



Comparison - 2Go Universal Mobile Access and some well known Remote Access vendors

2Go	Remote Access Vendor 1	Remote Access Vendor 2
<u>Simplicity</u>	<u>Complexity</u>	<u>Complexity</u>
The 2Go solution consists of only 4 components:	The Remote Access Vendor solution consists of multiple components	The Remote Access Vendor solution consists of multiple components
The 2Go Server (responsible for encrypted communication with clients as well as routing of authentication requests and connections to underlying enterprise applications)	May include one or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobile/Desktop server • Delivery Controller • Netscaler • vServer • Studio 	May include one or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • vSphere server • vSphere Desktop • User Environment Manager
The 2Go Validation Server (this cloud based server handles the validation of devices and the definition of target systems as well as delivering details to the device of user profiles following successful authentication)	May include one or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • License Server • File Server • RDS/TS License Server • Director 	May include one or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • vSphere server • vCenter server • App Volumes Manager
The 2Go Client (responsible for the encryption/decryption of communications between itself and the 2Go Server and handling the interactive display of streamed pixels)	May include or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web Interface • Receiver • Storefront 	May include or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H7 client • User Environment Manager • Mirage • Fusion Pro
The 2Go app-specific, application-specific VPN Gateway (automatically instigated by the 2Go Client if required to access the 2Go server)	Remote Access Vendor Hypervisor	vRealize

<u>Survivability</u>	<u>Risk of disruption</u>	<u>Risk of Disruption</u>
<p>The 2Go cloud-based servers run an automatic performance monitoring, automatic re-rerouting process which ensures that users are provided with continuous availability even in the event of failure of the 'designated' 2Go servers</p>	<p>Remote Access Vendor relies on the DDC being able to reconnect to VDA's in the Primary Zone but in the event of failure of the Primary Zone users will be reliant upon cached content in their local Satellite Zone which may not represent the current level of applications</p>	<p>Remote Access Vendor relies upon the vSphere server(s) being able to cope with demand levels from clients BUT there is an artificial limitation built in to the licensing to restrict each CPU to a maximum of 32 cores</p>
<u>Usability</u>	<u>Forced use of browser paradigm</u>	<u>Forced use of browser paradigm</u>
<p>The 2Go Client introduces a new level of end-user efficiency through the inclusion of a number of unique features such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Navigation toolbar which provides:- • full access to all of the applications available to the user via selected product icons, • 'jump back' access to previously opened applications via thumbnail snapshots of application state, • 'favorites' options to enable users to define their favorite applications, • Customized keyboards including Function and Control keys to enable users familiar access to keystrokes, • User-definable, user-selectable custom gestures to enable users to conduct complex workflows through a single gesture, • Voice recognition-based data entry/capture into even legacy applications 	<p>Remote Access Vendor relies upon delivering a browser based view of remote content to the end user and thereby imposes upon the remote client space constraints due to scroll bars, icon bars etc. as well as 'clumsy' mobile use e.g. having to pinch and zoom to access the red Close icon on screens, having to 'mirror' the actions of a remote cursor through gestures on the device etc.</p>	<p>Remote Access Vendor relies upon delivering a browser-based view of remote content to the end user and thereby imposes upon the remote client space constraints due to scroll bars, icon bars etc. as well as 'clumsy' mobile use e.g. having to pinch and zoom to access the red Close icon on screens, having to 'mirror' the actions of a remote cursor through gestures on the device etc.</p>



High Performance in Low Bandwidth	Low Performance in High Bandwidth	Low Performance in High Bandwidth
<p>The 2Go Server runs a response calculation algorithm which tracks the user interaction with the previous delivered 'view', computes the effect of that user interaction on the underlying application, calculates the 'delta' of pixels needed to represent that update and then transmits just the delta package thus providing for smooth and efficient use even in low bandwidth situations</p>	<p>The common perception of this Remote Access Vendor is that due to the need to redraw the entire screen each time there is an intervention by the end user, performance is slow</p>	<p>The common perception of this Remote Access Vendor is that due to the need to redraw the entire screen each time there is an intervention by the end user, performance is slow</p>
Straightforward Implementation	Complex Implementation	Complex Implementation
<p>The 2Go Server software does not require a dedicated physical server to support the use of the solution and can be co-located with the application software thus avoiding unnecessary investment in additional hardware. Simple to scale, the 2Go system provides for a federated server structure capable of supporting many thousands of mobile users if required.</p>	<p>The Remote Access Vendor 1 system requires the implementation of multiple technology stacks resulting in the need to allocate dedicated hardware or acquire additional hardware to enable implementation. Adding substantial numbers of users to the Remote Access Vendor 1 system is not a simple task and requires considerable advance planning to ensure proper operation.</p>	<p>The Remote Access Vendor 2 system requires the implementation of multiple technology stacks resulting in the need to allocate dedicated hardware or acquire additional hardware to enable implementation. Adding substantial numbers of users to the Remote Access Vendor 2 system is not a simple task and requires considerable advance planning to ensure proper operation.</p>



Low Cost	High Cost	High Cost
<p>Without access to the exact pricing of Remote Access Vendor's system it is our opinion that the initial purchase of the 2Go system would equate to something equivalent to the annual renewal of support for the Remote Access Vendor's solution i.e. about 80% cheaper. As a result annual running costs would also be lower and the lack of complexity would enable 2Go installations to be managed with fewer, less expensive staff to operate as well as to require less powerful and less numerous server capabilities</p> <p>As an example: to implement a full 2Go system serving 10,000 users over a 3-year term would require a budget of just under £3,000,000 including implementation.</p>	<p>The initial purchase costs of Remote Access Vendor 1's system are unknown but such intelligence as we can obtain points to them being around 5x more expensive than 2Go – this is without taking into account the TCO impact of having to have expensively trained staff in order to support the system which in the long term would make their solution even more expensive!</p> <p>As an example: to implement a full Remote Access Vendor 1 system serving 10,000 users of a 3-year term would require a budget of at least £15,000,000 + implementation costs</p>	<p>The exact initial purchase costs of Remote Access Vendor 2's system are unknown but such intelligence as we can obtain points to them being between 5x – 6x more expensive than 2Go – this is without taking into account the TCO impact of having to have expensively trained staff in order to support the system which in the long term would make their solution even more expensive!</p> <p>As an example: to implement a full Remote Access Vendor 2 system serving 10,000 users of a 3-year term would require a budget of over £15,500,000 + implementation costs</p>