Vendor Landscape: Mid-Market Project Portfolio Management

Collaboration meets project portfolio management.
Introduction

Mid-Market Project Portfolio Management (PPM) vendors are trying to unify collaboration with high-level portfolio planning and reporting.

This Research Is Designed For:

✓ Mid-market organizations seeking to select a commercial solution for Project Portfolio Management (PPM).

✓ Organizations that:
  • Need to have visibility into both ad-hoc and project-based work that is being completed.
  • Want to ensure that projects are aligning with business goals.
  • Require the ability to effectively manage resources.
  • Expect their project team members to interact with each other via the PPM solution on a daily basis.

This Research Will Help You:

✓ Understand what’s new in the mid-market PPM space.

✓ Evaluate Mid-Market PPM vendors and products for your enterprise needs.

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

Info-Tech evaluated eight competitors in the mid-market PPM space, including the following notable performers:

**Champions:**
- **AtTask** stands out with its strong “bottom-up” approach to PPM without compromising high-level portfolio functions.
- **Clarizen** is a comprehensive, easy-to-deploy solution suitable for both bottom-up and top-down approaches to PPM.
- **Project Insight** is a flexible PPM solution suited for mid-sized enterprises managing portfolios with a variety of project methodologies.
- **TeamDynamix** offers a full ITSM suite that is fully integrated with the PPM functionality. The solution is targeted at the Education vertical, though the functionality is broadly applicable.

**Value Award:**
- **TeamDynamix** promises the most “bang for the buck” in this very competitive landscape.

**Trend Setter Award:**
- **Clarizen** characterizes the continuous innovations that emerge in the progressive mid-market PPM landscape.

---

**Info-Tech Insight**

1. **Adoption via collaboration is the ideal:**
   Vendors in the mid-market PPM landscape are aggressively pushing collaboration features to drive adoption by the entire team.

2. **Start with a “zero-adoption strategy”:**
   Despite aggressive user adoption strategies, a proportion of task-level data won’t be maintained. Evaluate how effective portfolio-level planning and reporting will be without accurate timesheets and task-level data.

3. **Context is king:**
   PPM user experience is increasingly spread across multiple applications and devices. Look at how workflows integrate with email, file-sharing, other applications, and multiple devices, especially mobile.
The PPM market has not yet developed to the advantage of the commercial vendors. Identify the right class of solution before you buy.

Commercial PPM solutions have 16% market share within Info-Tech’s client base.

- **Commercial PPM solutions** have evolved to become comprehensive work management suites that pull project teams into a collaborative work management ecosystem with the PMO and the executive leadership team.

- **The benefits** of these solutions come from improved use of your team’s time. If you can avoid wasting just a few hours per user per year, the value of that time pays for the PPM software.

- **The costs** go beyond the Total Cost of Ownership for the solution because of a relatively high Cost-In-Use that demands coordinated and continual adoption by the project teams, project managers, PMO, and executives.

- **Alternative approaches** such as spreadsheets and intranets have diminished the opportunity to centrally optimize resource utilization, reducing the potential benefits of PPM. However, they have dramatically lower complexity and Cost-In-Use than commercial solutions because they don’t require coordinated and continual adoption by the project teams, projects managers, and executives.
Market Overview

**How it got here**

- Collaborative browser-based PPM emerged in the late 1990s as an improvement over single user project management tools like Harvard Project Manager and general purpose tools like Excel, whiteboards, and sticky notes.

- Mid-market PPM is *not* the same as enterprise PPM. Specifically, mid-market PPM differentiates itself by:
  - Driving *user adoption*.
  - Facilitating collaboration.
  - Supporting geographically distributed teams.
  - Providing real-time visibility into the work people are actually doing.

- This approach is a significant shift away from the project management of the past, which was tailored to a very “deterministic” style of planning defined by rigid timelines and strict parameters. Today, it’s different—organizations want more agility.

**Where it’s going**

- Social functionality such as activity streams, discussion threads, and user avatars are becoming table stakes in mid-market PPM.

- Interoperability and adaptability across user contexts will become even more critical for adoption (such as mobile, or within other applications such as email and file-sharing).

- The challenge for mid-market PPM going forward will be to improve the quality and currency of the data used in portfolio-level analysis and reporting by driving more consistent end-user adoption.

- Mid-market PPM vendors continue to improve the Agile functionality in their tools, but actual adoption of commercial PPM tools by Agile teams is unclear.

- Interestingly, some mid-market PPM vendors are increasingly Agile in their own development, and showed Info-Tech how they use their own solutions to manage shorter development and release cycles.

**Info-Tech Insight**

The influx of collaboration features into PPM tools has been partly negated by adoption of Agile methodologies (source: Info-Tech’s *Develop a Project Portfolio Management Strategy*). Organizations trying to implement PPM should establish effectiveness at the portfolio level before imposing new demands on Agile or high-autonomy teams.
Mid-Market PPM vendor selection / knock-out criteria: market share, mind share, and platform coverage

- Mid-market PPM solutions are driving more toward a “bottom-up” approach, focused at the team collaboration and task level. Adoption continues to be a challenge, so it’s critical that customers keep sight of high-level portfolio reporting.
- 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-sized enterprises.

Included in this Vendor Landscape:

- **AtTask.** Leader and innovator in mid-market PPM with an elegant collaborative interface.
- **Clarizen.** Comprehensive SaaS solution aimed at improving team collaboration and productivity.
- **Daptiv.** Robust platform for customizing and integrating project data with enterprise applications.
- **Innotas.** Flexible project and asset portfolio management solution for IT departments in mid-sized to large enterprises.
- **LiquidPlanner.** Unique, flexible solution for team planning, scheduling, and coordination.
- **Project Insight.** Comprehensive solution with good customization capabilities and enterprise support.
- **TeamDynamix.** Focused on the higher education vertical with integrated PPM and service desk functions.
- **Wrike.** Team-oriented tool focused on “bottom-up” collaboration and productivity.
### Mid-Market PPM criteria & weighting factors

#### 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 end-user and administrative interfaces are intuitive and offer streamlined workflow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Implementing and operating the solution is affordable given the technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Multiple deployment options and extensive integration capabilities are available.</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:

- **Features**: 45%
- **Usability**: 30%
- **Affordability**: 10%
- **Architecture**: 15%
- **Vendor**: 50%
- **Strategy**: 50%
- **Reach**: 30%
- **Channel**: 30%
- **Viability**: 30%
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The Info-Tech Mid-Market PPM Vendor Landscape

**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 comparatively 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>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Viability</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Channel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AtTask</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarizen</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daptiv</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innotas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiquidPlanner</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Insight</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeamDynamix</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrike</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: ● = Exemplary, ▲ = Good, ○ = Adequate, ▼ = Inadequate, □ = Poor

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

**What is a Value Score?**

The Value Score indexes each vendor’s product offering and business strength relative to its 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.

On a relative basis, TeamDynamix maintained the highest Info-Tech Value Score™ of the vendor group. Vendors were indexed against TeamDynamix’s performance to provide a complete, relative view of their product offerings.

Average Score: 79

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>The Table Stakes</th>
<th>What Does This Mean?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature</strong></td>
<td><strong>What it is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Traditional project scheduling and tracking functionality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Portfolio Management</td>
<td>Multi-project overview with comprehensive, high-level reporting on progress and cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>See who is available or over-assigned. Able to assign projects/task to specific resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timesheet Management</td>
<td>The ability to log time spent on projects, both in real-time or post hoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Management</td>
<td>Check in/check out versioning controls on documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If table stakes are all you need from your mid-market PPM solution, 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 its individual scores across the listed advanced features. Vendors were given one 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.

## Advanced Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>What we looked for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage Reactive Work</td>
<td>Ability to request, assign, and track ad-hoc work that happens outside of the project scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Adoption Strategy</td>
<td>Ability to conduct portfolio-level project planning and status reporting without team adoption to maintain timesheet and task data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agile Support</td>
<td>Functionality tailored to agile methodologies, such as Kanban boards and burndown charts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-User Portal</td>
<td>Portal that provides access to reports for individuals both within and outside the organization without a full license or profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What-If Planning</td>
<td>Ability to test scenarios and review implications of schedule and resource changes. Includes option to implement or cancel all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow Management</td>
<td>Ability to submit, manage, and be notified of work requests, approvals, and assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Support</td>
<td>Mobile application or at least web functions optimized for mobile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each vendor offers a different feature set; concentrate on what your organization needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AtTask</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daptiv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innotas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiquidPlanner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Insight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeamDynamix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrike</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 absent

For an explanation of how Advanced Features are determined, see Information Presentation – Feature Ranks (Stop Lights) in the Appendix.
AtTask is a Champion in this space due to its robust feature set and ability to manage all types of work

**Champion**

- **Product:** AtTask
- **Employees:** 400
- **Headquarters:** Lehi, UT
- **Website:** attask.com
- **Founded:** 2001
- **Presence:** Privately held

**Overview**

- With a focus on “work management” rather than “project management,” AtTask provides thought-leadership for this space and a solid tool for the mid-market.

**Strengths**

- AtTask’s PPM solution combines enterprise-grade portfolio management with consumer-grade usability.
- AtTask has the most mature and refined social functionality among mid-market PPM tools.
- Agile features such as Kanban boards and burndown charts are of the same caliber as pure-play Agile tools.
- Mobile applications are optimized for context (workflow management on smartphones and executive reporting on iPad).

**Challenges**

- AtTask effectively requires end-user adoption to be effective at the portfolio level.
- Project and portfolio managers who want to abstract portfolio reporting from end-user data will have to use workarounds.

**3 year TCO for this solution falls into pricing tier 6, between $100,000 and $250,000**

**Pricing (provided by vendor)**

$1 - $2.5M+
AtTask offers the best end-user collaboration experience – where users actually need a collaboration tool

**Vendor Landscape**

AtTask offers the best end-user collaboration experience – where users actually need a collaboration tool.

**Value Index**

81
6th out of 8

**Info-Tech Recommends:**

Put AtTask on your shortlist if end-user engagement and collaboration are key requirements. Diligently evaluate your end users’ actual needs to understand adoption challenges. Also, assess the value of the tool in scenarios where some end users never fully embrace it in their day-to-day work.
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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, Lead, and Principle 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, partial points to each feature that is partially present, and zero points to features that are deemed to be absent or unsatisfactory. 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

- **Innovators**: solutions with below average Vendor scores and above average Product scores.
- **Champions**: solutions with above average Vendor scores and above average Product scores.
- **Emerging Players**: solutions with below average Vendor scores and below average Product scores.
- **Market Pillars**: solutions with above average Vendor scores and below average Product scores.
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 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.

![Harvey Balls Chart]
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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. A single point is assigned to each evaluated feature that is regarded as being fully present, partial points to each feature that is partially present, and zero points to features that are deemed to be fully absent or unsatisfactory.
   - Fully present means all aspects and capabilities of the feature as described are in evidence.
   - Fully absent means all aspects and capabilities of the feature as described are missing or lacking.
   - 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.

2. Feature scores are converted to Stop Lights as follows:
   - Full points become a Green light.
   - Partial points become a Yellow light.
   - Zero 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>Stop Lights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature 1</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 2</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 3</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 4</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 5</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 7</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 8</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. In the event that insufficient pricing is available to accurately calculate a Value Index Info-Tech will omit it from the Vendor Landscape.
Vendor Landscape Methodology: Information Presentation – Price Evaluation: Mid-Market

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

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 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.

Analysts may also elect to list only the most Exemplary Performers for a given use-case. One to three vendors will appear for each of these purchasing scenarios with a brief explanation as to why we selected them as top-of-class.
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 Raw Pricing for the vendor either as received from the vendor or as collected from publicly available sources.
- 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 nor 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

A mid-level clothing manufacturer/retailer is looking to implement a centrally managed project portfolio management solution.

The expected solution capabilities are as follows:

- 100 primary/full users servicing a population of 1,000 who need to have access to project and portfolio reports through an end-user intranet/portal.
- License + Maintenance and/or SaaS service fees for the first three years of the deal, including typical professional services/consulting costs related to the deployment and any typical engagements over the first three years.
- If the solution being quoted is a SaaS solution, the cost of additional storage should be included, if applicable.
- Top-level support services should include all implementation support, ongoing support, and documentation.