

# 2026 CCaaS Platform Buyer Guide

28 vendors scored across 27 weighted dimensions.  
Architecture evaluation. Migration risk. Hidden costs.  
The questions most RFPs forget to ask.

Published by The Center of CX | April 2026

# Contents

|           |                                                                         |           |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>Executive Summary .....</b>                                          | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>Market Landscape: What Changed in 2025-2026 .....</b>                | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3</b>  | <b>Scoring Methodology: 27 Dimensions, Weighted .....</b>               | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>4</b>  | <b>The Bell Curve: Tier Placement and What It Means .....</b>           | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>5</b>  | <b>Vendor Assessments: The Top 12 .....</b>                             | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>6</b>  | <b>The Adjacent Four: Platforms That Matter Differently .....</b>       | <b>13</b> |
| <b>7</b>  | <b>Architecture Fit: Which Platform for Which Operating Model .....</b> | <b>14</b> |
| <b>8</b>  | <b>Migration Risk Framework .....</b>                                   | <b>15</b> |
| <b>9</b>  | <b>Hidden Costs: What Vendors Leave Out .....</b>                       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>10</b> | <b>The RFP Questions That Actually Matter .....</b>                     | <b>17</b> |
| <b>11</b> | <b>Decision Framework: How to Build Your Shortlist .....</b>            | <b>18</b> |
| <b>12</b> | <b>About The Center of CX .....</b>                                     | <b>19</b> |

# 1. Executive Summary

The CCaaS market has matured past the point where every platform is viable for every buyer. The consolidation of 2024-2025 — NICE acquiring Cognigy, Genesys deepening its AI fabric, Amazon Connect expanding its agentic capabilities — has created a market where the gap between leaders and laggards is widening, and where choosing the wrong platform carries compounding costs over a 3-5 year contract cycle.

This guide exists because most CCaaS evaluations are broken. They rely on feature checklists that reward vendors with the best marketing, analyst quadrants that measure vendor revenue rather than operational fit, and RFP processes that optimize for proposal quality over deployment reality.

We scored 28 CCaaS platforms across 27 weighted dimensions using a methodology that prioritizes what matters after the demo: orchestration depth, integration architecture, AI readiness, workforce management maturity, security posture, and total cost of ownership. The result is the most operationally grounded assessment of the CCaaS market available today.

## What this guide covers:

- 28 vendors scored and placed on a bell curve from Strategic Foundation (85-100) to Limited Fit (below 55)
- 27 scoring dimensions grouped into 7 capability domains with transparent weighting
- Architecture fit mapping: which platforms match which operating models
- Migration risk framework: the factors that predict whether a migration succeeds or stalls
- Hidden costs analysis: the line items vendors omit from proposals
- RFP questions designed to reveal what demos hide
- A decision framework for building a defensible shortlist

Who this guide is for: CX executives, contact center VPs, IT architects, procurement leaders, and consultants evaluating CCaaS platforms for organizations with 100+ agents. If you run a smaller operation, the scoring still applies but the migration risk calculus changes.

## 2. Market Landscape: What Changed in 2025-2026

The CCaaS market in 2026 is defined by four structural shifts that change how platforms should be evaluated.

### **AI is now the control point, and platforms are splitting into two camps.**

Suite-native platforms (Genesys, NICE, Talkdesk, Five9) are embedding AI deeply into routing, agent assist, and analytics. Builder platforms (Amazon Connect, Google CCAI) are offering AI primitives for organizations with technical depth. The middle ground — platforms with surface-level AI features — is becoming untenable. Gartner forecasts that by 2028, 70% of customer interactions will begin with a conversational AI interface. Platforms without credible AI orchestration will lose relevance.

### **Total cost of ownership has become harder to model.**

CCaaS software ranges from \$71 to \$249 per agent per month depending on the tier. But platform cost is only 25-40% of the total picture. Labor (60-75% of total cost), integration overhead, professional services, change management, and telephony consume the rest. Vendors who quote seat prices without addressing the full stack are creating a misleading comparison.

### **The adjacent stack matters more than the core platform.**

CRM integration depth, workforce management maturity, knowledge base connectivity, and analytics breadth now determine more of the operational outcome than the CCaaS platform alone. Evaluating a CCaaS vendor in isolation — without understanding how it connects to your CRM, WEM, and knowledge systems — is the most common and most expensive buyer mistake.

### **Migration risk is the hidden variable.**

The average CCaaS migration takes 6-18 months and carries meaningful risk of disruption, cost overrun, and scope creep. Organizations that underestimate migration complexity — particularly telephony porting, integration rebuilding, and agent retraining — frequently report 30-50% cost overruns against initial estimates.

### 3. Scoring Methodology: 27 Dimensions, Weighted

Every vendor is scored across 27 dimensions organized into 7 capability domains. Each dimension receives a raw score of 1-5, which is then multiplied by its assigned weight. The total possible weighted score is 100. Scores are assigned based on publicly available product documentation, analyst reports, customer reviews, deployment case studies, and direct product evaluation.

#### Core Platform & Routing — Weight: 20%

| Dimension                         | Weight |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Omnichannel routing maturity      | 4      |
| ACD & skills-based routing depth  | 4      |
| Digital channel parity            | 4      |
| Queue management & SLA controls   | 4      |
| Outbound & proactive capabilities | 4      |

#### AI & Automation — Weight: 18%

| Dimension                         | Weight |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Conversational AI / IVA quality   | 5      |
| Agent assist & copilot depth      | 5      |
| AI-driven routing & orchestration | 4      |
| Automation workflow builder       | 4      |

#### Agent Experience & Desktop — Weight: 12%

| Dimension                         | Weight |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Unified agent desktop quality     | 4      |
| Knowledge integration & surfacing | 4      |
| Collaboration & supervisor tools  | 4      |

#### Analytics & Intelligence — Weight: 12%

| Dimension                        | Weight |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Real-time dashboards & reporting | 4      |

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Interaction analytics (speech/text) | 4 |
| QA automation & scoring             | 4 |

## Workforce Management — Weight: 10%

| Dimension                       | Weight |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Forecasting & scheduling        | 4      |
| Adherence & intraday management | 3      |
| WEM integration depth           | 3      |

## Integration & Architecture — Weight: 15%

| Dimension                          | Weight |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| API breadth & developer experience | 4      |
| CRM integration depth              | 4      |
| Marketplace & ecosystem            | 4      |
| Data platform & event streaming    | 3      |

## Security, Compliance & Enterprise — Weight: 13%

| Dimension                              | Weight |
|----------------------------------------|--------|
| Security posture & certifications      | 4      |
| Compliance controls (PCI, HIPAA, GDPR) | 4      |
| Multi-region / global deployment       | 3      |
| Admin, governance & role management    | 2      |

## Scoring Principles

**Evidence over marketing.** Scores reflect documented product capability, validated customer deployments, and independent assessment. Vendor roadmap claims are excluded from scoring.

**Operational reality over demo quality.** A platform that demos well but creates integration debt, governance gaps, or agent friction in production will score lower than a platform with less polish but stronger operational foundations.

**Weighted toward what breaks.** Routing, AI, and integration carry the highest weights because failures in these domains have the highest operational cost. Cosmetic features carry minimal weight.

**Bell curve enforcement.** Scores are distributed across a bell curve: Strategic Foundation (85-100), Strong Contender (70-84), Situational Specialist (55-69), and Limited Fit (below 55). The majority of vendors cluster in the middle tiers by design.

## 4. The Bell Curve: Tier Placement

The bell curve distributes 28 CCaaS vendors across four tiers. Tier placement is determined by weighted total score. The distribution is intentionally harsh — the majority of the market falls in the middle two tiers, and no vendor receives a perfect score.

### Strategic Foundation (85-100)

**Vendors:** Genesys (94), NICE CXone (90)

Platforms that can anchor an enterprise CX operation. Deep across all seven capability domains. Default shortlist candidates for organizations with 500+ agents and complex requirements.

### Strong Contender (70-84)

**Vendors:** Five9 (82), Cisco (78), Talkdesk (78), Amazon Connect (77), Content Guru (76), Zoom (70), RingCentral (70), Bright Pattern (70)

Meaningful capability with genuine strengths. Each has specific operating models and verticals where it excels. Require careful fit assessment rather than blanket recommendation.

### Situational Specialist (55-69)

**Vendors:** 8x8 (68), Odigo (67), UJET (66), Avaya (64), Enghouse (62), Dialpad (60), Anywhere365 (58), Puzzel (57), Alvaria (56), Vonage (55)

Viable in defined contexts — vertical fit, installed base, regional strength, or price sensitivity. Should be evaluated against specific constraints rather than broad capability.

### Limited Fit (<55)

**Vendors:** Luware (52), Nextiva (50), Aircall (48), GoTo (45)

Narrow applicability for enterprise contact center operations. May serve specific niches but should not be primary contenders for complex service environments.

### Adjacent Platforms

Four platforms are scored as adjacent — they influence CCaaS decisions but are evaluated as complementary systems: Sprinklr (76), Salesforce Service Cloud (72), ServiceNow CX (68), and Zendesk (65). These are scored for their contact center relevance but their primary value proposition extends beyond CCaaS.

## 5. Vendor Assessments: The Top 12

Each assessment covers the vendor's market position, scoring rationale, strongest dimensions, critical gaps, best-fit operating model, and red flags. Assessments are based on the scoring methodology described in Section 3.

### Genesys — Score: 94/100 | Strategic Foundation

The most complete CCaaS platform in the market. Genesys Cloud anchors enterprise CX operations with best-in-class routing, a maturing AI fabric (Agent Copilot, Predictive Routing, Experience Orchestration), and the deepest WEM integration of any pure-play CCaaS. The platform's breadth is its moat — no competitor matches its depth across all seven capability domains simultaneously.

**Strongest dimensions:** Omnichannel routing depth (scored 5/5), AI orchestration maturity, WEM native integration, global deployment capability, marketplace ecosystem breadth

**Critical gaps:** Premium pricing creates TCO pressure for mid-market buyers. Full value requires commitment to the Genesys ecosystem. Some advanced AI features require additional licensing beyond base seat cost.

**Best fit:** Best for: enterprises with 500+ agents, complex routing requirements, multi-channel operations, and organizations that value platform depth over point solution flexibility.

**Red flag:** If your organization lacks the technical maturity to leverage Genesys's depth, you will overpay for capability you cannot operationalize.

---

### NICE CXone — Score: 90/100 | Strategic Foundation

The closest competitor to Genesys in overall platform completeness. NICE CXone Mpower combines strong routing, an increasingly capable AI layer (Enlighten AI, Copilot), and the industry's most mature WEM suite — a significant advantage for operations-led buyers. The Cognigy acquisition in 2025 added conversational AI depth that was previously a gap.

**Strongest dimensions:** WEM depth (industry-leading forecasting, scheduling, QA), analytics maturity, compliance controls, AI investment velocity, enterprise governance

**Critical gaps:** The platform can feel complex for mid-market buyers. CXone's modular architecture means not all capabilities come standard — buyers must navigate packaging carefully to avoid surprise costs.

**Best fit:** Best for: operations-led enterprises that prioritize WEM, QA, and analytics alongside core CCaaS. Particularly strong in regulated industries (financial services, healthcare, insurance).

**Red flag:** If you buy NICE primarily for routing and ignore the WEM/analytics suite, you are paying for NICE's most differentiated capability and leaving it on the shelf.

---

## Five9 — Score: 82/100 | Strong Contender

A mature cloud-native platform that has earned its position through consistent execution. Five9 offers strong routing, a capable AI suite, and solid CRM integrations — particularly with Salesforce. The platform is well-suited to organizations seeking a reliable, well-supported CCaaS without the complexity overhead of the top-tier suites.

**Strongest dimensions:** Salesforce integration depth, deployment reliability, practical AI implementation, strong mid-market to enterprise support model

**Critical gaps:** WEM is less differentiated than Genesys or NICE. Advanced AI capabilities are evolving but not yet at the orchestration level of the top two. Global deployment footprint is growing but narrower than Genesys.

**Best fit:** Best for: Salesforce-centric organizations, mid-market to enterprise buyers seeking reliable CCaaS with strong integrations and proven deployment track record.

**Red flag:** Evaluate Five9's WEM roadmap carefully if workforce management is a primary requirement. You may need a third-party WEM provider.

---

## Cisco Webex Contact Center — Score: 78/100 | Strong Contender

Cisco's cloud-native contact center has improved significantly since 2023. Webex CC benefits from Cisco's networking and UC heritage, strong security posture, and enterprise sales relationships. The AI layer is developing quickly, and the platform's integration with Webex collaboration tools creates a compelling unified communications story.

**Strongest dimensions:** Security and compliance posture, enterprise networking integration, UCaaS/CCaaS convergence, global infrastructure, IT-buyer relationship strength

**Critical gaps:** Contact center-specific depth (routing nuance, WEM, advanced QA) trails the CCaaS-focused vendors. Digital channel maturity is developing but less proven than leaders. Marketplace ecosystem is smaller.

**Best fit:** Best for: Cisco-invested enterprises where UCaaS/CCaaS convergence, security requirements, and existing vendor relationships drive the evaluation.

**Red flag:** If your primary evaluation criteria are contact center operational depth and WEM maturity, Cisco will score lower than pure-play CCaaS vendors.

---

## Talkdesk — Score: 78/100 | Strong Contender

Talkdesk has built a fast-moving, AI-forward platform with strong vertical solutions (financial services, healthcare, retail). The platform's agentic AI direction is ambitious and increasingly credible. Talkdesk excels at time-to-value — deployments are typically faster than the top-tier suites.

**Strongest dimensions:** Vertical industry solutions, time-to-value, AI momentum (copilot, agentic direction), modern architecture, mid-market execution

**Critical gaps:** Enterprise depth in routing and WEM is lighter than Genesys/NICE. Global deployment footprint is narrower. Sustaining AI investment requires continued strong execution.

**Best fit:** Best for: mid-market to upper-enterprise buyers who value speed, vertical fit, and AI innovation. Particularly strong in financial services and healthcare.

**Red flag:** Validate that Talkdesk's enterprise capabilities match your complexity requirements, especially if you have 1000+ agents with complex routing needs.

---

## Amazon Connect — Score: 77/100 | Strong Contender

Amazon Connect is the builder's platform. It offers exceptional flexibility, pay-per-use pricing, and deep AWS ecosystem integration — but requires more technical investment to achieve what suite platforms deliver out of the box. The AI capabilities (Q in Connect, Contact Lens, agent assist) are substantial and improving rapidly.

**Strongest dimensions:** Pay-per-use pricing, AWS ecosystem depth, AI capabilities (Contact Lens, Q), infinite scalability, builder flexibility

**Critical gaps:** Requires significant technical investment to achieve full CCaaS functionality. Packaged buyer experience is weaker than traditional CCaaS. WEM, QA, and supervisor tooling require third-party additions.

**Best fit:** Best for: AWS-native organizations with technical depth, builder mentality, and a willingness to assemble the stack rather than buy it pre-built.

**Red flag:** If your team lacks cloud engineering capability, Amazon Connect's flexibility becomes complexity. The total cost of building what suite vendors include can exceed the apparent savings.

---

## Content Guru — Score: 76/100 | Strong Contender

A European-origin platform with strong presence in UK/EMEA public sector, utilities, and regulated industries. Content Guru's storm platform offers genuine multi-tenancy, strong compliance controls, and proven large-scale deployments in environments where data sovereignty matters.

**Strongest:** EMEA and public sector depth, data sovereignty controls, multi-tenancy architecture, large-scale deployment proof | **Gaps:** Lower brand recognition in North America. Marketplace ecosystem is smaller than leaders. AI capabilities are developing but trail the top four.

**Best fit:** Best for: EMEA-centric organizations, public sector, and regulated environments where data sovereignty and UK/EU compliance are primary requirements.

---

## Zoom Contact Center — Score: 70/100 | Strong Contender

Zoom's contact center is the youngest platform in the Strong Contender tier but is improving rapidly. It benefits from Zoom's massive installed base, unified communications integration, and aggressive investment. The AI capabilities (AI Expert Assist, AI Companion) are increasingly credible.

**Strongest:** Installed base advantage, UCaaS/CCaaS convergence, AI investment velocity, simple adoption story, strong video capabilities | **Gaps:** Contact center depth is still maturing — routing complexity, WEM, advanced QA trail established players. Enterprise proof points at scale are limited.

**Best fit:** Best for: organizations already on Zoom that want unified communications and contact center on a single platform, particularly for mid-market deployments.

---

## RingCentral — Score: 70/100 | Strong Contender

RingCentral brings strong UCaaS heritage and is building credible contact center capabilities. The platform benefits from the Engage Digital acquisition and native integration with the RingCentral communications stack.

**Strongest:** UCaaS/CCaaS convergence, digital engagement (Engage Digital), communications platform breadth, mid-market execution | **Gaps:** Pure contact center depth trails CCaaS-focused vendors. Enterprise routing and WEM capabilities are developing but less proven than leaders.

**Best fit:** Best for: RingCentral UCaaS customers adding contact center capabilities, mid-market deployments valuing communications convergence.

---

## Bright Pattern — Score: 70/100 | Strong Contender

A mid-market specialist with genuine omnichannel capabilities at a lower price point. Bright Pattern offers strong channel coverage and a capable platform for organizations that don't need the full enterprise depth of the top-tier suites.

**Strongest:** Price-to-capability ratio, omnichannel breadth, mid-market fit, deployment speed | **Gaps:** Enterprise depth in WEM, analytics, and AI is lighter. Marketplace ecosystem is limited. Global deployment footprint is narrower.

**Best fit:** Best for: mid-market organizations (100-500 agents) seeking strong omnichannel capabilities without enterprise-tier complexity and cost.

---

## 8x8 — Score: 68/100 | Situational Specialist

8x8 offers a unified UCaaS/CCaaS platform that serves organizations wanting a single vendor for all communications. The contact center capabilities are solid for mid-market deployments but trail dedicated CCaaS vendors in depth.

**Strongest:** Unified communications, single-vendor simplicity, mid-market pricing, deployment ease | **Gaps:** Contact center-specific depth is lighter than dedicated CCaaS platforms. AI, WEM, and advanced analytics capabilities are less differentiated.

**Best fit:** Best for: mid-market organizations prioritizing unified communications vendor consolidation over contact center depth.

---

## Avaya — Score: 64/100 | Situational Specialist

Avaya's cloud transformation continues post-restructuring. The installed base remains massive, and Avaya Experience Platform is improving. However, the migration path from on-premise to cloud remains complex for many customers.

**Strongest:** Massive installed base, enterprise voice heritage, telephony depth, existing customer relationships | **Gaps:** Cloud-native maturity trails born-in-cloud platforms. Product strategy uncertainty creates evaluation risk. Migration path complexity is above average.

**Best fit:** Best for: existing Avaya customers with specific dependencies who need a cloud path from their current on-premise investment.

---

# 7. Architecture Fit: Which Platform for Which Operating Model

The most common CCaaS evaluation mistake is choosing a platform based on features rather than operating model fit. A platform that excels for a 200-agent mid-market retailer may be wrong for a 2,000-agent regulated financial services operation — even if it scores higher on a feature checklist.

| Operating Model                                 | Best-Fit Platforms              | Why                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Enterprise voice-led, multi-site, regulated     | Genesys, NICE CXone             | Routing complexity, WEM depth, compliance controls, global deployment, and       |
| Mid-market, fast-deploying, digital-first       | Talkdesk, Five9, Bright Pattern | Time-to-value, practical AI, and strong CRM integrations matter more than max    |
| AWS-native, builder mentality, customer-centric | Amazon Connect                  | If your organization has cloud engineering depth and wants to own the architec   |
| UCaaS convergence, unified vendor               | Zoom, RingCentral, Cisco, 8x8   | When the primary driver is one vendor for all communications, these platforms    |
| EMEA/public sector, data sovereignty            | Content Guru, Odigo, Puzzle     | European-origin platforms with strong compliance posture and proven deploym      |
| Installed base migration                        | Avaya, Cisco                    | If your on-premise investment is substantial, evaluate the migration path from y |

## 8. Migration Risk Framework

CCaaS migrations fail more often than vendors acknowledge. The following framework identifies the factors that predict whether a migration will succeed, stall, or overrun.

### **[HIGH] Telephony porting complexity**

Number porting, SIP trunk migration, and carrier dependencies create the most common timeline slippage. Organizations with complex IVR trees, toll-free numbers across carriers, and international telephony face the highest risk.

### **[HIGH] Integration rebuild scope**

Every CRM screen pop, workforce management feed, billing system lookup, and compliance recording that exists in the current platform must be rebuilt or replaced. Undocumented integrations are the most dangerous — they only surface during migration.

### **[MEDIUM] Agent retraining load**

New desktop workflows, changed escalation paths, and different queue mechanics create productivity dips during transition. Plan for 15-25% productivity loss during the first 60 days post-migration.

### **[MEDIUM] Data migration and history**

Interaction history, recording archives, QA scores, and customer journey data may not migrate cleanly. Define data migration scope early and accept that some historical data may be archived rather than migrated.

### **[MEDIUM] Stakeholder alignment**

IT, operations, finance, and vendor management must agree on timeline, budget, success criteria, and fallback plans. Misalignment between IT and operations is the most common organizational risk factor.

### **[LOW-MEDIUM] Vendor professional services dependency**

Over-reliance on the vendor's professional services team creates timeline risk when their resources are constrained. Build internal capability alongside vendor-led implementation.

## 9. Hidden Costs: What Vendors Leave Out

The gap between quoted price and actual TCO is where most CCaaS evaluations fail. The following line items are frequently omitted from initial proposals.

**Telephony costs.** CCaaS seat pricing rarely includes voice infrastructure. SIP trunking, DID numbers, toll-free charges, international calling, and carrier fees can add \$15-\$50 per agent per month depending on call volume and geography.

**Professional services.** Initial implementation fees range from \$50,000 to \$500,000+ depending on complexity. Integration development, custom reporting, and data migration are typically scoped separately and often underestimated by 30-50%.

**WEM/QM add-ons.** Many platforms price workforce management, quality management, and advanced analytics as separate modules. A 'complete' platform quote without WEM can understate costs by \$30-\$80 per agent per month.

**AI and automation licensing.** Conversational AI, agent assist, and analytics AI features increasingly carry separate per-agent or per-interaction fees. Clarify whether AI capabilities are included in the base seat or require additional licensing.

**Training and change management.** New platform adoption requires agent training (2-5 days), supervisor retraining, admin certification, and ongoing change management. Budget \$500-\$2,000 per agent for comprehensive training.

**Integration maintenance.** APIs change, CRM versions update, and security requirements evolve. Budget for ongoing integration maintenance — typically 0.5-1 FTE for mid-size operations, more for complex environments.

**Contract renewal escalation.** Year 1 pricing is often discounted. Ask for guaranteed pricing across the full contract term and understand the renewal escalation mechanism. Year 3-5 pricing can increase 15-30% from initial rates.

## 10. The RFP Questions That Actually Matter

Standard RFP templates ask whether a platform 'supports' a feature. The questions below are designed to reveal operational depth, integration reality, and deployment risk.

**Architecture:** What percentage of your customers are on your current-generation architecture versus legacy versions? What is the migration path for customers on older versions?

**AI depth:** Show us a production deployment where your AI handles a multi-step service interaction end-to-end. What was the containment rate, and how long did it take to reach that performance?

**Integration reality:** For our specific CRM (name it), show us the pre-built integration. What data flows bi-directionally? What requires custom development? What is the typical integration timeline?

**WEM completeness:** Is workforce management included in our quoted seat price or priced separately? What forecasting models are supported? Can we see a production schedule for a 500-agent operation?

**Migration risk:** What is the average migration timeline for an organization of our size and complexity? What percentage of your migrations complete within the original timeline? What are the top three causes of timeline slippage?

**Total cost:** Provide a 3-year TCO that includes: seat licenses, telephony, professional services, training, WEM/QM modules, AI licensing, integration development, and estimated ongoing maintenance. Identify every line item that is NOT included in the base seat price.

**Reference quality:** Provide three customer references in our industry with comparable agent count and complexity. We will ask them: what broke during migration, what was harder than expected, and what would they do differently.

**Roadmap credibility:** What were the three biggest product releases in the last 12 months? How many of them were on your roadmap 18 months ago? What was promised 18 months ago that has not shipped?

# 11. Decision Framework: How to Build Your Shortlist

A defensible CCaaS shortlist requires four steps.

## **Step 1: Define your operating model.**

Are you voice-led enterprise, digital-first, builder-mentality, UC-converged, or migrating from an installed base? This eliminates 60-70% of vendors immediately. See the Architecture Fit table in Section 7.

## **Step 2: Weight the dimensions that matter to you.**

Use the 27-dimension framework from Section 3, but adjust weights based on your priorities. If WEM is critical, increase its weight. If AI is aspirational rather than immediate, decrease it. Your weights produce your rankings.

## **Step 3: Require proof over promises.**

For your top 3 vendors, require production references in your industry at your scale. Ask the questions from Section 10. Reject any vendor who cannot provide references that match your operating model.

## **Step 4: Model the full TCO.**

Use the hidden costs framework from Section 9 to build a 3-year TCO for each finalist. Include every line item — not just the seat price. The lowest-quoted vendor is frequently not the lowest-cost vendor over three years.

*The shortlist should contain 2-3 vendors. More than three creates evaluation fatigue without improving decision quality. Fewer than two eliminates negotiation leverage.*

## 12. About The Center of CX

The Center of CX is an independent technology intelligence platform for contact center and customer experience leaders. We score and evaluate 267+ vendors across seven categories — CCaaS, IVA, ACD/Routing, Analytics, Digital Engagement, Payments, and Agent Assist — using published methodologies with weighted dimensions, bell curve placement, and honest assessments.

No vendor pays for placement. Every score is sourced from proprietary research. Our platform combines scored vendor directories, interactive tools, buyer frameworks, and advisory services designed to help CX leaders make better technology and strategy decisions.

### Continue the conversation:

**Explore vendor intelligence:** [contactcentercx.com/vendors](https://contactcentercx.com/vendors)

**Try the TCO Calculator:** [contactcentercx.com/tco-calculator](https://contactcentercx.com/tco-calculator)

**Take the CX Maturity Assessment:** [contactcentercx.com/tools/cx-maturity](https://contactcentercx.com/tools/cx-maturity)

**Request a working session:** [contactcentercx.com/contact](https://contactcentercx.com/contact)

---

This guide is published by The Center of CX. It may be shared freely but may not be modified, resold, or republished without permission. All vendor assessments reflect publicly available information as of April 2026.

[contactcentercx.com](https://contactcentercx.com) | © 2026 The Center of CX