Raab associates, inc.

345 Millwood Rd •Chappaqua, NY 10514

914.241.2117 • www.raabassociates.com

Demand Generation Deployment Survey

David M. Raab
Raab Associates Inc.
May 2009

Table of Contents

Demand Generation Deployment Survey

Executive Summary

A survey of demand generation users regarding the how soon after deployment they began using selected features found that:

- **Basic features can be deployed quickly.** More than sixty percent of respondents reported deploying an outbound email campaign in their first week and more than 40% had deployed five basic features within the first month.

- **Marketers deploy basic features first, followed by advanced and optional features.** The basic features require little cooperation from external departments and yield immediate returns from email campaigns. Advanced and optional features take longer to deploy but most marketers do eventually add them.

- **Fast deployment depends on preparation.** Features can be deployed immediately only if the necessary programs, integrations, process changes and staff training are prepared in advance. Companies that deploy the basic features quickly are able to expand sooner into advanced and optional features, speeding the return on their investment and increasing it.

- **A slow start can still be successful.** Companies that did not deploy immediately took one to three months to install the basic features. However, these firms ultimately deployed almost as many features as companies that executed campaigns in the first week.

- **Systems can be, and are, tailored to different company needs.** Companies showed great diversity in the features they deployed. This suggests that marketers are carefully selecting the features that meet their needs.

- **Systems are delivering value.** All respondents deployed a substantial numbers of features and most continued to add features over time. Steady growth suggests that marketers are seeing enough value to justify adding new features after the master the basic ones.

- **Responders are pleased.** Ninety-four percent of respondents said the system met or exceeded their expectations. Although respondents are may be atypically happy, skilled and committed marketers can still expect demand generation systems to deliver on their promises.

Key recommendations based on these findings are:

- **Start with the right system.** Although all demand generation systems can perform the same basic features, there are significant differences in their capabilities for the advanced

and optional features. Marketers should take care to select a system that will meet their long-term needs, and not just their basic, immediate ones.

- **Prepare before launch.** Marketers should begin work on campaign materials, staff training, process changes and cooperation with other departments well before a specific system is selected. Otherwise, the preparation time will delay the system launch, whether it occurs before or after the official "go live" date.

- **Plan for expansion.** Marketers must actively search for opportunities presented by their system and conduct regular reviews of current programs. External assistance is often essential, both to gain knowledge of what's worked elsewhere and because in-house staff is too busy with daily tasks to explore new options.

- **Measure and test.** A demand generation system opens many new possibilities for a marketing department, so testing and measurement of long-term results (not simply response rates) are essential to identify the most productive choices. Even though Web site analytics and campaign ROI reporting are classified as "advanced" features, they must be part of the plan for ultimate success.

Background

In April, 2009, Raab Associates hosted an open survey asking demand generation system users about their deployment experience. The major part of the survey listed 14 demand generation applications and asked how soon after deployment the respondent had first used them. Respondents were also asked the date they deployed their system, the vendor they used, and how well the deployment process and system itself met their expectations. All questions were optional.

Responses were solicited through Raab Associates blogs, queries on several Linked-In interest groups and Twitter. Nearly all replies were the result of Twitter posts by demand generation vendors and other industry participants. A total of 41 replies were received, of which two were rejected as incomplete and two because they referenced out-of-scope products, Zoho and Ad Giants PitchRocket.

Responses to the background questions are presented in Appendix A. They suggest that responses are skewed towards newer users and newer systems. They are also probably skewed towards more enthusiastic clients. The skews are likely caused by the mode of recruitment.

Given the small number of replies and apparent sample bias, results of this survey have limited absolute significance. However, they do provide useful insights into the general pace and functional sequence of demand generation system deployments.

Results

Feature Categories

The survey was designed to answer two questions: what demand generation features do marketers use, and when do they use them? Answers are tabulated in table 1, with features ranked by cumulative deployment rate. The features can be grouped into three categories, which closely correlate with deployment rates:

- **basic features** to send outbound emails and transfer the resulting leads to sales. These include outbound email campaigns, campaign response reporting, lead transfer to CRM, CRM integration / synchronization, and landing pages. All are deployed quickly and almost universally. The first four are used by more than 90% of respondents. Although landing pages are also an essential link in the campaign cycle, they just miss the 90% cut-off. This is probably because some marketers can (or must) build them on the company Web site outside of the demand generation system.

- **advanced features** that are used by 80-90% of respondents. These include Web site analytics, lead scoring, multi-step nurturing campaigns, Webinar campaigns, and campaign ROI reporting. These are more difficult to set up and not necessarily required by as many marketers. Several require cooperation from outside of the marketing department: Web site analytics rely on tags added to company Web pages; lead scoring rules must be built with sales inputs; and ROI reporting typically imports revenue from sales or financial systems. The need to involve other departments slows the deployment process and may prevent some marketers from ever using these features.

- **optional features** used by fewer than 80% of respondents. These include data cleansing, pay per click (PPC) campaign reporting, and Web and email surveys. What they have in common is that marketers have other ways to do them: data cleansing and PPC reports can be done outside the demand generation system, while surveys can be taken within the demand generation system by landing page forms.

Note that even the “optional” features were used by more than half the responders, and responders deployed an average of 11.5 features. Although responders to the survey may do more with their systems than most, this is still impressively broad utilization.

table 1								
"How soon after starting implementation did you first do..."								
number of responses	first week	first month	second month	third month	later	never	total	% used
outbound email campaign	23	8	5	1	0	0	37	1.00
campaign response reporting	12	16	3	2	4	0	37	1.00
lead transfer to CRM	19	5	8	0	2	2	36	0.94
CRM integration / synchronization	24	4	2	1	3	3	37	0.92
landing page	20	9	2	0	2	4	37	0.89
Web site analytics	14	8	6	2	2	4	36	0.89
lead scoring	12	8	3	0	10	4	37	0.89
multi-step lead nurturing campaign	8	10	7	2	6	4	37	0.89
Webinar campaign	5	13	5	2	6	5	36	0.86
campaign ROI reporting	6	11	4	0	8	7	36	0.81
data cleansing process	10	8	1	3	7	8	37	0.78
pay per click campaign reporting	9	5	1	2	6	13	36	0.64
Web page survey	3	6	5	1	6	16	37	0.57
email survey	2	2	7	1	7	16	35	0.54
	167	113	59	17	69	86	511	0.83

Deployment Speed

A casual glance at table 1 shows that the more commonly used features are also deployed sooner. Table 2 addresses this more precisely, showing the cumulative fraction of users who had deployed each feature through each time period. The first period with 75% or higher penetration is highlighted in blue. Category colors are repeated from table 1 and reinforce the close correlation between the pace of deployment and the ultimate deployment rate.

table 2						
cumulative deployment rate (all respondents)						
cumulative %	first week	first month	second month	third month	later	never
outbound email campaign	0.62	0.84	0.97	1.00	1.00	-
landing page	0.54	0.78	0.84	0.84	0.89	0.11
CRM integration / synchronization	0.65	0.76	0.81	0.84	0.92	0.08
campaign response reporting	0.32	0.76	0.84	0.89	1.00	-
lead transfer to CRM	0.53	0.67	0.89	0.89	0.94	0.06
Web site analytics	0.39	0.61	0.78	0.83	0.89	0.11
multi-step lead nurturing campaign	0.22	0.49	0.68	0.73	0.89	0.11
lead scoring	0.32	0.54	0.62	0.62	0.89	0.11
Webinar campaign	0.14	0.50	0.64	0.69	0.86	0.14
campaign ROI reporting	0.17	0.47	0.58	0.58	0.81	0.19
data cleansing process	0.27	0.49	0.51	0.59	0.78	0.22
pay per click campaign reporting	0.25	0.39	0.42	0.47	0.64	0.36
Web page survey	0.08	0.24	0.38	0.41	0.57	0.43
email survey	0.06	0.11	0.31	0.34	0.54	0.46
	0.33	0.55	0.66	0.70	0.83	0.17

Table 3 summarizes results by feature category.

table 3						
cumulative deployment rate by feature category (all respondents)						
average cumulative %	first week	first month	second month	third month	later	never
basic	0.53	0.76	0.87	0.89	0.95	0.05
advanced	0.25	0.52	0.66	0.69	0.87	0.13
optional	0.16	0.31	0.41	0.45	0.63	0.37

Tables 2 and 3 combine data for both users and non-users of a given feature. This masks the deployment speed among actual users. Table 4 shows cumulative deployment rates among users only. This drives home two points:

- **marketers deploy features very quickly.** Nearly 40% of features ever deployed were used in the first week. Two-thirds were used in the first month and 80% by the end of the second month. This is generally good news: marketers are deploying features and, presumably, gaining value very soon after implementation.

- **marketers add features over time.** Quick deployment might mean that marketers are learning what they need initially and then not developing any further. If this were true, all features would show roughly the same penetration rates for each time period in table 4. This is not the case. With minor exceptions, the basic features exceed 75% by the first month, advanced features reach 75% in the second or third month, and the optional features only reach it "later".

table 4						
cumulative deployment rate (users only)						
cumulative %	first week	first month	second month	third month	later	% used
landing page	0.61	0.88	0.94	0.94	1.00	0.89
outbound email campaign	0.62	0.84	0.97	1.00	1.00	1.00
CRM integration / synchronization	0.71	0.82	0.88	0.91	1.00	0.92
campaign response reporting	0.32	0.76	0.84	0.89	1.00	1.00
lead transfer to CRM	0.56	0.71	0.94	0.94	1.00	0.94
Web site analytics	0.44	0.69	0.88	0.94	1.00	0.89
multi-step lead nurturing campaign	0.24	0.55	0.76	0.82	1.00	0.89
Webinar campaign	0.16	0.58	0.74	0.81	1.00	0.86
lead scoring	0.36	0.61	0.70	0.70	1.00	0.89
campaign ROI reporting	0.21	0.59	0.72	0.72	1.00	0.81
data cleansing process	0.34	0.62	0.66	0.76	1.00	0.78
pay per click campaign reporting	0.39	0.61	0.65	0.74	1.00	0.64
Web page survey	0.14	0.43	0.67	0.71	1.00	0.57
email survey	0.11	0.21	0.58	0.63	1.00	0.54
	0.39	0.66	0.80	0.84	1.00	0.83

Table 5 shows the results by feature category.

table 5						
cumulative deployment rate by feature category (users only)						
average cumulative %	first week	first month	second month	third month	later	% used
basic	0.56	0.80	0.91	0.94	1.00	0.95
advanced	0.28	0.60	0.76	0.80	1.00	0.87
optional	0.25	0.47	0.64	0.71	1.00	0.63

Deployment Rates by Company

Averages can be misleading. Table 6 shows how many companies deployed all five basic features in each time period. Even though the average deployment rate for the five features was 53% in the first week (see table 3), only 14% of the respondents had actually deployed all five in that period. The fraction never exceeds 78%, even though the average final deployment rate of the five features taken separately is 95%. This suggests that **companies are more selective in what they deploy and how quickly they deploy it than the average deployment figures suggest.** See Appendix B for more detailed information.

table 6						
cumulative joint deployment rates for basic features (number of companies deploying all five features)						
features deployed	first week	first month	second month	third month	later	never
% companies deploying all 5 basic features	0.14	0.43	0.57	0.62	0.78	0.22
basic average deployment rate (table 3)	0.53	0.76	0.87	0.89	0.95	0.05

The company-level analysis also shows how widely deployment rates vary by company. A typical Pareto or "80-20 rule" distribution would have a few companies accounting for the bulk of the deployments. This does not happen. Table 7 shows the proportion of deployed features present in each of four equal-sized groups, with members ranked by deployment quantity. (That is, quartile 1 holds the 25% of cases with the fewest deployments, quartile 2 holds the 25% with the next-fewest, etc.) It finds **that the most active 25% of cases account for just 30% of the total deployed features**. The disparity starts out larger but shrinks steadily over time.

table 7					
% total features per quartile (ranked by numbers of features deployed)					
quartile	first week	first month	second month	third month	later
1	0.03	0.08	0.13	0.15	0.18
2	0.17	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.24
3	0.31	0.30	0.29	0.29	0.28
4	0.49	0.41	0.36	0.34	0.30
total	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Table 8 presents the average number of features per company, using the same quartiles as table 7. It confirms that **all companies, including the least active, continue to add features**

over time. This is important because there might have been a substantial group who failed to expand their systems beyond the initial deployment. Had this been so, the number of features per company in the first quartile would be stagnant. In fact, **the initially less-active companies actually add more features**, "catching up" with the firms that deployed many features at once. This is why the disparity among the quartiles shrinks over time.

table 8					
average features per company by quartile (ranked by numbers of features deployed)					
quartile	first week	first month	second month	third month	later
1	0.6	2.3	4.9	5.7	8.1
2	3.0	6.2	7.8	8.4	11.0
3	5.6	9.1	10.7	11.0	12.8
4	8.8	12.4	13.1	13.2	13.9
average	4.5	7.6	9.2	9.6	11.5

One caution: these figures almost certainly understate the number of features deployed by the most active companies, simply because the survey is limited to the most popular features. By the second month, quartile 4 already has deployed an average of 13.1 out of 14 possible features. In other words, the most active companies run out of new features to add. Had the survey contained more features, the average for the most active quartiles would probably have continued to grow. See Appendix C for additional information.

Initial vs. Final Deployment Rates

Do companies that start with few features also deploy fewer features in long run? Tables 7 and 8 do not answer this question because they reassign companies to quartiles for each period. Table 9 shows results when each company stays in its original quartile. The average feature counts in the later periods are fairly close for all quartiles, showing only slight correlation between the original feature counts and the final values. **Companies deploy roughly the same number of features regardless of how many they deploy at the start.** See Appendix D.

table 9					
average features per company by quartile (companies stay in original quartile over time)					
quartile	first week	first month	second month	third month	later
1	0.6	3.4	6.1	7.7	10.7
2	3.0	6.0	7.7	8.3	10.9
3	5.6	8.7	9.7	9.9	11.5
4	8.8	12.0	12.6	12.6	12.9
average	4.5	7.6	9.2	9.6	11.5

Table 10 uses the company-level data from table 9 to revisit the question of deployment speed. Table 3 showed nearly 40% of features ever deployed were deployed in the first week, rising to two-thirds by the first month and nearly 80% by the second month. Table 10 shows

these rates figures vary greatly by quartile: **the companies that begin with the most features quickly reach their limit, while the slow starters move at a much more deliberate pace.** For example, quartile 4 has deployed 93% of its features by the first month, while quartile 1 has deployed just 32%. Remember that the slow starters eventually come close to catching up, at least for the 14 features included in the survey.

table 10					
% of final features deployed by time period (companies stay in original quartile over time)					
quartile	first week	first month	second month	third month	later
1	0.05	0.32	0.57	0.72	1.00
2	0.28	0.55	0.70	0.77	1.00
3	0.49	0.76	0.84	0.86	1.00
4	0.68	0.93	0.97	0.97	1.00
average	0.39	0.66	0.79	0.84	1.00

These figures may reflect the initial preparation levels of the companies involved. **Marketers who immediately deploy multiple features have, presumably, prepared the necessary campaigns and processes in advance.** Those who start more slowly are probably spending their time on those tasks after initial implementation. This interpretation is supported by quartile-level deployment rates for the basic, advanced and optional features: companies that immediately deploy their basic features can quickly add other features, while companies that take two months to deploy the basic features must start on the other features much later. See Appendix E.

Conclusions

- **Demand generation systems can be deployed quickly.** More than sixty percent of respondents reported deploying an outbound email campaign in their first week and more than 40% had deployed all five basic features within the first month. Even though the survey results are probably better than industry-wide averages, they show what is possible.

- **Marketers deploy basic features first, followed by advanced and optional features.** The basic features require little cooperation from external departments and yield immediate returns from email campaigns. Advanced features are deployed more slowly, possibly because they require external cooperation and/or changes in marketing processes. Optional features are not especially difficult to deploy, but probably take a lower priority because marketers have alternative ways to accomplish the same tasks.

- **Fast deployment depends on preparation.** The most active quartile deployed an average 8.8 features in their first week. This is only possible if they carefully prepared the necessary programs, integrations, process changes and staff training in advance. Companies that deploy the basic features quickly are able to expand sooner into advanced and optional features, speeding the return on their investment and increasing it.

- **A slow start can still be successful.** Companies that did not deploy immediately took one to three months to install the basic features. However, these firms ultimately deployed nearly as many features as companies that executed campaigns in the first week. In fact, there is remarkably little relationship between the number of features a company deployed in the first week and the number it ultimately deploys.

- **Systems can be, and are, tailored to different company needs.** Companies showed great diversity in the features they deployed. Even among the basic features, which had a 95% average deployment rate, only 78% of respondents used all five. This suggests that marketers are carefully selecting the features that meet their needs.

- **Systems are delivering value.** All respondents deployed a substantial numbers of features and most continued to add features until they ran out of survey categories. Steady growth suggests that marketers are mastering basic features and then seeing enough value to justify adding new ones. Lack of growth would have meant they had deployed basic features and then lost interest or had abandoned their systems altogether.

- **Responders are pleased.** Ninety-four percent of respondents said the system met or exceeded their expectations. While again acknowledging that the survey respondents are probably atypical, this still suggests that skilled and committed marketers can expect demand generation systems to deliver on their promises.

Recommendations

This analysis suggests several recommendations that can help marketers to succeed with a demand generation system.

- **Start with the right system.** The survey showed that marketers were quite selective in the features they deployed, presumably reflecting the needs of their particular business. Although all demand generation systems can perform the same basic features, there are significant differences in their capabilities for the advanced and optional features covered in the survey, and for additional features the survey did not include. Marketers should be careful to select a system that will meet their long-term needs, and not just their basic, immediate ones.

- **Prepare before launch.** Marketers who deployed many features immediately received quicker return on their investment and were able to implement advanced and optional features much sooner. Fast initial deployment depends not just on preparing campaign materials, but also on managing staff training, process changes and cooperation with other departments. This work should begin well before a specific system is selected: otherwise, the preparation time will simply delay the system launch, deferring time-to-benefit just as much as an immediate launch followed by slow deployment.

- **Plan for expansion.** Survey respondents steadily deployed new features after their initial launch. This means they identified new business opportunities, understood how to tap them with their demand generation system, and then applied the necessary resources to execute successfully. None of this happens by accident. Marketers must actively search for opportunities presented by their system and conduct regular reviews of current programs. External assistance is often essential, both to gain knowledge of what's worked elsewhere and because in-house staff is often too busy with daily tasks to explore new options. Most demand generation vendors either have professional services staff or affiliated independent consultants to help clients in such efforts.

- **Measure and test.** A demand generation system opens many new possibilities for a marketing department, so testing and measurement of long-term results (not simply response rates) are essential to identify the most productive choices. The demand generation system can also provide much of the data for measurement, but only if it is set up to capture it. Even though Web site analytics and campaign ROI reporting are classified as "advanced" features–and even though they require cooperation with external departments including IT, sales and finance–they must be part of your plan for ultimate success.

About Raab Associates Inc.

Since 1987, Raab Associates Inc. has provided independent consulting on marketing technology and analysis to major firms in retail, communications, financial services, hospitality, and technology industries. David M. Raab has written hundreds of columns for publications including *DM News*, *DM Review* (now *Information Management*) and *Relationship Marketing Report* and spoken to audiences around the world. He is author of the *Raab Guide to Demand Generation Systems* and *The Marketing Performance Measurement Toolkit*.

Contact:
Raab Associates Inc.
345 Millwood Road
Chappaqua, NY 10514
www.raabassociatesinc.com
info@raabassociatesinc.com

Appendices

Appendix A.

"1. Which vendor's system did you use? (optional)"

table A-1	
number of responses	vendor
9	Marketo
6	Eloqua
3	Genius.com
3	LoopFuse
3	Pardot
2	Market2Lead
2	Treehouse Interactive
1	eTrigue
1	Vtrenz (Silverpop)
7	No Response
37	

This distribution does not match the known distribution of installations by industry vendors. In particular, Eloqua and Vtrenz (now Silverpop Engage B2B) are greatly under-represented. This probably reflects a relatively small Twitter presence by those vendors and/or their clients.

"2. When did you implement your system?"

table A-2	
number of responses	deployment date
3	4/09
3	3/09
1	2/09
3	1/09
13	2008
5	2005-2007
9	Invalid / No Response
37	

Thirty-one of the 37 accepted responses included a deployment date. Three were rejected as invalid: two were in the future (8/09 and 10/09) and one was 1990. One date of 6/01/2208 was edited to 6/01/2008.

The number of deployments for 2009 (10 in four months) seems disproportionately large compared with 13 in all of 2008 and 5 in all prior years, even considering the industry's very high current growth rate. This probably reflects more interest in responding among the newest customers.

The recency of some deployments (3 in 3/09 and 3 in 4/09) raises a question of whether their data should be included, since they have had only one or two months to start using different features. Although these six cases did report a higher portion of uses within the first month (83% vs 62% for all others), this did not appreciably skew the over-all average (66%). The newer cases actually reported using slightly more features than all others (13 vs. 11.2 features per company).

"3. How would you rate your experience with..."

Thirty-six of the 37 responses rated their experience with implementation and the system. Results for both questions were nearly identical and showed very high satisfaction levels: nearly two-thirds reported their expectations were exceeded and just one or two said things went worse than expected. Even though the self-selected respondents are probably more enthusiastic than average demand generation users, this still speaks well for industry-wide satisfaction rates.

table A-3

How would you rate your experience with...

% responses	better than expected	about as expected	worse than expected	total
system implementation	0.64	0.33	0.03	1.00
the system itself	0.65	0.31	0.06	1.00
number of responses	better than expected	about as expected	worse than expected	total
system implementation	23	12	1	36
the system itself	23	11	2	36

Appendix B.

Table B-1 shows how many companies had deployed a specified number of the five basic features (outbound email, CRM integration, landing pages, lead transfer, response reports) by each period. Figures for each row include any combination of features.

table B-1										
companies deploying basic features (outbound email, CRM integration, landing page, lead transfer, response reports)										
	number of companies					% of companies				
basic features deployed	first week	first month	second month	third month	later	first week	first month	second month	third month	later
1	31	35	37	37	37	0.84	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00
2	26	34	37	37	37	0.70	0.92	1.00	1.00	1.00
3	22	30	35	36	37	0.59	0.81	0.95	0.97	1.00
4	14	25	30	31	35	0.38	0.68	0.81	0.84	0.95
5	5	16	21	23	29	0.14	0.43	0.57	0.62	0.78

Table B-2 shows the number of companies deploying specific three-way combinations of features. Even though 100% of companies eventually deploy some three-way combination, no single combination is deployed by more than 92%.

table B-2									
% of companies deploying three-way combinations of basic features									
feature (deployment rate)					first week	first month	second month	third month	later
(1.00)	(1.00)	(0.94)	(0.92)	(0.89)					
outbound email	response reports		CRM integration		0.19	0.57	0.65	0.73	0.92
outbound email	response reports	lead transfer			0.19	0.54	0.70	0.76	0.92
outbound email		lead transfer	CRM integration		0.41	0.57	0.78	0.84	0.89
	response reports	lead transfer	CRM integration		0.19	0.54	0.68	0.73	0.89
outbound email	response reports			landing page	0.22	0.62	0.68	0.73	0.89
outbound email			CRM integration	landing page	0.32	0.57	0.68	0.73	0.81
	response reports	lead transfer	CRM integration		0.19	0.51	0.59	0.62	0.81
outbound email		lead transfer		landing page	0.30	0.51	0.70	0.73	0.81
	response reports	lead transfer		landing page	0.16	0.49	0.62	0.62	0.81
		lead transfer	CRM integration	landing page	0.38	0.51	0.70	0.73	0.78

Appendix C.

Table C-1 shows the number of companies that had cumulative deployed a specified number of features by the end of each time period. The cells are color-coded to indicate quartiles based on the number of features deployed.

The downward "movement" of the color blocks over time periods highlights the increasing number of features deployed within each quartile. The "compression" of the most active quartiles during the later periods illustrates their approach to the limit of 14 possible features per company. This visually suggests that the most active companies would have reported additional features had they been listed in the survey.

table C-1											
companies deploying specified number of features											
	number of companies						% of companies				
nbr features deployed	first week	first month	second month	third month	later		first week	first month	second month	third month	later
0	4	2					0.11	0.05			
1	6	1					0.16	0.03			
2	1	1	1				0.03	0.03	0.03		
3	4	2	0				0.11	0.05	0.00		
4	5	3	1	1			0.14	0.08	0.03	0.03	
5	3	3	5	3			0.08	0.08	0.14	0.08	
6	2	2	1	3	1		0.05	0.05	0.03	0.08	0.03
7	4	3	5	3	2		0.11	0.08	0.14	0.08	0.05
8	4	5	3	4	2		0.11	0.14	0.08	0.11	0.05
9	2	2	3	3	3		0.05	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.08
10	0	3	3	4	3		0.00	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.08
11	2	3	4	4	5		0.05	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.14
12		2	3	4	4			0.05	0.08	0.11	0.11
13		4	6	5	9			0.11	0.16	0.14	0.24
14		1	2	3	8			0.03	0.05	0.08	0.22
	37	37	37	37	37		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
median	4	8	9	10	12						
average	4.5	7.6	9.2	9.6	11.5						

Appendix C (continued)

Table C-2 shows the distribution of companies based on the number of features the company deployed in each feature category. Every company deployed at least three basic features and two advanced features. Four companies deployed zero optional features. This reinforces other findings that companies were selective in choosing which advanced and optional features to deploy.

table C-2						
final number of features deployed by company by feature category						
	number of companies				% of companies	
number of features deployed per company	basic (5 max)	advanced (5 max)	optional (4 max)	basic	advanced	optional
0	-	-	4	-	-	0.11
1	-	-	5	-	-	0.14
2	-	4	9	-	0.11	0.24
3	2	3	7	0.05	0.08	0.19
4	6	9	12	0.16	0.24	0.32
5	29	21	n/a	0.78	0.57	n/a
total	37	37	37	1.00	1.00	1.00

Appendix D.

Table D-1 shows the number of features deployed for each of the 37 survey cases over time. Colors indicate the original quartile for each case. The block on the left leaves each case in its original quartile for all periods, while the block on the right re-ranks the cases for each period. The mixing of colors shows how cases migrate from their original quartile over time.

table D-1
features deployed by case, ranked by number of features

	quartiles assigned in first week						quartiles reassigned each period				
quartile	first week	first month	second month	third month	later		first week	first month	second month	third month	later
1	0	0	0	6	6		0	0	0	4	6
1	0	1	2	4	7		0	0	2	5	7
1	0	5	5	6	8		0	1	4	5	7
1	0	0	5	5	13		0	2	5	5	8
1	1	8	10	10	11		1	3	5	6	8
1	1	7	8	8	11		1	3	5	6	9
1	1	4	7	9	13		1	4	5	6	9
1	1	4	5	7	13		1	4	6	7	9
1	1	2	13	14	14		1	4	7	7	10
q1 avg	0.6	3.4	6.1	7.7	10.7		0.6	2.3	4.3	5.7	8.1
2	1	3	8	10	14		1	5	7	7	10
2	2	3	5	5	7		2	5	7	8	10
2	3	5	7	8	9		3	5	7	8	11
2	3	5	7	7	10		3	6	7	8	11
2	3	6	7	8	12		3	6	8	8	11
2	3	11	11	12	14		3	7	8	9	11
2	4	4	4	5	10		4	7	8	9	11
2	4	8	9	9	11		4	7	9	9	12
2	4	9	11	11	11		4	8	9	10	12
q2 avg	3.0	6.0	7.7	8.3	10.9		3.0	6.2	7.8	8.4	11.0
3	4	8	9	10	11		4	8	9	10	12
3	4	11	12	12	12		4	8	10	10	12
3	5	6	6	6	9		5	8	10	10	13
3	5	7	7	7	12		5	8	10	11	13
3	5	8	10	11	14		5	9	11	11	13
3	6	7	8	8	8		6	9	11	11	13
3	6	10	12	12	13		6	10	11	11	13
3	7	9	9	9	9		7	10	11	12	13
3	7	10	13	13	13		7	10	12	12	13
3	7	11	11	11	14		7	11	12	12	13
q3 avg	5.6	8.7	9.7	9.9	11.5		5.6	9.1	10.7	11.0	12.8
4	7	12	14	14	14		7	11	12	12	13
4	8	10	10	10	10		8	11	13	13	14
4	8	13	13	13	13		8	12	13	13	14
4	8	13	13	13	13		8	12	13	13	14
4	8	8	11	11	14		8	13	13	13	14
4	9	12	12	12	12		9	13	13	13	14
4	9	14	14	14	14		9	13	13	14	14
4	11	13	13	13	13		11	13	14	14	14
4	11	13	13	13	13		11	14	14	14	14
q4 avg	8.8	12.0	12.6	12.6	12.9		8.8	12.4	13.1	13.2	13.9

Appendix E.

Table E-1 shows deployment rates by quartiles for the three feature categories (basic, advanced and optional). Quartiles assignments are based on the number of features deployed during the first week. Companies stay in their original quartile for all periods.

Basic features are deployed sooner than other features across all quartiles, suggesting that companies focus on the basic features first. Thus, quartile 4 (which largely completes its basic deployment in the first week) shows major growth in advanced deployment in the first month (jumping from 55% to 95% of total features) and for optional features during the first and second months (reaching 89% deployed by the second month). In contrast, quartile 1, which does not complete most basic deployments until the second month (growing from 53% to 85% deployed), only begins its major advanced deployment during that period (growing from 18% to 56% deployed) and ramps up its optional features even more slowly (50% by the third month).

table E-1

cumulative features deployed by quartile (based on first period rank)

		average deployed features by category					**% of final features deployed by period**				
quartile	feature category	first week	first month	second month	third month	later	first week	first month	second month	third month	later
1	basic	0.4	2.3	3.8	4.1	4.4	0.10	0.53	0.85	0.93	1.00
2	basic	2.4	3.7	4.1	4.2	4.7	0.52	0.79	0.88	0.90	1.00
3	basic	3.4	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.8	0.71	0.88	0.92	0.92	1.00
4	basic	4.2	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.84	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.00
avg		2.6	3.8	4.3	4.4	4.7	0.56	0.80	0.91	0.94	1.00
1	advanced	0.1	0.7	2.1	2.3	3.8	0.03	0.18	0.56	0.62	1.00
2	advanced	0.2	1.7	2.2	2.6	4.0	0.06	0.42	0.56	0.64	1.00
3	advanced	1.8	3.2	3.7	3.8	4.4	0.41	0.73	0.84	0.86	1.00
4	advanced	2.7	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.9	0.55	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00
avg		1.2	2.6	3.2	3.4	4.3	0.28	0.60	0.76	0.80	1.00
1	optional	0.0	0.4	0.8	1.2	2.4	0.00	0.18	0.32	0.50	1.00
2	optional	0.3	0.7	1.3	1.6	2.2	0.15	0.30	0.60	0.70	1.00
3	optional	0.4	1.3	1.6	1.7	2.3	0.17	0.57	0.70	0.74	1.00
4	optional	1.9	2.4	2.7	2.7	3.0	0.63	0.81	0.89	0.89	1.00
avg		0.6	1.2	1.6	1.8	2.5	0.26	0.49	0.64	0.72	1.00
1	all	0.6	3.4	6.7	7.7	10.7	0.05	0.32	0.63	0.72	1.00
2	all	3.0	6.0	7.7	8.3	10.9	0.28	0.55	0.70	0.77	1.00
3	all	5.6	8.7	9.7	9.9	11.5	0.49	0.76	0.84	0.86	1.00
4	all	8.8	12.0	12.6	12.6	12.9	0.68	0.93	0.97	0.97	1.00
avg		4.5	7.6	9.2	9.6	11.5	0.39	0.66	0.80	0.84	1.00