



An Executive Summary

An executive summary of the document “Maximizing Hardware Stability and Minimizing Maintenance Cost” which presents the rationale for an IT hardware reliability service called Reliability Plus two (R+2):

- Each year large IT organizations acquire millions of dollars of IT hardware with little or no consideration to the relative reliability of that hardware, despite the fact that the difference in reliability among competing products is often significant.
- The hardware that an IT organization acquires will positively or negatively impact the stability of its corporate computing system for the length of time that hardware remains on the system, which can be anywhere from four to eight years.
- In addition to maximizing the stability of the corporate system, selecting the most reliable hardware will encourage hardware vendors to create greater reliability in the future and should cause maintenance providers to charge less for maintenance (greater reliability means the hardware needs less maintenance and therefore should cost less to maintain).
- Participating in this service requires IT organizations to provide their maintenance data to RPI monthly. But this requires virtually no work on the part of those IT organizations because their maintenance providers will provide that data monthly at no charge.
- In addition to maximizing hardware stability and reducing maintenance costs, this service would enable each IT organization to compare their hardware performance monthly to industry standards and to identify which areas of their hardware generate the most disruptive hardware failures on their corporate computing system.

A Google search of the internet would disclose no other service that provides similar reliability statistics. The reliability pooling concepts that RPI uses in R+2 was first employed by RPI in R+, its mainframe monitoring service used by over 1,000 of the largest IT organizations from 1970 to 1999.

R+2 provides significant identifiable upside benefits and no downside other than changing a purchasing procedure that clearly warrants change.