VIRTUAL DESKTOP PERFORMANCE AND USER EXPERIENCE COMPARISON

A Comparison of VMware Horizon on Dell Technologies APEX Hybrid Cloud, Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS, and Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure
Given today's conditions, it's become increasingly likely that for the foreseeable future, employers and educational institutions will be looking for solutions that allow their employees and students to work remotely. In fact, this may end up being a long-term business strategy for many organizations. In light of the current conditions, now is the right time for organizations to re-evaluate how they connect their remote workers to their corporate data infrastructure. In this paper, we’ll compare the user experience and performance characteristics of three popular remote working solutions: VMware Horizon on Dell Technologies APEX Hybrid Cloud, Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS, and Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure.

With the current trend toward distance working and learning, many organizations are currently reevaluating their remote connectivity architectures. The ability to provide files and applications to users at scale within a secure, efficient, and cost-effective environment are key strengths of Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) and Desktop-As-A-Service (DaaS) environments.

Virtual Desktops are a way to connect user desktops to corporate IT regardless of whether they’re working from inside the IT network—or remotely from across the internet. Virtual desktops work by streaming a desktop image to any device running the remote access software or with equivalent capability provided through a web browser. Thus, it is possible to stream a high-powered desktop to an end-user’s low-powered PC, tablet—or even smartphone. The remote user interacts with the virtual desktop as if it were running locally.

VDI and DaaS environments also provide IT with robust tools to manage users and applications. Access controls for all users are common, no matter if they connect from inside the company network or outside on a public network. Since all data and applications reside on host servers, remote workers can access critical business datasets remotely, without compromising data security.

For all its benefits, it should be noted that designing a remote worker environment can be a complex task. To get the most out of the investment, the remote environment must be designed for scalability while at the same time providing a consistent user experience to remote workers as the infrastructure grows. Because of this, evaluating the overall user experience (including desktop performance) is crucial in choosing the remote platform best suited for your environment.

Dell Technologies has been an ardent supporter of remote data accessibility for many years, and is an early advocate of evaluating user experience as a key metric in comparing...
remote desktop platforms. In this paper, we will compare three popular remote worker platforms on the basis of user experience and overall performance criteria. The platforms included in this comparison are:

- VMware Horizon on Dell Technologies APEX Hybrid Cloud
- Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS
- Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure

Test Criteria

For many organizations, remote access begins with the implementation of simple Virtual Private Network (VPN) connections. While this may be acceptable in allowing a small number of users to work remotely; it is well-known that VPN gateways simply weren’t designed to support a large number of simultaneous users. Conversely, a well-designed remote worker environment offers substantial performance advantages over VPN, especially at large scale. Simply stated, a well-designed remote access environment allows more users to access company resources—without running into system and network bottlenecks.

Another major advantage of today’s remote worker platforms is that they are device agnostic. All that is needed to access the environment is a device with a reasonable internet connection and a web browser—whether that device is a smartphone, tablet, desktop, laptop, or thin client. While the variety of connected devices is an obvious advantage for remote users, it can also be a headache for IT to administer—making remote management a critical task.

From a user experience perspective, the goal in every remote session should be to deliver a user experience that does not impact productivity, application responsiveness, boot up and login times—in other words, provide equivalent performance to corporate desktops.

Test Configuration

Although desktop virtualization operates entirely over the network, there is much more to designing a robust remote environment than just ‘tuning the network’. Remote environments are heterogeneous by nature, with complexity that grows with scale. Any bottlenecks in the virtualization software layer or the cloud infrastructure will result in device sluggishness (and user complaints.)
To provide an apples-to-apples comparison of the remote user desktop experience, we configured a similar test environment for each platform. In each case, a cloud environment was created with two domains: 1) a workload domain which provided desktop resources to remote workers and 2) a management domain which provided administration resources to IT. This configuration simulates the design of a typical remote worker environment, and was the basis for all tests performed in this document.

For our tests, two industry-standard remote benchmarking tools were used. For performance tests, we utilized Login VSI, an independent load-testing application. Using Login VSI, we simulated 432 remote client sessions and compared baseline performance of the three platforms.

To simulate remote application usage, and measure the end user experience, Lakeside Software’s industry-standard SysTrack monitoring tool was utilized. SysTrack is run over a period of time, during which thousands of key data points are recorded. These data points monitor everything that may impact the end-user experience, including trend data for Average Latency, Average Receive Packet Loss, and Average Transmit Packet Loss. System resources are also monitored, including CPU, Memory, and Storage consumption.

The APEX Hybrid Cloud environment provides consistent infrastructure and makes workload mobility seamless across private and public cloud environments. It takes complexity out of multicloud environments by delivering consistent operations to manage private, public and edge computing scenarios. For the tests contained within this paper, the following APEX Hybrid Cloud components were utilized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VDI Server Environment</th>
<th>VDI Client Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM</td>
<td>SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-node Dell EMC VxRail E560F</td>
<td>4-node Dell EMC VxRail E560N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>CPU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Intel Xeon Gold 6248R (3.0GHZ)</td>
<td>(8) Intel Xeon Gold 6240R (2.4GHZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMORY</td>
<td>MEMORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576GB RAM</td>
<td>768GB RAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORAGE</td>
<td>STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell EMC vSAN with all-Flash NVMe</td>
<td>Dell EMC vSAN with all-Flash NVMe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When an organization makes the transition from physical to virtual desktops, IT does everything that they can to make sure that the virtual desktops perform as well, if not better than the physical desktops that they are replacing. To do so, administrators have long relied on performance metrics.

Today, however, Dell Technologies is driving a fundamental shift with regard to the way that virtual desktops are evaluated. To put it simply, organizations are beginning to realize that measuring the end-user experience is just as important as raw performance metrics. Monitoring the end-user experience provides a path to resolve common remote user complaints including:

- **Slow Logon** – The Windows logon process is complex and includes many phases. Systems that require arduous boot cycles, particularly during "boot storm" events, result in lost productivity.

- **Excessive Application Load Time** – The root cause for slow application load time will vary depending on the application type and dependencies. While often assumed to be a hardware performance issue, the issue may in fact be an internal application issue.

- **Excessive Application Response Time** – Response time can be defined as the time between when the user clicks their mouse and when the action translates on screen.

- **Poor Graphic Performance** – Image quality is based on the difference between what the image should look like and what it looks like on the user’s endpoint. Poor graphics often appear as an effort to save on other resources, such as bandwidth.

In each case, the key to resolving the issue is to identify the resource that is in short supply and then making any necessary adjustments. Again, it is important to keep in mind that performance issues are not always hardware related. An improper application configuration can just as easily cause user experience problems.

Although it is easy to become preoccupied with performance metrics, it is ultimately the end-user experience that really matters. The key to providing your users with a good experience is to understand the relationship between applications, hardware resources, user activities, and then use that information in a way that allocates the necessary resources to the individual virtual desktops.

To measure the remote end-user experience, the SysTrack monitoring tool was utilized. By capturing over 10,000+ data points every 15 seconds from each remote session, SysTrack provides a comprehensive benchmark which simulates the remote user experience in an impartial manner. Once all data points have been analyzed,
SysTrack provides an EUX score (End User Experience) for each session. The following table summarizes the results derived by SysTrack at the conclusion of our tests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of VDI Sessions Measured</th>
<th>Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud</th>
<th>Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure</th>
<th>Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failed Sessions (Not Ranked)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor (0% - 59%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (60% - 69%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair (70% - 79%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good (80% - 89%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good (90% - 99%)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional (100%)</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Remote User Productivity Comparison

After examining all relevant data points, SysTrack also provides a comparison of the productivity impact of each remote worker session. The result of this comparison for our tests indicated that Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud was the only remote platform in which SysTrack calculated no loss in productivity.

Remote user productivity is extremely important when considering today’s economic uncertainty and the need for organizations to reduce all possible costs, including losses in worker productivity. By demonstrating zero productivity loss, it is readily apparent that remote users can work effectively if they utilize a well-designed virtual desktop platform such as Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud.
3 Remote Knowledge Worker with Multimedia Plugin + Zoom Performance Comparison

Knowledge Workers are personnel who are engaged primarily in the acquisition, analysis, and manipulation of information as opposed to in production of goods or services. As such, remote Knowledge Workers are those that are most likely to require high speed, robust, and secure access to corporate data—in addition to the baseline performance requirements of “generic” remote workers.

For example, collaboration is key component in the effectiveness of remote Knowledge Workers. Zoom has become an important tool in this realm, providing video-telephony and online chat services through a cloud-based peer-to-peer software platform. To enable remote Knowledge Workers to work effectively, collaborative tools such as Zoom must operate seamlessly.

To simulate the remote desktop performance of Knowledge Workers, Lakeside Software’s SysTrack application was again utilized. To examine the efficiency of Knowledge Workers during remote access, four common Windows workloads were analyzed by SysTrack, including the Microsoft Office Suite, and Zoom. The results of this simulation, measured in msec of latency, were recorded in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud</th>
<th>WVD on Azure</th>
<th>Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTLOOK.exe</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCEL.exe</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWERPNT.exe</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOM.exe</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workload latency is an important factor when considering the productivity of remote Knowledge Workers. Lost time waiting for applications to display equals lost time in analyzing important data. As demonstrated across Knowledge Worker applications, Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud outperformed both Amazon WorkSpaces and Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure in four of the five workloads.

When simulating the all-important Zoom collaborative application (SysTrack refers to this test as “multimedia + Zoom”), Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud (41 msec average latency) outperformed Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure (63 msec average latency) by 34% and outperformed Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS (90 msec average latency) by 54%.
Once the user experience is fully understood, with its strengths and weak points - performance testing can help identify specific resources that are over or under provisioned. Baseline performance tests should be performed periodically as a method of validating (and correcting) faults exposed in the user experience tests.

For generic remote desktop performance tests, we utilized Login VSI, an independent load-testing application. Using Login VSI, we simulated 432 remote client sessions and compared the performance of three platforms: Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud, Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS, and Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure. The following table summarizes the results of the tests, with the top performer within each criterion highlighted in green:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud</th>
<th>Microsoft WVD on Azure</th>
<th>Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A VDI Sessions Launched</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Failed Sessions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Average Session Logon Time</td>
<td>25 seconds</td>
<td>45 seconds</td>
<td>35 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D VSIbase (Min. Workload)</td>
<td>823 msec</td>
<td>1,151 msec</td>
<td>966 msec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E VSImax Average (Avg. Workload)</td>
<td>982 msec</td>
<td>1,205 msec</td>
<td>1,092 msec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F VSImax Threshold (Max. Workload)</td>
<td>1,824 msec</td>
<td>2,151 msec</td>
<td>1,997 msec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A VDI Sessions Launched: for our test, an identical number of VDI sessions (432) were scripted to open sequentially on each platform. This simulates the typical VDI “Boot Storm” where the majority of users within a certain region begin to work remotely.

B Failed Sessions: the test software monitors the login of all VDI sessions and reports failures in three areas: a) VDI sessions which failed to launch; b) launched VDI sessions which failed to open; and c) open VDI sessions which failed to respond during performance tests.

C Average Session Logon Time: indicates the average logon time per session, measured from the time the test script starts running to the point when the Windows Shell (explorer.exe) is loaded.

D VSIbase: a measurement of the base performance of the VDI environment when there is no load on the environment. It indicates the best performance (lowest latency), measured in milliseconds, of the system during testing.
**E** VSImax Average: simulates a loaded VDI environment by applying several statistical rules to prevent anomalies from distorting performance calculations. For instance, VSImax Average removes noise (accidental spikes) from the VSIbase calculation by removing the top and bottom latency spikes from its calculation. In the below charts we removed 5 highest and 5 lowest reading from the table.

**F** VSImax Threshold: in most VDI environments, a 3x increase in response time compared to the baseline is regarded as the maximum acceptable performance degradation. VSImax Threshold simulates this point by adding latency to VSIbase until a point is reached where VSImax Average falls outside the acceptable performance range. VSImax Threshold simulates a true real-world environment and is considered the gold standard in measuring overall VDI performance. Measured in milliseconds, the lower the threshold, the more headroom available for unexpected spikes in demand.

---

**LoginVSI Logon Time**

- Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud
- WVD on Azure
- Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS

---

**Number of Sessions That Failed to Launch**

- Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud: 2
- WVD on Azure: 4
- Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS: 11
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The results of the overall performance tests clearly indicate that Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud outperformed Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS and Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure. With the best ranking in logon times, sessions completed, and latency across all load ranges, Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud is indicative of a robust design that is best prepared to take full advantage of a high performance remote environment.

In average remote session boot and logon time, Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud (25 seconds) outperformed Amazon WorkSpaces (35 seconds) by 28%, and outperformed Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure (45 seconds) by 44%. In measuring average latency across all remote desktops, Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud (982 msec) outperformed Amazon WorkSpaces (1,092 msec) by 10%, and outperformed Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure (1,205 msec) by 23%.

When measuring failed remote user sessions, Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud (2 sessions) again outperformed Amazon WorkSpaces (11 sessions) by 5.5x, and outperformed Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure (4 sessions) by 2x.

CONCLUSION

Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) and Desktop-as-a-Service (DaaS) have become key technologies in enabling workers and students to work remotely without losing productivity. In comparing remote desktop platforms; performance and user experience are important criteria in determining ultimate success.

For any organization contemplating remote worker deployment, and based on the test results outlined in this paper, Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud is an obvious consideration. Along with providing a robust environment, Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud also includes a complete set of its own measurement tools. This in turn identifies bottlenecks to scalability with detailed reports on users, sessions, services, apps, VMs, hardware, storage, network and other components for deep insights into remote performance bottlenecks.

Using results provided by industry standard test suites LoginVSI and SysTrack from Lakeside Software, the remote worker environment hosted by Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud repeatedly showed superior results when compared to Amazon WorkSpaces on AWS and Microsoft Windows Virtual Desktop on Azure in the areas of typical user experience and baseline performance.

APEX Hybrid Cloud provides a hybrid cloud environment and standardized infrastructure experience; a common set of data services for workloads; a common management model; and workloads abstracted and decoupled from the underlying hardware to enable workload mobility. Horizon on APEX Hybrid Cloud is a true hybrid cloud platform for running remote workloads, ensuring users can work anywhere, across any device.

DISCLAIMER OF WARRANTIES & LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

Cloud Evolutions, Inc. has made reasonable efforts to ensure the accuracy and validity of its testing. However, Cloud Evolutions, Inc. specifically disclaims any warranty, expressed or implied, relating to the test results and analysis, their accuracy, completeness or quality, including any implied warranty of fitness for any particular purpose. All persons or entities relying on the results of any testing do so at their own risk, and agree Cloud Evolutions, Inc. its employees and its subcontractors shall have no liability whatsoever from any claim of loss or damage on account of any alleged error or defect in any testing procedure or result. In no event shall Cloud Evolutions, Inc. be liable for indirect, special, incidental, or consequential damages in connection with its testing, even if advised of the possibility of such damages. In no event shall Cloud Evolutions, Inc.’s liability, including for direct damages, exceed the amounts paid in connection with Cloud Evolutions, Inc.’s testing. Customer’s sole and exclusive remedies are as set forth herein. Testing conducted under laboratory conditions using synthetic benchmark tools. Real-world performance may vary.

© 2020 Cloud Evolutions, Inc. All trademarks are the property of their respective owners.