What Most Buyers Miss in CCaaS and UCaaS Evaluations

OGS Group Point of View

An operator's perspective on architecture, automation, economics, support, and long-term fit

Prepared for executive and operational buyers evaluating unified communications, cloud telephony, contact center, and adjacent workflow decisions.

Core point: A communications decision is no longer just a platform purchase. It is a choice about operating model: where calling lives, how workflows move, how automation is applied, how support is handled, and how much flexibility remains once the system is live.

What this document is—and is not

This paper reflects OGS Group's point of view based on observed market patterns, platform evaluation experience, and recurring implementation issues across communications and customer engagement environments. It is written to help leaders make better decisions by clarifying the tradeoffs that matter once architecture, support, workflow reality, and long-term cost are taken seriously.

Working directly with CCaaS and UCaaS vendors, given the overlap in functionality and how blurred the lines have become, too often comes down to who has the better salesperson. We believe there is a better way: use an independent advisory partner that can compare the market objectively against your requirements, rather than against a single vendor narrative.

This Point of View isn't a vendor leaderboard, a formal analyst report, or a substitute for platform-specific diligence. It is an operator's perspective on some of the things we believe are important to consider in your evaluation framework to make the right CCaaS and/or UCaaS platform decision for your business.

Executive perspective

Most communications projects are still, unfortunately, framed more as infrastructure upgrades. In our experience, that is a mistake. A decision about calling, meetings, contact center, and workflow automation is usually a decision about operating model: which interface people will live in, where routing logic sits, how support escalates, and how much complexity the business is willing to own after go-live.

That is why vendor demos so often mislead buyers. The demo shows capability. It does not show where the capability actually lives; what has to be configured around it; which features depend on add-ons or third parties; or how the environment behaves when reporting, AI, compliance, and day-two support become real. We have seen credible platforms disappoint in practice not because the software was weak, but because the buyer underestimated the operating model that came with it.

That creates two predictable mistakes. Buyers compare visible features before defining what they are trying to optimize, and they still frame the market as an either/or contest when the more important question is often architectural: whether the collaboration layer also becomes the phone system, whether telephony is supplied natively or by a third party, and where automation should sit.

1. The market has changed—but evaluation models have not

Many buyers are not starting from a cloud-native blank slate. They are carrying years of PBX assumptions, carrier contracts, handset expectations, and break/fix habits into a market that now behaves very differently. A company moving off Cisco, Avaya, Mitel, or a hosted voice environment is not just replacing dial tone. It is deciding whether voice remains its own stack, folds into a collaboration platform, or becomes part of a broader workflow environment.

COVID accelerated one part of the shift and delayed another. Meetings and chat moved fast. Calling often did not. The result was a large population of hybrid estates: legacy or hosted telephony on one side, Teams, Zoom, or Webex on the other, and a patchwork of integrations in between.

That patchwork is one reason published feature lists are less useful than they used to be. A capability may exist natively, through an app, through Direct Routing or an embedded dialer, through CRM integration, or through a separate contact center layer. Those are not cosmetic differences. They change cost, support, reporting, administrative ownership, and how hard it is to live with the platform after the project team disappears.

In our experience, this is where weak evaluations start. Buyers compare products before they have decided what role the platform is supposed to play. Is the goal to replace a PBX, standardize a user interface, improve inbound call handling, tighten outbound workflows inside CRM, reduce vendor sprawl, support a contact center, or some combination of those? Those are different projects, even when the same vendors appear on the shortlist.

Typical Buyer lens

What Buyers often see	What Matters More
Features comparison	Where the capability lives in the native platform, ecosystem layer, API, or implementation customization
Per-seat pricing	Total cost behavior once PSTN, implementation, support, analytics, workflow requirements, and AI are modeled together
A clean demo	The support model, integration effort required, and accountability after go-live

If you are evaluating a move away from a premises PBX, a hosted voice service, or a stand-alone IP phone environment, this PoV will hopefully help you frame the decision more honestly before the vendor comparison starts.

What the next three years will likely look like

Over the next three years, we expect three pressures to matter more than headline features: continued migration away from legacy telephony, tighter links between UCaaS and CCaaS, and more AI placed inside real workflows rather than sold as a separate layer. That raises the costs of making the wrong decision. A weak choice can lock the business into the wrong support model, the wrong integration burden, and the wrong foundation for reporting and automation.

Why objective advisory matters more now

Objective advisory matters because vendors are not responsible for designing the buyer's decision process. They are responsible for making their platform look like the right answer. Those are not the same job.

2. Many organizations still start in the wrong place

A common mistake in CCaaS and UCaaS evaluations is starting with the wrong question. Many organizations begin by asking which vendor is best. The better starting question is what matters most in their environment, and which tradeoffs they are willing to accept.

Success criteria are not window dressing. They are the frame that determines whether the evaluation has integrity at all. If they are weak, vague, or implicit, the vendor with the strongest narrative often gains control of the process. If they are explicit, ranked, and tied to operating realities, the organization can evaluate options against its own priorities rather than borrowing the vendor's version of what matters.

Dimension	Tension
Deployment speed	vs. long-term flexibility
Cost containment	vs. capability depth
Simplicity	vs. control
Standardization	vs. customization
Internal efficiency	vs. customer experience differentiation

These are not generic strategy statements. They are operating choices. A company that values simplicity and rapid deployment should not be surprised when deeper routing, automation, or reporting needs later demand more structure. A company that values maximum control should not be surprised when integration burden and support dependence rise.

3. The foundational decisions that determine outcomes

This is the part of the project that usually determines whether the selection later looks smart or expensive. By the time a buyer is comparing scorecards and pricing, most of the real risk is already set by a handful of design decisions. We have seen well-run RFPs still produce weak outcomes because these choices were never made explicitly.

3.1 Architecture: unified vs. best-of-breed vs. hybrid

Architecture is not an abstract IT diagram. It is a decision about ownership, flexibility, support, and future change. Buyers often talk about 'the platform' as if there will be one clean answer. In practice, the real choice is usually among unified, best-of-breed, and hybrid models.

A unified architecture is attractive because it simplifies accountability. One platform carries more of the load, there are fewer moving parts, and there is usually less near-term integration work. Best-of-breed can create more long-term flexibility, but it also makes the buyer responsible for stitching together systems that vendors will each describe as integrated and then support separately once something breaks.

Hybrid models deserve more scrutiny than they usually get. Sometimes they are exactly the right answer. Teams Phone is positioned by Microsoft as a PBX replacement, which means Teams can become both the collaboration layer and the primary calling surface for the business. In other environments, Teams remains the user interface while a provider such as RingCentral supplies telephony, SMS, fax, and calling features through an embedded app or Direct Routing option. RingCentral also publicly positions its embedded Teams model as not requiring a Teams Phone license, which can matter economically, though buyers should treat the savings as situational rather than automatic. If the environment is heavily Microsoft, support expectations are high,

and power-user calling matters, that hybrid can be worth modeling. If the organization is already thin on admin capacity, it can just as easily become a support headache.[1,2]

3.2 System of control: where the logic and the truth sit

Every environment ends up with a real system of control, whether the buyer names it or not. It is the place where routing rules live, operational truth is reported, identities are enforced, and exception handling happens. The mistake is to assume the system with the most users should automatically be the system of control. Sometimes it should. Often it should not.

3.3 Integration strategy: the hidden cost driver

Integration is where much of the hidden cost sits. Nearly every vendor can demonstrate an integration. That is not the same as proving the workflow is clean, supportable, and resilient when other systems change. Buyers should ask four blunt questions: what is native, what is third-party, what requires custom work, and who owns the failure when the workflow breaks.

That matters most in outbound calling. Outbound is not just dial tone. It is list hygiene, click-to-call, CRM sync, call logging, disposition capture, compliance controls, and manager visibility. Zoom, for example, now supports Auto Dialer workflows tied to CRM or sales-engagement contact lists, and Zoom Phone's Salesforce integration supports click-to-dial, call logging, and call history inside Salesforce. The point is not that Zoom is uniquely special. The point is that outbound calling now lives much closer to workflow software than many buyers realize. [3,4]

3.4 Automation and AI: from feature set to operating design choice

Automation and AI are where buyers are easiest to distract. A long feature list is not a strategy. The real question is where automation belongs, what data it can reach, and whether the surrounding process is disciplined enough to produce value.

On the inbound side, the biggest gains usually come from simple things done well: auto attendants, call queues, after-hours routing, skills logic, knowledge surfacing, callback, transcription, and escalation paths that reflect how the business works. Microsoft's own planning guidance for Teams voice applications shows how much design work sits behind auto attendants, call queues, reporting, and click-to-call configuration. That is exactly the point. The value is not in having automation. The value is in designing it carefully enough that callers and employees feel less friction.

3.5 Support model: the dimension buyers notice too late

Support is where many elegant designs go to die. A support model is not a footer in the contract. It is part of the operating design. The buyer needs to know who owns first-line support, who owns cross-platform faults, how device break/fix works, and what happens when the problem crosses the border between collaboration, telephony, carrier, contact center, and network.

If 24x7 coverage, aggressive SLAs, language coverage, or high-availability expectations matter, those requirements need to shape the architecture up front, not get negotiated after the shortlist is already emotionally locked in. RingCentral, for example, publicly lists 24/7 support options, but buyers still need to ask what that means for their region, language, support tier, and escalation path.

---

[1]RingCentral, "RingCentral for Microsoft Teams": RingCentral says its embedded Teams app enables calling, SMS, fax, voicemail, and advanced calling features in Teams and says the embedded model does not require a Teams Phone license.

[2]Microsoft Learn, "Teams Phone features" (July 1, 2025): Microsoft describes Teams Phone as a PBX replacement and documents Teams calling and phone-system capabilities.

[3]Zoom, "Zoom Phone integrations": Zoom says its Salesforce integration supports making and receiving calls in Salesforce and includes click-to-dial, call logging, and call history.

[4]Zoom Support, "Using Zoom Auto Dialer": Zoom states that Auto Dialer can use contact lists from CRM or sales-engagement platforms and automate high-volume outbound dialing workflows.

4. The decision model: key evaluation areas required

By the time a buyer says: 'show me the best options,' the quality of the answer depends almost entirely on the quality of the inputs. A platform comparison is only as honest as the decision model sitting behind it.

In practice, we would not separate architecture, operations, economics, support, and assessment discipline. They move together. A platform that looks attractive technically can still be a bad operating fit. A platform that works operationally can still turn into a poor financial choice once PSTN design, implementation effort, AI add-ons, and post-go-live support are included.

Decision dimension	What it governs	Primary risk if underweighted
Architecture	Scalability, control, integration flexibility	Locked-in design that cannot evolve cleanly
Operations	Workflow fit, adoption, supervisory effectiveness	Workarounds, low adoption, inconsistent execution
Economics	Total cost behavior over time	Budget overruns and weak ROI realization
Support	Stability, accountability, ongoing optimization	Operational fragility and vendor/partner confusion
Assessment discipline	Whether the comparison reflects the buyer's actual environment	A polished vendor comparison built on incomplete inputs

4.1 Why a structured assessment should precede vendor comparison

The purpose of a structured assessment is not to create paperwork. It is to prevent a polished but shallow comparison. We have seen too many evaluations start with the vendor shortlist and only later discover a compliance constraint, an outbound workflow requirement, a WAN limitation, an existing CRM dependency, or a support expectation that should have changed the shape of the comparison from day one.

The assessment does not need to be public. It does need to be disciplined. Buyers should know, before demos begin, what they are actually trying to compare: a phone system, a collaboration layer, a contact center, an outbound workflow surface, a network design decision, or some combination of those.

Assessment domain	Examples of what must be understood	Why it changes the outcome
Business scope	UCaaS, CCaaS, outbound sales, CX/AI, network, virtual desktop or DaaS interest	Determines whether the decision is a platform choice, a workflow choice, or both
Commercial constraints	Preferred contract vehicle; marketplace preferences such as FedRAMP, AWS, Azure, or Google Cloud	Changes which vendors and procurement paths are practical
Compliance and risk	Required standards such as HIPAA, PCI, SOC 2, FINRA, GDPR, or sector-specific requirements	Narrows the field and changes architecture and support assumptions
Current ecosystem	Microsoft 365, Teams, Webex, Google Workspace, Slack, CRM, ticketing, ERP	Determines where adoption, identity, and integration gravity already sit
Network and connectivity	Internet, SD-WAN, MPLS, dedicated voice, current WAN design, replace vs. augment decision	Changes voice design, resiliency, quality expectations, and project scope
Workflow requirements	Inbound routing, recordings, reporting, supervisor tools, messaging, presence, collaboration, power-user calling	Separates nice-to-have features from the operating model requirements
AI and automation priorities	Summaries, note taking, knowledge retrieval, transcription, translation, sentiment, automated outbound workflow	Prevents buyers from overpaying for AI they cannot operationalize
Support and operating model	24x7 expectations, escalation ownership, admin maturity, device support, number of '9s' required	Determines whether the environment can be supported cleanly after go-live

5. Vendor landscape: understanding vendors through product philosophies

The vendor landscape is easiest to misunderstand when it is treated like a leaderboard. It is more useful to view vendors through product philosophy: what problem they solve first, what complexity they assume, and what type of operating environment they are built to support. These are directional observations, not rankings; fit depends on the buyer's operating model, support needs, integration reality, and administrative maturity.

5.1 UCaaS platforms

Our view is that Microsoft Teams is strongest when communications strategy is inseparable from the broader Microsoft productivity and governance environment. Zoom is strongest where simplicity, usability, and adoption velocity are central. Cisco Webex is strongest where reliability, control, security, and enterprise infrastructure discipline are part of the business case. RingCentral is strongest where the buyer values a mature cloud communications platform with broad integration depth and a more communications-centric operating model. Vonage is strongest where flexibility, application connectivity, and blended communications workflows are central to the business case.

UCaaS vendor	Core product philosophy	Where it is strongest	Where caution is warranted
Microsoft Teams	Productivity-led collaboration, governance, and cloud PBX potential	Standardized Microsoft environments; internal productivity; policy, identity, and administrative control; environments where Teams can become the primary calling interface	Deeper telephony, analytics, and CX requirements may depend on PSTN strategy, ecosystem layers, or added design work
Zoom	Experience-led simplicity and rapid adoption	Ease of deployment; user acceptance; lower-friction modernization; organizations prioritizing usability across calling, meetings, and chat	Simplicity at the user layer may not fully offset architecture and integration complexity elsewhere
Cisco Webex	Infrastructure-led control and enterprise reliability	Security, resiliency, enterprise-grade operating environments, and customers valuing control over calling environments	May be heavier and more complex than required in simpler or speed-driven environments
RingCentral	Communications-led cloud platform breadth and integration depth	Mature cloud telephony, strong reliability, power-user calling, and the option to extend telephony into Microsoft Teams while keeping Teams as the user interface	May be less attractive where buyers want the most native alignment to a single productivity ecosystem
Vonage	Flexibility-led cloud communications with strong application connectivity	Organizations valuing flexible calling, application integration, business messaging, and options to connect telephony or contact center capabilities into Teams-centric environments	Can require more diligence where the buyer wants the most standardized or tightly packaged operating model

5.2 CCaaS platforms

Our view is that Genesys is strongest where customer interaction design, journey orchestration, and routing flexibility are themselves strategic problems. NICE is strongest where AI, analytics, workforce optimization, and performance visibility are central. Five9 is strongest where the customer wants credible CCaaS capability without turning the environment into a large-scale design program. Zoom Contact Center is strongest where the buyer values a more modern, usability-led path into omnichannel customer engagement. Cisco Webex Contact Center is strongest where customer engagement requirements sit alongside broader enterprise reliability, security, and control expectations. RingCentral is strongest where the buyer wants a simpler path to customer engagement that aligns closely with a broader communications environment. Vonage is strongest where CRM-connected workflows, omnichannel engagement, and tighter alignment between employee and

customer communications matter. Microsoft Dynamics 365 Contact Center + Teams is strongest where the buyer wants contact center capability tied closely to the Microsoft ecosystem, workflow extensibility, Teams collaboration, and existing Teams Phone investments.

CCaaS vendor	Core product philosophy	Where it is strongest	Where caution is warranted
Genesys	Enterprise orchestration and journey flexibility	Complex, high-value customer journeys; large or sophisticated CX environments	Implementation and governance burden can be substantial
NICE	AI-, analytics-, and workforce-optimization-led CX management	Large-scale operations; environments where AI, visibility, quality, and workforce management are central	Capability depth can exceed what smaller or less mature environments can absorb
Five9	Balanced cloud CCaaS capability with a clearer deployment path	Mid-market to upper-mid-market organizations needing meaningful CX capability without maximum complexity	May be less ideal where global customization and the deepest orchestration flexibility are central
Zoom Contact Center	Experience-led contact center modernization with a strong usability bias	Organizations wanting omnichannel, outbound, AI, and WEM capabilities in a platform that often feels more approachable than legacy-heavy enterprise stacks	May be less ideal where the requirement is the deepest enterprise customization or operating-model sophistication
Cisco Webex Contact Center	Enterprise-grade customer engagement with strong control and reliability orientation	Organizations that value customer engagement capability alongside security, resiliency, analytics, and broader enterprise communications discipline	May be heavier than required in simpler or speed-driven environments
RingCentral	Customer engagement adjacent to a broader communications platform	Organizations wanting CCaaS capability with a simpler operating path and tighter alignment to voice, messaging, and communications modernization	May be less ideal where the primary requirement is the deepest contact-center-specific design flexibility
Vonage	Omnichannel, CRM-connected engagement with blended UCaaS + CCaaS alignment	Organizations prioritizing CRM-centered workflows, omnichannel engagement, and closer coordination between front-office and back-office communications	Can require more diligence where the buyer wants the most standardized, tightly packaged, or analytics-heavy enterprise contact center model
Microsoft Dynamics 365 Contact Center + Teams	CRM- and workflow-centered contact center tied to the Microsoft collaboration and telephony environment	Organizations already invested in Microsoft 365, Teams, Dynamics, Power Platform, or Teams Phone; environments where service workflows, collaboration, and contact center capabilities benefit from staying close to the Microsoft stack	May be less attractive where the buyer wants a more platform-neutral CCaaS choice, a simpler non-Microsoft operating model, or the deepest out-of-the-box contact-center specialization without broader Microsoft design dependencies

The right question is not which vendor looks strongest in the abstract. It is which vendor philosophy is most aligned with the buyer's priorities, operating model, integration reality, and likely complexity over time. In that sense, Microsoft belongs in the CCaaS discussion most accurately as Dynamics 365 Contact Center + Teams, not as Teams alone.

6. Economic realities: cost behavior matters more than pricing snapshots

Economic analysis in this market is often too shallow to be genuinely useful. Many organizations compare subscription pricing, add a rough implementation estimate, and assume they have a working business case. That is usually enough for procurement, but not enough for a decision that must hold up operationally for several years.

A better economic model separates at least five categories: core licensing, PSTN and telephony design, AI and add-on consumption, implementation and integration, support and optimization, and operational impact.

Cost component	What it typically includes	Why it matters
Core licensing	Seats, agents, calling plans, base platform modules	Visible, but only part of the total cost picture
PSTN / telephony design	Calling plans, operator connect or direct routing decisions, numbers, survivability design	Can materially change both cost and support accountability
AI / add-ons	Summaries, agent assist, analytics, WFO, premium workflow modules	Usage-based costs can expand faster than buyers expect
Implementation / integration	Configuration, migration, APIs, testing, workflow design	Often the largest source of budget variance
Support / optimization	24x7 coverage, partner support, device processes, change requests, tuning	Determines long-term stability and how much the platform really costs to run

Hybrid choices can also change the cost curve. A Teams-first user experience with third-party telephony may be more economical in some environments, especially when Teams Phone licensing, PSTN design, support coverage, calling features, and analytics are modeled together. In other environments, the hybrid model adds enough complexity that the apparent savings disappear. That is precisely why assessment and economics must be linked.

7. The cost of getting it wrong

By the time an organization recognizes that it made a weak platform decision, the most important part of the damage is often already done. These mistakes rarely reveal themselves in a single dramatic failure. They emerge gradually, after the contract is signed and after the business has started reshaping workflows, support structures, and reporting around the chosen environment.

The real cost is structural. It shows up in the way the organization is forced to work after the decision has already become difficult to reverse.

The most serious consequence is not simply living with a suboptimal environment. It is that the organization eventually realizes the platform cannot scale cleanly with its priorities, and fixing the problem may require another major transition: a new selection cycle, rebuilt integrations, retrained users, and another cutover.

Failure pattern	How it typically appears	Likely business consequence
Implementation variance	Change orders, rework, delayed milestones, complexity discovered too late	Higher cost and reduced confidence in the program
Operational inefficiency	Manual workarounds, multi-tool behavior, spreadsheet reporting, agent friction	Lower productivity and weaker customer experience consistency
Support dependence	Fragmented ownership across vendor, partner, carrier, and internal IT	Reduced agility and higher operating overhead
Delayed value realization	AI underuse, weak adoption, workflow improvement that never fully lands	ROI erosion and executive skepticism
Re-platforming risk	Growing recognition that the selected environment is a structural misfit	Future project cost and organizational fatigue

8. Why objective advisory matters more now

This point of view is shaped less by product marketing and more by what tends to go wrong after cutover, when support, reporting, integration ownership, and workflow reality show up.
The deeper value of an advisory partner is not familiarity with vendor decks. It is the ability to translate a customer's operating priorities into a defensible decision model, pressure-test vendor assumptions against real implementation and support realities and help the organization make tradeoffs consciously rather than accidentally.

That matters more now because the market is harder to evaluate honestly: more overlap, more AI claims, more ways for cost to look stable early and change later, and more hybrid designs that can either improve fit or create hidden support burden depending on how they are assembled.

8.1 Why use OGS Group, ATC, and AVANT in this decision process?

There is no shortage of firms that can help buyers evaluate, compare, and source communications platforms. The harder question is which kind of partner actually improves the quality of the decision.

In our view, the right advisor should do three things well. First, it should bring an objective evaluation framework that keeps the process anchored in the client's business priorities rather than a vendor narrative. Second, it should bring implementation-grounded judgment about what will actually work once the platform is live. Third, it should bring enough market access, engineering depth, and supplier visibility to compare viable options honestly and efficiently. That is the model behind the combination of OGS Group, ATC, and AVANT.

OGS Group brings the point of view, the executive framing, and the evaluation discipline. Its role is to help define what success should look like before the demo process starts, clarify the tradeoffs that matter, and keep the comparison focused on operating fit rather than feature theater. That matters because most weak platform decisions are not caused by selecting an obviously bad vendor. They are caused by choosing an environment whose support model, integration burden, workflow design, or long-term operating demands were never made explicit enough at the start.

ATC adds the practical judgment that comes from having evolved with the communications market itself. ATC's experience spans the progression from traditional carrier and voice services to hosted VoIP, then into broader digital-transformation consulting across voice, network, cloud, cybersecurity, and data and AI.[5] That history matters because UCaaS and CCaaS decisions do not sit in isolation. They are tied to WAN design, support expectations, device strategy, integration reality, and the day-two operating model. ATC brings that implementation-grounded perspective into the evaluation.[6]

AVANT contributes a different layer of value: broad provider access, current market intelligence, structured comparison tools, and specialist engineering support across UCaaS, CCaaS, cloud, connectivity, and security.[7] That does not replace advisory judgment. It strengthens it. It gives the evaluation broader market visibility, faster access to viable options, and more technical depth behind provider comparisons, quoting, and solution design.

Together, the combination is stronger than any one layer alone. OGS Group helps define the decision properly. ATC helps ensure the decision will hold up in implementation and support reality. AVANT helps ensure the market is covered broadly and compared with current supplier and engineering insight. The result is a more objective, more practical, and more durable evaluation process—one designed not just to choose a platform that looks good in selection, but one the business can still support and defend after go-live.

[5]ATC was founded in 1999, as an objective advisory IT / Telecom firm, grounded in telecom services, evolving into hosted VoIP, digital transformation, and wide-area network architecture into broader digital transformation consulting.

[6] ATC references 75,000+ UCaaS/CCaaS seats under management.
[7] AVANT Pathfinder is described as decision-support platform for Trusted Advisors, including provider analytics based on verified transactions, an expanded vendor portfolio, with a direct connection to AVANT sales and back-office resources.

Conclusion:

The most consequential decision in a UCaaS or CCaaS evaluation is rarely which vendor has the longest feature list. It is whether the business is choosing an environment that fits how it actually needs to operate once the system is live. That means deciding not only where calling will live, but how workflows will move, where automation belongs, how support will be handled, and how much complexity the organization is truly prepared to own.

Vendors are necessary to the process, but they are not designed to protect the buyer from a weak decision. Their job is to present why their platform can work. The role of an objective advisor is different: to define the decision more clearly, test vendor claims against operational reality, compare native and hybrid options honestly, and reduce the risk that a platform that looks good in selection becomes frustrating, expensive, or brittle after go-live.

That is why the right advisor matters. The real value is not in adding another opinion. It is in improving the quality, durability, and defensibility of the decision itself. When the evaluation combines objective framing, implementation-grounded judgment, and broad market visibility, the outcome is usually not just a better shortlist. It is a better answer to the more important question: what platform and operating model will the business still be able to support, scale, and defend two years from now?

