Anatomy of a Buyer Room: Infrastructure Control After the VMware Cliff

This is a synthetic example modeled from recurring enterprise infrastructure and platform strategy patterns. It is not a customer case study, transcript, or anonymized client deliverable.

Executive Snapshot

What it is. A Buyer Room is a moderated session where six to ten enterprise practitioners pressure-test a sponsor's strategy, messaging, or value proposition — as the buyer roles that would evaluate, challenge, implement, influence, or block it in a real enterprise purchasing process.

Why it is different. In a typical sales call, the goal is to earn the next meeting or close the deal. In a Buyer Room, the goal is to understand what would keep the deal alive — and what would kill it. The peer dynamic is the mechanism: practitioners react not only to the sponsor, but to each other. One participant raises an objection. Another sharpens it, disagrees with it, or explains how the same issue shows up differently in their environment. Disagreements matter as much as consensus.

What the sponsor gets. A structured internal readout that turns practitioner feedback into executive-level guidance: what buyers believed, what they challenged, where the story created friction, what evidence they required, and what should change in messaging, positioning, partner strategy, or field enablement. The readout can also be converted into field enablement assets — buyer validation questions, discovery prompts, objection-handling guidance, or a practitioner point-of-view piece for content marketing.

What this example shows. This synthetic example uses a server OEM evaluating VMware displacement, cloud repatriation, edge modernization, and enterprise infrastructure control. Eight panelists spanning manufacturing, retail, telecom, financial services, logistics, enterprise software, healthcare, and a multi-industry infrastructure advisor pressure-tested the sponsor's assumptions. The specific topic changes by sponsor; the format remains the same.

Core finding from this example. VMware is not being abandoned — it is being segmented. Buyers are sorting their estates into workloads that stay VMware-aligned, workloads that modernize to Kubernetes or OpenShift, workloads that repatriate from cloud, workloads that move to edge, and workloads that need governed AI infrastructure. The displacement opportunity is real but narrow. Operational trust — not technical equivalence — is the barrier. DR, NSX, patching, compliance workflows, and team skills are all VMware-shaped, and no alternative has cleared that bar yet. Cloud cost pressure, SaaS sprawl, and AI governance are all teaching the same lesson: dependency has a price, and buyers are now designing exit strategy into every new platform decision.

Recommended sponsor action. Lead with infrastructure control, not VMware replacement. Build workload cohort blueprints. Validate the operating model, not just the stack. Treat partners as part of the product. Train the field on buyer objections, not hardware specifications.

Format. Two-hour moderated session, virtual or in person. Sponsor shapes the panel profile in collaboration with the moderator. Deliverable is the structured internal readout (this document), with optional conversion to field enablement assets.

Buyer Room Format

The sponsor enters the session with a small set of strategic directions, assumptions, or value propositions it wants to test. These may include a platform message versus a component message, direct-to-customer positioning versus partner-led validation, a specific claim about operational value, or a thesis about how buyers evaluate cost, performance, integration, lifecycle burden, or strategic control.

The panelists are selected because they represent the buyer roles that would evaluate, challenge, implement, influence, or block the strategy. The sponsor may shape the panel profile by specifying industries, roles, technology postures, or decision-making stages that matter for the test. The sponsor may present short framing segments during the session, but the format is not a pitch. The goal is to create a trusted environment where practitioners can react honestly, challenge assumptions, compare notes, and explain how the decision would actually move through their organizations. Sessions are conducted under NDA to encourage candid feedback and protect both sponsor and participant context.

The peer dynamic is what makes the format valuable. One participant raises an objection. Another sharpens it, disagrees with it, or explains how the same issue shows up differently in their environment. That interaction surfaces deeper signal than a one-on-one interview or traditional focus group because buyers are not only reacting to the sponsor — they are reacting to each other. A room full of nods tells you less than a room where two experienced operators reach opposite conclusions from the same evidence.

My role is to moderate the conversation, keep the discussion grounded in real evaluation behavior, and push past polite feedback into the operational issues that determine whether a message holds up in market.

Sponsor Experience

From the sponsor perspective, the session feels like presenting to a room full of qualified enterprise buyers, except the objective is not to close the room. The objective is to learn where the story is credible, where it creates confusion, what evidence buyers need, and which parts of the message are likely to survive a real sales cycle.

Participant Experience

From the participant perspective, the session feels like an executive briefing where their job is not to be sold, but to help the sponsor understand what would actually hold up in an enterprise evaluation. They hear the sponsor's story, ask questions, compare it against their own operating reality, and pressure-test assumptions with peers in the room.

Standard Deliverables

The standard output is a structured internal readout based on the session — what you are reading now. It includes an executive summary, key buyer themes, friction points, buyer language, interpretation of what the signal means, and recommendations for messaging, product positioning, partner strategy, and sales enablement.

Depending on the use case, the readout can also be converted into field enablement assets: buyer validation questions, red flags for sales cycles, workflow checkpoints, sales discovery prompts, objection-handling guidance, or a practitioner point-of-view piece for content marketing.

The raw signal matters. The interpretation layer is what makes it actionable.

Synthetic Scenario: Sponsor Context

A global server OEM wanted to understand how enterprise customers are responding to the VMware/Broadcom disruption. The sponsor believed the market might be open to new on-premises infrastructure options, but wanted to avoid building a strategy around a simplistic "customers are leaving VMware" assumption.

The sponsor's specific questions were the ones that do not show up cleanly in surveys or analyst reports. Are enterprise customers actually prepared to move away from vSphere? Where does VCF remain sticky? Which alternatives have credibility, and with whom? How do cloud cost pressure, SaaS sprawl, edge modernization, and AI governance influence infrastructure decisions? And where does server hardware strategy fit in a world where customers are reassessing what they rent, what they own, and what they need to control directly?

Participant Profile

The panel was designed to reflect the buyer roles and industry diversity that shape how enterprise infrastructure decisions actually get made. Eight participants were selected.

A **VP of Infrastructure** from a regulated manufacturer with significant on-premises operations, edge production environments, and active AI workloads spanning data center and edge inference.

A **Head of Platform Engineering** from a national retailer operating cloud-native applications, legacy data center workloads, and lightweight distributed edge infrastructure across thousands of locations.

A **Director of Cloud and Data Center Services** from a telecommunications provider with hybrid cloud, latency-sensitive workloads, and mature private cloud automation.

An **Enterprise Architect** from a financial services organization with strict disaster recovery, audit, and operational resilience requirements.

A **VP of IT** from a logistics and supply chain company managing complex SaaS integrations, ERP dependencies, and real-time data exchange across fragmented partner ecosystems.

A **Director of Engineering** from a large enterprise software company operating an innovation lab and running AI-driven applications at production scale.

A **Senior Infrastructure Architect** from a healthcare system balancing clinical application modernization, compliance constraints, and multi-site operational consistency.

A **principal infrastructure advisor** with visibility into dozens of VMware migration assessments, cloud repatriation evaluations, and platform modernization programs across multiple industries.

Discussion Objective

The Buyer Room was structured around one central question:

How are enterprise customers making infrastructure control decisions when VMware is still operationally central, but commercially and strategically more contested?

The conversation was intentionally broader than VMware licensing. VMware was the catalyst, but not the whole problem. The discussion quickly moved into larger questions of platform trust, operational dependency, cloud economics, SaaS control, AI governance, edge resiliency, and the practical limits of enterprise modernization.

Discussion Guide

The discussion was organized around seven decision areas.

1. The Forcing Function

What changed after Broadcom? What was already under pressure before the VMware licensing disruption? Is VMware now an executive-visible risk, or is the organization still treating it as infrastructure plumbing?

2. Estate Segmentation

Which workloads are likely to remain on vSphere or VCF? Which workloads are candidates for modernization? Which workloads may move to cloud, edge, Kubernetes, OpenShift, bare metal, or alternative virtualization stacks?

3. Operational Trust

Where is VMware embedded beyond the hypervisor? How do disaster recovery, NSX, backup, monitoring, compliance, patching, automation, and team skills influence the practical ability to migrate?

4. Control vs. Convenience

Where have public cloud and SaaS helped the business move faster? Where have they introduced cost, governance, data, or process dependency? How are buyers deciding where they should rent capability and where they should own the operating model?

5. Modernization Reality

When does a platform change represent real transformation? When is it merely technical debt in motion? Are customers willing to do the work of transformation if the result is simply recreating the old VM estate on a different stack?

6. AI Pressure

Does AI push infrastructure toward public cloud, private cloud, edge, or hybrid models? How do data locality, governance, GPU cost, developer access, model choice, and auditability change infrastructure requirements?

7. OEM Implications

What should the sponsor build, validate, package, and message? Where does the server OEM have permission to lead? Where should the OEM partner? Where should it avoid overreaching?

Key Findings

Buyer comments in this example are representative composites, included to show the type of language and friction a Buyer Room surfaces.

Key Finding 1: The VMware Decision Is an Estate Segmentation Decision, Not a Binary Choice

The panel did not describe VMware strategy as "stay or leave." They described a segmentation exercise — and then immediately disagreed about where the lines should be drawn.

"They calculated it just right. The pain of staying on VMware is just slightly lower than the pain of switching. That was not an accident."

Another panelist agreed on the commercial analysis but pushed back on the implication. His organization had already invested in VCF standardization. He saw the broader platform as a potential buffer against the worst pricing pressure, even as he acknowledged the deeper entrenchment it created. "Do we dig in further or start paring down? That is genuinely the question we are asking, and we have not resolved it."

Elsewhere in the room, the calculus was different entirely. One participant's new workloads were already containerized and container-native. Legacy VMs existed but were not the center of gravity. The infrastructure team was running lightweight Kubernetes clusters on small-form-factor hardware at distributed locations with no hypervisor at all. For this buyer, VMware was a data center technology, not an estate-wide dependency. The migration question barely applied to the fastest-growing part of the infrastructure.

Another panelist complicated the picture from the opposite direction. His edge sites — manufacturing floors, regulated production environments — still needed VMware-like operating models for local resiliency, patching discipline, and disconnected operation during cyber events. "Same tooling as the data center, full stop. I cannot accept a different operating model at a production site just because someone tells me it is cheaper."

What the room demonstrated was that "VMware customer" is not a useful targeting category. The same enterprise can have four different VMware postures depending on which part of the estate you are looking at.

What the Sponsor Learned

The displacement opportunity is real but narrower than the sponsor assumed. Estate segmentation — which workloads stay VMware-aligned, which modernize, which move to cloud, which justify a new pattern — has to be built into the sales motion. A single "VMware alternative" message will land with one buyer persona and alienate three others in the same account.

Key Finding 2: Operational Trust Is the Barrier, and It Is Not What Most Vendors Think It Is

The room was clear that running a VM is not the hard part. The harder question — the one that actually blocks deals — is whether an alternative platform can inherit the operating model.

"A VMware alternative does not win because it boots the VM. It wins if I can still pass an audit, recover the application, patch the stack, explain the network path, and sleep through the weekend."

Several panelists pushed this further. One participant walked through a detailed assessment of every alternative he had evaluated in the field, and none of them cleared the bar on operational trust the way they cleared it on technical capability.

On Nutanix: feature-complete, but prescriptive architecture. HCI-based with limited storage integrations compared to VMware's open ecosystem.

On Hyper-V: stagnant. "The same product it was a decade ago." Shows up at edge because it is free and good enough for basic workloads, but nobody is building a data center strategy around it.

On OpenShift Virtualization: the virtualization-first offering only launched recently. Red Hat treated virtualization as an afterthought for a long time, and operations teams can feel it. The approach to operations is fundamentally different — policy-driven, code-driven — and the typical VMware admin who has been doing click-ops for fifteen years is not ready for that shift.

On Azure Local: projects exist, but scale problems emerge fast. "Storage Spaces Direct generates too much network traffic past six to eight nodes. Very chatty."

On Proxmox: growing in homelabs and small shops, but enterprise barriers remain — no 24/7 support, limited management at scale.

The point was not that these platforms are bad. The point was that technical credibility does not automatically translate into operational trust. An enterprise does not adopt a platform because it works in a lab. It adopts a platform because it can be operated, recovered, audited, and explained under pressure.

Where the Panel Disagreed

One panelist pushed back on treating this as a permanent barrier. His team had deliberately chosen Ansible and Terraform over vRealize Automation specifically because those tools were open source and gave them flexibility if they ever needed to move. "We did that on purpose. We were already planning optionality years ago." His argument: the lock-in is real, but it is not accidental for every organization. Some buyers have been building escape routes for years.

Another participant was less optimistic. "Most of the shops I see are not that disciplined. They adopted VMware because it worked, and now they are discovering how deep the roots go."

What the Sponsor Learned

The sponsor's competitive messaging was built around hardware performance and cost comparison. The room showed that the buying decision is made on operational trust — DR, patching, security segmentation, lifecycle management, observability, and audit evidence. The sponsor needs to validate those workflows, not just the hardware stack.

Key Finding 3: VCF Creates Both Relief and Entrenchment — and the Panel Could Not Agree on Which Matters More

One panelist was the strongest voice on VCF. His organization had standardized on the full platform. He saw value in fewer SKUs, stronger focus, and a clearer private cloud story. But he was also the most candid about the tension.

"I like the direction VMware is going technologically. The skepticism comes in with the trust factor of Broadcom. I like the idea of a more coherent private cloud platform. I am less comfortable with the idea that every step deeper into the platform gives the vendor more leverage over my operating model."

Another participant added a commercial dimension: "Broadcom is trying to move customers up to VCF because VCF pricing may actually soften the impact compared to piecing together individual licenses. But that creates a new problem — now you are deeper in, and the exit gets harder."

From a different corner of the room: "We are not trying to adopt a broader platform. We are trying to figure out how to limit the blast radius of any single vendor having this much control over our operations."

This was one of the most productive disagreements in the session. The room split between buyers who saw VCF as a path to stability and buyers who saw it as accelerating entrenchment. The sponsor needs to account for both postures. VCF customers are not obvious displacement targets — but they may be strong candidates for validated refresh, capacity expansion, edge extensions, or AI-adjacent infrastructure that lives outside the VCF boundary.

Key Finding 4: NSX Is a Warning About What Happens When Good Technology Becomes a Governance Dependency

Multiple participants confirmed that NSX integration — especially east-west firewalling — makes VMware migration significantly harder. But the panel did not describe NSX as a mistake. They described it as useful technology that became part of compliance, segmentation, and security operations in a way that made it structurally difficult to unwind.

"NSX has helped us a lot. But it is very much a lock-in point. Once it becomes part of compliance and segmentation, it is not just another VMware component. It is part of how the business understands its own security posture."

Another panelist connected this to a broader pattern: "Every vendor has a version of this. The capability works. That is the problem. You adopt it because it solves a real operational problem, and then two years later it is load-bearing. Telling me to reduce lock-in is not helpful. Tell me where dependencies are valuable, where they are risky, and where I can create cleaner boundaries over time."

What the Sponsor Learned

Simplistic "reduce lock-in" language will backfire. Buyers know why they adopted the capabilities they use. The better message is architectural optionality — not liberation from VMware, but the ability to segment dependencies and create boundaries where they did not exist before.

Key Finding 5: OpenShift Is a Transformation Path, Not a vSphere Clone — and the Room Was Skeptical of the Middle Ground

The discussion on OpenShift Virtualization produced one of the strongest consensus positions in the session, and it was not what the sponsor expected.

"Their approach to operations is fundamentally different. They want everything to be policy-driven and code-driven, not click-ops. The typical VMware admin is not ready for that shift."

Even a panelist whose team was already code-driven — Ansible, Terraform, no vRealize — acknowledged the barrier. "Our team would have to re-skill. We are not going from zero to code. We are going from one flavor of infrastructure-as-code to another. But the retraining cost is real, and we are asking our team to learn a completely different operational model."

The panel converged on a clear position: if you are going to transform your operations, transform fully. Do not use OpenShift Virtualization as a drop-in replacement for vSphere. Nobody is interested in paying the cost of transformation just to recreate the existing VM estate on a different stack.

"If we move to OpenShift, we are not doing that to recreate vSphere. At that point, we are changing the operating model. And if we are changing the operating model, we expect more than a cheaper place to run legacy VMs."

This creates a positioning challenge for anyone trying to sell OpenShift Virtualization as a VMware alternative. It competes against "stay on VMware" for VM workloads and against "go fully cloud-native" for new workloads. The middle ground — "migrate your VMs to OpenShift" — did not have a natural buyer in this room.

Key Finding 6: Cloud Cost Pressure Is Pulling Infrastructure Strategy Back Into the Boardroom

Cloud came up in the first five minutes and never left the conversation. Every panelist acknowledged cloud's value — speed, flexibility, innovation. But they also described increasing friction.

"Cloud gave us speed. But costs are just constantly accelerating. There is a ton of flexibility, amazing innovation, lots of opportunity — but costs are the constant challenge."

Another panelist was more surgical. His organization had already made the judgment call: steady-state workloads — managed database instances, anything requiring continuously running services — were where cloud costs spiraled. Elastic, bursty workloads still made sense in cloud. The question was not cloud versus on-prem. The question was which workloads still benefit from the cloud operating model and which ones are just paying rent for services that stopped being elastic a long time ago.

A third participant added a dimension the room had not considered: "Our financial model is CapEx-heavy. The cloud migration conversation hits different when your CFO has been managing capital expenditures for decades and now you are asking him to shift to an OpEx model. He is going to look at that very carefully."

The board dimension surfaced as well: "Cyber is at the forefront now. The board wants to know how we recover, how we manage external services, how we deal with data exposure. Cloud gave us answers for speed. The board is now asking different questions — about control, about resilience, about what happens when things go wrong."

What the Sponsor Learned

The repatriation story is real, but it must avoid sounding anti-cloud. The stronger position is workload placement discipline: cloud where elasticity, services, and speed matter; owned infrastructure where predictability, control, locality, and cost stability matter. The CFO angle — CapEx versus OpEx financial model alignment — is an underused entry point for the server OEM.

Key Finding 7: SaaS Sprawl and VMware Are the Same Pattern Wearing Different Clothes

This was where the conversation took a turn the sponsor had not anticipated. The SaaS discussion ran longer than any other topic, and it produced some of the strongest signal in the session.

"We realized we had over a dozen sales tools out there and didn't know. We really looked at our CMDB, truly consolidated, and after that we knew where things needed to be. A lot of the stuff is coming back in-house now."

Another panelist described a SaaS provider that had tripled its transaction-based pricing with no warning. "They just exploded the cost — three times what they were charging. Now I have been tasked by the CIO to find an alternative, which means rebuilding direct integrations, which means reconstructing capabilities the SaaS provider had as its moat."

The ERP dimension came up hard: "There are parts of our business where regulatory compliance causes a lot of change. The frequency of that change inside rigid SaaS systems is painful. The vendor does not care about our twenty percent that is unique. But that twenty percent is a huge deal for us."

Another participant described pulling specific capabilities back from SaaS and rebuilding with AI-assisted development. Not replacing the whole platform — decomposing the functionality where the SaaS provider was not keeping up with the business need. Others in the room confirmed they were seeing the same pattern in their organizations.

Then the connection to VMware became explicit: "Every time I design a system now, I am also designing an exit strategy. I try to find the API to get to the raw data so I can move it. We had a VMware moment. I am not going to have a SaaS moment."

I pushed the room: "So you are designing exit strategy into new platforms from the beginning?"

"Absolutely. I do not want another situation where the vendor understands our dependency better than we do."

The room nodded. But one panelist complicated the exit story. The challenge is not just getting data out — it is that SaaS vendors transform your data once it is inside their systems. "Just pulling back the transformed data does not get you where you started. The data has been changed, augmented, reformatted. You need your source data, and if you gave them all your cards, you have a problem." Another participant pushed further: some organizations are now using AI-driven workflows to handle that re-transformation as they repatriate — not traditional ETL, but agentic processes that reconstruct data lineage on the way out.

What the Room Surfaced

VMware is not an isolated event. It is the latest example of a dependency pattern that enterprise buyers are now seeing across their entire technology estate — cloud, SaaS, ERP, AI platforms. Buyers who were caught off guard by Broadcom are actively building architectural optionality into every new platform decision. The sponsor's message should not be about VMware replacement. It should be about infrastructure control as a design principle.

Key Finding 8: AI Is Creating the Same Governance Problem Cloud Created — Only Faster

AI came up as both an opportunity and a management problem. But the panel's concerns were more operational than strategic. This was not a room debating whether AI matters. This was a room dealing with AI as a sprawl and governance challenge that is already in motion.

"Everyone says they want AI. But when you look at the cost creep — Copilot, ChatGPT, Gemini, Zoom AI Companion — these SaaS providers are increasing their costs twenty, forty, fifty percent because of the AI capabilities they are rolling in. Your prior spend that you had forecasted is going up, and you did not budget for it."

The talent bottleneck was immediate: "AI is driving skills gaps, bursty workloads, and the need for hybrid applications. GPU is becoming central to many of our non-SaaS apps. We need an architecture reboot, and we need on-prem GPU to help us. But the same people I need to run that project are the same people running my critical infrastructure modernization."

The panel split on AI infrastructure strategy. Some organizations were consuming commercial models behind APIs with strong legal postures — not interested in buying GPU infrastructure, running traditional ML in managed analytics stacks, and exploring edge inference for specific use cases like quality inspection and operational monitoring. Others were evaluating VMware Private AI for proof-of-concept work, attracted by curated LLM catalogs and managed model lifecycle within the existing VMware footprint. One participant had a team training proprietary models and running consumer-facing LLM-based applications at production scale — a fundamentally different infrastructure requirement than anyone else in the room.

When asked about Red Hat's AI offerings, awareness existed but traction was thin. One panelist had seen the webinars but was not pursuing a POC. Another noted that his firm's AI practice was not deploying VMware Private AI either — and he could not actually confirm what platform they were standardizing on. The tooling landscape was moving faster than organizational decisions.

The NVIDIA question produced a telling exchange. "It has to do with talent. You are probably picking the platform that is more ubiquitous, easier to deploy, and just works, rather than making a science project." Another voice: "One of the fears is we are already feeling behind. Would we get even further behind if we chose a lesser path?" Nobody in the room was seriously considering AMD or alternative accelerators for production AI workloads.

I pushed back: "Training is NVIDIA's. CUDA has won that. But for inference, it seems like a wide-open race." No participant disagreed.

What the Sponsor Learned

The AI infrastructure opportunity is real, but the entry point is governance, not GPU capacity. Buyers want to know how AI interacts with sensitive data, how costs are contained, and how they avoid creating a new dependency. The sponsor should not lead with "buy GPUs." The better message is governed AI infrastructure — data locality, developer access, policy control, lifecycle management, and cost visibility. GPU capacity matters, but it is downstream of the governance decision.

Key Finding 9: Edge Is Not One Market — and the Panel Proved It in Real Time

The panel split the edge conversation into patterns so different they might as well have been separate product categories.

One participant was running lightweight Kubernetes distributions on small-form-factor commodity hardware at thousands of distributed locations. No hypervisor. Fleet-managed, remotely updated, designed for developer consistency across the entire estate. "Everything new has been containerized and container-native for quite a while. That is where we want to be."

Another needed the opposite: full enterprise VMware at the manufacturing edge. Standard server hardware running the same platform as the data center. The requirement was resilience for disconnected operation during cyber events — if the network went down, the production environment had to keep running with local compute, local recovery, and local patching discipline.

A third pattern surfaced from field experience across dozens of accounts: "Surprisingly, the most common alternative I have run into for edge is Hyper-V. Most everyone has access to it, and the fact that it is relatively stagnant is unimportant because it is viewed as good enough for basic workloads."

A fourth panelist described edge infrastructure that had historically been managed as one-off deployments outside the platform team's purview. Now being centralized. The key decision factor was not compute capability — it was lifecycle management. Patching, firmware, and support at sites without skilled staff.

Four panelists, four completely different edge strategies. The room made clear that a generic "edge compute" offering would not resonate with any of them.

What the Sponsor Learned

Segment the edge by operating model, not by hardware form factor. Lightweight container edge, regulated production edge, lifecycle-managed branch edge, and AI inference edge each need a different validation story, a different partner ecosystem, and a different sales motion.

Key Finding 10: Disaster Recovery Is One of the Strongest VMware Anchors — and Nobody Wants to Talk About It Until It Blocks the Deal

DR surfaced late in the session but hit harder than any other topic.

"Saving money on licensing sounds good until I have to explain why we need to redo the DR process, retrain the teams, and ask the business for another weekend test window."

The room quickly validated the observation. DR in most of these organizations is not a side process. It is an organizational ritual — infrastructure teams, application owners, business stakeholders, auditors, regulators. Recovery plans are tested, documented, and negotiated across the business. A failed DR test creates executive visibility fast.

VMware sits at the center of that process. Replication patterns, recovery runbooks, networking assumptions, and operational tooling are VMware-shaped. Even when recovery targets are in public cloud, the process often depends on VMware artifacts and conversion workflows.

The connection back to displacement was immediate: "This is why the pricing was calculated the way it was. They know that DR is the thing customers will not gamble on. You can be unhappy about your VMware bill and still decide the risk of redoing DR is worse."

What the Sponsor Learned

DR validation should be a first-class part of the OEM's VMware strategy. Any motion that involves helping customers move, modernize, or diversify infrastructure must show how recovery works before, during, and after the transition. If the sponsor cannot answer the DR question, the deal dies in the operating committee — not the technical evaluation.

Synthesis: What the Buyer Room Revealed

The Broadcom/VMware disruption did not create the infrastructure control problem. It exposed it.

Enterprise customers were already dealing with cloud cost pressure, SaaS sprawl, AI governance concerns, talent constraints, and loss of operational leverage. VMware became the latest trusted platform to remind buyers that renting control can become expensive once the vendor understands how deeply embedded it is.

The panel did not show buyers racing toward a single replacement platform. It showed buyers becoming more disciplined about segmentation — and more suspicious of any vendor claiming to have the universal answer. They want to know which workloads should stay on VMware, which should modernize, which should move to cloud, which should move back, which should run at the edge, and which should be governed as part of a new AI platform strategy.

The most important finding may be the one that cuts across every topic: buyers are now designing exit strategy into new platform decisions from the beginning. The VMware experience taught them that dependency has a price, and that price can change without warning. Any vendor entering this market — including the sponsor — will be evaluated against that lesson.

Recommended Sponsor Strategy

1. Lead With Infrastructure Control, Not VMware Replacement

The market does not need another "leave VMware" campaign. Customers already know they have a VMware problem. What they need is a way to reason through it. The sponsor should frame the conversation around infrastructure control: where to own, where to rent, where to modernize, and where to preserve the existing operating model.

2. Build Workload Cohort Blueprints

The sponsor should create validated blueprints that map to the buyer decision patterns surfaced in the Buyer Room.

A **VCF lifecycle refresh blueprint** for customers staying VMware-aligned but seeking to modernize hardware and reduce risk.

A **vSphere risk-reduction blueprint** for customers trying to limit deeper entrenchment without ripping out what works.

An **OpenShift or Kubernetes modernization blueprint** for customers ready to transform the application platform — not recreate the VM estate.

A **regulated edge blueprint** for manufacturing, healthcare, logistics, and industrial environments requiring local resiliency and patching discipline.

A **steady-state repatriation blueprint** for cloud workloads that no longer benefit from elasticity and where CapEx alignment makes financial sense.

A **governed AI infrastructure blueprint** for customers starting with data locality, developer access, and policy control before committing to large-scale GPU estates.

3. Validate the Operating Model, Not Just the Stack

Customers need proof that infrastructure can be operated under pressure. The sponsor should validate DR, patching, telemetry, security, compliance evidence, hardware lifecycle, and automation workflows. This is especially important for customers who are not trying to become infrastructure hobbyists again. They need modern control without reintroducing old toil.

4. Treat Partners as Part of the Product

Buyers expect ecosystems, not monoliths. But the sponsor should be opinionated about which partner combinations are validated for which workload cohorts. VMware where VMware remains the right answer. Red Hat where modernization is the goal. Public cloud where elasticity and managed services matter. Backup and DR partners where recovery is the anchor. AI platform partners where governance and data locality matter.

5. Create Sales Enablement Around Buyer Objections, Not Product Features

The sponsor's field teams need to be trained on the real objections surfaced in the Buyer Room.

Customers will ask whether switching platforms creates more risk than it removes. They will ask who owns the operating model after modernization. They will ask whether AI infrastructure is a real requirement or another executive-driven experiment. They will ask whether repatriation saves money after labor, tooling, and risk are included. They will ask how edge infrastructure is patched, monitored, recovered, and secured without skilled staff at every site.

The sponsor should prepare the field to answer those questions without defaulting to hardware specifications.

What Not To Say

Do not say customers are fleeing VMware. They are not.

Do not say every workload should come back on-premises. The cloud still earns its place.

Do not position OpenShift as a drop-in replacement for vSphere. The room rejected that premise.

Do not lead with GPU capacity as the AI infrastructure strategy. Governance comes first.

Do not treat edge as one market. The panel proved it is at least four.

Do not assume cost savings alone will justify platform migration. Operational risk outweighs licensing savings in every buying decision this room described.

Do not imply that customers made bad decisions by adopting VMware, cloud, or SaaS. They made rational decisions under prior conditions. Those conditions have changed. The sponsor can help them regain leverage without pretending the past was wrong.

The CTO Advisor | The Advisor Bench Buyer Room, Advisory, and Sponsored Content programs for enterprise technology vendors. Contact: Keith Townsend