

This report has been generated by • NEO, Licenseware's Software Licensing Assistant.

Cost Optimisation Insights Report

Generated by: NEO

Analysis Date: July 24, 2025

Disclaimer of Liability

This Software Licensing Analysis Report ("the Report") has been prepared solely for informational purposes to assist [Customer Name] in understanding its software licensing position based on the data provided. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the information contained herein, Licenseware makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to the accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of the content.

No Legal or Financial Advice

This Report does not constitute legal, accounting, tax, or other professional advice. It is intended as a guide based on currently available information, licensing terms, and interpretations as of the date of this report. Licensing rules and agreements are subject to change, and any final interpretation lies solely with the software vendor(s).

Limitations of Data

The analysis is based on the data, entitlements, and system inventory provided by [Customer Name]. Any errors, omissions, or inaccuracies in this source data may directly affect the results of this Report. Licenseware is not responsible for any conclusions or decisions made based on incomplete or inaccurate data submissions.

1. Introduction and Analysis Scope

This report presents a detailed Software Asset Management (SAM) analysis based on the software inventory, infrastructure, and lifecycle data provided. The objective is to identify actionable opportunities for cost optimization, mitigate compliance and security risks, and provide strategic recommendations for improving the technology portfolio's efficiency. The analysis is grounded in a conservative, evidence-based methodology, acknowledging that while the provided data is

extensive, certain gaps limit the precision of some findings. All financial figures are estimates based on public market research and require validation against specific vendor agreements.

The analysis employs a conservative approach, recognizing the complexity of enterprise software environments and data limitations. It acknowledges that significant optimization may have already occurred in mature environments. All cost estimates are based on publicly available market research and industry benchmarks, explicitly requiring validation through actual vendor negotiations. Where data gaps exist, recommendations are qualified, and methods for obtaining missing information are suggested to enable more accurate optimization guidance. The analysis also recognizes existing vendor relationships, volume discounts, and enterprise agreements, positioning vendor consolidation as an incremental opportunity.

2. Software Portfolio Analysis

Executive Summary

An in-depth analysis of the "Recognized Software Accumulated" dataset reveals significant opportunities for software rationalization across several key categories. The current software landscape shows considerable functional overlap, with multiple paid solutions being used for the same purpose. This leads to redundant spending, increased support overhead, inconsistent user experiences, and complex contract management.

By standardizing on single, preferred solutions and leveraging free, secure alternatives already present in the environment, substantial direct cost savings can be achieved, negotiation power with vendors can be improved, and IT operations can be streamlined. This section will focus on the most impactful categories for rationalization. Implementing the recommendations in this report could lead to significant annual savings, enhanced security, and a more efficient, standardized technology ecosystem.

Key Findings & Recommendations

The following sections detail areas of overlapping software functionality and provide actionable recommendations for consolidation. The analysis is based on software function, which in some cases overrides the pre-assigned categories in the dataset.

Enterprise Collaboration & Productivity Suite

Current Landscape: The organization has made a substantial investment in Microsoft 365, yet continues to incur costs for various overlapping collaboration and communication platforms, and disparate cloud storage solutions.

Product Name	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Monthly Cost	Overlap Function	Notes
Microsoft 365	593	Paid	\$6.00 per user/month	Productivity Cloud	Core investment.

Product Name	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Monthly Cost	Overlap Function	Notes
Microsoft Teams	147	Paid	\$0 (included in M365)	Video Conferencing, Chat	Licensed standard within M365.
OneDrive	579	Free	\$0 (included in M365)	Cloud File Storage	Licensed standard within M365.
Google Docs	21	Free	\$0	Document Creation	Free alternative, but creates data silos.
Google Sheets	21	Free	\$0	Spreadsheets	Free alternative.
Google Slides	21	Free	\$0	Presentation	Free alternative.
Gmail	21	Free	\$0	Email	Free alternative.
Google Drive	21	Free	\$0	Cloud File Storage	Redundant with OneDrive.
Zoom	41	Paid	\$14.99	Video Conferencing	Direct overlap with Teams.
Webex	43	Paid	Varies	Video Conferencing	Direct overlap with Teams.
GoToMeeting	5	Paid	\$12.00	Video Conferencing	Direct overlap with Teams.
BlueJeans	4	Paid	\$9.99	Video Conferencing	Direct overlap with Teams.
Dropbox	2	Free	\$9.99 (Pro plan)	Cloud File Storage	Redundant with OneDrive.
To Do	1	Free	\$0	Task Management	Included in M365.
ToDoist	1	Free	Free; Pro \$3/month; Business \$5/month	Task Management	Redundant with Microsoft To Do.
OneNote	1	Free	\$0	Note-Taking	Included in M365.

Product Name	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Monthly Cost	Overlap Function	Notes
Obsidian	2	Free	Varies	Note-Taking	Redundant with OneNote (if M365 standard).

Analysis: The organization has a substantial investment in the Microsoft 365 ecosystem. This investment provides a comprehensive suite including Microsoft Teams for communication and collaboration, and OneDrive for cloud file storage. Continuing to pay for numerous third-party video conferencing solutions (Zoom, Webex, GoToMeeting, BlueJeans) that directly duplicate Teams' functionality represents a significant and unnecessary drain on resources. Similarly, the use of other cloud storage providers like Google Drive and Dropbox, or alternative productivity suites like Google Docs/Sheets/Slides, fragments data, complicates management, and introduces potential security and compliance challenges, even if their base offerings are free.

Recommendation:

- 1. Mandate Microsoft 365 for Collaboration & Productivity: Establish a clear corporate policy that Microsoft Teams is the sole platform for all internal and external video conferencing, and Microsoft OneDrive is the standard for cloud file storage and sharing. All other paid communication and cloud storage services should be phased out.
- 2. **Strategic Decommissioning:** Cease renewals for Zoom, Webex, GoToMeeting, and BlueJeans contracts. Develop and execute a comprehensive migration plan to transition all users and their data to Microsoft Teams and OneDrive before contract expiry.
- 3. **Consolidate Productivity Apps:** While Google Docs/Sheets/Slides offer free alternatives, standardize on Microsoft Office applications (Word, Excel, PowerPoint) for primary document creation and editing due to the existing Microsoft 365 investment and tighter integration with Teams and OneDrive.
- 4. **Promote Integrated Task Management:** Leverage Microsoft To Do and OneNote, which are included with Microsoft 365, to replace standalone task managers like ToDoist and notetaking apps like Obsidian, fostering a unified workflow.
- 5. **User Training & Adoption:** Provide comprehensive training to ensure users are proficient and comfortable with the Microsoft 365 suite, maximizing adoption and reducing reliance on shadow IT solutions.

Potential Benefit: Extremely High. Eliminating redundant conferencing and storage tools could save tens of thousands of dollars annually, while consolidating data into OneDrive improves security, compliance, and collaboration.

IT Infrastructure & Asset Management

Current Landscape: The IT department is employing multiple, high-cost, agent-based solutions for IT asset discovery and inventory, leading to redundancy and inefficiency.

Product Name	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Cost	Notes
Ivanti Discovery Engine	602	Paid	Varies	Comprehensive discovery, inventory, and reporting.
Ivanti Inventory Engine	538	Paid	Varies	For asset management and inventory.
Ivanti Neurons AgentUI	590	Paid	Varies	Unified endpoint management.
LsAgent	494	Paid	~\$15 / agent	Lightweight agent for network discovery and asset management.
Lansweeper	3	Paid	Varies	IT Asset Management software, agentless discovery.
SolarWinds Discovery Agent	127	Paid	Varies	Automates discovery and mapping of IT assets.
ManageEngine Endpoint Central Agent	172	Paid	\$5.00 per device per month	Comprehensive endpoint management solution.

Analysis: The sheer number of paid agent-based discovery and asset management tools (Ivanti, Lansweeper, SolarWinds, ManageEngine Endpoint Central) represents a critical inefficiency. Each of these tools aims to provide a comprehensive view of IT assets. Running multiple such systems simultaneously leads to conflicting inventory data, preventing a "single source of truth" for IT assets. It also means multiple enterprise license agreements are being managed, tripling contract management overhead and preventing the organization from leveraging its full spend for volume discounts with a single vendor.

Recommendation:

- 1. Urgent Strategic Review: Convene IT leadership, operations, and procurement to conduct an immediate and thorough evaluation of all deployed IT asset management platforms (Ivanti, Lansweeper, SolarWinds, ManageEngine Endpoint Central). The objective is to select a single platform that best meets the organization's current and future requirements for discovery, inventory, patch management, software deployment, and endpoint security.
- 2. Standardize and Migrate: Once a primary platform is selected, develop a comprehensive project plan to migrate all relevant functionalities to this single tool. This includes standardizing agent deployment and data collection. The Licenseware Software Inventory Manager (SIM) and Microsoft Deployment Manager (MDM) from Licenseware can assist in centralizing software recognition and detailed Microsoft-specific deployments, respectively.
- 3. **Decommission Redundant Contracts:** Systematically terminate contracts and maintenance agreements for all non-selected platforms as soon as feasible, ensuring a smooth transition and data preservation during the process.

4. **Leverage for Broader IT Management:** Explore how the chosen core IT asset management platform can be extended to cover other IT management needs currently met by separate tools (e.g., Remote Monitoring, Network Management, SAM tools).

Potential Benefit: Extremely High. This category represents a significant portion of operational IT spend. Consolidating to a single, best-of-breed solution will eliminate multiple large annual license fees, maintenance costs, and reduce the administrative burden associated with managing fragmented tools.

PDF Editing & Document Management

Current Landscape: A notable expenditure on high-cost PDF editing software persists, despite the availability of free alternatives and a lack of clear differentiation in user needs.

Product Name	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Monthly Cost
Acrobat	389	Paid	\$14.99
Acrobat DC	133	Paid	\$0 (often higher tier)
PDF-XChange Editor	1	Paid	\$56 (perpetual)
CEMSuitePDF	1	Paid	Varies
Acrobat Reader	21	Free	\$0
Acrobat Reader DC	27	Free	\$0
CutePDF Writer	10	Free	\$0
NAPS2	1	Free	\$0
PDFHub	1	Free	\$0
Safeguard PDF Viewer	1	Paid	Varies
Software Operation Panel	1	Paid	Varies
Scanner Central Admin Agent	1	Paid	\$0 (perpetual)
PaperStream Capture	1	Paid	\$0 (perpetual)
PaperStream IP TWAIN	1	Paid	\$0 (subscription)
b2xtranslator	1	Free	\$0

Analysis: The organization is heavily invested in Adobe Acrobat with over 520 paid licenses, indicating a primary standard. However, the existence of other paid editors like PDF-XChange Editor and CEMSuitePDF is redundant. Crucially, the substantial number of free Adobe Acrobat Reader installations (48) and other free PDF creation tools (CutePDF Writer, NAPS2, PDFHub) suggests that many users likely only require viewing, printing, and basic annotation capabilities, not

the full feature set of expensive paid editors. The existence of multiple scanning/document management tools also points to fragmentation.

Recommendation:

- Centralize Adobe Licensing and Conduct Usage Audit: Consolidate all Adobe Acrobat
 procurement under a single enterprise agreement to maximize volume discounts.
 Simultaneously, conduct an immediate and thorough audit of all users with paid Acrobat
 licenses. Determine if their job roles genuinely require the full editing capabilities or if they
 primarily view, print, or perform basic commenting.
- 2. **Right-Size Licenses for Actual Need:** For users who do not require advanced editing, reclaim their paid Acrobat licenses and mandate the use of the free **Adobe Acrobat Reader DC**. This will significantly reduce recurring subscription costs.
- 3. **Decommission Redundant Editors:** Actively uninstall and prohibit the use of all other paid and non-standard free PDF editing or creation tools (e.g., PDF-XChange Editor, CEMSuitePDF, CutePDF Writer) to standardize the environment, reduce support burden, and mitigate potential security risks from unsupported software.
- 4. **Streamline Scanning Solutions:** Review the necessity of multiple document management and scanning solutions (e.g., PaperStream Capture, Software Operation Panel). Consolidate to one or two enterprise-approved solutions where appropriate.

Potential Benefit: High. Reducing the number of paid Adobe Acrobat licenses by even 20% (approximately 105 licenses) could save over **\$18,800 annually**. Further savings from eliminating niche tools would also be realized.

CAD, BIM, and Design Software

Current Landscape: This high-spend category shows a classic pattern of expensive editor licenses alongside a very large number of free viewers, indicating a prime opportunity for license optimization.

Product Name	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Annual Cost	Role
Autodesk Access	412	Paid	\$0 (bundled)	Access to Autodesk products
AutoCAD	4	Paid	\$2,100	Full 3D CAD Editor
AutoCAD LT	58	Paid	\$385	2D CAD Editor
AutoCAD Map 3D	1	Paid	\$1,610	GIS-based mapping
Revit	1	Paid	\$0 (often bundled)	BIM Software
Revit Unit Schemas	2	Paid	\$0 (bundled)	BIM components

Product Name	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Annual Cost	Role
Navisworks Manage	1	Paid	\$1,355	Project Review Software
DWG TrueView	531	Free	\$0	Autodesk File Viewer
Navisworks Freedom	548	Free	\$0	Autodesk Model Viewer
Visio	150	Paid	\$60 (\$5/month)	Diagramming Editor
Visio Viewer	562	Free	\$0	Visio File Viewer
Advanced Material Library Image Library	22	Free	\$0	Material textures
Material Library	530	Free	\$0	Autodesk materials
Material Library Low Resolution Image Library	530	Free	\$0	Autodesk materials
Personal Accelerator for Revit	1	Paid	\$0 (bundled)	Revit performance
Design Review	5	Free	\$0	2D/3D design viewer
Adobe Creative Cloud	21	Paid	\$52.99 per month	Graphic Design Suite
After Effects CC	1	Paid	\$20.99 per month	Video Software
Media Encoder	1	Paid	\$20.99 per month	Video Software
Premiere Pro	1	Paid	\$20.99 per month	Video Editing
Cinema 4D	1	Paid	\$59.99 per month	3D Design
KeyShot	1	Paid	\$99.00 per year	3D Rendering
Solid Edge	1	Paid	Varies	3D Design
nanoCAD	1	Paid	\$180	CAD Software

Analysis: The significant number of free viewer installations (DWG TrueView (531), Navisworks Freedom (548), and Visio Viewer (562)) compared to the lower count of expensive editing licenses (e.g., AutoCAD, AutoCAD LT, Visio) strongly indicates an opportunity for license optimization. Many users may only need to review or present designs, not actively create or modify them. The presence of multiple high-cost creative tools (Adobe Creative Cloud, Cinema 4D, KeyShot, Solid Edge, nanoCAD) suggests a lack of standardization or over-provisioning for specialized roles.

Recommendation:

- Rigorous License Audit for Editors: Conduct a precise audit of all users assigned high-cost licenses like AutoCAD, AutoCAD LT, Visio, and any individual Adobe creative applications.
 Validate that each user's job function explicitly requires the full editing capabilities of these tools.
- 2. Enforce "Viewer-First" Policy: For any user identified as only needing to view files, reclaim the paid license and enforce the use of the appropriate free viewer (e.g., DWG TrueView for CAD files, Navisworks Freedom for models, Visio Viewer for diagrams, Autodesk Design Review for general designs). This strategy prevents unnecessary new license purchases.
- 3. Consolidate Creative Suite: For creative roles, standardize on Adobe Creative Cloud, which includes applications like After Effects, Media Encoder, and Premiere Pro. Avoid purchasing individual Adobe app licenses or disparate tools like Cinema 4D or KeyShot if Adobe's tools can serve the purpose.
- 4. **Centralized Procurement & Vendor Management:** Consolidate all Autodesk and Adobe procurement under a single enterprise agreement to leverage overall spend for better pricing tiers and streamline contract management.
- 5. **Rationalize Niche CAD:** Evaluate the necessity of niche CAD tools like nanoCAD. If their functionality can be subsumed by standard AutoCAD licenses or a cheaper alternative, pursue decommissioning.

Potential Benefit: Very High. The per-license cost of these tools is substantial. Reclaiming just a few AutoCAD or Visio licenses can save thousands annually, and preventing future unnecessary purchases due to better license management is a major long-term benefit.

Remote Access & Support Tools

Current Landscape: Multiple paid solutions are deployed for remote support, along with unmanaged free tools that pose a security and compliance risk.

Product Name	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Monthly Cost	Notes
DameWare Remote Everywhere	173	Paid	\$30.00	Largest paid deployment.
AnyDesk	4	Paid	\$29.90	Redundant paid tool.
Splashtop Business	3	Paid	\$60.00 per year	Redundant paid tool.
Zoho Assist	2	Paid	Varies	Redundant paid tool.

Product Name	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Monthly Cost	Notes
ManageEngine Desktop Central Remote Control	1	Paid	Varies	Redundant paid tool.
ManageEngine UEMS Remote Control	1	Paid	Varies	Redundant paid tool.
Radmin Viewer	2	Paid	\$0 (perpetual)	Redundant paid tool.
TeamViewer / Host	2	Free	\$0 (Free for personal use; commercial use requires a paid license)	High compliance risk for commercial use.
UltraVNC Standard	10	Free	\$0	Open-source, potential support/security risk if unmanaged.
TightVNC	4	Free	\$0	Open-source, similar risk.
VNC Viewer	2	Free	\$0	Open-source, similar risk.

Analysis: This category represents a glaring example of redundant spending and unmanaged shadow IT. Paying for DameWare, AnyDesk, Splashtop, and various ManageEngine remote control solutions for the same purpose is highly inefficient and costly. Furthermore, the prevalence of "free" tools like TeamViewer (often used in violation of commercial terms), UltraVNC, TightVNC, and VNC Viewer creates significant security vulnerabilities and increases the burden on IT support due to non-standardized tools.

Recommendation:

- 1. Select a Single Enterprise Standard: Based on current deployment numbers and features, DameWare Remote Everywhere appears to be the most prevalent paid solution and a strong candidate for standardization. Alternatively, if the existing ManageEngine Endpoint Central license (from section on IT Infrastructure & Asset Management) includes robust remote control capabilities, that should be the preferred standard due to existing investment.
- 2. **Negotiate Enterprise Agreement:** Secure an enterprise-wide license for the chosen standard to cover all required users, optimizing pricing and simplifying procurement.
- 3. **Strict Decommissioning & Policy Enforcement:** Immediately terminate contracts for all other paid remote access solutions upon renewal. Implement a strict policy prohibiting the installation and use of any non-approved remote access tools, especially the "free" ones. Utilize endpoint security tools to block their execution.
- 4. **Security Review:** Conduct a thorough security review of the chosen standard remote access solution to ensure it meets the organization's security posture requirements.

Potential Benefit: High. Eliminating multiple paid remote access contracts will save thousands of dollars annually, and consolidating streamlines IT support and enhances overall security.

Software Development Environments (IDEs)

Current Landscape: Development teams are using a fragmented toolset, including expensive paid IDEs from JetBrains alongside powerful free alternatives from Microsoft.

Product Name	Vendor	Count	Paid vs Free	Est. Annual Cost (per user)
Visual Studio Code	Microsoft	14	Free	\$0
Visual Studio	Microsoft	1	Paid	\$2,944
Rider	JetBrains	4	Paid	\$139.00
PyCharm	JetBrains	11	Paid	\$0 (Varies based on edition)
DataGrip	JetBrains	4	Paid	\$89
GoLand	JetBrains	1	Paid	\$199.00
WebStorm	JetBrains	2	Paid	\$59

Analysis: While developer preference is important for productivity, the lack of a standard leads to significant costs and a fragmented development experience. **Visual Studio Code** is an extremely powerful, extensible, and free IDE that can handle many of the workloads covered by the various paid JetBrains IDEs. For .NET development, JetBrains Rider is a direct competitor to the high-cost Microsoft Visual Studio.

Recommendation:

- 1. **Establish a Standard Toolchain:** Work with development leadership to establish **Visual Studio Code** as the standard, free IDE for most programming tasks (Python, JavaScript/Web, Go, etc.). This aligns with leveraging already adopted free tools.
- 2. **Evaluate JetBrains "All Products Pack":** For developers who require the JetBrains ecosystem (e.g., using multiple JetBrains products), investigate the "All Products Pack" subscription. It is often more cost-effective than purchasing multiple individual product licenses (e.g., PyCharm + WebStorm + DataGrip).
- 3. **Consolidate .NET IDE:** Evaluate whether the team can standardize on either **Microsoft Visual Studio** or **JetBrains Rider** to eliminate one of these high-cost licenses. A cost-benefit analysis considering developer preferences and project requirements should inform this decision.

Potential Benefit: Medium to High. Standardizing on VS Code for applicable roles can eliminate numerous paid JetBrains licenses. Consolidating the remaining JetBrains users under an "All Products Pack" can reduce the cost per-developer. Savings could easily reach several thousands of dollars annually.

Oracle Java Licensing Risk

The analysis of the software inventory identified 267 devices with Java SE Development Kit (JDK) or Runtime Environment (JRE) installed.

Analysis: In January 2023, Oracle introduced a new "Java SE Universal Subscription" model [LINK], which licenses Java per employee, not just per user or server. This means that even if only a few servers use Java, an organization's entire employee count may need to be licensed, potentially representing a massive and unforeseen compliance risk and cost exposure. The prompt data shows 267 installations of Java SE Development Kit, which is highly relevant to this risk.

Immediate Action Required:

- 1. Identify Commercial Usage: Determine which of these 267 installations are actively used for commercial purposes (running production applications or being developed upon for commercial use cases).
- 2. Remediate & Remove: Uninstall Oracle Java from all devices where it is not essential for commercial operations. This includes developer machines not actively working on Java, and any servers running non-critical or non-commercial applications.
- 3. Explore Alternatives: Evaluate alternative Java distributions like Eclipse Temurin from Adoptium for applications that can be migrated away from Oracle Java. Eclipse Temurin is an open-source, high-performance, and enterprise-ready alternative that offers no licensing fees.

Licenseware Recommendation: Navigating Oracle's complex Java licensing requires a specialized tool. The Licenseware Oracle Java Deployment Manager (OJDM) is specifically designed to audit a Java estate, identify compliance risk under the new model, and help manage the transition to lowercost alternatives.



3. Windows Server Infrastructure Analysis

The Windows Server environment presents significant optimization opportunities, but these are currently obscured by critical gaps in the provided data.

Data Quality Assessment & Host-to-Guest Mapping

Analysis: A primary challenge in this analysis is the lack of reliable host-to-guest relationship data. The provided "Windows Server OS Details" table often lists virtual machines (e.g., VMware Virtual Platform) as physical servers. Without a definitive map of which VMs reside on which physical hosts, it is impossible to:

- Accurately assess the cost-effectiveness of Windows Server Datacenter licensing.
- Validate compliance in a virtualized environment.
- Identify opportunities to optimize licensing based on VM density (stacking).
- Correctly perform a cost-benefit analysis for different virtualization models.

Licenseware Recommendation: This data gap is a significant obstacle to achieving substantial cost savings in the server infrastructure. Licenseware Infrastructure Mapper (IFMP) or the Microsoft

Deployment Manager (MDM) can resolve this by automatically discovering the entire physical and virtual estate, mapping all relationships, and providing a complete picture of the deployment.

Critical Finding: Windows Server Datacenter Edition on Virtual Machines

Analysis: Despite the data limitations, the "Windows Server per VM" table clearly shows a highly inefficient licensing practice. The analysis identified 58 virtual machines running the expensive Datacenter edition of Windows Server. This configuration is almost always financially suboptimal. The primary benefit of a Datacenter license is providing unlimited virtualization rights for all VMs on a properly licensed physical host. Installing it directly on a VM provides no additional rights over the Standard edition but incurs a much higher cost.

Physical Server	Virtual Server	Licensable Edition	Highest Version	License Cost
Physical Host 1	Virtual Server A	Windows Server Datacenter	2022	\$1,526.88
Physical Host 1	Virtual Server B	Windows Server Datacenter	2022	\$1,526.88
Physical Host 1	Virtual Server C	Windows Server Datacenter	2019	\$1,526.88
(55 additional VMs)		Windows Server Datacenter		

(This table is a sample; see raw data for the full list)

Recommendation:

- 1. **Immediate Investigation:** Each of these 58 VMs must be investigated to confirm if there is a specific technical reason for requiring the Datacenter edition. In most cases, it is not necessary.
- 2. **License Re-evaluation:** For VMs that do not require Datacenter features, they should be downgraded to Windows Server Standard edition to realize significant cost savings.
- 3. **Host-Level Optimization:** The physical host `Physical Host 1`, which hosts these 58 VMs (and likely others), is the prime candidate for being licensed with Windows Server Datacenter at the host level to cover all its guests in the most cost-effective manner. This would ensure compliance while minimizing cost, as a single Datacenter license would grant unlimited virtualization rights for that host.

Maximum Virtualization Analysis Requirements

Analysis: Without a complete host-to-guest mapping, a precise cost comparison between individual VM licensing and host-level unlimited virtualization licensing cannot be fully performed. However, the presence of Datacenter edition on individual VMs implies that the organization might not be fully leveraging or understanding the cost benefits of maximum virtualization through host-level Datacenter licensing. If Enterprise edition is installed on any host, it is critical to confirm that

the advanced features of this edition are indeed required for those deployments, as unnecessary Enterprise edition installations also incur higher costs.

Recommendation:

- 1. **Prioritize Host-to-Guest Mapping:** Utilize **Licenseware Infrastructure Mapper (IFMP)** to establish definitive host-to-guest relationships across the entire virtualized environment.
- 2. **Perform Cost-Benefit Analysis:** Once mapping is complete, conduct a detailed cost comparison between licensing individual virtual machines with Standard edition and licensing physical hosts with Datacenter edition. This analysis will show when each model provides optimal cost efficiency based on VM density and host specifications.
- 3. **Validate Enterprise Edition Features:** For any hosts licensed with Windows Server Enterprise edition, validate that the specific advanced features of this edition are technically required, ensuring that the higher cost is justified by actual usage.

*

4. SQL Server Licensing Analysis

The SQL Server estate shows a mix of editions. While some optimization is evident, there are areas for potential cost savings and compliance review.

SQL Server Express Edition Deployments

Analysis: Numerous installations of SQL Server Express were identified. Per Microsoft's licensing terms, Express edition is free to use, even for commercial purposes, but it has technical limitations and is typically intended for smaller-scale applications or non-production environments. Any Express edition found in production environments would be a compliance risk requiring immediate attention, as it is not supported for most production workloads.

Device Name	Installed SQL Products	Recommendation
Device 1	['SQL Server Express LocalDB']	Verify Environment. Confirm this device is not a production server. Express is not supported for most production workloads.
Device 2	['SQL Server Express LocalDB']	Verify Environment. Confirm this device is not a production server.
Device 3	['SQL Server LocalDB', 'SQL Server Express LocalDB']	Verify Environment. Confirm this device is not a production server.

(This table is a sample; see raw data for the full list)

Recommendation: A full review of all SQL Server Express installations is needed to confirm they are not supporting production applications. Any production use should be migrated to a licensed

Standard or Enterprise edition to maintain compliance and ensure support.

Missing Component Data

Analysis: The provided data does not include granular details on SQL Server components (e.g., SSIS, SSAS, SSRS). This is a critical data gap, as components can have their own licensing requirements. For instance, installing Standard edition components on a server with a free Express database engine could trigger a licensing requirement for the full server, creating an unexpected compliance risk. Without this information, accurate licensing model optimization and compliance validation are limited.

Licenseware Recommendation: The Licenseware Microsoft Deployment Manager (MDM) captures this granular component-level data, allowing the identification of these specific compliance risks and ensuring every part of the SQL deployment is correctly licensed.

Component vs Database Edition Analysis

Analysis: Without the granular component edition data, it is not possible to fully assess potential edition mismatches. However, the risk exists if component editions or versions exceed the database edition or version, which may indicate licensing inefficiency or compliance gaps. Specifically, scenarios where Standard edition components exist alongside Express edition databases should be flagged, as these components may require separate licensing if not properly associated with the Express database, leading to unexpected costs.

Recommendation: Implement tools capable of discovering SQL Server component editions. Use this data to compare component editions against database editions. Remediation should be planned for any mismatches, potentially involving downgrading components or upgrading database editions to align with licensing requirements.



5. Security & Compliance Risk Assessment

This section summarizes products that pose an immediate risk due to their lifecycle status. Using unsupported software exposes the organization to unpatched security vulnerabilities and potential operational failures.

End-of-Life and Discontinued Software

Analysis: The Product Lifecycle data reveals numerous applications that are no longer supported by their vendors. The continued use of such software exposes the organization to critical security vulnerabilities, as no new security updates or bug fixes are provided. This also impacts compliance with various data protection and security regulations that mandate the use of supported software.

Product Name	Vendor	Lifecycle Status	End of Extended Support	Number of Installs	Risk & Recommendation
SQL Server	Microsoft	Discontinued	2025-07-08	17	Critical Risk. Unsupported for over 2 years (since

Product Name	Vendor	Lifecycle Status	End of Extended Support	Number of Installs	Risk & Recommendation
2012					mainstream support ended July 2022). Extended support for this version ends July 8, 2025. These instances must be upgraded to a newer version (e.g., SQL Server 2019/2022) or decommissioned immediately to avoid critical security and compliance exposure.
Office 2010	Microsoft	Discontinued	2020-10-31	3	Critical Risk. Unsupported for over 3.5 years. Migrate users to the Microsoft 365 subscription immediately to ensure security and receive ongoing support.
SQL Server 2008 / R2	Microsoft	Discontinued	2019-07-09 (ESU until 2022/2023)	3	Critical Risk. Unsupported for over 5 years. While Extended Security Updates (ESU) were available for a period, these instances are now fully end-of-life. Decommission or upgrade as an urgent priority to mitigate severe security and compliance risks.
Silverlight	Microsoft	Discontinued	2021-10-31	4	High Risk. This is a legacy browser plugin with known vulnerabilities. Identify the specific application requiring it and find a modern, supported alternative.
PI AF Client	OSIsoft	Discontinued	2023-12-01	160	High Risk. This widely deployed software is no longer supported. A migration plan to a supported version is essential to maintain data

Product Name	Vendor	Lifecycle Status	End of Extended Support	Number of Installs	Risk & Recommendation
					infrastructure integrity and supportability.
PI AF Server	OSIsoft	Discontinued	2023-12-01	1	High Risk. This widely deployed software is no longer supported. A migration plan to a supported version is essential to maintain data infrastructure integrity and supportability.
Beamex CMX	Beamex	In Extended Support	2030-01-01	52	Medium Risk. While support is available, plan for an upgrade before mainstream support ends to avoid future issues and potential increased costs for extended support.
Windows Server 2019	Microsoft	In Extended Support	2029-01-01	118	Informational. This widely deployed OS is in extended support. No immediate action is needed, but a long-term upgrade strategy should be developed to prepare for its eventual end-of-life.

Discontinued Product and Insider Preview Analysis: For discontinued products, the time elapsed since their discontinuation (e.g., SQL Server 2008 R2 since July 2019, Office 2010 since October 2020) indicates significant security risk exposure. These systems are no longer receiving critical patches, making them vulnerable to known exploits.

Evaluation and Preview Installation Compliance: While not explicitly detailed in the lifecycle table provided, any evaluation or insider preview installations found in the full dataset should be flagged as potential compliance risks. These installations often have usage restrictions or time limitations (e.g., 30-day trials) that, if exceeded in a production environment, could result in compliance violations and unexpected licensing costs.

This report provides a powerful analysis of the deployment data—what is installed. However, this is only half of the Software Asset Management equation. To unlock the full potential of cost optimization and achieve true compliance, deployment data must be compared against entitlement data—what the organization owns.

The Licenseware License and Contracts Module (LCM) is the bridge between these two worlds. By integrating purchasing records and contracts, the organization can:

- **identify Over-Licensing:** Discover where more licenses are owned than are being used and reclaim those costs.
- **Avoid Under-Licensing:** Find where software is being used without adequate licenses, preventing costly audit findings.
- **Optimize License Allocation:** Ensure expensive licenses are assigned to the users and devices that truly need them, maximizing value.
- **Leverage Contract Renewals:** Enter vendor negotiations with complete, accurate data on usage, allowing for the best possible terms.

To learn more, please visit the documentation at help.licenseware.io or contact Licenseware at contact@licenseware.io.

7 References

- Adobe Acrobat Pricing. The Business Dive.
- Adobe Acrobat Pricing. TrustRadius.
- Adobe Acrobat Pro pricing & options. Adobe.
- Autocad costs. Biohof Muhs.
- Autodesk AutoCAD LT 2026 | Get Prices & Buy Official AutoCAD LT. Autodesk.
- BlueJeans Meetings Pricing 2025.
- BlueJeans Pricing. RevPilots. (2022, November 27).
- BlueJeans Reviews, Features & Pricing 2025. G2.
- BlueJeans Virtual Meetings Pricing 2025. SaaSworthy.
- Buy AutoCAD LT Subscription | Price from \$455.00. NOVEDGE.
- Buy Visual Studio Enterprise Subscription Microsoft Store. Microsoft.
- Compare Microsoft 365 (Office 365) prices & plans. IONOS. (2023, June 27).
- Eclipse Adoptium building Temurin to support releases of OpenJDK builds SD Times. (2021, April 14).
- Eclipse Temurin. Adoptium.
- How Much Does an AutoCAD License Cost? Software Gate.
- How Much Does AutoCAD Cost? Pricing Explained Scan2CAD.
- How Much Does AutoCAD Cost? Noble Desktop.
- How Much Is Microsoft 365 Subscription? Talking Tech Trends. (2025, January 12).
- Microsoft 365 Pricing. Intermedia.
- Microsoft 365 Pricing Guide 2024: Plans and Costs Explained M365Corner. (2025, February 18).
- Microsoft Teams Pricing Guide 2025: Plans & Value Pumble.
- Microsoft Teams Pricing Guide For 2025: A Complete Breakdown of Plans & Features. (2025, May 14).

- Microsoft Teams Pricing 2025: Compare Plans and Costs TrustRadius.
- Microsoft Teams pricing: Plans, Features, Value Lark. (2025, June 25).
- PingPlotter Cloud Pricing.
- PingPlotter Pricing 2025.
- PingPlotter Reviews 2025: Details, Pricing, & Features. G2.
- SQL 2012 End of Support Key Dates Pro DBA. (2021, August 11).
- SQL Server 2012 and Windows Server 2012/2012 R2 end of support Microsoft Lifecycle. Microsoft Learn. (2022, June 29).
- SQL Server End of Life: All You Need To Know Lansweeper.com. (2025, May 28).
- SQL Server End of Support Dates Xynomix.
- Uncovering the Benefits of Eclipse Temurin by Adoptium YouTube. (2024, August 13).
- Visual Studio Pricing: Compare Subscription Plans & Costs.
- Visual Studio Pricing 2025: Compare Plans and Costs TrustRadius.
- What is Eclipse Temurin? All you need to know about it in 5 minutes YouTube. (2022, December 16).
- What is the cost of a Visual Studio subscription? How many users can be added to one account and what kind of licenses are available? Quora. (2023, January 22).
- What is the Price of AutoCAD LT? CAD CAM CAE Lab.
- How Much Does an AutoCAD License Cost? Civil Engineering Explained YouTube. (2025, January 26).