

About INPUT

INPUT provides planning information, analysis, and recommendations for the information technology industries. Through market research, technology forecasting, and competitive analysis, INPUT supports client management in making informed decisions.

Subscription services, proprietary research/consulting, merger/acquisition assistance, and multiclient studies are provided to users and vendors of information systems and services. INPUT specializes in the software and services industry which includes software products, systems operations, processing services, network services, systems integration, professional services, turnkey systems, and customer services. Particular areas of expertise include CASE analysis, information systems planning, and outsourcing.

Many of INPUT's professional staff members have more than 20 years' experience in their areas of specialization. Most have held senior management positions in operations, marketing, or planning. This expertise enables INPUT to supply practical solutions to complex business problems.

Formed as a privately held corporation in 1974, INPUT has become a leading international research and consulting firm. Clients include more than 100 of the world's largest and most technically advanced companies.

North America

San Francisco 1280 Villa Street Mountain View, CA 94041-1194 Tel. (415) 961-3300 Fax (415) 961-3966

New York Atrium at Glenpointe 400 Frank W. Burr Blvd. Teaneck, NJ 07666 Tel. (201) 801-0050 Fax (201) 801-0441

Washington, D.C. INPUT, INC. 1953 Gallows Road, Suite 560 Vienna, VA 22182 Tel. (703) 847-6870 Fax (703) 847-6872

International

INPUT OFFICES

London INPUT LTD. Piccadilly House 33/37 Regent Street London SW1Y 4NF, England Tel. (071) 493-9335 Fax (071) 629-0179

Paris INPUT SARL 24, avenue du Recteur Poincaré 75016 Paris, France Tel. (33-1) 46 47 65 65 Fax (33-1) 46 47 69 50

Frankfurt INPUT LTD. Sudetenstrasse 9 D-6306 Langgöns-Niederkleen, Germany Tel. (0) 6447-7229 Fax (0) 6447-7327

Tokyo INPUT KK Saida Building, 4-6 Kanda Sakuma-cho, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 101, Japan Tel. (03) 3864-0531 Fax (03) 3864-4114 NOVEMBER 1991

U.S. MIDRANGE SYSTEMS USER REQUIREMENTS

1991





1280 Villa Street, Mountain View, California 94041-1194

Published by INPUT 1280 Villa Street Mountain View, CA 94041-1194 U.S.A.

Customer Service Program (CSP)

U.S. Midrange Systems User Requirements, 1991

Copyright ©1991 by INPUT. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a data base or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

FCNEW-2 • 414 • 1991

Table of Contents

Ι	Introduction	I-1
	A. Scope	I-1
	B. Methodology	I-2
	C. Interpretation of Data	I-4
	D. Data Presented	I-5
П	Midrange Systems Summary	II-1
Π	Vendor Performance Data	III-1
	A. Data General	III-1
	B. DEC	III-13
	C. Hewlett-Packard 3000	III-25
	D. IBM 937X	III-37
	E. IBM AS/400	· III-49
IV	Summary Charts	IV-1
Appendix	A. Questionnaire	A-1

i

INPUT

Exhibits

I -1 -2	User Sample by Vendor User Sample by Industry Sector	I-1 I-2
II -1	Contract Coverage—Midrange Systems	II-2
-2	Service Vendor Selection Criteria—Midrange Systems	II-3
-3	Hardware Maintenance Provider—Midrange Systems	II-4
-4	Reasons IMO Not Used—Midrange Systems	II-5
-4A	Reasons for IMO Use—Midrange Systems	II-6
-5	Maintenance Contract Terms—Midrange Systems	II-7
-6	System Availability Performance Analysis—Midrange Systems	II-7
-7	System Failure Rates—Midrange Systems	II-8
-8	Hardware Service Required versus Received—Midrange Systems	II-8
-9	Software Maintenance Provider—Midrange Systems	II-9
-10	System Software Maintenance Contract Terms—Midrange Systems	: II-9
-11	System Software Problem Resolution—Midrange Systems	II-10
-12	System Software Support Required versus Received— Midrange Systems	II-11
-13	Ancillary Services—Midrange Systems	II-12
-14	Multivendor Services—Midrange Systems	II-13
-15	Discounts—Midrange Systems	II-13
III -A-1	Contract Coverage—Data General	III-2
-A-2	Service Vendor Selection Criteria—Data General	III-3
-A-3	Hardware Maintenance Provider—Data General	III-4
-A-4	Reasons IMO Not Used—Data General	III-5
-A-5	Maintenance Contract Terms—Data General	III-6
-A-6	System Availability Performance Analysis— Data General	III-6
-A-7	System Failure Rates—Data General	III-7
-A-8	Hardware Service Required versus Received— Data General	III-7

Exhibits (Continued)

Ш

-A-9	Software Maintenance Provider—Data General	III-8
-A-10	Data General	111-8
-A-11	System Software Problem Resolution—Data General	Ш-9
-A-12	System Software Support Required versus Received—	III-10
	Data General	
-A-13	Ancillary Services—Data General	III-11
-A-14	Multivendor Services—Data General	III-12
-A-15	Discounts—Data General	III-12
-B-1	Contract Coverage—DEC	III-14
-B-2	Service Vendor Selection Criteria—DEC	III-15
-B-3	Hardware Maintenance Provider—DEC	III-16
-B-4	Reasons IMO Not Used—DEC	III-17
-B-5	Maintenance Contract Terms—DEC	III-18
-B-6	System Availability Performance Analysis—DEC	III-18
-B-7	System Failure Rates—DEC	III-19
-B-8	Hardware Service Required versus Received—DEC	III-19
-B-9	Software Maintenance Provider—DEC	III-20
-B-10	System Software Maintenance Contract Terms—DEC	III-20
-B-11	System Software Problem Resolution—DEC	III-21
-B-12	System Software Support Required versus Received— DEC	III-22
-B-13	Ancillary Services—DEC	III-23
-B-14	Multivendor Services—DEC	III-24
-B-15	Discounts—DEC	III-24
-C-1	Contract Coverage—HP 3000	III-26
-C-2	Service Vendor Selection Criteria—HP 3000	III-27
-C-3	Hardware Maintenance Provider—HP 3000	III-28
-C-4	Reasons IMO Not Used—HP 3000	III-29
-C-5	Maintenance Contract Terms—HP 3000	III-30
-C-6	System Availability Performance Analysis—HP 3000	III-30
-C-7	System Failure Rates—HP 3000	III-31
-C-8	Hardware Service Required versus Received— HP 3000	III-31
-C-9	Software Maintenance Provider—HP 3000	III-32
-C-10	System Software Maintenance Contract Terms— HP 3000	III-32
-C-11	System Software Problem Resolution—HP 3000	III-33
-C-12	System Software Support Required versus Received—	III-34
	HP 3000	

Exhibits (Continued)

Ш

-C-13	Ancillary Services—HP 3000	III-35
-C-14	Multivendor Services—HP 3000	III-36
-C-15	Discounts—HP 3000	III-36
-D-1	Contract Coverage—IBM 937X	III-38
-D-2	Service Vendor Selection Criteria—IBM 937X	III-39
-D-3	Hardware Maintenance Provider—IBM 937X	III-40
-D-4	Reasons IMO Not Used—IBM 937X	III-41
-D-5	Maintenance Contract Terms—IBM 937X	III-42
-D-6	System Availability Performance Analysis—IBM 937X	III-42
-D-7	System Failure Rates—IBM 937X	III-43
-D-8	Hardware Service Required versus Received— IBM 937X	III-43
-D-9	Software Maintenance Provider_IBM 937X	III - 44
-D-10	System Software Maintenance Contract Terms	III-44 III-44
-D-10	IBM 937X	111 77
-D-11	System Software Problem Resolution—IBM 937X	III-45
-D-12	System Software Support Required versus Received—	III-46
	IBM 937X	
-D-13	Ancillary Services—IBM 937X	III-47
-D-14	Multivendor Services—IBM 937X	III-48
-D-15	Discounts—IBM 937X	III-48
-E-1	Contract Coverage—IBM AS/400	III-50
-E-2	Service Vendor Selection Criteria—IBM AS/400	III-51
-E-3	Hardware Maintenance Provider—IBM AS/400	III-52
-E-4	Reasons IMO Not Used—IBM AS/400	III-53
-E-5	Maintenance Contract Terms—IBM AS/400	III-54
-E-6	System Availability Performance Analysis—	III-54
	IBM AS/400	
-E-7	System Failure Rates—IBM AS/400	III-55
-E-8	Hardware Service Required versus Received—	III-55
	IBM AS/400	
-E-9	Software Maintenance Provider—IBM AS/400	III-56
-E-10	System Software Maintenance Contract Terms—	III-56
	IBM AS/400	
-E-11	System Software Problem Resolution—IBM AS/400	III-57
-E-12	System Software Support Required versus Received— IBM AS/400	III-58
-E-13	Ancillary Services—IBM AS/400	III-59
.F.1 4	Multivendor Services—IBM AS/400	III-60
.F.15	Discounts—IBM A S/400	III-60
-1-15		111-00

Exhibits (Continued)

IV

-1	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—System	IV-2
-2	Interruptions Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—System Availability	IV-2
-3	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance-Response Time	IV-3
-4	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—Repair Time	IV-3
-5	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—System Availability Satisfaction	IV-4
-6	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—Response Time Satisfaction	IV-5
-7	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—Repair Time Satisfaction	IV-6
-8	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—Hardware Maintenance Required versus Received	IV-7
-9	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—Hardware Maintenance Satisfaction	IV-8
-10	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—Software Support Required versus Received	IV-9
-11	Midrange Systems Vendor Performance—Software Support Satisfaction	IV-10

V

U.S. MIDE USER RE	Ange System. WIREMENT	> FCNEW2 1991
AUTHOR	//	C.4
TITLE		
DATE LOANED	BORROWE	R'S NAME
	-	
0		
RG		

© 1991 by INPUT. Reproduction Prohibited.



Introduction





Introduction

This report presents midrange system user requirements for and satisfaction with the service and support they receive from their service vendors. The report also analyzes users' requirements for services that are ancillary to the actual maintenance of the computer system.

A Scope

The report examines the service requirements of users of the following midrange systems: Data General, DEC VAX/MicroVAX, Hewlett-Packard 3000, IBM 937X, and IBM AS/400. Exhibit I-1 provides a breakdown of the manufacturers included in the sample.

User Sampl	e by Vendor
Vendor	Completed Interviews
Data General	32
DEC	31
HP 3000	32
IBM 937X	31
IBM AS/400	30
Total Sample	156
Total Sample	156

Each vendor/product analysis includes:

- Service contract coverage, both days per week and hours per day
- · Users' criteria for selecting a service vendor
- Service contract type
- Type of vendor providing service
- Perceptions of independent maintenance organizations, and why they are used or not used
- Traditional areas of system availability, response time, repair time and aspects of hardware service
- System software support areas, type of vendor, type of contract
- Aspects of systems software support
- Response/fix time for software problems
- Opportunities for other ancillary services
- Percent of users receiving multivendor service and the expected level of interest in three years in multivendor service and single point of contact service
- Current use of discounts and willingness of users to investigate discounts not currently received

The report is presented in four chapters. Chapter I provides an introduction to the report, the scope, methodology, interpretation of data, and data presentation. Chapter II is an overview of the midrange systems sample. Chapter III provides individual analyses by product vendor. Wherever possible, comparisons will be made to the information presented in the report U.S. Midrange Systems User Requirements, 1990, or to the sample as a whole. Chapter IV provides comparative exhibits, examining each area by vendor. Appendix A provides the questionnaire used for the user research.

<u>B</u> Methodology

For this report, INPUT surveyed 156 users of midrange systems in the U.S as to their requirement for and satisfaction with the service they receive. Each interview was conducted by telephone or fax using the questionnaire in Appendix A. INPUT targets the appropriate systems executive with responsibility for coordinating the maintenance of the system. Typical

titles include Data Processing Manager, IS Director or Manager, Data Center Manager, or Vice President of IS. The companies interviewed represent a variety of industries, as shown in Exhibit I-2.

EXHIBIT I-2

Industry	Respondents
Manufacturing	38
Distribution	12
Transportation	4
Utilities	5
Banking/Finance	16
Education	18
Insurance	7
Telecommunications	1
Services	22
Medical	12
Federal Government	12
State/Local Government	12
Other	4
Total	163

INPUT emphasizes the value of telephone interviews over other types of research-gathering techniques because of the ability of the interviewer to focus the respondent and control the source of information and the size of the sample. The questionnaire was faxed to many respondents who wished to see the full questionnaire before responding to it. After the data-gathering process was complete, the information was entered into a dBase III Plus (Ashton-Tate) data base and analyzed using ABstat (Anderson Bell). Quality control measures are applied at each step to ensure data integrity.

Interpretation of Data

Mean values are used throughout the tabulated data presented in this report. These means refer to the mean value of user ratings for specific aspects of service performance, or the mean value of a range of service performance required or received by the respondents.

In this report, the ratings for service requirements ranged from 1 to 10, with 1 equal to a very low requirement or satisfaction and 10 being an extremely high requirement or satisfaction. In some cases, 0 was used to denote no requirement for service or a service not received at all from the vendor.

For the purposes of this report, the following definitions apply:

- System availability refers to the time the system is actually available for processing, disregarding non-critical peripheral outages or normal preventive maintenance downtime.
- Response time is the time between the placement of a service call to the vendor and the arrival of the service engineer on site.
- Repair time relates to the time the service engineer spends working on the system until it is fully operational.
- Difference is a comparison of the mean service required with the mean service received. A negative number denotes a shortfall in the service received. A positive number denotes the mean service received exceeding the mean service required.
- Percent satisfied is based on whether the service received met or exceeded service required for each individual respondent. A count is made of how many individuals had their requirements met or exceeded for that particular service requirement; this converts to the percent satisfied.

D Data Presented

For each of the six user sections (Midrange Systems, Data General, DEC VAX/MicroVAX, Hewlett-Packard 3000, IBM 937X, and IBM AS/400) of this report, the following fifteen exhibits will be presented:

Exhibit 1 - *Contract Coverage* presents the days-per-week and hours-perday maintenance coverage as reported by the respondents.

Exhibit 2 - Service Vendor Selection Criteria analyzes the importance of certain criteria in selecting a service vendor.

Exhibit 3 - *Hardware Maintenance Provider* presents the reported sources of service used by the sample to provide required maintenance on their hardware. Multiple sources of hardware maintenance service are allowed.

Exhibit 4 - *Reasons IMO Not Used* present the reasons why users do not use an IMO as part of their maintenance plan for equipment.

NOTE: When applicable, a special Exhibit 4A (*Reasons for IMO Use*) is included to describe issues relating to why users have an independent maintenance organization as part of their maintenance plan.

Exhibit 5 - *Maintenance Contract Terms* provides information on the length of contracts or types of maintenance contracts held by the sample.

Exhibit 6 - System Availability Performance Analysis examines the mean system availability, response time and repair time required by the sample; the system availability, response, and repair times received; and the percent of users having their requirements met or exceeded.

Exhibit 7 - System Failure Rates are presented, giving the mean number of failures per year, and the mean percentages for the approximate causes of the failures.

Exhibit 8 - *Hardware Service Required versus Received* examines six individual aspects and overall hardware maintenance service as to the level of service required, the level received, satisfaction with service and the percent of respondents having their requirements met or exceeded.

Exhibit 9 - Software Maintenance Provider presents the sources used by the sample to provide system software support. Multiple sources are recorded where applicable.

Exhibit 10 - System Software Maintenance Contract Terms presents the types of service contracts held by the respondents to support system software.

Exhibit 11 - System Software Problem Resolution provides information on the resolution of system software problems, on site and over the phone. The exhibit also covers the percent of respondents that had their software support requirements met or exceeded in the issues of response time and fix time on software problems.

Exhibit 12 - System Software Support Required versus Received examines six aspects and overall system software support as to the level of support required by the respondents, the level received, mean satisfaction with system software support and the percent of users having their requirements met or exceeded.

Exhibit 13 - Ancillary Services presents information on the current market for other services ancillary to the maintenance function and the possibility for expansion of these services. Information is presented on the number of respondents currently receiving these services, their mean requirement, mean level received, and the percent of respondents having their requirements met or exceeded.

Exhibit 14 - *Multivendor Services* examines the percent of respondents receiving multivendor services on their CPU, peripherals, and network products. The level of interest in multivendor services in three years and the interest in single-point-of-contact service is also presented.

Exhibit 15 - *Discounts* shows the percent of respondents currently receiving discounts for reduced levels of service or special contractual arrangements and the interest in these discounts by those not receiving them at this time.



Midrange Systems Summary





Midrange Systems Summary

The overall 1991 midrange systems sample consists of 156 users of Data General, DEC, HP 3000, IBM 937X, and IBM AS/400 midrange systems. Data for the user group as a whole is presented with the following key highlights:

- There is a greater percentage of users reporting extended 7 X 24 coverage for their midrange systems than in past years.
- Service quality issues rated higher in mean importance when selecting a service vendor. In the mid- to late-1980s, price and quality of service alternated, with quality remaining the steady issue for the last three years.
- There was a small number of users who used an IMO as part of their service scheme (11 out of 156). The main reasons given by the respondents include lower cost, local service, and a more flexible contract.
- The major reasons given by respondents not using an IMO were satisfaction with the manufacturer and the technological advantage of the manufacturer.
- The mean level of system availability dropped from that of the 1990 midrange sample, with the percent of respondents receiving their required level dropping from 69% to 60%.
- Overall, there appears to be a greater requirement for ancillary services. Except in the area of facilities management, over 55% of the respondents expressed some need for ancillary services. The percent of respondents who actually received some level of ancillary service from their vendors ranged from 28% to 76% of the total sample of midrange users.
- Less than 25% of the midrange users reported receiving any type of multivendor service from their service vendor. Only 9% reported receiving service on other manufacturers' CPUs, with their mean level of interest in receiving these services ranging from 2.3 to 2.8 on a scale of 1 5.

-

	Percent of	of Sample
	1991	1990
Days Covered		
Monday - Friday Monday - Saturday Monday - Sunday	37 3 60	61 5 34
Hours Covered		
1 - 9 10 - 16 17 - 24	29 15 56	53 12 35



Hardware	Maintenand	ce Provider
Mic	drange Syst	ems

Provider	Percent of Mentions	Primary
Manufacturer	94	93
Dealer/Distributor	1	0
Independent Maintenance Organization	8	6
In-House	3	1
Other	2	0
Multiple Responses Allowed.	2	<u></u>





Maintenance Contract Terms Midrange Systems	
Hardware Maintenance	Percent of Respondents
Warranty	3
Five Years	14
Three Years	13
One Year	59
Time and Materials	2
Other	9
None	0

EXHIBIT II-6

System Availability Performance Analysis Midrange Systems

	Mean Required	Mean Received	Percent Satisfied
System Availability (%)	96.5	96.0	60
Response Time (hrs.)	4.4	3.4	90
Repair Time (hrs.)	4.3	3.5	82



EXHIBIT II-8

Hardware	Hardware Service Required versus Received Midrange Systems			
	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied
Spares Availability	8.8	8.4	8.7	64
Engineer Skills	9.1	8.8	8.9	70
Documentation of Maintenance	7.1	7.5	8.1	80
Help Desk Support	7.7	7.6	. 8.1	75
Remote Diagnostics	7.3	7.6	8.2	84
Real-Time Software Diagnostics	7.3	6.9	7.3	69
Overall Hardware Maintenance	9.2	8.8	8.9	66

Note: Scale 1-10, 1 = Lowest, 10 = Highest

Software Maintenance Provider Midrange Systems				
Provider	Percent of Mentions			
Hardware Manufacturer	79			
Other Hardware Service Provider	2			
Software Product Vendor	12			
Value-Added Reseller (VAR)	4			
In-House	34			
Other	7			
L Multiple Responses Allowed.	<u>I</u>	1		

EXHIBIT II-10

System Software Maintenance Contract Terms Midrange Systems

Software Maintenance	Percent of Respondents
Included in License Fee	31
Three-Year	3
One-Year	35
Custom	10
None	8
Don't Know	13

System	Software	Problem	Resolution
-	Midrang	je Systen	IS

Solved by Phone (%) Elapsed Time (hrs.)	80 6.9
Other Problems	
Response Time • Required (mean hrs.) • Received (mean hrs.) • Percent Satisfied	11.6 10.8 86
Fix Time • Required (mean hrs.) • Received (mean hrs.) • Percent Satisfied	8.3 7.1 88

.

System Software Support Required versus Received Midrange Systems

	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied
Engineer Skills	8.9	8.1	8.2	60
Documentation	8.6	7.6	7.8	48
Software Installation	8.2	7.4	8.0	64
Provision of Updates	8.3	7.9	8.1	69
Operational Training	6.8	6.2	7.2	64
Software Remote Support	7.7	7.5	7.9	75
Software Support Overall	8.8	8.1	8.1	57

Note: Scale 1-10, 1 = Lowest, 10 = Highest

...

	Ancillary Services Midrange Systems				
	Number of Mentions Currently Contracted	Mean Level Required	Mean Level Received	Percent Satisfied	Number of Mentions Not Receiving But Required
Configuration Planning	91	6.8	7.1	73	30
Capacity Planning	91	7.0	6.9	62	30
Environmental Planning	71	6.0	6.5	81	25
Cabling	75	6.6	7.0	77	25
Software Evaluation	72	6.6	6.3	63	26
Maintenance-Related Training	68	5.9	5.9	70	25
Install/Deinstall/Move	119	7.5	7.8	79	9
Consulting	92	6.9	6.9	73	13
Network Planning	85	6.7	6.4	60	23
Network Management	70	6.3	6.0	60	23
Disaster Recovery	67	7.0	5.9	58	32
Facilities Management	43	5.5	5.3	79	28
Problem Management	72	6.7	6.5	63	19
Applications Software Support	81	6.9	6.6	52	24

Multivendor Services Midrange Systems					
Service on Other Manufacturers'	Percent Receiving	Interest in Three Years			
CPUs	9	2.3			
Peripherals	23	2.7			
Network Products	14	2.8			
Level of Interest					
Single Point of Contact	3	.6			
Note: Scale 1 - 5, 1 = Lowest, 5 = Highest					

EXHIBIT II-15

Discounts Midrange Systems					
	Percent Receiving	Mean Willingness to Receive			
Multiyear	49	5.5			
Prepayment	38	4.5			
Call Screening/Problem Management	13	4.5			
Deferred Response	13	3.8			

Note: Scale 1 - 10, 1 = Lowest, 10 = Highest

-



Vendor Performance Data




Vendor Performance Data

Chapter III presents the individual vendor/product analyses for Data General, DEC VAX/MicroVAX, HP 3000, IBM 937X, and IBM AS/400 midrange systems.

A Data General

The Data General sample consisted of 32 users of the Data General MV midrange systems. In the analysis of the Data General information, the following points are noteworthy:

- Service issues of quality, technical expertise, spare parts, and system availability rated highest in terms of evaluating service vendors. Price had a higher mean rating for the Data General sample as opposed to other midrange systems, but ranked sixth in selection criteria importance.
- The percent of users receiving their required level of system availability dropped significantly—from 61% of the 1990 sample to 29% of the 1991 sample. Response time satisfaction percent stayed approximately the same, but repair time also dropped from 91% receiving their required repair time or less to 76% in 1991 receiving a satisfactory repair time.
- The mean failures per year also increased from 3.3 in the 1990 study to 5.6, with an increase in the mean percent of the failures due to hardware problems.
- The analysis of hardware service shows that only 41% of the Data General users received their required level of overall hardware support or better. Forty-four percent of the users had their requirements for spares availability met or exceeded.

	Percent of Sample	
	1991	1990
Days Covered		
Monday - Friday Monday - Saturday Monday - Sunday	66 0 34	68 9 23
Hours Covered		
1 - 9 10 - 16 17 - 24	47 25 28	64 13 23



In-House

Multiple Responses Allowed.

Other

Hardware Mainter Data Ge	nance Prov eneral	ider
Provider	Percent of Mentions	Primary
Manufacturer	97	100
Dealer/Distributor	3	0
Independent Maintenance Organization	9	0

3

0

0

- 0

III-4



.

-

EXHIBIT III-A-5

Mainter	Maintenance Contract Terms Data General		
Haro Maint	dware enance	Percent of Respondents	
Warranty	,	0	
Five Yea	rs	16	
Three Ye	ars	31	
One Yea	r	53	
Time and	Materials	0	
Other		0	
None		0	
L			

System Availabili Dat	System Availability Performance Analysis Data General		
	Mean Required	Mean Received	Percent Satisfied
System Availability (%)	97.3	94.4	29
Response Time (hrs.)	6.6	6.4	85
Repair Time (hrs.)	4.9	4.5	76



EXHIBIT III-A-8

Hardware Service Required versus Received Data General

	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied
Spares Availability	9.2	8.0	8.3	44
Engineer Skills	9.3	8.8	8.8	66
Documentation of Maintenance	7.2	7.3	7.8	74
Help Desk Support	7.3	7.4	7.7	63
Remote Diagnostics	7.4	8.3	8.4	77
Real-Time Software Diagnostics	7.2	6.2	7.1	47
Overall Hardware Maintenance	9.5	8.4	8.5	41

Note: Scale 1-10, 1 = Lowest, 10 = Highest

Software Maintenance P Data General	Provider	
Provider	Percent of Mentions	
Hardware Manufacturer	53	
Other Hardware Service Provider	3	
Software Product Vendor	22	
Value-Added Reseller (VAR)	7	
In-House	41	
Other	3	
Multiple Responses Allowed.	L	

EXHIBIT III-A-10

System Software Maintenance Contract Terms Data General

Software Maintenance	Percent of Respondents
Included in License Fee	41
Three-Year	6
One-Year	25
Custom	3
None	22
Don't Know	3

Solved by Phone (%)	73
Elapsed Time (hrs.)	6.5
Other Problems	
Response Time	
 Required (mean hrs.) 	12.5
 Received (mean hrs.) 	9.4
 Percent Satisfied 	75
Fix Time	
 Required (mean hrs.) 	6.6
 Received (mean hrs.) 	6.9
 Percent Satisfied 	90

System Software	Support	Required	versus	Received
-	Data C	General		

	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied
Engineer Skills	8.9	8.2	8.6	57
Documentation	8.7	7.1	7.4	32
Software Installation	7.9	7.1	8.1	68
Provision of Updates	8.5	7.5	8.1	60
Operational Training	7.1	5.9	7.2	55
Software Remote Support	8.0	7.5	8.3	70
Software Support Overall	8.9	8.3	8.3	58

Ø

	Dat	ary Service a Gener	vices ral		
	Number of Mentions Currently Contracted	Mean Level Required	Mean Level Received	Percent Satisfied	Number of Mentions Not Receiving But Required
Configuration Planning	13	6.8	7.2	62	16
Capacity Planning	16	7.1	7.0	63	13
Environmental Planning	9	6.2	6.4	56	11
Cabling	13	6.9	6.9	42	14
Software Evaluation	14	6.9	7.1	57	10
Maintenance-Related Training	13	6.5	7.1	62	10
Install/Deinstall/Move	27	8.1	8.1	73	1
Consulting	19	6.8	6.8	74	5
Network Planning	15	6.6	5.6	53	8
Network Management	13	6.1	5.2	46	9
Disaster Recovery	9	7.7	6.6	56	15
Facilities Management	6	6.1	5.8	50	11
Problem Management	14	7.3	7.4	50	8
Applications Software Support	16	7.7	6.6	31	11

Г

Multiven Data	dor Services General	
Service on Other Manufacturers'	Percent Receiving	Interest in Three Years
CPUs	13	1.9
Peripherals	22	2.4
Network Products	9	2.3
	Level of	f Interest
Single Point of Contact	3	.6

Discounts Data General				
	Percent Receiving	Mean Willingness to Receive		
Multiyear	68	5.1		
Prepayment.	35	3.1		
Call Screening/Problem Management	20	3.6		
Deferred Response	16	3.3		
Note: Scale 1 - 10, 1 = Lowest, 10 = Highest				

В		
DEC		
	The DEC sample consisted of 31 users of DEC VAX and MicroVAX	

The DEC sample consisted of 31 users of DEC VAX and MicroVAX midrange systems. The following points appear significant in the DEC information:

- There has been a slow steady move over the last three years to expand contractual maintenance coverage. This reflects the expanded role of midrange equipment in the enterprise. As the criticality of the application increases, so do the demands on the equipment and the neccessity of high system availability, resulting in increased maintenance coverage.
- Overall, the mean ratings of importance of all service selection criteria increased. The rankings of the mean ratings stayed about the same, with the issues of quality of service, technical expertise, spares availability, and system availability being the top four.
- Satisfaction with the manufacturer and the technological advantage of the manufacturer were given most often as the reasons why users stayed with manufacturer service. Lower cost, local service, single-source service, and more flexible contracts were reasons for respondents' use of independent maintenance as part of their service plan.
- Almost every respondent in the DEC user group that had a requirement for ancillary services received some level of service from their maintenance vendor.
- Forty-two percent of the DEC respondents received service on other vendors' peripherals, with other multivendor services being received by less than 30% of the respondents.

r

Contract E	Contract Coverage DEC			
	Percent c	of Sample		
	1991 ·	1990		
<u>Days Covered</u> Monday - Friday Monday - Saturday Monday - Sunday	55 3 42	66 6 28		
<u>Hours Covered</u> 1 - 9 10 - 16 17 - 24	45 26 29	47 22 31		



.

Hardware	Maintenance	Provider
	DEC	

Provider	Percent of Mentions	Primary
Manufacturer	84	77
Dealer/Distributor	0	0
Independent Maintenance Organization	16	13
In-House	10	5
Other	10	5 -
Multiple Responses Allowed.		





.

-

EXHIBIT III-B-5

Maintenance Contract Terms DEC				
	Hardware Maintenance	Percent of Respondents		
	Warranty	7		
	Five Years	7		
	Three Years	13		
	One Year	70		
	Time and Materials	3		
	Other	0		
	None	0		

System Availability Performance Analysis DEC			
	Mean Required	Mean Received	Percent Satisfied
System Availability (%)	96.8	· 97.2	65
Response Time (hrs.)	4.2	2.2	90
Repair Time (hrs.)	5.0	2.8	71



EXHIBIT III-B-8

Hardware Service Required versus Received DEC				
	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied
Spares Availability	9.0	8.5	8.7	47
Engineer Skills	9.1	8.8	9.2	70
Documentation of Maintenance	7.5	8.1	8.7	79
Help Desk Support	7.8	7.9	8.7	82
Remote Diagnostics	7.8	8.0	9.0	83
Real-Time Software Diagnostics	8.3	7.9	7.9	68
Overall Hardware Maintenance	9.1	8.9	8.9	67

Note: Scale 1-10, 1 = Lowest, 10 = Highest

Software Maintenance Provider DEC			
	Provider	Percent of Mentions	
	Hardware Manufacturer	90	
	Other Hardware Service Provider	0	
	Software Product Vendor	13	
	Value-Added Reseller (VAR)	0	
	In-House	33	
	Other	13	
	Multiple Responses Allowed.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	

System Software Maintenance Contract Terms DEC		
Software Maintenance	Percent of Respondents	
Included in License Fee	26	
Three-Year	~ 7	
One-Year	48	
Custom	3	
None	0	
Don't Know	16	

Solved by Phone (%)	81
Elapsed Time (hrs.)	9.8
Other Problems	
Response Time	
• Required (mean hrs.)	13.6
• Received (mean hrs.)	17.0
 Percent Satisfied 	90
Fix Time	
• Required (mean hrs.)	13.8
• Received (mean hrs.)	6.6
 Percent Satisfied 	89

System Software Support Required versus Received
DEC

	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied	
Engineer Skills	8.6	8.2	8.4	68	
Documentation	8.7	8.2	8.1	50	
Software Installation	7.7	7.8	8.5	75	
Provision of Updates	8.4	8.3	8.2	73	
Operational Training	5.7	6.1	7.9	78	
Software Remote Support	8.6	8.3	8.3	79	
Software Support Overall	8.7	8.2	8.3	59	
Note: Scale 1-10, 1 = Lowest, 10 = Highest					

Ancillary Services DEC					
	Number of Mentions Currently Contracted	Mean Level Required	Mean Level Received	Percent Satisfied	Number of Mentions Not Receiving But Required
Configuration Planning	19	6.7	6.4	50	1
Capacity Planning	18	6.7	6.5	67	1
Environmental Planning	13	[•] 6.3	7.0	77	2
Cabling	14	6.9	7.3	85	1
Software Evaluation	13	7.1	6.8	69	0
Maintenance-Related Training	11	5.7	4.9	60	1
Install/Deinstall/Move	24	7.3	7.4	78	0
Consulting	19	6.9	6.7	74	0
Network Planning	17	6.9	5.9	50	1
Network Management	13	6.1	5.3	67	1
Disaster Recovery	11	5.1	4.2	64	1
Facilities Management	9	4.3	4.2	89	0
Problem Management	14	6.1	6.3	71	2
Applications Software Support	22	7.0	6.3	41	0

Convice on Other	Dereent				
Manufacturers'	Receiving	Three Years			
CPUs	10	3.1			
Peripherals	42	3.7			
Network Products	29	3.5			
Level of Interest					
Single Point of Contact	3	.9			

Discounts DEC						
	Percent Receiving	Mean Willingness to Receive				
Multiyear	56	5.2				
Prepayment	63	3.9				
Call Screening/Problem Management	12	4.9				
Deferred Response	8	2.9				

C Hewlett-Packard 3000

The sample consisted of 32 users of HP 3000 midrange system. In analyzing the data collected, the following points appear notable:

- As in other portions of the midrange systems sample, HP 3000 respondents value the service quality components more than contractual items when evaluating a service vendor.
- There appeared to be a shift in percent from respondents with their HP equipment still under warranty to one-year contracts—31% under warranty in 1990 to 3% in 1991. These users are now more approachable by the independents for service maintenance.
- Response time and repair time appear to be satisfactory, with 96% of the respondents receiving the time they require or less. System availability had a much lower percent of respondents receiving the level of service they require—69%.
- Overall, ratings for user satisfaction with aspects of hardware maintenance improved from the 1990 sample, with over 70% of the sample receiving the level of service they require or greater.
- Mean satisfaction ratings for the individual aspects of software support increased or stayed the same from the ratings for the same aspects examined in 1990. Operational training and software support overall had the lowest percent of users receiving support at or greater than their requirement—56% and 59%, respectively.
- There appears to be a demand for ancillary service by the HP 3000 respondents; over 50% of them had a requirement for ancillary services. Only facilities management fell below the 50% demand, with 30% of the respondents expressing a requirement for facilities management services, and 70% of those receiving the services receiving satisfactory levels of service.

Г

Contrac Hi			
	Percent	of Sample	
	1991	1990	
Days Covered			
Monday - Friday Monday - Saturday Monday - Sunday	37 13 50	59 8 33	
Hours Covered			
1 - 9 10 - 16 17 - 24	22 25 53	42 25 33	



Hardware N	laintenance HP 3000	Provider
------------	------------------------	----------

Provider	Percent of Mentions	Primary			
Manufacturer	94	94			
Dealer/Distributor	0	0			
Independent Maintenance Organization	6	6			
In-House	0	0			
Other	0	0			
Multiple Responses Allowed.					



.

-

EXHIBIT III-C-5

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Hardware Maintenance	Percent of Respondents	
Warranty	3	
Five Years	3	
Three Years	3	
One Year	72	
Time and Materials	0	
Other	19	
None	0	
	Hardware Maintenance Warranty Five Years Three Years One Year Time and Materials Other None	Hardware MaintenancePercent of RespondentsWarranty3Five Years3Three Years3One Year72Time and Materials0Other19None0

System Availability Performance Analysis HP 3000				
	Mean Required	Mean Received	Percent Satisfied	
System Availability (%)	97 .8 ·	97.2	69	
Response Time (hrs.)	5.5	3.6	96	
Repair Time (hrs.)	5.4	3.7	9 6	



Hardware Service Required versus Received HP 3000					
	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied	
Spares Availability	9.0	9.1	9.2	81	
Engineer Skills	8.9	9.0	9.0	84	
Documentation of Maintenance	7.6	8.1	8.5	81	
Help Desk Support	8.3	8.5	8.8	83	
Remote Diagnostics	7.8	8.5	8.6	94	
Real-Time Software Diagnostics	7.7	7.8	8.2	72	
Overall Hardware Maintenance	9.2	9.1	9.3	75	

Software Maintenance Provider HP 3000				
	Provider	Percent of Mentions		
	Hardware Manufacturer	88		
	Other Hardware Service Provider	0		
	Software Product Vendor	16		
	Value-Added Reseller (VAR)	0		
	In-House	25		
	Other	13		
[Multiple Responses Allowed.	L		

EXHIBIT III-C-10

System Software Maintenance Contract Terms HP 3000

Software Maintenance	Percent of Respondents
Included in License Fee	13
Three-Year	0
One-Year	66
Custom	12
None	3
Don't Know	6

Solved by Phone	(%)	94
Elapsed Time (hr	s.)	2.8
Other Problems		
Response Time		
• Required (mear	hrs.)	9.9
• Received (mear	ו hrs.)	9.0
Percent Satisfie	d 1	100
Fix Time		
• Required (mear	hrs.)	4.5
• Received (mear	ı hrs.)	5.3
• Percent Satisfie	d	85

System Software Support Required versus Received HP 3000

Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied
9.1	8.3	8.4	67
8.4	7.5	7.8	47
8.6	8.3	8.1	69
8.2	8.5	8.3	77
7.3	7.3	8.0	56
8.2	8.5	8.9	83
8.8	8.4	8.3	59
	Mean Required 9.1 8.4 8.6 8.2 7.3 8.2 8.2 8.8	Mean Required Mean Received 9.1 8.3 8.4 7.5 8.6 8.3 8.2 8.5 7.3 7.3 8.2 8.5 8.2 8.5 8.2 8.5 8.2 8.5 8.2 8.5 8.2 8.5	Mean RequiredMean ReceivedMean Satisfaction9.18.38.48.47.57.88.68.38.18.28.58.37.37.38.08.28.58.98.88.48.3

	Ancill F	ary Serv IP 3000	vices		
	Number of Mentions Currently Contracted	Mean Level Required	Mean Level Received	Percent Satisfied	Number of Mentions Not Receiving But Required
Configuration Planning	26	6.4	7.0	84	3
Capacity Planning	22	7.3	6.5	50	4
Environmental Planning	18	6.0	6.6	94	5
Cabling	16	5.6	6.3	94	3
Software Evaluation	15	6.3	6.3	73	7
Maintenance-Related Training	18	5.3	5.9	82	4
Install/Deinstall/Move	24	7.4	8.3	92	2
Consulting	23	6.7	6.7	70	3
Network Planning	18	6.9	6.4	61	4
Network Management	17	6.7	6.2	53	4
Disaster Recovery	19	7.9	6.0	50	4
Facilities Management	10	5.4	4.7	70	3
Problem Management	15	7.2	6.6	53	2
Applications Software Support	16	7.2	7.0	50	3

HP	3000	
Service on Other Manufacturers'	Percent Receiving	Interest in Three Years
CPUs	6	2.0
Peripherals	9	2.3
Network Products	13	2.9
	Level of	Interest
Single Point of Contact	3	.9

Discounts HP 3000			
	Percent Receiving	Mean Willingness to Receive	
Multiyear	17	. 4.7	
Prepayment .	24	4.4	
Call Screening/Problem Management	7	4.1	
Deferred Response	24	3.5	
<u>D</u> IBM 937X

The sample consisted of 31 users of IBM 937X midrange systems. The following points are noteworthy in the 937X user group data analysis:

- Three percent of the 937X group reported using independent maintenance as their primary service, with all of the users responding that they use the manufacturer for all or part of their service plan.
- There was no overwelming reason why the respondents did not use an IMO as part of their plan.
- Mean system availability for the 937X group exceeded the mean requirement, yet only 64% of the group received system availability that met or exceeded their requirements. Response time and repair time had higher percentages (96% and 87%) of users receiving satisfactory service in these areas.

Г

Contract Coverage IBM 937X		
	Percent of Sample 1991	
Days Covered		
Monday - Friday Monday - Saturday Monday - Sunday	10 0 90	
Hours Covered		
1 - 9 10 - 16 17 - 24	10 0 90	
	Days Covered Monday - Friday Monday - Saturday Monday - Sunday Hours Covered I - 9 I0 - 16 I7 - 24	Percent of Sample 1991Days CoveredMonday - Friday Monday - Saturday Monday - SundayMonday - SundayHours Covered1 - 910 - 1610 - 1617 - 2490



Provider	Percent of Mentions	Primary
Manufacturer	100	97
Dealer/Distributor	3	0
Independent Maintenance Organization	3	3
In-House	0	0
Other	0	Ũ



.

~

EXHIBIT III-D-5

F

Maintenance Con IBM 937		
Hardware Maintenance	Percent of Respondents	
Warranty	3	
Five Years	10	
Three Years	7	
One Year	57	
Time and Materials	6	
Other	17	
None	0	

System Availability Performance Analysis IBM 937X			
	Mean Required	Mean Received	Percent Satisfied
System Availability (%)	94 . 8 [.]	95.4	64
Response Time (hrs.)	2.7	2.4	96
Repair Time (hrs.)	2.6	2.4	87



Hardware	Service	Required	versus	Received
		IBM 937X		

	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied
Spares Availability	7.9	7.9	8.2	74
Engineer Skills	8.6	8.4	8.6	74
Documentation of Maintenance	6.2	6.5	7.3	84
Help Desk Support	6.7	6.4	7.0	67
Remote Diagnostics	5.6	5.3	6.0	82
Real-Time Software Diagnostics	5.0	4.7	5.3	86
Overall Hardware Maintenance	3.9	8.8	9.0	81

Software Maintenance P IBM 937X	Provider	
Provider	Percent of Mentions	
Hardware Manufacturer	81	
Other Hardware Service Provider	3	
Software Product Vendor	3	
Value-Added Reseller (VAR)	0	
In-House	45	
Other	0	
Multiple Responses Allowed.	1	I

EXHIBIT III-D-10

System Software Maintenance Contract Terms IBM 937X

Software Maintenance	Percent of Respondents
Included in License Fee	36
Three-Year	3
One-Year	19
Custom	19
None	10
Don't Know	13

Solved by Phone (%)	76
Elapsed Time (hrs.)	9.4
Other Problems	
Response Time	
• Required (mean hrs.)	10.9
• Received (mean hrs.)	10.0
 Percent Satisfied 	93
Fix Time	
• Required (mean hrs.)	7.4
• Received (mean hrs.)	8.0
 Percent Satisfied 	86

System Software Support Required versus Received IBM 937X

	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied
Engineer Skills	8.8	7.8	7.8	57
Documentation	8.4	7.2	7.5	45
Software Installation	8.2	6.8	7.6	58
Provision of Updates	7.5	6.9	7.3	68
Operational Training	6.2	5.0	6.0	68
Software Remote Support	5.5	5.4	5.7	70
Software Support Overall	8.5	7.7	7.8	58

	Ancilla IE	ary Serv 3M 937X	vices		
	Number of Mentions Currently Contracted	Mean Level Required	Mean Level Received	Percent Satisfied	Number of Mentions Not Receiving But Required
Configuration Planning	21	7.0	7.0	76	2
Capacity Planning	19	6.7	6.6	63	5
Environmental Planning	16	5.3	5.9	81	6
Cabling	19	6.6	6. 6	63	3
Software Evaluation	15	6.2	4.9	60	2
Maintenance-Related Training	14	5.3	4.9	64	5
Install/Deinstall/Move	26	6.8	7.2	85	2
Consulting	17	6.8	6.8	71	1
Network Planning	18	5.9	6.1	61	5
Network Management	15	5.7	6.0	60	5
Disaster Recovery	11	5.9	5.5	55	6
Facilities Management	9	4.7	4.9	75	4
Problem Management	13	4.9	4.8	77	5
Applications Software Support	13	5.3	5.2	69	4

Service on Other	Percent	Interest in
Manufacturers'	Receiving	Three Years
CPUs	7	2.5
Peripherals	13	2.6
Network Products	10	2.7
	Level of	Interest
Single Point of Contact	3	.1

Percent Receiving	Mean Willingness to Receive
40	5.8
20	5.4
12	4.9
4	4.6
	Percent Receiving 40 20 12 4

E IBM AS/400

The user group consisted of 30 users of the AS/400 system. The following items appeared to be noteworthy in comparing the 1991 AS/400 user group with the 1991 user sample as a whole:

- A high percent of the AS/400 users reported having a five-year contract with the manufacturer as opposed to the sample as a whole—38% versus 14%.
- The AS/400 user group reported a lower number of system failures per year than the midrange group as a whole, with a higher percent attributed to hardware problems.
- Compared to the whole midrange group and other vendor/product groups, the AS/400 group seems to have a lower requirement for service ancillary to the maintenance function. Less than 50% of the respondents reported either contracting for ancillary services or requiring service they are not receiving.
- A fairly high percent of the respondents did report receiving discounts for signing multiyear contracts and contracts with prepayment clauses.

Contract Coverage IBM AS/400			
		Percent of Sample 1991	
	<u>Days Covered</u> Monday - Friday Monday - Saturday Monday - Sunday	17 0 83	
	<u>Hours Covered</u> 1 - 9 10 - 16 17 - 24	17 0 83	



Hardware Maintenance Provider IBM AS/400

Provider	Percent of Mentions	Primary			
Manufacturer	93	93			
Dealer/Distributor	0	0			
Independent Maintenance Organization	7	7			
In-House	0	0			
Other	0	[~] 0			
Multiple Responses Allowed					



III-53

Maintenance Contract Terms IBM AS/400				
	Hardware Maintenance			
	Warranty	3		
	Five Years	38		
	Three Years	10		
	One Year	42		
	Time and Materials	0		
	Other	7		
·	None	0		

System Availability Performance Analysis IBM AS/400					
Mean Mean Percent Required Received Satisfied					
System Availability (%) 95.8 95.7 72					
Response Time (hrs.)3.02.884					
Repair Time (hrs.) 3.6 3.8 77					



EXHIBIT III-E-8

Hardware Service Required versus Received IBM AS/400						
	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied		
Spares Availability	8.7	8.6	9.0	75		
Engineer Skills	9.5	8.8	8.8	55		
Documentation of Maintenance	7.2	7.7	8.3	82		
Help Desk Support	8.4	7.9	8.3	79		

7.9

8.3

8.8

8.7

8.2

8.8

84

63

66

Note: Scale 1-10, 1 = Lowest, 10 = Highest

Remote Diagnostics

Real-Time Software

Overall Hardware

Diagnostics

Maintenance

7.7

8.8

9.2

Software Maintenance Provider IBM AS/400						
Provider	Percent of Mentions					
Hardware Manufacturer	83					
Other Hardware Service Provider	3					
Software Product Vendor	7					
Value-Added Reseller (VAR)	13					
In-House	27					
Other 3						
Multiple Responses Allowed.						

System Software
Maintenance Contract Terms
IBM AS/400

Software Maintenance	Percent of Respondents
Included in License Fee	43
Three-Year	0
One-Year	13
Custom	14
None	3
Don't Know	27

-

EXHIBIT III-E-11

Solved by Phone (%)	77
Elapsed Time (hrs.)	7.0
Other Problems	
Response Time	
• Required (mean hrs.)) 11.3
• Received (mean hrs.) 10.6
 Percent Satisfied 	71
Fix Time	
• Required (mean hrs.)	9.4
• Received (mean hrs.) 8.5
 Percent Satisfied 	91

- -

System Software Support Required versus Received IBM AS/400

	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction	Percent Satisfied
Engineer Skills	9.0	7.8	7.9	54
Documentation	8.6	8.0	8.4	68
Software Installation	8.7	7.3	7.9	54
Provision of Updates	9.0	8.3	8.6	64
Operational Training	7.7	6.8	7.0	70
Software Remote Support	8.6	7.9	8.2	70
Software Support Overall	8.9	7.9	7.9	50

Ancillary Services IBM AS/400						
	Number of Mentions Currently Contracted	Mean Level Required	Mean Level Received	Percent Satisfied	Number of Mentions Not Receiving But Required	
Configuration Planning	5	7.3	8.3	92	9	
Capacity Planning	1	6.9	6.9	69	7	
Environmental Planning	1	6.4	6.6	86	2	
Cabling	5	6.9	8.0	100	4	
Software Evaluation	3	6.4	6.7	53	7	
Maintenance-Related Training	3	6.7	6.8	75	5	
Install/Deinstall/Move	2	7.6	7.8	61	4	
Consulting	5	7.4	7.8	79	4	
Network Planning	3	7.3	7.6	71	5	
Network Management	3	6.8	7.5	75	4	
Disaster Recovery	3	7.3	7.0	65	6	
Facilities Management	1	6.2	7.3	100	10	
Problem Management	2	7.6	7.1	63	2	
Applications Software Support	1	7.1	7.6	79	6	

Service on Other	Percent	Interest in
Manufacturers'	Receiving	Three Years
CPUs	10	1.9
Peripherals	27	2.4
Network Products	7	2.5
	Level of	Interest
Single Point of Contact	3	.3

Discounts IBM AS/400			
	Percent Receiving	Mean Willingness to Receive	
Multiyear	69	7.3	
Prepayment	48	5.0	
Call Screening/Problem Management	17	5.0	
Deferred Response	12	4.6	



Summary Charts



.



Summary Charts

In this chapter, INPUT presents a summary of selected data from the 1991 midrange systems user requirements study. These summary charts allow a vendor-by-vendor comparison of service performance. Data is presented on factors that can be compared on an absolute basis.

The key to customer satisfaction is the ability of the vendor to meet or exceed the expectations of the customer. Even the highest rating is insufficient if the user's requirement exceeds the rating.

In these charts, the following definitions apply:

- Difference is a comparison of the mean service required with the mean service received. A negative number denotes a shortfall in the service received. A positive number denotes the mean service received exceeding the mean service required.
- Percent satisfied is based on whether the service received met or exceeded service required for each individual respondent. A count is made of how many individuals had their requirements met or exceeded for that particular service requirement; this converts to the percent satisfied.

Midrange Systems Vendor Performance System Interruptions							
	Mean		Percent Caused By:				
Vendor	Number Per Year	Hardware	System Software	Applications Software	Other		
Data General	5.6	65	10	0	25		
DEC	5.0	48	11	4	37		
HP 3000	2.4	50	25	5	20		
IBM 937X	3.1	54	14	3	29		
IBM AS/400	1.9	74	13	2	11		
All Vendors	3.3	58	14	3	25		

EXHIBIT IV-2

Midrange Systems Vendor Performance System Availability

	System Availability (Percent)				
Vendor	Required	Received	Difference		
Data General	97.3	94.4	-2.9		
DEC	96.8	97.2	0.4		
HP 3000	97.8	97.2	-0.6		
IBM 937X	94.8	95.4	0.6		
IBM AS/400	95.8	95.7	-0.1		
All Vendors	96.5	96.0	-0.5		

Midrange Systems Vendor Performance Response Time					
	R	esponse Tim (Hours)	10		
Vendor	Required Received Difference				
Data General	6.6	6.4	0.2		
DEC	4.2	2.2	2.0		
HP 3000	5.5	3.6	1.9		
IBM 937X	2.7	2.4	0.3		
IBM AS/400	3.0	2.8	0.2		
All Vendors	4.4	3.4	1.0		

EXHIBIT IV-4

Midrange Systems Vendor Performance Repair Time				
	Repair Time (Hours)			
Vendor	Required	Received	Difference	
Data General	4.9	4.5	0.4	
DEC	5.0	2.8	2.2	
HP 3000	5.4	3.7	1.7	
IBM 937X	2.6	2.4	0.2	
IBM AS/400	3.6	3.8	-0.2	
All Vendors	4.3	3.5	0.8	



FCNEW-2







IV-6

Midrange Systems Vendor Performance Hardware Maintenance Required versus Received

Vendor	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction
Data General	9.5	8.4	8.5
DEC	9.1	8.9	8.9
HP 3000	9.2	9.1	9.3
IBM 937X	8.9	8.8	9.0
IBM AS/400	9.2	8.8	8.8
All Vendors	9.2	8.8	8.9



Midrange Systems Vendor Performance Software Support Required versus Received

Vendor	Mean Required	Mean Received	Mean Satisfaction
Data General	8.9	8.3	8.3
DEC	8.7	8.2	8.3
HP 3000	8.8	8.4	8.3
IBM 937X	8.5	7.7	7.8
IBM AS/400	8.9	7.9	7.9
All Vendors	8.8	8.1	8.1



FCNEW-2
Appendix

•



Appendix: Questionnaire

A. GENERAL

- 1. What is the make and model of the main computer on your site and how many units do you have?
 - Make _____
 - Model _____
 - Units _____
- 2. Are you the person responsible for this system?

If not, then who would be the correct person?

Name of person responsible

Phone Number _____

- 3. Do you have another system? What is the make and model number of that system, and how many units do you have?
 - Make _____
 - Model _____
 - Units _____

All of the following questions that I am going to ask you are related to your ______ system.

4. Could you please rate the importance of the following criteria in selecting your service vendor, on a scale of 1 to 10 (1=Low, 10=High)?

	<u>Criteria</u>	Rating
a)	Price	
b)	Quality of service	
c)	Guaranteed system availability level	
d)	Guaranteed availability of spare parts	
e)	Technical expertise	
f)	Response time on a service call	
g)	Availability of software support	aller and the state of the stat
h)	Ability to provide other services	<u></u>
i)	Contract flexibility	
j)	Ability to maintain open system	
k)	Ability to service other products	
1)	Vendor reputation	

B. SERVICE VENDOR SELECTION

I would like to ask you some questions about the basic hardware maintenance of your computer system.

5. Would you please tell me who services your system hardware? Who is the primary service vendor? (check one)

(Please circle appropriate service provider type; multiple answers are allowed.) <u>Primary</u>

٠	Manufacturer	Y/N	
٠	Dealer/distributor	Y/N	<u> </u>
•	Independent maintenance company	Y/N	
•	Own company	Y/N	
•	Other	Y/N	

If the respondent answered YES to independent maintenance, continue with question 6A. If not, go to question 6B.

6A. Your system, or part of it, is serviced by an independent maintenance company. Could you tell me the reason why you use independent maintenance?

(Please circle appropriate answer; multiple answers are allowed.)

٠	Lower cost	Y/N
•	Local service	Y/N
٠	Single-source service	Y/N
•	Better able to maintain open system	Y/N
٠	TPM service higher quality	Y/N
٠	More flexible contract	Y/N
٠	Other	Y/N
•	Do not know	Y/N

(Go to question 7)

6B. You <u>do not</u> use an independent maintenance company. What is the reason for this? (Please circle appropriate answer; multiple answers are allowed.)

٠	Satisfied with manufacturer	Y/N
٠	Manufacturer has a technological advantage	Y/N
٠	IMO cannot support software	Y/N
٠	Tied to manufacturer with long-term contract	Y/N
٠	Fear of system supplier response	Y/N
٠	Considered and rejected IMO	Y/N
٠	IMO financial weakness	Y/N
٠	Unaware of IMO service	Y/N
٠	Other	Y/N
•	Do not know	Y/N

- 7. What maintenance coverage do you receive on this CPU:
 - a. How many days per week? _____
 - b. How many hours per day?
 - c. Which type of hardware maintenance contract do you currently have on the main part of your system?

(Please circle appropriate answer; only ONE answer allowed.)

٠	Warranty	1	
٠	Five years	2	
٠	Three years	3	
•	One year	4	
•	Time and Materials	5	
٠	Other	6	
•	None	7	

8. Over the last 12 months, how many system interruptions (system failures) did you have per month? ______ or per year? ______

And, what percentage of these system failures were due to:

Hardware _____%

Systems software _____%

Applications software _____%

Other (i.e., power failure) _____%

(Please check that percentages add up to 100%)

- 9. If we defined SYSTEMS AVAILABILITY as the percentage of your normal working hours that the system is operational (disregarding non-critical peripheral outages), what percentage availability do you require? What is the percentage actually received over the last twelve months for that system?
 - Required _____%
 - Received _____%

- 10. Defining HARDWARE RESPONSE TIME as the time it takes between reporting a fault and the arrival of the service engineer on site, in working hours, what response time (in hours) do you require, and what did you actually experience as an average over the last twelve months?
 - Require____Hours
 - Experienced _____Hours
- 11. If REPAIR TIME is defined as the time taken to get the system fully operational from the time the engineer arrives on site, what time do you require (in working hours) and what time did you experience during the last twelve months?
 - Require____Hours
 - Experienced _____Hours
- 12. I would now like to go through a list of seven aspects of hardware maintenance and ask you to give each a rating on a scale of 1-10 for the service level you require, the service level you receive, and your satisfaction with that service.

		<u>Required</u>	Received	Satisfaction
•	Spares Availability			
•	Engineer Skills			
•	Documentation of Maintenance			
•	Help Desk Support			
•	Remote Diagnostics			
•	Real-time Software Diagnostics			
•	Overall Hardware Maintenance			

- **13.** If possible, I would like you to provide some information on hardware maintenance pricing.
 - a) What percentage price increase or decrease did you pay for hardware maintenance in the year 1990?
 - Increase _____%
 - Decrease____%
 - No Change Y/N (Circle)

- b) What do you expect the price changes for hardware maintenance to be in the future, in percentage terms per year?
 - Increase _____%
 - Decrease _____%
 - No Change Y/N (Circle)

C. SOFTWARE SUPPORT

I would like to ask you some questions now regarding the software service that you receive. These questions relate to system software only - NOT APPLICATIONS SOFTWARE.

14A. Who supports your systems software?

(Please circle appropriate answer; multiple answers allowed.)

٠	Hardware Manufacturer	Y/N
•	Other Hardware Service Provider	Y/N
	(Specify)	
٠	Software Product Vendor	Y/N
٠	Value-Added Reseller (VAR)	Y/N
٠	In-house	Y/N
٠	Other (Specify)	Y/N
٠	Do not know	Y/N

14B. What type of systems software support contract do you currently have?

(Please circle appropriate answer. Only ONE answer allowed.)

٠	Support included in software license fee	1
•	Three-year contract	2
٠	One-year contract	3
•	Ad hoc/custom	4
•	None	5
•	Do not know	9

- 15. What percentage of systems software problems are solved by telephone, and on average, how long does this take in elapsed time?
 - Solved by Phone _____%
 - Elapsed Time _____Hours
- 16. For those problems that are NOT possible to solve over the telephone, what RESPONSE TIME would you find acceptable, and what time (on average and in working hours) have you experienced over the last twelve months? (Take RESPONSE TIME to mean from the time the problem is reported to the arrival of the engineer on site.)
 - Acceptable _____Hours
 - Experienced _____Hours
- 17. If FIX TIME is defined as the time taken to get the system software fully operational from the arrival of the engineer on site, then what time (in working hours) do you find acceptable, and what did you experience over the last twelve months?
 - Acceptable _____Hours
 - Experienced _____Hours

18. I would like to go through a list of aspects of SYSTEMS SOFTWARE SUPPORT and ask you to give an IMPORTANCE or REQUIRED rating of the aspect, a RECEIVED rating, and a SATISFACTION with service received rating for each. (Scale 1-10)

		Importance/ <u>Required</u>	Received	Satisfaction
•	Software Engineer Skills Level			
٠	Software Documentation			
٠	Software Installation			
٠	Provision of Updates			
•	Operational Training			
•	Software Remote Support			
•	Software Support Overall			

- **19.** If possible, I would like you to provide some information on systems software support pricing.
 - a) What percentage price increase or decrease did you pay for systems software support in the year 1990?
 - Increase _____%
 - Decrease ____%
 - No Change Y/N (Circle)
 - b) What do you expect the changes for systems software support to be in the future, in percentage terms per year?
 - Increase ____%
 - Decrease ____%
 - No Change Y/N (Circle)

D. ANCILLARY SERVICES

I would like to discuss with you now services beyond normal maintenance. I am particularly interested in obtaining your views on other services or modified current service offerings that your service suppliers could provide that would help to improve the running of your computer systems.

20. On a scale of 1-10, could you rate your requirement for these services and what you are now receiving. (Scale 1-10, not required/receiving = 0)

		(a) Require <u>(1-10)</u>	(b) Received <u>(1-10)</u>
•	Configuration Planning		
٠	Capacity Planning		
٠	Environmental Planning		
•	Cabling		
•	Software Evaluation		
•	Maintenance-Related Training		
•	Installation/Deinstallation/Moves		. <u></u>
•	Consulting		
•	Network Planning		
•	Network Management		
٠	Disaster Recovery		
٠	Facilities Management		
•	Problem Management		·
•	Applications Software Support		

- 21. How important is it that your service vendor communicates with you regularly and effectively to advise you of, for example:
 - The status of your system
 - Possible problems
 - Repair plans
 - Availability of spare parts
 - Routine visits
 - Hardware and software changes

Could you please rate your requirement for this communication on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 indicates a low requirement or communication received and 10 is a high requirement or communication received.

- Required
- Received
- 22a. Do you currently receive any of the following multivendor services from your service provider? (Circle)

a.	Service on other manufacturers' CPUs?	Y/N
b.	Service on other manufacturers' peripherals?	Y/N
c.	Service on other manufacturers' network products?	Y/N

22b. Please rate on a scale of 1-5 how important these services would be in the next three years for you. (1 = no interest and 5 = high interest)

		(1-5)
a.	Service on other manufacturers' CPUs?	
b.	Service on other manufacturers' peripherals?	
c.	Service on other manufacturers' network products?	

22c. On a scale of 1-5, what would be your level of interest in a single-point-of-contact service arrangement?

(1 = no interest, 5 = high interest)

23a. Do you currently receive any of the following discounts off your service pricing?

23b. For those not receiving, what is your level of interest in these discounts?

	(a) Y/N	(b) LOI (1-10)
Multiyear		
Prepayment		
Call Screening/ Problem Management		
Deferred Response		
Other		

24. To wrap this up, may I ask what you would consider to be your single most pressing service concern at this time?

25. And, if you could choose one additional service that your vendor is not currently providing, what would that be?

This completes the questionnaire. I would like to thank you on behalf of INPUT for helping us to complete this survey. To express our appreciation for your time, we will be sending you a "Thank You" package containing a summary of the results from our survey. To make sure you receive your complimentary report summary, let me check the spelling of your name and the address information. (Confirm and record on cover sheet.)



Report Quality Evaluation

To our clients:

To ensure that the highest standards of report quality are maintained, INPUT would appreciate your assessment of this report. Please take a moment to provide your evaluation of the usefulness and quality of this study. When complete, simply fold, staple, and drop in the mail. Postage has been pre-paid by INPUT if mailed in the U.S.

				Thank You		
1.	Report title: U.S. Midrang	e Systems User Requ	uirements, 1991	(FCNEW-2)		
2.	 Please indicate your reason for Required reading Area of high interest Area of general interest 	reading this report: New product developme Business/market planning 	nt	hase decision anning		
3.	Please indicate extent report us Executive Overview Complete report Part of report (%)	ed and overall usefulness: Extent Read Skimmed	Usefulness (1=L 1 2 3	ow, 5=High) 4 5 □□ □□		
4.	How useful were: Data presented Analyses Recommendations		····· □ ····· □ ····· □ ···· □ ···· □ ···· □ ···· □ ···· □ ···· □ ···· □ ···· □ ···· □ ···· □ ··· □ ··· □ ··· □ ··· □ ··· □ ··· □ ··· □ ··· □ ··· □ ··	00 00		
5.	How useful was the report in the Alert you to new opportunitie Cover new areas not covere Confirm existing ideas Meet expectations Other	ese areas: es or approaches ed elsewhere				
6.	Which topics in the report were the most useful? Why?					
7.	In what ways could the report	have been improved?				
8.	Other comments or suggestio	ns:				
	·		<u></u>			
	Name	Title				
	Department					
	Company	·····				
	Address		. <u></u>			
	City	State	ZIP			
	Telephone	Date	completed			

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

M&S 633/01 12/89



FOLD HERE

