customer!) collaboration portals.
- Acquia, a commercial open source software company, supports Drupal by providing products, services, and tech support.

**Strengths**

- Drupal Commons provides a pre-configured collaboration platform out-of-the-box, which is immediately ready for use or can be further customized with the 16,000 extensions available.
- The ability to collaborate within groups is a strong feature of this product. Granular permission controls are available and admin has the ability to create open or closed groups.
- Comments posted to the site can be voted up or down and are ranked accordingly, allowing the most popular or relevant comment to appear first.

**Challenges**

- Email integration with the platform is currently unavailable, this is expected to be an upcoming feature in their version 3 release.
- The ability to do real-time collaboration (i.e. presence, live chat, live audio, live video, etc.) requires integration with a third-party solution.
- The activity stream and micro-blogging features do not natively support the sharing of rich content.

---

3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 7, between $100,000 and $250,000

Pricing provided by vendor

---

Info-Tech Research Group
Drupal Commons offers commonly used features out-of-the-box, but many advanced features must be added-on with extensions.

**Vendor Landscape**

**Product**
- Overall
- Features
- Usage
- Affordability
- Architecture

**Vendor**
- Overall
- Value
- Strategy
- Reach
- Channel

**Value Index**

**100**
1st out of 11

**What we’re hearing**

> Integration with other systems can be facilitated through mature modules like the "feeds" and the "services" modules. And there is a large and very professional community of Drupal companies and developers, so you'll always be able to find great support.

Robin van Emden, Co-initiator, Stichting Platform57
(source: LinkedIn)

> Some modules on which Commons depends, exist for Drupal 6, but no stable version is available for Drupal 7.

Anonymous

**Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Content mgmt</th>
<th>PIM</th>
<th>Real-time</th>
<th>Commun. collab</th>
<th>Repositories</th>
<th>Profiles</th>
<th>Activity streams</th>
<th>Micro-blogs</th>
<th>Social tags</th>
<th>Workflow mgmt</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Info-Tech Recommends:**

Drupal Commons, being commercially-supported open source, boasts a lower TCO than many other proprietary solutions. This makes it an affordable option for small-mid market enterprises or organizations with budget constraints. The highly extensible platform will also appeal to organizations that desire high degrees of platform customization.
eXo is a rapidly growing vendor for enterprise collaboration

**Overview**
- eXo offers a cloud-ready portal and uses a service-based architecture to provide modern collaboration features.
- eXo began as an open-source Java-based project and was the first Java portlet container in the industry.

**Strengths**
- eXo includes a gadget directory that enables easy access to a variety of useful tools (e.g. calculator, currency converter, translator, etc.); gadgets can also be used to track memory or analytics.
- eXo’s solution integrates with Outlook for personal information management via email and calendar.

**Challenges**
- While eXo’s on-premise solution offers live chat and instant messaging functionality, eXo’s cloud deployment solution does not provide any real-time collaboration capabilities.
- eXo does not provide an administratively defined taxonomy for the tagging of content.
- Reporting engine is also limited, as are search capabilities.
- eXo is also one of the more expensive solutions that Info-Tech evaluated.

**Emerging Player**
- **Product:** eXo Platform 3.5
- **Employees:** 180+
- **Headquarters:** Paris, France
- **Website:** exoplatform.com
- **Founded:** 2003
- **Presence:** Private

3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 9, between $500,000 and $1,000,000

Pricing solicited from public sources
eXo provides a solid solution for content management, but is lacking in terms of real-time, social tags and search.

**Value Index**

10
8th out of 11

**Info-Tech Recommends:**

eXo is an enterprise level solution for government, financial services, and insurance verticals. It offers a flexible platform that can support intranets and customer-facing extranets, and is a leading option for Java-based organizations. However, certain feature deficiencies, and a steep price make it a less attractive option for the mid-market.
Identify leading candidates with the **Collaboration Platform Vendor Shortlist Tool**

The Info-Tech **Collaboration Platform Vendor Shortlist Tool** is designed to generate a customized shortlist of vendors based on *your* key priorities.

**This tool offers the ability to modify:**

- Overall Vendor vs. Product Weightings
- Individual product criteria weightings:
  - Features
  - Usability
  - Affordability
  - Architecture
- Individual vendor criteria weightings:
  - Viability
  - Strategy
  - Reach
  - Channel
Today’s workforces are highly mobile: select vendors that give your employees tools for on-the-go collaboration!

These vendors enable mobile collaboration by pairing strong mobile application capabilities with solid real-time and social features.

1. **Mobile Workforce Support**

2. **Exemplary Performers**
   - Cisco
   - IBM
   - TIBCO

3. **Viable Performers**
   - Podio
   - Socialtext
   - SAP

**Why Scenarios?**

In reviewing the products included in each Vendor Landscape™, certain use-cases come to the forefront. Whether those use-cases are defined by applicability in certain locations, relevance for certain industries, or as strengths in delivering a specific capability, Info-Tech recognizes those use-cases as Scenarios, and calls attention to them where they exist.

For an explanation of how Scenarios are determined, see Information Presentation – Scenarios in the Appendix.
Social workflow management is a rapidly evolving space: pick these solutions if you need teams to work *in-the-flow*

Social-driven project management capabilities are a new direction for this market. These products pair overall social strength with workflow management.

**Exemplary Performers**

- SAP
- PODIO
- TIBCO

**Viable Performers**

- IBM
- eXo
- salesforce

**Why Scenarios?**

In reviewing the products included in each Vendor Landscape™, certain use-cases come to the forefront. Whether those use-cases are defined by applicability in certain locations, relevance for certain industries, or as strengths in delivering a specific capability, Info-Tech recognizes those use-cases as Scenarios, and calls attention to them where they exist.

For an explanation of how Scenarios are determined, see *Information Presentation – Scenarios* in the Appendix.
If you have an extensive application ecosystem requiring collaboration integration, take a look at these solutions:

Seamless integration with other business systems and apps that publish into the activity feed make it easier to access and engage with your information.

Why Scenarios?

In reviewing the products included in each Vendor Landscape™, certain use-cases come to the forefront. Whether those use-cases are defined by applicability in certain locations, relevance for certain industries, or as strengths in delivering a specific capability, Info-Tech recognizes those use-cases as Scenarios, and calls attention to them where they exist.

Exemplary Performers

Exemplary Performers

Viable Performers

For an explanation of how Scenarios are determined, see Information Presentation – Scenarios in the Appendix.
Alternative solutions in this space that were not evaluated: HyperOffice, Yammer

HyperOffice
- Product: HyperOffice Collaboration Suite
- Employees: ~50
- Headquarters: Rockville, Maryland
- Website: hyperoffice.com
- Founded: 1998
- Presence: Private

Details regarding exclusion:
- HyperOffice provides decent support for personal information management and employee intranets, but was not evaluated due to systemic deficits in key areas across social tool capabilities and real-time collaboration.
- The solution is becoming dated and is lacking core capabilities – during evaluation, HyperOffice had yet to release a public version of any social collaboration tools.
- If your firm only needs basic PIM, HyperOffice may warrant a look.

Yammer
- Product: Yammer
- Employees: ~400
- Headquarters: San Francisco
- Website: yammer.com
- Founded: 2008
- Presence: NASDAQ: MSFT

Details regarding exclusion:
- Yammer was not evaluated in this vendor landscape due to its recent acquisition by Microsoft.
- Microsoft’s strategy for Yammer is unknown at this point, so Info-Tech cannot recommend this product.
- In the intermediate term, Info-Tech expects Yammer to be positioned as the user interface of choice for SharePoint and Lync. Microsoft desperately needs a more social UI, and the Yammer acquisition can help secure this. Expect to see Yammer integrated with post-2013 SharePoint.
Use these tools and templates to assist your vendor selection process

**Collaboration Platform RFP Template**

- Use this request for proposal (RFP) template to create a formal invitation for collaboration platform vendors to submit a proposal, meeting your collaboration requirements.

**Collaboration Platform RFP Scoring Tool**

- Enterprises considering a collaboration solution need to comparatively score potential solutions. A key component of any evaluation is an RFP.
- This tool enables enterprises to evaluate and compare the results of an RFP process quickly and easily.

**Collaboration Platform Vendor Demo Script Template**

- Use this script to standardize demonstrations and simplify the process of selecting a collaboration platform to ensure you get all of the needed information from vendors in order to make the best selection for your organization.
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Vendor Landscape Methodology: Overview

Info-Tech’s Vendor Landscapes are research materials that review a particular IT market space, evaluating the strengths and abilities of both the products available in that space, as well as the vendors of those products. These materials are created by a team of dedicated analysts operating under the direction of a senior subject matter expert over a period of six weeks.

Evaluations weigh selected vendors and their products (collectively “solutions”) on the following eight criteria to determine overall standing:

- **Features:** The presence of advanced and market-differentiating capabilities.
- **Usability:** The intuitiveness, power, and integrated nature of administrative consoles and client software components.
- **Affordability:** The three-year total cost of ownership of the solution.
- **Architecture:** The degree of integration with the vendor’s other tools, flexibility of deployment, and breadth of platform applicability.
- **Viability:** The stability of the company as measured by its history in the market, the size of its client base, and its financial performance.
- **Strategy:** The commitment to both the market-space, as well as to the various sized clients (small, mid-sized, and enterprise clients).
- **Reach:** The ability of the vendor to support its products on a global scale.
- **Channel:** The measure of the size of the vendor’s channel partner program, as well as any channel strengthening strategies.

Evaluated solutions are plotted on a standard two by two matrix:

- **Champions:** Both the product and the vendor receive scores that are above the average score for the evaluated group.
- **Innovators:** The product receives a score that is above the average score for the evaluated group, but the vendor receives a score that is below the average score for the evaluated group.
- **Market Pillars:** The product receives a score that is below the average score for the evaluated group, but the vendor receives a score that is above the average score for the evaluated group.
- **Emerging Players:** Both the product and the vendor receive scores that are below the average score for the evaluated group.

Info-Tech’s Vendor Landscapes are researched and produced according to a strictly adhered to process that includes the following steps:

- Vendor/product selection
- Information gathering
- Vendor/product scoring
- Information presentation
- Fact checking
- Publication

This document outlines how each of these steps is conducted.
Vendor Landscape Methodology:
Vendor/Product Selection & Information Gathering

Info-Tech works closely with its client base to solicit guidance in terms of understanding the vendors with whom clients wish to work and the products that they wish evaluated; this demand pool forms the basis of the vendor selection process for Vendor Landscapes. Balancing this demand, Info-Tech also relies upon the deep subject matter expertise and market awareness of its Senior and Lead Research Analysts to ensure that appropriate solutions are included in the evaluation. As an aspect of that expertise and awareness, Info-Tech’s analysts may, at their discretion, determine the specific capabilities that are required of the products under evaluation, and include in the Vendor Landscape only those solutions that meet all specified requirements.

Information on vendors and products is gathered in a number of ways via a number of channels.

Initially, a request package is submitted to vendors to solicit information on a broad range of topics. The request package includes:
• A detailed survey.
• A pricing scenario (see Vendor Landscape Methodology: Price Evaluation and Pricing Scenario, below).
• A request for reference clients.
• A request for a briefing and, where applicable, guided product demonstration.

These request packages are distributed approximately twelve weeks prior to the initiation of the actual research project to allow vendors ample time to consolidate the required information and schedule appropriate resources.

During the course of the research project, briefings and demonstrations are scheduled (generally for one hour each session, though more time is scheduled as required) to allow the analyst team to discuss the information provided in the survey, validate vendor claims, and gain direct exposure to the evaluated products. Additionally, an end-user survey is circulated to Info-Tech’s client base and vendor-supplied reference accounts are interviewed to solicit their feedback on their experiences with the evaluated solutions and with the vendors of those solutions.

These materials are supplemented by a thorough review of all product briefs, technical manuals, and publicly available marketing materials about the product, as well as about the vendor itself.

Refusal by a vendor to supply completed surveys or submit to participation in briefings and demonstrations does not eliminate a vendor from inclusion in the evaluation. Where analyst and client input has determined that a vendor belongs in a particular evaluation, it will be evaluated as best as possible based on publicly available materials only. As these materials are not as comprehensive as a survey, briefing, and demonstration, the possibility exists that the evaluation may not be as thorough or accurate. Since Info-Tech includes vendors regardless of vendor participation, it is always in the vendor’s best interest to participate fully.

All information is recorded and catalogued, as required, to facilitate scoring and for future reference.
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Scoring

Once all information has been gathered and evaluated for all vendors and products, the analyst team moves to scoring. All scoring is performed at the same time so as to ensure as much consistency as possible. Each criterion is scored on a ten point scale, though the manner of scoring for criteria differs slightly:

- Features is scored via **Cumulative Scoring**
- Affordability is scored via **Scalar Scoring**
- All other criteria are scored via **Base5 Scoring**

In Cumulative Scoring, a single point is assigned to each evaluated feature that is regarded as being fully present, a half point to each feature that is partially present or pending in an upcoming release, and zero points to features that are deemed to be absent. The assigned points are summed and normalized to a value out of ten. For example, if a particular Vendor Landscape evaluates eight specific features in the Feature Criteria, the summed score out of eight for each evaluated product would be multiplied by 1.25 to yield a value out of ten.

In Scalar Scoring, a score of ten is assigned to the lowest cost solution, and a score of one is assigned to the highest cost solution. All other solutions are assigned a mathematically determined score based on their proximity to / distance from these two endpoints. For example, in an evaluation of three solutions, where the middle cost solution is closer to the low end of the pricing scale it will receive a higher score, and where it is closer to the high end of the pricing scale it will receive a lower score; depending on proximity to the high or low price it is entirely possible that it could receive either ten points (if it is very close to the lowest price) or one point (if it is very close to the highest price). Where pricing cannot be determined (vendor does not supply price and public sources do not exist), a score of 0 is automatically assigned.

In Base5 scoring a number of sub-criteria are specified for each criterion (for example, Longevity, Market Presence, and Financials are sub-criteria of the Viability criterion), and each one is scored on the following scale:

- 5 - The product/vendor is exemplary in this area (nothing could be done to improve the status).
- 4 - The product/vendor is good in this area (small changes could be made that would move things to the next level).
- 3 - The product/vendor is adequate in this area (small changes would make it good, more significant changes required to be exemplary).
- 2 - The product/vendor is poor in this area (this is a notable weakness and significant work is required).
- 1 - The product/vendor is terrible/fails in this area (this is a glaring oversight and a serious impediment to adoption).

The assigned points are summed and normalized to a value out of ten as explained in Cumulative Scoring above.

Scores out of ten, known as Raw scores, are transposed as-is into Info-Tech's Vendor Landscape Shortlist Tool, which automatically determines Vendor Landscape positioning (see Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation - Vendor Landscape, below), Criteria Score (see Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation - Criteria Score, below), and Value Index (see Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation - Value Index, below).
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation – Vendor Landscape

Info-Tech’s Vendor Landscape is a two-by-two matrix that plots solutions based on the combination of Product score and Vendor score. Placement is not determined by absolute score, but instead by relative score. Relative scores are used to ensure a consistent view of information and to minimize dispersion in nascent markets, while enhancing dispersion in commodity markets to allow for quick visual analysis by clients.

Relative scores are calculated as follows:

1. Raw scores are transposed into the Info-Tech Vendor Landscape Shortlist Tool (for information on how Raw scores are determined, see Vendor Landscape Methodology: Scoring, above).
2. Each individual criterion Raw score is multiplied by the pre-assigned weighting factor for the Vendor Landscape in question. Weighting factors are determined prior to the evaluation process to eliminate any possibility of bias. Weighting factors are expressed as a percentage such that the sum of the weighting factors for the Vendor criteria (Viability, Strategy, Reach, Channel) is 100% and the sum of the Product criteria (Features, Usability, Affordability, Architecture) is 100%.
3. A sum-product of the weighted Vendor criteria scores and of the weighted Product criteria scores is calculated to yield an overall Vendor score and an overall Product score.
4. Overall Vendor scores are then normalized to a 20 point scale by calculating the arithmetic mean and standard deviation of the pool of Vendor scores. Vendors for whom their overall Vendor score is higher than the arithmetic mean will receive a normalized Vendor score of 11-20 (exact value determined by how much higher than the arithmetic mean their overall Vendor score is), while vendors for whom their overall Vendor score is lower than the arithmetic mean will receive a normalized Vendor score of between one and ten (exact value determined by how much lower than the arithmetic mean their overall Vendor score is).
5. Overall Product score is normalized to a 20 point scale according to the same process.
6. Normalized scores are plotted on the matrix, with Vendor score being used as the x-axis, and Product score being used as the y-axis.
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation – Criteria Scores (Harvey Balls)

Info-Tech’s Criteria Scores are visual representations of the absolute score assigned to each individual criterion, as well as of the calculated overall Vendor and Product scores. The visual representation used is Harvey Balls.

Harvey Balls are calculated as follows:

1. Raw scores are transposed into the Info-Tech Vendor Landscape Shortlist Tool (for information on how Raw scores are determined, see Vendor Landscape Methodology: Scoring, above).
2. Each individual criterion Raw score is multiplied by a pre-assigned weighting factor for the Vendor Landscape in question. Weighting factors are determined prior to the evaluation process, based on the expertise of the Senior or Lead Research Analyst, to eliminate any possibility of bias. Weighting factors are expressed as a percentage, such that the sum of the weighting factors for the Vendor criteria (Viability, Strategy, Reach, Channel) is 100%, and the sum of the Product criteria (Features, Usability, Affordability, Architecture) is 100%.
3. A sum-product of the weighted Vendor criteria scores and of the weighted Product criteria scores is calculated to yield an overall Vendor score and an overall Product score.
4. Both overall Vendor score / overall Product score, as well as individual criterion Raw scores are converted from a scale of one to ten to Harvey Ball scores on a scale of zero to four, where exceptional performance results in a score of four and poor performance results in a score of zero.
5. Harvey Ball scores are converted to Harvey Balls as follows:
   - A score of four becomes a full Harvey Ball.
   - A score of three becomes a three-quarter full Harvey Ball.
   - A score of two becomes a half full Harvey Ball.
   - A score of one becomes a one-quarter full Harvey Ball.
   - A score of zero (zero) becomes an empty Harvey Ball.
6. Harvey Balls are plotted by solution in a chart where rows represent individual solutions and columns represent overall Vendor / overall Product, as well as individual criteria. Solutions are ordered in the chart alphabetically by vendor name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Via.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Harvey Balls represent individual Raw scores.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Harvey Balls represent weighted aggregates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation – Feature Ranks (Stop Lights)

Info-Tech’s Feature Ranks are visual representations of the presence/availability of individual features that collectively comprise the Features’ criterion. The visual representation used is Stop Lights.

Stop Lights are determined as follows:

1. Scores over 0.7 (out of 1.0) are regarded as being fully present, a score of 0.5 to 0.6 indicates a feature is partially present or pending in an upcoming release, and scores at 0.4 or lower are deemed to be absent.
   - Fully present means all aspects and capabilities of the feature as described are in evidence.
   - Fully absent means inadequate aspects and capabilities of the feature as described are in evidence.
   - Partially present means some, but not all, aspects and capabilities of the feature as described are in evidence, OR all aspects and capabilities of the feature as described are in evidence, but only for some models in a line.
   - Pending means all aspects and capabilities of the feature, as described, are anticipated to be in evidence in a future revision of the product and that revision is to be released within the next 12 months.

2. Feature scores are converted to Stop Lights as follows:
   - 0.7 to 1.0 points become a Green light.
   - 0.5-0.6 become a Yellow light.
   - 0.0 to 0.4 points become a Red light.

3. Stop Lights are plotted by solution in a chart where rows represent individual solutions and columns represent individual features. Solutions are ordered in the chart alphabetically by vendor name.

For example, a set of applications is being reviewed and a feature of “Integration with Mobile Devices” that is defined as “availability of dedicated mobile device applications for iOS, Android, and BlackBerry devices” is specified. Solution A provides such apps for all listed platforms and scores “Green”, solution B provides apps for iOS and Android only and scores “Yellow”, while solution C provides mobile device functionality through browser extensions, has no dedicated apps, and so scores “Red”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature 1</td>
<td>Feature 2</td>
<td>Feature 3</td>
<td>Feature 4</td>
<td>Feature 5</td>
<td>Feature 6</td>
<td>Feature 7</td>
<td>Feature 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green means a feature is fully present; Red, fully absent. Yellow shows partial availability (such as in some models in a line).
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation – Value Index

Info-Tech’s Value Index is an indexed ranking of solution value per dollar as determined by the Raw scores assigned to each criteria (for information on how Raw scores are determined, see Vendor Landscape Methodology: Scoring, above).

Value scores are calculated as follows:

1. The Affordability criterion is removed from the overall Product score and the remaining Product score criteria (Features, Usability, Architecture) are reweighted so as to retain the same weightings relative to one another, while still summing to 100%. For example, if all four Product criteria were assigned base weightings of 25%, for the determination of the Value score, Features, Usability, and Architecture would be reweighted to 33.3% each to retain the same relative weightings while still summing to 100%.

2. A sum-product of the weighted Vendor criteria scores and of the reweighted Product criteria scores is calculated to yield an overall Vendor score and a reweighted overall Product score.

3. The overall Vendor score and the reweighted overall Product score are then summed, and this sum is multiplied by the Affordability Raw score to yield an interim Value score for each solution.

4. All interim Value scores are then indexed to the highest performing solution by dividing each interim Value score by the highest interim Value score. This results in a Value score of 100 for the top solution and an indexed Value score relative to the 100 for each alternate solution.

5. Solutions are plotted according to Value score, with the highest score plotted first, and all remaining scores plotted in descending numerical order.

Where pricing is not provided by the vendor and public sources of information cannot be found, an Affordability Raw score of zero is assigned. Since multiplication by zero results in a product of zero, those solutions for which pricing cannot be determined receive a Value score of zero. Since Info-Tech assigns a score of zero where pricing is not available, it is always in the vendor’s best interest to provide accurate and up to date pricing.
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation – Price Evaluation

Info-Tech’s Price Evaluation is a tiered representation of the three year Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) of a proposed solution. Info-Tech uses this method of communicating pricing information to provide high-level budgetary guidance to its end-user clients while respecting the privacy of the vendors with whom it works. The solution TCO is calculated and then represented as belonging to one of ten pricing tiers.

Pricing tiers are as follows:

1. Between $1 and $2,500
2. Between $2,500 and $5,000
3. Between $5,000 and $10,000
4. Between $10,000 and $25,000
5. Between $25,000 and $50,000
6. Between $50,000 and $100,000
7. Between $100,000 and $250,000
8. Between $250,000 and $500,000
9. Between $500,000 and $1,000,000
10. Greater than $1,000,000

Where pricing is not provided, Info-Tech makes use of publicly available sources of information to determine a price. As these sources are not official price lists, the possibility exists that they may be inaccurate or outdated, and so the source of the pricing information is provided. Since Info-Tech publishes pricing information regardless of vendor participation, it is always in the vendor’s best interest to supply accurate and up to date information.

Info-Tech’s Price Evaluations are based on pre-defined pricing scenarios (see Product Pricing Scenario, below) to ensure a comparison that is as close as possible between evaluated solutions. Pricing scenarios describe a sample business and solicit guidance as to the appropriate product/service mix required to deliver the specified functionality, the list price for those tools/services, as well as three full years of maintenance and support.
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation – Scenarios

Info-Tech’s Scenarios highlight specific use cases for the evaluated solution to provide as complete (when taken in conjunction with the individual written review, Vendor Landscape, Criteria Scores, Feature Ranks, and Value Index) a basis for comparison by end-user clients as possible.

Scenarios are designed to reflect tiered capability in a particular set of circumstances. Determination of the Scenarios in question is at the discretion of the analyst team assigned to the research project. Where possible, Scenarios are designed to be mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive, or at the very least, hierarchical such that the tiers within the Scenario represent a progressively greater or broader capability.

Scenario ranking is determined as follows:

1. The analyst team determines an appropriate use case.
   For example:
   • Clients that have multinational presence and require vendors to provide four hour onsite support.

2. The analyst team establishes the various tiers of capability.
   For example:
   • Presence in Americas
   • Presence in EMEA
   • Presence in APAC

3. The analyst team reviews all evaluated solutions and determines which ones meet which tiers of capability.
   For example:
   • Presence in Americas – Vendor A, Vendor C, Vendor E
   • Presence in EMEA – Vendor A, Vendor B, Vendor C
   • Presence in APAC – Vendor B, Vendor D, Vendor E

4. Solutions are plotted on a grid alphabetically by vendor by tier. Where one vendor is deemed to be stronger in a tier than other vendors in the same tier, they may be plotted non-alphabetically.
   For example:
   • Vendor C is able to provide four hour onsite support to 12 countries in EMEA while Vendors A and B are only able to provide four hour onsite support to eight countries in EMEA; Vendor C would be plotted first, followed by Vendor A, then Vendor B.
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation – Vendor Awards

At the conclusion of all analyses, Info-Tech presents awards to exceptional solutions in three distinct categories. Award presentation is discretionary; not all awards are extended subsequent to each Vendor landscape and it is entirely possible, though unlikely, that no awards may be presented.

Awards categories are as follows:

- **Champion Awards** are presented to those solutions, and only those solutions, that land in the Champion zone of the Info-Tech Vendor Landscape (see Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation - Vendor Landscape, above). If no solutions land in the Champion zone, no Champion Awards are presented. Similarly, if multiple solutions land in the Champion zone, multiple Champion Awards are presented.

- **Trend Setter Awards** are presented to those solutions, and only those solutions, that are deemed to include the most original/inventive product/service, or the most original/inventive feature/capability of a product/service. If no solution is deemed to be markedly or sufficiently original/inventive, either as a product/service on the whole or by feature/capability specifically, no Trend Setter Award is presented. Only one Trend Setter Award is available for each Vendor Landscape.

- **Best Overall Value Awards** are presented to those solutions, and only those solutions, that are ranked highest on the Info-Tech Value Index (see Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation – Value Index, above). If insufficient pricing information is made available for the evaluated solutions, such that a Value Index cannot be calculated, no Best Overall Value Award will be presented. Only one Best Overall Value Award is available for each Vendor Landscape.
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Fact Check & Publication

Info-Tech takes the factual accuracy of its Vendor Landscapes, and indeed of all of its published content, very seriously. To ensure the utmost accuracy in its Vendor Landscapes, we invite all vendors of evaluated solutions (whether the vendor elected to provide a survey and/or participate in a briefing or not) to participate in a process of Fact Check.

Once the research project is complete and the materials are deemed to be in a publication ready state, excerpts of the material specific to each vendor’s solution are provided to the vendor. Info-Tech only provides material specific to the individual vendor’s solution for review encompassing the following:

- All written review materials of the vendor and the vendor’s product that comprise the evaluated solution.
- Info-Tech’s Criteria Scores / Harvey Balls detailing the individual and overall Vendor / Product scores assigned.
- Info-Tech’s Feature Rank / Stop Lights detailing the individual feature scores of the evaluated product.
- Info-Tech’s Value Index ranking for the evaluated solution.
- Info-Tech’s Scenario ranking for all considered scenarios for the evaluated solution.

Info-Tech does not provide the following:

- Info-Tech’s Vendor Landscape placement of the evaluated solution.
- Info-Tech’s Value Score for the evaluated solution.
- End-user feedback gathered during the research project.
- Info-Tech’s overall recommendation in regard to the evaluated solution.

Info-Tech provides a one-week window for each vendor to provide written feedback. Feedback must be corroborated (be provided with supporting evidence), and where it does, feedback that addresses factual errors or omissions is adopted fully, while feedback that addresses opinions is taken under consideration. The assigned analyst team makes all appropriate edits and supplies an edited copy of the materials to the vendor within one week for final review.

Should a vendor still have concerns or objections at that time, they are invited to a conversation, initially via email, but as required and deemed appropriate by Info-Tech, subsequently via telephone, to ensure common understanding of the concerns. Where concerns relate to ongoing factual errors or omissions they are corrected under the supervision of Info-Tech’s Vendor Relations personnel. Where concerns relate to ongoing differences of opinion they are again taken under consideration with neither explicit not implicit indication of adoption.

Publication of materials is scheduled to occur within the six weeks immediately following the completion of the research project, but does not occur until the Fact Check process has come to conclusion, and under no circumstances are “pre-publication” copies of any materials made available to any client.
Product Pricing Scenario

The corporate office breakdown is as follows:

- **Enterprise Name**: Nai-Chen Incorporated
- **Enterprise Size**: Mid-Sized
- **Enterprise Vertical**: Financial Services – Diversified
- **Total Number of Sites**: Three office locations, ten branches
- **Total Number of Employees**: 1800
- **Total Number Collaboration Platform End-Users**: 1000
- **Total Number of IT Staff**: 60
- **Operating System Environment**: Windows XP; transition to Windows 7 underway
- **Office Productivity Suite Environment**: Office 2007 Enterprise Edition

Functional Requirements and Additional Information:

Nai-Chen Incorporated is a provider of diversified financial services (insurance, banking) across the Mid-West United States. The organization is currently looking to adopt a new collaboration platform to facilitate better communication between employee teams and sites. There are 1800 employees with the firm, but only 1000 of these are knowledge workers who will require access to the platform (the rest are process workers). The company is predominantly looking for a platform that will allow better collaboration around documents than e-mail – so content management is a must-have. Additionally, the organization would like to deploy a portal for social collaboration, with features such as employee profiles and activity feeds. Management is also interested in real-time collaboration features, though this is not a pre-requisite for vendor selection.

Vendors provided 3-year Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) including list prices for software and licensing fees to meet the requirements of the above scenario.