

NO

4



 REALVNC®

Vendor Comparison Matrix for Remote Access Software

BUYERS GUIDE

Objective

To provide an IT Director with a comprehensive comparison of potential vendors for remote access software, focusing on key features, costs, support, and market reputation, to facilitate an informed decision.

Please note, this matrix contains dummy data and should be used as an example of the data type for comparison. The matrix is also not exhaustive and should only be used as a starting point and adapted for your specific business requirements.

1. Feature Comparison

OBJECTIVE

To compare the key features offered by each vendor, ensuring alignment with the organization's needs for IT Support and Device Management.

Feature Category	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Comments/Notes
Security Protocols	AES-256 encryption, Multi-factor authentication (MFA)	AES-128 encryption, MFA, SSL/TLS support	AES-256 encryption, SSO, Zero Trust model	Vendor A and C offer stronger encryption and advanced security features
Performance Metrics	99.9% uptime, low latency (average 20ms)	99.5% uptime, medium latency (average 50ms)	99.8% uptime, low latency (average 30ms)	Vendor A has superior uptime and performance
User Experience	Intuitive UI, customizable dashboards	Standard UI, limited customization	User-friendly UI, basic customization	Vendor A offers the most customizable user interface
Integration Capabilities	Integrates with major ITSM tools, AD, and MDM platforms	Limited ITSM integration, supports AD	Full ITSM and AD integration, limited MDM support	Vendor A offers the broadest integration capabilities
Scalability	Supports up to 10,000 users, dynamic scaling	Supports up to 5,000 users, manual scaling	Supports up to 8,000 users, dynamic scaling	Vendor A offers the highest scalability
Compliance	GDPR, HIPAA, and ISO 27001 certified	GDPR and HIPAA compliant, not ISO certified	GDPR and SOC 2 compliant, HIPAA in progress	Vendor A and C have stronger compliance certifications

2. Cost Analysis

OBJECTIVE

To compare the key features offered by each vendor, ensuring alignment with the organization's needs for IT Support and Device Management.

Cost Component	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Comments/Notes
Licensing Costs	\$XX,XXX/year	\$X,XXX/year	\$X,XXX/year	Vendor A is the most expensive, but offers the most features
Implementation Costs	\$X,XXX (one-time)	\$X,XXX (one-time)	\$X,XXX (one-time)	All vendors have comparable implementation costs
Ongoing Support Costs	\$X,XXX/year	\$X,XXX/year	\$X,XXX/year	Vendor B offers the lowest ongoing support costs
Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)	\$XXX,XXX (over 3 years)	\$XX,XXX (over 3 years)	\$XX,XXX (over 3 years)	Vendor B offers the lowest TCO, but with fewer features
Potential Savings	High due to reduced downtime and efficiency gains	Moderate savings, fewer automation tools	High due to automation and lower maintenance	Vendor A and C offer potential savings through advanced features

3. Support and SLA Comparison

OBJECTIVE

To assess the quality of support and the terms of service level agreements (SLAs) provided by each vendor.

Cost Component	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Comments/Notes
Support Channels	24/7 phone, email, chat support	Business hours phone and email support	24/7 phone, chat, no email support	Vendor A offers the most comprehensive support
Response Time	<1 hour for critical issues	<2 hours for critical issues	<1 hour for critical issues	Vendors A and C offer faster response times
Dedicated Account Manager	Yes	No	Yes	Vendors A and C provide dedicated account management
SLA Terms	99.9% uptime guarantee, financial penalties for non-compliance	99.5% uptime guarantee, no penalties	99.8% uptime guarantee, limited penalties	Vendor A has the most favorable SLA terms
Customer Satisfaction	95% satisfaction rate	85% satisfaction rate	90% satisfaction rate	Vendor A has the highest customer satisfaction rate

4. Reputation and Market Position

OBJECTIVE

To evaluate each vendor's market reputation, based on customer satisfaction, industry awards, and analyst reports.

Reputation Metric	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Comments/Notes
Customer Satisfaction Ratings	4.7/5 (based on 500+ reviews)	4.2/5 (based on 300+ reviews)	4.5/5 (based on 400+ reviews)	Vendor A has the highest satisfaction rating
Industry Awards	Best Remote Access Software 2023	Rising Star 2023	Best Customer Service 2023	Vendor A and C have prestigious industry awards
Analyst Reports	Leader in Gartner Magic Quadrant	Niche Player in Forrester Wave	Best Customer Service 2023	Vendor A is recognized as an industry leader
Market Share	30% market share	15% market share	20% market share	Vendor A has the largest market share

Summary and Recommendations

1

Finalize the Communication Strategy

Vendor A stands out with superior security, performance, integration capabilities, and compliance certifications, making it the best fit for a large enterprise with complex IT Support and Device Management needs.

Vendor C offers a balanced mix of features with good security and user experience, suitable for mid-sized enterprises.

Vendor B is cost-effective but may not provide the comprehensive features needed for more complex environments.

2

Cost Analysis:

Vendor B has the lowest total cost of ownership, making it suitable for budget-conscious organizations with simpler needs.

Vendor A is the most expensive but offers the highest potential for savings through improved efficiencies and reduced downtime.

3

Support and SLA Comparison:

Vendor B has the lowest total cost of ownership, making it suitable for budget-conscious organizations with simpler needs.

Vendor A is the most expensive but offers the highest potential for savings through improved efficiencies and reduced downtime.

4

Reputation and Market Position:

Vendor A is the clear leader in terms of reputation, market share, and analyst recognition, indicating a strong and reliable market presence.

Vendor C is a strong contender with a good reputation and recognition, making it a viable alternative if Vendor A is not chosen.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION:

Vendor A

is recommended for large enterprises that require robust features, superior support, and are willing to invest in a higher TCO for long-term benefits.

Vendor B

is a strong alternative for organizations that need a balanced feature set with good support but at a slightly lower cost.

Vendor C

may be suitable for smaller organizations or those with limited budgets, provided the feature limitations are acceptable.