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### 4.1 Introduction

This Chapter deals primarily with Canadian companies manufacturing the following Office Communications Systems (OCS) equipment:

```
* Multifunctional workstations
    * Voice/data PABXs
    * Local Area Networks (LANs)
    * Storage peripherals
    * Input and output devices
    * Office systems software
```

In accordance with the Terms of Reference, we have identified the major Canadian companies and their competitors, their product/system offerings, their strategies, and their strengths and weaknesses. We have also outlined potential opportunities and threats to the Canadian ocs industry.

Companies have been discussed in this chapter, generally relative to the following four vendor categories:

1) Total system suppliers
2) Niche suppliers
3) Commodity suppliers
4) Defence suppliers

Total system suppliers can provide all the components of an integrated office communications system, including mainframe. They are the prime contractors and assume all responsibilities for integration. Niche suppliers can provide major subsystems, generally following the standards set by the major system suppliers. These major subsystems may also be capable of being integrated with the subsystems provided by other suppliers, into a total overall system. Commodity suppliers produce components e.g. terminals, printers, mass storage devices. Defensive suppliers provide office communications systems primarily to protect their installed base of data processing mainframes.

Most Canadian vendors fall into the niche or commodity catagories. Northern Telecom is the only Canadian firm with the capability to be a total system supplier. To achieve this, they have acquired two U.S. data processing firms and are entering into agreements with the major mainframe companies. Only through this strategy will they be able to offer complete systems, short of eventually purchasing a major mainframe company. In addition, they are also positioning themselves as a niche supplier, with the "Open World" concept. With this strategy, Northern Telecom will be able to supply $\operatorname{PABX}$ and other subsystems, capable of integration with either the total system supplier's offering or with subsystems from other suppliers. (Further details are provided in Section 4.3.)

Mitel is a major niche supplier, capitalizing on its experience in telecommunications. Before the collapse of its agreement with IBM, it was moving towards a very powerful niche position with its equipment being part of IBM's total system offering. AES Data Ltd. and Micom (a division of Philips Information Systems) are both niche suppliers, currently struggling to move from being dedicated word processor suppliers to multi-functional workstation integrated system suppliers. Gandalf, Develcon and several others are successfull niche suppliers, using their telecommunications base to develop subsystems for use in overall office communications networks. Canstar Communications and others are niche vendors with LAN offerings. On the software side, Officesmiths, OCRA Communications and Systemhouse are niche suppliers, with Officesmiths providing electronic filing subsystems and OCRA and Systemhouse offering systems integration software and facilities. GEAC, the only Canadian mainframe manufacturer, is basically a defensive supplier, providing office automation systems to protect its installed base in the library and financial sectors. Most other Canadian vendors are commodity suppliers. These and the above companies are detailed further in this chapter of the report.

Canadian firms, by world standards, are generally quite small. The most successful ones have usually carved out a very specialized product area for themselves and are not directly competing against the larger multinationals. Other firms are assemblers of foreign technology; or build custom equipment and systems; or provide systems in a local geographic
area, where sales and service can overcome competition from the larger suppliers. In the software sector, with a very few exceptions, most firms are providing custom software services, or non-integrated packaged systems, usually in the area of financial and accounting software. There are no large Canadian vendors with significant sales of packaged software for office systems.

Table 4-l presents a summary of the product offerings of selected major suppliers. Financial highlights are shown in Table 4-2. Appendix 4A contains the most recent fiscal information available on the major public companies.

All the major multinationals have offices in Canada but few manufacture office communications systems here, other than on a commodity basis. IBM and DEC have manufacturing plants in Canada, but are not manufacturing products here in the areas covered by this report. Control Data manufactures a super microcomputer in Toronto, but say they do not intend to enter the office systems market. Micom (a division of Philips) has been previously discussed; Memorex (a division of Burroughs) is producing storage peripherals in Canada; Dysan Corporation of the U.S. is expected to start manufacturing here shortly, and several others are outlined in this report. However, there is a great deal more manufacturing which could be done in Canada by the multinationals, particularly if they followed the world product mandate strategy endorsed by the Canadian government.

Some product offerimgs fron selected hajor vemodrs


TABLE 4-2
MAJOR COMPANIES PARTICIPATING
IN THE
OFFICE COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS INDUSTRY

| COMPANY | TOTAL SALES \$ MILLIONS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NET } \\ & \text { INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | $\qquad$ | R\&D EXPEN- DITURE | $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SALES } \\ & \text { GROWTH** } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AT\&T | 69,848 | 249 | . 4 | 862 | 1.2 | 6.2 |
| IBM | 40,180 | 5,485 | 13.7 | 3,682 | 9.2 | 16.9 |
| XEROX | 8,464\% | 466 | 5.5 | 130 | 1.5 | . 1 |
| RAYTHEON CO. | 5,937* | 300 | 5.1 | 66 | 1.1 | 7.7 |
| HONEYWELL | 5,753* | 231 | 4.0 | 429 | 7.5 | 4.8 |
| DEC | 5,584 | 328 | 5.9 | 631 | 11.3 | 30.7 |
| SPERRY CORP. | 4,914 | 216 | 4.4 | 102 | 2.1 | 5.4 |
| HEWLETT PACKARD | 4,710. | 432 | 9.2 | 493 | 10.5 | 12.4 |
| BURROUGHS CORP. | 4,390* | 197 | 4.5 | 65 | 1.5 | 4.9 |
| MOTOROLA INC. | 4,328* | 244 | 5.6 |  |  | 14.3 |
| NCR CORP. | 3,731* | 288 | 7.7 | 64 | 1.7 | 5.8 |
| NORTHERN TELECOM | 3,304 | 268 | 8.1 | 325 | 9.8 | 8.8 |
| WANG LABORATORIES | 2,185 | 210 | 9.6 | 1,068 | 48.9 . | 42.0 |
| HARRIS CORP. | 1,996 | 80 | 4.0 |  |  | 10.3 |
| MICOM | 1,132 | 21 | 1.9 | 12 | 1.1 |  |
| APPLE COMPUTER INC. | 983* | 77 | 7.8 | 60 | 6.1 | 68.6 |
| DATA GENERAL | 829. | 23 | 2.8 | 85 | 10.2 | 2.9 |
| AMDAHL | 778* | 46 | 5.9 | 102 | 13.1 | 68.2 |
| ROLM CORP. | 660 | 38 | 5.8 | 49 | 7.5 | 31.2 |
| DATAPOINT | 540 | 8 | 1.5 | 10 | 1.9 | 6.2 |
| PRIME COMPUTER | 517* | 33 | 6.4 | 52 | 10.1 | 18.5 |
| LANIER BUSINESS PRODUCTS | 389* | 14 | 3.6 |  |  | 11.3 |
| MAI | 376* | 40 | 10.6 | 18 | 4.8 | 4.9 |
| MITEL CORP. | 343 | -32. | -9.3 | 50 | 14.4 | 34.3 |
| DYSAN | 180* | 49 | 27.2 | 35 | 19.4 | 26.1 |
| CONVERGENT TECHNOLOGIES | 164* | 15 | 9.1 | 16 | 10.0 | 69.5 |
| INTECOM INC. | 79* | 14 | 17.7 | 7 | 9.0 | 130.9 |
| GANDALF | 69 | 5 | 7.2 | 9 | 13.2 | 18.0 |
| GEAC | 48* | 3 | 6.3 | 4 | 8.1 | 35.0 |
| DEVELCON | 16\% | 3 | 18.8 | 1 | 3.6 | 67.6 |
| * 1983 Fiscal Year (All others 1984) ** Last 2 Fiscal Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: 1) Dialog Information Services, Disclosure II Database (See Appendix 4A) <br> 2) Company Annual Reports |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Besides the prospects for Northern Telecom, there are only three, possibly four, U.S. based companies with the potential to become total system suppliers. These are IBM, DEC, WANG \& AT\&T. Other major companies will either remain as niche suppliers or attempt to move up to total system supplier status by merging or making some kind of arrangement with other vendors. The following outlines the strategies and strengths and weaknesses of the four potential total system suppliers.

IBM reported revenues of $\$ 46$ billion in 1984 , and has targetted for sales increases of $15 \%$ per year. During the year they became very aggressive in the office communications systems market and the personal business computer market. There has been a rapid introduction of new products; e.g. the IBM AT, a scaled down System 36 (which will act as a department level computer) and the PC Network. They engaged in very intense marketing tactics e.g. personal computer price cuts of $20 \%$ or more, special dealer promotions and new distribution channels. One of the most significant events for IBM in 1984 was the purchase of ROLM. The merger of IBM's computer expertise with ROLM's telecommunications expertise marks the entry of IBM into the total system supplier category.

IBM is the dominant force in the data processing market ( $80 \%$ of all large mainframes are IBM). It is also their intention to become the dominant force in the office communications system market. The purchase of ROLM and their entry into the personal computer business (they now have about
$40 \%$ market share) are two major steps in this direction. Despite their technical, financial and marketing strength, IBM does have several weaknesses. They are:

1) Lack of product line compatibility

At the present time, IBM has a mainframe based office system, a department based office system, and various other subsystem offerings. Full integrated compatability is not expected until 1990.
2) Networking

IBM is not expected to be able to provide their token passing ring LAN for another two years.
3) Telecomunications

The acquisition of ROLM will not be followed by smooth integration into the IBM world. IBM may be able to avoid major problems similar to those encountered by Northern Telecom in their acquisition of two U.S. data processing firms, but it will take time to digest. such a major move into the telecommunications world.

IBM is a financial/marketing dominated firm. Telecommunications firms tend to be the opposite, with engineering/technical
dominance. Managerial and organizational problems will slow the pace towards new total system offerings.

Digital Equipment Corporation posted revenues of $\$ 5.6$ billion in 1984, an increase of $31 \%$ over 1983. Their 1984 net income was $\$ 329$ million, up from $\$ 283$ million in 1983. Recently, DEC redefined their corporate market strategy. They abandoned the "commodity" microcomputer business (i.e. retail marketing of DEC products). In the office automation sector, DEC is concentrating its efforts on providing integrated solutions. DEC claims to have one thousand "integrated systems" already installed and working in offices around the world. They are concentrating on their traditional strength in the supply of systems directly to the larger companies.

DEC has a number of strengths that will enable it to remain one of the leaders in office communications systems. These are:

1) An excellent reputation in data processing; providing easy to use interactive computer systems.
2) An extensive installed base of VAX computers, (e.g. over 3,400 in Canada)
3) Good communications expertise, with approximately 1,500 Ethernet LANs installed, and 1,000 systems using PABX's.
4) A multivendor approach to providing a total integrated system.

DEC's major weakness, according to industry observers, has been a lack of cohesive strategy and organizational structure, aimed at the office systems market. It is too early to tell, but the refocussing of their marketing strategy is a positive sign that their internal problems may be over. Another weakness has been a lack of major capabilities in the integration of voice, data and image. DEC is now making a conscious $R \& D$ effort to correct this. For example, in Canada, DEC has donated $\$ 25$ million to the University of Waterloo to conduct research in a number of areas of interest to them, including graphics, videotext, artificial intelligence, networking and software engineering.

The prognosis for DEC is that they will be a successful total system supplier. Generally, most vendors are making their equipment compatible with the IBM world, the DEC world, or both.

WANG reported revenues in 1984 of $\$ 2.2$ billion -- an increase of $42 \%$ over the previous fiscal year. Their corporate objective is to increase revenue by 15 to $20 \%$ annually. WANG's primary office communications systems strategy is to expand their strong traditional word processing base into a unified office automation system. They recognize the requirement to live in a multivendor environment, hence the commitment to connect to
various IBM and DEC products. WANG is also producing IBM compatible machines, recognizing the opportunity to connect to the IBM mainframe world. In 1984 WANG signed agreements with Mitel, AT\&T and Northern Telecom in order to integrate their systems with the PABX offerings of the major suppliers. They have dropped their original intent to develop their own PABX system. More announcements are expected in 1985 moving WANG towards their goal as a supplier of integrated office communications systems.

WANG's strengths are:

1) An excellent reputation as the number one word processing manufacturer.
2) A strong understanding of office systems and end user requirements.
3) A willingness to enter into corporate alliances in areas where they lack the expertise to go it alone (e.g. PABXs).
4) Good integrated systems, with continuing research and development on providing integrated voice/data workstations.
5) Rapid, consistent revenue growth and financial performance.

WANG's primary weakness is related to their traditional position as the world's leading word processor company. While they have a range of small to medium-sized data processing systems, they are generally perceived to be weaker than IBM and DEC in data processing capabilities. They now have to make the transition from a dedicated work processor company to an office communications system company. Industry contacts also indicate that there have been service problems associated with Wang's rapid growth and that their marketing is weak outside of their traditional customer base. However, in 1984 WANG captured $4 \%$ of the U.S. personal computer market. This may signal the start of a successful expansion beyond their administrative/ secretarial base into the manager's and professional's office. The prognosis for WANG is that they will succeed as a total office system supplier to smaller organizations, operating in a multivendor environment, and as a niche supplier to larger organizations.

AT\&T had revenues of $\$ 69.8$ billion in 1984 , with a net income of $\$ 248.7$ million. AT\&T's strategy towards office automation is very aggressive. Part of the reason for this is their late entry into the ocs industry, and the after shock of deregulation. Their overall strategy is simply to be a leader in office automation systems. They have not delineated a detailed strategic path to the integrated office system. In 1984 they offered twice as many products as in 1983, and are planning to continue that trend. They intend to be IBM compatible with

Connectability to WANG, Hewlett Packard, Honeywell, and DEC mainframes.

AT\&T's most important strengths are their financial resources and reputation. They are very strong in the telecommunications industry sector. Another strength is their UNIX ${ }^{4-1}$ operating system. It is the backbone of their office systems offering. With IBM adopting a UNIX operating based system for the IBM AT, this may now tend to become the standard for multi-user environments.

AT\&T's weaknesses at this time are substantial. They do not have a detailed strategic approach to the office communications systems market and do not have an integrated product line. They lack experience in designing and selling equipment in a non-regulated environment and their "3B" family of computers does not have a large installed base. Finally, they do not have a strong market identity as a supplier of office communications systems and have not traditionally been a strong marketing organization.

AT\&T have the financial resources to succeed.
However, it will be several years before they reach the stage of being able to offer a total system, unless they acquire the expertise through acquisitons or mergers.

### 4.2 Multifunctional Workstations

### 4.2.1 Overview

Word processors, desktop microcomputers (both standalone and communicating) and special terminals used in office communications systems, are covered in this section.

The trend has been a shift from standalone word processors to shared logic and shared resource systems. At the same time, the microcomputer has increased its penetration of the word processing market as prices fall and both software and hardware continue to become more sophisticated. As well, the telecommunications companies are integrating the telephone with the terminal and the microcomputer. These three products -- the word processor, microcomputer and communicating workstation -are merging to yield the multifunctional workstation.

The trend towards multifunctional workstations is illustrated by the scope of vendor offerings. Figure 4-1 illustrates the industry in early 1980. Vendors basically produced either word processors or microcomputers plus a few voice/data terminals. The one exception was XEROX which produced the "XEROX STAR", a hybrid workstation. Figure 4-2 shows the current situation where vendors are manufacturing a wider range of products, and the distinction between product type is becoming fuzzier. For example, IBM now manufactures both a word processor and a personal computer (which itself can be used for personal
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computing and word processing). In 1985, IBM, (among other manufacturers) will also be offering an integrated voice/data microcomputer.

In the following analysis, emphasis has been placed on those firms manufacturing word processors, microcomputers and voice/data terminals in Canada. They have been analyzed in terms of their size, major competitors, product line, $R \& D$ and financial/marketing resources. They have also been viewed within the context of the four vendor catagories outlined in Section 4.1.

### 4.2.2 Word Processor Manufacturers

Canada has two world class firms manufacturing word processing equipment in Canada. They are AES Data Limited and Micom Co. (a subsidiary of Philips Information Systems) both of Montreal. In Canada they compete under their respective names. Outside of Canada the Micom product line is sold under the Philips label and AES is sold under the Lanier name. (Lanier is Micom's main distributor.) In 1985 Micom will be marketing outside Canada under their own name, using the Lanier and Savin distribution networks.

There are no other firms manufacturing word processing equipment in Canada. Nelma Data Corporation are purchasing their word processing equipment from an OEM supplier (ONTEL Corp.) in the United States.

Table 4-3 illustrates the breakdown by major companies, of the Canadian word processor market. As can be seen by the changing market shares, the entry of IBM into the market had a major impact on AES and Micom. DEC and Olivetti have had a similar impact on the "other category". The latter includes over twenty different suppliers of word processing equipment.

AES Data Ltd. of Montreal has been caught between an economic downturn, intense competition from U. S. manufacturers such as IBM, a shift towards utilizing microcomputers for word processing and increasing use of clustered word processing systems. During 1982 and 1983 they showed financial losses and their R\&D expenditures had dropped to $8 \%$ of total sales. Recently the company underwent a major retrenchment. They received an investment of $\$ 15$ million from their parent company (the Canada Development Corporation), cut their break even point by $\$ 30$ million, and streamlined their product offerings. They have now increased their commitment to R\&D expenditures to $10 \%$ of sales and are becoming more marketing oriented.

AES has decided on a three stage strategic approach to office automation. The first stage is to continue their commitment to providing clustered and standalone word processing systems for office support staff. The second stage is to produce workstations for the manager and the professional. The third is to produce an integrated office system. This is expected to be offered in 1985. It will be based on a star configured LAN ("AES Net"), with a UNIX operating system and

TABLE 4-3
WORD PROCESSING AND OFFICE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS Percentage of units installed in Canada

| COMPANY |  | Y E | A R |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984(est) |
| AES Data Ltd | 33 | 18 | 19 | 18 |
| Philips/Micom Inc. | 26 | 18 | 16 | 17 |
| Wang Canada Ltd. | 12 | 14 | 15 | 14.5 |
| I B M | - | 28 | 27 | 27.5 |
| DEC | - | - | - | 5 |
| Olivetti | - | - | - | 5 |
| Others | 29 | 22 | 23 | 13 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Ref: Evans Research Corp. Market Forecast for Canadian Information Processing Systems, October, 1983.

Ref: Evans Research Corp. An Analysis of Selected Major Vendors of Multi-terminal word processing Systems, April, 1982.
their 7600 series network controller.

AES's strengths are their expertise in word processing and text handling, their capability to connect with systems other than AES and their overall financial strength as part of the Canada Development corporation. Their recent financial problems and management changes have also had a positive side in that they now have a corporate strategy for handing the office communications systems market. As well, the change in their U.S. distribution strategy now allows AES to market through more than one distributor, and to build a market position under the AES name. Previously, they distributed in the U.S. under the Lanier name, with Lanier as the exclusive distributor.

A primary AES weakness is that they are approaching the integrated office systems market from the word processing side. However, the integrated office of the 80 's is oriented towards computer and communications technologies. This is not an area in which AES has a great deal of experience. In addition, AES's traditional marketing strength lies in sales to office support staff. Now, they must also sell to managerial and professional users. A further weakness is that they are not well known in the United States (approximately $70 \%$ of their production is sold there), and they must now build a new brand name in that highly competitive market.

AES will be a niche supplier in a multivendor environment. They will continue to be a supplier of word
processing systems at least until 1988, selling to their already installed base of AES customers. They will also supply systems to companies with high text handling requirements and attempt to move into the integrated systems market with their new offerings.

Micom Co., Montreal, is a subsidiary of Philips Information Systems, Toronto, and ultimately Philips NV of the Netherlands. Compared to AES, Micom is in a much stronger position. Philips Information Systems, which is responsible for the marketing and distribution of Micom's office automation products, recorded sales of $\$ 62$ million, up from $\$ 38$ million in 1983, an increase of $38.7 \%$. Of the $\$ 62$ million in sales, approximately $\$ 42$ million came from the sales of MICOM word processors. Micom has also recently begun to manufacture the Philips personal computer in Canada, and have reportedly sold over 10,000 units. During 1984 Micom relocated to a new 230,000 square foot facility in Saint Laurent, Quebec, the result of an investment of $\$ 15$ to $\$ 20$ million. They are now manufacturing the Micom line and the Philips PC in this plant, and are assembling an expanded version of the Megadoc storage and retrieval system (See Section 4.5)

The Philips strategy is to provide products from the entry level word processor stage through to office systems integration via a local area network. Figure 4-3 shows one of the MICOM 3000 series word processors, and the Philips personal computer, both key elements in their integrated office communications systems strategy. Philips also produces: An
MICOM 3003 WORD PROCESSOR
PHILIPS PERSONAL COMPUTER

|  |
| :---: |
|  |  |
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Information Management Facility (IMF) (a distributed document processing system); an Information Processing System (IPS) (a 32 bit microcomputer UNIX based system); a LAN (a twisted pair, token passing system); the MEGADOC mass storage system; and the COMIS office automation software (developed by Philips). Philips' systems are capable of operating on an IBM or IBM compatible mainframe. Their overall strategy is to be an integrated office system supplier operating in an IBM world.

Micom's position as part of the overall Philips corporate group is a major strength. Philips has focussed on office automation as a growth area, and are committed to being a major participant. This should have a positive effect on the Montreal and Toronto operations. For example, the merger of its data and telecommunications divisions may result in an integrated voice/data workstation, and the logical manufacturing plant is in Montreal. A further strength is that other divisions of Philips are manufacturing large computers, hence there is a good installed base of both mainframes and word processing systems. Finally, they have an excellent distribution system worldwide.

Micom's only weakness is that they are somewhat late in formulating and implementing their office communications systems strategy and, like AES, they are coming from the word processing side. However unlike AES they have access to Philips' technology and marketing strengths.

The prognosis for Micom and Philips Information Systems is very favourable. They will most likely be a strong niche supplier, working within a multivendor environment and making corporate alliances to enhance their competitive position in the integrated office systems marketplace.

### 4.2.3 Office Personal Microcomputers

As stated earlier, the desktop microcomputer is evolving into the multifunctional workstation. There are a number of reasons for this transition:

1) The increase in random access memory (RAM), speed and storage capacity.
2) The decrease in hardware costs.
3) The proliferation of inexpensive software (standard packages for word processing, spread sheets, data base management).
4) The development of cost effective communications hardware and software.
5) The increasing networking capabilities and micro to mainframe functionality.
6) The entry of major companies such as IBM, Wang, DEC, and Xerox into the field. Plus the more recent entry of firms such as Olivetti, AT\&T, and Hewlett-Packard.
7) The increasing acceptance of the microcomputer as an essential piece of office equipment.

In Canada over fifty vendors of personal computers are supplying the marketplace. Table $4-4$ shows the respective market shares of the major companies. None of these major suppliers is manufacturing here. Canada does have a few smaller scale companies. However, the two leading firms, Comterm (formerly Bytec-Comterm) and Osborne Canada, have ceased manufacturing. A smaller firm, David Computers, has also ceased manufacturing and is distributing computer parts. The remaining Canadian manufacturers are summarized in Table 4-5.

Comterm announced the closure of their Hyperion manufacturing plant in October 1984. This closure resulted in a loss of $\$ 48.3$ million and a lay off of 125 employees. The difficulties with the Hyperion are said to be related to faulty disk drives purchased from Ramax Inc. of California, in addition to high production costs and marketing problems. The company attempted to market the Hyperion on a direct sales basis throughout Canada and the United States, with a marketing budget of about $\$ 7$ million. They faced increasing competition from IBM as well as from, numerous other microcomputer manufacturers. Increasing competition caused prices to decline and Comterm's losses increased. In 1983 the retail price of the Hyperion was about $\$ 6,000$. By late 1984 it was selling for less than $\$ 2,700$.

Comterm is currently in the process of retenching.

TABLE 4-4
THE SHARES OF THE MICROCOMPUTER MARKET HELD BY THE MAJOR VENDORS

| COMPANY | Y E |  |  |  | A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984(est) |  |
| IBM Canada | - | $8 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $39 \%$ |  |
| Radio Shack (Tandy) | $40 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $11 \%$ |  |
| Commodore Business <br> Machines | $20 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $11 \%$ |  |
| Apple Canada | $27 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $6 \%$ |  |
| DEC | - | - | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ |  |
| Others | $13 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $29 \%$ |  |

## Sources:

Evans Research Corporation, Report on Microcomputer Markets in Canada, July 10, 1982.

Evans Research Corporation, Forecasts for the Canadian Information Processing Industry (Systems less than $\$ 15,000$ ), October 1, 1983 .

Newton-Evans Research Company, Corporate Strategies for the U.S. Computer Industry, 1983-1984 ed.

## TABLE 4-5

## CANADIAN MICROCOMPUTER MANUFACTURERS

| COMPANY | $\begin{array}{r} 1984 \\ \text { SALES } \\ (\$ \text { mil }) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NUMBER } \\ \text { OF } \\ \text { EMPLOYEES } \end{gathered}$ | PRODUCT OFFERINGS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CEM Corporation | N/A | 10 | ICON educational computer |
| Cybernex Lta. | 5.0 | 113 | Video displays \& terminals |
| DY-4 Systems Inc. | 2.2 | 75 | STD bus and VME products, microcomputers, local area networks |
| Nelma Data Corporation | 5.0 | 100 | "Persona" personal computer, intelligent terminals, wireless modem |
| ```Spectrix Microsystems Inc.``` | 3.0 | 12 | "Super" 32 bit microcomputer |

This year the company realized $\$ 814,000$ net income on sales of $\$ 10.8$ million. They are concentrating on the terminal business utilizing the expertise gained in producing the Hyperion. By combining their terminal expertise plus Hyperion technology, they are hoping to regain entry to the office automation marketplace. Comterm will continue to face difficult times over the next few years, if they survive.

CEM Corporation (Canadian Educational Microcomputer Products) of Toronto, designed and markets the ICON educational microcomputer. Microtel Ltd. is assembling this computer at their Brockville plant. The ICON was developed under a $\$ 10$ million contract from the ontario Ministry of Education. It is a dedicated educational computer and is not expected to be used in general office automation.

Cybernex Ltd., while predominately a supplier of video displays, also produces intelligent terminals. They are an OEM manufacturer and are manufacturing computer terminals for Honeywell. Cybernex are not producing business microcomputers or office automation equipment of their own.

DY-4 Systems Inc. of Ottawa, designs and manufactures all of its products in Canada. They have sales of about $\$ 2.2$ million (1984) and employ a workforce of 75 . While their strength is in manufacturing STD bus and VME products, they have expanded their product line by producing a system of distributed microcomputers based on a local area network. To date they have

95 of these systems installed in Canada, each connecting on the average of 12 to 16 workstations.

DY-4's "Dynasty" system consists of 8 bit CP/M based microcomputers, interconnected via a dual twisted pair LAN. The microcomputer is manufactured from the board level up. In 1985, DY-4 expects to offer a new system. This will support up to 48 workstations, (including the IBM PC) employs an OMNI net protocol with collision detection, and will operate over a distance of 4000 feet. After the test phase of this system, they hope to sell the technology and marketing rights to a.large company, such as Crowntek, who have the financial and marketing strength to handle Canadian and U.S. sales.

DY-4 cannot compete directly against the major manufacturers. They also recognize that they do not have the financial or market strength to sell their product on a direct sales basis. They have good products and have gained valuable expertise in system configuration and interconnectability. They recognize their technical strengths and the need for assistance in marketing. It is expected that DY-4 will be a successful Canadian niche supplier, producing specialized products for đistribution by larger firms.

Nelma Data Corporation of Mississauga manufacturers the Persona personal computer, a smart terminal, a visual display terminal, and a wireless modem. They also distribute word processing equipment, IBM compatible computers and portable
microcomputers. Nelma Data employs about 100 and has sales of about $\$ 5$ million. Recent information indicates that Nelma lost $\$ 1.85$ million in fiscal year 1984, considerably better than the $\$ 5.79$ million lost in the previous year. In October 1984 , Nelma received new funds from the Ontario Government and have taken a number of refinancing measures.

The Persona personal computer is shown in Figure 4-4. It uses a z8OA microprocessor with a CP/M operating system. The computer is assembled in Canada using mostly imported parts and technology.

Nelma Data Corp. has undergone a very difficult financial time combined with adverse publicity. They have been very close to bankruptcy. In spite of their problems, they are still surviving. With the refinancing measures their strategy now is to focus on increased distribution and to concentrate on the development of unique products such as their wireless modem. If they survive, Nelma Data will be a commodity supplier and distributor of office systems equipment.

Spectrix Microsystems. Inc. of Markham produces the SPECTRIX super microcomputer family, incorporating the 32 bit Motorola MC 68000 processor. The SPECTRIX computer can support up to twenty-six users and can be networked using Ethernet. Figure 4-5 is a copy of the technical specifications for the SPECTRIX 30 system. The SPECTRIX group of products are in their third generation of development and occupy a unique niche between


THE NELMA PERSONAL COMPUTER
CPU: Zilog z80A

MEMORY: $\begin{aligned} & 8 \times 64 \mathrm{~KB} \text { Dynamic RAM Chips } \\ & \\ & 2 \times 2 \mathrm{~KB} 2716 \text { Chips for Operating System Software }\end{aligned}$
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the micro and the minicomputer markets. They are also WANG 2200 compatible.

Spectrix Microsystems has gained extensive experience in producing and marketing these products. They are gaining valuable experience in a Manitoba pilot project where the SPECTRIX super microcomputer is being used with Telidon technology and Trigon software. SPECTRIX microsystems is a strong supplier in a very specialized niche.

### 4.2.4 Voice/Data Workstations

The voice/data workstation is essentially a combination of telephone and microcomputer. It can have fully integrated functions or can be "plastic" integrated (that is, a phone and computer together in a plastic case.) These products are recent entrants into the office automation market and are expected to become increasingly important.

Mitel is manufacturing a voice/data workstation called the KONTACT (Figure 4-6). The KONTACT is one of the first of its kind with integrated capabilities, handling voice, text and data. It can send or receive messages while the user is performing other tasks. The KONTACT's standard software includes: telephone, electronic mail, data communications, terminal emulations, word processing, spreadsheet and time management. Its hardware includes a built in modem, RS232C communications port, telephone, standard display and keyboard.

The KONTACT was the first of its type on the market, and presently there are few comparable products. (1985 is expected to see similar products from IBM and Northern Telecom. Rolm launched similar products in 1984.)

Lanpar, the national distributor of the KONTACT workstation, has installed approximately 300 units. Sales have been very disappointing. Part of the problem is that the KONTACT workstation is not able to run other popular software (i.e. IBM). While Mitel has no plan to produce an IBM compatible KONTACT in the near future, they may manufacture a UNIX based system, depending on what IBM does over the next couple of years. A further problem is price. The basic unit cost is about $\$ 5,300$, with $246 k$ RAM. This is considerably more than a displayphone, or other personal computers. While it has integrated voice/data features, the market has not yet accepted the need for such a higher priced workstation.
(See Section 4.3.1 for further analysis of Mitel in their main business area, the PABX.)

Northern Telecom is planning to market an integrated voice/data workstation in early 1985. There is a picture of it in their financial report, but details have not yet been released. The predecessor to this new voice/data workstation is the displayphone which was introduced a few years ago.


The two main uses of the displayphone are database access and electronic mail, in addition to its enhanced telephone features. The displayphone has been designed for use by management and executives. Its disadvantages are:

1) not price competitive compared with separate equipment;
2) limited display size
3) lacks computing capability;
4) lacks graphics capability;
5) 300 baud modem
6) small keyboard
7) limited telephone directory

ROLM, a U.S. PABX manufacturer, recently introduced three new personal communications terminals called the Cedar, Cypress and Juniper. The Cypress (Figure 4-7) has a phone built into a terminal. It has a 128 kb dynamic RAM for program code and 8 kb non-volitile, removable RAM for personal data. The Cedar has the same functions as the Cypress, plus it is compatible with IBM PC software. The Juniper has the functionality of a personal computer coupled to a digital phone.

## THE CYPRESS

## PACKAGE



The ROLM Cypress personal communication terminal consists of four basic components:

1. A 9 -inch screen displaying up to 25 lines of 80 characters, plus a special 48 character line for status information when used in the 3270 mode. This high-resolution screen (7 X 9 dots per character) is equipped with a brightness control and uses an anti-glare design for maximum readability.
2. A multiple-section dashboard giving the user
easy access to the various control keys. The following groups of keys are conveniently mounted on the dashboard:

- A telephone dialing pad that is also used as a calculator numeric pad.
- 10 "soft" function keys, which have different functions depending on how the Cypress terminal is being used.
- $1-4$ line keys for accessing different telephone lines.

Again it is IBM PC compatible. The Juniper is the closest to the Mitel KONTACT. Although Rolm has a subsidiary in Canada, none of these products are manufactured here as yet.

Samanda of Mississauga is another recent entry into the personal communications workstation market. They will be manufacturing a unit with combined telephone and microcomputer features, targeted to the executive secretary. The workstation is based on Micom and Northern Telecom technology. It will not be IBM compatible, and the microcomputer capability will not be stressed because they hope to avoid the intense competition within the microcomputer market. The product will be priced in the $\$ 4,000$ to $\$ 5,000$ range. Without IBM compatability, Samanda may run into the same problems which have hit other non IBM compatible products.

Cygnet Technologies, of California, manufactures the only other competitive product to the KONTACT, called the CoSystem. It is similar to the displayphone, with a $Z 80$ microprocessor. It supports PC-DOS and MS-DOS operating systems, ASCII terminal emulation and communications with the IBM PC/xT.

### 4.2.5 Other Systems

GEAC is the only Canadian mainframe manufacturer. Instead of competing directly with firms like IBM and DEC, they have developed a specialized niche for themselves in integrated
on-line processing systems for specific vertical markets, primarily financial institutions and libraries. GEAC has recently introduced a new office automation system, called Goast, to complement their current offerings. (See Figure 4-8) GEAC is strong in their specialized market area and it is expected that they will be equally successful in marketing the GOAST system, particularly to their installed customer base. Sources estimate that GOAST will account for revenue of over $\$ 10$ million within the next two years.

GOAST provides complete office automation features including spread sheet, electronic mail, word processing, and electronic filing. The system is compatible with other GEAC installed systems. One major disadvantage of the GOAST system is its total reliance on the mainframe computer. If there are problems at the mainframe the whole network goes down. GEAC is also in the process of evaluating a number of new products which they have in the prototype stage, and in some cases test installed at customer sites. These products include a GEAC micro that is IBM compatible, a Financial Terminal Systems product, optical disc technology, "C" compiler, Relational Data Base Management System and a new family of terminals. GEAC is also conducting an office automation pilot project at the Ministry of State for Economic and Regional Development.

GEAC is currently a defensive supplier, producing office systems products to defend their installed base. They are currently moving towards being a niche supplier, specializing in

financial and library market segments.

There are other firms in Canada manufacturing special terminals, including business graphics. These firms are outside the Terms of Reference; however, they deserve a brief mention.

* Matrox is a supplier of high resolution, interactive colour graphics terminals and is also a supplier of boards and related products.
* Electrohome Electronics has a unit for the display projection of microcomputer images, a high performance colour graphics terminal, and a number of other video display products.
* Norpak is one of the hardware suppliers for Telidon. Cableshare is another hardware participant.

The major international firms producing colour business graphics are Hewlett-Packard, IBM, and Datapoint.

### 4.3 Voice/Data PABXs

### 4.3.1 PABXs ${ }^{\text {. }}$

Digital switching technology has gained wide acceptance since the introduction of the first digital PABX, the Rolm CBX in 1974. Today, it is estimated that over $10 \%$ of all PABX installations employ digital technology for both control and switching functions. In 1979 the role of the digital PABX was expanded through the introduction of new data interface equipment. These data interface products allowed terminals, computers, word processors and other data devices to be directly connected to, and have their data switched through, the digital PABX.

The digital PABX with its data interface modules has the potential to meet most of the office communications switching requirements, with the additional advantage of being able to permit simultaneous voice/data transmission over existing wiring. The PABX has become the focal point of the integrated electronic office, and a global race is on to integrate data handing capabilities with the traditional voice function of the PABX.

The major vendors include: American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT\&T) and the ITT Corporation, both of New York; Rolm Corporation of Santa Clara, California; and the Canadian firms Northern Telecom of Mississauga and Mitel

Corporation of Kanata. Table 4-6 details the product offering of these and other major PABX vendors.

There are four major Canadian vendors manufacturing digital PABXs. These are:

* Northern Telecom Ltd.

Mississauga, Ontario

* Mitel Corporation

Kanata, Ontario

* Microtel Ltd. (formerly AEL Microtel Ltd.) Burnaby, British Columbia
* TIE/Telecommunications Toronto, Ontario

Northern Telecom is the largest and is in the best competitive postion. Northern is one of the world's leading manufacturers of digital switching equipment, and has been a pioneer in the development and implementation of digital business communication systems.

Revenue for 1983 amounted to $\$ 3.3$ billion, an increase of nearly $9 \%$ over 1982 revenue. Total revenue for 1984 is expected to exceed $\$ 4$ billion representing an increase of more than $25 \%$ over 1983. Figure 4-9 illustrates the historic growth of sales and net income over the past five fiscal years.

## MAJOR VENDORS OF DIGITAL PABXS
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Northern's key strength is in the company's commitment to research and development. Bell Northern Research (BNR) is by far the largest private research organization in Canada. BNR, Northern's research arm, is jointly owned by Northern Telecom (70\%) and Bell Canada (30\%). Expenditures on R\&D alone amount to about $7 \%$ to $9 \%$ of annual revenue. R\&D plus overall capital investment will total approximately $\$ 900$ million in 1984 , with about half of the capital investment in Canada.

In digital switching equipment, Northern has a significant marketing and technological edge and enjoys large economies of scale in manufacturing and distribution. At the heart of Northern Telecom's digital business communications systems is the SL family of PABXs. One of the major features of the SL family is the product's large degree of versatility.
"A wealth of software written to support the SL-1, offers special features for industry, government, health care facilities, hotels and motels, and educational institutions. New capabilities were added to the SL-1 during 1982 and beyond, including interface capability with digital networks; compatibility with X .25 data protocol to enable operating with the SL-10 system in data packet networks; synchronous data capability and connectivity with selected local area networks."4-2

In 1978 Northern acquired two U.S. data processing firms, Sycor Incorporated and Data 100 Corp. These firms were
leaders in the design and marketing of terminal-based networks for distributed information systems. Datamation analyzed this acquisition in its June 1984 publication:
"... The Canadian telecommunications hardware vendor bought several U.S. data processing companies in the late 1970's in hopes of meshing their terminals and CPU's with PBX's and other gear and creating the office of the future available from one vendor. Instead it lost key DP designers and marketers, customers and money. In 1983, however, the hemorrhaging ended when the company announced that the last consolidation of its DP operation into an Electronic Office Systems group (EOS) led to break-even or marginally profitable operations at year end."

As a result of these acquisitions, Northern obtained the technology associated with Sycor's Models 445 and 585 distributed data processing systems. This technology significantly strengthened Northern's data processing capability.

In an industry sector characterized by competitor allegiances Northern Telecom is apparently going it alone. However, agreements have been reached with such major companies as Digital Equipment Corporation, Sperry Inc., Hewlett-Packard, Data General and Wang. The focus of these agreements has been to allow compatibility between Northern's digital business communications products and the data processing hardware of the other companies. This is part of Northern Telecom's Open World Concept.

The "Open World" will enable organizations to connect many types and makes of equipment into one integrated system which can then evolve as requirements and technology evolve. The Open World concept has placed Northern Telecom in a key competitive position. Many analysts believe that because of the large number of office products available from different vendors, the key to integration will be open communication systems. To test this concept Northern Telecom, Bell Canada and Sperry Inc. have recently conducted field trials on the integration of office communications, host computer and workstations. The trials allowed 20 Sperry workstations to be linked to a host computer via Northern Telecom's SL-l digital switch. It is one of the first office automation trials using existing equipment and with communications over ordinary telephone wires.

Northern is involved in a major field trial carried out as part of the Office Communications Systems (OCS) program administered by the Federal Department of Communications. The trial is being carried out at the Department of Revenue (Customs and Excise) by Bell Northern Research. The development of the integrated office system is divided into two phases:

1) The initial phase involves

- one digital PABX switch located in the Toronto regional office and one in Ottawa;
- fifty workstations installed in Toronto and fifty in Ottawa, distributed primarily amongst the Tax Interpretation and Special Audit divisions;
- the system provides:
- electronic messaging
- advanced telephone service
- personal filing
- report production.

2) The second phase involves:

- expansion of the system incorporating more areas of the Department.

Table 4-7 outlines the equipment Bell Northern Research is using in the OCS Field Trial. In 1985 they will be offering more sophisticated integrated office systems including an integrated voice/data workstation.

Northern Telecom's experience in digital communcation technology along with a solid commitment to make its products compatible in the Open World concept, have helped ensure Northern's role as a key niche supplier in the office communications systems market. Further, Northern's acquisition of data processing expertise and its program of compatibility with major mainframe suppliers may give it the capability of becoming a total systems supplier.

Mitel Corporation of Kanata is the next most important Canadian supplier of PABX's. Until 1981 Mitel had enjoyed phenomenal growth, experiencing eight consecutive years of revenue doubling. Figure 4-10 illustrates the trend in sales and net income over the last five fiscal years. For fiscal 1984,

TABLE 4-7
BELL NORTHERN RESEARCH FIELD TRIAL AT
CUSTOMS AND EXCISE
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revenues totalled $\$ 343$ million, an increase from $\$ 255$ million in 1983. However, even with this substantial growth, Mitel incurred a loss of over $\$ 30$ million in 1984 , counting extraordinary items. Financial losses were coupled with layoffs at many plants and at Mitel's Kanata headquarters.

During the rapid growth years, Mitel's strength was in the small to medium size PABXs. Their overall share of the U.S. PABX market was $12 \%$ in 1982. In comparison, however, their share of the under 100 line segment was $36 \%$, more than three times its nearest competitor. In order to capitalize on this large base, Mitel introduced the Generic 1000. The Generic 1000 allows earlier Mitel switches to be upgraded with modern digital technology. Northern Business Information estimates this product will allow Mitel to capitalize on an existing base of over two million lines.

Mitel's entry into the office of the future has been its digital PABX, the SX2000. Mitel finally began shipment of the SX-2000, in January of 1984. Delays of more than a year in the introduction of the $5 X-2000$, have cost the company dearly. IBM cancelled its agreement with Mitel; a Canadian dealer dropped the $s X-2000$ in favour of the Saturn Series of digital PABXs made by Siemens Electric Ltd., citing the consistent failure of Mitel in meeting stated delivery dates, and others followed. Although the $S x-2000$ is now being produced, so are similar products by at least four other competitors. Most notable is the 2400 made by the Nippon Electric Company (NEC) of Japan. Northern Business

Information estimates that NEC had completed about 30 installations of the 2400 by January 1984. Also, Mitel has all but been shut out in sales of the $S X-2000$ to the U.S. regional telephone companies.

Mitel hopes to be producing about 50 SX-2000s per month by the end of 1984 thus contributing about $\$ 50$ million in revenue for fiscal 1985. As of December, 1984 a total of 96 SX-2000s had been installed in four countries. Many analysts feel the success of the $5 X-2000$ is vital to the short-term well being of Mitel.

Further product enhancement involves a technology development agreement with Octel Communications Corporation of San Jose, California. The agreement provides for the development and use of Octel's Aspen voice messaging system on Mitel equipment. Development of this system will give voice messaging features to a range of Mitel's PABXs including the $\mathrm{sX}-100$, sX-200, and sX-2000. Together with the Generic 1000, Mitel has a good opportunity to offer certain office automation features on some of its existing installed base.

In May of 1983 Mitel ceased development of Skyswitch (a satellite communications switch). However, Mitel still has an interest in Skyswitch. SED Systems Inc. of Saskatoon along with Mitel, are major shareholders in Skyswitch Satellite Communications Company of Denver, Colorado. The company hopes to manufacture and market satellite communications technology previously developed by Mitel. In 1982, Mitel and IBM announced
plans to develop a product similar to the $S X-2000$ that would link with IBM's computer products. However, on July 10, 1984 IBM dropped Mitel and entered into an agreement with Rolm. Since then, IBM has acquired ownership of Rolm, one of Mitel's major competitors.

Mitel's other office product offering is their KONTACT workstation. This has been already discussed in Section 4.2.4.

Mitel has been the shining light of the Canadian "high tech" industry, with its good product line and rapid growth rate. During the past year and a half it has suffered financial losses, management turmoil (with five key executives leaving), a plant closing, loss in investor confidence, problems in delivering the SX-2000, and loss of the IBM agreement. On the positive side Mitel has reached agreements with a number of other companies such as WANG; they are finally delivering the $s X-2000$; and they have a large installed customer base. As such, Mitel has the potential to be in a sound competitive position as a niche supplier of office communications equipment.

Microtel Ltd. (formerly AEL Microtel Ltd.) was formed through the amalgamation of Automatic Electric (Canada) and Lenkurt Electric (Canada). Microtel's immediate parent is the British Columbia Telephone Company (B. C. Tel) which is ultimately controlled by the General Telephone and Electronics Corporation (GTE) of Stanford, Connecticut. For the first nine months of 1984, Microtel reported an operating loss of $\$ 9$
million, on sales of $\$ 98$ million versus a profit of $\$ 1.8$ million on sales of $\$ 145$ million in 1983. Microtel employs approximately 2800.

Due to these losses, Microtel has begun restructuring to streamline company product offerings, expand exports and increase profitability. They have dropped several product lines, including certain types of analog multiplex equipment, some telephone sets (such as rotary dial), and some analog PBX equipment. They have consolidated manufacturing activities by closing their Winnipeg plant and selling off their telephone interconnect business. They have also reorganized their marketing department. Microtel is currently concentrating on five product lines: the Spacetel satellite communications system, the System 51 switch, digital transmission products, cellular mobile radio, and their VLSl circuit shop.

Microtel has negotiated world product mandates on several product lines from its U.S. parent, GTE. These include System 51 monitoring devices and the Spacetel satellite communication system. Spacetel incorporates a computer controlled method of sharing the transmission circuit to and from the satellite. This significantly reduces satellite communications costs. Microtel is working to enhance Spacetel so it can be marketed as a closed communication system for companies wishing to transmit inter-office data.

One of Microtel's key strengths is its association with Automatic Electric, the manufacturing subsidiary of its American parent, GTE. The family of digital systems introduced by Microtel in 1982 centres around the GTD EAX\#5 switchboard developed in cooperation with Automatic Electric in the United States. Last year, GTE announced a new digital PABX, the Omni. Microtel has been negotiating with GTE for the introduction of the Omni into Canada.

Microtel's primary weakness has been its domestic orientation. A large portion of the company's sales have been to domestic customers, with B.C. Tel and Quebec Telephone being the major buyers. In 1982 for example, exports accounted for only $15 \%$ of sales. Since then the company's new strategy has been to focus on a relatively narrow market segment and to move vigorously into the U.S. market. Backed by GTE, Microtel should be able to develop a major niche position as a supplier of communications systems to the integrated office. While much of its product line has been aimed in the past at domestic markets, it is now taking a world product mandate strategy.

TIE/Communications Canada Ltd. of Toronto is planning to produce a new digital PABX, the Mercury, in its new automated assembly plant in Sherbrooke, Quebec. The Mercury was acquired, unfinished, from Plessey Canada when TIE agreed to purchase Plessey Canada from Plessey Company of Britain. TIE is supported in this venture by the marketing strength and expertise of its U.S. parent company TIE/Communications Inc. of Shelton,

Connecticut. The acquisition of Plessey places TIE in direct competition with other established Canadian companies, such as Northern Telecom and Mitel.

Assistance from the Canadian Industrial Renewal Board in the form of a grant of $\$ 8.3$ million has aided $T I E$ in the expansion of their Canadian operations. $\$ 5.6$ million went to assist in the construction and pre-production expenses for their new plant in Sherbrooke, Quebec and a further $\$ 2.7$ million went to enhance the R\&D operations in Toronto, where advanced software is being developed for the TIE PABX. Revenue for 1983 amounted to $\$ 18.3$ million, up from $\$ 11.6$ million the previous year.

TIE recently announced marketing agreements with Bell Canada, B.C. Tel, and CTG. The agreement with Bell is worth over $\$ 20$ million and allows Bell to market TIE's Meritor family of electronic key telephone systems throughout Bell's operating territory. The Meritor systems are to be built in TIE's Sherbrooke plant. The agreement with B.C. Tel is similar and is worth about $\$ 4$ million. The agreement with CTG (TIE's largest independent dealer) is for $\$ 6$ million in microprocessor-controlled communications equipment, TIE's Ultracom and Ultrakey electronic key telephone systems and its new digital PABX, the Mercury.

TIE/Communications Canada Ltd. will be a strong niche supplier of Canadian manufactured communications equipment to the automated office.

### 4.3.2 Communications Devices

This analysis deals primarily with modems and multiplexers, a product area where Canadian companies are actively involved.

The widespread use of distributed data processing has fuelled a dynamic market growth rate for both modems and multiplexers. 1982 shipments of modems by U.S. manufacturers totalled about $\$ 950$ million. Multiplexer shipments totalled about $\$ 220$ million. There is intense competition in this market with about 75 modem vendors and 35 multiplexer vendors competing for market share.

Table 4-8 details some of the leading U.S. based manufacturers plus Gandalf Technologies (Ottawa, Canada). In addition to Gandalf, other major Canadian manufacturers include Develcon Electronics, ESE Limited, and Tran Communications.

Gandalf Technologies is the leading Canadian manufacturer of data communications equipment with revenue of $\$ 58.6$ million in fiscal 1984. Figure 4-11 contains information on their revenue trend over the past five years, as well as their net income. Gandalf realized an increase of $15.2 \%$ in revenue over 1983, and an increase of $35.8 \%$ in net income. Research and development expenditures rose from 7.9\% of revenue in fiscal 1982 to ll. $1 \%$ in fiscal 1983, and were $13.2 \%$ of revenue for fiscal 1984. This increase in R\&D expenditures is in response to

DOLLAR VALUE OF WORLDWIDE 1982 SHIPMENTS OF MODEMS AND MULTIPLEXERS BY U.S. - BASED MANUFACTURERS

| COMPANY | MODEMS |  |  | M ULTIPLEXERS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ VALUE OF SHIPMENTS | \% OF TOTAL SHIPMENTS | MARKET-SEGMENT STRENGTHS | \$ VALUE OF SHIPMENTS | \% OF TOTAL SHIPMENTS | MARKET SEGMENT OF SHIPMENTS |
|  | \$ IN MILLIONS |  |  | \$ IN MILLIONS |  |  |
| Rachel Milgo | 198 | 20.8 | M, H | - | - | - |
| Codex (Motorola) | 160 | 16.8 | M, H | 55 | 25.0 | M |
| Paradyne | 125 | 13.2 | M, H | 2 | . 9 | - |
| A T \& T | 110 | 11.6 | L, M | - | - | - |
| Racel Vadic | 85 | 9.0 | L | - | - | - |
| UDS (Motorola) | 50 | 5.3 | - | - | - | - |
| General Data Comm. | 43 | 4.5 | L, M | 13 | 5.9. | H |
| Gandalf | 23 | 2.4 | SHM | 5 | 2.3 | - |
| Intertel | 16 | 1.7 | - | - | - | - |
| Micom | 7 | . 7 | - | 34 | 15.5 | L |
| Infotron | - | - | - | 30 | 13.6 | M, H |
| Timeplex | - | - | - | 25 | 11.4 | M |
| Rexon | 52 | 5.5 | - | 10 | 4.5 | - |
| Digital Communication | - | - | - | 7 | 3.2 | - |
| Other | 81 | 8.5 | - | 39 | 17.7 | - |
| Total | 950 | 100 |  | 220 | 100 |  |

MODEMS:
$L=10 w$ speed- 1200 bps or less
$M=$ medium speed - between 1200 and 2400 bps
$H=$ high speed - greater then 2400 bps
$S H M=$ short haul modems

MULTIPLEXERS:
$L=10 \mathrm{w}$ end ( 1 to 16 input channels)
$M=$ medium ( 24 to 96 input channels)
$H=$ high ( 96 input channels or more and high capacities e.g. wideband)

SOURCE: DATA COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT INDUSTRY, KIDDLER, PEABODY \& CO. - AUGUST 2, 1983
RobertsonNickerson
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increased competition and a need for the company to revamp almost its entire product line. R\&D expenditures are expected to stabilize at about llo of revenue. Gandalf employs approximately 1000 .

Gandalf primarily manufactures local data sets (short haul modems) and private automatic computer exchanges (PACXs). The company has significant market strength in the short haul modem market with about $50 \%$ market share. This stems from the company's traditional ability to design and sell products to meet the requirements of limited distance transmission over local networks. In addition to an extensive line of modems, the company also markets a device called the "line miser". This device allows existing telephone wiring to be used simultaneously for voice and data transmission. Data does not pass through a telephone PABX but is switched by Gandalf's PACX, which sits next to the PABX. This provides the voice/data handling capability of a digital PABX.

Gandalf manufactures a wide variety of PACXs. The most recent, the PACX 2000 (Figure 4-12) is designed to provide a communications link between personal computers, terminals, word processors, printers and other equipment. It is a software controlled distributed switching system which can handle up to 896 intelligent devices. Multiple systems can also be interconnected to form a network capable of handling thousands of attachments. The PACX 2000 is a new product line positioned to penetrate the market for networking applications in the automated office.


The PACX 2000 In The Background

Gandalf has a reputation for producing good, reliable, well manufactured equipment. They have recognized the market trends and where they can excel in satisfying their customer needs. The greatest difficulty ahead for Gandalf may be increasing competition between the PABX, LAN, and PACX technologies. However, the industry view is that different applications and customers will evolve for each of these three technologies. Therefore, it is expected that Gandalf will remain a strong successful niche vendor providing communications systems and equipment for the automated office.

Develcon Electronics Ltd. of Saskatoon specializes in modems and data switching systems. (Recently, they also began to deliver a local area network called Develnet, which is discussed in Section 4.4 of this report). In fiscal year 1984 Develcon reported sales of $\$ 20.3$ million and net income of $\$ .89$ million. Figure 4-13 illustrates their sales and net income for the past five years. Develcon spent $\$ 572,000$ on research and development in 1983 (3.5\% of sales). They employ approximately 120.

The U.S. is Develcon's major market, accounting for over 67\% of sales in 1983. To further aid in the penetration of the U.S. market and to combat intense competition, Develcon's strategy has been to build a strong U.S. sales and distribution network and establish brand recognition. They have had a number of problems with their U.S. branch and recently underwent a major reorganization. One indicator that the reorganization may have been successful, is a recent contract valued at $\$ 5.2$ million with NASA for the supply of data communications equipment.

## DEvELCON ELECTRONICS
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ESE Limited of Toronto is part of the Motorola Information Systems Group. Other group members include Four-Phase Systems and Universal Data Systems. ESE designs and manufactures data and telecommunication products for worldwide markets and offers a complete line of modems and multiplexers. As part of Motorola's Information Systems Group, ESE can rely on Motorola's expertise in semiconductor technology and the group's expertise in distributed data processing.

Late in 1983 ESE announced the construction of a new 27,000 square foot manufacturing facility. About two-thirds of the new plant's production is aimed at the U.S. and other export markets.

Motorola Information Systems Ltd. was formed by the merger of ESE Ltd, and Four Phase Systems. Also included in this corporate family is Codex and Universal Data Systems. Mortorola supplies a complete range of telecommunications products, i.e., PABXs, multiplexers, data network products, business computers, and office automation products. Their fiscal 1983 sales were $\$ 514$ million with a loss in net income of $\$ 5$ million.

In 1984, Motorola Information Systems completed construction of a $\$ 14$ million headquarters facility in Brampton. Ontario. This facility employs 500-600 and has approximately $50,000 \mathrm{sq} . f t$. of manufacturing space primarily for the production of multiplexers and modems.

Tran Communications Ltd. Mississauga, was a subsidiary of Tran Telecommunication Corporation of the U.S. They were purchased by the U.S. computer manufacturer, Amdahl Corporation, and Tran now forms part of Amdahl's Communications Systems Division. Tran manufactures digital time division multiplexers and limited distance data sets in Canada, and reports sales in excess of $\$ 18$ million. TRAN is well positioned for the manufacture of time division multiplexers capable of operating on $T-1$ lines. The demand for such devices will increase as $T-l$ services become more popular amongst business users.

### 4.3.3 Digital Voice Messaging

Digital voice messaging systems are already being introduced in Canada by Bell and several of the provincial telephone companies. The Manitoba Telephone System is currently operating the "Hello Central" system as a value added service to subscribers; Sask Tel has introduced a similar service; and B.C. Tel has also announced its intention to establish a service.

Bell Canada's digital voice messaging system is currently undergoing field trials. This involves the testing of two types of systems. One is based on a public network concept and operates on a similar basis to the Envoy 100 electronic mail system. The second involves integrating a digital voice messaging system with a digital PABX. This is intended to, provide private network services suitable for corporate messaging requirements. Northern Telecom has also recently announced an
agreement with Comterm of Montreal to adapt Comterm's voice messaging system to its SL-1 switch.

Glenayre Electronics of Vancouver has acquired the rights to a voice mailboxing system developed by VMX Inc, of Dallas, Texas. Potential applications include connection to an office PABX. Glenayre employs 165 people and has sales of $\$ 15.5$ million. Their primary business is train control systems, radio communications, and custom electronics.

Communtron Ltd, of Toronto manufactures digital voice storage systems for use in applications where a caller must wait for a free operator, for example, airline reservation numbers or catalogue ordering. Although this type of system is not capable of store and forward, it is providing the company with valuable experience in digitized voice storage. Communtron has sales of $\$ 1.5$ million and employs 25.

Voice and Data Systems of Nepean, is developing a voice messaging system. Using a digital touchtone telephone, their system will permit users to send and receive voice messages through a combination of voice "mailbox" and "store and forward" techniques.

### 4.4 Local Area Networks

A Local Area Network (LAN) is a communications system allowing a number of information processing devices to communicate on a local basis. Such a system does not cross public boundries or become subject to CTRC/FTC regulations. Thus, a LAN would be used within a building or between buildings for sharing different computer and peripheral resouces. It would normally be the property of the companies and institutions using it. (Technical details on local area networks are provided in Chapter 3 of this report.)

The leading firms supplying LANs are $3 M$, Datapoint, Xerox, Wang, Hewlett-Packard, Digital Equipment, Prime Computer, IBM and NEC. Table 4-9 illustrates some of the major companies producing LANs, their types and characteristics. In Canada there are basically six companies producing local area networks. They are Canstar, Develcon, DY-4 Systems, Nortel, NET ONE Data Corporation, and the University of Waterloo.

Canstar Communications, a unit of the Canada Wire and Cable Co. Ltd. (part of the Noranda Group), has developed a local area networks (Hubnet) utilizing fibre optic technology. The company was established in 1977 as a result of the work carried out by Dr. Stewart Lee and Dr. Peter Boulton of the University of Toronto to develop a network for the University campus. Canstar expects to begin full scale marketing of the Hubnet system in 1985, with a medium sized, high-speed LAN costing approximately
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\$150,000. It has already signed a technology and sales agreement with Lynd Communications Systems of Reno, Nevada. Canstar's strategy is to provide local area networks for applications requiring transmission of high volumes of data, for example, from one host computer to another. Canstar also envisions its LAN with a PABX gateway.


In December, 1984, Canstar was awarded a substantial contract (up to $\$ 20$ million) from CNCP Telecommunications of Toronto. In January 1984, Canstar installed a local area network for Systemhouse as part of the Department of National Defence ocS field trial, sponsored by the Department of Communications. At the same time they have implemented a full scale test of Hubnet involving 300 terminals, at the University of Toronto. These activities will place Canstar in a strong position as a Canadian niche supplier of LAN systems.

Develcon of Saskatoon, a manufacturer of data communications equipment, has also recently announced a local area network offering - Develnet. Develnet is made up of local switches or nodes providing distributed switching as well as a cost effective LAN. Up to 64 Develnet nodes may be interconnected, and each node can support up to 248 data lines -- a potential 16,000 line network. Develcon expects its Develnet to be as popular as its Dataswitch was five years ago. With sales of $\$ 16.1$ million and distribution throughout North America, Develcon should be successful in marketing Develnet. Other details on the company were provided in Section 4.3.2.

DY-4 Systems markets a LAN as part of its Dynasty System described in Section 4.2.3. It is a dual twisted pair LAN connecting their 8 bit $C P / M$ based microcomputer workstations. In 1985 DY-4 will be offering a network for supporting up to 48 workstations, including the IBM PC, using OMNI net protocol with collision detection.

DY-4 Systems is a smaller company but with good technical experience, concentrating on being a niche supplier, selling through larger firms and distributors.

Northern Telecom has announced a star configured local area network using the standard telephone lines and integrated with its family of PABXs. At the present time they expect practical data rates of $56 \mathrm{~Kb} / \mathrm{sec}$. By 1990 they are aiming for data rates of $2.54 \mathrm{Mb} / \mathrm{sec}$. Nortel is also working towards compatibility between the Ethernet based LAN and its SL 1 data switch. "Open World (by Northern Telecom) is the strategy for the office of the future, entailing a big shift to private networks as integrated office networks and systems become more important to businesses, because they can provide better management and efficiency." (Mr. Light, Chairman of Northern Telecom).

Northern Telecom also has extensive experience in fibre optics. As part of a $\$ 22$ million contract with the Saskatchewan government, Nortel has implemented a $3,200 \mathrm{~km}$ fibre optics network designed to link Saskatchewan's eight cities and 40 larger towns. As part of this project Nortel built a fibre
optics manufacturing plant in Saskatoon. Nortel has also installed fibre optics in Manitoba, and are conducting research in Alberta. As of 1983 Northern Telecom has designed, manufactured and installed 132 fibre optic systems in Canada.

Northern Telecom is discussed in more detail in Section 4.3. Their financial statement is also presented in Appendix 4A.

Net One Data Corporation of Mississauga produces the Easy Net line linking 8 and 16 bit machines, such as Xerox, NCR and Kaypro. The LAN uses bus topology and can link a maximum of 255 microcomputers. However, its efficiency declines significantly if over 60 units are networked. Net One forecasts sales of 27,000 units worldwide in 1984. They currently employ 15 and have sales of $\$ 4$ million.

The University of Waterloo's Computer Systems Group produces JANET. This is an IBM PC LAN supporting up to 16 workstations (with or without floppy drives), public and end user ID protected files, print server, and multiple hard disks of variable capacity on the PC file server. They also produce the Waterloo PC Network (marketed exclusively by IBM). This is an IBM PC to IBM mainframe network supporting disketteless workstations, protected files, print server, micro-mainframe file access and 3270 terminal emulation.

Associated with the University of Waterloo is Waterloo Microsystems Inc. The company was established in 1982 and is owned by its employees, with minority interests held by Crowntek Investments ( $35 \%$ ) and the University of Waterloo (7\%). Waterloo Microsystems produces the Waterloo Port which was developed in the University's research laboratory.

Waterloo Port claims to be the first network operating system to integrate a friendy user interface with multi-tasking, sophisticated networking and real-time performance. Port also supports PC-DOS as a guest operating system. Port has been licenced to Crowntek Networks Inc. (See Section 4.7) for use as the foundation of their office networking product, PROD/NET. Crowntek offers PROD/NET as a "full solution" office automation system providing an integrated set of software for both micro and host computers. PROD/NET integrates local area networks and peripherals with word processors, terminals, other networks, and host computer applications into a single office system.

### 4.5 Storage Peripherals

With the increasing volume of computerized data, users are requiring peripheral memory with greater and greater storage capacity. Typically, storage peripherals can range from less than 20 megabytes to support a small microcomputer system, to over 1 gigabyte for large mainframes. (See Chapter 3 for technical details on storage peripherals.)

The magnetic storage peripheral market is dominated by IBM, Memorex, and 3M Corporation. Their strengths vary in different sectors of the market.

* IBM claims $17 \%$ of the hand pack rigid disk market.
* Memorex leads the $14^{\prime \prime}$ rigid disk segment claiming an $18 \%$ market share. They also claim $15 \%$ of the $8 "$ mini rigid disk segment and $20 \%$ of the data cassette market.
* $3 M$ dominates the cartridge segment of the market, claiming $90 \%$ to $95 \%$ of the market share.

Other leading firms include Dysan Corporation, Tabor Corporation, Vertex Peripheral, Shugart Corporation, Control Data Corporation, Century Data Systems, and DEC.

Optical disk technology is becoming increasingly important. It will ultimately be used for the transfer and storage of large volumes of information in much the same way that paper is used today. However, the technology is still being developed and only large corporations are expected to be using optical disk storage for the next several years. Products employing optical storage technology are in the late stages of development in Toshiba, Philips and the RCA Laboratories. Other firms with large R\&D expenditures include AT\&T, Control Data, Eastman Kodak, Wang, and IBM. Current manufacturers of this technology include Philips, Control Data, and Dexter Technology Corporation.

Memorex, a division of Burroughs, is currently the largest firm producing storage peripherals in Canada (although Philips is assembling the Megadoc storage system here). Burroughs Memorex Inc., operates a plant in Winnipeg with a world product mandate for storage peripherals. During 1984 they switched from manufacturing head disk assemblies to Memorex disk drives. The plant is currently being renovated. The Winnipeg plant employs 366 people and has gross revenues of about $\$ 72$ million (1983). Table 4-10 contains a breakdown of Burrough's Canadian operations. Burroughs (Canada) had sales of $\$ 135$ million in 1983. Burroughs Corporation (U.S.) had worldwide sales of approximately $\$ 6$ billion with employment of 64,000. Appendix 4A contains a financial report for Burroughs, U.S.

In 1980, Burroughs underwent a major management restructuring and corporate reorganization as part of an overall
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acquisition program. Typical firms acquired were: Systems Development Corporation, Systems Research Incorporated, Midwest Systems Group Inc., and Memorex Corporation. The Memorex acquisition will prove to be the most valuable since a key weakness in the Burroughs' product line was the company's peripherals. Memorex brings to Burroughs an extensive expertise in the manufacture of disk products and a complete range of storage media. Memorex has also been developing an optical storage system.

Burroughs has entered the office communication systems market with its Office Information System -- the Burroughs OFIS 1. The system has a full range of capabilities including personal computing, word processing, host computer, and line of peripherals. These products are not manufactured in Canada. Burroughs' office automation strategy is to focus on specific vertical markets such as government, manufacturing, distribution, finance, and the health care industry through the creation of a new group called Industry Systems. The responsibility of this new group is the vertical markets of these target sectors and the delivery of office automation offerings to them.

Burroughs has gradually expanded their operation in Canada. They now do much more manufacturing and R\&D than in the past, through the acquisition of the Winnipeg facility and the establishment of a software research and development division in Montreal, which employs 44. They estimate that exports account for $48 \%$ of total revenue, a figure they consider excellent

compared to IBM and Digital. The position of Burroughs Memorex in Canada is that of a commodity supplier to the office automation market. Given their overall capabilities, more could be done in Canada, particularly with respect to the OFIS offering, to position the Canadian operation as a niche supplier with a world product mandate.

Didak Manufacturing Limited has established an 18,000 square foot plant in Arnprior, Ontario to produce 8 " and $51 / 4$ " floppy disks. The plant is expected to cost $\$ 2.7$ million with the federal government assisting with a $\$ 655,000$ repayable grant. The company is hoping for annual sales of $\$ 7$ to $\$ 8$ million, and to achieve a Canadian market share of $5 \%-8 \%$ by 1986. Didak is importing the coated oxide and mylar coated polyester media, stamping it and assembling with a liner and PVC jacket. They are also planning to expand their product line to include microdiskettes $4^{\prime \prime}$ and under. Didak employs approximately 60 in the Arnprior plant.

At the present time, there is intense competition in the floppy disk market and the Arnprior plant has probably come on stream just at a particularly difficult time. However, Didak has stated that their product will be produced to the highest industry standards and they have acquired high quality production machinery. In addition, their sales will be only through established distributors with a reputation for quality products and service.

If Didak can live up to this satement of quality, distribution and service while producing a price competitive product, they should be a successful commodity supplier to the office communications systems market.

Dysan Corporation of Santa Clara will shortly be constructing a manufacturing plant in Canada. Industry contacts did not know whether the purchase of Dysan by Xidex Magnetics (Kodak) will have an impact on the construction of this plant. If it is built it is expected to cost between $\$ 6$ and $\$ 10$ million. The first phase of operations will be to provide facilities for producing software copies. The next phase is anticipated to be the manufacture of diskettes (i.e., $51 / 4$ ", 3 1/2"). Dysan forecasts that $80 \%$ to $90 \%$ of the demand for their diskettes (Figure 4-15) in Canada will be satisfied by this plant. Dysan is expected to be very successful in Canada as a commodity supplier, because of their reputation and excellent distribution network.

A finacial report for Dysan (U.S.) is presented in Appendix 4A. In fiscal 1983, they had gross sales of $\$ 180$ million, and net income of $\$ 48.9$ million. Their R\&D expenditures were 19\% of sales, or $\$ 35$ million. Dysan has a reputation for good quality products, excellent R\&D, and innovative management. In November 1984, Xidex purchased Dysan for $\$ 214.6$ million, and as a result, greater emphasis has been placed on marketing and advertising.


Philips Information Systems has already been discussed in Section 4.2.2 under the subject of Micom (a division of Philips). As indicated, Philips is assembling the Megadoc (an office filing system using optical disk technology) in their Saint Laurent plant. The Megadoc can electronically store over eight million pages. Philips has also joined with Control Data Ltd. to develop and manufacture optical storage systems.

### 4.6 Input and Output Devices

Input and output devices include a wide variety of products ranging from computer card readers, high speed printers, VDTs, and other peripherals such as the mouse, touch screens, and joysticks. The focus of this section will be on the following sectors:

1) Optical Character Recognition equipment
2) Laser printers
3) Facsimile

Most analysts feel these products will play a very prominent. role in the automated office of the future. However, these are all markets where Canadian industry has been traditionally weak, with little manufacturing activity.

### 4.6.1 Optical Character Recognition (OCR)

HiTech Canada Limited of Ottawa, is the only company in Canada actively involved in R\&D and the manufacturing of optical character recognition equipment. Incorporated in 1973, HiTech has been engaged in the development of advanced technology in both computer and communications systems. Since 1973 HiTech has grown to employ over 65 with annual revenue of about $\$ 4.0$ million. It has two distict divisions: the System Division
which is responsible for custom computer systems and consulting services; and the Imaging Products Division, which specializes in imaging processing/OCR technology.

Products currently manufactured in Ottawa and marketed internationally include the Imager 1000, the company's most popular series of OCR equipment. The HiTech Imager l000, shown in Figure 4-16, is the standard model capable of handing four different fonts (Courier, Letter Gothic, and Prestige Elite) in either French or English. It has an error rate of less than one in 150,000 characters, and it is able to scan in a nominal range of 10 to 17 seconds per page. The company is also nearing completion of research and development on a new series of Automatic Document Entry equipment. Included in this series are: Mark Sense Readers, Text/Graphic Readers, and Document Readers.

HiTech's R\&D in optical character recognition and data compression is recognized internationally. While relatively small, they have the capability to become a successful commodity supplier to the automated office. However with the forthcoming technology changes vis-a-vis the integration of OCR and FAX, they face the danger of not having the financial resources to maintain their position in the marketplace.


### 4.6.2 Laser Printers

Currently, there are no laser printers being produced in Canada, but one Canadian company is manufacturing a similar type of non-impact printer.

Delphax Systems of Mississauga, manufacture high speed non-impact printers using ionography technology. (See Chapter 3 for details.) Delphax, in mid-1984, introduced a printing system capable of 60 pages per minute and 240 dots per inch.

Delphax employs 70 and has sales of approximately $\$ 5.5$ million. About $75 \%$ of their production goes to the U.S., with the remainder sold in Canada and Europe. Delphax recently moved its head office to Westwood, Massachusetts in order to be closer to its major market. However, its manufacturing plant remains in Mississauga and is expected to about double its employment in 1985. In December, 1984 Xerox announced that it was purchasing the Canada Development Corporation's share of Delphax. Dennison Manufacturing company of Framingham, Massachusetts continues to own the remaining $50 \%$ of Delphax.

Delphax competes against at least fifty different vendors of laser printers. Although the printing technology employed by Delphax does not provide as good a quality print as laser technology, the Delphax offering does have some competitive advantages. Laser printers often require as many as 3,000 moving parts compared to only 276 for Delphax's ionographic printers.

With fewer moving parts the printer's reliability is increased and hardware costs are reduced.

Delphax has entered into a licensing agreement with Itoh Electronics Inc. of Japan for the production of a desk top thirty page per minute non-impact printer, the s3000. Itoh will make the printer while Delphax will manufacture the print cartridges and dielectric cylinders. The first shipments of the S3000 are expected early in 1985. The competitive significance of this agreement is that, at least for the moment, Delphax can offer the fastest non-impact printer on the market, at the lowest price.

The competition in the non-impact printing market will be tough with such established firms as IBM, Siemens, Xerox. Hewlett-Packard, Datapoint, and Canon being the major U.S. manufacturers. Japan is rapidly entering this market and included among the Japanese participants are Hitachi, Fujitsu, Minolta and NEC. The part ownership of Delphax by Xerox changes the possible outlook for Delphax. They are now part of a major organization with significant financial and marketing resources, an excellent reputation in the copier business, and an extensive dealer/distribution network. As a result. Delphax is expected to play a successful role as a comodity supplier to the office automation market.

### 4.6.3 Facsimile Devices

Industry analysts beliveve the Canadian market for facsimile equipment will grow at about $25 \%$ per year. The total market is expected to reach 28,000 units in 1985 .

There are no facsimile equipment manufacturing plants in Canada, at this time. Muirhead Systems Ltd. of Toronto does some custom engineering (e.g. computer to FAX interface) but all the facsimile equipment which they sell is imported.

Growth of the facsimile market is expected to be encouraged by the introduction of advanced CCITT Group. IV machines. These machines will have store and forward capabilities, be able to print teletex and have superior print compared to the existing group III facsimile. With the introduction of these new machines, current facsimile devices will be considered obsolescent.

Stiff competition in the facsimile market is coming from Japanese vendors. Leading Japanese competitors include Hitachi, Matsushita, GEC, NEC, Ricoh, and Toshiba. Frost and Sullivan predict that the Japanese market share of facsimile equipment will increase from 54\% to $85 \%$ in the $1983-1987$ period. This is a very significant increase since A. D. Little is projecting that the entire facsimile market (including both terminal costs and transmission costs) will double from $\$ 1$ billion to $\$ 2$ billion over nearly the same period.

Industry contacts believe that, in the face of the increasing Japanese competition, there is no possibility of Canadian facsimile manufacturing in the forseeable future. The only opportunity might be some assembly or parts manufacturing under license from a Japanese supplier.

### 4.7 Office Applications Software

Table 4-1l details the ten leading U.S. software publishing firms and Table 4-12, the most popular programs. Analysts expect the U.S. market to grow by $32 \%$ per year and to top $\$ 10$ million in 1984. In Canada, Evans Research Corporation estimated the Canadian market for total. software at $\$ 457$ million in 1980 and $\$ 608$ million in 1981. The market is expected to grow by $28 \%$ annually, reaching $\$ 5.4$ billion by 1990 . The applications software market was estimated at $\$ 114$ million and $\$ 161$ million in 1980 and 1981, respectively, and analysts estimate that it will reach $\$ 2.2$ billion by 1990 -- an annual growth rate of $34 \%$. (See Chapter 2 for more detail on market estimates.) Office applications software is defined as being office automation applications only (i.e. standard or semi-standard "off-the-shelf" packages).

Statistics Canada estimates there are 1,400 software companies in Canada. Although there are hundreds of very small firms, Evans Research estimated that, in 1981, 28 Canadian suppliers accounted for $53.4 \%$ of the total software market. However, in general these firms tend to produce custom designed software for large Canadian computer users, not packaged software for office automation applications.

There are no firms in Canada competing in a significant way in the most popular types of microcomputer based

| COMPANY |  | MILLION |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| I B M * | - | $\$ 100$ |
| Radio Shack | - | 110 |
| Apple | - | 68 |
| Microsoft | - | 68 |
| Visa Corp | - | 55 |
| Micro Pro | - | 52 |
| Digital Research | - | 46 |
| Lotus Development | - | 40 |
| Ashton Tate | - | 35 |
| Peach Tree | - | 22 |
| *Note: IBM usually purchases software from |  |  |

Source: Business Week, "Software The New Driving Force" February 27, 1984
TABLE 4-12
MOST POPULAR MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE PROGRAMS

TYPE $\quad$| MONTHLY SHIPMENTS |
| :---: |
| $(1,000 s ~$ |
| 1983$)$ |

| Spread Sheets |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lotus | $\cdots$ | 24 |
| Visicalc | - | 21 |
| Multiplan | - | 17 |
| Supercalc | - | 7 |
| Database Management |  |  |
| PFS: File | $\cdots$ | 10 |
| dBase II | $\pm$ | 8 |
| PF'S: Report | - |  |
| Word Processing |  |  |
| Wordstar | - | 17 |
| Apple Writer | - | 15 |
| Easy Writer | - | 6 |
| Accounting |  |  |
| Home Accounting | $\infty$ | 13 |
| BPI General Accounting | - | 7 |
| Peach Tree General Ledger | $\infty$ | 4 |
| TOTAL | - | 156 |

Source: Business Week, "Software The New Driving Force" February 27. 1984
packaged software, such as spread sheets. There are many with specialized software applications, particularly in the accounting area, but these are not applications with significant relevance to the integrated office automation market. There are a few Canadian firms, primarily those working on the Department of Communications OCS field trials (e.g. Systemhouse, OCRA and Officesmiths), who are producing and developing systems software. Others of interest include those working on fourth generation languages (e.g. Cognos, Synerlogic, Catalyst) since this area is already impacting on the development of office systems software, through increased programming productivity.

The focus of this section of the report is on Canadian software producers of packaged office automation programs. It does not include custom shops producing specialized one-of-a-kind software for the office.

Systemhouse Limited of Ottawa, provides a wide variety of software product lines and services. During the first nine months of the 1984 fiscal year, they reported revenues of $\$ 43,270,000$, and a loss of $\$ 4,318,490$. Systemhouse has consistently reported losses for the past few years. In fiscal 1983 they lost $\$ 28.8$ million, in 1982 they lost $\$ 29.5$ million, and in 1981 their loss was $\$ 27.5$ million. In 1984, Systemhouse reorganized into five discrete companies -- XIOS Systems Corp., Systemhouse Controls Limited, Systemhouse Graphics Systems Limited, Systemhouse Business Systems Limited and Systemhouse (International) Limited. The reorganization was effective at
the beginning of the new fiscal year, September $1,1984$.

Analysts view the reorganization as a positive move in order for Systemhouse to regain the credibility lost since 1981. Part of the problem was that Systemhouse expanded too rapidly into the U.S. They also made a number of wrong investments and had very high R\&D expenditures much of which did not result in the development of successful new products. systemhouse has recently began to shift its emphasis from custom software services to software products. In 1981 software products accounted for almost negligible revenue. In 1983 the company estimated that software products accounted for 40 per cent of revenue and now expect they will exceed 50 per cent in 1984.

Systemhouse (XIOS Systems Corporation) is conducting one of the largest Department of Communications OCS field trials at the Department of National Defence. Some of the features of this field trial are:

- includes multiple components, i。e., 12 microcomputer nodes, 94 personal work centress 15 word processors, 3 personal computers, 14 letter-quality printers and 19 displayphones:
- provides broad functionality, from management activities to document preparation and editing:
- follows the "Open World ${ }^{18}$ concept:
- is expandable to any size of client site;
- encompasses multiple geographic locations;

From the field trial, Systemhouse has developed extensive expertise in linking multi-vendor products into an integrated office communications system. They used over nine different equipment suppliers, including IBM, DEC, Spectrix, Comterm, Gandalf, and Canstar. The field trial started in October 1982, with the first workstations installed in August 1983. The complete system is expected to be fully functional in 1985 .

Systemhouse has been in a generally weak position because of their substantial financial problems. The reorganization is expected to improve their image and attract new capital to the stronger divisions. Industry contacts indicate that Systemhouse overall has a strong recognition factor but this is more closely associated with EDP consulting, not office automation. However, the field trial places the XIOS System Corporation of Systemhouse in a strong position to become a successful niche supplier of office automation system software and integration expertise.

Cognos Coporation, of Ottawa, formerly Quasar Systems Ltd., is one of the major software firms in Canada. It employs 230 people and has gross revenues of $\$ 20$ million from worldwide sales. Established in 1969, the company's primary business was consulting and custom software. However, since 1979 the emphasis has been on packaged application software. In the current fiscal year, $79 \%$ of its revenue is from software product sales. and $21 \%$ from consulting fees.

The name change from Quasar to Cognos was effective January 1.1984 . Its purpose is to reflect their changing business direction and new emphasis on packaged software. Cognos is concentrating on the development of fourth generation
languages. Recently they received five software awards including one for Powerhouse, their new fourth generation language. Cognos has also expanded its product line to include software for DEC as well as Hewlett-Packard computers. They have also signed an agreement with Data General on a joint software development program.

Cognos has managed to establish a very strong recognition factor, in spite of its recent name change. After Systemhouse, it is the most recognized Canadian software company. Cognos distributes in over 25 countries with $75 \%$ of its sales to the U.S. Hence it has a good base for North American distribution. Cognos also has a good technical reputation. Cognos will be a strong software supplier primarily concentrating on fourth generation language packages and other productivity tools for the automated office.

Synerlogic (formerly Bailey and Rose) while predominately a software consulting firm, is moving towards the supply of software products. The company feels this shift in focus has resulted in an increase in profits despite a small drop in revenue (e.g. "A turning point for the company occurred early last year when it acquired the rights to $A C T / I$, a unique Canadian software product.") ACT/I is a software program for
increasing programming productivity in the development of on-line office systems.

Synerlogic was founded in 1976 and now employs 150 with sales over $\$ 7.5$ miliion. This year it relocated the corporate office from Ottawa to Calgary. Synerlogic is focusing on three specific areas: custom software development, productivity tools such as $A C T / 1$, and computer assisted learning (CAL). Through its consulting division, it also provides solutions to office automation problems.

Officesmiths Inc of Ottawa are developing office automation software, primarily in electronic filing and records managment. Established in 1981, Officesmiths currently have a staff of 10 and sales of about $\$ 700,000$ (1983 fiacal year.) Officesmiths is another participant in the OCS field trials and is working with the Department of Engergy, Mines and Resources (EMR). The focus of this field trial is on policy and procedures management. The software is being provided by Officesmiths and the hardware by ZILOG, a subsidiary of EXXON. Since the start of the field trial, Officesmiths has begun licencing discussions with ten companies interested in using its electronic filing system software. Officesmiths currently sell the software as a package and provide custom modifications for specific applications. They are focussing on markets within governments and large organizations. Typical systems, including training, cost in the area of $\$ 250,000$. The company forecasts sales of $\$ 10$ million over the next three years.

Officesmiths is one of the few Canadian companies with a specific office systems software niche. It has gained experience and proved out its product through its participation in the field trials. However, the firm remains quite small with limited resources, and sales have been slow. Its position may also be threatened by the new productivity tools (i.e. fourth generation languages) which now allow firms to develop their own software systems much faster and cheaper then previously possible.

Logo Computer Systems Inc. (System d'Ordinateur Logo Inc.) of Montreal, produces software packages for the Apple Computer and IBM. They have also signed an agreement with Fujitsu Ltd. of Japan, making LCSI logo software available to Fujitsu microcomputer users. Logo software is also available for DEC, Atari, Coleco, Thomson Brant and Sinclair computerso Lugo was incorporated in 1980 and employs approximately 70 . An estimated $90 \%$ of its sales are outside of Canada.

Catalyst International Business Systems Inc. has developed an office automation software package which analysts say may be a prototype expert system for business. The new software is a fourth generation language with some artificial intelligence features. Currently the software operates on mainframes only. The cost is between $\$ 35,000$ and $\$ 75,000$. Within a year software should be available for microcomputers. Catalyst International forecasts sales of 15,000 packages per year for the microcomputer version.

OCRA Communications Ltd., Ottawa, is primarily a systems integrator and systems software developer. OCRA employs 15 and has annual sales of about $\$ 1.6$ million. OCRA is installing an office automation system at Environment Canada under the OCS field trials. The pilot stage initially involved 33 workstations installed in the Management Services Directorate and 38 workstations in the Environment Protection Agency. In May 1984 OCRA was awarded a $\$ 1.2$ million contract to carry out the second phase of the project.

OCRA encountered major delays in implementing the field trials. The company had thought it could put together the sort of system people wanted simply by customizing existing products. However they could not find a cost-effective software package to integrate all the components. As a result, they licensed Officesmiths' Electronic Filing Cabinet and modified it to fit the requirement. OCRA backers include CNCP Telecommunications, Mitel, Gandalf, and Nabu.

OCRA has gained significant experience as a systems integrator due to the ocs field trials. However, the type of work is highly customized in nature. As a result there is not a great deal of proprietary packaged software that can be used for future systems, and it is this latter area that provides the higher profit margins. There is also intense competition in the custom software field with practically all software firms claiming expertise in solving office automation problems.

A key marketing problem for OCRA will be to take their current field trial experience and "package" it in such a way as to be able to differentiate themselves from the competition.

Northern Telecom (BNR) is participating in the OCS field trial at the Department of Revenue. (This has already been discussed in Section 4.3.1.) About two thirds of the research staff at BNR is engaged in software development. However, this is primarily with respect to Northern Telecom's current product offerring -- PABXs, although research in a variety of other areas such as artificial intelligence is underway.

Crowntek Inc. of Markham, Ontario is a subsidiary of Crownx Inc.. which also owns the Crown Financial Group and the Extendicare Group. Crowntek Inc. was established in July 1983 and consists of 23 business units with more than 1300 employees. The major units of interest are:

1) Crowntek Communications Inc。

This unit absorbed the operations previously carried on by Datacrown Inc. a major computer timesharing service organization established in 1971.
2) Crowntek Networks Inc.

Development of computer-based integrated

```
    office automation systems e.g. PROD/NET, a com- plete networking system for micros with micro to mainframe communications.
3) Datacrown Technology Inc.
```

A software development unit engaged in the development of computer systems software, including electronic mail and electronic storage systems.
4) Polaris Technology Corporation

Developer of industry specific software applications, primarily data base management systems.
5) Waterloo Microsytems Inc. (35\% ownership)

Software systems development (e.g. Water:loo Port - a network operating system.

Crowntek has a number of other major operating units but the above are the primary Canadian ones concerned with office systems software.

Duncan MacLachlan, President and Chief Executive Officer of Crowntek Inc. says that "Crowntek Communications Inc. will be one of some 20 to 30 companies which are emerging
throughout the world as super integrated information service companies, emphasizing information management based on a combination of services and software, as opposed to data processing."

With its financial resources, worldwide distribution networks and integrated technology units. Crowntek will be a strong Canadian niche participant in the office software market.

### 4.8 Opportunities and Threats to Canadian Industry

There are opportunities for Canadian manufacturers to compete in specialized niches in the office communication systems market. Expertise exists mainly in communications, word processing, local area networks, and software. Some expertise is being developed to deliver systems for the integrated electronic office, primarily by Northern Telecom, but also by others. Threats to Canadian industry include increasing competition from U. S. vendors, and in certain areas, from Japanese vendors.

IBM, Wang, and DEC are the leaders in the move to full integrated multifunctional systems. IBM's strategy is to provide full corporate office automation facilities based on their mainframe offerings, and to provide multifunctional workstation systems used in a LAN configuration, with mainframe connection capabilitiy. Wang's strategy is to build upon their very strong office presence with user-friendly, integrated, multifunctional systems and become a major departmental system niche vendor. DEC's strategy is to provide integrated systems directly to the larger companies and to their installed mainframe customer base.

The only potential Canadian competition is from Northern Telecom. Northern Telecom's strategy is the "Open World" concept. This will allow Northern Telecom to build on their PABX expertise and compete for a position as a major departmental system niche vendor and; in co-operation with major mainframe suppliers, as a possible total systems vendor.

Northern Telecom will shortly introduce a multifunctional voice/data workstation and integrated office system. With their technical and financial strengths, Northern Telecom will be a major contender in this market. (Mitel also has a voice/data workstation but it is a stand alone and Mitel has no current plans to continue its development as part of an integrated system.)

The other Canadian companies with the best prospects are AES, Micom and Geac. AES and Micom are moving from dedicated word processing systems towards the supply of integrated office systems. AES has some ways to go but, if it succeeds, it will be a departmental system niche vendor serving the smaller to medium sized firms. Micom is likely to integrate its Canadian manufactured product line within the overall Philips systems offering, and also become a major departmental system niche vendor. Geac will be successful in selling integrated systems to their existing mainframe customers in their very specialized market niche (libraries and financial institutions).

Limited opportunities exist for Canadian manufacturers in the stand alone workstation market. The market is microcomputer based and the only two major Canadian manufacturers of microcomputers have recently ceased production. Some niche suppliers remain (e.g. educational microcomputers) and it is likely only in specialized products of this nature, that future opportunities may arise. Currently, there is intense competition in the workstation market and the industry shake out is
continuing. Only major suppliers capable of also offering the workstation as part of an integrated office system will survive.

The competition for workstations is predominately from American vendors. The Japanese have had problems penetrating this market because of the English language barrier and lack of software development by independent software firms. Typical Japanese firms now entering the market include Sanyo, Canon, Sony, Epson, Panasonic, Seiko, and NEC Corporation. However, the Japanese are not expected to excell in producing multifunctional workstations, unless the workstation becomes a great deal more generic in nature than at present. Competition is expected to remain primarily American.

It is unlikely that any future manufacturers of stand alone multifunctional workstations or microcomputers will emerge in Canada, in light of current competitive pressures. All current suppliers are attempting to hold their own.

Canadian PABX manufacturers have established themselves as leaders in digital technology and should be in a key competitive position to meet the opportunities of the integrated electronic office market. Northern Telecom is in the best position to take advantage of the demand for voice/data PABXs. They have a good reputation, extensive distribution network, experience and good technology.

The most recent major event of importance to Northern Telecom and the other Canadian PABX manufacturers has been the

AT\&T divestiture. This allows AT\&T to diversify into new unregulated markets, such as computer manufacturing and the information industry. As a result, AT\&T, along with its PABX manufacturing subsidiary, Western Electric, may now strategically position itself to be a totally integrated office systems supplier. This presents both a threat and an opportunity to Canadian firms. A significant market opportunity was created by the separation of AT\&T from its twenty-two Bell operating companies. Previously, these companies acquired almost all their telecommunications equipment from AT\&T. As a result of the divestiture they are now free to buy from other manufacturers. Northern Telecom led the way in sales in 1983 with $\$ 360$ million of mainly large scale DMS switches.

While the market for voice/data PABXs is expected to more than double by 1988, PABX manufacturers will face increasing competition in a deregulated marketplace. A competitive advantage" will lie with companies offering value-added features such as electronic mail and voice. LANs, and packet switching.

The most serious threat to Canadian manufacturers lies in the competitive allegiances now forming between key PABX manufacturers and major computer hardware and software vendors. Most notable is the purchase of Rolm by IBM. To date, Northern Telecom has taken a different strategy with its "Open world" concept. Instead of acquiring an interest in a major mainframe manufacturer, it is attempting to develop PABX equipment and system compatability with all mainframe manufacturers. In
addition, it has acquired DP expertise through the purchase of two relatively smaller DP firms in the U.S. (See section 4.3.) With these moves, Northern Telecom will be able to:

1) Sell a completely integrated office system, connected to the installed mainframe base of any computer manufacturer.
2) Sell PABX equipment to mainframe manufacturers (except IBM) for incorporation into their integrated office system offerings.
3) Maintain the viability of their own installed PABX base, by allowing the integrated connection of other mainframes and other integrated office systems.

From a purely technical viewpoint, this places Northern Telecom in a reasonable position to compete with the IBM/Rolm threat. However, it does make for a weaker overall marketing position, since it will be extremely difficult to place its PABXs within the IBM dominated mainframe world. IBM's marketing strength will tend to "pull" Rolm with it.

After Northern Telecom, the next largest Canadian PABX supplier is Mitel. Despite its difficulties, Mitel is now delivering its SX2000 switch. However, the delays, financial losses and the termination of their IBM agreement have had a serious affect on their potential. At the moment Mitel is left
with the worst of two worlds. They have not as yet achieved Northern Telecom's "Open World" concept of compatability nor are they aligned with a major integrated office systems supplier like IBM. It further appears that they will have no multifunctional workstation system offering of their own, unless further work is done on the Mitel KONTACT to build it into an office system. As a result Mitel will likely remain a niche vendor of PABXs. A major factor in their future success in office communications systems will depend on how fast they can achieve compatibility with systems vendors such as Wang and DEC. The Japanese PABX manufacturers also appear to be another serious threat on the horizon to Mitel, in the North American market. According to a Frost and Sullivan report, Japan's share of the PBX market will jump from $15 \%$ to $32 \%$ between 1983 and 1987.

The other major PABX vendors. Microtel and TIE/ Communications are subsidiaries of multinationals. Both are primarily telecommunications niche vendors in Canada and will not be major competitors in the integrated systems market. from theis Canadian base. However, both have manufacturing facilities here and, with their parents' resources, could become major niche exporters if they adopted a world product mandate strategy.

Good opportunities exist for Canadian firms manufacturing specialized data communications equipment and systems. The market is growing rapidly and the industry has a good technological base from Canada's traditional strength in telecommunication equipment. The U.S. market for modems and
multiplexers alone totalled over $\$ 1.2$ billion in 1982 and by 1987 is estimated to be worth nearly $\$ 3$ billion. (See Table 4-8). Canadian firms have mainly entered this market as niche vendors, such as Gandalf and Develcon, who have beem major innovators in the limited distance data set market.

The key characteristics essential to success in this market are:

1) the need for continuing technical innovation;
2) the need for compatibility of products both within a vendor's product line and with other types of. communications equipment;
3) the need for a clear market approach, i.e., total communications system supplier vs. niche or commodity supplier:
4) the need for efficient economies of scale in both manufacturing and distribution, to withstand the price pressures caused by intense competition.

The data communications market is not seriously affected by competition from Europe and Japan. This is largely due to the systems and service requirements of data communications. The importance of the service aspect was stressed by a Gandalf staff member recently commenting on the introduction of their PACX system to the U.S. market.
> '"... We didn't even attempt to sell it in the U.s. until we had the appropriate base of technical people trained to maintain the PACX, and until we had sufficient test equipment, spare parts and organization so that we could service a customer quickly..."

A few Japanese firms such as NEC and Fujitsu have participated in this market on an ОЕM basis. However, the unwillingness of large businesses to use products from new vendors will be another key barrier to foreign competition.

Digital voice messaging systems, or voice mail systems, are currently being offered or have been announced by such major vendors as IBM, Wang and Sperry. These systems are just emerging and are still in the embryonic stage of developo ment. There are opportunities in this area, but with the need for integration, these will be limited to the larger systems suppliers such as Northern Telecom and Mitel.

Opportunities exist for Canadian manufacturers of local area networks. There are several strong Canadian contenders such as Canstar and Crowntek/Waterloo Microsystems (See Section 4.4). However, the market may become much more threatening, when the current controversy over standards and the PABX versus LAN are finally resolved. Once standards are set. the market will become very competitive with only the best and most cost effective surviving.

With respect to the $P A B X$ versus LAN controversy, $a$. hybrid system will undoubtedly evolve. In the small office with a limited number of work stations and peripherals, the digital PABX will be adequate. Maximum transmission rates are in the area of 9.6 kilobytes and are within the capabilities of available digital PABXs . It is also more cost effective to use the installed base of telephone cable, than install coaxial cable, or fibre optics.

In an office where there is a requirment to have access to the mainframe(s) (for major file transfer and data manipulation): to use graphics and video; to handle high speed peripherals such as laser printers, and so forth; a LAN is the most effective solution. Of particular importance is the ability to access common shared resource peripherals. These devices are generally very expensive to provide to users individually but are comparatively inexpensive when use is distributed among many users. A coaxial cable or fibre optics based local area network can provide the high volume, high speed communications required.

A hybrid system involves an interface between the local area network and digital PABX. Through this interface, terminals connected to the PABX have access to all of the computer and peripheral ports just the same as those which are directly connected to the IAN. Another advantage to this system is that the both terminals on the PABX and on the LAN have access to a common modem pool for connection to the external worldwide communications system.

The threat to the Canadian LAN industry, is the potential dominance of the market by the large multinationals. As indicated previously, the lack of standards has resulted in a proliferation of LAN offerings. This may change as IBM enters the market. One view is that an IBM LAN could give legitimacy to the market and possibly increase the sale of all LANs. Another view is that the market is so small that after IBM takes its share, there might be nothing left. However, IBM does not as yet have a serious LAN offering. The current one is only an interim measure. Once IBM does come out with its LAN offering, standards will stabilize and the market will shake out into a smaller number of larger vendors, most of whom will have to have formed alliances with the major office communications systems vendors. in order to survive.

Opportunities exist for Canadian manufacturers in the production of storage peripherals. The most important are floppies and microfloppies, Winchester technology disks. and optical disks.

The microfloppy diskettes and regular floppies are considered opportunities because of the participation of Memorex. Didak and Dysam。 Currently the industry is growing at about $45 \%$ per year. The trend is towards the $31 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ microfloppy with 0.5 and over megabyte capacity. These units will capture the market where data portability is most important. At $\$ 2$ a diskette ${ }_{\theta}$ it's $^{\prime}$ as cheap to use a diskette as a file especially when they can be carried in the pocket.

Winchester disk systems also appear to be an opportunity. The first Winchesters that came on the market used 14" disks and these are still being used on mainframe systems. The market is moving down to standards of $51 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ disks and the even smaller $3^{\prime \prime}$ sizes are now emerging to suit the personal business computing market. It is here that the greatest growth is foreseen. Tallgrass Technologies Canada Inc. is a newly incorporated Canadian distributor of their U.S. parent's hard disk for microcomputers. They project sales of $\$ 12$ to $\$ 14$ million for 1984. There are no Canadian firms with Winchester disk technology. However, the market in Canada will soon develop to a size sufficient to support production, and possibly with Canadian government encouragement, firms such as Tallgrass can be persuaded to start manufacturing here.

Optical disk technology is on the threshold of becoming a viable alternative to magnetic recording for the mass storage of information. It will be used for the storage of large volumes of information in much the same way that paper is used today. The reason is the low cost of storage promised by optical disk technology, coupled with the speed and convenience with which the stored information can be handled. Optical disk technology is expected to be a complimentary system to the spinning magnetic disk and magnetic tape drive. Memorex, Philips, and Control Data are all strong in optical disk technology and there are opportunities for specialized applications. For example, Dexter Technology Corporation of Mountainview, California has manufactured wallet-size read-only
cards that use an optically modified surface. These cards are read by photo diode arrays. The advantage is the cards cost about $\$ 1.50$ each when manufactured in volume at 100,000 units per day. Each card can handle about two million characters or about 800 pages of text.

With the large $R \& D$ expenditures required, it is unlikely that Canadian firms will be able to enter this market as niche suppliers of optical disk systems. Currently, the major contenders are all large multinationals. However, there are many opportunities for applying optical disk technology to office systems and for using this technology in innovative ways to produce other systems and products (e.g. systems for technical manuals and maintenance). It is in this area that opportinities exist for Canadian firms. In addition, there will be opportunities for manufacturing in Canada by the multinationals. most of whom already have other plants here. Essential to this is the adoption of a world product mandate strategy by these firms, to produce in Canada as a comodity suppliex for domestic and export markets.

The greatest threat to Canadian mass storage suppliers is the fierce competition that can be expected from Japan. Weak marketing and cultural differences have so far inhibited the Japanese suppliers from major penetration of the computer market. As a result, they have followed a strategy of concentrating on peripheral equipment and are investing heavily in optical disk technology and other areas such as input/output devices.

Competition in the production of input/output devices is intense. Canadian industry is weak in this market and is expected to remain that way. There do not appear to be opportunities for new Canadian vendors unless they have a very unique product, or are multi-national subsidiaries with major financial and marketing capabilities. While Canada has one firm (Delphax) with a unique product in non-impact printing, the market will be tough with such established firms as IBM, Siemens, Xerox, Hewlett-Packard, Datapoint, and Canon being the major U.S. manufacturers. Japan is also rapidly entering this market, with such firms as Hitachi, Fuj̣itsu, Minolta, and NEC.

Growth of the facsimile market is expected to be encouraged by the introduction of advanced CCITT Group IV machines. There are no Canadian manufacturers and stiff competiton in the market is coming from Japanese vendors. Leading Japanese competitors include Hitachi, Matsushita, GEC, NEC, Ricoh, and Toshiba. Frost and Sullivan predict that the Japanese market share of facsimile equipment will increase from $54 \%$ to $85 \%$ in the $1983-1987$ period. As a result there appears to be no opportunities for Canadian manufacturing except under licence from one of the established firms.

Opportunities do exist in the merger of OCR and facsimile technologies. HiTech is currently the only Canadian company in a position to take advantage of this market. Howevers HiTech is small (65 employees) and may lack the financial strength to make the very large investments needed to be a major
player in this field. However, the firm does have the technological base to develop into a strong specialized supplier, particularly if it were able to obtain the required resources through association with a large corporation.

- Canada has a strong consulting software industry, developing custom systems, but is weak in applications software capability. There are no major Canadian suppliers of the most common packaged software for office automation. There are several smaller companies producing specialized software. For example, Logo in educational software officesmiths with their electronic filing cabinet and others with a variety of accounting and financial systems. However, even in these areas, much of the market is moving towards integrated software, and there are no major Canadian suppliers in this market. There are two reasons for this:

1) The market requires large expenditures on marketing and distribution. Canadian firms have the technical capability, but do not have the financial resources to market the product.
2) As software requires more and more integration the market for individual specialized software packages is declining.

The best opportunity is in integrated software packates for the international market. However, this market is dominated by U.S.
firms. There is already a shake-out in this industry and it is generally agreed that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a new firm to enter the market at this time and produce applications packages to compete with the major firms, like Microsoft. The exception would very specialized software targeted to a specific vertical market sector, e.g. forestry related business applications.

Canada's weakness in office communications systems software means increasing dependance on foreign vendors, in an information dominant society. This will not be good for Canada and may retard the development of the Canadian OCS industry. This problem is well known and the following comments are typical:
"Applications software is the fastest-growing segment of the market. It is expected to have an average annual growth of 34 percent to 1990."4-3
"In the past, many Canadian software companies failed despite the fact that they developed excellent technical products, because they could not solve financial and marketing problems."4-4
"Unlike U.S. start-ups., Canadian companies rarely have the five necessary ingredients for success o general management skills, financial management, technology, production and distribution."4-5

## FOOTNOTES

## CHAPTER 4

| 4-1 | UNIX was originally developed by Bell Laboratories for use on its own equipment. It was designed for minicomputers and therefore became more popular when the 16 bit microcomputers became available. UNIX has a large software base written in "C" but there are many variations of UNIX and not all support the same features. (See also Section 3.7.1 of Chapter 3。) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4-2. | "Corporate Strategies of U.S. Computer Companies." Newton Evans Research Company, 1983-1984 Edition. |
| 4-3 | "Growth Surge Marks the Software Industry" Globe and Mail, October 1983 |
| 4-4 | "Crowntek Sets Up Networks for Software" Globe and Mail. May 1984 |
| 4-5 | "Province Seeks to Widen Use of High Tech Innovations" Globe and Mail. April 1984 |

## APPENDIX 4A

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS -
MAJOR PUBLIC COMPANIES
IN THE

OFFICE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

| MEARE SORF <br> DSGCLOBLRE CO NO: ABG0G7S000 <br> GROGS REFEFENCE: NA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AUditor change: Na |  |  |
| AUDITOR: ARTHLR ANDERSEN \& CO. |  |  |
| ALOITOR'S REFORT: LINQUALIFIED |  |  |
| fiscal year ending | 12/30/83 | 12/31/82 |
|  | ASSETS (000 | 005) |
| Cash | 27,565 | 4,997 |
| MRKTABLE SECURITIES | NA | NA |
| RECEIVABLES | 249,276 | 154.275 |
| Inventories | 123,261 | 156,519 |
| Ran materials | Na | NA |
| WORK IN PRUGRESS | NA | NA |
| FINISHED G000 | NA | NA |
| notes receivable | NA | NA |
| ITHER CURRENT ASSETS | 21,059 | 21.969 |
| total current assets | 421,131 | 355,756 |
| FROP, FLANT \& EQUIP | 413,627 | 309,251 |
| accumulateo dep | 170,802 | 128,113 |
| NET PROF \& EDUIF | 242,025 | 183.183 |
| INVEST \& ADU TO SLis | NA | NA |
| OTH NON-CUR AGSETS | 59.645 | 42.429 |
| deferred changes | NA | NA |
| INTANGIELES | Na | NA |
| DEFOSITS \& OTH ASSET | NA | NA |
| TOTAL ASSETS | 723,651 | 565.320 |
|  | LIABILITIES | (0005) |
| NOTES PAYABLE | 22,035 | 16,296 |
| Accolints payable | 23,305 | 26,249 |
| CUR LONG TERM DEBT | 1,778 | 1,024 |
| ELR PORT CAP LEASES | NA | NA |
| ACCRUED EXPENSES | 99,183 | NA |
| Income taxes | NA | MiA |
| OTher clirrent liab | 56.373 | 118,051 |
| TOTAL Clirrent liab | 208,134 | 161,600 |
| MORTGAGES | NA | NA |
| DEFERRED CHARGES/INC | 36,681 | 53,245 |
| CONVERTIBLE DEET | NA | NA |
| LONG TERM DEET | 56,447 | 78,053 |
| non-cur cap leases | NA | NA |
| OTHER LONG TERM Liab | NA | NA |
| total liabilities | 351,312 | 294,898 |
| MINORITY INT (LIAB) | NA | NA |
| FREFERRED STOCK | NA | NA |
| COMmON STOCK NET | 1.940 | 877 |
| Eapital slirplus | 237,465 | 175.695 |
| REtained Earnings | 132,934 | 93,850 |
| TREASURY STIOCK | NA | NA |
| OTHER LIABILITIES | NA | NA |
| SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY | 372,339 | 270.422 |
| TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH | 723,651 | 565,320 |
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AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: COOPERS \& LYBRAND
AUDITORS REPORT: UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING 12 31, 33 1231, 32 ASSETS (0005)
CASH
MFKTAELE SECURITIES RECEIVABLES
INVENTORIES
RAW MATERIALS
WORK IN PROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NOTES RECEIVABLE
OTHER CURRENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS
PROP: PLANT \& EQUIP
ACCUMULATED DEP
NET PROP \& EQUIP
INVEST \& ADV TO SUBS
OTH NON-CUR ASSETS
DEFERRED CHARGES
INTANGIBLES
DEPOSITS \& ETH ASSET
TOTAL ASSETS
$4,775,100 \quad 2,453,700$
$\mathrm{NH} \quad \mathrm{NH}$
3,730,500 3,573,500
$1,436,300 \quad 1,173,800$
NA NA
NA NA
NA NA
$\mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{NA}$
674.200 245,800
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CUR PORT CAP LEASES
ACCRUED EXPENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURRENT LIAS
TOTAL CURRENT LIAR
MORTGAGES
DEFERRED CHARGESJINC CONVERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEBT
NON-CUR CAP LEASES
OTHER LONG TERM LIME
TOTAL LIABILITIES
MINORITY INT (LIAS)
PREFERRED STOCK
COMMON STOCK NET
CAPITAL SURPLUS
RETAINED EARNINGS
TREASURY STOCK
OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY
TOT LIAS \& NET WORTH

| NA | NA |
| ---: | ---: |
| $1,462,500$ | $1,339,700$ |
| $2,307,500$ | $3,045,000$ |
| $N A$ | $N A$ |
| $2,816,800$ | $3,491,300$ |
| $N A$ | 263,700 |
| $9,261,900$ | $5,619,300$ |
| $15,868,700$ | $13,959,500$ |
| $N A$ | $N A$ |

26,055, 100 25, 220,800
NA NA
$44,810,300 \quad 44,105,000$
NA NA

NA NA
86,734,000 83,885,300
$510,500 \quad 535,800$
1,522,500
965.700

36,289,800
23,506,500

62,234,900
149,539,800
1,851,400
896.400

32,120,100
28,808,500
NA
NA
$63,764,400$
$148,185,500$

そET SALES
EQST G GOOOS
GRDSE FRDFIT
F \＆EXFENDITURES EE：L GEN \＆AOMIN EXP INE BEF DEP \＆AMURT DEFEECIATIDN \＆$\triangle M O R T$ NOM－DPERATINE INE MTEFEST EXFESSE INEGYE BEFORE TAX FREU FDR INE TAXES MINDRITY INT（INC） INVEST GAING，LOSSES OTHER INGCOME
NET INE BEF EX ITEMS EK ITEMS \＆DISC OPS NET INCOHE IUTSTANDINE SHARES

DMARTERLY REPORT FOR
$\because こ T$ SALES
EUST OF GOODS
GROSS FROFIT
F \＆E EXPENDITURES
SELL SEN $\therefore$ ADMIN EXP TNG EEF DEF \＆AMORT EEPRECIATIDN \＆AMORT NON－DFERATING ING INTEREST EXPENSE INCUME BEFORE TAX FROU FOR INC TAXES MINGRITY INT（INC） IHEST GAINS／LOSSES DTHEF INCOME NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \＆DISC OPS MET INGOPE
DUTSTANDING SHARES
$12 / 31 / 33$
OTAO
INCOME STATEMENT（GOOS

$$
\therefore 0, \geq 15,000
$$

E5， 566,4015 シE，BEA． 70 20，313，400 20，114，700 17，617，200 $49,400,500$

45，751，700 41，537，500 507.200 $15,3417,400$ $22,185,0100$ 7． 900,310 303.900 4，シ52，800 $10,230,700$ $4,119.1015$ N MA 711,300 6，322，301 NA
$5,322,300$ 815，108，000

36玉，200 25，703，5010 22，834，900 3，854，200 393，700 4，307，200 9，067．200 3，371，300 NA NH 50，700 5，745，800 （5，497，900） 248，700
965，731，000

610， 600
21，218，010 23，523，100 8，7：34，500 327.000 $3,330,000$
$11,585,600$ $4,530,300$ NA 336，700 6，992，000 286，800 $7,278,300$ 396，425，000

123431

## 03／31／84

06／30／34
$09 / 30 / 84$ INCOME STATEMENT（000S）

$$
8,139,300
$$

3，842，500 $4,256,700$

535，100
$3,318,510$ 440，200 NA 131,300 210，300 360，500 133，600 NA NA NA 236，900 NA 226，900
996，223，000
EEGMENT DATA
NA

3，627，301 3，003，300
$3.380 .400 \quad 3.947 .100$ $4,646,900 \quad 4,062,800$ $592,500 \quad 575,500$ 3，259，900 2．976，1000 $794,700 \quad 507,500$


SALES（DOOS）OP INCOME

FIUE YEAR SIJMMARY


EOPHENTS：
DFERATING EXFENSES TREATED AS SELLING，GENERAL \＆ADHINISTAATIUE EXPENEES （10－0 03－31－83）（10－0 06－30－83）（10－Q 03－30－33）；0THER INCOME IS EQUITY EHRNING（10－4 03－31－33）（10－0 06－30－83）（10－1 09－30－33）（1983 ANNUAL KEFORT TO SHAREHOLDERS）：CASH INCLUDES MARKETABLE SECURITIES：NET OF DRAFTS DLTSTANDING；DEFDSITS \＆UTHER ASSETS INCLUDES DEFERRED EHARGES：EXTRAORDINARY ITEM IS EFFECT OF CHANEE IN ALCOUNTING POLIEIESIDUTSTANDING STOCK AS OF
 IS 1，D25， 561,000 AND AS OF $10-31-84$ IS 1，027，460．000（10－0 09－30－54）

AFFLE COMFUTEF INC DISCLOSURE CD NO: A71. 500000 CROSS REFEFENCE: NA
aUditar change: na
AUDITOR: ARTHUK YOUNG \& COMFANY AUDITOR'S REFORT: UNGUALIFIED FIGCAL VEAR ENDIUG

09/30/8S
$09 / 24 / 92$
ASSETS (000S)
145,284
153.056

NA
MRKTABLE SECURITIES
FECEIVAELES
$156.420 \quad 71,478$

INVENTORIES 142,457 75, 568
FAW MATERIALS
WOFK IN FROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NaTES RECEIVABLE
OTHER CURRENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS
FROF: FLANT \& EQUIF
ACCUNULLATED DEF
NET FROF \& EQUIF
INVEST \& ADV TO SUES
OTH NON-CUR ASSETS
deFERFED CHARGES
INTANGIELES
DEFOSITS \& OTH ASSET
TOTAL ASSETS

| NA | NA |
| :--- | :--- |
| NA | NA |

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { NA } & \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } & \text { NA }\end{array}$
NA - NA
46,852 11, 512

| 468,995 | 311,214 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 169,960 | 57,294 |
| 42,910 | 22,811 |
| 67,050 | 54,485 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 20,586 | 12,090 |
| 556,579 | 357,787 |

LIABILITIES (OOOS)
NA 4,185
NDTES FAYAELE
ACCOUNTS FAYABLE
CUF LONG TERM DEET
CUR FOFT CAF LEASES
ACCRUED EXFENSES
income taxes
athef curfent liab
tatal current liag moftgages
DEFEFRED CHARGES/INC
CONVERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEBT
NON-CUF CAF LEASES
OTHER LONG TEFM LIAB
total liabilities
MINORITY INT (LIAB)
FREFERRED STOCK
COMMION STICK NET
CAFITAL SURPLUS
FETAINED EAFNINGS
TREASURY STOCK
OTHEF LIAEILITIES
SHAREHOLDEF"S EQUITY
TOT LIAE \& NET WORTH

| NA | 4,185 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 52,701 | 25,125 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 57,31 | 24,349 |
| NA | 15,307 |
| 38,764 | 16,790 |
| 128,786 | 85,756 |
| NA | NA |
| 48,584 | 12,887 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 1,308 | 2,052 |
| NA | NA |
| 178,678 | 100,675 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 185,715 | 141,070 |
| NA | NA |
| 195,046 | 118,532 |
| NA | NA |
| 6801 | 6,3101 |

FIEGAL YEAF ENDING
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GFOSS FFOFIT
Fi \& D EXFENDITUFES
GELL GEN \& ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF $\%$ AMORT DEFFECIATIDN \& FMOFT NDN-DFEFATING INC INTEFEGT EXFENSE INCOME EEFDFE TAX FROV FOF INC TAXES MINOFITY INT (INC) INVEST GAINS/LOSSES
QTHEF INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \% DISC DFS
NET INCONE
DUTSTANDING SHAFES
QUAFTEFLY FEFGRT FOF
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS FROFIT
F \& D EXFENDITUFES
SELL GEN $\because$ ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF \& AMORT DEFFECIATION \% AMOFT NON-DFEFATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFOFE TAX
FROU FOF INC TAXES
MINOFITY INT (INE)
INVEST GAINS/LOGSES
OTHEF: INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OFS
NET INCOME
GUTSTANDING GHAFES
gEGMENT DATA
NA
$07 / 30 / 8.09 / 24 / 82 \quad 09 / 25 / 61$
INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)
782, 767
505,765 477,004 60.040 287. 325 129,6.59 NA 16,483 NA
146:122 69.40E NA NA NA
76,714 NA
76.714
59.178 .397

12/30/8\%
INCOME
ㅍ6.227
182, 828
1 $3: 401$
25.269

102,671 5,461

NA 5,125 NA
10,586 4,764

NA
NA
NA 5.822

NA
5.822

59,409,868

FIVE TEAR SUMMARY
YEAF
1793
SALES (000S)
782.769

5日ت゙・061
1792
3.4.78.
117.126

1790
1979

NET INCOME
76.714 1.28
61.3061 .06
$39.420 \quad 0.70$
$11.698 \quad 0.24$ 5.0750 .12

COMMENTS:
CASH INCLUDES MARKETAELE SECLURITIES:OTHER EQUITY IS NOTES FECETVAELE FRDM GHFFEHOLDEFG: NONOFEFAT ING INCOME IS NET INTEFEST AND DTHEF TMCDME (10-G 12-30-23)

BURROUGHS CORF
DISCLOSURE CO ND: B948600000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: PRICE WATERHOUSE AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED FISCAL YEAR ENDING

CASH
MRKTABLE SECURITIES RECEIVABLES
INVENTORIES
RAW MATERIALS
WORK: IN PROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NOTES RECEIVABLE
OTHER CURRENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS FROE, FLINT \& EQUIP ACCUMULATED DEF
NET FFIOF \& EQUIP
INVEST \& ADV TO SUBS
ETH NON-CUR ASSETS
deferred charges
INTANGIBLES
DEPOSITS \& OTH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS

NOTES PAYABLE
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
CUR L Lang term debt
CUR FORT CAP LEASES
ACCRUED EXPENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURRENT LIAR
total current liam:
mortgages
deferred charges/inc
CONVERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEBT
non-Cur cap leases
OTHER LONG TERM LIAR
total liabilities
MINORITY INT (LAB)
PREFERRED STOCK
COMMON STOCK NET
CAPITAL SURPLUS
RETAINED EARNINGS
TREASURY STOCK
OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER "S EQUITY
TOT LIAR \& NET WORTH


FIGGML YEAF ENDING
MET SALES
COST OF GODDS
GEOSS FFDFIT
F：D EXFENDITURES
GELL GEN \＆ADNIN EXF INC EEF DEF \＆AMDFT DEFRECIATIDN \＆AMDFT WON OFCESATTHG IRC INTEREST EXFENSE INCOME EEFDFE TAX FFOU FDF INC TAXES MINOFITY INT（INC） INVEST GAINS／LDSSES GTHEF INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \＆DISC DFS NET INCDIUE OUTGTANDING GHAFES

QUAFTERLY FEFOFT FOF
NET SALES
COST OF GODDS GFOSS FROFIT F 2 D EXFENDITUEES SELL GEN ：ADMIN EXF INC EEF DEF \＆AMDET DEFFEEIATION：AMORT NON－DFERATING INC INTEFEST EXPENSE INCOME BEFORE TAX FFOU FDR INC TAXES MINOFITY INT（INC） INVEST GAINS／LDSSES OTHEF INCOME NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS ：DISC DFS NET INCOME
DUTGTANDING SHAFES

## SEGMENT DATA

NA

12／31／8 $\quad 12 / 31 / 82 \quad 12 / 21 / 81$
INCOME GTATEMENT（OOOS）
$4,296,500 \quad 4,095,291 \quad \Xi, 313,491$
$2,638,500 \quad 2,669,690 \quad 1,896,360$
$1,658,000 \quad 1,425,601 \quad 1,422.121$
$248,200 \quad 220,560$ 220，187
$1,084,900 \quad 1,048,780 \quad 889.677$
224．900 150．261 シ12，267
NA NA NA
$93,200 \quad 80,760 \quad 86,937$
$115,400 \quad 172,095 \quad 145,078$
502，700 75，12日 254，126
$105,800 \quad$（16，100）105，200
NA NA NA
NA NA NA
NA NA NA
$176.700 \quad 148.228$ 1486
NA 26，400 NA
$117.628 \quad 148,926$
$42,176,000 \quad 42,022,000$
06／ד0／84 09／80／84
$\begin{array}{cc}03 / 51 / 84 & 06 / \Xi O / 84 \\ \text { INCOME STATEMENT（OOOS）}\end{array}$
$1,082,500 \quad 1,217,800 \quad 1,136.800$
$665.400 \quad 515.200 \quad 691.400$
$417.100 \quad 402.600 \quad 45.400$
$64.800 \quad 67.100 \quad 70.500$
$275.700 \quad 528.400 \quad 281.100$
$78,600 \quad 105,100 \quad 95.800$
NA NA NA
16，900
26,200
69.300
26.300

NA
NA．
NA
43,000
NA
4．3． 006
$45,390,712$
15,900
28,500
72，500
$52.200 \quad 26.800$
NA NA
NA NA
NA NA
$57,300 \quad 50.200$
NA
50，200
$45,3.37,485$
SALES（OOOS）DF INCOME

FIVE TEAF GUMMAFY

| YEAF | SALES | （000s） | NET．INCOME | EFG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1983 | 4．387．700 |  | 196．900 | 4.60 |
| 1782 | 4，186， 300 |  | 117，600 | 2.80 |
| 1791 | 玉，405，400 |  | 148． 900 | ．58 |
| 1780 | 2，902．400 |  | 82.000 | 1.97 |
| 1979 | 2，851．000 |  | 505，500 | 7.45 |

COMMENTS：
FINANCIAL DATA TAKEN FROM 198.5 ANNUAL REFORT TO SHAREHOLDEFS：CASH INCLUDESSHDFT－TEFM IAUESTMENTS：OTHER EQUITY IS FRGN．CURRENEY TRANSLATION GDJUETMENT：FIVE YEAF：SLMMAFY SALES REFFESENT TDTAL FEVENUES

## CONVERGENT TECHNOLOGIES INC DISCLOSURE CO NO: C757200000 CROSS REFERENCE: NA

AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: COOPERS \& LYBRAND
AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED



FISCAL YEAR ENDING
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT

R \& D EXPENDITURES SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP. :NC REF DEP \& AMORT DEPRECIATION \& ABORT NON-OPERATING INC INTEREST EXPENSE INCOME BEFORE TAX PRON FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INVEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER INCOME NET INC REF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS NET INCOME OUTSTANDING SHARES


SALES (DOS) OP INCOME
SEGMENT DATA
NA
FIVE YEAR SUMMARY

| YEAR | GALES (ODS) | NET | INCOME | GPS |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1983 | 163.542 | 14.903 | 0.40 |  |
| 1982 | 36.462 | 11.915 | 0.42 |  |
| 1981 | 13.105 | 777 | 0.04 |  |
| 19.0 | 351 | $(3.365)$ | $N A$ |  |
| 1979 | $N A$ | $(317)$ | $N A$ |  |

COMMENTS:
FINANCIALS TAKEN FROM 1983 ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS; OTHER LIABILITIES IS NOTES RECEIVABLES FROM SHAREHOLDERS ;FIVE YEARS SUMMARY DATA FOR 1979 IS
FOR FIVE MONTH PERIOD

TATA GENEFAL COFF
DISCLDSURE CO ND：D102000000
CRUSS REFERENCE：NA
ALDITOR CHANGE：NA
AUDITOF：FFICE WATERHOUSE
AUDITOF＊S REFORT：UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING

| 09／24／83 | 09／25／82 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ASEETS | （0005） |
| 210， 815 | 155， 324 |
| 24，225 | 56，554 |
| 169.637 | 167：768 |
| 216．280 | 217， 210 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 9：585 | 8，450 |
| 630,540 | 585，406 |
| 421，822 | －58，090 |
| 207，476 | 157.015 |
| 214， 346 | 201．077 |
| n．NA | NA |
| －NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |

CASH
MFKTAELE SECURITIES
FECEIVABLES
INVENTOFIES
FAW MATEFIALS
WOFK：IN FROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NOTES FECEIVABLE
OTHER CURFENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURFENT ASSETS
FFOP：FLANT \＆EQUIF
ACCUMLLATED DEF
NET FROF＊EQUIF
INVEST \＆ADV TG SLES
DTH NON－CUR ASSETS
－NA
NA
DEFEFRED CHAFGES
INTANGIELES
DEFOSITS \＆OTH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS

844．886
786．483
LIABILITIES（OOOS）

| 16．452 | 15.166 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 46，12S | 45，580 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 23040 | 19．6．88 |
| 67，787 | 63，181 |
| 55.751 | 44,465 |
| 209，15． | 188，030 |
| NA | NA |
| 27，857 | 30,177 |
| NA | NA |
| 138，978 | 139，こご |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 375，888 | 357．440 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 226 | 218 |
| 140，526 | 123，714 |
| 528，246 | 305，111 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 468，998 | 429．043 |
| 844，886 | 786．483 |

1. L. SCAL YEAFE END ING

HET SALES
LIOST OF GOODS
FFOSS FFOFIT
Fi $\&$ EXFENDITUFES SELL GEN : ADMIN EXF INC EEF DEF \& AMORT DEFFECIATIDN \& AMOFT HBN-OFEFATING INC INTEREST EXFENSE INCOME EEFORE TAX FFOU FOF INC TAXES MINOFITY INT (INC) INVEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER IMCOME WET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITENS : DISC DFS NET INCOME OUTSTANDING SHAFES

QUAFTEFLY FEFDFT FOF

NET SALES
CUST DF GOUDS
BFOSS FROFIT
F 2 E EXFENDITUFES SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXF TNC EEF DEF : AMORT DEFFECIATION: AMORT NON-OFEFATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFDRE TAX FFROU FOR INC TAXES MINOEITY INT (INC) INVEST GAING/LOSSES OTHEF INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \% BISC DFS NET IMCOME
UUTSTANDING SHAFES
SEGMENT DATA
$\because A$
$09 / 24 / 83$ 09/25/82 09/26/81
INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)
828.704 805.710 756.872
476. 591 457.414 582.555

픈.515 $\quad 348,496 \quad 354,317$
84:662 84,538 74,573
2J1, 521 228,052 198, 587
$36,550 \quad 31,355$
NA NA NA
21,290 18,727 15, 878
$16.810 \quad 17,582 \quad 19,58.5$ $41.010 \quad 37.051 \quad 75.550$ 17.975

NA
NA
NA
2玉:135
NA
23:125
$22,641,00 \%$
12/17/83
INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)


217,586 27:946 19.714
50.11

13:615
1.430

15:045 21.007
4.018

25,902
7,842
NA
NA
16,960
3.47
19.5.
$24,190,000$

SALES (OOOS) OF INCOME

FIVE YEAR SUMMAFY
YEAF:
1785
SALES
(0005)

NET
INCOME
EFS
25:15E 0.76
24.6581 .14

1792
928.904
805.710

756,872
653.887
507.48 .5
$50,663 \quad 2.39$
$54.690 \quad 2.60$
$49.814 \quad 2.41$

COMMENTS:
$\therefore$ ASH INCLUDES MAFKETAELE SECURITIES:19日2 EALANCE SHEET IS RESTATEE

DATAFOINT COFF
DISCLOSUFE CO NO：D157000000
CFOSS REFEFENCE：WAS COHFUTER TERMINAL CORF
AUDITOR CHANGE：NA
AUDITOF：FEAT，MAFWIEK゙，MITCHELL \＆ED． AUDITOR＇S FEFORT：UNGUALIFIED

FISCAL YEAR ENDING
CASH
MRK゙TAELE SECURITIES FECEIVABLES
INVENTOFIES
RAW MATERIALS
WORE IN FROGFESS
FINISHED GOUDS
NOTES RECEIVABLE
QTHEF CURFENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURFENT ASSETS
FROF，FLANT \＆EOUIF
ACCUMULATED DEF
NET FFOF \＆EQUIF
INVEST \＆ADV TO SUES
DTH NDN－CUR ASSETS
DEFEFRED CHAFGES
INTANGIELES
DEFOSITS \＆DTH ASSET
TOTAL ASSETS

NOTES F＇AYAELE
ACCOUNTS FAYAELE
CUF LONG TEFM DEET
CUR FGRT LAF LEASES
ACCRUED EXFENSES
INCOME TAXES
GTHER CURRENT LIAE
TOTAL CURRENT LIAE
MORTGAGES
DEFERFED CHAFGES／INC
CONVEFTIRLE DEET
LDNG TERM DEET
NON－CUF CAF LEASES
DTHER LONG TEFN LIAE
TOTAL LIAEILITIES
MINORITY INT（LIAE）
FREFERFED STOCK
COMMON STOCK NET
CAFITAL SURFLUS
FETAINED EAFNINGS
TFEASURY STOCK：
वTHEF LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER＇S EQUITY
TOT LIAE \＆NET WOFTH


LIAEILITIES（OOOS）
8．1．38 14．597
28．020 21，053
$8,299 \quad 5,479$

NA
NA
$55.451 \quad 58.892$
$\because 997$ 2．479
$1.927 \quad 1.834$
$105.802 \quad 104,354$ NA NA
27．172 9．856 NA NA
12お． 737 131，603 NA NA NA NA
$256.711 \quad 245.795$ NA（19E） NA NA
$5.026 \quad 4.992$
1日7．227 185．253
$149,251 \quad 141,174$ NA NA
（11，541）（5，269）
$329.965 \quad 526.150$
$586.674 \quad 571.750$

FISCAL YEAF ENDING
NET SALEES
CUST OF GOODS
GFOSS FROFIT
F: D EXFENDITUFES
SELL GEN ADMIN EXF INC EEF DEF : AMOFT DEFFECIATION \& AMDRT NON-DFEFATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFOFE TAX FFOU FOF INC TAXES MINOFITY INT (INE) INVEST GAINSILDSSES
OTHEF: INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC DFS NET INCDME UUTSTANDING SHAFES

QUAFTEFLY FEFOFT FOF
NET GALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS FFROFIT
$R \&$ D EXFENDITUFES
SELL GEN 2 ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF \& AMDRT
DEFFECIATION \& AMDRT
NON-DFEFATING INC
INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFDRE TAX FROV FOF: INC TAXES MINDFITY INT (INE) INUEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHEF INCOME
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC OFS NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING BHAFES


SEGMENT DATA
NA
FIVE YEAR SUMMAFY
YEAF
1793
1782
1981
1780
1979
SALES
540.192

506, 486 449:490
표, 826
232,101
(0005)

NET INCOME
EFS
8.077
0.40
$2.405 \quad 0.12$
48,761 2.45
23.478 1.90
$25.246 \quad 1.46$
COMMENTS:
NA

OEVELCON ELECTRONICS LTD
DISCLOSURE CO NO: D464500000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
auditor change: Na
AUDITOR: FEAT, MARWICK, MITCHELL \& CO.
AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED;EXCEPT FOR, CHANGE IN THE METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR DEUELOPMENT COSTS WITH WHICH THE ALIDITORE CONCUR
FISCAL YEAR ENDING 08/31/83 03/31/82
ASSETS (0005)
CASH
MRKTABLE SECURITIES
RECEIVABLES 1,047 3,203 $\mathrm{Na} \quad \mathrm{Na}$

INUENTORIES
RAW MATERIALS
WORK IN PROGRESS
5,616 2,804
4,221 1,640
Na Na
FINISHED GOODS $\mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{Na}$

NOTES RECEIVABLE NA NA

OTHER CURRENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS
PRQP, PLANT \& EQUIF
ACCUMULATED DEP
NET PROP \& EQUIP
INUEST \& ADU TO SUBS
OTH NON-CUR ASSETS
Na Na
$486 \quad 336$
11,370 7,988
1,808 1,229
NA NA

DEFERRED CHAREES
INTANGIBLES
DEPOSITS \& OTH ASSET
TUTAL ASSETS
13,261 9,271

NOTES PAYABLE
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
CUR LONG TERM DEBT
CUR PORT CAF LEASES
ACCRUED EXPENSES
income taxes
OTHER CURRENT LIAB
TOTAL CURRENT LIAB mortgages
1.308 1.229

83 NA
$\mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{NA}$
NA NA
NA .NA
$\mathrm{Na} \quad 54$
13,261 9,271
LIABILITIES (000S)
650 NA
1,112662
3254
NA NA
$471 \quad 241$

DEFERRED CHARGES/INC
782613
Na Na
$3,047 \quad 1,570$
$\mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{NA}$
CONVERTIBLE DEBT NA NA
LONG TERM DEBT 531 576
non-cur caf leases
OTHER LUNG TERM LIAB
total Liabilities
MINORITY INT (LIAB)
freferred stock
COMMON STOCK NET
CAFITAL SURPLUS
RETAINED EARNINGS
treasury stock.
OTHER LIABILITIES

| NA | NA |
| ---: | ---: |
| NA | NA |
| 3,749 | 2,276 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 4,785 | 4,785 |
| NA | NA |
| 4,883 | 2,366 |
| 156 | 156 |
| NA | NA |
| 9,512 | 6,995 |
| 13,261 | 9,271 |


| NA | NA |
| ---: | ---: |
| NA | NA |
| 3,749 | 2,276 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 4,735 | 4,785 |
| NA | NA |
| 4,883 | 2,366 |
| 156 | 156 |
| NA | NA |
| 9,512 | 6,995 |
| 13,261 | 9,271 |

SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY
TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH

FISCAL YEAR ENOINIG
r:ET SALES
EOST OF GOODS
EROSS FROFIT
F \& O EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP INE BEF DEP \& AMORT DEPRECIATION \& AMORT AUN-DFERATING INE INTEREST EXPENSE : NCOME BEFGRE TAX FROU FOR INC TAKES :IINORITY INT (INC) INUEST GAINS/LOSSES ITHER INCOME NET INE BEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS FET INCOME
dutstanding shares
DUARTERLY REFGRT FOR

- IET SALEE

OUST OF GOODS
GROSS FFOFIT
F \& D EXPENDITURES
EELL EEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC EEF DEF \& AMORT DEPRECTATION \& AMORT
NONGIDERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE
income before tax
PROU FOR INC TAXES
MINORITY INT (INC)
IMNEST GADNS/LOSSES
other income
NET INC beF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
REET INCOHE
:JUTSTANDING SHARES
EEGMENT DATA
NA
FIUE YEAR SUMMARY
(RAR
$\because E A R$
$\because O S S$
1982
$\begin{array}{ll}1981 & 6,673 \\ 1980 & 3,089\end{array}$
1979 1,258
$06,31 / 82 \quad 06,81 / 81$
$03 / 31 / 83$
INEOME STATEMENT (000S)
INCDME STATE, 9,660 (0006) 6,573
6,014 3,909 2,804
$10,177 \quad$ 5,751 3,869
572 . 290 264
5.133 2.823 1,802 4,472 2,633 1,503 304129 93
$263 \quad 73$. NA
$83 \quad 279$ 262

4,343 2,293 1.42e
$1,831 \quad 984$
$\mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{NA}$
NA NA NA
NA NA
$2.517 \quad 1.314 \quad 931$
NA NA
$1,314 \quad 931$
2, 837,500 NA
$02 / 29 / 84 \quad 05 / 31 / 84$
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)


SALES (000S) OP INCOME

COMPENTS:
*FOREIGN CURRENCY, CANADIAN DOLLARS:ALL INFORMATION FROM EEGST FOI NO. 2-57522, 10-31-33;CASH INCLUDES BANK TERM DEPOSITS;EXTRAORGINARY ITEM IS TAX EENEFIT FROM OPERATING LOSS GARRYFOWARD (10-0 05-3L-34::

```
% TYPE 3/E/
```

$3 / 81$
0002530
oIgital equifment gorf
DISCLOSURE CO NO: DS70000000
CROES REFERENCE: NA

AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: CQOPERS \& LYERAND AUDITOR'S REFDRT: UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING 06/30,84 07/02/83 ASSETS (000S)
CASH
MRKTABLE SECURITIES
RECEIVAELES
INUENTORIES
Raw materials
WORK IN PROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
notes receivable
OTHER CURRENT ASSETE
total current aseets
FROF, PLANT \& EQUIP accumblated dep
NET FROF \& EQUIP
INVEST \& ADU TO SUBS
OTH NON-CUR ASSETS 476,150

556,209 NA
1,527,257 1,125,037
1,852,168 1,353,830
$456.490 \quad 320.820$
614,766 557,509
780,912 475,501
NA NA
226.353 165,283

4,081,513 3,201,355
2,351,786 1,561,368
840,446. 621,642
$1,511,340 \quad 1,339,725$
NA NA

DEFERRED CHARGES NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA
INTANGIBLES NA NA
DEPOSITS \& OTH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS

NOTES PAYABLE
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
CUR LONG TERM DEBT
CUR PORT CAF LEASES
5,593,253 4,541,085
LIABILITIES (000S)
13,1E1 14,897

278,111 213,728
$1,374 \quad 1,371$
NA Na
224,036 194,035
incume taxes
OTHER CURRENT LIAB
total current liab mortgages
DEFERRED CHARGES/INC
COHERRTIBLE DEET
312.871

250,971
$1,080,544$
NA
221,820
176,516
824,367 NA
92.150 82.625

| 92,160 | 82,625 |
| ---: | ---: |
| NA | NA |
| 441,313 | $92,8 \mathrm{NA}$ |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| $1,514,037$ | 999,803 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 57,811 | 56,357 |
| $1,610,575$ | $1,509,781$ |
| $2,310,830$ | $1,975,144$ |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| $3,979,216$ | $3,541,282$ |
| $5,593,253$ | $4,541,035$ |

LONG TERM DEET
non-cur cap leases
OTHER LONG TERM LIAB
total liabilities $\begin{array}{rr}\text { NA } & \text { Ne, } 2.0 \\ \text { NH }\end{array}$ NA NA

MINORITY INT (LIAB)
FREFERRED STOCK
COMMON STOCK NET
cafital surplus
RETAINED EARNINGS
treasury stock
OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER'S EGUITY
TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH


[^0]DVEAN COFF
disclosure co no: D990000000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
aUditor change: na
AUDITOF: FFICE WATEFHOUSE
AUDITOF:S REFORT: UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING 10/29/8S ASSETS (000S)

| 60,678 | 14,771 |
| ---: | ---: |
| NA | NA |

MFKTABLE SECURITIES
FECEIVABLES
5,619 25,170
anventories $35,387 \quad 35,220$
RAW MATERIALS
NA . NA
WOFE IN FROGRESS NA NA
FINTSHED GOODS
notes receivable
OTHER CURRENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURFENT ASSETS
FRREF, FLANT \& EQUIF
ACCUMULATED DEF
NET FROF \& EQUIF INVEST \& ADV TO SUES OTH NON-CUF ASSETS NA NA
NA NA
$2,048 \quad 4,965$
$151,732 \quad 78,126$
$100,396 \quad 80.850$
NA NA
$100,396 \quad 80,850$
6.737 10.851

DEFERRED CHARGES
NA NA
INTANGIELES
DEFQSITS \& OTH ASSET tatal assets
NA NA
$2.020 \quad 1.151$
$240,735 \quad 170,778$

NOTES FAYABLE
ACCOUNTS FAYABLE
CUR LONG TEFM DEET
CUF FDRT CAF LEASES
ACCRUED EXFENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURRENT LIAE
TOTAL EURRENT LIAE mortgages
DEFERRED CHARGES/INC CONVERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEET
non-clif cap leases
OTHER LONG TERM LIAE
total Liabilities
mindeity int (LiAB)
FREFERRED STOCK
COMMON STOCK NET
CAFITAL SUFFLUS
RETAINED EAFNINGS
TREASURY STOCK
OTHER LIAEILITIES
shareholder's eguity
TOT LIAE \& NET WORTH
LIABILITIES (OOOS)

| NA | NA |
| ---: | ---: |
| 18.570 | 9,128 |
| 861 | 728 |
| NA | NA |

$5,211 \quad 4,387$
$\begin{array}{ll}6.888 & 4,262 \\ 758 & 856\end{array}$
2.285 17, 256

NA NA
9.179 5.999

| 10,218 | 5,000 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 9.097 | 9.657 |
| NA | NA |
| 60,777 | 40.012 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |

101.592 101.324

NA NA
78.564 27.642

NA NA
NA NA
$180.150 \quad 130,966$
240.735 170,978
$\therefore$ OLAL TEAF ENDING

NET GALES
COST OF GODDS
GFOGS FROFIT
F $\because$ E EAFENDITUFES
GELL GEN ？GDNIN EXF
INC EEF DEF \＆AMDFT
DEFFECIATION $\because$ AMOFT
NON－OFEF：ATING INC
INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFDFE TAX
FFIOU FOF INC TAXES
MINOFITY INT（INC）
INVEST GAINS／LOSSES
OTHEF INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEHS ：DISC OFS
NET INCONE
OUTSTANDING SHAFES

DUARTEFLY FEFOFT FFOF
NET SALES
COST OF EOOOS
GFOSS FFOFIT
Fi D EXFENDITUFES
SELL GEN \％ALMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF \＆AMOFT
DEFFECIATTON \＆AMDFT
NON－DFEFATING INC
INTEFEST EXFENSE
INCOME BEFOFE TAX FFROU FOR INC TAXES MINOFITY INT（INC） INVEST GAIMS／LOSSES DTHEF TNCOME NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \＆DISC OFS NET INCOME
DUTETANDING SHAFES

|  | 10／29／83 | $10 / 50 / 82$ | 10／31／E1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INCOTIE STATEMENT（OOOS） |  |  |  |
|  | 180，013 | 142，756 | 104，202 |
|  | 109，482 | 82，776 | 67，118 |
|  | 70，531 | 58，960 | －7，084 |
|  | T5，001 | 25．491 | 15，866 |
| F | 20．211 | $2 \mathrm{E}, 627$ | 12．162 |
|  | 5，319 | 7，840 | 9，056 |
| T | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 67．732 | 700 | NA |
|  | NA | NA | － 227 |
|  | 73，251 | 10，740 | 5.727 |
|  | 25．850 | Fi050 | 1， 800 |
|  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 1．521 | 1． 20 | 727 |
| 5 | 48，722 | 7.010 | 5.158 |
|  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 48.922 | 9.010 | 5.158 |
| 16．9 | 982．966 | $16,760.715$ | 14，080．778 |
| F：O1 | 01／27／84 | 05／05／84 | 03／04／34 |
|  | INCOM | STATENENT 100 | 9S） |
|  | 52．102 | 44.773 | $52,1.47$ |
|  | 32，574 | 27．200 | 37．975 |
|  | 19．528 | $17.77 \div$ | 14.174 |
|  | 9.802 | 7，217 | 229627 |
| F | 7，930 | 7．236 | 11.610 |
|  | （207） | 1．268 | （20，063） |
| T | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 3.31 | －1．022 | 1.174 |
|  | NA | NA | 26 |
|  | 3.124 | 32．290 | （18．715） |
|  | 1，100 | 10.665 | （4，275） |
|  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 67 | 8．7 | 146 |
| S | 2.091 | 22,462 | （14．494） |
|  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 2.071 | 22．462 | （14．474） |
| 17.170 .272 |  | 17.172 .122 | 17，212，447 |
|  |  | SALES（O00S） | OP INCOME |
| SALES | （000s） | NET INCOME | EFS |
| 160．015 |  | 48，922 | 2.85 |
| 142．756 |  | 7，010 | 0.55 |
| 104，202 |  | 5，158 | 0.38 |
| 62， 671 |  | 7，793 | 0.74 |
| 玉玉，777 |  | F，001 | 0.82 |

SEGMENT DAT：A
NA
FIVE YEAF SUMWAF：Y
YEAF
1983
1982
1981
1980 62，971
$1 ヶ 79$ 3゙， 777
CDIMEHTS：
OTHEF INCDHE IS EOUITY EAFNINGS（10－G O1－29－83）（10－Q 04－9－9S）（10－E


EXXON CORP
DISCLOSURE CO NO: E979562000
CROSS REFERENCE: WAS STANDARD OIL CO OF NEW JERSEY
AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: PRICE WATERHOUSE
AUDITOR'S RE: : : T: UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING 12/31/83 12/31/82
ASSETS (000S)
748,266
3,347, 3
741,324
CASH
MRKTABLE SECURITIES
RECEIVABLES
INVENTORIES
RAW MATERIALS
WORK IN R OGRESS
FINISHED .THIS
NOTES RECEIVABLE
OTHER C :HENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS PROP, PLANT \& EQUIP ACCUMULATED DEP
NET PROP \& EQUIP INVEST \& ADV TO SUBS OTH NON-CUR ASSETS DEFERRED CHARGES INTANGIBLES DEPOSITS \& TH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS

4,970,803 5,536,221 NA 3,798,532 NA 1,737,689 NA NA
7,900,237 8,366,098
1,628,296 2,441,627
18,595,460 19,792,68\%.
61,785,831 58,109,505
20,917,407 19,127,676
40,868,424 38,981,829
1,746,620 1,714,484
NA NA
NA NA
1,752,486
NA
1,799,551
62,962,990 62,288,550
LIABILITIES (000S)
867,285 2,747,685
11,000,240 11,692,366
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE CUR LONG TERM DEBT CUR PORT CAP LEASES ACCRUED EXPENSES NA $N A$

INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURRENT LIAB TOTAL CURRENT LIB mortgages
DEFERRED CHARGES/INC CONVERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEBT
NON-CUR CAP LEASES OTHER LONG TERM LIB TOTAL LIABILITIES MINORITY INT (LIAR)
PREFERRED STOCK
COMMON STOCK NET
CAPITAL SURPLUS
RETAINED EARL: S
TREASURY STOCK OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER'S ECiUI TY
TOT LIAR \& NET WORTH

| NA | NA |
| ---: | ---: |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| $3,171,163$ | $2,024,689$ |
| NA |  |
| NA |  |
| $15,038,688$ | $16,464,740$ |
| NA |  |
| $9,327,744$ | $8,944,340$ |
| NA | NA |
| $4,668,915$ | $4,555,580$ |
| NA | NA |
| $3,271,905$ | $2,697,771$ |
| $32,307,252$ | $32,662,431$ |
| $1,212,643$ | $1,185,928$ |
| NA | NA |
| $2,822,254$ | $1,760,554$ |
| NA | NA |
| $29,515,384$ | $27,211,257$ |
| $1,824,146$ | NA |
| $(1,070,35,9$ | $(531,620)$ |
| $29,443,095$ | $28,440,191$ |
| $62,962,990$ | $62,288,550$ |

FISCAL YEAR ENDING

NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
$R$ \& D EXPENDITURES
GELL GEN . MMIN EXP
INC BEF DEP \& AMORT DEPRECIATION \& AMORT NON-OPERATING INC INTEREST EXPENSE INCOME BEFORE TAX PRON FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INUEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER INCCINI
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS NET INCOME GUTSTANDING SHARES

QUARTERLY REPORT FOR
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
$R$ \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC BEF DEP \& AMORT
DEPRECIATION \& AMORT
NON-OPERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE
INCOME BEFORE TAX
PROU FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INUEST GAINS/LOSSES
OTHER INCOME
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDI: SHARES
$12 / 31 / 83 \quad 12 / 31 / 82$. $12 / 31 / 81$
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)
93,446,663 102,058, 395 113,220,300
57,159,849 66,789, 54: 76,076,432
36,286,814 35,269,535 37,143,868
$1,408,009 \quad 1,773,318 \quad 1,650,214$
$4,948,385 \quad 5,253,148 \quad 5,232,793$
29,930,420
$28,243,069 \quad 30,24,861$ 3,527,817 3,333,455 2,898,920

748,758
26,941,153
21,805,511
157,685
NA
$N A$
4,977,957
NA
4,977,957
84,697,004
$1,287,308 \quad 1,499,650 \quad 1,702,261$ 669,:45
25,739,669 21,443,070 110,657 4,185,932 4,826,215

NA
4,185,932
866,005,691

NA 115,554 NA NA

779,688 28,284,514 23,342,745 115,554 NA $4,826,215$ 4, 826,215 866,005,691
$03 / 31 / 84 \quad 06 / 30 / 84$
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)
24,498,000 24,031,000
12,582,000 14,481,000
11,916,000 9,550,000
$307.000 \quad 301 \% .000$
7,728,000 7,119,000
3, 881,000 2,122,000
978,000 953,000
362,000 276,000
132,000 55,000
3,133,000
$1,658,000$
1,390,000
NA
N
NA
1,475,000
NA
1,475,000
836,334,095

40,000
N
NA
1,:350,000
NA
$1,350,000$
NA

SEGMENT DATA (12/31/83)
PETROLELM
CHEMICALS
OTHER
$\begin{array}{cr}\text { SALES (000S) } & \text { OP INCOME } \\ 83,6 \therefore 3,000 & 5,083,000 \\ 6,392,000 & 270,000 \\ 3,433,000 & 37,000\end{array}$

FIUE YEAR SUMMARY
YEAR SALES (0005) NET INCOME EPS
1983
1982
$1981 \quad 102,059,000$
1981 113,220,000
$1980 \quad 108,412,000$
$1979 \quad 83,555,000$

| NET INCOME | EPS |
| ---: | ---: |
| $4,978,000$ | 5.78 |
| $4,186,000$ | 4.82 |
| $4,6.6,000$ | 5.58 |
| $5,350,000$ | 6.15 |
| $4,295,000$ | 4.57 |

COMMENTS:
DTHER EQUITY IS CLI: ITIUE FRGN EXCHANGE TRANSLATION ADIUSTMENTS;NON OPERATING INCOME/EXPENSE INCLUDES MINORITY INTEREEST (10-0 03-31-84)
gandalf TECHNOLOGIES inc DISCLOSURE CO NO: GOS3000000 GROSS REFERENCE: NA
auditor change: na AUDITOR: PEAT, MARWICK, MITCHELL \& CO. AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED; EXCEPT FOR, CONSISTENCY APPLICATION RE CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR FRAN. CURRENCY TRANSLATION LANDER FAZE NO. 52, WITHUHIICH THE AUDITORS CONCUR.


FISCAL YEAR ENDING
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS FRIFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES
GELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC BEF DEP \& AMORT
DEPRECIATION \& AMORT NON-GPERATING INC INTEREST EXFENSE INCOME BEFGRE TAX PRUU FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INUEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER IINCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
GUTETANDING SHARES
QUAARTERLY REPGRT FOR
NET GALES
CDST OF GODDS
GRDSS PFOFIT
F. $\&$ D EXPENDITURES

EELL EEN \& ADPISN EXF
INE REF DEP \& AMORT
DEPRECIATION \& AMORT
NON-OPERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE
INCOME BEFDRE TAX
FRUV FOR INC TAXES
MINGRITY INT (INC)
INUEST GAINS/LDSSES
DTHER INEOPAE
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS
EX ITETS \& DISE OPS
NET INCOME
DIJTSTANDING SHARES
segident data
NA
$07 / 31 / 33 \quad 07 / 31 / 82 \quad 07 / 31 / 81$
INCOME STATEMENT (OOUS)

| 58,580 | 53,313 | 40,214 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31,251 | 25, 377 | 19,324 |
| 27,329 | 27,441 | 20,300 |
| 6,491 | 4,217 | 2,813 |
| 17,405 | 14,564 | 10,282 |
| 3,433 | 8.660 | 7,295 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 1,678 | 2,016 | 34 |
| 390 | 270 | 928 |
| 4,721 | 10,406 | 5,401 |
| 1,022 | 3,712 | 2,290 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 3,699 | 6,594 | 4,111 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 3,699 | 6,594 | 4,111 |
| 9,832,134 | 9,800,554 | NA |

$10 / 29 / 83 \quad 01 / 28 / 84 \quad 04 / 23 / 64$
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)
14.777 15.349 17.432
$8.175 \quad 8,092 \quad 9.040$
$5,602 \quad 7,75 \% \quad 3,592$
$2.058 \quad 2.102 \quad 3.467$
$4,260 \quad 4,712 \quad 4,651$
234
NA
419
75
628
113 NA $\mathrm{N}=$旍 515
P会
515
9,841,382
3,858,994 9,354,015
SALES (000S) OP INCOME

FIVE YEAR SUNHAARY
$\left.\begin{array}{lrrrr}Y E A R & \text { SALES } & \text { (OUOS) } & \text { NET } & \text { INCOME }\end{array}\right]$ EFS
*FOREIGN CURRENCY, CANADIAN DOLLARS (10-K 07-31-E3) ANO (10-U 10-29-83); INCOME TAX INCLUDES EURRENCY TRANSLATI ON ADJUSTMENT

HAFRIS COFP FLA
DISCLOSURE CO NO: H2OT156000
CFOSS FEFERENCE: WAS HARRIS INTERTYFE CDFF
AUDITOF CHANGE: NA
AUDITOF: EFNST \& WHINNEY
AUDITOF'S FEFOFT: UNGLALIFIED
FISCAL YEAF ENDING

CASH
MRETAELE SECURITIES RECEIVAELES
INUENTOFIES
FAW MATERIALS
WORK IN FROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NDTES RECEIVABLE
OTHEF CUFFENT ASSETS
TOTAL CUFRENT ASSETS
FFOF: FLANT \& EQUIF
ACCUMULATED DEF
NET FFOF $\theta$ EQUIF
INVEST \& ADV TO SUES
OTH NON-CUR ASSETS
DEFEFFED CHAFGES
INTANGIELES
DEFOSITS \& OTH ASSET
TOTAL ASSETS


NOTES FAYABLE
ACCOUNTS FAYABLE
CUR LONG TERM DEET
CUF FDRT CAF LEASES
ACCFUED EXFENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CUFFENT LIAB TOTAL CURFENT LIAE MOFTGAGES
DEFERRED CHARGES/INC
CONVERTIELE DEBT
LONG TEFM DEET
NON-CUR CAF LEASES
OTHEF LONG TERM LIAB
TOTAL LIABILITIES
MINORITY INT (LIAE)
FFEFEFFED STOCK゙
COMMON STOCK NET
CAFITAL SUFFLUS
FETAINED EARNINGS
TFEASUFY STOCF:
OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER'G EQUITV
TOT LIAE \& NET WDFTH
$11,716 \quad 11,260$
$128,590 \quad 98,127$ NA NA NA NA
$153.096 \quad 167.085$
134:149 115,75
$129.122 \quad 97,318$
$556,663 \quad 493,555$ NA NA
$108.813 \quad 124,858$ NA 30,000
213,296 227,492 NA NA NA NA
878.772 875.905 NA NA NA NA
40.009 37.555
130.566 117. 593
658.465 612.881

226
174
$(10,723) \quad(9,357)$
818.051 761.266

1,676, 865 1,657,171

FIEGGL $\because E A F E D D C N G$
NET GALEES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS FFOFIT
E $\because$ D EXFENDITUFES
GELL EEN : ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF \& AMOFT
DEFFECIATION : AMORT
NON-OFEFATING INC
INTEFEST EXFENSE
INCOME EEFOFE TAX
FROV FOF INC TAXES
MINOFITY INT (INC)
INVEST GAINS/LOSSES
QTHEF INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC QFS NET INCOME
IUTSTANDING SHAFES
QUAFTEFLY REFORT FOR
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GFOSS FFOFIT
F : D EXFENDITURES
GELL GEN \& ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF $\because$ AMORT
OEFFECIATION $\because$ AMORT
NOLN-OFEFAT ING INC
INTEFEST EXFENSE
INCOME EEFOFE TAX
FFOU FOF INC TAXES
MINOFITY INT (INC)
INVEST GAINS/LOSSES
OTHEF INCOME
WET INC EEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMG \& DISC DFS
NET INCORE
OUTGTANDING SHAFES
$96 / 30 / 84 \quad 06 / 30 / 8 \% \quad 16 / 868$
INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)
$1,795,802 \quad 1,809,302 \quad 1,646.181$
$1,316,792 \quad 1,177,536 \quad 1,026,245$ 679.01063 .609 .936

NA NA NA
590.871 540.036 482, 23 3
$88.139 \quad 91.730 \quad 127,713$
NA
30,366
25,039
95. 466 21,774 NA
NA
6.718 80,410

NA
80,410
37,948,121
127, N1.
$14,90.3$
15,609
127,007
47,758 NA
NA
1,128
80,177
21,279
101,476
$31,317,522$

09/28/84
INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)
巨11,726
536.972

174,754
NA
156.460

18,274
NA
$10,31 \%$
6,732
21,855
(78)

NA
NA
S 384
25.317

NA
25.3i17
$40,221,975$
SEGMENT DATA (OG/ד0/84)
INFOFMATION SYSTEMS
LAMIEF
COMMUNICATIONS
GEMICONDUCTOF:
GOVEFNMENT SYSTEMS
SALES (OOOS) OF INCOME
320,400
22,100 409.600
22.900
401. 100
20.500 234,300
15.100 397,300

51,400
FIVE YEAR SUMMAFY

| VEAF: | GALES | (0005) | NET INCOME | EFS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1984 | 1,995,802 |  | 80.410 | 2.02 |
| 1793 | 1,809,302 |  | 65.819 | 1.62 |
| 1902 | 1,646,181 |  | 80.177 | 2.05 |
| 1981 | 1,418,776 |  | 105,740 | 2.75 |
| 1780 | 1,177,174 |  | 73.911 | 1.94 |

COMMENTS:
PEIUF YEAFS FINANCIALS RESTATED TO CONFDFM TD CURRENT FRE゚SEIVIATION:FIVE YEAF SLMMARY NET INCOME IS INCOME EEFDRE EXTFADRDINAFY ITEM

HEWLETT FACEAFD CD
DISCLOSURE CO NO: H497200000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: FRICE WATERHOUSE
AUDITOR'S REFORT: UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING
CASH
MRK゙TABLE SECURITIES
FECEIVAELES
INVENTORIES
RAW MATERIALS
WORE IN FROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NOTES RECEIVABLE
OTHER CLFFEENT ASSETS
TOTAL CLIFRENT ASSETS
FFROF, PLANT \& EQUIF
ACCUMULATED DEF
NET FROF \& EQUIF
INVEST \& ADV TO SUBS
OTH NON-CUR ASSETS

| $10 / 31 / 83$ | $10 / 31 / 82$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| ASSETS | (000S) |
| 880,000 | 684,000 |
| NA | NA |
| 951,000 | 773,000 |
| 748,000 | 659,000 |
| 469,000 | 428,000 |
| NA | NA |
| 279,000 | 231,000 |
| NA | NA |
| 55,000 | 99,000 |
| $2,632,000$ | $2,215,000$ |
| $2,157,000$ | $1,760,000$ |
| 726,000 | 589,000 |
| $1,431,000$ | $1,171,000$ |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |

INTANGIELES
DEFOSITS \& OTH ASSET total assets

NOTES FAYAELE
ACCOUNTS FAYABLE
cuf long terim deet
CUR FORT CAF LEASES
ACCRUED EXFENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CUFFENT LIAE
tutal current liab
mortgages
98,000
$4,161,000 \quad 3,470,000$
84,000

LIABILITIES (000S)
148,000
203,000
156,000
139,000
NA NA
NA
457,000
$112,000 \quad 151,000$
$\begin{array}{rr}\text { NA } & \text { NA } \\ 920,000 & \text { NA }\end{array}$
283,000 219,000
NA NA
DEFERRED CHAFGES/INC
CONVERTIELE DEET
LONG TERM DEET
NON-CUR CAF LEASES
OTHER LONG TERM LIAE
total liakilities
MINORITY INT (LIAB)
FREFERRED STOCK
COMMON STOCK NET
CAFITAL SURFLUS
RETAINED EARNINGS
TREASUFY STOCK
71,000 39,000
NA NA
NA NA
1,274,000 1,121,000
NA NA
NA NA
735,000 587,000
NA NA

OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER"S EQUITY
TOT LIAE \& NET WORTH

| $2,154,000$ | $1,762,000$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| $2,867,000$ | $2,349,000$ |
| $4,161,000$ | $3,470,000$ |

NET GALES
COST DF GOODS
GFOSS FFOFIT
F \＆D EXFENDITURES GELL GENS B ADMIN EXF INC EEF DEF \＆ANOFT DEFRECIATION \＆AMOFT NON－OFERATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFOFE TAX
FFDV FOF INC TAXES MINOEITY INT（INC） INVEST GAINS／LOSSES OTHEF INCOME NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \＆DISC DFS NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
QUAFTERLY FEFORT FDR

NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GFOSS FFOFIT
Fi \＆E EXFENDITUFES
SELL GEM \＆ADMIN EXF INC EEF DEF \＆AMDRT DEFFECIATIDN ？AMORT NON－OFEF：ATING INE INTEREST EXFENSE INCOME EEFDFE TAX FFIDV FOF INC TAXES MINDFITY INT（INC） INVEST GAINS／LOSSES OTHEF INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \％DISC DFS NET INCOME
QUTSTANDING SHAFES
INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)


$$
254,714,000 \quad 125,346,000 \quad 122,672,551
$$

$$
01 / 31 / 84 \quad 04 / 30 / 84 \quad 07 / \Xi 1 / 84
$$

INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)


SEGMENT DATA（10／シ1／B．亡）
COMFUTEF FFODLUTS
ELECTRONIC TEST \＆MEASLSEMENT
MEDICAL ELECTFONIC EQUIFMENT
ANALYTICAL INSTFLMENTATION

| SALES（000S） | OF 1 INCOME |
| ---: | ---: |
| 2.420 .000 | 292.000 |
| 1.753 .000 | 381.000 |
| 34.000 | 61.000 |
| 194.000 | 25.000 |

FIVE YEAR GLMMARY


## COMMENTS：

FECLASSIFIED CERTAIN AMOUNTS IN BALANCE SHEET（19日2）AND INCOME STATEMENTS （1981 \％1982）TO CONFORM WITH THE 19日S FOFMAT：CASH INCLUDES MARKETAELE SECLFITIES：INUENTORIES，RAW MATERIALS INCLUDES WORK－INOFROGRESS：COMMDN STOCK INELUDES GAFITAL SURFLUS：EARNINGS FEF SHAFE FEFLECT 2－FOF：1 STOCK SFILIT IN OB－gS

HONEYWELL INC
DISCLOSURE CO NO: H715000000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: DELOITTE GASKINS \& SELLS
AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING
CASH
MRKTABLE SECURITIES RECEIVABLES
INVENTORIES
RAW MATERIALS
WORK IN PROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NOTES RECEIVABLE
OTHER CURRENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS PROP, PLANT \& EQUIP ACCUMULATED DEP NET PROP \& EQUIP INVEST \& ADV TO SUBS OTH NON-CUR ASSETS DEFERRED CHARGES
INTANGIBLES
DEPOSITS \& TH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS

NOTES PAYABLE
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
CUR LONG TERM DEBT
CUR PORT CAP LEASES
ACCRUED EXPENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURRENT LIB
TOTAL CURRENT LAB
mortgages
DEFERRED CHARGES/INC
CONVERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEBT
NON-CUR CAP ! MSES
OTHER LONG TERM LIAB
TOTAL LIABILITIES
MINORITY INT (LAB)
PREFERRED STOCK
COMMON STOCK NET
CAPITAL SURPLUS
RETAINED EARNINGS
TREASURY STOCK
OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY
TOT LIAS \& NET WORTH


FISCAL YEF 'ADING

NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP INC BEF DEP \& ANE DEPRECIATION \& AMORT NON-E: RATING INC INTEREST EXPENSE INCOME BEFORE TAX PRON FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INUEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER INCOME NET INC BEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC DPS NET INCOME OUTSTANDING SHARES

QUARTERLY REPORT FOR

NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP INC BEF DEP \& AMORT DEPRECIATION \& AMORT NON-OPERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE INCOME BEFORE TAX PRON FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INUEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER INCOME
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS NET INCOME
QUTSTANDING SHARES
$12 / 31 / 83 \quad 12 / 31 / 82 \quad 12 / 31 / 31$ INCOME STATEMENT (000S)
$5,753,100 \quad 5,490,400 \quad 5,351,200$
$3,814,800 \quad 3,541,600 \quad 3,422,200$ $1,938,3001,948,8001,929,000$ 428,6r!: 396,900 368,800 $1,172,800$

336,900
NA
69,600
91,800
314,700
83,500
N
NA
NA
231,200 NA
231,200
$46,866,336$

04/01/84
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)
1,392,300
928,000
464,304
101,400
301,400 61,500

NA
NA
3,700
57.800

18,200
NA
NA
NA
39,600
NA
39,600
$46,883,893$

1,206,700 345,200

NA
157,000
118,100
384,100 1il,200

## NA

NA
272,900
NA
272,900
22,727,859

07/01/84

1,486,700
970,000
515,700 104,100 298,100 114,500 NA
NA
4,000
110,500 36,200

NA
NA
NA
74,300
NA
74,300
46,912,080
$1,145,600$
414,600
N
71,900
123,100
363,400
104,100
NA
NA
NA
259,300
NA
259,300
23,173,999
09/30/84
$1,496,400$
996,200
500,200
108,700 304, 400
87,100
NA
NA
7,100
80,000
(13, 300)
N
NA
NA
93,300
NA
93,300
47,427,396

SEGMENT DATA (12/31/83)
AEROSPACE AND DEFENSE
CONTROL PRODUCTS
CONTROL SYSTEMS
INFORMATION SYSTEMS

SALES (000S) OP INCOAP 1,540,100 209,000 40,200 976,100 134,900 130,800

FIVE YEAR SLMMARY

| YEAR | SALES | (0005) | NET INCOME | EFS |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1983 | $5,753,100$ | 231,200 | 5.03 |  |
| 1982 | $5,490,400$ | 272,900 | 6.08 |  |
| 1981 | $5,351,200$ | 259,300 | 5.69 |  |
| 1980 | $4,924,700$ | 288,900 | 6.46 |  |
| 1979 | $4,209,500$ | 256,400 | 5.85 |  |

COAMENTS:
1382 AND 1981 INCOME STATEMENT ARE RECLASSIFIEDIOTHER EQUITY IS PRGN. CURRENCY TRANSLATION ADJUSTMENT

| DISCLOSURE CO NO: 1382060000 CROSS REFERENCE: NA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AUDITOR CHANGE: NA |  |  |
| AUDITOR: ARTHUR YOUNG \& COMPANY |  |  |
| AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED |  |  |
| FISCAL YEAR ENDING | 12/30/83 | 12/31/82 |
|  | ASSETS | (0005) |
| CASH | 29,384 | 12,691 |
| MRKTABLE SECURITIES | 56,454 | 17,048 |
| RECEIVABLES | 27,043 | 6,761 |
| INUENTORIES | 24,746 | 15,171 |
| RAW MATERIALS | 9,382 | 9,111 |
| WORK IN PROGRESS | 15,364 | 6,060 |
| FINISHED GOODS | NA | NA |
| NOTES RECEIVAble | NA | $N A$ |
| OTHER CURRENT ASSETS | 2,137 | 386 |
| TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS | 139,764 | 52,057 |
| PROP, PLANT \& EQUIP | 16,653 | 7,562 |
| ACCUMULATED DEP | 3,155 | 1,333 |
| NET PROP \& EQUIP | 13,498 | 6,229 |
| INUEST \& ADU TO SUBS | NA | NA |
| OTH NON-CUR ASSETS | 751 | NA |
| deferred charges | NA | NA |
| INTANGIBLES | NA | NA |
| DEPOSITS \& OTH ASSET | 453 | 61 |
| TOTAL ASSETS | 154,466 | 58,347 |
|  | LIABILITI | IES (000s) |
| NOTES PAYABLE | NA | NA |
| ACCOUNTS PAYABLE | 11,213 | 5,967 |
| CUR LONG TERM DEBT | 47 | 54 |
| CUR PORT CAP LEASES | NA | NA |
| ACCRUED EXPENSES | 7,784 | 2,752 |
| INCOME TAXES | NA | NA |
| OTHER CURRENT LIAB | 7,793 | 8,658 |
| TOTAL CURRENT LIAB | 26,837 | 17,431 |
| mortgages | NA | NA |
| DEFERRED CHARGES/INC | NA | NA |
| CONUERTIBLE DEBT | NA | NA |
| LONG TERM DEBT | 89 | 121 |
| NON-CUR CAP LEASES | NA | NA |
| OTHER LONG TERM LIAB | 460 | 501 |
| total liabilities | 27,386. | 18,053 |
| MINORITY INT (LIAB) | NA | NA |
| PREFERRED STOCK | NA | NA |
| COMMON STOCK NET | 121,038 | 47,726 |
| CAPITAL SURPLUS | NA | NA |
| RETAINED EARNINGS | 6,042 | (7,432) |
| TREASURY STOCK | NA | NA |
| OTHER LIABILITIES | NA | NA |
| SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY | 127,080 | 40,294 |
| TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH | 154,466 | 58,347 |

FISCAL YEAR ENDING $\because 30 / 83$. 12/31/82 12/31/81
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)
NET SAl: S
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC REF DEP \& MORT
DEPRECIATION \& ABORT
NON-OPERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE
INCOME BEFORE : $\because$ C
FIIOU FOR INC TAXES
MINORITY INT (INC)
INVEST GAINS/LOSSES
OTHER INCOME
NET INC REF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
QUARTERLY REPORT FOR
NET SALES
CUT T OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
$\because$ \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC REF DEF \& MORT
DEPRECIATION \& MORT
NO. :iterating INC
INTEREST EXPENSE
INCOME BEFORE TAX
PROV FOR INC TAXES
MINORITY INT (INC)
INVEST GAINS/LOSSES
OTHER INCOME
NET INC BI: EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
SEGMENT DATA
NH

| 79,370 | 34,371 | 8,458 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 48,960 | 22,241 | $1 \%, 21$ |
| 30,410 | 12,130 | $(2,003)$ |
| 7,137 | 4,354 | 2,237 |
| 13,854 | 5,081 | 1,846 |
| 9,419 | 2,695 | $(6,086)$ |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 5,587 | 884 | 190 |
| NA | 142 | 305 |
| 15,006 | 3,437 | $(6,201)$ |
| 4,926 | 1,561 | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | Ni |
| 10,080 | 1,876 | $(6,201)$ |
| 3,394 | 1,561 | NA |
| 13,474 | 3,437 | $(6,201)$ |
| 604,452 | $13,527,620$ | $11,714,583$ |

30,604,452
06/30/84 09/30/84
03/31/84
TATEMENT (0005)
21,010
14,418
6,592
2,239
4,921
28,267
40,011
19,203 25,963
(56:\%) 1.300 5,418
NA
1,423
NA
855
299
NA
NA
NA
556
NA NA NA
$556 \quad$ 1,784 4,948
$301: 7,452 \quad 32,376,586 \quad 32,441,986$
SALES (000S) OP INCOME

FIVE YEAR SUMMARY
FIVE YEAR SUGARY
YEAR


COMMENTS:
EXTRAORDINARY ITEM IS BENEFIT OF LOSS CARRYFORHARD ( 100007008083 ) AND (10-K 12-30-83);FINANCIAL DATA TAKEN FROM ANNAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS;CASH INCLUDES INTEREST-BEARING-DEPOSITS

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP
OTSELOSLRE CO NO: I 510 GOU000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
AUDITGR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: PRICE WATERHOUSE
AUDITQR• 9 REPQRT: UNQUALIFIED

| FISCAL YEMR ENDINE | $\begin{array}{r} 12 / 31 / 33 \\ \text { AS5ETS } \end{array}$ | $(0005)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CASH | 616.000 | 405,000 |
| MRKTABLE SECURITIES | 4,920,000 | 2,895,000 |
| RECEIVABLES | 5,735,000 | 4,376,000 |
| INUENTORIES | 4,381,000 | 3,492,000 |
| RAW MATERIALS | Na | NA |
| WORK IN PROGRESS | NA | NA |
| FINISHED GOODS | NA | NA |
| NOTES RECEIUABLE | NA | NA |
| OTHER CURRENT ASSETS | 1,618,000 | 1,246,000 |
| TOTAL EURRENT ASSETS | 17,270,000 | 13,014,000 |
| FROP, PLANT \& EQUIP | 29,157,000 | 30,767,000 |
| ACCUMULATED DEF | 13,045,000 | 13,204,000 |
| NET FROP \& EQUIP | 16,142,000 | 17,563,000 |
| INUEST \& ADU TO SUES | 3,831,000 | 1,964,000 |
| OTH NON-CUR ASSETS | NA | NA |
| DEFERRED CHARGES | NA | NA |
| INTANEISLES | Ni | NA |
| DEPOSITS \& OTH ASSET | NA | NA |

TOTAL ASSETG
$37,243,000 \quad 32,541,000$
LIABILITIES (000S)
NOTES PAYABLE
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
CUR LONG TERM DEBT
CUR PORT CAP LEASES
ACCRUED EXPENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER EURRENT LIAB
TOTAL CURRENT LIAB
MORTGAGES
OEFERRED CHARGES/INC
CONUERTIELE DEBT
LONG TERM DEBT
NON-CUR CAP LEASES
OTHER LONG TERM LIAB
TOTAL LIABILITIES
MINORITY INT (LIAB)
PREFERRED STOCK
COMHON STUCK NET
CAPITAL SURPLUS
532,000 529,000
$1,253,000 \quad 983,000$
NA NA
NA NA
4,120,000 3,441,000
3,220,000 2,354,000
382,000 402,000
9,507,000 $8,203,000$
$713,000 \quad 323,000$
NA NA
$\begin{array}{rr}2,674,000 \\ \mathrm{NA} & 2,851,000 \\ \mathrm{NA}\end{array}$
$1,130,000 \quad 1,190,000$
$14,024,000 \quad 12,581,000$
NA NA
NA NA
NA NA
RETAINED EARNINGS
$16,259,000$
TREABURY STOCK
OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY
TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH

| $5,800,000$ | $5,008,000$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| NA | NA |
| $19,489,000$ | $16,259,000$ |
| NA | NA |

$(2,070,000)(1,307,000)$
23,219,000 19,960,000
37,243,000 32,541,000

FIEDAL YEAR ENDING

OET SALES
EUST UF GUODS
GRDSS FROFIT
R \& E EXPENDITURES SELL GEN S ADMIN EXP INC EEF DEF \& AMORT DEPRECIATION \& AMORT NON-OPERATING INC INTEREST EXPENSE INCOME BEFORE TAX PRDU FOR INE TAXES MINORITY INT (INE) IAUEST GAINS,LOSSES JTHER INCOME NET INC BEF EX ITEMS EX ITERAS \& DISC OFS NET INCOME DUTSTANDING SHARES

ULARTERLY REPORT FOR
NET SALES
CUST DF GODDS
GRDSS PROFIT
R S D EKFENDITURES
EELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
IME BEF DEF \& AMORT
DEPRECIATIDN \& AMDRT NON-OFERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE
INCOME BEFORE TAX
PROU FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INE) INVEST GAINS/LOSSES ITHER INCOPAE
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS
E× ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
$12 / 31 / 83 \quad 12 / 31 / 82 \quad 12 / 31,81$
INCOME GTATEMENT (OODG)

| 40, 130,000 | 34,364,000 | 29,070.000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16,355,000 | 13,666,000 | 11,757.000 |
| 23,735,000 | 20,575,000 | 17,333,000 |
| 3,582,000 | 3,042,000 | 2,451,000 |
| 10,514,000 | 3,286,000 | 3, 353,000 |
| 3,589,000 | 3,348,000 | 6,499,000 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 741,000 | 328,000 | 368.000 |
| 330,000 | 454,000 | 407.100 |
| 9,540,000 | 8,222,000 | 6,460,000 |
| 4,455,000 | 3,313,000 | 2,850,000 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 5,485,000 | 4,409,000 | 3,610,000 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 5,485,000 | 4,409,000 | 3,610,000 |
| 610,724,641 | 602,406,128 | 592,293,624 |

$610,724,641$
603,406,128 592,293,624
03/31/84 05/30/84
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)
3,585,000 11,139,000
3,355,000 4,533,000
$5.630,0005.565 .0100$
1,018,000
2,617,000 2, 328,000
2, 105, 000 2, 326,000
NA
237.000

101,000
2,962,000
1,339,000
$N A$
NA
NA
1,623,000
1,623, 1000
611,500,893

EEGMENT DATA
SALES (00US) OP INEOME
NA
PIUE YEAR SUMMARY

| $Y E A R$ | SALES | $(000 S)$ | NET INCOME | $E P S$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1983 | $40,130,000$ | $5,485,000$ | 3.04 |  |
| 1382 | $34,364,000$ | $4,403,000$ | 7.33 |  |
| 1581 | $23,070,000$ | $3,610,000$ | 5.14 |  |
| 1330 | $26,213,000$ | $3,397,000$ | 5.32 |  |
| 1975 | $22,863,000$ | $3,011,000$ | 5.16 |  |

## EOMMENTS:

FINANCIALS TAKEN FROA 1383 ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS:REGGASSIFIED INCOME STATEMENTS (1381 \& 1982) TO REFLECT STATE AND LUCAL INCOME TAXES IN CONFORMITY WITH 1983 PRESENTATION;INUESTMEMTS \& ADVANCES TO GUBSIDIARIES INCLIDES OTHER ASSETSझACCRUED EXPENSES INELUDES OTHER CURRENT LIAEILITIESIUTHER EQUITY IS FRGN。 CURRENCY TRANGLATION ADJUSTMENT

LANIER BUSINESS PRODUCTS INC DISCL 'ME CO NO: L158125000.
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: ERNST \& WHINNEY AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED



FISCAL YEAR ENDING
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC REF DEP \& MORT
DEPRECIATION \& ABORT NON-OPERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE INCOME BEFORE TAX
PRON F:: INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INVEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER INCOME
NET INC REF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS NET INCOME
outstanding shares


QUARTERLY REPORT FOR
NET SALES
CIST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC REF DEF \& AMOR
: UECCIATION \& MORT
NON-OPERATING INC
372
INTEREST EXPENSE
INCOME BEFORE TAX
PROV: I INC TAXES
M\&NORITY INT (INC)
INVEST GAINS/LOSSES
OTHER INCOME
NET INC REF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
SALES (000S) OP iNCOME
: sEGMENT DATA
NA
FIVE YEAR SUMMARY
$\left.\begin{array}{lrrrr}\text { YEAR } & \text { SALES } & \text { (000S) } & \text { NET } & \text { INCOME }\end{array}\right]$ FPS

COMMENTS:
CURRENT AND LONG-TERM PORTIONS OF DEBT INCLUDES CAPITALIZED LEAS: :OTHER EQUITY IS FRGN. CURRENCY TRANSLATION ADJUSTMENT;OTHER INChOATE IS EQUITY EARNINGS (10-K 05-31-83) (10-Q 09-02-83) © COMPANY ERRG F 1485000 IN INCOME BEFORE INCOME TAXES (10-Q 09~02~83)

MANAGENENT ASSISTANCE INC
DISCLOSUFE CO NO：M108900000
CROSS FEFERENCE：NA
AUDITOF CHANGE：NA
AUDITOF：FEAT：MARWICF゙，MITCHELL \＆CO．
AUDITOF； 5 FEFORT：UNOUALIFIED：EXCEFT FOR，LHANGES IN THE METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR VACATIDN FAY AND FENSION COSTS WITH WHICH THE AUDITOFS

## cONCUR

FIGCAL YEAR ENDING
CASH
FIFKTAELE SECURITIES
FECEIVABLES
INVENTORIES
RAW MATERIALS
WORK゙ IN FFOGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NOTEG RECEIVABLE
OTHER CURFENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURFENT ASSETS
PROF：FLANT \＆EQUIF
ACCUMULATED DEF
NET FFOF \＆EQUIF
INVEST \＆ADV TO SUBS
OTH NON－CUR ASSETS
DEFERRED CHARGES
INTANGIELES
DEFDSITS \＆DTH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS

| 09／30／85 | 09／30／82 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ASSETS | （0005） |
| 4，78． | 4，007 |
| 2，187 | 4，552 |
| 62.190 | 50.199 |
| 79．641 | 67．502 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 21：277 | 20．566 |
| 170，078 | 146，826 |
| 92，455 | 81，189 |
| 50，831 | 23．864 |
| 61，624 | 57.325 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 7．883 | 10，799 |
| 259，585 | 214，950 |

NOTES FAYABLE
ACCOUNTS FAYABLE
CUR LONG TERM DEET
CUR FORT EAF LEASES
ACCFUED EXFENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURFENT LIAE
TOTAL CURRENT LIAE
MDRTGAGES
DEFEFRED CHARGES／INC
CONVERTIEILE DEBT
LONG TEFN DEET
NON－CUR CAF LEASES
OTHER LONG TEFM LIAE
TOTAL LIABILITIES
MINOFITY INT（LIAB）
FREFERFED STOCK゙
COMMON STOCK゙ NET
CAFITAL SURFLUS
FETAINED EARNINES
TREASURY STDCF
DTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDEF＇S EQUITY
TOT LIAE \＆NET WORTH

| LIAEILITIES | （0005） |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4，135 | 5，897 |
| 16．593 | 13，572 |
| 775 | 476 |
| NA | NA |
| ［1，581 | 52， 11 |
| 1，547 | 2.156 |
| 12，920 | 10．740 |
| 67， 349 | 63.154 |
| NA | NA |
| 19，541 | 18．876 |
| NA | NA |
| 73，997 | 51． 564 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 160，687 | 113， 394 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| S， 370 | 玉， 548 |
| 76，515 | 70．029 |
| 27．789 | 26，741 |
| 25.405 | 1，096 |
| （3．171） | （3，466） |
| 78.898 | 101，556 |
| 259，585 | 214，950 |

FIGCAL YEAF ENDING

NET SALES
COAT OF GOODS
GROGS FROFIT
Fi
GELL GEN $\because$ ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF \＆AMOFT
DEFFECIATION ：AMOFT
NON－DFEFATING INC
INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFDFE TAX FFIOV FOF INC TAXES MINOFITY INT（INC） INUEST GAINS／LOSSES QTHEF INCOME
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \＆DISC DFS NET INCOME DUTETANDING GHAFES

QUAFTTEFLY FEFGFT FQR
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GFOSS FFOFIT
F：$\because$ EXFENDITURES SELL GEN ：ADMIN EXF INC EEF DEF \＆AMORT DEFFEEIATION \＆AMORT NON－DFERATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFDRE TAX FROU FOK INC TAXES MINOFITY INT（INC） INUEST GAINS／LOSSES OTHER INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \＆DISC OFS NET INCOME
DUTSTANDING SHAFES

98／50／8
$09 / 30 / 82$
$09 / 30 / 81$
INCOME STATEMENT（OOOS）

| 375，885 | З58， 587 | －2， 136 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 212，713 | 172，105 | 180，0．4 |
| 163，172 | 166，282 | 152，152 |
| 18，025 | 15，467 | 15，214 |
| 136，601 | 134，203 | 121， 3 －1 |
| 8，546 | 16，612 | 15，577 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 673 | 1，665 | 2，166 |
| 5.572 | 3，4．34 | 玉，115 |
| B，647 | 14，84．5 | 14，6． 0 |
| 3.603 | 8，567 | 8，185 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 44 | 6.276 | 6．445 |
| 1,004 | 1，258 | 2,307 |
| 1，048 | 7，5．34 | 8．752 |
| 7，107，223 | 8，304，344 | 0， 311.073 |

$12 / \Xi 1 / 8.03 / 31 / 84 \quad 06 / 30 / 84$
INCOME STATEMENT（OOOS）

| 102.910 | 108，975 | 107，473 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 58,926 | 62，517 | 64．182 |
| 4．3：784 | 46．458 | 4．3．291 |
| 4，648 | 5，259 | 5.140 |
| 耳5．027 | 439707 | 36，970 |
| 4.307 | （2，688） | 19161 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 187 | 156 | 146 |
| 2，161 | 1．240 | 1．065 |
| 20.35 | （3，772） | 242 |
| 1．285 | （2，075） | 2.450 |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 1.950 | （1．677） | （2，188） |
| NA | NA | NA |
| 1．950 | （19．697） | （2，188） |
| ，152，051 | 8，426， 507 | －59．616 |

SEGMENT DATA（09／30／8玉）
INFOFMATION FFOCESSING SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE \＆FELATED SERVICES DTHER

SALES（OOOS）DF INCOME 205．169（10，205）
$175137 \quad 28,034$ 6.6921 .198

FIVE YEAR SUMMAF＇Y
$\left.\begin{array}{lrrrr}Y E A F & \text { SALES } & (000 S) & \text { NET } & \text { INCOME }\end{array}\right]$ EFS

COMMENTS：
QTHER EQUITY IS UNAMDRTIZED CDST OF FESTFICTED STOCK GRANTS：EXTRAORDINARY ITEM IS UTILIZATION OF FFGN．TAX LOSS CARFYFORWARD CREDITS：SEGMENT DATA SALES INCLUDES INTEFSEGMENT SALES：FIVE YEAF SUMMARY NET INCDMES AND EAFNINGS FER SHARE AFE FROM CONTINUING OFEFATIONS．BEFORE EVTFAOFDIMARY ［TEMS

MICOM SYSTEMS INC DISCLOSURE CO NO: M519000000 CROSS REFERENCE: NA

AUDITOR CHANGE: NA AUDITOR: ERNST \& WHINNEY AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED

| FISCAL YEAR ENDING | $03 / 31 / 84$ | $03 / 31 / 83$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | ASSETS (000S) |  |
| CASH | 11,903 | 26,151 |
| MRKTABLE SECURITIES | NA | NA |
| RECEIVABLES | $33,74 E$ | 18,234 |
| INUENTORIES | 29,012 | 11,901 |
| RAW MATERIALS | NA | NA |
| WORK IN PROGRESS | NA | NA |
| FINISHED GOODS | NA | NA |
| NOTES RECEIVABLE | NA | NA |
| OTHER CURRENT ASSETS | 6,340 | $1,6!$ |
| TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS | 81,001 | 57,888 |
| PROP, PLANT \& EQUIP | 44,425 | 12,746 |
| ACCUMULATED DEP | 7,200 | 3,454 |
| NET PROP \& EQUIP | 37,225 | 9,292 |
| INUEST \& ADU TO SUBS | 12,035 | 2,500 |
| OTH NON-CUR ASSETS | NA | N |
| DEFERRED CHARGES | NA | NA |
| INTANGIBLES | NA | NA |
| DEPOSITS\& OTH ASSET | 5,153 | 374 |
| TOTAL ASSETS | 135,314 | 70,054 |


|  | LIABILITIES (0005) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| NOTES PAYABLE | 1,099 | NA |
| ACCOUNTS PAYABLE | 8,498 | 4,275 |
| CUR LONG TERM DEBT | 252 | 121 |
| CUR PORT CAP LEASES | NA | NA |
| ACCRUED EXPENSES | 8,965 | 4,623 |
| INCOME TAXES | 1,429 | 1,964 |
| OTHER CURRENT LIAB | NA | NA |
| TOTAL CURRENT LIAB | 20,273 | 10,983 |
| MORTGAGES | NA | NA |
| DEFERRED CHARES/INC | 483 | 393 |
| CONUERTIBLE DEBT | NA | NA |
| LONG TERM DEBT | 1,362 | NA |
| NON-CUR CAP LEASES | NA | 148 |
| OTHER LONG TERM LIAB | NA | NA |
| TOTAL LIABILITIES | 22,118 | 11,524 |
| MINORITY INT (LIAB) | NA | NA |
| PREFERRED STOCK | NA | NA |
| COMMGN STOCK NET | 64,755 | 30,071 |
| CAPITAL SURPLUS | NA | 29,022 |
| RETAINED EARNINGS | 49,744 | NA |
| TREASURY STOCK | NA | NA |
| OTHER LIABILITIES | $(1,303)$ | $(563)$ |
| SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY | 113,196 | 58,530 |
| TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH | 135,314 | 70,054 |

FISCAL YEAR ENDING

NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
$R$ \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC REF DEP \& AMORT
DEPRECIATION \& MORT NON-OPERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE
INCOME BEFORE TAX
PROV FOR INC TAXES
MINORITY INT (INC)
INVEST GAINS/LOSSES
OTHER INCOME
NET INC REF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
QUARTERLY REPORT FOR
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
$R \cdot S$ D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC REF DEP \& AMORT
DEPRECIATION \& MORT
NON-OPERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE
INCOME BEFORE TAX
PRON FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INVEST GAINS/LOSSES
OTHER INCOME
NET INC REF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
$03 / 31 / 84 \quad 03 / 31 / 83 \quad 03 / 31 / 82$
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)
$132,540 \quad 84,276 \quad 57,671$
$57,849 \quad 37,974 \quad 25,581$
$74,691 \quad 46,302 \quad 32,090$
$12,090 \quad 7,953 \quad 4,647$
34,899 21,724 15,855
$27,70216,625 \quad 11,588$
NA NA NA
2,097 2,706 3,176
306111218
$29,49319,22014,546$ $8,771 \quad 5,786 \quad 5,850$

NA
NA
NA
$20,722 \quad 13,434 \quad 8,696$
NA NA NA
$13,434 \quad 8,696$
14,391,776 14,225,682
$06 / 30 / 84$
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)
41,745
18,843
22,902
3.721

10,589
8,592
N
393
80
8,905
2,654
NA
NA
NA 6,251

NA
6. 251
$15,365,968$

SEGMENT DATA
NA
FIVE YEAR SUMMARY
YEAR SALES (000S) NET INCOME BPS
1984
1983
1982
1981
$1980 \quad 36,445$
$16.940 \quad 1,823 \quad 0.16$
COMMENTS:
OTHER LIABILITIES IS FREN CURRENCY TRANSLATION ADJUSTMENTS AND NOTES RECEIVABLES RELATED TO COMMON STOCK ISSUED


FISCAL YEAR ENDING
net sales
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL L GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC REF DEP \& AMOR DEPRECIATION \& ABORT NON-OPERATING INC INTEREST E : NS E INCOME BEFORE TAX PRON FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INVEST GAINS/LOSSES
OTHER INCOME
NET INC REF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OF:;
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
QUARTERLY REPORT FOR
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC REF DEF \& MORT DEPRECIATION \& ABORT NON -OPERATING INC INTEREST EXPENSE income before tax PRON FOR ING TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INVEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER INCOME NET INC REF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
SEGMENT DATA
NA


204,129
92,977
111,9:42
18,814
59,169
33,169
10,377
9,472
27,824
NA
N 27,958

NA
27,958
37,274,800

SALES (000S) OP INCOME

FIVE YEAR SUMMARY

YEAR 1984 1983
1982
1981
1980

SALES (000S) 342,609 255,085 204,129 111,212
$4 \div, 41$

NET INCOME
ES
(32,411)
(0.85)

14,797
0.39

27,958
0.77

14,334 0.44 3,658 0.12

COMMENTS:
*FOREIGN CURRENCY, CANADIAN DOLLAR;INTEREST EXPENSES INCLUDE DEBENTURE REDEMPTION PREMIUM (10-Q 05-25-84)AND (10-Q 08-24-84);CASH INCLUDES SHORT-TERM INVESTMENTS (10-Q 08-24-84):OTHER LIABILITIES AMOUNT IS TRANSLATION ACCOUNT (10-q 08-24-84):ACCOUNTS PAYABLE BNELUDE ACCRUED LIABILITIES (10-Q 08-24-84)
motorala ine
DISCLOSURE CO NO: M848100000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
AUDITGR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: FEAT, MARWICK, MITCHELL \& CO.
AUDITOR"S REFOFT: UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING 12/31/83 12/31/82
ASSETS (000S)
$25,000 \quad 21,000$
CASH
MristaEle securities
RECEIVABLES
inventaries
fal materials
WOFK IN PROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
notes receivable OTHER CURRENT ASSETS total curirent assets FROF, FLANT \& EQUIF ACCUMLLATED DEF
NET FROF \& EQUIF
INVEST \& ADV TO SURS
OTH NON-CUR ASSETS
deferfed charges
INTANGIELES
DEFOSITS \& OTH ASSET
TUTAL ASSETS
notes Fayable
ACCOUNTS FAYABLE
CUR LONG TERM DEET
CUR FORT CAF LEASES
ACCRUED EXFENSES
incume taxes
OTHEF CURFENT LIAB
total curfent liag
MDRTGAGES
DEFEFRED CHARGES/INC
CONVERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEBT
NON-CLR CAF LEASES
OTHER LONG TERM LIAE
total liagilities
MINORITY INT (LIAE)
FREFERRED STOCK
COMMON STOCE NET
CAFITAL SURFLUS
FETAINED EARNINGS
TREASURY STOCK
OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER" 5 EQUITY
TOT LIAE \& NET WORTH

655,000 55:,000
$679,000 \quad 653,000$
NA NA
542,000
111,000
NA
157,000
1,730,000 1,512,000
2,278,000 1,957,000
849,000 691,000
1,429,000 1,266,000
44,000 36,000
NA NA
NA NA
NA NA
33,000 19,000
उ,256,000 2,85,000
LIABILITIES (000S)
NA NA
340,000. 223,000
8,000 7,000
NA NA
398,000 318,000
90,000 38,000
NA NA
836,000 588:000
NA NA
108.000 112.000

263,000 NA
NA NA
82,000 64,000
1,288,000 1,133,000
NA NA
NA NA
$119,000 \quad 115,000$
463,000 400,000
1,567,000 1,185,000
NA NA
NA NA
1,948,000 1,700,000
3,236,000 2,833,000

FEBMAL BEAF ENDING

NET SHLES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS FROFIT
Fi：D EXFENDITUFES
SELL GEN ？ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF $\because 纟$ AMOFT DEFREEIATION \＆AMORT NON－DFEFATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFORE TAX FFOU FOF INC TAXES MINOFITY INT（INC） INVEST GAINS／LOSSES
QTHEF INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \＆DISC OFS NET INCOVE OUTSTANDING SHAFES

DUAFTEFLY FEFORT FOR
NET SALES
COST UF GOODS
GFOSS FFOFIT
F \％D EXFENDITUFES
GELL GEN \＆ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF \＆FMORT
DEFFECIATION \＆AMORT NON－OFEFATINE INC INTEREST EXFENSE INCOME EEFDFE TAX FFOV FOR INE TAXES MINOFITY INT（INE） INVEST GAINS／LOSSES DTHEF INCOME NET INC BEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \＆DISC DFS NET INEOME
DUTSTANDING SHAFES

12／玉1／8こ 12／こ1／日2 1ごご，日1 INCOME STATEMENT（OOOS）
$4,326,000 \quad \pi, 786,000 \quad 3,50,000$
2，592．000 2，267．000 2．086．000 $1,7 \pi 5.000 \quad 1.517 .000$ 1．484．000 NA NA
1．113，000 1，013，000 985．000
622．000 504．000 497．000
289.000 244．000 205．000

NA NA NA
24,000
309．000 65,000

NA
NA
NA
244,000
NA
244．000
39，384，281
$0.3 / \Xi 1 / 84$
INCOME
1．256，000
715，000
$541: 000$
NA
55． 000
188.000

日1．000
NA
3.000

164,000 26，000

NA
NA
NA
78.000

NA
78.000
$39,445,713$
SEGMENT DATA（12／シ1／8．5）
COMAUNICATIONS FFODUCTS
SEMICONDUCTOF FRODUCTS INFOFIMATION SVSTEMS FRODUCTS
OTHEF FROLUCTS
FIVE YEAR SUMPAF＇Y

| $Y E A F$ | $5 A L E S$ | $(0005)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1932 | $4,328,000$ |  |
| 1792 | $3,786,000$ |  |
| 1781 | $2,576,000$ |  |
| 1780 | $2,284,000$ |  |
| 1779 | $2,879,000$ |  |

SALES（000S）
NET INCOME
EFS 244．000 6．26 $178.000 \quad 4.87$ 182，000 5．10 $192.000 \quad 5.45$ 171：000
4.91

NER CORF
DISCLOSURE CO NO: N416250000
CfOSS feference: was national cash fegister co
AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: FRICE WATERHOUSE
AUDITOR"S FEFORT: UNQUALIFIED:EXCEFT FOR, CONSISTENCY AFFLICATION FELATED TO CHANGE IN ACCOUNTING METHOD FUESUANT TO FASE NO. 52 WITH WHICH THE AUDITORS CONCUR FISCAL YEAR ENDING

CASH
MFETAELE SECURITIES
FECEIVABLES
INVENTORIES
RAW MATEFiALS work in frogress
FINISHED GOODS notes feceivable
OTHER CURRENT ASSETS
TITAL CUFRENT ASSETS FROF: FLANT \& EQUIF ACCUMULATED DEF NET FROF \& EQUIF INVEST \& ADV TO SUBS OTH NON-CUR ASSETS DEFERRED CHARGES INTANGIBLES
DEFOSITS \& OTH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS
notes fayable ACCOUNTS FAYABLE CUR LONG TERM DEBT CUF: FORT CAF LEASES ACCFUED EXFENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURRENT LIAB total cuffent liab mortgages
DEFERRED CHARGES/INC CONVERTIBLE DEET LONG TEFW DEET
NON-CUR CAF LEASES other long terim liab tatal liabilities MINORITY INT (LIAE) FREFERRED STOCK COMMON STOCK NET CAFITAL SURFLUS
FETAINED EARNINGG TFEASURY STOCK OTHER LIABILITIES SHAREHOLDER*S EQUITY TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH

| 12/31/83 | 12/31/82 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Assets | 005) |
| 516.941 | 411.924 |
| NA | NA |
| 910,690 | 934.841 |
| 721,575 | 694,140 |
| 252,945 | 216.055 |
| NA | NA |
| 468,630 | 478,085 |
| NA | NA |
| 44.567 | 70, 184 |
| 2,193,773 | 2,111,089 |
| 1,938,059 | 1.712,986 |
| 1,091,385 | 1,060,592 |
| 846:654 | 852, 394 |
| 139,501 | 101,105 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 124,940 | 126.973 |
| 255,434 | 181,485 |
| 5,560,302 | S, 875,046 |
| LIAEILITIES | (0005) |
| 57,670 | 78,047 |
| 140,402 | 117:904 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 129,114 | 116.782 |
| 202,721 | 149,654 |
| 517:950 | 504:065 |
| 1,047,857 | 766,452 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 325.298 | 341:298 |
| NA | NA |
| 67,635 | 66.997 |
| 1,440,790 | 1,374,749 |
| 74,639 | 61.722 |
| 32 | 58 |
| 424,366 | 415,232 |
| NA | NA |
| 1,841,630 | 1,623,889 |
| 99,500 | 7,211 |
| (121,655) | (93, 393) |
| 2,044,875 | 1,936,575 |
| 3,560,302 | E. 37.046 |

FISCAL YEAF: ENDING
NET GALES
COST OF GOODS
GFOSS FFROFIT
Fi $\because$ EXFENDITUKEG
SELL GEN ? ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF \& AMOFT
DEFFECIATIUN \& AMOFT NON-DFEFATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFOFE TAX FROU FOR INC TAXES MINCFEITY INT (INC) INVEGT GAINS/LOSSES OTHEF: INCOME NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC DFS NET INCDIME OUTGTANDING SHARES

QUAFTEFLY FEFOFT FOR

NET GALES
COST OF GOODS
GFOSS FFOFIT
Fi 3 EXFENDITUFES BELL GEN \& ADHIN EXF INC BEF DEF \& AMDFT DEFFEEIATIDN \& AMOFT NON-DFEFATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE TWCOME BEFORE TAX FROU FIF INC TAXES MINCJFITY INT (INE) INUEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHEF: INCOME
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS : DISC DFS
NET INCOME
DUTSTANDING SHAFES

INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)

$$
\Xi, 7 \Xi 0,951 \quad \Xi, 526,217 \quad 3,422,701
$$

1,856,169 1,792,463 1,803,252
$1,874,782 \quad 1,74.7,754$ 1,629,449
248,647 229,195
$1,100,651 \quad 1,057,314$
ت94,456 $\quad 542,440$
NA
B8,292
72,498
358,254
150,000

NA
208,254
NA
208, 2玉4
26,609,301
$\begin{array}{cc}0.31 / 84 & 06 / 50 / 84 \\ \text { INCOME STATEMENT }\end{array}$
INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)
B61,455 798,802
$459.842 \quad 475.128$
$421.595 \quad 503.674$
$6.3681 \quad 68,700$
200, 2060.364 $77.376 \quad 130.210$

NA
15.174

9,723
82.827
$37.300 \quad 64.300$
NA NA
NA . NA
NA NA
76.212

NA
76.212
$105,5 \div 7,420 \quad 102,112,597$
SALES (OOOS) OF INCOME

SEGMENT DATA
He
FIVE YEAF SUMMARY

| TEAF: | SALES | (0005) | NET INCOME | EF'S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 198.5 | 3,730,951 |  | 287,665 | 10.55 |
| 1782 | З,526,217 |  | 234,411 | 8.75 |
| 1981 | З, 4.2, 701 |  | 208,2ङ4 | 7.72 |
| 1980 | , 322,370 |  | 254,686 | 9.51 |
| 1979 | 3,092.640 |  | 234,602 | 8.78 |

COMMENTS:
EASH INCLUDES MAFKETAELE SECUFITIES:OTHER EQUITY IS FFGN. CURRENY TFAMMSLATION ADJUSTMENTS

NOFTHERN TELECOM LTD
DIECLOSURE CO NO: NS5S375000
EROSS REFERENCE: WAS NORTHEFN ELECTRIG CO LTD
AUDITDR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: TOUCHE ROSS S CO.
AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED:AFTER GIUING EFFECT TD CHANGE IN METHDO DF ACCOUNTING FOR FRGN. CURRENCY TRANSLATION, WITH WHICH THE ALIGITGRS EONEUR:
FISGAL YEAR ENDING
CASH
MRKTAELE SECURITIES
RECEIVAELES
INUENTORIES
RAW MATERIALS
WURK IN FROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NOTES RECEIUABLE
DTHER CURRENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS
FROP: FLANT \& EQUIF
ACCUMULATED DEP
NET FFOF \& EQUIP
INVEST \& ADU TU SUBS
OTH NON-CUR ASSETS DEFERRED CHARGES
INTANGIBLEE
DEPOSITS \& OTH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS

NOTES FAYAbLE
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
CUR LONG TERM DEBT
CUR PORT CAF LEASES
ACCRUED EXPENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURRENT LIAB
total current liag mortgages
deferred charges/INC
CONVERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEET
Non-Clir cap Leases
UTHER LONG TERM LIAB
total liabilities
MINORITY INT (LIAB)
preferred stock
COMMON STOCK NET
CAPITAL SURPLUS
RETAINED EARNINGS
TREASURY STOCK
OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY
TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH


| -ISCAL YEAR ENCING | $12 / 31 / 33$ <br> INCOME | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BE } 3182 \\ & \text { GTATEMENT } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{12 / 31 / 31}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NET BALES | 3,304,000 | 3,035,500 | $2,570.900$ |
| EUST OF GOODS | 2,112,000 | 2,124,200 | 1,347,200 |
| GROSE SROFIT | 1,192,000 | 311,300 | 723,701 |
| $R$ E EXPENDITURES | 324,800 | 241,400 | 281,600 |
| SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP | 560,700 | 451,900 | 359,300 |
| INC BEF DEF S AMORT | 306,500 | 208,000 | 162,800 |
| EEFRECIATION \& AMORT | NA | NA | NA |
| NON-OPERATING INC | 29,200 | 24,400 | 30.400 |
| INTEREST EXFENSE | 10,600 | 39,500 | 54,200 |
| INCOME EEFORE TAX | 325,100 | 192,310 | 145,000 |
| FRIU FUR INC TAXES | 98,000 | 60,400 | 35,300 |
| MINORITY INT (INC) | NA | NA | NA |
| INUEST GAINS/LOSSES | NA | NA | NH |
| UTHER INCOME | NA | NA | Na |
| NET ING BEF EX ITEMS | 227,100 | 132,400 | 113, 200 |
| EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS | 41,300 | 7,000 | 16,000 |
| NET INCOME | 268,400 | 139,400 | 139,200 |
| OUTSTANDING SHARES | 114,607,222 | 106,352,286 | 34,947,544 |
| QUARTERLY REPORT FOR | $0.3 / 31 / 84$ | 106/30/84 |  |
|  | INCOME | STATEMENT <00 | U5) |
| NET GALES | 899,100 | 1.048,200 |  |
| GUST DF GOODS | 556,700 | 640,900 |  |
| GRDSS PROFIT | 342,400 | 407,300 |  |
| F \& EXPENDITURES | 101,400 | 110:400 |  |
| SEL- GEN A ADMIN EXP | 163,000 | 187.600 |  |
| INC EEF DEP \& AMORT | 78,000 | 109,300 |  |
| DEFRESIATION \& AMORT | NA | NA |  |
| NON-OPERATING INC | 6,000 | 20,800 |  |
| INTEREST EXPENSE | NA | 10,500 |  |
| INCOME BEFORE TAX | 84,000 | 113,600 |  |
| FRUU FOR INE TAXES | 26,900 | 34,900 |  |
| MINORITY INT (INC) | NA | NA |  |
| INUEST GAINS/LOSSES | NA | NA |  |
| OTHER INCOME | NA | NA |  |
| NET INC BEF EX ITEMS | 57,100 | 73,700 |  |
| EX ITEPA \& DISC OPS | NA | NA |  |
| NET INEOME | 57.100 | 78,700 |  |
| UUTSTANDING SHARES | 114,849,012 | 115,093,697 |  |
| SEEMENT DATA |  | SALES (0003) | OF INCOME |

$N \hat{N}$
FIUE YEAR SUMMARY
YEAR
1533
1532
1901
SALES
3,304,000
3,035,500
1980
2,570,900
1979
2,054,600
$1,900,500$
(OOOS) NET INCOME
EFS
-

| 268,400 | 2.42 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 133,400 | 1.32 |
| 123,200 | 1.24 |
| $185,100)$ | $(1.33)$ |
| 111,200 | 1.21 |

COMMENTS:
सFOREIEN CURRENCY, CANADIAN DQLLARS:FINANCIAL STATEMENTS EASED DNV CANADIAN ACCOUNTING STANDARDS;FIUE YEAR SUMMARY DATA FOR PRIOR YEARS, 1932 FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND 1981 INCOME STATEMENT RESTATED TO REFLECT CHANGE IN ACCOLJNTING METHOD; CASH INCLUDES SHORT-TERM INUESTMENTS;OTHER LIAEILITIES FIEURE REPRESENTS FRGN. EXCHANGE ADJUSTMENT;EXTRAORDINARY ITEM IS INGUME TAX REDUCTION FROM PRIOR YEARS' TAX LOSSES OF SUBSIDIARY

PRIME COMPUTER INC DISCLOSURE CO NO: P729138000 CROSS :S.:-ERENCE: NA

AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: ARTHUR ANDERSEN \& CO.
AUIDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED FISCAL YEAR ENDING 12/31/83


CASH
MRKTABLE SECURITIES
RECEIVABLES
$161,139 \quad 149,151$
INVENTORIES
85,219 57,491
RAW MATERIALS
NA NA
WORK IN PROGRESS
FIN SHED GOODS
NOTES RECEIVABLE
OTHER CURRENT ASSETS
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS
PROP, PLANT \& EQUIP ACCUMULATED DEP NET PROP \& EQUIP INVEST \& ADV TO SUBS ETH NON-CUR ASSETS
DEFERRED CHARGES INTANGIBLES
DEPOSITS \& OTH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS
NA NA
$\mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{NA}$
NA Nf
$7.548 \quad 5,667$
298,975 242,209

186,828 154,321
52,300 34,455
134,528 119,866
NA . NA
NA NA
NA NA

NA NA
11,237 14,092
$444,740 \quad 376,167$

NOTES PAYABLE
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
CUR LONG TERM DEBT
CUR PORT CAP LEASES
ACCRUED EXPENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURRENT LIMB
TOTAL CURRENT LIAB
MuFf: $\operatorname{AGES}$
DEFERRED CHARGES/INC
CONVERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEBT
NON-CUR CAP LEASES
OTHER LONG TERM LIAB
TOTAL LIAS:]: TIES
MINORITy; INT (LIAR)
PREFERRED STOCK
COMMON -TICK NET
CAPITAL SURPLUS
RETAINED EARNINGS
TREASURY STOCK
OTHER LIABILITIES
SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY
TOT LIAR \& NET WORTH
LIABILITIES (000S)
5,645 4,318
$\begin{array}{rr}40,985 & 28,361 \\ N A\end{array} r$
$\begin{array}{rr}\mathrm{NA} & \mathrm{NA} \\ 891 & 1,048\end{array}$
32,616 25,052
$11,275 \quad 13,571$
4,598 5,009
96,010 77,359
64,272 52.728

NA NA
$\therefore$ : $1000 \quad 10,000$
6.279 7,173

| 176,561 | 147,260 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $N A$ | $N A$ |
| $N A$ | $N A$ |
| 595 | 392 |
| 97,732 | 89,836 |
| 175,392 | 142,889 |

NA NA
$(5,540) \quad(4,210)$
268,179 228,907
444,740 376,167

FISCAL YEAR ENDING
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC BEF DEP \& AMORT DEPRECIATION \& AMORT NON-OPERATING INC INTEREST EXPENSE INCOME BEFORE TAX
PROU FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INUEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER INCOME NET INC BEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS NET INCOME OUTSTANDING SHARES

QUARTERLY REPORT FOR

| $12 / 31 / 83$ | $12 / 31 / 82$ | $12 / 31 / 81$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| INCOH: | ITATEMENT (000S) |  |
| 516,503 | 435,826 | 364,787 |
| 242,934 | 185,667 | 159,663 |
| 273,569 | 250,159 | 205,124 |
| 52,074 | 37,047 | 27,521 |
| 170,530 | 124,484 | 118,277 |
| 50,965 | 68,628 | 59,326 |
| $N A$ | $N A$ | $N A$ |
| $(1,482)$ | $(1,998)$ | 769 |
| 1,686 | 1,266 | 5,146 |
| 47,797 | 65,364 | 54,949 |
| 15,294 | 20,438 | 17,271 |
| $N A$ | $N A$ | $N A$ |
| $N A$ | $N A$ | $N A$ |
| $N A$ | $N A$ | $N A$ |
| 32,503 | 44,926 | 37,678 |
| $N A$ | $N A$ | $N A$ |
| 32,503 | 44,926 | 37,678 |
| $47,635,589$ | $31,372,114$ | $29,635,353$ |

09/30/34
INCOME STATEMENT (000S)

| NET SALES | 165,01. |
| :---: | :---: |
| COST OF GOODS | 77,193 |
| GROSS PROFIT | 87,823 |
| R \& D EXPENDITURES | 16,489 |
| SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP | 51,880 |
| INC BEF DEP \& AMORT | 19,454 |
| DEPRECIATION \& AMORT | NA |
| NON-DPERATING INC | $(1,906)$ |
| INTEREST EXPENSE | 136 |
| INCOME BEFORE TAX | 17,412 |
| PROV FOR INC TAXES | $(4,453)$ |
| MINORITY INT (INC) | NA |
| INUEST GAINS/LOSSES | NA |
| OTHER INCOME | NA |
| NET INC BEF EX ITEMS | 21,365 |
| EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS | NA |
| NET INCOME | 21,865 |
| OUTSTANDING SHAR:: | 47,324,933 |

SEGMENT DATA SALES (OOOS) OP INCOME

FIUE YEAR SUMMARY

| YEAR | SALES | (000S) | NET INCOPM | EPS |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1983 | 516,503 |  | 32,503 | 0.68 |
| 1982 | $435,-i .5$ | 44,926 | 0.99 |  |
| 1981 | 364,787 |  | 37,678 | 0.84 |
| 1980 | 267,637 |  | 31,222 | 0.71 |
| 11,9 | 152,943 |  | 16,940 | 0.43 |

FAYTHEDN CO
DISCLOSURE CO NO: R171100000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
AUDITOF CHANGE: NA
AUDITOF: " COUFERS \& LYEFAND
AUDITOR: $\operatorname{BE}$ EGORT: UNQUALIFIED
FIGCAL YEAR ENDING 12/S1/8S 12/S1/82
CASH
MRKTAELE SECURITIES
RECEIVABLES
INVENTORIES
FIAW MATEFIALS
WURF: IN FROGFESS
FINISHED GUODS
NOTES FECEIVABLE
OTHEF CUFFENT ASSETS
TUTAL CURRENT ASSETS
FROF: FLANT \& EQUIF'
ACCUIVILATED DEF
ASSETS (000S)
$38,310 \quad 42,9.9$
$789.619 \quad 777.006$
$600,292594,599$
992,848 - 680,250
$708.271 \quad \mathrm{NA}$
284,577 NA
NA NA
NA NA
$15,280 \quad 306,674$

NET FROF \& EQUIF
INVEST \& ADV TO SUES
OTH NON-CUF ASSETS
DEFEFRED CHAFGES
INTANG IELES
DEFUSITS \& OTH ASSET
TUTAL ASSETS

NOTES FAYABLE
ACCOUNTS FAYABLE
CUF LONG TERM DEET
CUR FURT CAF LEASES
ACCRUED EXFENSES
INCOME TAXES
GTHER CUFRENT LIAE
TUTAL CURRENT LIAB
MORTGAEEG
DEFERRED CHARGES/INC
CONVEFTIBLE DEET
LONG TEFM DEET
NON-CUR CAP LEASES
OTHEF: LONG TEFM LIAE
TOTAL LIAEILITIES MINOFITY INT (LIAE) FFEFERFED STUCK゙
COMMON STOCK NET
CAFITAL SURFLUS
FETAINED EAFNINGS
TFEASURY GTOCF:
OTHER LIAEILITIES
SHAFEHOLDER" 5 EQUITY
TUT LIAE \& NET WORTH

FEBCBL YEAF ENDBNG
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS
GFOSS FFOFIT
$F: \&$ D EXFENDITUFES SELL GEN \＆ADMIN EXF INC EEF DEF \＆AMORT DEFFECIATION \＆AMOFT NON－GFEFAATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFDFE TAX FFIUV FOR INE TAXES MINOFITY INT（INE） INVEST GAINSiLDSSES DTHEF INCOME NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEITS \＆DISC OFS NET INCOME OUTSTANDING SHAFES

GUAFTEFLY FEFOFT FOF
NET GALES
COST DF GOODS
GFOSS FROFIT
F \％D EXFENDITUFES
GELL GEN \＆ADMIN EXF
INE EEF DEF ？AMORT
DEFRECIATION \＆AMORT
NON－OFEFATING INC
INTEFEST EXFENSE
INCDME EEFDFE TAX
FROU FDF INC TAXES
MINOFITY INT（INC）
INVEST GAINS／LDSSES
QTHEF：INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \＆DISC OFS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING BHAFES

12／玉1／日天 12／ $1 / 82$ 12／さ1／81 INCOME STATEMENT（OOOS）

$$
5,957,264 \quad 5,515,30 \quad 5,656,184
$$

$$
4,738,167 \quad 4,592,049 \quad 4,490,714
$$

$$
1,199,097 \quad 1,121,221 \quad 1,145,470
$$

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
247,663 & 195,935 & 171,450
\end{array}
$$

$$
595,157 \quad 550,102 \quad 5.51,160
$$

$$
558,277 \quad 487,284 \quad 442,860
$$

$$
\text { NA } \quad \text { NA NA }
$$

$$
130,209 \quad 137,565 \quad 115.700
$$

$$
15,098 \quad 17,020 \quad 18,409
$$

$475.38 日 \quad 507.627 \quad 5.3 .151$
175，241 18日，86玉 214．110 NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA
300,147
NA
300.147

84，626．000

31日，766 524,041
NA NA

524，041
84，180，000

71日，766
日4，41こ，000
$04 / 01 / 84 \quad 06 / 50 / 84$ INCOME STATEMENT（OOOS）
1，577．867 1，522．222
1，271，089 1，218，170
306．77日 304,052
$65,505 \quad 60,291$
$14 日, 54 日 \quad 133.426$
92．725 110.245
NA NA
3日， 5529 29．960
3．716 1．964
127.361 15日，41

48，198 5：3．
NA NA
NA
NA
$79: 16.3$
NA
79：16．3
84，657，000
SEGMENT DATA
（12／玉1／83）
ELECTFFINICS
AIFEFAFT FRODUCTS
ENEFGY GEFVICES
HAJDR AFFLIANCES
FIVE YEAF：SUMMAFY

| $Y E A F$ | $S A L E S$ | $(0005)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1983 | $5,957,200$ |  |
| 1782 | $5,513,400$ |  |
| 1981 | 565,620 |  |
| 1780 | $5,002,100$ |  |
| 1779 | $4,554,200$ |  |

NET INCOME 300,100
318，800
324，000
282， 300
240，300

EFS
3．55
ジ・7日
5． 86
3.40
2.91

COMMENTS：
QTHEF EQUITY IS FFGN．CUFRENCY TRANSLATION ADJUSTMENT：EXTFAORDINAFYY ITEM IS INCOME FFIDM DISCONTINUED OFEFATION（10－G GG－TO－B4）

ROLM CORP
DISCLOSURE CO NO: R761775000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA

AUDITOR CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: ARTHUR ANDERSEN \& CO.
AUDITOR'S REPORT: UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING 06/29/84 07/01/83 ASSETS (000S)
237,372 213,211
NA NA
146,015 $\quad 95,662$
167,275 73,705
NA NA
NA NA
NA NA
NA NA
7,944 11,446
558,606 394,024
225,313 161,366
$56,058 \quad 40,656$
$169,255 \quad 120,710$
NA NA
$\mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{NA}$
$N A \quad N A$
NA NA
8,479 5,181
736,340 519,915
LIABILITIES (000S)
NA NA
NOTES PAYABLE
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
44,94
28,503
CUR LONG TERM DEBT
CUR PORT CAP LEASES ACCRUED EXPENSES
INCOME TAXES
OTHER CURRENT LIAB
TOTAL CURRENT LIAB MORTGAGES
DEFERRED : i, $R$ GES/INC
CQNUERTIBLE DEBT
LONG TERM DEBT
NON-CUR CAP LEASES
OTHER LONG TERM LIAB
TOTAL LIABILITIES
MINORITY INT (LIAB)
PREFERRED STOCK
COMMON STOCK NET
GAPITAL SURPLUS
RETAINED EARNINGS
TREASURY STOCK
OTHER LIABILITIES
43
NA
NA
NA NA
58,497 37,289
37,029 21,437
31,485 19,210
$171,954 \quad 106,439$
NA NA
19,522 8,198
NA NA
3,528 23,559
NA NA
NA NA
195,004 138,196
NA NA

NA NA
443,476 254,247
NA NA
97,860 127.472
NA NA
NA NA
SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY
TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH
541,336 381,719
736,340 519,915

FISCAL YEAR ENDIF:
NET SALES
COST OF GOODS GROSS PROFIT
R \& D EXPENDITURES SELL Gf: \& ADMIN EXP INC BEF DEP \& AMORT DEPRECIATION \& AMORT NON-OPERATING INC INTEREST EXPENSE INCOME BEFORE TAX PROU FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INVEST GAINS/LOSSES OTHER INCOME
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES
QUARTERLY REPORT FOR
NET SAL:S
COST OF GOODS
GROSS PROFIT
$R$ \& D EXPENDITURES
SELL GEN \& ADMIN EXP
INC BEF DEP \& AMORT
DEPRECIATION \& AMORT
NON-OPERATING INC
INTEREST EXPENSE
IN ME BEFORE TAX
PROU FOR INC TAXES
MINORITY INT (INC)
INUEST GAINS/LOSSES
OTHER INCOME
NET INC BEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS \& DISC OPS
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHARES

06/29/84 07/01/83 07/02/82 INCOME STATEMENT (000S)

| 659,704 | 502,642 | 380,577 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 366,338 | 249,848 | 185,754 |
| 293,366 | 24,794 | 194,823 |
| 49,251 | 35,326 | 24,410 |
| 217,616 | 163,424 | 118,272 |
| 26,499 | 54,044 | 52,141 |
| $N A$ | $N A$ | $N A$ |
| 36,255 | 6,908 | 2,904 |
| $N A$ | $N A$ | $4 A$ |
| 62,754 | 64,952 | 55,045 |
| 25,023 | 25,409 | 25,218 |
| $N A$ | $N A$ | $N A$ |
| $N A$ | $N A$ | $N A$ |
| $N$ | 35,543 | 29,827 |
| 37,731 | $N A$ | $N A$ |
| $N 7,731$ | 35,543 | 29,827 |
| 23,333 | $21,951,211$ | $17,564,444$ |

09/08/84
INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)
193,665
113,237.
30,428
16,070
66,322
$(1,964)$ NA
5,006
NA
3,042
406
$N:$
NA
NA
2,636
Nis
2,636
NA

SEG :IHT DATA
NA
FIUE YEAR SLMMARY
YEAR
1984
1983
1982
1981
1980
SALES (000S)
NET

| INCOH: | EPS |
| :--- | ---: |
| 37,731 | 1.49 |
| 35,543 | 1.80 |
| 29,827 | 1.70 |
| 23,777 | 1.39 |
| 17,340 | 1.08 |

COMMENTS:
1983 SECOND QUARTER SNCOME STATEMENT IS FOR SIX MONTHS (20-Q 12-30-83):CASH INCLUDES TEMPORARY CASH INUESTMENTS

## SFERFY CORF

DISCLOELRE CO NO: S60s450000
CROSS REFERENCE: WAS SFERRY RAND CORF
AUDITOF CHANGE: NA
ALDITOF: ARTHUR YOUNG * COMFANY
AUDITOR'S REFORT: UNQUALIFIED
FISCAL YEAR ENDING $03 / \mathbb{1 / 8 4} 03 / 31 / 83$
CASH
MFETABLE SECURITIES
RECEIVAELES
INUENTORIES
RAW MATERIALS
WORK IN FROGRESS
FINISHED GOODS
NOTES FECEIVAELE OTHEF CURRENT ASSETS
TOTAL CLIRRENT ASSETS
PROP, FLANT \& EQUIF ACCUMLLLATED DEF
NET FROF \& EQUIF
INVEST \& ADV TO SUBS
OTH NON--CLF: ASSETS
deferfied chafiges
intangieles
ASSETS (000S)
11,700 JT, 700
155,100 31, 200
956.600 956,500
1.180,200 1.007,900
NA NA

DEFOSITS \& OTH ASSET
total assets
NA NA

| NA | NA |
| ---: | ---: |
| $55.500 ~ 451.200$ |  |

2,63:9:100 2,480,800
1,810,600 1,695,700
969,600 888,300
841.000 805,400

427,400 596,600
1,415,800 1,529,600
NA NA
179,300 67,400
5,502,600 5,279,800
notes fayaele
ACCULNTS FAYABLE
CLFi LONG TEFM DEET
clif fort caf leases
ACCRUED EXFENSES
INCOME TAXES
oTHER CLIFREINT LIAB
TOTAL CLIRENT LIAB
mortgages
dEFERRED CHARGES/INC
CONVERTIELE DEBT
LONG TERM DEET
non-clir caf leases
OTHER LONG TERM LIAE
LIABILITIES (OOOS)

| 111,800 | $38,7,700$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 240,100 | 177,300 |
| 35,200 | 35,500 |
| NA | NA |
| 270,000 | NA |
| NA | 210,500 |
| 899,000 | 776,300 |
| 556,100 | $1,581,500$ |
| NA | NA |
| 433,900 | 442,400 |
| NA | NA |
| 709,700 | 857,000 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |

TOTAL LIAEILITIES
MINORITY INT (LIAB)
FREFERFED STOCK:
COMMON STOCK NET
CAFITAL SLIFFLUS
FETAINED EARNINGS
TREASLIFY STDCE
OTHER LIAEILITIES
SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY
TOT LIAE \& NET WORTH
$2,699,700$
NA
NA

22,800
604,800
1.986,100 NA
(214,800)
$\begin{array}{ll}(231,300) & (214,800) \\ 2,802,900 & 2,398,900\end{array}$
5,502,600 5,279,800

FISEHL YEAK ENDING
NET GALES
COST OF GOUDS
GROSS FROFIT
F: D EXFENDITUFES
SELL GEN $\because$ ADMIN EXF IWC EEF DEF : AMORT DEFFECIATION : AMOFT NOM-OFEFATING INC INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFORE TAX FFIQU FOR INC TAXES MINORITY INT (INC) INVEST GAINS/LDSSES OTHEF INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS EX ITEMS : DISC DFS NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHAFES
GUAFTEFLY FEFORT FOF

NET SALES
COST OF EOODS
GRDSS FFOFIT
F: $\because$ E EXFENDITUFES
SELL GEN 3 ADMIN EXF
INC EEF DEF \& APIORT
DEFFEECIATION \& AMOFT
NON-OFEFATING INC
INTEFEST EXFENSE INCOME EEFORE TAX
FROU FOF: INC TAXES
MINOFITY INT (INC)
INVEST GAINS/LDSSES
OTHEF INCOME
NET INC EEF EX ITEMS
EX ITEMS : DISC DF'S
NET INCOME
OUTSTANDING SHAFES

INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)
4.714.000 4.665.600 5.045,300 -,054,100 . 2,886,800 $3.105,600$ $1,857,700 \quad 1,776.800 \quad 1,741,700$ $410,400 \quad 375,700$ 375,200 $1,015.400 \quad 1,063,200$ 1.029.900
$45,100 \quad 5.5 .700$ 56.600 NA NA

50,600
36.000 65. 400

267,000
166.600 228.900

305,500
105.500

NA
NA
NA
200,000 16.200
216.200
$54 . \Xi 47.711$
06/30/84
INCOME STATEMENT (OOOS)
1,197.100
744,100
445.000
101.700
247.300 92,000

NA
(14.100)

43,200
-4,700
14,600
NA
NA
NA
20.100

NA
20,100
55, 177, 5

## SEGMENT DATA <br> (03/E1/84)

COMFUTEF SYSTEMS \& EQUIFMENT
GUIDANCE \& CONTFOL EQUIFMENT
FAFM EGUIFMENT

| SALES (000S) OF INCOME |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| $2,825,500$ | 265,700 |
| $1,427,400$ | 122,500 |
| 728,500 | 71,800 |

F.IVE YEAF SUMMAF'Y

EAF:
SALES (OOOS)
1984
1793
1922
1981
1980
SALES
$4,914,000$
$4,663,600$
$5,045,300$
$4,896,100$
$4,261,800$

EPS
4. 17

216,200
2.65

118,100
5.25
221. 900

311,200
7.63
$274.400 \quad 7.53$
COMIENTS:
EXTFADFDINAFY ITEM IS DISCONTINUED OFERATIONS (10-Q 12-51-8S) (10-4
OE- $-1-34$ ) ; 1781 INCOME STATEMENT AND 1982 FINANCIALS AFE RESTATED:

WANG LAEORATORIES INC
DIECLOSURE CO NO: W122000000
CROSS REFERENCE: NA
AUDITGE CHANGE: NA
AUDITOR: ERNST \& WHINNEY
AUDITOR"S REPGRT: UNQUALIFIED
fiscal year ending
CASH
MRKTABLE EECURITIES
RECEIVABLES
INUENTORIES
FAN MATERIALS
WORK IN PROGRESS
FINI SHED GOODS
notes receivable OTHER CURRENT ASSETS TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS FROF, PLANT \& EQUIF ACCUMLLATED DEP NET PROP \& EQUIF INEEST \& ADU TO SUES OTH NON-CUR ASSETS deferred charges
INTANGIBLES
DEPOSITS \& OTH ASSET TOTAL ASSETS

| $06 / 30 / 34$ | 0680.83 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Assets | (0005) |
| 16,000 | 12,700 |
| 57,000 | 220,100 |
| 445,200 | 320,500 |
| 562,800 | 316,200 |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 46,900 | 57,700 |
| 1,127,900 | 927,600 |
| 1,154,800 | 813,200 |
| 346,300 | 245:400 |
| 808,000 | 567,800 |
| 262,400 | 137,600 |
| NH | NA |
| NA | NA |
| NA | NA |
| 53,500 | 43.500 |
| 2,251,900 | 1,681,800 |


|  | LABILIT | 05) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOTES PAYABLE | 192,200 | 34,300 |
| ACCOUNTS PAYABLE | 243,500 | 183,800 |
| CUR LONG TERM DEBT | 21,200 | 27,700 |
| CUR PORT CAP LEASES | NA | NA |
| ACCRUED EXPENSES | NA | NA |
| income taxes | 6,500 | 6,200 |
| OTHER CURRENT LIAB | 73,500 | 51,700 |
| TITAL CURRENT LIAB | 541,900 | 308,700 |
| mortgages | NA | NA |
| deferred charges/inc | 102,000 | 72,000 |
| COMUERTIBLE DEST | NA | NA |
| LONG TERM DEET | 353,600 | 363,300 |
| NON-CUR CAP LEASES | NA | NA |
| UTHER LONG TEFM LIAB | NA | NA |
| total liabilities | 1,002,500 | 744,000 |
| MINORITY INT (LIAB) | NA | NA |
| PREFERRED STOCK | NA | Na |
| COMMON STOCK NET | 65,300 | 66,100 |
| CAPITAL SURPLUS | 576,700 | 453,500 |
| RETAINED EARNINGS | 637,400 | 443,400 |
| TREASURY STOCK | 400 | 500 |
| OTHER LIABILITIES | ( 33,600 ) | (24,800) |
| SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY | 1,249,400 | 937,800 |
| TOT LIAB \& NET WORTH | 2,251,900 | 1,681,800 |

FigCal fear EIdDING
NET EALES
cost bf rione
GROGS FRGFIT
त \＆E EKFENDITURES
SELL GEN \＆ADMIN EXF INE BEF DEP \＆AMORT DEFRECIATION \＆AMORT NON－DFERATING INC INTEREST EXPENSE INOUNE EEFDRE TAX FROU FOR INC TAXES IIINORITY INT（INC） DHEST GAING／LOESES OTHER INCOME NET INE BEF EX ITEIS EX ITEMS \＆DISC OPS NET INEOME gutetandoling shares

QUARTERLY REFORT FOR
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### 5.0 FEDERAL PROGRAMS, POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

### 5.1 Introduction

This Chapter analyses federal programs and policies supporting the Office Communications Systems program. It is primarily the result of interviews with the leading Canadian ocs firms outlined in Chapter 4 (Competitive Analysis and Canadian Industrial Performance).

In accordance with the Terms of Reference, the industry has been interviewed with respect to:

1) Major programs supporting the OCS industry, as follows:
a) OCS Field Trials
b) Enterprise Development Program (EDP). (Now restructured to the Industrial and Regional Development Program [IRDP].)
c) Source Development Fund (SDF)
d) Program for Export Market Development (PEMD)
2) Policies, as follows:
a) Regional industrial development
b) Procurement policy (direct procurement, Canadian content rules, offset programs, government-tom government。)
c) Telecommunications regulatory policies

### 5.2 Programs

### 5.2.1 Introduction

Figure 5-1 shows the distribution of the companies interviewed and the various programs they have used. Six were involved in the field trials. Only one of the firms interviewed had used the Source Development fund. Suprisingly, given these are all major firms, six companies had used no programs at all. The reason given by the majority was that they really did not know much about them. Other comments were:
a) They didn!t have their product line ready and couldn ${ }^{\circ} t$ take advantage of the programs
and
b) All activities were controlled through the U.S. head office.


TOTAL 25

### 5.2.2 Use of Federal Programs

Figure 5-2 shows the respondents' answers to the question: "Would you use the Program again?". The answers show that the majority of respondents were reasonably happy and would continue to use the programs. All respondents were 100 percent for the PEMD program, which is viewed as being very effective with little red tape. There was some hesitation on the EDP program, where 25 percent stated they would not use it again; and the field trials, where 33 percent would not use it again. The perceived advantages and disadvantages and reasons for such answers are fairly clearly indicated in the responses shown in Figures 5-3 to 5-10.

These figures provide the answers to the following questions:

1) How closely did you find the program fulfilled your needs?
2) How much time and effort did it take you to obtain funding?
3) How adequate was the funding to your needs?
4) How much will the use of this program contribute to your ocs product line?

## FIGURE 5-2



### 5.2.3 Impact of Federal Programs

As indicated in Figures 5-3 and 5-4, the majority of respondents on the field trials were very positive. They felt the program did fulfill their needs, funding was reasonably adequate and the program did contribute to their product line. only one company ranked each question at Level 2, all others were at Level 3 and above. However, one problem is shown in Figure 5-3. Most companies felt the time and effort associated with obtaining funding was excessive. Other comments included:

1) A feeling that the field trials were really too short and a more extended period was necessary. Also, there should be some follow-up to the field trials.
2) DSS treated the field trials like a regular contract and not like a development program. As such, management time and effort expended was high and companies were expected to strictly define aspects of the program that were of a developmental nature and could not be defined, in the usual contractual terms.
3) Public endorsements could not be used, as they might be with a private sector client (e.g. "ABC company is fully satisfied with the products provided by " $X^{\text {ef }}$ )。

All-in-all however, the data indicates a highly successful program.
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Figures 5-5 and 5-6 show the reaction to the EDP program on the part of major OCS industry firms. The reaction was reasonably positive, although slightly less so than the field trials. "Fulfilled needs" is ranked somewhat higher than the field trials, but level of "funding" appears less adequate and the "contribution to product line" is somewhat less. The "time and effort" to obtain funding is ranked high with three out of four respondents at Level 5 ("A great deal of effort"). General comments include:

1) EDP assumes that a firm can totally define a program ahead of time with no flexibility afterwards, i.e., no change. So firms tend to make the project , look like it is supposed to look, in order to obtain funding。
2) The level of funding support is so variable, firms never know how much they would get.
3) It takes 12 months to get the funding; a go/no go decision should be made quicker.
4) The process needs to be streamlined.

Generally, the problems are amplified by the rapid change in technology associated with the OCS marketplace. R\&D must fit this very rapidly changing environment. However, by the time a company obtains funding approval on the basis of an
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application submitted months before, some aspect of the marketplace may have changed. If the program has little flexibility, the company cannot keep up with the rapidly changing pace. It may, therefore, wind up developing a product on the basis of the funding application rather than on the basis of what the market indicates it needs.

In non-OCS product areas, this is not a problem. However, in ocs, the pace of technology is such that for funding to be effective, it must be quick and it must be flexible. Otherwise, the competition will have the product developed while government and industry are still renegotiating the funding agreement. This implies a need for a different funding mechanism in areas of rapid technological change, such as Office Communications Systems.

Given that only one firm has used the Source Development Fund, it does not appear to be a very important area to the OCS industry. However, the single recipient was enthusiatic and ranked (See Figures $5-7$ and 5-8) "fulfilled needs" and "contribution to product line" at Level 5 ("A great deal"). However, "time and effort" was ranked higher than other programs and "level of funding" was ranked lower.

Figure 5-9 and 5-10, show the responses by companies utilizing PEMD funding. The majority of respondents felt the program "fulfilled their needs" and provided "adequate funding". Obviously, the PEMD program also did not require a great deal of time and effort to obtain funding, as compared to other programs. However, that might be expected as the PEMD
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## PEMD
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funding does not involve capital projects and is therefore usually for smaller amounts than other programs. The only area in which PEMD scored less than the other programs vis-a-vis the OCS industry was in "contribution to product line". Whereas this was ranked very high in the field trials and EDP, it was ranked only average for PEMD. Again, as PEMD is oriented towards export marketing rather than R\&D, this is quite understandable. Suggestions for improvement include:

1) Quicker fùnding. Marketing requirements cannot wait.
2) Some ambiguous questions on the form (e.g. Canadian content requirements).
3) Expand definition of assistance.
4) Lift ceiling of three applications.
5) A company with offshore offices cannot apply for funding, even though the offshore office is another division and has nothing to do with the product line for which the application is being made.

All-in-all however, the OCS industry respondents indicate a high level of satisfaction with PEMD.
5.3. Federal Policies and Strategies

Figure 5-11 shows the support of the OCS industry for regional development programs. The response was the answer to the question:
"Do you believe we need more/less/the same level of regional industrial development incentives to encourage the growth of the ocs industry in Canada?"

Given that the majority of the companies interviewed were in Ontario and quebec, the response shows not only support, but a total lack of any negative attitude towards regional development by the ocs industry. In fact, it shows a high level of support for increased incentives, not only by those companies benefiting, but also by the industry as a whole.

Figures 5-12 to $5-15$ show the responses to the
question:
"To what extent would the following help Canada's OCS industry?"

As a general overview to these figures, it is evident that there is a great deal of support for:

1) More direct government procurement of Canadian OCS equipment and systems.

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOFMENT INCENTIVES FOR OCS

2) More field trials
3) More tax breaks

There was not a great deal of support for "More Canadian content regulations", "Offset programs" or "Government-to-government deals". Reaction to regulatory aspects was mixed.

Dealing with each of these in turn, Figure 5-12 shows the response to "More direct government procurement of Canadian ocs equipment and systems". There is a very high level of support for this policy/strategy. About 87 percent of those interviewed, responded at Level 3 and above, indicating the industry feels that direct government procurement has a major potential to help the growth of the ocs industry in Canada. This is obviously related to the response to the field trails where again, over 75 percent felt that more field trials would help Canada's OCS industry. Since the field trials themselves are a form of direct government procurement, the response to these two questions indicates an overwhelming positive response to this program. Other comments were:

1) The field trials should have been larger. They were not extensive enough.
2) More ongoing support and follow-up to the field trials are needed.
positive impact of the following; MORE DIRECT GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT
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3) There are problems in obtaining information on the present and future needs of government departments, as well as delivering Canadian product information to the departments.
4) Since Canadian firms cannot provide complete systems, the government should support the purchase of multivendor systems by departments, to which Canadian companies can then contribute equipment and subsystems. If governments order one-vendor systems, Canadian firms will be locked out of the market.
5) Some respondents feel government procurement policy is geared to offshore equipment, as the "least risk" solution to departmental office automation problems.
6) Give private companies a tax break to "Buy Canadian".
7) Most computer peripherals enter duty free into Canada but not from Canada to the United States.
8) More "Buy Canadian" promotion.
9) More federal/provincial procurement liason on "Buy Canadian" policies.
10) A Canadian Software Development Agency could help with: a) Identification of opportunities.
b) Ways to distribute and display software products.
c) Increasing government information flow.

Interestingly, the OCS industry is lukewarm to the introduction of more Canadian content regulations (See Figure 5-13). Only 56 percent ranked this at Levels 3 and above, as having a positive impact on the industry. It would appear that some companies believe that it is quite easy to get around the Canadian content regulations. Several respondents pointed out that government departments had bought from IBM, Wang and others on specifications that did not even allow Canadian companies to compete. Other respondents felt that too many foreign multinationals had been rationalized as being "Canadian" for Canadian content purposes.

This reaction is similar for offset programs, (see Figure 5-13) with about 62 percent being favourable, but without any strong consensus. However, since very few companies have had anything to do with offsets, their reaction is not based on exposure to these programs, which are mostly military in nature. Turning to Figure 5-14, the question on "More government-to-government deals" got the same response; very lukewarm with only 53 percent being at all positive, at Levels 3 and above. The rest felt that this policy would not contribute to the growth of the OCS industry. (Note: government-togovernment deals means federal/provincial arrangements, interaction with foreign governments, direct assistance vis-avis state buying agencies.)

As indicated in Figure 5-14, "More tax breaks" received the greatest positive response of all possible policy alternatives, a total of 87.5 percent at Levels 3 and above.
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This is somewhat suprising as many companies in this industry, with its very heavy $R \& D$, are often unprofitable during their growth years and as such, would pay little tax anyway. However, the OCS industry is heavily reliant on venture capital and the stock market. As such, firms are very sensitive to their investors' perceptions of the tax implications of companies' current and future profitabilities.

Figure 5-15 shows the attitude within the OCS industry to the impact of "Current Regulations" and possible "Deregulation of the Telecomunications industry"。 Deregulation is supported at Level 3 and above, by about 73 percent of the respondents, as having a potentially positive impact on the OCS industry. However, support is not overwhelming, with few indicating the impact would be at Level 5. i.e. "a great deal of impact". The industry is positive but cautious. The industry's perception of the impact of "Current regulations" is also cautious. A slight majority ( 58 percent) believe that current regulations are $O K$ and have a somewhat positive impact on the industry. The rest ( 42 percent) believe that current regulations have a slightly negative impact. There is obviously no consensus on "current regulations", although most still agree that deregulation would be the best policy option.
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### 6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 6.1 Office Comminications Systems (OCS)

The North American OCS market will be worth \$10.7 billion in 1985, for the industry and government sectors being analyzed. Growth is high resulting in a forecast market of $\$ 17.0$ billion by 1988 (in constant dollars). The Canadian market is relatively small at about 5 percent of the U.S. market (some specific sectors are larger). Almost all the market growth is for integrated office systems. The non-integrated systems market begins to decline by 1986 and by 1988 will be slightly below the 1983 market (in real terms). Within the industry sectors being studied, the largest market is in manufacturing with a little over three times the market size of any other sector.

Most firms in Canada and the United States are currently at the "Partial" automation level, but almost 30 percent still remain at the "Early" level. However, automation is proceeding quickly and about 75 to 80 percent of all organizations expect to achieve "Full" automation within five years. The factors currently impeding the progress of office automation are, in order of importance:

- Financial and product compatability factors
- Corporate motivation and user acceptance factors
- Technology

Generally, most organizations did not feel that technology was a very significant problem.

The general approach to office automation by most organizations indicates a "do-it-yourself" philosophy. They neither expect to simply purchase a complete offering as recommended by one supplier, nor to hire an outside consultant to do the whole job. As a result, this does not appear to offer a very good market for total systems integrators. Only 12 percent of organizations in Canada and 5 percent in the U.S. would engage a consultant to do the complete systems integration. The wording of the question however, should be kept in mind. This does not mean that there is no market for consultants or integrators, only that they will be engaged to do specific pieces of work rather than a total project. This result was consistent across all industry sectors in both Canada and the United States.

In purchasing office automation systems, organizations ranked "maintenance/reliability" as the most important factor, followed closely by "product/compatibility". Other factors in their order of importance were:

* Maintenance/reliability
* Product/compatibility
* Company support
* Product scope
* Manufacturer's reputation
* Price
* Advanced technology
* Product availability
* Sales personnel/marketing

There are opportunities for Canadian manufacturers to compete in specialized niches in the office communication systems market. Expertise exists mainly in communications, word processing, local area networks, and software. Some expertise is being developed to deliver systems for the integrated electronic office, primarily by Northern Telecom, but also by others. Threats to the Canadian industry include increasing competition from U.S. vendors, and in certain areas, from Japanese vendors.

IBM, DEC, and Wang are the leaders in the move to full integrated multifunctional systems. IBM's strategy is to provide full corporate office automation facilities based on their mainframe offerings, and to provide multifunctional workstation systems used in a LAN configuration, with mainframe connection capability. DEC's strategy is to provide integrated systems directly to the larger companies and to their installed mainframe customer base. Wang's strategy is to build upon their very strong office presence with user-friendly, integrated multio functional systems and become a major departmental system niche vendor.

Most Canadian vendors fall into the niche or commodity categories. Northern Telecom is the only Canadian firm with the capability to be a total system supplier. To achieve this, they have acquired two U.S. data processing firms and are entering into agreements with the major mainframe companies. Only through this strategy will they be able to offer complete systems, short of eventually purchasing a major mainframe company. In addition, they are also positioning themselves as a niche supplier, with the "Open World" concept. With this strategy, Northern Telecom will be able to supply PABX and other subsystems, capable of integration with either the total system supplier's offering or with subsystems from other suppliers. Northern Telecom will also shortly introduce a multifunctional voice/data workstation and integrated office system. With their technical and financial strength, Northern Telecom will be a major contender in this market. (Mitel also has a voice/data workstation but it is a stand alone and Mitel has no apparent plans to continue its development as part of an integrated system.)

Mitel is a major niche supplier, capitalizing on its experience in telecommunications. Before the collapse of its agreement with IBM, it was moving towards a very powerful niche position, with its equipment being part of IBM's total system offering. AES Data Ltd. and Micom (a division of Philips Information Systems) are also both niche suppliers, currently struggling to move from being dedicated word processor suppliers to multi-functional workstation and integrated system suppliers. AES has some way to go but, if it succeeds, it will be a departmental system niche vendor serving the smaller to medium
sized firms. Micom is likely to integrate its Canadian manufactured product line within the overall Philips systems offering, and also become a major departmental system niche vendor. Galdalf, Develcon and several others are successful niche suppliers, using their telecommunications base to develop subsystems for use in overall office communications networks. Canstar communications and others are niche vendors with LAN offerings. On the software side, Officesmiths, OCRA, Communications and Systemhouse are niche suppliers, with Officesmiths providing electronic filing subsystems and OCRA and Systemhouse offering systems integration software and facilities. GEAC, the only Canadian mainframe manufacturer in the ocs market, is basically a defensive supplier, providing office automation systems to protect its installed base in the library and financial sectors. Most other Canadian vendors are commodity suppliers. These and the above companies are outlined further in the sections of this report dealing with their product categories.

Canadian firms, by world standards, are generally quite small. The most successful ones have usually carved out a very specialized product area for themselves and are not directly competing against the larger multinationals. Other firms are assemblers of foreign technology; or build custom equipment and systems; or provide systems in local geographic areas, where sales and service can overcome competition from the larger suppliers. In the software secor, with a very few exceptions, most firms are providing custom software services, or non-integrated packaged systems, usually in the area of financial
and accounting software. There are no large Canadian vendors with significant sales of packaged software for office systems.

All the major multinationals have offices in Canada but few manufacture office communications systems here, other than on a commodity basis. IBM and DEC have manufacturing plants in Canada, but are not manufacturing the products covered by this report. Control Data manufactures a super microcomputer in Toronto, but apparently do not intend to enter the office systems market. Micom (a division of Philips) has been previously discussed; Memorex (a division of Burroughs) is producing storage peripherals in Canada; Dysan Corporation of the U.S. is expected to start manufacturing in Canada shortly, and several other Canadian suppliers are outlined in this report. However, there is a great deal more manufacturing which could be done in Canada by the multinationals, particularly if they followed the world product mandate strategy endorsed by the Canadian government. Such a strategy allows the Canadian operation to concentrate its R\&D, production and manufacturing resources towards a specific product sector, for which it has a mandate to sell worldwide. This is distinct from a branch plant strategy by which the Canadian organization produces a variety of foreign designed products only for the Canadian market.

In general, with a few exceptions, the OCS industry in Canada is relatively weak. If this trend is allowed to continue, the resulting trade deficit will grow into the billions. This, combined with the lost export potential, will result in a lost opportunity to create tens of thousands of well paying jobs in a
growing technological market. With a few exceptions, the size of the industry is too small to be able to compete in the open market without government assistance. Generally, this has taken the form of a variety of government funding programs, mainly to support R\&D costs. While these have assisted the industry in the creation of products, the OCS market place is characterized by a need for financial and marketing strength. Many smaller Canadian firms have the technological capability but lack the resources to bring their product to market. Without neglecting R\&D incentives, a greater focus should be placed on an organization's overall financial requirements to penetrate and sustain itself in the market place. It is of little benefit to encourage firms to develop products which they cannot sell.

Given that the first priority should be to develop the Canadian owned sector of the industry, it must be recognized that large parts of the market are held by large foreign multinationals. The prospect of Canadian firms penetrating some of these sectors is dim, not because of a lack of technical capability, but because of a lack of size. In some sectors of the market, only very large, well financed firms can survive and grow. Therefore, government policy should be directed at helping smaller firms achieve the rapid growth necessary to bring them to a competitive size as soon as possible. Such growth curves necessitate high levels of financing, primarily from venture capital sources.

The second priority should be foreign investment. In many areas, the only practical strategy for increasing the size
of the industry in Canada, lies in encouraging foreign companies, already dominant in the market, to establish operations in Canada. Many already have plants here. However, the industry cannot function on a branch plant basis. With a market of only 5 percent or so of the U.S. market, all industrial strategy in this sector must be aimed at exports. Therefore, a world product mandate strategy for the OCS sector would be appropriate. Governments can assist in building such a strategy by encouraging major multinationals to allow their Canadian subsidiaries to stake out unique positions in the market place, fitting within their parent's overall corporate strategy. In most cases, R\&D tax credits and other tax incentives are the best way to do this, since the firms already have the necessary financial and marketing strength.

### 6.2. Workstations

The workstation market was analyzed for six industry sectors plus government. The North American market is large at over $\$ 7$ billion (1985) and is growing rapidly. The main growth is in networked microcomputer based workstations. The standalone and clustered word processor market is declining and the stand alone microcomputer market is only growing slowly. By 1988, networked microcomputer based workstations will hold over 50 percent of the total workstation market.

Limited opportunities exist for Canadian manufacturers in the standalone market. The market is microcomputer based and the only two major Canadian manufacturers of microcomputers have recently ceased production. Some niche suppliers remain (e.g. educational microcomputers) and it is likely only in specialized products of this nature, that future opportunities may arise. Currently, there is intense competition in the workstation market and the industry shakeout is continuing. Only major suppliers capable of also offering the workstation as part of an integrated office system will survive.

The competition for workstations is predominately from American vendors. The Japanese have had problems penetrating this market because of the English language barrier and lack of software development by independent software firms.

Typical Japanese firms now entering the market include Sanyo, Canon, Sony, Epson, Panasonic, Seiko, and NEC Corporation. However, the Japanese are not expected to excel in producing multifunctional workstations, unless the workstation becomes a great deal more generic in nature than at present. Competition is expected to remain primarily American.

It is unlikely that any future manufacturers of multifunctional workstations or microcomputers will emerge in Canada, in light of current competitive pressures. All current suppliers are attempting to hold their own.

We expect that the future market will be dominated by IBM and the major multinationals. Position in the market place will be decided, not so much by technology, as by marketing, price and financial strength. Smaller firms will only survive if:

1) They are very low cost suppliers, primarily manufturing IBM compatible machines in low wage countries.
or
2) They serve very specialized niche markets with low to medium volume production and with a high technology content e.g. vertical markets, mobile/ ruggedized units, specialized military equipment, workstations for explosive/corrosive environments.

Most workstations will either be procured as part of an integrated system or will be bought with the objective of integration into a system. Companies offering integrated office systems (either corporate or departmental) will be able to sell their workstations as part of the integrated system offering. Vendors without system offerings, will sell lower cost workstations, designed to fit within the integrated systems of the larger vendors e.g. IBM, Dec, Wang.

IBM standards will continue to dominate the industry. All other vendors will trend towards IBM compatibility. Workstations will be multi-user, multi-tasking, real time systems with increased memory ( 1 Mbyte) and storage ( 5 to 20 Mbytes). Prices will drop at the low end for standalone units, and an entire IBM PC will be reduced to a single chip.

Canadian companies interested in this market should proceed with care. Generally price, distribution and marketing/ sales strength are likely to be greater factors for success, than technological strength. It is expected that Canadian firms would only enter this market in a very specialized niche, with a high value product in low to medium volume production, and with a high technology content. Examples of such products are those by Electrohome, Spectrex and Dy-4. (See Section 4.2 of Chapter 4 for details.)

The Canadian word processor industry is in the process of transition. It is attempting to move from the dedicated word processor market, which is in decline, to the
integrated, microcomputer based workstation and office systems market, which is growing rapidly. The major firms involved are AES and Micom. Since it is unlikely that other Canadian firms will be able to enter this market, the focus of government policy should be directed at assisting the existing industry to make the necessary transition. If they do not, the likely result will be a trade deficit in this product sector of over $\$ 600$ million annually by 1988. Although forms of $R \& D$ assistance are desirable, the primary factor for success in this market will lie in achieving wide North American distribution, brand name recognition, and automated low cost production. The technical configuration of the offering must be integrated, multi-user, multi-tasking, with an emphasis on higher and higher levels of memory and storage. Systems must be IBM plug compatible and capable of networking in a multi-vendor environment.

A Canadian industry operating in this market must be large scale with sales directed primarily at the U.S. As such, it would be desirable to eliminate all U.S/Canadian tariffs so that Canadian operations could achieve the necessary scale required for lower cost production. Even then, it should be expected that much production would be done "off shore" to maintain price competitiveness. However, engineering, R\&D, parts production, assembly of certain higher value models, and installation/servicing are all large components which would remain in Canada.

### 6.3 PABXs

The market is large at about $\$ 5$ billion (1985) annually, but is relatively flat. Instead of new installations, the market is becoming predominantly a replacement one, i.e. upgrading existing installations. While the largest market is in the over 250 line segment, the fastest growing market is in the under 100 line segment.

The market is virtually all digital, with few manufacturers producing any analog systems. The technology trend is towards voice/data PABXs handling voice and data in digital form.

Canadian PABX manufacturers have established themselves as leaders in digital technology and should be in a key competitive position to meet the opportunities of the integrated electronic office market. Northern Telecom is in the best position to take advantage of the demand for voice/data PABXs. They have a good reputation, extensive distribution network, experience and good technology.

The most recent major event of importance to Northern Telecom and the other Canadian PABX manufacturers has been the AT\&T divestiture. This allows AT\&T to diversify into new unregulated markets, such as computer manufacturing and the information industry. As a result, AT\&T, along with its PABX manufacturing subsidiary, Western Electric, may now strategically
position itself to be a totally integrated office systems supplier. This presents both a threat and an opportunity to Canadian firms. The opportunity was created by the separation of AT\&T from its twenty-two Bell operating companies. previously, these companies acquired almost all their telecommunications equipment from AT\&T. As a result of the divestiture they are now free to buy from other manufacturers.

The most serious threat to Canadian manufacturers lies in the competitive allegiances now forming between key PABX manufacturers and major computer hardware and software vendors. Most notable is the purchase of Rolm by IBM. To date, Northern Telecom has taken a different strategy with its "Open World" concept. Instead of acquiring an interest in a major mainframe manufacturer, it is attempting to develop PABX equipment and system compatability with all mainframe manufacturers. In addition, it has acquired DP expertise through the purchase of two relatively smaller DP firms in the U.S. With these moves, Northern Telecom will be able to:

1) Sell a completely integrated office system, connected to the installed mainframe base of any computer manufacturer.
2) Sell PABX equipment to mainframe manufacturers (except IBM) for incorporation into their integrated office system offerings.
3) Maintain the viability of their own installed PABX base, by allowing the integrated connection of other mainframes and other integrated office systems.

From a purely technical viewpoint, this places Northern Telecom in a reasonable position to compete with the IBM/Rolm threat. However, it does make for a weaker overall marketing position, since it will be extremely difficult to place its PABXs within the IBM dominated mainframe world. IBM's marketing strength will tend to "pull" Rolm with it.

After Northern Telecom, the next largest Canadian PABX supplier is Mitel. Despite its difficulties. Mitel is now delivering its SX2000 switch. However, the delays, financial losses and the termination of their IBM agreement have had a serious affect on their potential. At the moment Mitel is left with the worst of two worlds. They have not as yet achieved Northern Telecom's "Open World" concept of compatibility nor are they aligned with a major integrated office systems supplier like IBM. It further appears that they will have no multifunctional workstation system offering of their own, unless further work is done on the Mitel KONTACT to build it into an office system. As a result Mitel will likely remain a niche vendor of PABXs. A major factor in their future success in office communications systems will depend on how fast they can achieve compatibility with systems vendors such as Wang and DEC. The Japanese PABX manufacturers also appear to be another serious threat on the horizon. According to a Frost and Sullivan report, Japan's
share of the PABX market will jump from $15 \%$ to $32 \%$ between 1983 and 1987.

The other major PABX vendors, Microtel and TIE/ Communications are subsidiaries of multinationals. Both are primarily telecommunications niche vendors in Canada and will not be major competitors in the integrated systems market, from their Canadian base. However, both have manufacturing facilities here and, with their parents' resources, could become major niche suppliers if they adopted a world product mandate strategy.

Good opportunities exist for Canadian firms manufacturing specialized data communications equipment and systems. The market is growing rapidly and the industry has a good technological base from Canada's traditional strength in telecommunication equipment. The U.S. market.for modems and multiplexers alone totalled over $\$ 1.2$ billion in 1982 and by 1987 is estimated to be worth nearly $\$ 3$ billion. Canadian firms have mainly entered this market as niche vendors, such as Gandalf and Develcon, who have beem major innovators in the limited distance data set market.

The key characteristics essential to success in this market are:

1) the need for continuing technical innovation;
2) the need for compatibility of products both within a vendor's product line and with other types of communications equipment;
3) the need for a clear market approach, i.e., total communications system supplier vs. niche or commodity supplier;
4) the need for efficient economies of scale in both manufacturing and distribution, to withstand the price pressures caused by intense competition.

The data communications market is not seriously affected by competition from Europe and Japan. This is largely due to the systems and service requirements of data communications. The importance of the service aspect was stressed by a Gandalf staff member recently commenting on the introduction of their PACX system to the U.S. market.
"... We didn't even attempt to sell it in the U.S. until we had the appropriate base of technical people trained to maintain the PACX, and until we had sufficient test equipment, spare parts and organization so that we could service. a customer quickly..."

A few Japanese firms such as NEC and Fujitsu have participated in this market on an OEM basis. However, the unwillingness of large businesses to use products from new vendors will be another key barrier to foreign competition.

Success in the PABX industry will depend upon:

1) Technology and marketing strength.
2) Offering value added features, such as voice mail.
3) Providing PABX compatibility with the office systems offerings of the major vendors (e.g. IBM, Digital, Wang).
4) Developing the PABX as a "gateway" to the integrated office system and providing a PABX-LAN hybrid network for integrated systems.
5) Developing the voice/data PABX with value added features.

Northern Telecom has already positioned itself as a PABX supplier, capable of providing an integrated office system based on its $P A B X$ and integrating its offerings with others in a multi-vendor environment. However, it has not yet positioned itself as an office communications systems supplier, despite its acquisition of two U.S. DP firms. It needs to do so since, as systems integration proceeds, it is likely that more and more linkages like the IBM-Rolm connection will take place. This will begin to break down even further the distinction between the office systems PABX and the computer. Once that distinction becomes blurred, the market edge will tend towards suppliers like IBM-Rolm with both converging technologies within one corporate group.

Mitel must position.itself as a major PABX supplier to a multi-vendor system world. It must either follow Northern Telecom's "Open World" concept or link with a major computer vendor, as it tried to do with IBM. The latter course would be the most successful. As indicated previously the converging technologies of computers and telecommunications will make it necessary for major firms to develop both technologies within their corporate organization.

The other major PABX vendors, Microtel and TIE/Communications, are subsidiaries of foreign multinationals. A branch plant operation in Canada is unlikely to be successful. With de-regulation in the U.S. and a trend in a similar direction in Canada, the Canadian market is opening up to intense competition. The industry must export to survive and must base its strategy on a North American market. Current foreign multinationals in Canada should therefore adopt a world product mandate strategy for their operations here. Governments could encourage this through assistance in negotiations with the multinational's parent firms, combined with financing incentives for $R \& D$ in Canada.

With the traditional strength of the Canadian industry in this sector, government must consider it a high priority within the ocs industry. In this competitive market place, Canada needs to build on its strengths. The PABX market is dominated by Northern Telecom, who needs little direct assistance from government. Northern Telecom's policy has consistently been
oriented towards the creation by government of an environment conducive to investment in R\&D and technology, with increased tax credits. However, besides tax credits, government procurement policy could also have a significant role to play. A policy emphasizing the PABX and PABX-LAN hybrid network as the core to OCS systems in government, combined with a multi-vendor (Open World) procurement policy, would do much to ensure the future success of the industry. Further, since Canadian firms must base their strategy on the total North American market in order to achieve the scale necessary to compete, it seems apparent that government policy should be directed toward a tariff free border in this product sector.

### 6.4 LANS

The LAN market was analyzed for six industry sectors plus government. The North American market is, relatively speaking, not large (\$l.l billion in 1985), but it is growing rapidly ( $\$ 2.0$ billion in 1988). The Canadian market is relatively small and the industry must aim its strategy at the U.S. market place, if it wishes to survive.

We expect the market for LANs will develop very similar to that for personal computers, although the size of the market is much smaller. Despite the high market growth rate, the current proliferation of firms will result in a shakeout within a few years, as the technology matures and standards begin to evolve. The entry of IBM into the market within the next couple of years will drastically reduce the available market for the remaining firms. Survivors will be:

1) Large firms selling LANs as part of their overall system offerings.
2) Smaller firms selling very high performance LANs for specialized applications.
3) Firms selling low cost LANs, with a strategy prio marily based on price and distribution strength, rather than on the technological strength of the offering.

Opportunities exist for some Canadian manufacturers of local area networks. There are several strong Canadian contendors such as Canstar and Crowntek/Waterloo Microsystems. With respect to the PABX versus LAN controversy, a hybrid system will undoubtedly evolve within a few years. In the small office with a number of work stations and peripherals, the digital PABX will be adequate. Maximum transmission rates are in the area of 9.6 kilobytes and are within the capabilities of available digital PABXs. It is also more cost effective to use the installed base of telephone cable, than install coaxial cable, or fibre optics. In an office where there is a requirement to have access to the mainframe (for major file transfer and data manipulation); to use graphics and video; to handle high speed peripherals such as laser printers, and so forth; a LAN is the most effective solution.

Hybrid systems involve an interface between the local area network and digital PABX. Through this interface, terminals connected to the PABX have access to all of the computer and peripheral ports just the same as those which are directly connected to the LAN. Another advantage to this system is that both terminals on the PABX and on the LAN have access to a common modem pool for connection to the external worldwide communications system.

With the emergence of a PABX-LAN hybrid network, the PABX will provide the gateway. This means that LAN vendors must design their networks to be compatable with the major PABX
suppliers. This presents another rather dangerous threat to LAN vendors, since it is likely that PABX suppliers will also enter the LAN market with a PABX-LAN hybrid offering. As in the situation between PABX and computer vendors, independent LAN vendors will have to seek arrangements with one or more PABX suppliers, as it is likely that the merging of these technologies will favour the PABX supplier of a PABX-LAN network.

Despite the high growth rate, Canadian firms should be cautious about entering this market. Unless they fit the "survivor" criteria in 1) to 3) above, it would be wiser to stay out. Canadian firms already in the market should concentrate on high performance LANs and seek links to the major PABX and office systems suppliers. Canadian firms should also concentrate mainly on penetration of the U.S. market since the Canadian market is small and will be slower to develop.

Government should encourage the growth and development of this industry only in the high cost, high performance LAN networks, which do not compete on price and distribution but on technology. The industry should avoid the "retail" type LAN market which is developing along similar lines to the PC market. Government should also support the industry in developing the PABX-LAN hybrid and in developing links between LAN, PABX and office systems vendors. A government procurement policy aimed at utilizing a PABX-LAN hybrid network, with PABX gateway, in a multi-vendor workstation environment would assist the industry to develop and enhance its capabilities in this area of technology.

### 6.5 STORAGE PERIPHERALS

The North American storage peripherals market is large and growing. It was about $\$ 3$ billion in 1985 and will be $\$ 5$ billion in 1988 (within the sectors being analyzed). The Canadian market is large and will be about $\$ 385$ million in 1985 , growing to $\$ 764$ million in 1988 . The largest market is for magnetic based systems. Optical disk systems will begin to penetrate the market in the next few years but will still only achieve about a 20 percent market share by 1988.

The mainframe market remains the largest with about a 60 percent market share (1985). Both the mainframe and the non-mainframe market for storage peripherals exhibit good growth. In the non-mainframe market, the trend is towards high disk storage at the workstation. By 1988; over 50 percent of all workstations will have fixed storage. About 70 percent of these will have a fixed storage of between 5 and 20 Mbytes per workstation.

In this sector, the technology trend is towards 5.25" floppies with 1 Mbyte storage and 3.5" microfloppies. R\&D into vertical magnetic recording is continuing and may show promise in the late $80^{\prime} s$, but current cost and technical difficulties remain to be resolved. Winchester drive technology displays the same trend as for floppies i.e. high densities at lower cost (e.g. 5.25" drives at 100 Mbyte capacity and 3.5" at 12 Mbyte capacity). As previously indicated, optical disk technology is ađvancing rapidly and promises great advances in mass storage,
with capacities of 1 to 10 billion bytes per single $14^{\prime \prime}$ disk. In addition to increasing mass storage capacity, prices per million bits of storage will be reduced by several orders of magnitude.

Opportunities exist for Canadian manufacturers in the production of storage peripherals. The most important are floppies and microfloppies, Winchester disks, and optical disks.

The microfloppy diskettes and regular floppies are considered opportunities because of the participation of Memorex, Didak and possibly Dysan. Currently the industry is growing at about 45 percent per year. The trend is towards the $31 / 2$ " microfloppy with 0.5 and over megabyte capacity. These units will capture the market where data portability is most important. At a few dollars a diskette, it's as cheap to use a diskette as a file, especially when they can be carried in the pocket.

Winchester disk systems also appear to be an opportunity. The first Winchesters that came on the market used 14" disks and these are still being used on mainframe systems. The market is moving down to standards of $51 / 4 "$ disks and the even smaller $3^{\prime \prime}$ sizes are now emerging to suit the personal business computing market. It is here that the greatest growth is foreseen. Tallgrass Technologies Canada Inc. is a newly incorporated Canadian distributor of their U.S. parent's hard disk for microcomputers. They project sales of $\$ 12$ to $\$ 14$
million for 1984. There are no Canadian firms with Winchester disk technology. However, the market in Canada will soon develop to a size sufficient :to support production, and possibly with Canadian government encouragement, firms such as Tallgrass can be persuaded to start manufacturing here.

Optical disk technology is on the threshold of becoming a viable alternative to magnetic recording for the mass storage of information. It will be used for the storage of large volumes of information in much the same way that paper is used today. The reason is the low cost of storage promised by optical disk technology, coupled with the speed and convenience with which the stored information can be handled. Optical disk technology is expected to be a complementary system to the spinning magnetic disk and megnetic tape drive. Memorex, Philips, and Control Data are all strong in optical disk technology and there are opportunities for specialized applications. For example, Dexter Technology Corporation of Mountainview, California has manufactured wallet-sized read-only cards that use an optically modified surface. These cards are read by photo diode arrays. The advantage is the cost (about $\$ 1.50$ each, manufactured in volume, at 100,000 units per day). Each card can handle about two million characters or about 800 pages of text.

With the large R\&D expeditures required, it is unlikely that new Canadian firms will be able to enter this market as niche suppliers of optical disk systems. Currently, the major contenders are all large multinationals. However,
there are many opportunities for applying optical disk technology to office systems and for using this technology in innovative ways to produce other systems and products (e.g. systems for technical manuals and maintenance). In addition, there will be opportunities for manufacturing in Canada by the multinationals, most of whom already have other plants here. Essential to this is the adoption of a world product mandate strategy by these firms, to produce in Canada as a commodity supplier for domestic and export markets.

The greatest threat to Canadian mass storage suppliers is the fierce competiton that can be expected from Japan. Weak marketing and cultural differences have so far inhibited the Japanese suppliers from major penetration of the computer market. As a result, they have followed a strategy of concentrating on peripheral equipment and are investing heavily in optical disk technology and other areas such as input/output devices.

Despite the competitive pressures this is not an area which Canadian industry or government can afford to ignore. Without competitive Canadian production, the trade deficit in this product sector would be over $\$ 700$ million by 1988 . Since optical disk technology will play such a large role in future mass storage, an effort needs to be made to encourage R\&D and production in Canada. This could best be done by encouraging the firms already in the business (all foreign multinationals). to adopt a world product mandate strategy for their Canadian operations. This strategy will need to be aided by government incentives for $R \& D$ or possibly an industry/government co-operative R\&D program.


#### Abstract

In the magnetic disk sector, there is already a small but growing industry in Canada. Given the size of the North American market, this industry should be encouraged and assisted in its growth, with strategy targetted at the U.S. market. Assistance needed will be primarily in the area of marketing, distribution and automated production.


### 6.6 Input/Output Peripherals

OCR, FAX, and Laser printers were analyzed for six industry sectors plus government. The total market in North America is large (over $\$ 2.5$ billion in 1985) and growing. The largest and fastest growing segment is in Laser printers, particularly in desk top printers of the under $\$ 10,000$ price range. Growth rates are also good in the $\$ 10,000$ to $\$ 100,000$ price range.

Competition in the production of input/output devices is intense. Canadian industry is weak in this market and is expected to remain that way. There do not appear to be opportunities for new Canadian vendors unless they have a very unique product, or are multinational subsidiaries with major financial and marketing capabilities. While Canada has orie firm (Delphax) with a unique product in non-impact printing, the market will be tough with such established firms as IBM, Siemens, Xerox, Hewlett-Packard, Datapoint, and Canon being the major U.S. manufacturers. Japan is also rapidly entering this market, with such firms as Hitachi, Fujitsu. Minolta, and NEC.

Growth of the facsimile market is expected to be encouraged by the introduction of advanced CCITT Group IV machines. There are no Canadian manufacturers and stiff competiton in the market is coming from Japanese vendors. Leading Japanese competitors include Hitachi, Matsushita, GEC.

NEC, Ricoh, and Toshiba. Frost and Sullivan predict that the Japanese market share of facsimile equipment will increase from $54 \%$ to $85 \%$ in the 1983-1987 period. As a result there appears to be no opportunities for Canadian manufacturing except under licence from one of the established firms.

Opportunities do exist in the merger of OCR and facsimile technologies. HiTech is currently the only Canadian company in a position to take advantage of this market. HiTech is relatively small and may lack the financial strength to make the very large investments needed to be a major player in this field. However, the firm does have the technological base to develop into a strong specialized supplier, particularly if it were able to obtain the required resources through association with a larger corporation.

The lack of Canadian manufacturing in this sector will lead to close to an annual $\$ 600$ million trade deficit by 1988. Therefore, it needs to be viewed with some concern by governments. That size of deficit could, if eliminated, create 5,000 to 10,000 new jobs in Canada. There are several options:

1) Encourage manufacturing in Canada by the current multinational leaders in the market place.
2) Identify interested Canadian firms and assist them to enter the market through a combination of licencing and R\&D.
3) Target laser printing technology as a priority item and develop an industry/government approach to new market penetration.
4) Some combination of all of the above.

Certainly, the current leaders in the market place should be encouraged to manufacture in Canada. Adoption of a world product mandate strategy would ensure that such manufacturing is not solely on a branch plant basis. To place new Canadian firms in a position to enter this market would take a longer term effort. However, given the potential size of the deficit, it would be worthwhile. probably a combination of options 2) and 3) above would be the way to go. Canada does have leaders in laser technology although their capabilities have not as yet been applied to this market place.

### 6.7 Software

This report only covers the following "packaged" office automation software:

* PERSONAL MANAGEMENT

Calendars/datebook, schedules/time control, telephone directory, file handling, and report generation.

* DECISION SUPPORT

Spreadsheets, business graphics, financial modelling, database management.

* CLERICAL/ADMINISTRATIVE

Electronic mail, word processing, electronic filing.

The North American market will be worth about $\$ 800$ million in 1985 for the six industry sectors plus government, being analyzed. The market shows a very high growth rate with the best market being for Decision Support software, closely followed by Clerical/Administrative.

Canada has a strong consulting software industry, developing custom systems, but is weak in this "packaged" software sector. There are no major Canadian suppliers of the most common packaged software for office automation. However,
there are several smaller companies producing specialized software. For example, Logo in educational software, Officesmiths with their electronic filing cabinet and others with a variety of accounting and financial systems. Even in these areas though, much of the market is moving towards integrated software, and there are no major Canadian suppliers. There are two reasons for this:

1) The market requires large expenditures on marketing and distribution. Canadian firms have the technical capability, but do not have the financial resources to market the product.
2) As software requires more and more integration, the market for individual specialized software packages is declining.

The best opportunity is in integrated software packages for the international market. However, this market is dominated by U.S. firms. There is already a shakeout in this industry and it is generally agreed that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a new firm to enter the market at this time and produce applications packages to compete with the major firms, like Microsoft. The exception would be very specialized software targeted to a specific vertical market sector, e.g. forestry related business applications.

Canada's weakness in office communications systems software means increasing dependence on foreign vendors, in an information dominant society. This will not be good for Canada and may retard the development of the Canadian ocs industry. However, it is unlikely that a Canadian industry will develop in this sector in the near term. It is also doubtful that this should be a high priority for government encouragement. There are many other areas with similar problems but with greater impact and Canada cannot be in them all. Canada's overall software industry, working on customized systems or larger volume "packaged"systems is quite strong and it may be better to build support in that area. In particular, there are a number of firms developing "packaged" fourth generation productivity tools, and these hold good promise of a market not so highly competitive as the above sectors. Other areas would be specialized "packaged" software such as that by Logo Computer Systems Inc.; large scale ocs software such as Officesmith's electronic filing cabinet, software for electronic mail and other types of storage systems; systems integration software for specialized applications (e.g. field trials software) and so on.

If government desires to develop a Canadian industry in this sector, it will require a very large scale firm to survive. Such a firm would concentrate primarily on the U.S. market, and would have major financial and marketing strength. Technical strength is essential but secondary. A firm could not survive or develop in this market by technical strength alone. The best industry candidates for such a move by government,
would be a current large Canadian distributor such as Crowntek, with North American operations. Such a firm would produce software themselves but also act on behalf of the smaller software houses in Canada, which have the technical capability but do not have the marketing strength. An entry into this market, even by such a larger firm, would require government financial assistance. There is really little incentive for any company to do the final extensive work which would be necessary to put such a Canadian group together. With industry co-operation, and government taking the initiative and financially supporting the development of a group effort, it might be done.
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