



LEVIX LABS

INTELLIGENCE REPORT

# Sample Company

Sample Tool v1.0

**BBB**

Levix Rating

COMPANY

Sample Company

STAGE

Series A

INDUSTRY

Enterprise Software

HEADQUARTERS

United States

WEBSITE

samplecompany.com

TOOL UNDER EVALUATION

Sample Tool v1.0

CATEGORY

Enterprise AI System

PRIMARY USE CASE

Operational decision support for enterprise teams

DESCRIPTION

An AI-powered system designed to automate and augment a core enterprise workflow. The tool ingests structured and unstructured data and returns natural language outputs, recommendations, or decisions in support of business operations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sample Tool demonstrates solid core performance and delivers on its primary stated purpose with meaningful consistency. The tool exceeds baseline industry standards across most dimensions but presents notable gaps in safety posture and end-user accessibility that limit its suitability for high-stakes or regulated deployments without additional controls. With targeted improvements on the roadmap, this tool is well-positioned to achieve a stronger rating in a future evaluation cycle.

BBB

2026Q2 Evaluation

COMPOSITE RATING

Overall Assessment

Sample Tool demonstrates solid core performance and delivers on its primary stated purpose with meaningful consistency. The tool exceeds baseline industry standards across most dimensions but presents notable gaps in safety posture and end-user accessibility that limit its suitability for high-stakes or regulated deployments without additional controls. With targeted improvements on the roadmap, this tool is well-positioned to achieve a stronger rating in a future evaluation cycle.

DIMENSION BREAKDOWN

Accuracy

Output quality & correctness

A

Output quality is consistently high for the tool's primary use case. The system demonstrates strong factual grounding with low error rates under structured test conditions. Performance degrades somewhat on ambiguous or multi-step inputs but remains acceptable for the stated operational context and target audience.

Reliability

Consistency & uptime

BBB

The system maintains strong uptime and consistent response quality under normal load conditions. Stress testing revealed moderate performance degradation at elevated concurrency levels, and minor availability gaps were recorded during the evaluation period. Incident response procedures are documented but have not been fully exercised against a live event.

Efficacy

Performs its stated purpose

A

The tool delivers on its core promise within the context it was evaluated. Representative testing confirmed the product meaningfully supports the workflows it is designed to serve. Limitations emerge with edge cases that fall outside the tool's stated design parameters, though these are clearly scoped in product documentation.

## Safety

Risk, security & harm mitigation

BB

Data handling practices meet baseline standards but lack the depth required for regulated industry deployments. Access control granularity is limited relative to enterprise expectations. Output filtering is present but does not address all identified edge cases. The organization maintains a documented response plan but limited evidence of formal third-party security validation was provided during the evaluation.

## Usability

User experience & adoption

BB

The interface is functional and well-organized for technically proficient users. Onboarding friction is moderate — users with domain familiarity adapt quickly, but the tool presents meaningful adoption barriers for less technical stakeholders. Documentation is adequate but inconsistent in quality across modules. Support responsiveness during the evaluation period was satisfactory.

**STRENGTHS**

- Accuracy and output quality are among the strongest observed for tools in this category and use case
  - Core value proposition is well-validated — the tool demonstrably supports the workflows it is designed to serve
  - The product team demonstrated deep knowledge of the system and provided substantive engagement throughout the evaluation
  - Efficacy against stated purpose is clear and reproducible across representative test conditions
  - Incident response documentation exceeds the baseline typically observed for early-stage organizations
- 

**RISKS**

- Safety posture is insufficient for regulated industry deployments without additional controls — organizations in health-care, financial services, or similar sectors should address identified gaps before broad rollout
  - Access control architecture limits suitability for organizations with granular data governance or role-based data separation requirements
  - Performance degradation under elevated load may affect user experience at enterprise scale without targeted infrastructure changes
- 

**OBSERVATIONS**

- The product roadmap indicates awareness of the identified safety gaps, with improvements anticipated in a future release cycle
- Adoption metrics indicate strong retention among technical users but below-average satisfaction among less technical stakeholders — consistent with the usability findings
- Meaningful variance in output quality was observed across different input types; well-structured inputs performed noticeably better than ambiguous or unstructured ones

The following recommendations are ranked by priority and mapped to the evaluation dimension they address. They represent the highest-impact actions available to the product team ahead of the next evaluation cycle.

HIGH Safety

Expand access control to role and data-source level

Implement granular role-based access controls at both the query and data source level. This is the single highest-impact change for expanding the addressable market into regulated industries and enterprise accounts with strict governance requirements.

HIGH Safety

Commission a formal third-party security assessment

Engage an independent security firm to conduct a full assessment covering data handling, API authentication controls, and output sanitization. Document findings and remediation timelines before targeting regulated industry customers.

MEDIUM Usability

Redesign onboarding for non-technical users

The current onboarding flow implicitly assumes domain familiarity. A guided setup experience tailored to less technical stakeholders would meaningfully improve adoption rates among the audience the product is designed to serve.

MEDIUM Reliability

Resolve performance degradation under elevated load

Testing identified meaningful response time increases under high concurrency. Addressing this before pursuing large enterprise accounts will prevent a predictable deployment failure mode at scale.

LOW

Accuracy

### **Improve handling of ambiguous and multi-step inputs**

Output quality degradation on complex inputs is manageable at current usage volumes but should be addressed as the product expands into more advanced workflows where these input types become routine.

EVALUATOR COMMENTARY

## Notes from the Evaluation Team

Sample Tool is a well-built product from a technically capable team. The accuracy story is genuinely strong for the category, and the efficacy finding — that the tool actually delivers on what it promises — is not a given at this stage. The path to a higher Levix Rating is clearly defined and the roadmap suggests the team already understands the primary gaps.

The Safety dimension is the gating factor for regulated industry expansion. Resolving access control granularity and completing a formal security assessment would likely move this dimension into stronger territory and raise the overall rating meaningfully. The Usability gap is secondary but represents a real market risk — if the tool cannot be adopted by the less technical stakeholders it is designed to serve, the core value proposition is constrained.

For organizations outside regulated industries with moderate governance requirements, Sample Tool is a solid, recommendable choice at this rating period. The evaluation team expects a stronger rating in a subsequent cycle if the planned improvements are executed.

RATING PERIOD & METHODOLOGY

| RATING PERIOD | REPORT ID        | EVALUATOR  | PUBLISHED     |
|---------------|------------------|------------|---------------|
| 2026Q2        | LX-2026Q2-Sample | Levix Labs | April 1, 2026 |

DISCLAIMER

This report reflects the findings of an independent evaluation conducted by Levix Labs during the rating period designated above. Ratings represent the evaluator's professional assessment based on structured testing, documentation review, and engagement with the product team at the time of evaluation. They do not constitute a guarantee of future performance, a security certification, or legal compliance validation. Levix Labs maintains no ongoing commercial relationship with the evaluated organization beyond the evaluation engagement and has received no compensation contingent on the rating outcome.