

90%

of AI vendors fail within year one

80%

of implementations fall short

\$4.7M

avg. hidden opportunity cost

65–70%

typical tagging accuracy (industry avg.)

FOUR QUESTIONS THAT EXPOSE EVERYTHING

01 Accuracy

How accurate is your system at tagging and categorizing real conversations?

🚩 Red flag: only cites transcription accuracy

👍 Good: shows 85%+ tagging accuracy on real data

02 Depth

Show me behavioral insights, not just surface-level categories.

🚩 Red flag: labels like "billing" or "complaint" only

👍 Good: multi-level intent analysis - the why, not just the what

03 Architecture

Does your system use task-specific models, or one model for everything?

🚩 Red flag: single model for compliance, sentiment, and sales

👍 Good: specialized models optimized per task

04 Implementation

What does end-to-end implementation look like, including change management?

🚩 Red flag: 6–9 month timelines with no references

👍 Good: documented 30-day deployments with named customer references

CRITICAL DEAL BREAKERS - WALK IF YOU SEE THESE

Claims "99% accuracy" without specifying tagging vs transcription

Cannot contractually guarantee 85%+ tagging accuracy

Single model for all tasks, no optimization per use case

No 30-day implementation references available

No training data from real contact center conversations

"Set it and forget it" claims - models drift, needs change

No change management methodology

ROI promises with no measurable targets attached

TAGGING VS. TRANSCRIPTION - KNOW THE DIFFERENCE

TRANSCRIPTION
Speech to text
Table stakes. Industry avg. 85%+

TAGGING & CATEGORIZATION
Meaning & intent
Revenue driver. Avg. 65–70%

Vendors who conflate these two are telling you something important.

SCORING — TOTAL __ / 25

Five categories, five questions each: Technology, Domain Expertise, Implementation, Business Results, Partnership. Full checklist at qevalpro.com

20+ Strong candidate - move to detailed evaluation

15-19 Proceed with caution - identify and close gaps

<15 Walk away - redirect budget to stronger options

REQUIRED NEXT STEPS AFTER SCORING

1. Request confusion matrix on your actual conversation data
2. Contact three named customer references
3. Review their documented 30-day implementation methodology
4. Negotiate contractual KPI guarantees before signing
5. Validate claims with a proof-of-concept on your data

HOW QEval™ PASSES ITS OWN TEST

90%+

Conversation tagging accuracy on real contact center data

30-day

Proven deployment with named customer references

\$2.9M

Documented savings at Synovus within 6 months

ICMI 2025 Winner

Best new technology - beat Cognigy and Verint

CMP Prism Leader

Named a leading provider in automated QA/QM

SUCCESS METRICS TO TRACK

- Tagging accuracy improvement
- First call resolution rate
- Avg. handle time reduction
- Compliance failure reduction
- Agent productivity gains
- Time to first value (<30 days)

THE CONVERSATION DOESN'T END HERE

If any of this resonated with what you're dealing with in your operation, let's talk specifics.

email:
CX@etechgs.com



Free Stack Audit

We'll run the four-question framework against your current AI stack and tell you what to keep, fix, or replace. etechgs.com

QEval™ Demo

See 94%+ accuracy QA in action - trained on 138M+ interactions, built for contact center operations. etslabs.ai

Implementation Review

Struggling with adoption? We'll identify the change management gaps and build a 30-day fix plan. etechgs.com

Connect With : [Jim Iyoob](mailto:jim.iyoob@etechgs.com) | President, ETS Labs, CRO, Etech Global Services | jim.iyoob@etechgs.com