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Executive Summary

The 2022 edition of Enterprise Management Associates’ biennial “Network Management Megatrends” is the definitive benchmark of the state of enterprise network operations. Based on a survey of more than 400 IT organizations and one-on-one interviews with senior networking experts in Fortune 500 companies, this report should help network managers optimize operations while planning for future initiatives.
Network Operations: Red Alert
Enterprise Management Associates (EMA) has been publishing its biennial “Network Management Megatrends” research since 2008. The report benchmarks trends large and small from year to year, providing not only current insight into the state of network operations, but also a historical record of how things evolve over time.

This 2022 edition of EMA’s “Network Management Megatrends” research will reveal how IT groups organize the function of network operations and outfit it with tools and processes to address the network management requirements of enterprises. It also explores emerging megatrends that are impacting the network management strategies of IT organizations, such as the cloud and the Internet of Things. However, in this introduction, we call the reader’s attention to something ominous.

EMA sees an alarming warning sign. The effectiveness of network operations teams is declining. Figure 1 details a half-decade’s worth of data generated in response to a simple question: “How would you rate the success of your network operations organization over the past year?” There has been a precipitous decline in the number of respondents who believe their network operations groups are completely successful, from 49% in 2016 to 35% in 2020 to just 27% in 2022. EMA sees a growing number of network operations teams that believe that they could and should be doing better.

Figure 1. Percentage of IT organizations that are completely successful with network operations.
What is happening? Throughout this report, EMA will attempt to answer this question. For now, we offer some words from networking professionals interviewed for this project.

“[Network operations] is not super effective. I’ve seen big companies that don’t put enough investment into the people in their network operations centers (NOCs). They have a lot of entry-level people and just a few senior-level people, and they have to push too many things to second- or third-tier support.”

Network engineer who has worked for two Fortune 500 financial companies over the last decade

“Good job? Of course not. Our network is one of the biggest in the world. We have hundreds of people maintaining it, and it’s still a tremendous mess. We have people who have zero networking knowledge who are reviewing and approving network changes. There is nothing that I think we do well.”

Network team manager, Fortune 100 pharmaceutical company

“If we’re going to measure it against critical incidents, we’re doing okay. But if we’re going to measure it against low-impact incidents, I’d say no. We’re doing a good job of keeping the network up and running, but the number of pending tickets for low-impact incidents is usually around 1,000. We need to develop automation focused on dealing with those.”

Network engineer, Fortune 100 consumer goods manufacturer
Methodology and Demographics

This report combines quantitative and qualitative insights into the general state of network operations in today’s enterprises. EMA began this project by interviewing a half-dozen networking professionals from Fortune 500 companies about the state of network operations inside their organizations. These interviewees are quoted anonymously throughout the report. Their response influenced the development of the questionnaire EMA used for the quantitative portion of this research.

EMA surveyed 409 IT professionals whose roles focus significantly on network infrastructure and operations. EMA’s goal was to collect data from a broad cross-section of companies in terms of size, revenue, and industry, as well as the perspectives of people from all levels of the IT organization, from subject matter experts to executives. EMA collected this survey data in March 2022.

The following charts provide demographic information on these survey participants.

![Job titles](Figure 2. Job titles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT/Network engineer/analyst</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/Network architect</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO/CTO (IT executive management)</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT manager/supervisor (or equivalent)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT director (or equivalent)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator (e.g., network, systems)</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Vice President (or equivalent)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software developer/engineer</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-related business analyst</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Program manager</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site reliability engineer</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/Integrator</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Group or team within the IT organization](Figure 3. Group or team within the IT organization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group or Team</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network engineering/architecture</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT executive suite (CIO, CTO, VP)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT architecture</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DevOps</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT asset management/financial management/IT business analysis</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT project/program management</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud architecture/operations</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network operations (e.g., NOC)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data center operations</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Location of respondents

- North America: 65.0%
- Europe: 35.0%

Sample Size = 409

Figure 5. Size of company by number of worldwide employees

- SMBs (100 to 499 employees): 13.9%
- Midmarket Enterprises (500 to 2,499 employees): 17.4%
- Enterprises (2,500 to 19,999): 61.6%
- Very Large Enterprises (20,000 or more): 7.1%

Sample Size = 409
Figure 6. Annual sales revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Revenue Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5 million to less than $10 million</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 million to less than $50 million</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 million to less than $250 million</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250 million to less than $1 billion</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 billion to less than $5 billion</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 billion or more</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable; I work for a government or nonprofit agency</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size = 409

Figure 7. Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking/Finance/Insurance</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/Utilities</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical services (not related to IT)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics/Wholesale/Distribution</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Civil Engineering</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare provider/Hospitals</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (college/university/research institute)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life sciences/Pharmaceutical/Medical technology</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media/Entertainment/Content provider</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (national, regional, municipal)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense/Aerospace</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size = 409
To understand the size and nature of the networks operated by the organizations represented in this research, EMA asked respondents to reveal how many network devices they have under management (network equipment, not servers, printers, PCs, or other network-connected devices) and how many corporate sites they have connected to a wide-area network or the internet (not including home offices).

![Figure 8. Number of network devices under management (network equipment, not endpoints)](image)

Sample Size = 409
Figure 9. Number of corporate sites connected to the corporate network via WAN or internet
Key Findings
Key Findings

• The percentage of network operations teams that are successful is in steep decline, from 49% in 2016 to 27% in 2022
• This is the first year that network operations teams have recognized public cloud, SaaS applications, and cloud-native application architectures as the most critical drivers of their network management strategies
• Enterprises that integrate network operations into a cross-domain operations center are more successful than those that keep network operations in a standalone NOC
• When NetOps lives in a cross-domain operations center, network professionals spend more time on strategic projects
• 31% of all IT service problems are reactive. End users report them to IT before NetOps is aware
• Only 34% of alerts from network monitoring tools are actionable
• Network data quality and a shortage of skilled personnel are the biggest challenges to NetOps
• Network managers are interested in SaaS-based network management tools, but they have data security concerns and struggle with legacy tool lock-in
• Only 12.5% of IT organizations find it very easy to hire and retain networking personnel. They are especially struggling to hire people with network security, network automation, and network monitoring skills
• Most companies are multi-cloud today, and their network operations teams are using network tools to monitor the cloud. Only 18% believe they are very effective at cloud monitoring with network tools
• DevOps and NetOps teams are closely collaborating, and in some cases fully integrating. Security policies, application optimization, and network capacity planning are important areas of collaboration
• 96% of corporate networks have or will have Internet of Things devices and sensors connecting to them. IoT is driving investments in network security, network performance monitoring, and network automation
The Network Operations Team
IT organizations take a variety of approaches to network operations. There is the traditional standalone network operations center (NOC), a sort of mission control center for network monitoring and management. Others take a distributed or informal approach in which people contribute to network operations from various discrete groups, such as IT architecture, network engineering, and service management. More recently, cross-domain operations teams have formed, pulling expertise from all aspects of the organization to provide a unified, full-stack approach to monitoring and management of IT services. The way a company organizes around network operations can influence the tools, processes, and procedures that it adopts.

Drivers of NetOps Strategy

EMA is observing a fundamental shift in what drives enterprise network operations strategies. Figure 10 reveals the IT initiatives that are influencing network management strategies. Since 2008, the number-one response to this question has always been server virtualization, which suggests an intense focus on addressing the rise of east-west traffic in data centers. This year, virtualization dropped to fourteenth on this list. What happened? The cloud has turned things upside down. Public cloud, cloud-native applications, and SaaS applications have risen to the top of network managers’ minds. Members of a network engineering team were extremely likely to single out public cloud and SaaS applications. Data center modernization also eclipsed server virtualization, due in part to a shift toward hybrid cloud.
“We had to shift to cloud-first,” said a network team manager with a Fortune 100 pharmaceutical company. “Instead of data centers, we are using colocation data centers, where we will shut down our data centers and move to colos with 10% of the original footprint. The rest just goes to the cloud, and we have to work on connectivity services and a DMZ for security between the cloud and colos.”

Two years ago, IoT was the second-highest driver of network management strategies, but this year it’s waned to a low secondary driver. However, the IT executive suite, network engineering, and the NOC all identified it as a major influence.

The influence of ITIL and other best practice initiatives, as well as unified communications and collaboration technologies, has doubled since 2020. Both were afterthoughts before this year. Members of network engineering teams listed ITIL as one of their top priorities, suggesting a desire to implement best practices around network engineering and operations.

Members of network engineering teams and DevOps teams are also very focused on zero trust security in 2022. “With everyone working from home, we’re trying to determine where we hold the line of our perimeter since it’s not the office anymore,” said a network security architect with a large American bank. “We’re waiting to see how network access control vendors adjust to working from home. Right now, a lot of heavy lifting is being done on VPN concentrators, and they weren’t built do this so much of this.”

SaaS applications and application performance optimization drive the most successful network teams, while less successful teams focus more on digital experience management.

**Figure 11** examines the network technology investments that are influencing network management strategy. Network security is the top driver, as it was in 2020.
Most companies are also making investments in network performance management tools, WAN transformation, network automation, and data center SDN. WAN transformation was a minor driver two years ago, but now dominates the enterprise networking world. Larger companies are the most influenced by WAN transformation. Larger companies are also more likely to invest in Wi-Fi 6/6E and private 5G.

Network observability, application delivery networking, and LAN switching upgrades are the chief tertiary priorities. Network observability is an emerging concept that EMA expects will merge with and drive the network performance management industry in the future. Members of DevOps teams were the most likely to select network observability, which is unsurprising since DevOps groups are much more familiar with the concept than most traditional networking teams.

Organizing NetOps

Figure 12 reveals how enterprises generally organize network operations today. The majority have formed operations centers, with more than one-third using a traditional NOC and the rest using a cross-domain operations team. A smaller number take a distributed, informal approach to network operations. Fifteen percent are primarily outsourcing the function. The smallest companies were the most likely to outsource, and the largest companies were the most likely to have a NOC. The size of a network also had some correlation with organizational strategy. The smallest networks (15 to 149 network devices) were the most likely to outsource operations. Midsized networks (150 to 999 devices) tended to have a NOC. The largest networks (1,000 or more) often had a cross-domain operations team.

The cross-domain operations team appears to be a potential best practice. Enterprises with a cross-domain operations team were the most likely to be successful with network operations. Organizations that relied on a NOC were less successful. EMA believes that cross-domain operations strategies will become more important as enterprises expand their use of the cloud. Network teams often struggle to have an equal voice in discussions about architecture and operations in the cloud. A traditional NOC will be at a disadvantage, but a cross-domain operations team may have more creditability, given its ability to bring a broad set of expertise to the table.
The Typical Workday

As this research will demonstrate in later sections, networking personnel are valuable resources that are in short supply. IT organizations must optimize how network infrastructure and operations professionals work. Most of their time should be devoted to enabling the business, not to repetitive, busy work. **Figure 13** reveals that generally, this is not the case. The average respondent estimates that he or she spends less than 25% of the workday on strategic projects, such as building out new IT services. Another 18% is devoted to capacity planning. However, 19% of the day is spent on generating reports, something that should be mostly automated. Another 22% is devoted to troubleshooting.

EMA found that network professionals in an organization with a traditional NOC tend to spend more time generating reports and less time working on strategic projects. On the other hand, those with a cross-domain operations center tend to spend more time on strategic projects and less time on report generation.

From a job title perspective, consultants/integrators (40%) and site reliability engineers (39%) devote the biggest portion of their workday to strategic projects. Network engineers and network architects devote just 23% and 24% of their days to strategic projects, respectively. Network engineers and architects need to find a way to free up more time for important projects, and report generation is the place to do it. Network architects, network engineers, and network administrators all spend 21% of their day on report generation. Project managers spend just 9% of their day on it.
Addressing Network Trouble

Detecting Network Trouble

In the average IT organization, end users detect and report 31% of all service problems before network operations teams are aware of them. Figure 14 shows the results when EMA asked respondents to estimate how many IT service problems are first reported by end users, as opposed to being recognized proactively by network operations. This means that 31% of all IT service problems are already impacting end users before IT can react. While the network operations team goes into firefighting mode, productivity is already down, business processes are disrupted, and customers are inconvenienced.

This situation has improved in recent years. In 2020, end users detected 33% of IT service problems and they detected 40% in 2018. This looks like progress. However, it’s occurring while overall network operations success is in decline.

Root Causes of Complex Problems

EMA believes that network operations teams are struggling partially because of increased overall complexity in IT infrastructure and services. This is evident in Figure 15. EMA asked research respondents to identify the root cause of the last three complex IT service issues that forced network operations to collaborate across IT silos. Since 2016, the top response to this question has been the network. This year, security incidents, client devices, and user errors eclipsed the network.

The complexity introduced by the massive rise in remote work could be part of this shift. Home offices are extremely vulnerable to user error, for instance, where users have exclusive access to the WAN edge device and the local area network. Remote work also introduced new vectors for security incidents. Organizations with a NOC were less likely to cite security incidents as a root cause of trouble. Operators of larger networks were more likely to cite security incidents.

External service providers are also a frequent source of trouble. This points to the rise of cloud adoption and internet connectivity, two places where network operations have less visibility. When these providers have problems, tracing the problem can be impossible. Organizations with a cross-domain operations center were more likely than those with a NOC to cite external providers as a root cause.

---

**Figure 14. NetOps and detection of IT service problems: reactive vs. proactive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive (End users report problems before NetOps detects them)</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive (NetOps detects problems first)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size = 409, Valid Cases = 409, Total Mentions = 1,163
Tool Support of Troubleshooting

*Figure 16* reveals that network operations teams believe their tools could be better at supporting troubleshooting tasks. For instance, only 23% are fully satisfied with how tools handle alerts and escalations. Only 30% are fully satisfied with support of problem isolation, and only 28% are fully satisfied with root-cause analysis support.

![Satisfaction with how network management tools support troubleshooting tasks](chart.png)

*Figure 16. Satisfaction with how network management tools support network troubleshooting tasks*

Sample Size = 409
“Other than having a dashboard that gives you an overall view, tools are limited in troubleshooting scenarios,” said a network engineer who has worked for two Fortune 500 financial companies over the last decade. “Triage work is better supported, but troubleshooting isn’t.”

“Traditional tools are good at telling us that there is something going on and we need to look. But there’s a lot of manual troubleshooting after that,” said a network security architect at a large American bank. “Tools are good for problem isolation, but not root-cause analysis.”

“I have to use two or three tools to troubleshoot an issue,” said a network engineer with a Fortune 100 consumer goods manufacturer. “As an experienced network engineer, it’s easy for me to correlate that data across tools, but if I present that data to a non-expert, he would have a hard time correlating it.”

Organizations that outsource network operations are particularly unhappy with how their tools support problem isolation and root-cause analysis. Successful network operations teams tend to have good problem isolation and root-cause analysis support in their tools.

**Broken Processes and Tools**

**Manual Errors**

Network management is a highly manual profession. Network engineers often perform critical work within the command line interface (CLI) of network devices. For instance, network engineers often reconfigure switches and routers in CLI. These manual processes are highly susceptible to user error. On average, survey respondents in this research told EMA that manual administrative errors, such as a bad configuration change, cause 27% of all network problems. This number is up very slightly from 26% in 2020.

**Figure 17** shows that network management tool sprawl has a strong correlation with negative outcomes. Organizations with 21 or more network management tools have the highest percentage of problems caused by manual errors, while organizations with just one to three tools have the lowest percentage. EMA suspects there are several issues behind these numbers. A large toolset could encourage poor processes and policies around change controls because these tools will have overlapping capabilities around network changes that make such controls impossible to impose. Also, a fractured toolset leads to poor overall visibility into network data. For instance, a network team with 20 or 30 tools might have more than one repository for configuration data. Network admins might accidentally consult the wrong source when making a change. All of this points to the need to consolidate network management tools as much as possible.

![Manual administrative errors cause 27% of all network problems.](image)

**Figure 17.** Percentage of network-related problems caused by manual administrative errors, by number of network management tools

Sample Size = 409
Alert Fatigue

Network monitoring tools are infamous for producing floods of alarms and alerts. For instance, one bad interface on a network device might trigger a series of alerts associated with five, ten, or even hundreds of other devices that have a dependency on that failed interface. Network monitoring tool vendors often try to differentiate themselves by developing features that minimize this issue, such as topology-based alarm suppression.

The network management toolsets represented in this survey is not doing so well on this issue—and things are getting worse. Figure 18 reveals that only 34% of alerts generated by network monitoring tools are actionable in 2022, down from 43% in 2020. In other words, only 66% of all alerts are indicative of a real problem.

EMA found that larger revenue companies were worse off than smaller revenue companies. Companies with more revenue in this research tended to have more network management tools and larger networks. This may help explain the problems that richer companies are having.

Can Better Tools Help?

EMA asked research respondents to estimate what percentage of network-related problems could be prevented with better network management tools. The mean response was 44%. In other words, network operations professionals believe they could reduce network problems by nearly half if they had better management tools.

Respondents in North America saw a bigger opportunity from improved management tools than Europeans. People who work within IT architecture and IT project and program management were more bullish on this idea than people who work in cloud architecture and operations and data center operations. EMA believes that network teams have a tremendous opportunity to improve operations if they can find the budgets and the time to optimize their toolsets.
NetOps Success and Failure

Let’s revisit the statistics around self-reported network operations success and dig a little deeper into the numbers. **Figure 19** reveals that only 27% of enterprises have a fully successful network operations team.

Network teams with larger network management toolsets are feeling more confident about success than those with smaller toolsets. This is counterintuitive and conflicts with EMA’s overall recommendations for consolidating and optimizing toolsets. However, this is also a trend EMA observed for several years in the data. Still, we see indicators of trouble between the lines. Network teams with larger toolsets have more problems with manual errors, for instance. They were reported a high number of IT service problems caused by manual errors in network administration.

Network engineers and CIOs are less enthusiastic about success than network architects. Europeans are less enthused than North Americans. Members of network engineering and cloud engineering teams are less sanguine than the IT executive suite.

![Figure 19. Respondents rate the overall success of their network operations organization over the past year](image-url)
**Figure 20** reveals how network operations teams are measuring this success. Security risk reduction is a major focus, eclipsing everything else. Two years ago, security risk reduction tied with end-user experience as the top measure of success, but this year, end-user experience waned. Improved network visibility and cross-team collaboration remain top secondary priorities, as they did in 2020. However, mean time to repair emerged as a new secondary priority this year after being an afterthought two years ago. Members of the IT architecture and network engineering groups are especially focused on mean time to repair, but the IT executive suite is less concerned with it. Instead, the executive suite emphasizes the importance of cross-IT collaboration and security risk reduction. Cloud enablement and time to deploy services remain overall afterthoughts, as they did in 2020.

Organizations that have a cross-domain operations center are the most likely to measure success with application performance and security risk reduction, while organizations with a NOC are most likely to focus on faster deployment of services. Smaller revenue companies focus on internal SLAs and improved network visibility. Large revenue companies focus on security risk reduction.

![Bar chart showing the most important measures of success for network management teams](chart.png)

**Figure 20.** Most important measures of success for network management teams

Sample Size = 409, Valid Cases = 409, Total Mentions = 1,132
The two biggest issues that challenge network operations teams today are network data quality and a shortage of skilled personnel. Figure 21 reveals the issues that are most challenging for network operations teams today. The two biggest issues are network data quality and a shortage of skilled personnel. The personnel issue is especially problematic for SMBs and midsized enterprises. We will explore this issue in greater depth in the Megatrends section. EMA believes this is an endemic problem that is undermining most companies today. The IT executive suite, the cloud group, and the IT architecture group are all more likely to perceive an issue with data quality. Network engineering is less concerned.

A lack of network use policies, poorly implemented infrastructure projects, and poor cross-domain collaboration are the main secondary issues. Less effective network operations teams identified bad infrastructure projects as their biggest issue. It’s also an issue in general for larger companies, which are more likely to struggle with cross-domain collaboration and end-to-end network visibility. Smaller companies are struggling more with a lack of budget.

A network team manager with a Fortune 100 pharmaceutical company said he is struggling with a combination of poorly implemented infrastructure and a lack of end-to-end visibility, a consequence of complexity created by mergers and acquisitions. “We perform 15 to 30 acquisitions a year. We buy a company and absorb their network. Sometimes we rip and replace and other times we just provide connectivity and standardize later when there is time. These acquisitions have created all these snowflake topologies.”

Large toolsets (fragmentation of tools) are generally a minor issue. However, network operations teams with very larger toolsets are struggling more with data quality and with cross-domain collaboration, suggesting that network teams need to optimize these large toolsets to address these issues. The IT governance group (asset management, financial management) identified tool sprawl as their top issue.

NOC staff singled out a lack of defined processes as a major problem. Network engineering team members pointed to a lack of change management controls.
Network Management Tool Strategies
Large Toolsets are the Norm

Although many network management tools are multifunction solutions that address a variety of use cases and workflows, EMA has long found that most network operations teams use large, fragmented toolsets. Figure 22 reveals that the network team has anywhere from 4 to 15 tools. It is very rare for a network team to have fewer than four tools.

“We’re close to 20 tools and six or eight vendors,” said an IT operations manager with one of the world’s largest government agencies. “Some of those tools don’t have a lot of people using them because they are specialized, maybe for a specific vendor.”

Figure 22. Total number of tools organizations use to manage, monitor, and troubleshoot networks

Sample Size = 409
Figure 23 illustrates how the size of a network impacts the size of a network management toolset. Almost all organizations with fewer than 150 network devices are using 10 or fewer tools, while nearly all organizations with 5,000 or more devices are using 11 or more tools. Network size leads to complexity, and complexity requires more tools. EMA observed similar correlations with the size of a company and the annual sales revenue. Larger revenue equals more tools.

“Ten tools is my conservative guess,” said a network team manager for a Fortune 100 pharmaceutical company who claims his network is one of the largest corporate networks in the world. “One tool is for generating topology, another is for link utilization, another is for events, and so on.”

Network engineers and architects perceive larger toolsets than IT middle managers and executives. This contrast suggests that executives are unaware of how many tools technical teams are using. For instance, executive leaders might have visibility into commercial tools that require budget for licensing and support. However, technical teams often use free open-source tools, which require no budget, and thus no permission from executive management to acquire.
Smaller Toolsets are Preferred

“We would like to have as few tools as possible,” said a network engineer with a Fortune 100 consumer goods manufacturer. “If one tool could do all the jobs [that our current 12-tool portfolio does], it would be easier in terms of integration and maintenance. But no one tool can do everything we need.”

**Figure 24** echoes the above sentiment. The most popular procurement strategy for network management tools is the adoption of fully integrated multifunction platforms. The most successful network operations teams prefer this approach. “I like multifunction tools,” said an IT operations manager with one of the largest government agencies in the world. “We have a multifunction tool, but it won’t scale to our environment, so we have to do several installations. We have more than one million devices, so scalability is an issue that drives so many of our tools.”

Many seek best-of-suite solutions from a single vendor, although their preference for the extent of integration within those suites varies. Only 23% profess a preference for adopting stand-alone, best-of-breed tools for each network management requirement that they have. The least successful network operations teams demonstrated the highest preference for stand-alone, best-of-breed tools.

IT organizations have been expressing this preference for more consolidated toolsets for well over a decade, but EMA continues to see extremely large toolsets persisting in network operations teams.

A network engineer who has worked for two Fortune 500 financial companies over the last decade explained why he often encountered bloated network management toolsets: “Companies tend to buy a lot of tools and use them for only 10% of their functionality. It isn’t that the new tools do something that the old tools can’t do. It’s just that the new tool was sold to somebody who wasn’t technical enough to understand that we already had tools that could do the job just as well. The issue is that tools aren’t fully onboarded, so you’re not using them to their full capability. People will be working on a tool project and then have to ditch it for a new project.”

![Figure 24. Preferred strategies for acquiring and deploying network monitoring and management products](chart.png)
Deployment and Licensing Preferences

Network operations teams are no longer married to on-premises management tools. Figure 25 reveals that only 29% of network teams prefer an on-premises deployment of a network management tool. Instead, nearly 44% want to deploy tools in the cloud, and 29% prefer a SaaS solution from their management vendors. The least successful network operations teams in this research had a very strong preference for on-premises tools. Larger companies and operators of larger networks preferred SaaS deployments, while smaller companies and operators of smaller networks preferred cloud-based deployments.

“As the guy who is implementing it, everything should be in the cloud,” said a network team manager with a Fortune 100 pharmaceutical company. “As a network guy, I don’t want to be involved in spinning up a VM, patching servers, dealing with tool upgrades. There is a tremendously complicated process here for requesting a VM, spinning up a tool, and paying for the bill-back. It can take three of four months. In the cloud, it’s up and running fast. But then the battle is around security. Information security doesn’t like it.”

“I like SaaS-based tools because patching is a huge effort,” said a network security architect with a large American bank. “Keeping up with maintenance is a huge pain. Anything that can offload it to the software providers is a benefit. At my previous job, we had people devoted only to patching tools.”

An IT operations manager with one of the world’s largest government agencies explained why he remains one of the 28% who stick with on-premises tools. “When it comes to the keys to your kingdom, you hold them close. Until we hand over our networks to a vendor, it stays in-house. I’d also like to keep anything in-house that handles certificates and domain logins.”

Figure 25. Preferred deployment model for network management tools
**Figure 26** reveals that most network operations teams prefer to have a vendor or service provider handle administration of their network management tools. Only 44% prefer to handle maintenance themselves, which points to a future in which SaaS-based management tools are the norm. While deploying a tool in the cloud removes some platform complexity, it doesn’t remove administrative responsibility. Only a managed cloud-based tool or a true SaaS tool can do that.

![Figure 26 Preferred approach to administration of network management tools](image1.png)

**Figure 27** identifies the licensing model preferences that network teams have for their management tools. Clearly, the market is coalescing around the subscription model in which a minimum term commitment is expected. Perpetual licenses, which were the default license model 12 or 15 years ago, are fading from the market. While some vendors still offer them as an alternative to subscriptions, EMA has observed some of the largest network management tool vendors in the world eliminate perpetual licenses from their price lists. Finally, the chart reveals that a small minority are looking for pay-as-you-go tools.

![Figure 27 Preferred license model for network management tools](image2.png)
With SaaS emerging as the future of network management tool consumption, EMA asked respondents to identify their top requirements for SaaS-based tool delivery. Figure 28 reveals two major considerations for buyers. They want assurances around platform security and they want the ability to integrate SaaS tools with their other management tools, whether those tools are on-premises or in the cloud. IT executives were especially focused on platform security.

The top secondary requirements are scalability and simplicity of data retention, rapid implementation, and easy-to-find pricing and licensing terms. Data retention is more important to larger revenue companies, while rapid implementation is more important to smaller revenue companies.

“The preference is now SaaS,” said a network engineer with a Fortune 100 consumer goods manufacturer. “It’s for savings, but also faster deployment, and you can scale it easier.”

Resiliency is a low priority overall. People who work within a NOC selected it as one of their top priorities, while members of DevOps teams were least likely to focus on it. Iterative product cycles in which new features are rolled out without software upgrades especially appeal to members of network engineering and architecture groups. People who work in IT executive suites did not see the value of this.

---

**Figure 28. Most important characteristics of a SaaS-based network management tool**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platform security (certifications, breach reporting, etc.)</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with third-party tools (SaaS or on-prem)</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data retention scalability/simplicity</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid implementation/time to value</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent pricing and licensing</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resiliency/Uptime (SLAs)</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-demand scaling of monitoring</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sovereignty/residency</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iterative product cycle (no upgrades required for new features)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size = 409, Valid Cases = 409, Total Mentions = 1,110
Figure 29 reveals why network operations teams might be reluctant to embrace SaaS-based tools. The top issue is related to one of the top requirements of SaaS tools: security. IT organizations are worried about data security in SaaS tools. This is a bigger issue for larger companies.

The other two big issues are legacy tool lock-in and latency, and performance issues with tools outside the enterprise premises. SMBs are especially struggling with legacy lock-in. Unsuccessful network operations teams are also more likely to struggle with lock-in. SaaS tools have gotten better at supporting customization, given that it is the least problematic issue for network operations teams.

![Bar chart showing the top barriers to using a SaaS-delivered network management solution.](chart)

**Figure 29. Top barriers to using a SaaS-delivered network management solution.**

- Data security concerns: 40.6%
- Legacy tool lock-in - too difficult to change management tools: 37.7%
- Latency/performance issues: 37.4%
- Compliance requirements: 33.7%
- Connectivity barriers/air-gapped networks: 33.3%
- Cultural resistance - we like to control our tools: 32.8%
- Lack of customization: 29.3%
- None of the above: 2.4%
- Other: 0.2%

Sample Size = 409, Valid Cases = 409, Total Mentions = 1,012
Tool Requirements

Platform Characteristics

**Figure 30** reveals that the top three general platform and business requirements for management tools are integrations with other systems, ease of use, and low maintenance and support costs. Very large enterprises are especially concerned with integrations. SMBs are concerned most with ease of use. Organizations with large network management toolsets are the most likely to require tool integrations. Those with smaller toolsets want low maintenance and supports costs as well as ease of use. Ease of use is very important to lower-skilled admins and IT executives, but of little interest to network engineers and architects.

Rapid ROI, strong customer support, flexible deployment options, and tool resilience and stability are the chief secondary requirements.

“The deal-breaker for us is the support model,” said a network team manager for a Fortune 100 pharmaceutical company. “What’s the footprint? Do they have a presence in every single region, or just running on California time for eight or nine hours? Do I have a phone number to call, or do I just send an email and pray that I will get a response?”

Multi-vendor infrastructure support and role-based access control (RBAC) are the lowest priorities. However, successful network management teams make RBAC a priority, suggesting that they have a wider variety of users accessing their tools. Engineers and architects believe multi-vendor support is very important, but IT executives are unlikely to feel that way.

![Figure 30. Top business and platform requirements for network management products](image-url)
General Feature Requirements

*Figure 31* identifies the top general features requirements that IT organizations are looking for in network management tools. Four features top the list. They need integrated security insights, integrated collaboration tools and workflows, customizable reporting and dashboards, and mapping and visualization of data. Managers of smaller networks seek collaboration tools, mapping, and visualization.

Compliance scorecards and reports are a low product feature priority, but the most successful network operations teams make them a top feature priority. Service dependency mapping is a middling priority, but very large enterprises (20,000 or more employees) consider it essential. Members of DevOps teams also prioritize it.

![Bar chart showing general network management tool features](chart.png)

**Figure 31.** General network management tool features that are most important and useful

Sample Size = 409, Valid Cases = 409, Total Mentions = 1,120
Network Availability Monitoring Features

Network availability monitoring tools detect, isolate, and investigate network problems associated with network devices. They focus on the operational state of the devices on a network. **Figure 32** identifies the network availability monitoring features that are delivering the most value to IT organizations.

Auto-discovery of endpoints and applications, automated notifications and escalations, and the presentation of network topologies and inventories across infrastructure are the top three features. Auto-discovery of endpoints and applications is especially valuable to organizations that struggle the hardest with hiring and retaining networking personnel. Successful network operations teams are the most interested in topology and inventories across infrastructure.

Automated trouble ticket generation and clearing and alarms based on deviations from normal conditions are secondarily important. People who work within a NOC were more likely to value ticket generation and clearing, as well as automated notifications and escalations. Event correlation is not a high priority overall, but less successful network operations teams value it highly.

![Figure 32. Network availability monitoring features that are delivering the most value](image-url)
Network Performance Monitoring Features

Network performance monitoring overlaps with availability monitoring. Rather than focusing on the operational state of network devices, performance monitoring seeks to understand end-to-end performance across the network. Thus, performance monitoring combines device-centric monitoring with insights into utilization, latency, and network paths. **Figure 33** reveals the features of network performance monitoring that are delivering the most value.

The top feature is cross-domain monitoring. IT organizations want to understand network performance in the context of the overall infrastructure stack. Performance data trending is also very important to these organizations. This latter feature is especially important to larger companies and to managers of the largest networks. Members of DevOps and cloud operations teams are especially interested in data trending.

Traffic volume analysis, end-user experience correlation, application performance insights, and response time metric analysis round out the top feature priorities. The most successful network operations groups are the most likely to need response time metric analysis. Companies that struggle the most with hiring networking personnel are the most likely to need application performance insights. Managers of the smallest networks are most likely to want end-user experience insights.
Packet Monitoring Preferences

Network packets are an excellent source of network performance data. Packet monitoring tools can deliver high-precision insights into application performance if they are intelligent enough to analyze application-layer information in packets (Layers 5, 6, and 7). Other tools focus solely on network performance, diving no deeper than Layer 4. This latter approach gives insight into the health and performance of network sessions established with transport protocols, such as TCP and UDP. EMA found that network operations teams have one of two philosophies when it comes packet-based performance monitoring. Either they focus on the network layer and leave application performance to a different team, or they manage networks from an application performance perspective. Figure 34 reveals the current mix of perspectives on this issue. More than half prefer an application-layer packet monitoring tool. A minority prefer a network-layer view into packet-based performance.

Layer 7 intelligence can be expensive. Thus, larger companies in this survey were more likely to prefer application-centric tools. Engineers and architects were more likely to value Layer 7 tools, while lower-skilled admins were content with Layer 4 tools.

EMA analysis revealed that network operations teams that are focused on application performance optimization are more likely to seek Layer 7 intelligence from packet monitoring tools.

![Figure 34. Preferences for the depth of insight provided by packet-based network performance monitoring tools](image-url)
Tool Integrations

Network operations teams integrate their tools with other IT operations management systems to exchange data, automate workflows, and enable cross-silo collaboration. Figure 35 reveals current priorities for tool integration versus two years ago. The top priorities are security monitoring, cloud-native application management, IT and cloud orchestration, application performance management, and cross-domain IT monitoring. Integration with cloud-native platforms and cross-domain monitoring have become higher priorities since 2020.

Successful network operations groups are more likely to integrate their tools with cloud-native application platform management, IT service management, and help desk systems.

EMA relabeled “advanced IT analytics” as “AIOps” from the 2020 study to the 2022 study, and that change may explain the massive decline in integration priorities. Also, many network management vendors have added native AIOps capabilities since 2020, which reduces the need to integrate with standalone AIOps solutions. EMA research found that interest in AIOps is high among network teams, but integration with tools is not the priority.
Megatrend #1: Networking Brain Drain
EMA believes that a shortage of skilled networking personnel is contributing to the lack of success many enterprises are experiencing with network operations. **Figure 36** illustrates this issue. Only 12.5% of enterprises believe it is very easy to hire and retain skilled networking professionals, meaning most companies see room for improvement with staffing. Nearly 37% claim it is somewhat easy, but things could be better. More than 26% are having true difficulty with staffing. A deeper analysis of the data found that IT organizations that struggle with hiring are less likely to report overall success with network operations. The data also revealed that companies that struggle with hiring tend to outsource network operations.

“We’ve had some security positions that were very difficult to hire for,” said a network security architect for a large American bank. “It seems like there is not a lot of talented people applying. From my experience, when there are turbulent times, a lot of talent sits tight.”

Smaller companies struggle more than larger companies with hiring. European companies struggle more than companies in North America.
Why Hiring is Difficult

**Figure 37** reveals the challenges that companies encounter when they try to hire networking professionals. All respondents were asked this question, regardless of whether they indicated in the previous question that they considered it difficult or easy to hire and retain people. Note that overall, 98% of these respondents identified at least one issue that makes hiring a challenge, which is far higher than the number of people who admitted that hiring is difficult.

Overall, the biggest issue is a technical skills among the available talent pool. Companies are struggling to find people with specialized networking skills. Organizations that maintain a standalone NOC or a cross-domain operations center are both struggling with this issue more often than organizations that take a distributed and informal approach to network operations.

The chart reveals that five secondary challenges are impacting hiring equally, starting with COVID-related issues. COVID-related difficulties are hitting higher-revenue companies harder than lower-revenue companies. “Before the pandemic, there was no issue,” said a network engineer with a Fortune 100 consumer goods manufacturer. “It is hard because we have limited travel. As a global company, if someone based in Costa Rica needs to fly to the US for a job, it’s not possible.”

Benefits expectations, leadership’s desire for a lean staff, inexperienced talent pools, and long hiring processes are all big issues, too. Benefits expectations hit lower-revenue companies harder. Leadership’s preference for a lean network operations team is an issue for very large enterprises (20,000 or more employees), but not an issue for SMBs (100 to 499 employees). The inexperienced, junior talent pool tends to hit midmarket companies the hardest. It also impacts companies that outsource network operations.
Companies are struggling to hire network security and network automation skills. Figure 38 reveals the skills that companies are struggling to hire in the labor market. Network security and network automation skills are the scarcest. Companies that struggle with hiring networking personnel the most are the most likely to identify network security as a difficult skill to find. Higher-revenue companies struggle more with network automation. Respondents who work within an IT executive suite or a DevOps team were also more likely to select network security for scarcity.

Secondarily, many companies are struggling to find people with monitoring, troubleshooting, and public cloud skills. Respondents who work within a NOC are the most likely to consider cloud skills hard to find. DevOps team members say monitoring skills are very hard to find.

More than one-quarter of companies are also struggling to find WAN experts and Wi-Fi experts. WAN skills are more challenging for successful network operations teams to find than less successful teams. EMA believes that successful teams are more likely to transform their WANs with software-defined WAN and related technologies, and thus encounter a shortage of skills with these new technologies. Basic skills, like switching and routing and DNS, are the least difficult to find. However, smaller revenue companies did report difficulty with finding switching and routing experts.

Figure 38. Networking skills that are the most difficult for companies to find in new hires
Can Network Management Tools Help?

EMA research has often found that an effective network management toolset will make network operations teams more efficient and effective. To some degree, improved efficiency should help mitigate shortages in skilled networking personnel.

Figure 39 reveals that more than 78% of IT professionals at least somewhat agree that network automation tools can mitigate challenges associated with understaffed network teams. Only 22% strongly agree with this idea. Previous EMA research found that operational efficiency is the top benefit that IT organizations pursue with network automation investments. They expect the tools to reduce the amount of time personnel spend on repetitive tasks.

“The more you automate, the less human intervention is needed,” said a network engineer who has worked for two Fortune 500 financial companies over the last decade. “You might have a gold standard that engineers created. It removes any typos and mistakes. On the flipside, I’ve seen automation freeing up those engineers so they don’t have to track down an issue.”

Organizations that struggle the most with hiring networking personnel are the least likely to believe automation can help. IT and network architects and network engineers are more convinced than middle managers and executives to believe in automation, which is a positive argument in favor of the notion since engineers and architects are usually the ones implementing and working closely with network automation tools. They use a tool to automatically solve problems.

Figure 39. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Network automation tools can mitigate the challenges associated with a lack of skilled networking personnel.

Sample Size = 409
Figure 40 reveals that 77% at least somewhat agree that a modern network performance management tool can mitigate a personnel shortage. Only 22% agree strongly with the idea. In its interactions with network operations professionals, EMA has seen evidence that such a tool can help.

Organizations that struggle the least with hiring are also the least convinced that a network performance management solution can help. North Americans are more likely to agree with this idea than Europeans.

EMA Advice

Companies that struggle with hiring have several distinct priorities for their network operations toolsets. EMA suspects that these organizations are trying to compensate for their lack of personnel by adopting tools with specific capabilities. If you are struggling with hiring, the following list of capabilities may help. These organizations are more likely to require the following from their network operations tool vendors:

- Integrated security insights
- Strong mapping and visualization of data
- Layer 7 (application layer) visibility from packet monitoring tools
- Network usage policy enforcement
- Tools that emphasize proactive problem prevention
- Better features and workflows for
  - Alarms and escalations
  - Problem isolation
  - Root-cause analysis

Finally, here is some advice from a couple of network operations leaders.

- IT operations manager at one of the world’s largest government agencies: “It’s important to have someone with a decent IQ and a willingness to learn. A good personality is way more important than knowing absolutely everything about technology. You can train someone who is new, give them experience and responsibility. If they want that, then it works out great.”
- Network team manager at a Fortune 100 pharmaceutical: “I’m not looking for specific skills. I look for potential. I ask, ‘What have you done?’ Based on that answer, if he understands technically what he has done on the job, I believe he can learn to work on a new technology. We don’t often hire for top-tier skills in a very specific technology. We’re just looking for general networking skills.”
Megatrend #2: Multi-Cloud Ubiquity and Network Operations
Nearly 99% of the enterprises in this survey have adopted the public cloud. More significantly, 72% have moved into a multi-cloud strategy, using at least two infrastructure as a service (IaaS) providers, as Figure 41 demonstrates. The chart also reveals that nearly 88% of companies will be multi-cloud within two years, with more than 47% expecting to have three or more providers. Larger companies (by employee count and revenue) are the most likely to be multi-cloud today, and smaller companies are the most likely to have a single cloud provider.

Other EMA research recently determined that there are two primary drivers for multi-cloud adoption. IT organizations are trying to optimize performance by distributing cloud workloads closer to end users. They are also trying to establish high-availability architectures so that applications remain available even if a cloud provider or private data center goes down. Data sovereignty, cost optimization, and specific workload requirements are secondary drivers.

Network Monitoring and the Cloud

**Figure 42** reveals that nearly 91% of network operations teams are using network monitoring tools to monitor public cloud infrastructure. Successful network operations teams are the most likely to monitor the cloud.

"We are monitoring and troubleshooting cloud networks," said a network engineer with a Fortune 100 consumer goods manufacturer. "People always blame the network. If the problem has something to do with the cloud application itself, we’re not good at getting that data. Tools need better visibility into the cloud."

Monitoring the cloud will require some adjustments to network operations toolsets. This research found that 38.4% of network operations teams consider cloud provider flow logs to be an essential source of data for network monitoring today. Network managers tasked with monitoring the cloud will need their tool vendors to collect and analyze this data. Not all tool vendors will adequately support cloud visibility. In fact, enterprises with three or more cloud providers are extremely likely to use 21 or more network monitoring and management tools. EMA suspects that these teams are adding new tools to address multi-cloud operations.
Figure 43 reveals that most network operations teams need better cloud visibility. Only 18% described their tools as very effective at monitoring the cloud. Successful network operations teams are twice as likely as less successful teams to have very effective cloud monitoring capabilities. This correlation suggests that cloud visibility can make or break a network operations team in this era of cloud ubiquity. Network teams that use cloud enablement as a measure of their own success are more likely to report very effective cloud visibility.

Enterprises that conduct network operations within a cross-domain operations center are the most likely to have very effective cloud monitoring, whereas companies that maintain a NOC or a distributed approach to network operations are less likely to have good cloud monitoring. EMA suspects that cross-domain operations teams are adopting less network-centric tools for monitoring and troubleshooting, and this is leading to a more optimized toolset for the cloud.

This research also found that network operations teams are more likely to have good cloud visibility if DevOps, application performance optimization, SaaS application adoption, and AIOps adoption heavily influence their overall network management strategy. Network teams that are focused on network performance management tool upgrades and enhancements are also more likely to report effective cloud monitoring.

Network teams that are successful with cloud monitoring prefer fully integrated, multi-function platforms for network monitoring and management tools, rather than best-of-breed tools or loosely integrated best-of-suite tools. They also tend to integrate their network management tools with systems management tools, security monitoring, and IT service management systems.

Finally, effective cloud visibility correlates strongly with use of active, synthetic network monitoring tools and streaming network telemetry.

**EMA Advice**

Network operations teams must gain visibility into the cloud. Many network managers tell EMA that they have abdicated responsibility for this domain, and we believe this is a grave mistake. The future of IT is hybrid. While multi-cloud architecture is becoming ubiquitous, private infrastructure will persist. Network operations teams must be able to manage network health and performance across both domains. This will require tools that can collect and analyze data from the cloud. EMA also believes it will require active synthetic monitoring tools that can emulate and reveal how end users are experiencing cloud services.
Megatrend #3: DevOps Partnerships
DevOps is loosely defined as a set of principles that bring software development and IT operations closer together. It often involves the use of agile development, automation, and observability to improve the time to deployment and quality of applications. DevOps teams often spearhead private and public cloud initiatives. Network operations teams often find themselves on the fringes of DevOps-led transformation. EMA believes it is important for network teams to build strong partnerships with DevOps teams.

This research found that 64% of organizations have the equivalent of a DevOps team today. Another 33% are planning to establish one in the future. DevOps teams were more frequent in enterprises (2,499 employees or more) and high-revenue companies ($1 billion or more). They were also more frequent in North America.

**Figure 44** reveals expectations for the relationship between network operations and DevOps. More than 38% believe these teams will be integrated into a single group. Keep in mind that 29% of these organizations already have a cross-domain operations center, so they are necessarily breaking up a traditional NOC. Also, 21% have informal or distributed network operations teams that already take a flexible approach to organization.

More than half expect network operations and DevOps teams to adopt formalized collaboration, while a much smaller number will go with loose, informal collaboration. The intent is clear. IT organizations want to closely align network operations and DevOps functions. The most successful network operations teams are expecting to be completely integrated into DevOps. Less successful teams expect formalized partnerships between the distinct groups.

“Our network monitoring team has team members who attend all DevOps meetings,” said an IT operations manager for one of the world’s largest government agencies. “It’s going okay. The monitoring team is always hammering the DevOps team, telling them they need to set up more monitoring. It goes over to varying degrees of success. DevOps always says, ‘We have customers to deal with. This can wait.’ It’s not at the top of their list.”

![Figure 44: Expected relationship between DevOps and network operations teams](image)
Where NetOps and DevOps Collaborate

**Figure 45** examines where network operations and DevOps need to focus their collaboration. Security policy design and implementation are clearly essential areas of collaboration between network and DevOps teams. Many also see a good opportunity to work together on application optimization and network capacity planning. Day 2 operations, such as monitoring and troubleshooting, are less of a priority, as is compliance. However, respondents who are actual members of a DevOps team identified operational monitoring as their highest priority. In other words, they need network observability. On the other hand, people who work in a NOC were the most likely to think that troubleshooting is an important collaboration area with DevOps.

Organizations that conduct network operations within a cross-domain operations team were more likely to cite compliance as a collaboration priority. Respondents who work within a cloud architecture and operations team were also more likely to select compliance. Members of the cloud team and the network engineering and architecture team were also more likely to select change management.

### Figure 45. Most important areas of collaboration that should occur between a network team and a DevOps team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security policy design/implementation</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application optimization/fail-fast iteration</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network capacity planning</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application planning/design</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational monitoring</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change management (moves, adds, and changes)</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troubleshooting</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges to NetOps/DevOps Collaboration

Figure 46 details the challenges that network operations and DevOps teams encounter when they try to work together. The biggest issue is with cross-team skills gaps. Organizations that outsource network operations and organizations that have a cross-domain operation center are the most likely to complain of skills gaps.

- Cross-team skills gaps: 41.3%
- Lack of integrated tools to facilitate collaboration: 37.2%
- Budget limitations: 34.2%
- Lack of best practices and policies to follow: 33.0%
- Divided leadership (e.g., DevOps does not collaborate): 32.8%
- Lack of communication: 29.6%
- Cultural resistance: 24.7%
- Poor IT leadership: 24.0%
- Don’t know: 1.2%

Figure 46. Most difficult challenges to overcome when network teams and DevOps teams collaborate

A network security architect with a large American bank told EMA that skills gaps were holding network operations and DevOps apart in his company. “They only come together when it’s a proven need, and it’s out of necessity due to there not being a ton of cross-training. The traditional network guys don’t know a lot about the cloud. Managers see that, so they think it’s just a different skill set. It would take a lot of cross-training.”

The number-two challenge is a lack of integrated tools to facilitate collaboration. These two teams probably have separate tools for monitoring and for automation and orchestration. They need to tie them together.

Budget issues and a lack of best practices and policies are other obvious problems that these teams need to sort out. Rounding out the top five challenges is divided leadership. Unlike network operations, many DevOps teams do not report to the CIO. They may be part of a line-of-business organization that dove into the cloud without IT’s blessing or guidance. Individuals from DevOps teams were less likely to see this as a problem, but members of a network engineering and architecture group were the most likely to see this as a barrier.

EMA Advice

Given how cloud-driven most network teams are today, EMA believes that it is critical for network operations teams to overcome collaboration barriers and form strong partnerships with the DevOps team. Network operations professionals should identify the barriers that prevent their teams from collaborating with DevOps and break them down. EMA’s data shows that network security and network capacity planning knowledge will be immensely valuable to DevOps teams.
Megatrend #4: The Internet of Things and Private 5G Engagement
Multiple industries are embracing the Internet of Things (IoT), connecting smart devices and sensors to their corporate networks to support new digital applications for manufacturing, medicine, retail and logistics, smart buildings, and more. At the same time, EMA has observed growing interest in the use of private 5G networks as a supplement to enterprise Wi-Fi, specifically to support IoT connectivity requirements.

Figure 47 reveals that nearly 96% of the enterprises represented in this research expect IoT devices to connect to their corporate networks. Nearly 30% have such devices on the network today, and another 53% will add them by the end of this year. The larger the network, the more likely it is to have IoT devices connected to it.

EMA found that the following industries are the most likely to already have IoT devices on the network:
- Healthcare
- Logistics/Wholesale/Distribution
- Transportation

These industries are most likely to connect IoT devices to the network this year:
- Manufacturing
- Construction/Civil Engineering
- Retail

![Figure 47. Timeline for connecting Internet of Things devices and sensors to enterprise networks](image)

Sample Size = 409
IoT-Driven Network Investments

Figure 48 reveals that nearly 100% of the companies that have connected or plan to connect IoT devices to their networks are investing in networking technologies to support the project. The majority are investing in new network security, network performance monitoring, and network automation solutions to enable IoT. Essentially, they’re looking for ways to better secure and manage networks with IoT.

“We have a dedicated team for [IoT connectivity],” said a network team manager with a Fortune 100 pharmaceutical company. “Usually it’s under manufacturing. We have complex machines that are monitoring the environment where manufacturing takes place, and we have the manufacturing devices themselves. We’re investing in security to support it. There are discussions on how to segment the network to isolate these devices.”

Secondarily, these organizations are investing in new infrastructure (Wi-Fi, switching, and routing) and IoT-specific WAN connectivity services, such as low-power WAN. Companies with 500 or more employees were most likely to target IoT-specific WAN connectivity. It’s also most common in the energy, manufacturing, and retail industries.

This research also found that 53% of IT organizations intend to use IT management tools to discover and manage IoT devices. This is most common in smaller companies. It was also most common among the companies that are most successful with network operations.

![Figure 48. Investments made by the network team to address connectivity requirements of IoT devices and sensors](image-url)
Private 5G Networking Engagement

Private 5G networking is not necessarily new. Many mobile network operators (MNOs) have used network slicing to offer private, dedicated connections to corporate customers over their public mobile networks for years. More recently, a new set of solution providers emerged that would allow enterprises to use dedicated 5G infrastructure for local connectivity. The idea is that private 5G is a better choice than Wi-Fi for connecting certain IoT devices and enabling critical communications. Private 5G is still emerging, with MNOs, cloud providers, and hardware vendors racing to offer DIY and managed solutions.

EMA suspects there is some confusion in the market as to what private 5G is. Figure 49 reveals the supposed current state of engagement with private 5G solutions. More than one-third of companies claim to be using or implementing private 5G today. This number is much too high. EMA believes many of the respondents are confusing private 5G LAN services with 5G slicing or fixed mobile 5G connections for remote sites and branch offices. Overall, the interest in private 5G networks appears quite high.

Figure 49. Engagement with private 5G technology (private 5G services or 5G LAN infrastructure)
Benefits of Private 5G

Figure 50 reveals the aspects of private 5G (and 4G) technology that are most valuable to enterprises. The top two are higher bandwidth connections and improved security. Secondarily, companies are also very interested in a private 5G network’s ability to support high-density concurrent connections. High-density connectivity is most appealing to energy/utility companies and manufacturers.

Lower-latency connections, long-range network signals, and network slicing for quality of services emerged as secondary opportunities. Enterprises were least interested in reduced interference and seamless roaming. The most successful network teams were most likely to select high-density connections and reduced interference as top benefits, suggesting that these might be the biggest potential benefits of using the technology.

Figure 50. Aspects of private 4G/5G technology that are most valuable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher bandwidth</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved security</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density of concurrent connections</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower latency</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-range network signal</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network slicing for quality of service</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced interference</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamless roaming</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges of Private 5G

Figure 51 reveals the challenges that enterprises expect to encounter when adopting private 5G solutions. There are four major issues to address. First, enterprises are uncertain that they can find 5G solutions from trusted vendors. Do they want to install a 5G LAN solution from an MNO or a cloud provider? Do they want to work with a specialized startup? IT executives in this survey were the most likely to cite this as a problem.

The other major issues are technology complexity and a general lack of monitoring and troubleshooting tools for private 5G. This latter issue could end up being a major stumbling block. While enterprises often use native management tools from their infrastructure vendors, they supplement these native tools with many third-party management tools. We expect private 5G to be no different. Yet, EMA is not aware of any third-party vendors offering 5G monitoring and troubleshooting solutions for private enterprise networks. While CIOs and CTOs are not concerned about this right now, network teams and their engineers in this survey were especially concerned.

Figure 51. Top challenges to implementing and using private 5G

Next, companies are struggling with integrating private 5G networks with the rest of the network, such as the LAN and WAN. Larger companies (by revenue and employee count) are especially concerned with this. Enterprises from the energy and utilities industry are also particularly concerned about this integration.

EMA Advice

IoT is coming to most enterprise networks over the next year or so. Network teams may be tempted to focus on upgrading or adding network connectivity, such as Wi-Fi and low-power WAN services, to address these requirements. Management tools will be most essential to success. IT operations will be tasked with managing many of these devices. Network operations teams should invest in security, performance monitoring, and automation tools to support IoT. Also, private 5G technology will address some of the unique connectivity needs of IoT devices in some enterprises.

Network operations teams should invest in security, performance monitoring, and automation tools to support IoT.

Network teams should familiarize themselves with the emerging market of private 5G solutions and determine whether they want to adopt a DIY product or a managed service. They should look for a trusted vendor that offers a solution if they decide to adopt private 5G. They’ll also need to pay special attention to integrating the technology with their end-to-end networks and ensuring that they have sufficient monitoring and troubleshooting tools to empower network operations to support the technology.

Sample Size = 409, Valid Cases = 409, Total Mentions = 1072
Megatrends #5: Emerging Network Operations Data
Streaming Telemetry

Streaming telemetry is an emerging technique for collecting metrics and events from network devices. Today, network monitoring tools poll devices at regular intervals, usually via SNMP. Streaming telemetry is a subscription model. Devices push real-time data continuously as it is generated. Tools subscribe to the data types that they need to analyze. Network engineers consider streaming telemetry more efficient, secure, and real-time than polling. The newest switches and routers from leading vendors support some form of it today, but EMA believes that overall adoption is low at this point.

Figure 52 reveals higher than expected adoption numbers, with nearly 43% claiming to use streaming network telemetry today. EMA believes that some respondents may have conflated streaming network telemetry with streaming telemetry techniques used for collecting metrics, logs, and traces for DevOps-oriented observability solutions. Members of the DevOps group were more likely to say their network operations groups are using it today, but so too were members of the network engineering and network operations groups, who are less likely to conflate streaming network telemetry with DevOps-oriented telemetry.

Regardless, interest in streaming telemetry from network operations teams is high. The most successful network operations teams are the most likely to be using it today. Members of the DevOps group were more likely to say their network operations groups are using it today, but so too were members of the network engineering and network operations groups, who are less likely to conflate streaming network telemetry with DevOps-oriented telemetry.

Cloud-scale companies, like Google, have declared in the past that they intend to eliminate SNMP from their networks through the adoption of streaming telemetry. One of the core missions of the OpenConfig, a consortium of network engineers from hyperscale companies, is to enable that transition by creating a de facto open standard for streaming telemetry. OpenConfig has been successful in getting leading network hardware vendors to support its streaming telemetry implementations in their latest hardware platforms.
EMA asked research participants whether they have determined that streaming telemetry will be a requirement in the future to eliminate SNMP from their networks. **Figure 53** reveals that 27% are leaning this way. The rest are exploring the value of streaming telemetry. In the past, most network teams told EMA that they see streaming telemetry as complementary to SNMP, not a replacement. It appears that most of the market is still leaning in that direction.

Finally, network managers perceive an opportunity to make data collection more reliable. A device’s response to an SNMP poll doesn’t always make it to the tool. Streaming telemetry uses a variety of transport protocols, like RESTCONF, NETCONF, and gNMI, to ensure more reliable and efficient data transfers. The most successful network operations teams are more likely to seek this benefit. They are also more likely to value data standardization, which is otherwise an afterthought for most people.

Finally, extensibility of streaming telemetry is not a high priority for most, but the most sophisticated networking experts in EMA’s survey (network engineers and network architects) identified this as one of their highest priorities, suggesting that there is an opportunity to customize streaming telemetry with metrics that SNMP cannot support.

**Figure 53. Current goals for using streaming telemetry**

**Figure 54** reveals why network teams are interested in using streaming telemetry. First, they like the improved data granularity available through it. Network management tools that poll devices via SNMP and related techniques often struggle to collect data at high intervals. This leads to instances in which brief spikes in metrics are missed.

Second, network managers like the more efficient data transfer of streaming telemetry. SNMP is often derided for adding unnecessary traffic to a network.

Real-time insights are the third benefit. Not only is the data more granular, but it arrives whenever conditions on the network change. When a network manager is reviewing telemetry data, they know that they are reviewing and acting on real-time conditions on the network.

**Figure 54. The most valuable benefits of streaming network telemetry**

Sample Size = 378

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved data granularity</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient data transfer/reduced load on the network</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-time insights</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable data collection</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensibility/more types of stats and metrics</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced security risk associated with data collection</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data standardization</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 55** reveals the barriers that often prevent network teams from adopting streaming network telemetry. The top issue is skills gaps. Plenty of network teams have people familiar with SNMP, but a new technology requires new knowledge on how to implement it. Skills gaps are especially a problem for companies that outsource network operations, lower-revenue companies, and companies with smaller networks.

Secondarily, many are struggling with security risk, understanding the business value, and network equipment that doesn’t support network telemetry. Very large companies (20,000 or more employees) and companies with very large networks (5,000 or more devices) are more likely to struggle with business value.

![Skills gaps](image)

**Figure 55. Primary barriers to adoption of streaming network telemetry**
Active Synthetic Traffic

Active synthetic traffic is less novel than streaming telemetry, but it has gained traction in network operations teams in recent years because passive monitoring data (network flows, packet data) has become difficult to collect in certain environments. Figure 56 reveals that interest in using active monitoring tools for network operations is extremely high today.

Successful network operations teams are the most likely to use it today. The disparity of adoption between successful and less successful teams suggests that this class of tools can help many network teams overcome the challenges EMA identified in this report. Both NOCs and cross-domain operations centers are much more likely to use active synthetic monitoring today. Informal and distributed network operations teams are less likely to use it.

Organizations with larger network management toolsets (11 or more) are more likely to use it today, suggesting that active monitoring is contributing to tool sprawl.

Figure 56. Is your networking team interested in using active, synthetic monitoring tools for network operations?

Sample Size = 409
Figure 57 identifies why there is so much interest in active monitoring tools. A large majority of network operations teams are trying to gain better visibility into public cloud providers. People who work in network engineering, DevOps, and IT architectures were the most likely to cite public cloud.

Successful network operations teams were most likely to cite SaaS and internet connectivity as drivers of active monitoring.

EMA Advice

EMA believes that any network operations team that is impacted by cloud and SaaS applications, hybrid WAN, and work-from-home requirements should explore the utility of active synthetic monitoring today. There is a variety of vendors offering products with varying functionality, and at a wide range of price points. Over the last couple years, EMA has spoken with IT managers in within both SMBs and Fortune 50 companies that are making extensive use of such technology.

Streaming network telemetry is still an emergent technology today, but it is a promising solution for network teams that are dissatisfied with SNMP. Network infrastructure and operations teams should evaluate this technology today, especially those who are planning an investment in new network hardware. With more vendors adding support for streaming telemetry in their newest switches and routers, it should be a part of the planning process for management tool investments.
Conclusion: Network Operations Teams Need to Modernize for the Cloud Era
EMA believes that network operations teams are at a cloud crossroads today. Most are struggling as the public cloud, SaaS applications, and cloud-native application architectures start to drive IT strategy.

Network operations teams have a people problem and a technology problem. They don’t have enough skilled personnel and their management tools are not optimized for today’s digital world. Network operations leaders need to make it clear that they are essential to cloud transformation and other initiatives, like IoT. They also need to win budget, they need to win support for new hires of technical personnel, and they need to modernize their tools. Today’s network management toolsets are bloated, inefficient, and disconnected. These tools are contributing to manual errors that degrade the network, and they are producing too many false alerts.

This report highlights many of the challenges that network operations professionals are struggling with today, but it also points to countless best practices that can help overcome these challenges. Use this report as a guide to optimize your organization.
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