Executive Summary

Deploying server-hosted virtual desktops can provide significant benefits to IT organizations. By moving desktop computing environments from user desktops on physical PCs to virtual machines hosted on servers in the data center, companies can realize significant cost-of-ownership reductions associated with the ongoing support and maintenance of their end-user computing resources.

As Desktop Virtualization technology matures, the latest versions of VMware View and Citrix XenDesktop represent an evolution in the Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) solutions towards ease of management and workflow efficiency, while aiming to deliver a rich user experience that is closer to using a physical PC. VMware's PC over Internet Protocol (PCoIP) and Citrix's HDX technologies make advances towards delivering smoother multimedia experience comparable to a physical PC. While Citrix XenDesktop 5 introduced several improvements - such as Machine Creation Services (MCS) and Desktop Studio - for creating and managing virtual desktops, VMware View 4.6 continues to offer a significantly simpler management and administration workflow using a single management interface. In contrast XenDesktop 5 continues to require the use of multiple interfaces - Desktop Studio, Provisioning Services Console, Active Directory, etc. Combining these usability advantages with the lower licensing costs for a 1000 user deployment, View 4.6 delivers savings in both acquisition and ongoing administration costs over XenDesktop 5.

The Bottom Line

VMware View 4.6 Premier:

1. Saves customers between 34% and 67% in licensing costs compared to Citrix XenDesktop 5 Platinum for a 1000 user deployment
2. Provides end-users a much more consistent multimedia user experience using PCoIP
3. Reduces management complexity by allowing the management of all virtual desktop administration through a single web-based GUI
4. Is much easier to upgrade from View 4.5 to View 4.6 compared to the effort to upgrade Citrix XenDesktop 4 to XenDesktop 5
5. Installs more rapidly with fewer steps and less manual intervention (6 steps for VMware View compared to 14 steps for Citrix XenDesktop)

Virtual Infrastructure Components

Comparison of Citrix and VMware Software Used in Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>VMware</th>
<th>Citrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Desktop Management</td>
<td>VMware View Manager 4.6</td>
<td>Citrix XenDesktop Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Desktop Provisioning</td>
<td>VMware View Manager 4.6 Web Interface</td>
<td>Citrix XenDesktop Setup Wizard 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Optimization</td>
<td>VMware View Composer 2.6</td>
<td>Citrix Provisioning Server 5.6 SP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Desktop Agent</td>
<td>VMware View Agent 4.6</td>
<td>Citrix Virtual Desktop Agent 5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Both VMware View and Citrix XenDesktop components were tested as Virtual Machines running on VMware vSphere 4.1. Citrix products support Citrix XenServer, VMware vSphere and Microsoft Hyper-V as the underlying virtualization platform.

Source: Tolly, March 2011

Table 1
Background & Findings

In this study, Tolly engineers evaluated the installation of the VMware View 4.6 Premier and Citrix XenDesktop 5 Platinum and compared the effort involved in day-to-day operations of administering a virtual desktop environment in a representative LAN. Engineers also compared the upgrade process for the VMware View 4.6 and Citrix XenDesktop 5 from VMware View 4.5 and Citrix XenDesktop 4, respectively.

Tests also focused on the multimedia performance of a Wyse R90LW thin client running a virtual desktop using PCoIP over VMware View 4.6, and a virtual desktop with Citrix HDX under XenDesktop 5. Finally, the licensing costs for a 1000 user deployment was compared for both solutions.

The goal of the test was to help prospective users of the VMware and Citrix solutions better understand the process of setting up and managing the respective desktop virtualization environments. Current release offerings were used for both solutions. Table 1 provides details of components and release levels for each solution.

The focus of the evaluation was on measuring the number of major steps required to deploy virtual desktops, instead of measuring the absolute number of clicks or time taken in the process. Furthermore, engineers noted whether a single management interface or multiple management interfaces had to be accessed to accomplish a given task.

Initial Deployment

Building the Underlying Virtualization Environment

As noted earlier, engineers utilized an existing virtualization environment based on VMware vSphere 4.1 as the starting point to install the virtual desktop solutions from both VMware and Citrix. The effort to build this base virtualization environment was considered beyond the scope of the test, and was not counted towards the effort to deploy either VMware or Citrix solutions.

Citrix XenDesktop supports deployment on a variety of virtualization platforms including Citrix XenServer, VMware vSphere and Microsoft Hyper-V. Engineers chose to use VMware vSphere in this test for operational efficiency of being able to use one virtualization platform to host both the VMware View and Citrix XenDesktop deployments for testing purposes.

Observations from Initial Deployment

VMware View 4.6

Engineers found the deployment process for the View 4.6 to be significantly simpler than the process required by the XenDesktop 5. The outline in Table 2 provides a visual comparison of the installation process for the View 4.6 and XenDesktop 5 solutions.

For View 4.6, the infrastructure component setup process required five major steps:
- Creation of the base virtual desktop VM with the VMware View Agent.
- Install View Composer services on the VMware vCenter server. View Composer allows use of linked-clone virtual machines as the source for virtual desktops, yielding storage efficiencies by reducing the number and size of VM images to be managed across the network.
- Create a server VM from the VM template running on Windows 2008 R2. Install the View Connection Server and specify an administrator to manage the View Connection Server.
- Create an SQL Server 2005 Express or Oracle Database Standard Edition for event logging. This step is optional.
- Provision new virtual desktops from the View Administrator console.

Citrix XenDesktop 5

On the other hand, the infrastructure component setup process for the XenDesktop solution was found to be considerably more complex and required more explicit manual configuration.

As shown in Table 2, XenDesktop 5 required 14 major steps during the initial deployment, including the manual configuration of Microsoft infrastructure components and the installation of non-Citrix applications/frameworks (Microsoft SQL Server Express 2008 and Microsoft .Net Framework 3.5 SP1).

In total, XenDesktop 5 required at least one extra server (running Citrix Provisioning Services) compared to the View 4.6, and required extensive interaction across six different management interfaces (vSphere Client, Desktop Studio, Desktop Director,
While the workflow has been simplified in XenDesktop 5 compared to XenDesktop 4, engineers still felt that View 4.6 implemented a much more simplified and streamlined management workflow mostly through a single Web-based management interface. Engineers noted that the multiple management interface paradigm of the XenDesktop solution presented a less integrated feel than the View solution.

While both solutions require a database to store configuration information, the View solution installs the database component as part of its base infrastructure that was installed prior to the start of the deployment. While a database application was provided on the deployment media with the XenDesktop solution, the installation of the database was an additional manual step.

VMware View allows administrators to store the virtual machine disks on tiered storage, thereby optimizing storage for performance and high availability. For example, the

---

**Comparison of Workflow for VDI Infrastructure Component Setup**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VMware View 4.6</th>
<th>Citrix XenDesktop 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Install View Composer on the vCenter server</td>
<td>Create a server VM from the Windows 2008 R2 VM template, and install XenDesktop Server components on the server</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a VM from the Windows 2008 R2 VM template, and install View Connection Server</td>
<td>Configure XenDesktop Controller with Desktop Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configure View Connection Server by logging on to View management web interface</td>
<td>Create a server VM from the Windows 2008 R2 template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a SQL Server 2005 Express or Oracle Database Standard Edition for event database logging (optional)</td>
<td>Install Citrix Provisioning Services 5.6 SP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create the master Windows 7 VM from the Windows VM template, install VMware View Agent and take a snapshot</td>
<td>Configure the Provisioning Services Farm with Provisioning Services Configuration Wizard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy new virtual desktops from View management Interface</td>
<td>Create a master Windows 7 VM from Windows 7 VM template and install XenDesktop Virtual Desktop Agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No. of servers used:** 3

- Domain Controller, vCenter, View Manager/View Connection Server

**No. of management interfaces used:** 2

- vSphere Client and View Management web interface

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citrix XenDesktop 5</th>
<th>VMware View 4.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of servers used: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Domain Controller, vCenter, XenDesktop Controller, Provisioning Server

**No. of management interfaces used:** 6

- vSphere Client, Desktop Studio, Desktop Director, Provisioning Services Console, Provisioning Services Configuration Wizard and Provisioning Services Imaging Wizard

---
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Table 2
A replica of a virtual desktop disk may be stored on the local, high-performance Solid State Drive (SSD) to deliver improved virtual desktop performance. In contrast, XenDesktop 5 stores the master disk image on each datastore, which makes it impossible to use a tiered storage model.

**Virtual Desktop Provisioning**

Engineers conducted several provisioning activities involving individual desktops and both storage-reduced (streamed/linked-clone) desktops and full-clone desktop pools.

Prior to beginning this test, engineers created the requisite Microsoft Windows 7 Enterprise image loaded with applications like Microsoft Office 2007, Adobe Acrobat Reader 9 and Mozilla Firefox 3.6, and the corresponding vendor's virtual desktop agent. These images would be specified for virtual desktops that were allocated 2 GB of virtual RAM and 1 virtual CPU. (See Test Environment section for full details of the physical and virtual environments.)

As with the initial deployment phase, engineers noted that VMware View 4.6 offered a more unified interface for carrying out the provisioning and administrative functions compared to XenDesktop 5.

In contrast, XenDesktop 5 offered administrators two ways of provisioning virtual desktops:

- Create catalogs of new pooled/dedicated virtual desktops or existing virtual or physical desktops using the Machine Creation Services (MCS) through the Citrix Desktop Studio.
- Create streamed virtual desktops that load the operating system over the network using Provisioning Services (Console and Imaging Wizard).

Machine Creation Services (MCS) represented a welcome feature in XenDesktop 5 as it offered automated workflow options to create multiple virtual desktops using a wizard-based interface. However, the need to still use a completely different set of tools in the Provisioning Services to create the streamed desktops is a disadvantage and introduces management overhead compared to View 4.6 -- which did almost all provisioning activities using the View Administrator console.

Even though Citrix recommends using the Quick Deploy feature of MCS, engineers chose not to use this option due to its limitations such as restrictions on naming schemes for the virtual desktops, and the requirement for all the XenDesktop server-side components (Controller, Desktop Studio, the Web Interface, the Citrix License Server, and Microsoft SQL Server 2008 R2) to be installed on one server. (See [http://support.citrix.com/proddocs/index.jsp?topic=/xendesktop-rho/cds-quick-deploy-rho.html](http://support.citrix.com/proddocs/index.jsp?topic=/xendesktop-rho/cds-quick-deploy-rho.html)).

These restrictions are acceptable in a limited-scale deployment like that of a proof-of-concept deployment in a lab, but are not practical in a real-world deployment scenario with hundreds or thousands of virtual desktops. Moreover, engineers also focused on deployment of streaming virtual desktops using the Provisioning Server. This is considerably more complicated than the wizard-based Machine Creation Services because a production environment that has a mix of hosted and streamed desktops mandates the use of the Provisioning Server. (See [http://community.citrix.com/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=161743115](http://community.citrix.com/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=161743115)).

The XenDesktop 5 solution required extensive manual interaction to create both individual virtual desktops and full-clone pools. For example, to prepare the master target device to serve as the source for the streamed virtual desktops, it was required to manually modify of its BIOS settings to allow for PXE boot over the network.

Similarly, deleting any virtual desktops or machine catalogs requires careful coordination across multiple management interfaces to make sure that all users are logged off the target desktops in a catalog, that all the target desktops are powered off, and that the virtual desktops are put into maintenance mode, etc. Having to jump between multiple interfaces increases the chance of human errors.

**End-user Multimedia Experience Comparison**

Engineers evaluated the quality and support for playback of various popular multimedia formats using a Wyse thin client across a LAN using several popular media player applications.

**VMware PCoIP**

VMware View 4.6 used the PCoIP technology that compresses, encrypts, encodes and transmits the display output of a virtual desktop from the data center to the endpoint client over standard IP network. Since PCoIP encrypts the video out of the virtual desktop at the pixel-level on the server-side, the end-user is assured playback of any media format and media player application supported on the virtual desktop.

**Citrix HDX**

Citrix XenDesktop 5 used HDX (High Definition User Experience) technology to deliver audio and video output of the virtual desktop to the endpoint device over an IP network. HDX uses the processing power of the endpoint device to render the multimedia content by sending compressed multimedia information directly from the datacenter to the endpoint in its native format.

HDX MediaStream supports numerous multimedia formats including DIVX video, XVID video, MPEG4 V2 video, MPEG1 Layer3 audio, MP2 video, WMV video, AC3 audio, WMA audio, and MP3 audio. Since HDX takes advantage of the processing power of...
the endpoint device, it is necessary to make sure that the server-side virtual machine and the endpoint device have matching multimedia player/codec configuration. This adds management overhead to ensure compatibility of the configuration of the codec on the virtual desktop, the server and the endpoint. In case of a configuration mismatch between the server-side and the endpoint, multimedia playback falls back to server-side rendering, thus losing the benefits of multimedia acceleration on the endpoint device, which is the key benefit of using HDX for multimedia playback.

Media Playback - User Experience

A pair of identical Wyse thin clients accessed the View 4.6 and XenDesktop 5 virtual desktops across a LAN.

Engineers observed that:

- The media playback experience with View 4.6 and PCoIP was more predictable, while with XenDesktop 5 and HDX, quality of playback depended on the file format being played and whether that media format is supported for client-side rendering using the HDX MediaStream technology. Particularly, the QuickTime (.MOV) playback was not supported for client-side rendering (Multimedia Redirection, or MMR) and defaulted to server-side rendering, with a choppy video playback and audio sync issues.

- For media types that supported MMR over HDX, and using default configuration for HDX, the playback experience for a XenDesktop 5 virtual desktop varied depending on the native resolution of the media (high resolution video caused choppy playback and audio sync issues), and the client-side display resolution (windowed versus full-screen). This implied that the HDX configuration needed to be tweaked to deal with high resolution media.

For the same media files, on a View 4.6 virtual desktop with PCoIP, the playback quality was better, with a smoother video playback irrespective of the client-side display resolution, and no audio sync issues.

- Citrix technical documentation for HDX MediaStream for Flash content dictates a Windows-based endpoint device and low latency LAN-type network connection between the endpoint device and the XenDesktop Virtual Desktop Agent platform. (See [http://support.citrix.com/proddocs/index.jsp?topic=/receiver-linux-blackfoot/linux-config-improving-multimedia.html](http://support.citrix.com/proddocs/index.jsp?topic=/receiver-linux-blackfoot/linux-config-improving-multimedia.html)). When these conditions are not met, the playback falls back to server-side rendering that is not optimal for rich multimedia experience.

The overall quality of video playback is better with View 4.6 and PCoIP, compared to XenDesktop 5 and HDX. Full screen playback and navigation back and forth in the playback timeline was acceptable with View 4.6, while XenDesktop 5 exhibited choppy video playback and audio sync issues.

### Upgrade/Migration From Prior Versions

Engineers compared the vendor provided documentation detailing the process of

---

**Multimedia File Types Tested**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Type (Encoding Format)</th>
<th>File Format (File Extension)</th>
<th>Test File Name</th>
<th>Media Player Application</th>
<th>VMware View 4.6 with PCoIP</th>
<th>Citrix XenDesktop 5 with HDX MediaStream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIVX Video</td>
<td>AVI, MPEG, MPG</td>
<td>X-Men - The Last Stand - Trailer.avi</td>
<td>Windows Media Player 12</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPEG-4 Video</td>
<td>ASF</td>
<td>Spider-Man 3 - Teaser Trailer.mp4</td>
<td>Windows Media Player 12</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMV</td>
<td>WMV</td>
<td>The_Magic_of_Flight_720.wmv</td>
<td>Windows Media Player 12</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash</td>
<td>FLV</td>
<td>The_Sorcerer_s_Apprentice.flv</td>
<td>Real Player 14</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Not Accelerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Media</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Robotica_1080.rv</td>
<td>Real Player 14</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Not Accelerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuickTime</td>
<td>MOV</td>
<td>Avatar.mov</td>
<td>Windows Media Player 12</td>
<td>Not Accelerated</td>
<td>Not Accelerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Silverlight</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><a href="http://www.microsoft.com/silverlight/">http://www.microsoft.com/silverlight/</a></td>
<td>Mozilla Firefox 3.6</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Not Accelerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iis-smooth-streaming/demo/#/home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ou6_MklvKOO">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ou6_MklvKOO</a></td>
<td>Mozilla Firefox 3.6</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

**Accelerated:** Accelerated multimedia performance. Server-side acceleration for VMware PCoIP, and client-side acceleration for Citrix HDX.

**Not Accelerated:** Multimedia performance not accelerated. Fall back to unaccelerated server-side rendering.

Source: Tolly, March 2011

Table 3
upgrading from View 4.5 to View 4.6, and from XenDesktop 4 to XenDesktop 5. Updating the underlying virtualization environment (to VMware vSphere 4.1 and vCenter 4.1 from their earlier product versions) has been considered beyond the scope of this evaluation.

Engineers focused on the upgrade/migration process from VMware View 4.5 to View 4.6 and from Citrix XenDesktop 4 to XenDesktop 5 versions, as these were considered to represent the majority of deployments, and represented the last major release of the products widely deployed in the field. Upgrade/migration instructions from earlier versions of the VMware and Citrix products were considered beyond the scope of this evaluation, and the readers are encouraged to refer to the corresponding product upgrade/migration guides.

### High-Level Overview of Upgrade/Migration Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VMware View 4.5 to View 4.6</th>
<th>Citrix XenDesktop 4 to XenDesktop 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade View Connection Server(s) from version 4.5 to 4.6</td>
<td>Set up a XenDesktop 5 site and upgrade Web Interface and XenServer to the latest versions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade View Composer from version 2.5 to 2.6</td>
<td>Update user devices with the latest version of Citrix Receiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade the View agent on the base virtual machine</td>
<td>Upgrade virtual desktops to the XenDesktop 5 Virtual Desktop Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade View Composer Desktop Pools to use the upgraded base virtual machine</td>
<td>In XenDesktop 4, put the virtual desktops into maintenance mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade View Client</td>
<td>Ensure you understand which data can be exported and imported, and how this applies to your own deployment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a detailed description of the upgrade process, see the VMware View Upgrade guide at: https://www.vmware.com/pdf/view-46-upgrades.pdf

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export data and settings from your XenDesktop 4 farm to an XML file</td>
<td>Edit the XML file so that it contains only the data and settings you want to import into your XenDesktop 5 site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit the XML file so that it contains only the data and settings you want to import into your XenDesktop 5 site</td>
<td>Import data and settings from the XML file to your XenDesktop 5 site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat steps 6 to 8 as many times as necessary. Alternatively, if the XenDesktop 4 farm is not changing very much during this time, you can keep the original exported XML file and just repeat steps 7 and 8 rather than repeating the export step</td>
<td>Complete the post-migration tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a detailed description of the upgrade process, see the guide "Migrating to XenDesktop 5" at: http://support.citrix.com/proddocs/index.jsp?topic=xendesktop-rho/cds-upgrade-wrapper-rho.html

**Note:**
- The above upgrade/migration process focuses on VMware View 4.5 to View 4.6 and from Citrix XenDesktop 4 to XenDesktop 5 versions, as these were considered to represent the majority of deployments, and represented the last major release of the products widely deployed in the field. Upgrade/migration instructions from earlier legacy versions of the VMware and Citrix products were considered beyond the scope of this evaluation, and the readers are encouraged to refer to the corresponding product upgrade/migration guides.
- Each upgrade step outlined above consists of multiple smaller actions, and the overall number of steps outlined above is not indicative of the relative ease or difficulty of the upgrade process. This table is provided only to provide a high-level overview of the upgrade/migration process for each solution.

Source: Tolly, March 2011

Table 4
The salient steps to upgrade from VMware View 4.5 to View 4.6, and to migrate from Citrix XenDesktop 4 to XenDesktop 5 are shown in Table 4.

**Maintenance Operations**

**VMware View 4.6**

Virtualizing desktops helps reduce the maintenance costs associated with physical machines. Still, maintenance needs to occur in the virtual world as well when, for example, a service pack or a security update is issued for the desktop operating system.

For this test, engineers started with a base Windows 7 Enterprise installation on the master/base virtual desktop image. Then, engineers simulated software maintenance operations like installing an operating system update - installing the Service Pack 1 for Windows 7, in this case.

Initially a subset of the user desktops were updated – thus simulating a process where administrators may want to pilot a new update for a select group of users before rolling it out to their full user community.

Using VMware View Composer, network administrators can apply the software updates to the base virtual desktop image just like they would on a physical PC and then create a “snapshot” of that image with a one-click operation using the vSphere Client management interface.

The View solution gives organizations the flexibility to pilot the new software updates before making it generally available to all users. Using the same management interface that was utilized initially to create the virtual desktop pool, administrators can quickly assign a subset of users to the newly updated desktop.

Later, when the administrators feel a software update is ready for general deployment, all users in the pool can be updated by specifying the VMs to use the updated base image.

Depending on the urgency of the deployment of updates, the administrator can schedule rollout of high priority updates to the virtual desktops immediately, and release non-urgent updates at a scheduled time. The administrator can send messages alerting the users of the update schedule and allow users to save important work prior to the application of updates.

It is important to note that since one virtual desktop pool can contain different versions of the base desktop image (in this case virtual desktops running Windows 7 Enterprise with and without Service Pack 1), a common set of management policies can still be applied to the entire pool.

**Citrix XenDesktop 5**

Citrix XenDesktop 5 follows an upgrade workflow that is similar to VMware View, where a catalog of virtual machines could be upgraded by applying the updates to the master/base VM for that catalog using the Citrix Desktop Studio. Once the updates have been applied to the base VM, administrators can decide when to roll out the updates:

- After the users log off, for non-urgent updates. Administrators may choose to send a message to the users informing
of upcoming update that would be applied after the user logs off.

- For critical updates, administrators can force the powered on virtual desktops to restart immediately by logging out all active users, or restart after a delay by sending a message to the active users about impending updates.

- Administrators can selectively deploy updates to a subset of all virtual desktops, thereby allowing phased roll out of updates across the network. The administrators can also revert back to an earlier version if something goes wrong.

To update streamed desktops using Citrix Provisioning Services, administrators can apply the desired updates to the associated vDisk, and specify a schedule for the update of the underlying vDisk for the target devices. The target devices pick up the updated vDisk image at next login.

**Licensing Costs**

Engineers examined the licensing costs for the VMware View 4.6 Premier and Citrix XenDesktop 5 Platinum editions, based on pricing from CDW.com, a leading online reseller of both VMware and Citrix products. VMware View licensing is based on the number of concurrent users, while Citrix XenDesktop offers licenses based on either the number of individual or named users/devices, or based on the number of concurrent users. However, as shown in Table 5, concurrent user licensing for XenDesktop 5 Platinum is much more expensive than comparative licensing for View 4.6 Premier.

For a deployment for 1,000 virtual desktops, VMware View 4.6 solution cost up to 67% less than Citrix XenDesktop 5 solution for concurrent user licensing. VMware View 4.6 solution cost 34% less than Citrix XenDesktop 5 solution for named users/devices licensing assuming the concurrency rate for View to be 100%. In reality, the concurrency rate is typically much lower than 100%, so VMware View saves customers even more than 34% on licensing cost in this case.

**Test Environment**

**Physical Environments**

Identical physical environments were built for the tests consisting of one physical server each. Both servers were of identical hardware configuration. Each server was running Microsoft Windows 2008 R2, and was outfitted with two quad-core Intel® Xeon® E5540 2.53 GHz 64-bit processors, 48 GB RAM, and up to 1 TB FC SAN for storage.

**Common Virtual Infrastructure Environment**

The underlying virtualization environment consisted of a cluster of two physical servers running VMware vSphere 4.1 hypervisor, a Fibre Channel (FC) SAN providing the storage for virtualized assets, and a set of template virtual machines (VMs) running Microsoft Windows Server 2008 R2 for server VMs and running Microsoft Windows 7 Enterprise for virtual desktop VMs. A server VM running Windows Server 2008 R2 was created and was configured as the domain controller for the test network domain. Active Directory, DNS and DHCP server roles were enabled on this server, and provided these services to both the VMware and Citrix virtual desktop deployments to be created later. Finally, engineers created a server VM and installed VMware Virtual Center (vCenter) to manage the virtual environment.

**VMware View Virtual Environment**

As shown in the Figure 1, the VMware View virtual environment consisted of a server VM running View Connection Server/View Manager and View Administrator Console. The View Composer services are installed on the server VM running VMware vCenter, and the server VM acting as the domain controller provides the Active Directory, DNS and DHCP services for the virtual machines within the View virtual environment.

**Citrix Virtual Environment**

As shown in the Figure 1, the Citrix XenDesktop virtual environment consisted of a server VM acting as a XenDesktop controller, running the Citrix Desktop Studio (with Desktop Director and Machine Creation Services). Another server VM was used with Citrix Provisioning Services 5.6 SP1 to deploy streamed virtual desktops. The Active Directory, DNS and DHCP (Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol) services were provided by the virtual machine shared with the VMware View solution test bed. The server VM running VMware vCenter was used to manage the virtual environment assets in the Citrix virtual environment.

**Virtual Desktop Configuration**

All virtual desktop machines were configured identically for both vendors and consisted of the following software and virtual hardware components:

- 1 virtual CPU core, 2 GB RAM
- 20 GB Hard disk drive storage
- Microsoft Windows 7
- Microsoft Office 2007 (Full install)
- Adobe Acrobat Reader 9
- Mozilla Firefox 3.6.
### Note:

- Physical servers equipped with dual Quad-core Intel Xeon E5540 CPUs at 2.53 GHz, 48 GB RAM and FC SAN with 1 TB storage.
- All virtual servers equipped with 1 virtual CPU, 4 GB RAM and running Microsoft Windows Server 2008 R2.
- All virtual desktops were equipped with 1 virtual CPU, 2 GB RAM and running Microsoft Windows 7 Enterprise.
- The virtual servers running VMware vCenter, and the AD, DHCP and DNS roles were shared by both VMware and Citrix virtual environments.
- Both VMware View and Citrix XenDesktop were deployed on an underlying virtualization infrastructure running on VMware vSphere 4.1.

Source: Tolly, March 2011
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**Test Bed Topology**

Two Physical Servers in a Cluster Running VMware vSphere 4.1

**Common Virtualization Infrastructure Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VMware vCenter (View Composer)</th>
<th>Domain Controller (Active Directory, DNS, DHCP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Virtualized Assets**

- VMware View 4.6 Deployment
  - Virtual Desktop 1
  - Virtual Desktop 2
  - Virtual Desktop n
  - VMware View Connection Server (View Manager, View Administrator)

- Citrix XenDesktop 5 Deployment
  - Virtual Desktop 1
  - Virtual Desktop 2
  - Virtual Desktop n
  - Citrix XenDesktop Controller (Citrix Desktop Studio, Citrix Desktop Director)
  - Citrix Provisioning Server (Provisioning Services Console, Provisioning Services Imaging Wizard)
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You can reach the company via E-mail at sales@tolly.com, or via telephone at +1 561.391.5610.

Visit Tolly on the Internet at: http://www.tolly.com

Interaction with Citrix Systems, Inc.

In accordance with our process for conducting comparative tests, The Tolly Group contacted Citrix Systems, Inc. to notify them of the evaluation and invite their participation. A management representative of Citrix Systems, Inc. reviewed the test plan. Citrix did not offer any comments on the test plan.

For more information on the Tolly Fair Testing Charter, visit: http://www.tolly.com/FTC.aspx

Terms of Usage

This document is provided, free-of-charge, to help you understand whether a given product, technology or service merits additional investigation for your particular needs. Any decision to purchase a product must be based on your own assessment of suitability based on your needs. The document should never be used as a substitute for advice from a qualified IT or business professional. This evaluation was focused on illustrating specific features and/or performance of the product(s) and was conducted under controlled, laboratory conditions. Certain tests may have been tailored to reflect performance under ideal conditions; performance may vary under real-world conditions. Users should run tests based on their own real-world scenarios to validate performance for their own networks.

Reasonable efforts were made to ensure the accuracy of the data contained herein but errors and/or oversights can occur. The test/audit documented herein may also rely on various test tools the accuracy of which is beyond our control. Furthermore, the document relies on certain representations by the sponsor that are beyond our control to verify. Among these is that the software/hardware tested is production or production track and is, or will be, available in equivalent or better form to commercial customers. Accordingly, this document is provided "as is", and Tolly Enterprises, LLC (Tolly) gives no warranty, representation or undertaking, whether express or implied, and accepts no legal responsibility, whether direct or indirect, for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness or suitability of any information contained herein. By reviewing this document, you agree that your use of any information contained herein is at your own risk, and you accept all risks and responsibility for losses, damages, costs and other consequences resulting directly or indirectly from any information or material available on it. Tolly is not responsible for, and you agree to hold Tolly and its related affiliates harmless from any loss, harm, injury or damage resulting from or arising out of your use of or reliance on any of the information provided herein.

Tolly makes no claim as to whether any product or company described herein is suitable for investment. You should obtain your own independent professional advice, whether legal, accounting or otherwise, before proceeding with any investment or project related to any information, products or companies described herein. When foreign translations exist, the English document is considered authoritative. To assure accuracy, only use documents downloaded directly from Tolly.com.

No part of any document may be reproduced, in whole or in part, without the specific written permission of Tolly. All trademarks used in the document are owned by their respective owners. You agree not to use any trademark in or as the whole or part of your own trademarks in connection with any activities, products or services which are not ours, or in a manner which may be confusing, misleading or deceptive or in a manner that disparages us or our information, projects or developments.