

We still had a problem that service providers could differentiate and undermine the market. However, we also had a solution as our development process used test driven development and the entire platform was exposed through APIs. In the process of developing we had created an extensive testing suite. This testing suite would be used to distinguish between community platforms providers (those who have taken the code but modified it in a significant way) and certified Zimki providers (those who complied with the testing suite). Through the use of a trademarked image for Zimki providers we could enforce some level of portability between the providers.

By creating this marketplace, backed by an Open Zimki Foundation, we could overcome one source of inertia (reliance on a single provider) whilst enabling companies to try their own platform in-house first and developing new opportunities for ourselves from an application store, market reporting, switching services, brokerage capability, training, support and pre built stand-alone Zimki clusters. Such an approach would also reduce our capital exposure given the constraints we existed under.

*Point 4* — we needed to build an ecosystem to allow us to identify the future services we should create and hence we had to build an ILC model. Obviously we could only directly observe the consumption data for those who built on our service but what about other Zimki providers?

By providing common services such as GUBE (generic utility billing engine) along with an application store, a component library (a CPAN