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NETTING IT OUT
This Bull's-Eye report gives you our overall comparative rating of seven enterprise content management products. This rating combines our previously-published Bull’s-Eyes on the create step, the compose/stage step and the produce/deliver step of our content management lifecycle, as well as on granularity, metadata management, and application integration.

The Documentum 5 ECM Platform has the highest score. Close behind, and tied for second place with identical scores, are FileNet P8 and Stellent Content Management System 6. Interwoven 5.5 Content Infrastructure and Merant Collage 4.0 rank fourth and fifth, followed by IBM Content Manager v8.2 and Microsoft Content Management Server 2002. (For complete details, see links to each Bull’s-Eye Report at the end of this report.)

DETERMINING THE COMPOSITE RATINGS
Summing Up Our Research
In September, 2002, we published our framework for evaluating and comparing enterprise content management systems. We developed this framework so that you could assess and compare the growing number of products with equivalent functionality and similar supplier claims.

Our framework focuses on six major evaluation criteria:
• Content management lifecycle support, which is based on a four-step process: create, compose/stage, produce/deliver, and age/archive
• Granularity
• Metadata management
• Application integration
• Administration
• Globalization

We have published individual evaluations of seven content management products against this framework. The products are:
• Documentum 5 ECM Platform
• FileNet P8
• IBM Content Manager v8.2
• Interwoven 5.5 Content Management Infrastructure
• Merant Collage 4.0
• Microsoft Content Management Server 2002
• Stellent Content Management System v6
To net out our evaluations, we publish Bull’s-Eye reports that present our comparative reviews of all seven products against the criteria that differentiate these products the most. The closer a product comes to hitting our Bull’s-Eye, the closer it comes to meeting the majority of customers’ requirements in the areas of product functionality that should matter most to customers.

**Differentiating Products**

What are the differences among product functionality that make the biggest difference in the long run? We chose six Bull’s-Eye criteria based on their importance for managing enterprise content and on their ability to draw distinctions among the seven products. Therefore, we produced separate Bull’s-Eye reports on three of the four steps within our content management lifecycle: create, organize/stage, and produce/deliver. We also published reports on granularity, metadata management, and application integration.

We did not produce reports on administration, globalization, or the age/archive step of our content management lifecycle, as we did not find much differentiation among products in these areas.

**How Are Bull’s-Eyes Scored?**

For each Bull’s-Eye, a product can earn a score of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, with 1 being the best score and 5 being the worst. Multiple products may earn the same score. In these reports, the scores are presented and explained in the narrative and are presented visually within Bull’s-Eyes or archery targets. A product with a score of 1 would be presented as hitting the center of the Bull’s-Eye.

**How Is the Composite Bull’s-Eye Weighted?**

The Composite Content Management Bull’s-Eye combines the factors that we considered in our six criteria-specific bull’s-eyes. We decided to weight each of the bull’s-eye scores equally as we cannot distinguish any one as being substantially more significant than another. The net effect is to emphasize the three sub-criteria underlying our content management lifecycle, and weight each of them as being as important as granularity, metadata management, and application integration.

To create the composite Bull’s-Eye score, we have simply summed the individual scores from the separate Bull’s-Eyes. Theoretically, 6 is the perfect score and 30 is the worst possible score.

Thus, the scores can range from 6 to 30. A product that hits all six Bull’s-Eyes rates a “perfect 6,” while another that consistently scores a 5 will have a composite score of 30. Visually, a perfect score would hit the Bull’s-Eye. Lower scores would hit the outer bands of the Bull’s-Eye. Those outer bands correspond respectively to scores of 7-12, 13-18, 19-24, and 25-30.

Table A shows the individual criterion scores and the composite scores for each of the seven products. Illustration 1 shows the Composite Content Management Bull’s-Eye.

**THE BOTTOM LINE**

While no product hits the Composite Content Management Bull’s-Eye with a “perfect” 6, the Documentum 5 ECM Platforms comes close with a score of 7. This product provides a wide range of enterprise content management features and functions. It supports all of the critical services identified for Compose/Stage and the Produce/Deliver steps of our content management lifecycle, as well as essential features and functions for granularity, metadata management, and application integration. The Documentum 5 ECM Platform, however, is not quite as strong in its content creation capabilities as FileNet P8 and Stellent v6.5, as it does not (yet) include integrated WYSIWYG editing features.

FileNet P8 and Stellent Content Management System v6 are tied for second place with a Composite Content Management Bull’s-Eye score of 12. FileNet P8 hits the Content Creation Bull’s-Eye and the Granularity Bull’s Eye, highlighting its capabilities for managing granular content components. Stellent hits the Content Creation Bull’s-Eye and the Compose/Stage Bull’s-Eye, emphasizing its abilities for organizing and managing content. Notably, neither product scores below a 3 on any Bull’s-Eye.

Interwoven 5.5 Content Infrastructure and Merchant Collage 4.0 rank neck and neck, with Composite Content Management Bull’s-Eye scores of 19 and 20 respectively. Both products focus on managing Web-based content and are designed to provide content to third-party runtime delivery environments, such as e-commerce servers, enterprise portals, or external Web sites:
Composite Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Management Lifecycle</th>
<th>Granularity</th>
<th>Metadata Management</th>
<th>Application Integration</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentum 5 ECM Platform</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FileNet P8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM Content Manager v8.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interwoven 5.5 Content Infra-structure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merant Collage 4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Content Management Server 2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellent Content Management System v6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A. This table shows the individual Bull’s-Eye scores for the seven content management products, together with the composite score.

Remember that this composite bull’s-eye gives you a cross-criteria overview. However, based on your organization’s specific requirements, you may find the criteria-specific bull’s-eyes more useful in developing your own short-list of products to consider. Here’s a product-by-product recap of our composite summary:

- Interwoven scores highest in its metadata management capability, the result of including its industry-leading MetaTagger product within its overall platform offering. Otherwise, Interwoven rates a 3 or above, scoring a 5 on the Produce/Deliver Bull’s-Eye.

- Merant Collage 4.0 garners a 2 on both the Content Creation Bull’s-Eye and the Granularity Bull’s-Eye. The product is designed to manage fine-grained content components. However, Merant has yet to follow through with strong metadata management capabilities. Currently, it relies on predefined metadata definitions. Collage 4.0 has no capabilities for supporting automatic or semi-automatic content categorization based on the linguistic analysis of text. Collage 4.0 is also weak in application integration capabilities. It provides a self-contained environment without a published API set, where individual content components cannot be easily called from third-party applications.

- IBM Content Manager v8.2 falls slightly behind Interwoven’s offering with a Composite Content Management Bull’s-Eye score of 22. Content Manager v8.2 scores a 2 with the Produce/Deliver Bull’s-Eye, a reflection of its ability to manage the distribution of enterprise content to both hardcopy and many different electronic environments. The product showed up weakest in our Content Creation Bull’s-Eye and our Compose/Stage Bull’s-Eye. However, since we published our product review (in April, 2003), IBM has announced its intention to substantially improve its Web-based content creation capabilities with its recently announced ac-
Once IBM completes the integration of this product, we expect to lower the Content Creation Bull’s-Eye score. (The resulting score will be based on the degree of integration with the core platform offering.)

Finally, Microsoft Content Manager Server 2002 rates the lowest in our Composite Content Management Bull’s-Eye with a score of 26. This product earns a 3 in the Application Integration Bull’s-Eye as a result of being within Microsoft’s family of .NET server products. Otherwise, it has relatively low ratings on the remaining five Bull’s-Eyes.

Going forward, we will keep a close eye on these seven products and the implications for the enterprise content management marketplace. We plan to publish updates to the individual product evaluations as companies release major new versions. We also plan to update the content management Bull’s-Eyes as the products and the underlying technologies on which they are based evolve. Stay tuned for future updates.

Previously-Published Content Management Bull's-Eye Reports:

- “Hitting the Content Creation Bull's-Eye,”

- “Hitting the Compose/Stage Bull's-Eye,”

- “Hitting the Produce/Deliver Bull's-Eye,”

- “Hitting the Content Granularity Bull's-Eye,”

- “Hitting the Metadata Management Bull's-Eye,”
  [http://www.psgroup.com/doc/products/2003/7/PSGB7-3-03CC/PSGB7-3-03CC.asp](http://www.psgroup.com/doc/products/2003/7/PSGB7-3-03CC/PSGB7-3-03CC.asp)

- “Hitting the Application Integration Bull's-Eye,”