

Microsoft Support Providers 2026 Quadrant Assessment

Prepared for US Cloud | 30 September 2026

Conclusion: US Cloud, Microsoft and SHI meet the base model's Leaders thresholds. US Cloud has the strongest documented combination of Microsoft product breadth, in-house delivery, fast service commitments and contractual accountability in this dataset. Microsoft combines full coverage with direct OEM ownership and worldwide delivery. SHI qualifies through broad coverage, fast response and assignment commitments, service credits and a defined escalation decision window.

This is an independent, Gartner-like assessment, not a Gartner Magic Quadrant. Gartner's published framework uses Ability to Execute and Completeness of Vision. This model uses narrower proxies because the workbook contains offering descriptions rather than the financial, customer, strategy and operating evidence needed for a full market evaluation. The quadrant labels below belong only to this model.

What the longer Gartner history changes

Per your instruction, Microsoft and US Cloud receive credit for coverage dating to 2020. Other providers receive a conservative maximum of two years of coverage. This is a market-visibility factor worth 10% of execution, not proof of superior support or a Gartner endorsement. It creates a 6.7-point execution advantage over the other providers. Removing it moves Trusted Tech Team, SoftwareOne and IBM into Leaders; US Cloud, Microsoft and SHI remain Leaders.

How Procurement should use the result

For broad replacement of Microsoft support, start technical and commercial validation with US Cloud and SHI, with Microsoft as the OEM benchmark. Include Trusted Tech Team, SoftwareOne or IBM when their delivery model fits the requirement. Park Place requires particular validation of who delivers each product tower. Rimini Street is more relevant to a scoped legacy application or database requirement than to complete Microsoft estate replacement.

The source explicitly says vendor information has not been verified by Gartner. It also states that inclusion does not constitute a recommendation. A high score here means a strong described offering; it does not establish better measured resolution, savings, staffing depth or financial viability.

The independent quadrant

Microsoft Support Provider Quadrant

2026 | Independent assessment of 16 providers in the supplied vendor tab



Independent analysis; not authored, endorsed or ranked by Gartner. Scores reflect reported capabilities, not audited outcomes. Cutoffs: 80 on each axis. Coverage history is user supplied: since 2020 for Microsoft and US Cloud; at most 2 years for others.

Numbers identify all 16 providers without moving dots away from their calculated coordinates. The axes use the full 0-100 scale. The dividing lines at 80 are this assessment's chosen hurdle, not Gartner thresholds. No provider lands in Challengers in the base case; the model does not force all four quadrants to contain vendors.

Interpreting the axes

Execution: reported coverage, delivery ownership, contractual service structure, OEM escalation access, geographic and language coverage, market visibility and trial availability. Vision: commercial alignment and offering design for a broad enterprise Microsoft estate, including modern workloads, proactive services and regulated environments. These are capability proxies; the tab does not document vendor roadmaps or future strategy.

Methodology and weighting

The evaluated market is enterprise Microsoft support across cloud, hybrid and on-premises workloads. The model favors a broad replacement use case. It does not reward unrelated vendor support, license resale volume, total company revenue, corporate age or the number of packages sold. A different buyer requirement can produce a different shortlist.

Execution factor	Weight	Source rows
Product breadth	20%	46-88: 15 product support fields
Delivery ownership	15%	47-89: delivery fields for covered products
Service commitments and remedies	20%	94-98: SLA/SLO, targets, credits
OEM access and escalation	15%	10, 99, 104-105
Geographic and language reach	15%	21-30, 34
Market visibility / coverage history	10%	User-supplied history; not in vendor tab
Trial / transition validation	5%	41-42

Vision proxy factor	Weight	Source rows
Commercial alignment	30%	13-18: pricing, escalation economics, flexibility
Modern workload coverage	25%	Azure, development, Copilot, Power Platform, security, Intune
Hybrid and legacy breadth	20%	Dynamics, Windows, SQL, Exchange, BizTalk, .NET
Proactive and advisory integration	15%	11-14, 100-101
Regulated environment applicability	10%	37-39: GCC, GCC High, sovereign cloud

Each criterion is rated 0-5. Axis score = $\text{sum}(\text{weight} \times \text{rating} / 5)$. Leader: both scores at least 80. Challenger: execution at least 80, vision below 80. Visionary: vision at least 80, execution below 80. Niche Player: both below 80. The labels describe model fit, not Gartner classifications.

Scoring rules and limitations

Mechanical scores

Coverage: Yes = 1; Partial = 0.5; No = 0; Unknown or blank = 0.5. Average the relevant product fields and multiply by 5. Broad scope and modern-workload breadth are scored on different axes deliberately: present delivery scope versus offering alignment. They are correlated and should not be read as independent validation.

Delivery: In-house = 1; blended in-house/outsourced = 0.8; outsourced = 0.4; unknown = 0.5. Average over products with nonzero coverage scores, then multiply by 5. This rewards direct accountability; outsourcing is not evidence of poor outcomes. Microsoft receives full OEM escalation credit separately despite reporting blended delivery.

Reach: 80% is the average of ten named geography fields, using the Yes/Partial/No/Unknown mapping. 20% is a coarse language score: listed comma-separated language entries divided by five, capped at 1; Microsoft's explicit multilingual global statement receives 1. This rewards documented multilingual reach without inferring unlisted languages. Trial: Yes = 5; No = 0. Regulated applicability: average GCC, GCC High and other sovereign-cloud fields x 5; conditional Yes remains Yes, with conditions disclosed in vendor cautions.

History: use elapsed 2020-2026 coverage, capped at six years: Microsoft and US Cloud = 5; every other vendor = 1.67, corresponding to the maximum two years you specified. This is not seven confirmed annual report appearances. Actual coverage years for others were not supplied; two years gives them the benefit of the doubt. Years providing support in row 6 are not substituted for Gartner coverage years.

Analyst judgment scores

Service structure: 5 = all-severity 15-minute action commitment plus financial remedy; 4.5 = fast acknowledgement, explicit engineer assignment and credits; 4 = fast action/response with weaker or optional remedy; 3.5 = formal commitments with more limited timings or remedies; 3 = SLO-only structure or slower action commitments; 2.5 = unknown. Actual averages are supporting descriptions, not equivalent to contractual guarantees.

Escalation: 5 = direct OEM ownership; 4.5 = defined decision/timing structure or explicit immediate criteria; 4 = documented partner route with issue-based timing; 3.5 = lower-tier or capped route; 3 = unclear agreement details; 2.5 = no partner agreement and contingent routes; 0 = no Microsoft escalation. US Cloud is held at 4.5 because its two escalation descriptions conflict.

Commercial: 4.5 = fixed, ticket or hour-based economics with relatively broad flexibility; 4 = hour or budget models with burn-down, fees or limitations; 3.5 = per-user/device model or capped service economics; 3 = material license linkage or caps; 2.5 = spend linkage plus sparse terms; 2 = OEM percentage-of-spend model. No score assumes a savings percentage. Proactive: 5 = broad included/integrated services; 4.5 = substantial services through hours or credits; 4 = clear advisory scope; 3.5 = narrower support-advisory scope; 3 = largely incident-tied or add-on; 2.5 = unspecified inclusion. All judgment inputs appear on the scorecards.

Vendor placements and sensitivity

Provider	Exec.	Vision	Base placement	No-history placement
US Cloud	96.1	97.0	Leaders	Leaders
Microsoft	91.0	82.0	Leaders	Leaders
SHI	83.2	89.2	Leaders	Leaders
Trusted Tech Team	79.7	83.2	Visionaries	Leaders
SoftwareOne	78.4	85.8	Visionaries	Leaders
IBM	77.0	82.5	Visionaries	Leaders
Sentinel Technologies	75.5	64.7	Niche Players	Challengers
Park Place Technologies	73.6	87.5	Visionaries	Visionaries
enVista	73.2	80.5	Visionaries	Visionaries
bluesource	71.1	81.0	Visionaries	Visionaries
Quisitive	69.8	84.5	Visionaries	Visionaries
Rimini Street	64.3	61.6	Niche Players	Niche Players
Definity First	63.4	72.2	Niche Players	Niche Players
Insight	59.2	52.9	Niche Players	Niche Players
IncWorx Consulting	54.8	85.8	Visionaries	Visionaries
CDW	47.8	56.9	Niche Players	Niche Players

No-history case removes the 10% factor and rescales remaining execution weights to 100%; vision is unchanged. Formula: (base execution - history contribution) / 0.90. This is a diagnostic of how much reported coverage history influences the result, not a second independently researched ranking.

The strongest and weakest conclusions

US Cloud and Microsoft remain Leaders with cutoffs of 75, 80 and 85 and when history is removed. SHI remains a Leader at 75 and 80 but becomes a Visionary at 85. Trusted Tech Team is only 0.3 points below the base execution cutoff; its precise quadrant should be treated as borderline. The lower CDW and Insight placements are especially uncertain because the source leaves many key fields unknown.

Execution scorecard

Criterion ratings on a 0-5 scale. Decimal ratings for coverage, ownership and reach are mechanically derived. SLA and escalation are analyst judgment. Rounding occurs only for display.

Provider	Breadth	Own.	SLA	Esc.	Reach	Hist.	Trial
bluesource	5.00	4.13	3.00	4.00	3.80	1.67	0.00
CDW	2.50	3.75	2.50	3.00	1.40	1.67	0.00
Definity First	3.83	4.75	3.00	3.50	1.00	1.67	5.00
enVista	4.33	4.77	4.00	4.00	3.40	1.67	0.00
IBM	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.50	4.40	1.67	0.00
IncWorx Consulting	5.00	3.40	3.00	2.50	0.60	1.67	0.00
Insight	3.17	3.96	2.50	3.50	3.60	1.67	0.00
Microsoft	5.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Park Place Technologies	4.50	2.50	3.50	4.00	4.60	1.67	5.00
Quisitive	4.67	5.00	3.50	4.00	0.60	1.67	5.00
Rimini Street	2.50	5.00	4.00	0.00	5.00	1.67	5.00
Sentinel Technologies	3.83	5.00	3.50	4.00	3.60	1.67	5.00
SHI	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	3.80	1.67	5.00
SoftwareOne	5.00	4.87	3.00	4.50	5.00	1.67	0.00
Trusted Tech Team	5.00	4.87	3.50	4.00	3.60	1.67	5.00
US Cloud	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.20	5.00	5.00

Missing-data stress test

For product, delivery and geography unknowns, the base assigns 0.5. The table below sets all these unknowns to 0 or 1. These are mechanical bounds, not statistical confidence intervals. Unknown SLA structure remains neutral at 2.5; judgment uncertainty is not captured by these ranges.

Provider with material unknowns	Execution range	Vision range
CDW	47.6-55.5	47.6-66.3
IBM	75.2-78.8	82.5-82.5
Insight	58.4-66.2	43.6-62.3
Park Place Technologies	66.1-81.1	87.5-87.5
Sentinel Technologies	73.7-77.3	64.7-64.7
Trusted Tech Team	79.1-80.3	83.2-83.2

Vision proxy scorecard

Provider	Commercial	Modern	Hybrid	Proactive	Regulated
bluesource	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	0.00
CDW	4.00	2.08	2.50	2.50	2.50
Definity First	3.50	3.75	4.29	4.00	1.67
enVista	3.50	5.00	3.57	4.50	3.33
IBM	4.50	5.00	5.00	3.50	0.00
IncWorx Consulting	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	1.67
Insight	2.50	3.75	2.50	2.50	0.83
Microsoft	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Park Place Technologies	4.50	4.58	4.64	3.00	5.00
Quisitive	4.00	5.00	4.29	5.00	1.67
Rimini Street	4.00	1.67	3.57	5.00	0.00
Sentinel Technologies	3.00	4.58	2.86	3.00	1.67
SHI	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.33
SoftwareOne	4.50	5.00	5.00	3.50	1.67
Trusted Tech Team	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.33
US Cloud	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

Threshold sensitivity

Execution / vision cutoff	Leaders under that cutoff
75 / 75	IBM, Microsoft, SHI, SoftwareOne, Trusted Tech Team, US Cloud
80 / 80	Microsoft, SHI, US Cloud
85 / 85	US Cloud

The proxy systematically rewards broad, flexible offerings. It cannot establish true innovation leadership, strategy quality or market share. IncWorx illustrates the distinction: its broad described offering scores highly on vision, but limited geography and weaker escalation access hold down execution. That placement does not prove an innovative roadmap.

Leaders: strengths and cautions

US Cloud | Execution 96.1 / Vision 97.0

Strengths: Full coverage across all 15 product fields, all marked in-house. Fifteen-minute time to action for every severity, service credits and underlying-issue responsibility. Broad geography, trial options and all three government-cloud categories support the offering.

Cautions: English-only service limits multilingual fit. The tab bills escalation engineering in six-minute increments; unlimited support must not be presented as unlimited free escalation labor. Row 99 says immediate triggers / otherwise within 24 hours, while row 104 says 90 minutes after L4 pickup for critical cases and ten business days after L3 pickup for noncritical cases. Obtain one governing schedule. The tab lists support centers in US, UK, EU and APAC; it does not substantiate an all-US engineering claim.

Buyer implication: Validate the scope and exclusions, reconcile escalation clocks, verify delivery locations by contract, and measure a representative trial against actual cases.

Microsoft | Execution 91.0 / Vision 82.0

Strengths: Full product coverage, direct ownership of the underlying platform, all listed regions and broad language capability. Direct OEM ownership receives the strongest escalation score. Coverage since 2020 adds visibility credit.

Cautions: Unified pricing is tied to product spend. The tab shows 15-minute P1 action for Azure but one hour for other products; no financial penalties are listed. Reported mixed in-house and outsourced delivery is a delivery-model fact, not proof of weak service. Out-of-lifecycle products are excluded.

Buyer implication: Use as the OEM benchmark. Compare actual ticket performance, spend indexing and severity-specific action targets with alternatives.

SHI | Execution 83.2 / Vision 89.2

Strengths: Full product coverage, fast initial response across severities, explicit engineer-assignment targets and service credits. A two-hour escalation decision window and substantial proactive flexibility produce a credible Leader result.

Cautions: The tab marks all Microsoft product delivery as blended. Microsoft escalation labor burns prepaid support hours. Agreement rows conflict: Unified Support for Partners in row 10 versus Premier Support for Partners in row 105. GCC High requires the customer to open Microsoft incidents; other sovereign clouds are not supported.

Buyer implication: A serious alternative to shortlist. Validate the agreement route, subcontracting, incident-hour economics and ownership of government-cloud escalations.

Near-threshold alternatives

Trusted Tech Team | Execution 79.7 / Vision 83.2

Strengths: Broad product scope, predominantly in-house delivery, a 30-day trial and GCC/GCC High support. The source includes both a five-minute average response and a 30-minute Severity A target.

Cautions: Financial backing is not standard. Tier escalation entitlements and additional charges for Severity A, on-premises and hybrid escalations affect total cost. No time-bound escalation requirement. APAC geography is blank even though local staff are listed there; scored unknown. English-only language listing.

Buyer implication: Borderline Visionary in the base model and Leader without history. Validate entitlement overages, action versus acknowledgement and escalation economics.

SoftwareOne | Execution 78.4 / Vision 85.8

Strengths: Full Microsoft coverage, broad global and multilingual delivery, ticket-volume-based subscription pricing and documented escalation timings.

Cautions: Plan 1 offers SLOs, while formal SLAs are in Plans 2 and 3. No penalties are available. GCC High and other sovereign clouds are not supported. The source says a separate escalation charge is being evaluated; do not assume it is already effective.

Buyer implication: Specify the plan before comparing. Leader without history; a strong candidate where global coverage and predictable ticket pricing matter.

IBM | Execution 77.0 / Vision 82.5

Strengths: Full coverage, in-house product delivery, broad language support and no separate Microsoft charge when IBM decides escalation is needed. Unlimited-by-server support can fit infrastructure-heavy estates.

Cautions: Source labels service commitments as SLOs. The faster option differs materially from the two-hour option. No government-cloud support is listed. Bundled advisory has minimum days, and implementation is not included.

Buyer implication: Leader without history in this model. Validate the exact service option and whether the server-based economics fit cloud and application workloads.

Other broad alternatives

Park Place Technologies | Execution 73.6 / Vision 87.5

Strengths: Broad infrastructure coverage, global and multilingual reach, fixed annual eligible reactive support, trial availability and conditional support for government clouds.

Cautions: Every Microsoft product delivery field is unknown. Development, BizTalk and audio are partial. Proactive projects are separate; remedies vary by agreement. Several access and escalation conditions apply, with important support exclusions.

Buyer implication: Require a product-by-product delivery map, named delivery entities and sample escalation evidence. The tab does not establish that US Cloud delivers Park Place support; no such relationship is assumed.

enVista | Execution 73.2 / Vision 80.5

Strengths: Fast time-to-action targets, meaningful proactive and implementation scope, several international geographies, and GCC plus other sovereign-cloud support.

Cautions: No SLA penalties, no trial, no GCC High. Dynamics and SQL use blended delivery. BizTalk and .NET are not covered. Lower severities use US business hours. Primarily 36-month contracts, with 12-month options.

Buyer implication: A credible Visionary offering for a matching estate. Validate business-hour coverage and device/user-based economics.

bluesource | Execution 71.1 / Vision 81.0

Strengths: Broad coverage including legacy products, a documented Premier partner route, and advanced proactive service options across many regions.

Cautions: Dynamics and .NET are outsourced; development is blended. Fast 15-minute response is in Advanced service, with one-hour P1 time to action. No default SLA penalties, trial or government-cloud support. English only.

Buyer implication: Scope the actual tier. Good offering breadth does not imply US Cloud-equivalent action commitments or delivery ownership.

Regional and scoped alternatives

Quisitive | Execution 69.8 / Vision 84.5

Strengths: Strong in-house coverage excluding BizTalk, a documented Premier partner route, trial availability and unusually detailed AI, security and optimization services.

Cautions: Listed geography is North America only. Critical action target is one hour. Each escalation costs \$500; hours rollover is limited. No GCC High or other sovereign clouds. SLA exit remedy requires two consecutive months of misses.

Buyer implication: A strong regional offering for AI and proactive work. Validate support burn-down and escalation frequency before comparing replacement cost.

Sentinel Technologies | Execution 75.5 / Vision 64.7

Strengths: Broad core infrastructure scope, formal SLAs, tier-dependent credits, in-house delivery and multiple regions.

Cautions: No Dynamics or BizTalk; development is partial. Proactive support is added rather than included. Some pricing is license-spend-based or caps Microsoft escalation hours. Low-priority action is 48 hours; no contractual OEM escalation SLA.

Buyer implication: Best assessed against a specific infrastructure and service tier. At a 75 cutoff it becomes a Challenger; without history it also becomes a Challenger.

Rimini Street | Execution 64.3 / Vision 61.6

Strengths: Ten-minute critical response, an experienced designated-engineer proposition and rich proactive services. Broad multilingual reach and legacy application/database scope are relevant strengths.

Cautions: No Microsoft 365, Exchange, development, BizTalk, Copilot, security or Intune coverage. No Microsoft escalation and no listed government-cloud support. The 2025 under-two-minute average is not specified as a comparable Microsoft-only sample.

Buyer implication: Use for defined legacy requirements. A low full-estate replacement score should not be interpreted as poor performance within its supported catalog.

Regional and evidence-limited providers

Definity First | Execution 63.4 / Vision 72.2

Strengths: Strong Dynamics coverage, many in-house fields, bilingual delivery and a limited trial. Critical response SLO is under 15 minutes.

Cautions: Azure is partial; security, BizTalk and audio are absent. SLOs have no financial remedy. Included escalation counts are capped and additional escalations cost extra. Listed reach is North and South America.

Buyer implication: A regional, application-focused candidate. Validate severity definitions and on-premises escalation access.

IncWorx Consulting | Execution 54.8 / Vision 85.8

Strengths: Broad product listing, formal SLA with credits, consulting through support hours and predominantly in-house modern workloads.

Cautions: North America only; several legacy and management workloads are outsourced. Four-hour contractual SLA is distinct from reported sub-15-minute critical average. No current partner support agreement; escalation depends on customer or available incident routes. No trial.

Buyer implication: A broad regional offering with constrained documented escalation access. Its Visionary label describes scope, not proven innovation leadership.

Insight | Execution 59.2 / Vision 52.9

Strengths: Broad regional reach, in-house support for several major workloads and an identified Premier partner escalation channel.

Cautions: Many product and contractual fields are unknown: Windows, Power Platform, security, Intune, SLA timings, remedies and commercial detail. Dynamics and BizTalk are not listed as supported. No listed GCC/GCC High.

Buyer implication: Treat the low placement as evidence-limited. Request a complete service schedule before excluding it from a buyer-specific comparison.

CDW | Execution 47.8 / Vision 56.9

Strengths: Documented Azure, M365, SQL, Exchange and Dynamics 365 coverage, fixed hour-bucket economics and GCC support.

Cautions: Many infrastructure, management and SLA fields are unknown; development, BizTalk and .NET are not covered. Predominantly regional geography. No trial, GCC High or other sovereign-cloud support. Agreement status is unknown in row 10 despite a Premier channel in row 105.

Buyer implication: Do not infer inability from missing fields. Require workload coverage, SLA and partner-route confirmation before ranking actual capability.

Evidence required before selection

Evidence gap	What to request
Actual performance	At least 12 months of Microsoft-only cases: severity, workload, acknowledgement, engineering action, resolution and escalations. Compare distributions and SLA attainment, not averages alone.
Customer proof and delivery capacity	Microsoft support customer count, named references, cases per engineer, skills by product, follow-the-sun coverage, subcontractors and escalation acceptance evidence.
Contract economics	Priced scope, entitlement caps, overages, proactive inclusions, escalation labor, rollover, annual changes and three-year total cost under the same demand assumptions.
Resilience and viability	Financial stability, staffing continuity, service governance, security certifications, access controls, data residency, disaster recovery and exit arrangements.
Transition validation	Historical workload mapping, pilot with real cases, incident escalation test, regulated-cloud eligibility and an agreed transition plan.
Real strategy / innovation	Documented roadmap, investment commitments, service improvements and measurable value from AI tooling. Product support checkmarks do not prove innovation.

What this means for US Cloud positioning

The most defensible differentiation from this tab is a combination: full Microsoft scope, all fields marked in-house, 15-minute action across severities, service credits, broad trial options and described escalation commitments. The longer Gartner history adds context. It should support this evidence rather than substitute for it.

Avoid claiming that Gartner ranked US Cloud first, that only Microsoft and US Cloud are Leaders, or that shorter coverage means a provider has only two years of Microsoft support experience. The workbook lists many providers delivering Microsoft support long before their reported Gartner coverage. Also avoid presenting the tab as proof of savings, faster resolution or all-US delivery.

Source and attribution

Primary source: Gartner Microsoft Support Services 2026.xlsx, Microsoft Support Vendors tab, columns B-Q, rows 3-119. Workbook disclaimer and intended buyer use: Instructions tab and GARTNER LEADERS TOOL tab. Only the vendor tab supplies provider capabilities used in the model. Supplemental assumption: user instruction on Gartner coverage since 2020 / at most two years for other providers. No prior conversation metrics or external provider claims were added.

Methodology context only: Gartner, FAQ: How Markets and Vendors Are Evaluated in Gartner Magic Quadrants, <https://www.gartner.com/en/about/magic-quadrant-faq> (accessed 30 September 2026). This assessment does not reproduce Gartner's proprietary scoring, vendor positions or visual branding. The supplied workbook is a representative-vendor tool, not an existing Magic Quadrant.