
Subject: Re: Pricing (was Re: LINUX version of IDL)
Posted by [Geoff.Sobering](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 1994 13:41:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <fskmjm.89@puknet.puk.ac.za>, fskmjm@puknet.puk.ac.za (Mathews, MJ) wrote:

> If they made the price per site licence more realistic (say \$300), guess
> how many we'd buy? More than five, so they'd make MORE money!

Same here. We've slowly (over 6 years) worked our way up to a resonable number of IDL licenses (13 for 20 worksations and ca. 50 users). At \$2-3K per pop that added up!

BUT, don't forget to consider support/upgrade costs!

We used to be able to argue that the high purchase price of IDL was great deal because we got free upgrades. Then we could eaisly claim that \$200/year for a site was resonable to help support continuing development at RSI. Now, we have to try and BS our way arguing that \$200/year/license on top of the \$2-3K/license is **still** a good buy.

In our case, our yearly outlay to RSI has been roughly constant at \$3-5K/year - before we were purchasing a license or two (or five) per year, now we're spending more and more of that budget on upgrade fees. Don't get me wrong, I have **no** problem supporting the continued development of IDL, I'd **much** rather justify the outlay with more licenses than nebulous arguments like, "there are a bunch of new features...". Our users respond much better to a note that they should be seeing less of the dread "No More Licenses Available..." message.

Basically, I really wish RSI would be more flexible with licensing medium to largeish sites. For example, I'd be **very** happy to pay \$6K/year for 50 one-year licenses (or 100 - essentially an unlimited number) and upgrades, rather than grumbling about spending \$6K on support and one or two new licenses per year. This would have been **particularly** attractive a few years ago before we invested \$30K in floating licenses, so I suspect there are a lot of sites out there interested in IDL, but turned off by the large initial investment to get a useful number of licenses. I'm sure there are others who would be interested in non-standard licensing arrangements to fit their own requirements.

Sorry to waste bandwidth on non-technical stuff...

--

Geoff Sobering (Geoff.Sobering@nih.gov)
In Vivo NMR Research Center
National Institutes of Health

Subject: Re: Pricing (was Re: LINUX version of IDL)
Posted by [Ralf.Utermann](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 1994 16:05:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <Geoff.Sobering-111094084157@gybe.ncrr.nih.gov>, Geoff.Sobering@nih.gov (Geoff Sobering) writes:

[stuff deleted]

|> years ago before we invested \$30K in floating licenses, so I suspect there
|> are a lot of sites out there interested in IDL, but turned off by the large
|> initial investment to get a useful number of licenses. I'm sure there are
|> others who would be interested in non-standard licensing arrangements to fit
|> their own requirements.
|>

Same here. Some two years ago I thought of having IDL as *the* graphics system at our site. But, of course, the price made it impossible. So we are running now one floating license and one unlimited user/node locked license, which means that if you want, you can use IDL, but it may *very* slow on the node-locked license machine. And it's especially difficult to argue for IDL, if you get the IBM Data Explorer practically for free in a Campus Software License program ...

Another point: Many users, who from time to time would need 3D or other features of IDL, will not use it as long as their favorite 2D-Plot program under Windows/Mac is much more comfortable than IDL -- annotate and pwidget are really just a beginning.
=> And in turn, they won't spend money for this and participate in joint floating licenses bought by many groups together.

- Ralf

--

Ralf Utermann

University of Augsburg (Germany),	Institute of Physics
Memmingerstr.6	"Speaking for me and nobody else"
D-86135 Augsburg	Phone: +49-821-5977-235
SMTP: Ralf.Utermann@Physik.Uni-Augsburg.DE	Fax: -222
