

# Unified Communications Features in New Zealand Councils

Report November 2008



## Table of contents

Abstract.....	1
Introduction .....	1
Method .....	2
Results and Discussion .....	2
Council Investment in UC .....	2
Usage and Planned Usage of UC Features in Councils.....	3
<i>The most commonly used UC features among councils</i> .....	3
<i>UC features that are rapidly becoming commonly used by councils</i> .....	3
<b>Table 1.</b> The Main UC Features Councils Use or Plan to Use.....	3
<i>UC features that are gradually becoming used more by councils</i> .....	5
<i>UC features that match the operations of a subset of councils</i> .....	5
<i>UC features that may eventually be used in councils</i> .....	5
UC Features That Have Had the Greatest Impact on Council Operations .....	6
<b>Table 2.</b> UC Features That Have Had the Greatest Impact on Council Operations .....	6
Intended and Realised Benefits of UC.....	7
<b>Table 3.</b> The Main Intended and Realised Benefits of UC.....	7
<b>Table 4.</b> The Main Additional Realised Benefits of UC .....	8
UC Implementation Issues.....	8
<b>Table 5.</b> The Main People Involved in the Decision to Implement a UC feature .....	8
<b>Table 6.</b> The Main Return-On-Investment (RIO) Metrics used for UC Implementations.....	9
<b>Table 7.</b> Table 7. The Main Barriers to overcome when implementing a UC feature.....	9
Summary and Limitations .....	10
Bibliography .....	11
Research Sponsor: Zeacom.....	14

## Abstract

This paper reports on the interim findings of a survey assessing usage and planned usage of Unified Communications features (UC) in New Zealand Councils. This survey was sponsored and supported by the Unified Communications provider, Zeacom. 33 of the 85 New Zealand local authorities responded to the online survey. The findings indicate an increasing use of UC among councils. The UC features of VoIP, Contact Centre Voice Queuing and IP PBXs are the most popularly implemented features to date. However, the number of Councils implementing the UC features of Microsoft Outlook Calendar integration with Presence, Presence, Unified Messaging and Microsoft Outlook Inbox integration with Voicemail is expected to rise rapidly. The council operations that have been impacted the most by the implementation of the UC features are VoIP, Contact Centre Voice Queuing and Outlook Calendar Integration. It was also found that, generally, the main intended benefit of implementing UC features is to promote work efficiencies for end users, and this benefit is often realised. In addition the results of the survey show that the greatest barriers to implementing UC features are typically financial or people issues rather than technical problems.

## Introduction

Unified communications (UC) is defined in Wikipedia as "a term used to describe all forms of call and multimedia/cross-media message-management functions controlled by an individual user for both business and social purposes". Current features or technologies which may potentially be incorporated within UC include:

- VoIP (Voice over an Internet Protocol network)
- IP PBX (Private Branch eXchange)
- Softphones
- Presence
- Unified Messaging (emails, voice messages and faxes all in the same inbox)
- Various forms of conferencing (audio, video and web)
- Mechanisms for Microsoft Outlook users to integrate the calendar component of the application with Presence profiles and the inbox component with voicemail (a partial solution to unified messaging)
- Facilities for PC users to share documents and desktops
- Integration of mobile and landline telephony and other services
- A range of Contact Centre Operations such as voice, email, SMS message queuing, enhanced routing of calls and interactive voice recognition services.

Many of the above features are explained further in this report's Glossary.

It is unlikely that every currently available UC feature could be effectively utilised by any particular organisation. For instance, an organisation dealing with the public or a large customer base may require many of the Contact Centre Operations to function efficiently but have no need of any conferencing features. This research attempts to identify the UC features that are most suitable for use in New Zealand Local Authorities (i.e. Councils) by conducting a survey of current and planned adoption of UC features among councils and eliciting insights into the suitability of particular UC features for council operations.

The main objectives of the survey are to:

- Ascertain the levels utilisation or planned utilisation of the various UC features within New Zealand councils
- Establish the UC features considered to have the most impact on the operation of councils
- Determine the intended and realised benefits of adopting UC features in general for councils
- Identify the key barriers to implementing UC features in general and the main staff involved in the implementation decision

## Method

The survey consisted of a questionnaire containing general questions about UC in councils. These covered the current and projected council investments in UC, the expected and observed benefits of UC in councils and UC implementation issues. Other questions about specific UC features were also included. These elicited which UC features are currently used and which are planned to be used by councils, and which UC features have had the greatest impact on council operations.

The questions were initially composed by a team consisting of ALGIM researchers, a representative from the survey sponsor, UC provider Zeacom, and a council executive with more than thirty years experience across a wide range of council activities, including information technology and management and contact centre operations. The questions were then refined with input from members of the ALGIM Executive Committee and entered into the online survey instrument QuestionPro.

The candidate subjects for this survey were IS or IT Managers or similar positions among the 85 New Zealand councils. Each candidate was invited to participate in the online survey via email. The survey was conducted for two weeks in October 2008.

## Results and Discussion

Representatives from 33 of the 85 Councils from throughout New Zealand responded in the survey - a response rate of 39%. The councils involved in the survey varied greatly in their organisational sizes, ranging from 40 to 2300 employees. Respondents' job titles were predominantly IS or IT Managers, but several Chief Information Officers (CIOs) and Corporate Services Managers also took part in the survey. All respondents reported that they had either some or substantial familiarity with UC concepts.

### Council Investment in UC

76% of survey respondents identified that their councils had at least some investment in UC to date. For these councils, their average investment is around \$125k. However, one Council has investments of over \$350k. In the next two years, 85% of respondents report that their councils will be expanding their investments in UC. On average an additional \$73k will be spent. The scale of the average expected growth in UC investments compared to the current level indicates that the use of UC features in councils is likely to steadily rise in the near future.

Respondents also describe that new UC features are typically implemented as a separate project, although it is not unusual for features to be implemented as a component of a larger technology-related project. This suggests that most councils will be involved in a reasonable number of UC implementation projects over the next two years.

## Usage and Planned Usage of UC Features in Councils

Table 1 summarises the UC features in use or planned to be in use among councils as reported by respondents. The usage of most of the UC features described in Table 1 can be grouped into the following categories:

### *The most commonly used UC features among councils*

Table 1 identifies that the three UC features most commonly used in Councils are VoIP, Contact Centre Voice Queuing and IP PBXs. Furthermore, only 15% of respondents describe that they have plans to begin using or to expand usage of these three features in the future. This suggests that this group of features appears to be reaching a saturation point among the councils involved in our survey. Most of the councils surveyed consider that these features are useful for their operation and they are already utilising them. This is also symptomatic that the technology to implement these three features has attained a level of maturity higher than that of the other UC features.

### *UC features that are rapidly becoming commonly used by councils*

A number of features in Table 1 have a reasonable level of current usage and strong planned usage, such as Microsoft Outlook Calendar integration with Presence Profiles, Presence, Unified Messaging, and Microsoft Outlook Inbox integration with Voicemail. These features are a good match for the operation of most councils in the survey, as a high proportion either currently use them or plan to use them in the short to medium term.

Unlike the implementation of many of the other UC features, the roll-out of a Presence product is potentially problematic because end users must regularly update their availability for the product to operate as intended. One of the questions included in the survey concerned the Presence updating habits of end users in councils. 27% of respondents report that Presence updating is a regular habit for their end users and another 30% of respondents identified that it is a semi-regular habit for their end users. As only about half the respondents' councils currently have an automated Presence feature (see Table 1), this suggests that a few councils have end users struggling with manual versions of Presence products. Moreover, the data on Presence updating habits indicates that few councils should have problems with end user acceptance issues when their planned Presence product implementations proceed in the near future.

**Table 1.** The Main UC Features Councils Use or Plan to Use

UC Feature	% of Respondents using or planning to use the feature	Scope of usage or planned usage and term of plans (short, medium, long)
VoIP	Current: 70%	mostly only in several parts of each council
	Planned: 15%	nearly all enterprise wide and in the short to medium term
Contact Centre Voice Queuing	Current: 61%	About half are enterprise wide
	Planned: 15%	nearly all enterprise wide and in the long term
IP PBX	Current: 55%	mostly enterprise wide
	Planned: 15%	All enterprise wide but only about half in the short to medium term
Microsoft Outlook Calendar integration with Presence Profiles	Current: 52%	mostly enterprise wide
	Planned: 36%	mostly enterprise wide and only a little over half in the short to medium term
Presence	Current: 48%	mostly enterprise wide
	Planned: 24%	mostly enterprise wide and only a little over half in the short to

		medium term
Audio Conferencing	Current: 48%	about half enterprise wide
	Planned: 12%	all enterprise wide and in the medium to long term
Unified Messaging	Current: 45%	mostly enterprise wide
	Planned: 36%	mostly enterprise wide and only a little over half in the short to medium term
Microsoft Outlook Inbox integration with Voicemail	Current: 42%	mostly enterprise wide
	Planned: 36%	mostly enterprise wide and only a little over half in the short to medium term
Call control for operators or receptionists	Current: 42%	mostly enterprise wide
	Planned: 12%	all enterprise wide but of varying terms
Document Sharing	Current: 36%	mostly enterprise wide
	Planned: 21%	a little over half enterprise wide and in the medium to long term
Contact Centre Email Queuing	Current: 27%	almost all enterprise wide
	Planned: 21%	nearly all enterprise wide and in the medium to long term
Hands off calls between mobile and landline devices	Current: 27%	a little less than half enterprise wide
	Planned: 15%	about half enterprise wide and in the long term
Contact Centre Presence Viewing across the organisation	Current: 24%	about half enterprise wide
	Planned: 15%	all enterprise wide but of varying terms
Desktop Sharing	Current: 24%	about half enterprise wide
	Planned: 15%	mostly only in several parts of the council and in the short to medium term
Video Conferencing	Current: 21%	mostly enterprise wide
	Planned: 30%	considerable variation in organisational scope and the term of plans
Enhance Contact Centre Call Routing	Current: 18%	about half enterprise wide
	Planned: 21%	mostly enterprise wide but of varying terms
Contact Centre Interactive Voice Recognition	Current: 15%	variable organisational scope
	Planned: 21%	majority enterprise wide and in the medium to long term
Access UC functionality from mobiles	Current: 12%	about half enterprise wide
	Planned: 30%	the majority enterprise wide and in the medium to long term
Workflow Integration	Current: 12%	mostly only in several parts of the council
	Planned: 27%	mostly only in several parts of the council and in the short to medium term
Contact Centre SMS / Text Message Queuing	Current: 6%	all enterprise wide
	Planned: 30%	mostly enterprise wide and in the medium to long term

### ***UC features that are gradually becoming used more by councils***

Document Sharing, Contact Centre Email Queuing, Video Conferencing and Enhanced Contact Centre Call Routing are all features from Table 1 that have either a reasonable or, for the last two features, a comparatively low level of current usage. However a large number of councils have medium to long term plans to implement more of these features, indicating that they may soon become more common. This suggests that while the features are a satisfactory match for operations within many councils, some of the current technologies used to implement them may be less mature, more expensive or less integrated with many existing communications systems than some other UC features.

### ***UC features that match the operations of a subset of councils***

Table 1 shows that some UC features have a reasonable level of current use but few councils are planning to implement these features in the future. Audio conferencing, call control for operators or receptionists, hands off calls between mobile and landline devices, Contact Centre Presence Viewing across the organisation and Desktop Sharing fall into this category. These features are a good match for the operations of only a subset of councils and they are making use of them. Further analysis may reveal commonalities among the councils using these features. For instance, they may all be comparatively large organisations.

### ***UC features that may eventually be used in councils***

Several features in Table 1 have few councils currently employ them but a reasonable number of councils think that they could make use of them if and when they become available. These features are access to UC functionality from mobiles, Contact Centre SMS / Text Message Queuing, Contact Centre Interactive Voice Recognition, and, to some extent, Workflow Integration. Council plans for these features are predominantly medium to long term, suggesting that either the current technological products related to the features lack maturity or that deployment of the products relies on a level of communications infrastructure that few councils have at present. Workflow Integration products are a possible exception to this as a quarter of the councils in the survey plan to deploy them, mostly in the short to medium term, but typically to only several parts of their organisation rather than the whole council.

Several UC features are not included in Table 1 as they are seldom used and have little planned use among councils in our survey. These are the Contact Centre features of Webchat, Automated Outdial and Callback. However, a few councils either presently use or plan to use all of three of features.

## UC Features That Have Had the Greatest Impact on Council Operations

A summary of the UC features that our respondents thought had the greatest impact on the operation of their respective Councils is given in Table 2. The table shows that VoIP, Contact Centre Voice Queuing and Outlook Calendar Integration have had the greatest impact when implemented in councils. Table 1 indicates that these three features rank in the top four implemented features. Table 2 reveals that the fourth most implemented feature, IP PBX, has had much less impact on operations than the other features. This is likely to be because an IP PBX within an organisation often provides more of an infrastructural basis for other UC features, such as VoIP and Unified Messaging, rather than being prominently and noticeably utilised itself by end users.

Table 1 and Table 2 also show that Document Sharing has had a greater impact than several of the features that are more widely implemented among councils. Document Sharing has proved to be a substantial operational enhancement for more than one third of the surveyed councils. However, current planning indicates that the number of councils using Document Sharing is likely to increase only slowly over time. This suggests that many councils should revisit their plans for the use of this feature.

**Table 2.** UC Features That Have Had the Greatest Impact on Council Operations

UC Feature	% of respondents reporting medium to high impact
VoIP	45%
Contact Centre Voice Queuing	45%
Microsoft Outlook Calendar integration with Presence Profiles	42%
Document Sharing	36%
Presence	33%
Microsoft Outlook Inbox integration with Voicemail	33%
Unified Messaging	27%
IP PBX	24%
Call control for operators or receptionists	24%
Contact Centre Email Queuing	21%

## Intended and Realised Benefits of UC

Tables 3 and 4 report on the benefits of the general use of UC features. Direct comparisons between the intended and realised benefit figures in Table 3 may be misleading as Table 1 identifies that many respondents' councils plan to use a log of UC features but have not implemented them yet. This has the effect of increasing responses to inquiries into intended benefits but not realised ones. However, the rank of intended benefits can be usefully compared to the rank of realised benefits in Table 3.

Promotion of work efficiencies for end users was the most reported intended benefit and realised benefit of introducing UC among the respondents respective local authorities. Speeding up of internal communication, reduction of delays, and supporting integration of business processes are benefits that rank as more realised than intended. This suggests that they were somewhat unexpected beneficial side-effects of implementing UC. The realised benefit of speeding up internal communication and reducing delays recorded by respondents in Table 3 is entirely consistent with the reduction in inefficient co-ordination reported as the main additional realised benefit by respondents in Table 4. Table 3 indicates that an improvement in customer service levels is often an intended and sometimes realised benefit of UC. This finding parallels the benefit of reducing poor customer service from Table 4 which was reported by about a quarter of respondents.

Rank analysis of Table 3 also reveals that although many respondents thought UC would reduce operational costs, few achieved reductions after implementation. This supports the efficacy of basing business cases for UC implementations on soft returns-on-investment (ROIs), such as increased efficiencies or productivity gains, rather than on hard ROIs such as cost savings, as noted by Elliot (Elliot, 2007).

**Table 3.** The Main Intended and Realised Benefits of UC

Potential Benefit	% of respondents indicating that this was an intended benefit	% of respondents reporting that this was a realised benefit
Promotion of work efficiencies for end users	79%	45%
Improvement in measurable customer service levels	60%	33%
Improvement in communication between different organisational divisions	58%	33%
Speeding up of the rate of internal communication and reduction of delays	55%	33%
Reduction of operational costs	45%	12%
Support for integration of business processes	42%	18%
Support for integration of business application packages	42%	12%

**Table 4.** The Main Additional Realised Benefits of UC

Potential Benefit	% of respondents reporting it was a realised benefit
Reduction in inefficient co-ordination	27%
Reduction in poor customer service	24%
Reduction in voice mail frustrations	18%
Reduction in onsite productivity losses	18%
Reduction in barriers to collaboration	15%

### UC Implementation Issues

Respondents were questioned about general issues pertaining to the implementation of any UC feature. The responses to these questions are summarised in Tables 5, 6 and 7.

**Table 5.** The Main People Involved in the Decision to Implement a UC feature

Position	% of respondents reporting involvement in any UC implementation decisions
IS / IT Manager	76%
Corporate Services Manager	58%
Customer Services Manager	58%
CEO	33%
CIO	30%
CFO	24%
Call Centre Manager	24%

Table 5 shows that a council's IS / IT Manager, Corporate Services Manager and Customer Services Manager are typically the main people involved in the decision to implement any particular UC feature in local authorities. Most of the survey respondents hold one of the first two positions.

Table 6 indicates that customer satisfaction and productivity gains are used as ROI metrics for UC implementation projects for more than two thirds of the councils surveyed. The data in this table reinforces comments from the previous section describing that soft ROIs are often more appropriate to evaluating UC projects than hard ROIs like cost reductions. The benefits of UC are largely derived from its ability to reduce human latency in business processes and human latency in a business process typically occurs when there is a requirement to gather more information or to consult with colleagues (Elliot, 2007). Many UC features have the ability to reduce the time required to contact colleagues and some, particularly the conferencing features, could reduce the time taken up with consultation. Thus, time savings have the potential to be useful ROI metrics for many UC implementations. However, Table 6 reveals that most of the respondents in our survey rated time savings relatively low as a ROI metric. This may be due to difficulties in quantifying specific time savings for individuals undertaking business processes. Survey respondents more frequently opted for the overall measures of increases in customer satisfaction and productivity, possibly because they are usually more easily quantified.

**Table 6.** The Main Return-On-Investment (RIO) Metrics used for UC Implementations

Metric	% of respondents reporting they would use it as a ROI metric
Customer Satisfaction	82%
Productivity Gains	67%
Cost Reduction	42%
Time Savings	39%

Table 7 identifies that respondents clearly feel that by far the greatest issue to overcome when implementing a UC feature is gaining budget approval. Gaining buy-in for a new feature from both management and end users can also be a significant implementation barrier. Table 7 reveals that overcoming various technical difficulties in a UC implementation project is usually less of a problem than impediments caused by financial or people issues.

**Table 7.** Table 7. The Main Barriers to overcome when implementing a UC feature

Issue	% of respondents reporting it as a barrier to UC implementation
Obtaining Budget Approval	58%
Management Buy-In	39%
End-User Buy-In	39%
Lack of Technical Infrastructure	27%
Lack of Technical Expertise	21%

## Summary and Limitations

This survey has found that most councils are planning for a steady rise in their investment in UC in the near future.

Information about the various UC features currently used by councils, and the features that they plan to use, was also collected and analysed in this survey. VoIP, Contact Centre Voice Queuing and IP PBXs are the UC features currently most commonly implemented in councils and the technology to implement these features appears to have attained a high level of maturity. Council plans indicate that in the near future there is likely to be a rapid growth in the use of the UC features of Microsoft Outlook Calendar integration with Presence, Presence, Unified Messaging and Microsoft Outlook Inbox integration with Voicemail. Slower growth is expected in the use of the UC features of Document Sharing, Contact Centre Email Queuing, Video Conferencing and Enhanced Contact Centre Call Routing.

A subset of councils currently use the UC features of Audio Conferencing, call control for operators or receptionists, hands off calls between mobile and landline devices, Contact Centre Presence Viewing across the organisation and Desktop Sharing. Few councils look likely to join this subset in the future. Access to UC functionality from mobiles, Contact Centre SMS / Text Message Queuing, Contact Centre Interactive Voice Recognition, and Workflow Integration are UC features that few councils use at present. However, a large number of councils have medium to long term plans to adopt these features.

Other findings from the survey indicate that the implementation of the UC features VoIP, Contact Centre Voice Queuing and Outlook Calendar Integration have had the greatest impact on the operation of councils to date.

Several issues regarding the implementation of UC features in general were also investigated in the survey. It was found that the greatest barrier to overcome when implementing a UC feature in councils is gaining budget approval. A lack of management or end user buy-in can also be problematic. However, technical issues are not usually a significant issue. In addition the most reported intended and realised benefit of implementing UC features in councils is the promotion of work efficiencies for end users.

Data from 39% of New Zealand's local authorities was gathered in this survey. Due to the voluntary nature of the survey, councils who are early adopters of UC features are most probably over represented among the survey's respondents. Thus, the survey findings may more accurately reflect the experience and plans of a sizable group of early adopters of UC among councils. This potential limitation is largely unavoidable in a survey of this kind and, overall, it is unlikely to compromise the applicability of most of the survey findings to New Zealand councils in general. Indeed, summaries of the future plans of early adopters of UC and their views on the benefits of and barriers to UC implementation projects provides useful information to councils that have yet to implement UC features. The main area where this potential limitation may impart misleading information is in the current levels of the utilisation of UC features among councils. The levels reported in this survey may be slightly overstated in relation to all New Zealand councils.

## Bibliography

Elliot, B. (2007). *Magic Quadrant for Unified Communications*. Gartner RAS Core Research Note G00150273.

### **Glossary of Unified Communications Terms**

#### ***Access UC functionality on the mobile***

Using the mobile phone as the link to the office environment. Viewing on the mobile, who left landline and mobile messages, and ability to click the ones that should be listened to first. Using a 'Buddy List' to check the Presence of colleagues. Using phone numbers from the central Corporate Directory.

#### ***Call control for the operator / receptionist***

Enabling the receptionist or operator to be as efficient as possible, with communications tools such as Presence visibility, voice messaging and fax on the PC, a central address book, chat, serviced office functionality, or the ability to give VIP callers priority.

#### ***Conferencing***

Setting up audio, video or web conference calls from a PC, and using the mouse to drag and drop participants into a conference call – on the spur of the moment or scheduled in advance. Cuts out the expense of conference overhead bridges and reduces travel costs.

#### ***Desktop Sharing***

Remote access to and collaboration on another person's computer and desktop screen.

#### ***Document Sharing***

The sharing of documents between employees by using a centralised database of documents with version control and check-in/check-out features.

#### ***Hand off calls between mobile and landline devices***

Manually transferring active calls from a desk phone to mobile and vice versa, by clicking an icon on the PC or having UC functionality automatically forward calls from a desk phone to the mobile or vice versa based on a user's Presence profile.

#### ***IP PBX***

An IP (Internet Protocol) PBX (Private Branch Exchange) is a business telephone system designed to deliver voice over a data network and interoperate with the normal Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN).

### ***Microsoft Outlook Calendar integration***

Integrates Presence with Microsoft Outlook Calendar, so that staff Presence profiles always correctly indicate where colleagues are, until when, and how they can best be contacted.

### ***Microsoft Outlook Inbox integration with voicemail***

Voice messages as part of the Inbox.

### ***Presence***

Presence provides a window into colleagues' availability. It acts as the gateway to UC since it enables real-time communications and allows viewing from a PC screen whether somebody is active at their desk, has momentarily walked away, is in a meeting, on sick leave etc. It also allows the viewer to be notified of their return the moment they come back, or see at a glance what the best way is to contact somebody.

### ***Softphones***

A softphone is a software program for making telephone calls over the internet using a PC rather than dedicated hardware. It often behaves like a traditional telephone, sometimes appearing as an image of a phone on the screen with a display panel and buttons with which the user can interact, and uses either a USB phone or a headset that is connected to the sound card of the PC.

### ***Unified Contact Centre***

A Unified Contact Centre is characterised by UC functionality. It gives agents Multimedia Queuing to control all media (calls, faxes, IM, text, web chat) so that customers never need to wait, regardless of the media they use. Agents can monitor their own and colleagues' performance in real time and can self-manage using Presence functionality.

### **Smart features could include:**

- Multimedia Queuing for Voice / E-mail / Fax / Webchat / SMS or Text Messaging so that all queues are monitored and managed with equal priority
- Presence view across the organisation to see where people are and their time of return
- Enhanced Routing (skills-based or value-based to route the right caller to the right agent)
- Interactive Voice Recognition (IVR) to automate repetitive, straightforward info requests and conversations)
- Automated Outdial (to schedule in outbound campaigns for downtimes when agents have time available)
- Callback (so that callers do not lose their place in the queue if they choose to be called back by an agent)

### ***Unified Messaging***

Emails, voice messages, and faxes all appear in the e-mail client inbox for easy handling and quick access.

### ***VoIP (Voice Over IP)***

Voice over Internet Protocol is optimised for the transmission of voice through the internet or other packet-switched networks. VoIP is often used to refer to the actual transmission of voice rather than the protocol implementing it, and is also referred to as IP telephony, internet telephony, voice over broadband, broadband telephony, and broadband phone.

VoIP gateways can be used on a pure IP system which in most cases produces greater cost savings, greater mobility and increased redundancy, or can be combined with traditional PBX functionality which enables businesses to use their managed intranet to help reduce long distance expenses, enjoy the benefits of a single network for voice and data, and use other advanced CTI (Computer Telephony Integration) features.

### ***Workflow Integration***

Integration of communications as part of current workflows to avoid human latency. Avoids communication bottlenecks or automates specific business processes in order to speed up or improve service provision, information processing or decision making.



## Research Sponsor: Zeacom

Zeacom is a technology-led company with a global presence, delivering advanced Unified Communications (UC) and full featured Contact Centre solutions to some 2800 organizations across 25 countries.

### ***A Global Company***

Although founded in New Zealand, Zeacom's heritage in providing award-winning contact centre solutions has given the company a strong global presence ever since it was established by CEO Miles Valentine in 1994. Zeacom now employs over 120 staff globally. Offices in the US, UK, Australia and New Zealand and vendor partners across Asia, plus a global network of trained resellers, implement advanced UC solutions.

Our partnerships with PBX manufacturers are especially important, with NEC over-branding the Zeacom Communications Centre ('ZCC') as 'Unified Communications for Business' (UCB) - their business solution for small to medium sized business.

### ***Zeacom's Mission***

Zeacom is a dynamic customer driven organisation, delivering innovative communications solutions that enable our global customers to be more productive and optimise their business opportunities.

### ***Zeacom's Competitive Advantage***

Zeacom offers you something that other market leaders find hard to match – more simplicity.

Our UC solution was built on one single source code, all the way from the ground up. We didn't go out to buy different parts of the UC puzzle from various suppliers, and merge them together through forced integration.

Zeacom Communications Center is truly unified. Our 'ZCC = 1 + 1 + 1' formula gives us a huge advantage: we can provide UC through 1 server, 1 application and 1 administration interface.

ZCC is a single server product, while most other UC products in the market require separate servers, using different code bases.

ZCC brings together Unified Messaging, mobility, conferencing, desktop telephony, contact center, operator console functionality and much more, in a single application. Most competitors offer similar functionality but in multiple product offerings. Each has a different user interface and each requires a different server.

ZCC offers a single administration environment, so that IT Managers only administer one interface

### ***Proud Sponsor of Kiwi Can***

Zeacom supports Kiwi Can, a programme to help young New Zealanders achieve. Kiwi Can is a life skills and values programme for Year 1 to Year 8 students that is run in primary and intermediate schools across New Zealand.

By helping build children's self-esteem, attitudes and aspirations, Zeacom wants to help the younger generation take the first steps towards a better future for the whole country.