Organisation: DIGITALEUROPE	Name: Sylvie Feindt	Date: 8 May 2015

ENTR Lot 9: Enterprise servers and data equipment

Document comment relates to	Section in document	Page number	Topic	Comment	Proposed change
Task 2	**2.5.3.2, Figure 16**	**38**	**Storage sales by type**	**The last two sentences on page 38 state that NAS systems lead by volume followed by DAS. This does not match the data legend in figure 16.**	**Switch DAS and SAN in the legend on figure 16. , as SAN shows the second highest level of unit sales volumes in figure 16.**
Task 2	**2.5.3**	**38-39**	**Storage Sales projections**	**The discussion only assess unit sales and does not address system capacity or power consumption.**	**Given that an OL-1 system is typically a single drive and capacity per unit sales grows significantly with each increase in On-line level, it seems necessary to translate the unit sales into capacity and discuss the relative capacity sold and the impact of COMS on future capacity growth. In turn, the capacity review should lead to a consideration of the relative power footprint and the impact of each category on power use and consumption.** **An industry expert estimates that the entry level systems (OL-2) represented by the base case represents 40% of the unit sales but only 20% of the power use. OL-3 products represent approximately 30% of sales and 40-50% of power use. The percentages do not include OL-1 systems, which are consumer systems and not consider in the Lot 9 scope.**
Task 2	**Table 22**	**43**		**IBM no longer manufacturers or brands network**	**Remove IBM from column 3 of table 22.**

Document comment relates to	Section in document	Page number	Topic	Comment	Proposed change
				switches.	
Task 2	**Table 24**	**48**		**The IDC unit shipment data should be used instead of the Gartner unit shipment data, as it matches better to the SNIA taxonomy and the network attach functionality.**	**Digital Europe recommends the report use the IDC data, as it is more representative of the network attach functionality and the SNIA taxonomy and allows for a better assessment of the market conditions and product capability and functionality.**
Task 2	**Table 24**	**48**	**CAS products**	**CAS pricing is off by an order of magnitude based on our experience. CAS category should be removed, as it is functional vs. network connectivity and is inconsistent with the categorization used in the task documents. In addition, the report notes that CAS should be removed due to its minor market share.**	**Remove CAS category from Table 24 and the accompanying discussion, as CAS is used to designate functional activity, not network connectivity. DAS, NAS and SAN category types indicate the type of network connectivity.**
Task 2	**5.1**	**52**	**Exclusions**	**Resilient server category has 1.25% of the market, which includes a significant piece of the 4 socket server products suggesting the two socket resilient servers represent approximately 1% of the total server market. This 20% of the stated threshold of 5% of the market.**	**Resilient servers should be excluded from the regulatory product.**
Task 2	**5.1**	**52**	**Exclusion of network switches**	**The paragraph regarding covered network equipment appears to be inconsistent with Task 1, section 2.2.4.1 which stated that only data center switches would be included in scope.**	**Make the discussion and recommendations on covered network switches consistent between the Task 1 and 2 documents.**