A Buyer's Checklist

for Evaluating NDR Solutions

The most effective system for comparing NDR solutions

Introduction

The Network Detection and Response (NDR) market has been saturated with noisy Al hype and vendor claims, making it a growing challenge for CISOs and IT decision-makers to find truly effective solutions that are best suited to their needs.

This guide presents a structured evaluation framework and practical checklist to support informed, objective comparisons of NDR vendors based on measurable capabilities. While each team and organization will have unique use cases, these criteria will act as a starting point for evaluating and comparing vendors in the market.

Part 01: Methodology
Analysis methodology
Part 02: Assessment Categories
Organizational roadmap and ROI assessment
Scope and deployment
Network behavioral analysis
Threat detection
Triage and investigation
Containment and response
Additional functionality
Bonus Section: How to evaluate Al
Part 03: The Evaluation Process
Step 01: Commercial evaluation
Step 02: Technical evaluation
Conclusion



Methodology

How to use this document

This checklist is designed to help you assess and compare modern NDR solutions.

Part 2 of this document will contain the assessment categories split into sections: organizational roadmap & ROI, scope and deployment, network behavioral analysis, detection, alerting, and investigations, threat detection, and additional functionality.

Each category will have a description and a list of questions to ask an NDR vendor. We recommend highlighting the capabilities you are looking for and using the questions we provide as part of your evaluation criteria.

Here's how you can make the most out of this document:



Initiate vendor discussions

Use the checklist as a conversation starter with potential vendors. Ask open-ended questions based on the criteria to better understand how each solution aligns with your organization's priorities.



Compare solutions

Use the checklist to compare different solutions in a structured manner, to identify where each solution meets, exceeds, or falls short of your requirements.



Clarify and validate concerns

If you have concerns or uncertainties about specific features, refer to the relevant criteria in the checklist to guide deeper discussions and request further details or demonstrations. Ensure that vendors are providing accurate and substantiated information.



Prioritize capabilities

Consider assigning a priority level - High, Medium, or Low - to each criterion based on your organization's risk profile and security objectives. This will help focus your evaluation on the capabilities that matter most.

To ensure a fair and objective assessment of network security solutions, it's useful to adopt an A/B comparison approach evaluating vendors side-by-side against the same set of criteria. This method helps eliminate bias, highlights real capability differences, and creates a level playing field for evaluation.

Here are some factors to consider to ensure a fair comparison:

Deployment

Establish the same scope: Ensure all solutions have the same visibility across relevant subnets and desired network entities.

Establish a concrete timeline: Test all solutions in the same environment, for the same number of days. Similar timelines allow for the comparison of learning periods and evolution of learning, which may differ depending on the solution.

Tuning and configurations

Compare on optimal performance: Consult your selected vendors on what an optimal deployment looks like and adjust accordingly, especially if you have a complex network or unique outcomes you'd like to achieve.

Consider the long term: Adjust the solution with the long term in mind. A short fix or configuration process will not reveal the future state of the configuration requirements.

Data visibility: Ensure all solutions can retain and have search capabilities on all the data throughout the evaluation period.

Evaluation

Coordinate your decision criteria: All vendors must be held to the same previously established evaluation criteria.

Understand vendor threat classification: Different vendors will have different threat scoring, tags, explanations, and criteria. Make sure to fully understand the nuances to ensure an equivalent comparison.

Consider active vs. passive functionality: Some capabilities may not be active during a trial or proof of concept but could have a substantial impact for a live deployment. Response action are one example of this. Consider how any passive features would affect how the solution handles attacks in the real world when they are made active.

Maintain communication: Communicate with the corresponding vendors if results do not seem accurate. This will show the vendor's capability for support and remediation.

Conclusion

Evaluate the solution based on results: Compare results based on your agreed success criteria and metrics. These could include reduction of alert noise, number of critical incidents raised, and total analyst investigation time saved across the test period.

Evaluate qualitative areas: Go beyond the numbers to consider the entire user experience, relationship with the vendor's team, what support is available, integrations, and the vendor's wider platform capabilities.

Review evaluation criteria and results: Review internally but also ensure to communicate the results to your selected vendors.



Assessment Categories

The following checklist outlines key capabilities that organizations should consider when evaluating modern NDR solutions. Use this as a structured point of comparison between vendors, not just to confirm the presence of a feature, but to assess the depth, effectiveness, and approach each solution takes in delivering it. Some vendors may claim that they have a particular feature or capability, however when you dig deeper, they may not equate to relevant security outcomes.

While not every feature needs to be checked off by a single provider, this checklist can help you establish your expectations for your network security stack.

Organizational roadmap and ROI assessment

Criteria	Questions for vendors	
Business case parameters	Does the vendor include ROI modeling, total cost of ownership, licensing model clarity, and operational resource burden?	
Transparency around how AI is used for security operations	Does the vendor articulate how AI is used in detection, alerting, and response. Includes details on model types (e.g., supervised, unsupervised, rule-based), training data sources, how false positives are handled, and mechanisms for analyst oversight?	
	Is the vendor compliant with one or more of the following regulations regarding Al:	
	■ ISO/IEC 42001:2023 - Al Management System Standard	
	■ ISO/IEC 23894:2023 - Al Risk Management	
	Does the vendor document Al limitations, explainability features, and how updates are communicated or governed?	
Vendor transparency & roadmap alignment	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Product scalability & performance metrics	Does the vendor support growth across environments with metrics like throughput, sensor density, latency, and ingestion capacity?	
Pricing scalability	■ Does the vendor support a scalable licensing model with volume-based and multi-year discounts?	
Deployment flexibility	Does the vendor support multi-environment deployment (i.e. on-premises, virtual networks, containerized environments, hybrid cloud, remote devices, email, OT devices, air-gapped environments)?	
Licensing flexibility	Does the vendor provide flexible licensing options to support changes in infrastructure, for example the migration of on-premises IPs to cloud workloads?	
Core capabilities	Which capabilities are included as part of the vendor's core product? Which features are priced separately or require additional licensing?	

Scope and deployment

Aspect	Description	Key points to consider
Out-of-band monitoring	Passively monitor network traffic to avoid any impact to the production environment	■ Port mirroring via SPAN session or TAP, typically deployed into a core switch
		 Analysis of raw network traffic (packets)
	p. 0 4 6 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 Passive network monitoring instead of in-line deployment
		 Automatically identifies all network assets without relying on users or active scanning
		 Solution should be agentless by default
		 Quality of data ingested, e.g. is it purely source and destination IP? Typically, the richer the data the better the analysis
Integrations	Connecting third-party	Not reliant on, but can integrate with, tools such as:
	technologies to enhance detection, response and	Firewalls, VPNs, SASE and ZTNA solutions
	investigation workflows.	EDR and XDR solutions
		SIEM and SOAR platforms
		Microsoft 365
		Cloud services such as Microsoft Azure and AWS
		IAM platforms including Microsoft Entra ID, Okta and Duo
		SaaS applications such as Dropbox, Salesforce, Slack and Zoom
		Vulnerability management tools such as Rapid7 and Tenable
		Workflow and ticketing solutions including ServiceNow and Jira
		Enrichment from threat intelligence feeds and known CVEs
Data retention	Retention of raw network packets and metadata for analysis and investigation	Ability to retain:
		■ PCAPs
	3	Flows and key metadata
		Log data for deeper investigation
Air-gapped and	Does not lose core functionality in air-gapped environments	Option to operate entirely independently with no outbound connections
highly secure / segregated		 Can hold all data on-site within a supplied appliance
networks		Not reliant on any external connectivity for:
		Detection and response
		Incident investigations
		Continuous Al model updates
		Third party threat intelligence
		PCAP storage and search
		Creation of custom detection and response models
		Custom configurations and edits to system and detection and response models

Aspect	Description	Key points to consider
Cloud environments, hybrid cloud, laaS, PaaS, SaaS	Coverage and visibility of fully cloud-based and hybrid cloud environments	 Natively extends network coverage to cloud environments and can view both through a single platform
		 Ability to deploy in fully cloud-native and hybrid environments, and during transition from on-prem to cloud
		■ Ingestion of flow logs (e.g., AWS VPC Flow Logs, Azure NSG Flow Logs)
		 Agentless by default, or leverage VPC mirroring or virtual taps
		 Dynamically maps Azure architecture, including ephemeral resources like containers and serverless applications
		 Deployment options for virtual machines and in container orchestration environments
		 Integrates with services like AWS Security Hub, IAM, CloudTrail, and Azure equivalent to understand identity, control plane and network context
OT/CPS and IoT devices	Coverage and visibility of Operational Technology/Cyber	 Natively covers converged and segregated IT/OT systems, IoT, IIoT, and remote edge devices in a single platform
	Physical Systems and Internet of Things devices (IoT, IIoT, mIoT, BMS, SCADA, HMIs, PLCs)	 Can be deployed in fully air-gapped environments
		 Can perform deep packet inspection across OT-specific protocols
		 Active discovery for OT asset inventory and vulnerability insights
		 Coverage of all levels of the Purdue Model, from Level 0 physical processes to Level 5 enterprise networks
		Solution is vendor agnostic
		 Performs continuous risk assessment and vulnerability correlation by analyzing real-time asset behavior, network exposure, and exploitability
Remote worker endpoints	Full network visibility for remote worker devices	 Full network-level visibility of remote worker endpoints and travelling devices, in addition to EDR alerts
		 Coverage of small satellite offices or shared workspaces with no/limited network infrastructure

Network behavioral analysis

Aspect	Description	Key points to consider
Artificial intelli- gence and machine	Uses multiple AI techniques for threat detection, investigation	• Multi-layered approach to AI that is layered sequentially and hierarchically, including:
learning an	and response	Unsupervised machine learning
		 Supervised machine learning
		Bayesian learning
		Clustering algorithms
		Ensemble methodsGraph Neural Networks (GNNs)
		Natural Language Processing (NLP)
		Domain-Specific Language Models (DSLMs)
		Security-specific custom Large Language Models (LLMs)
Self-Learning Al	Al that learns the unique environment it is deployed	 Builds an understanding of what is 'normal' for each unique environment without relying on pre-defined rules and signatures
	into, adapting and learning by itself	 Detection of anomalous activity based on what is considered normal behavior, rather than historical attack data
		 Drastically reduces ongoing manual detection engineering compared to traditional tools
		 Can automatically adapt to changes in the environment without requiring manual updates or configuration
		 Automatically sorts devices into groups and clusters by their behavioral similarity
		Solution is completely configurable and allows for fine-tuning where desired
Deployment of Al	Location of Al for ongoing learning and processing of data	 Al is deployed locally, and learns based on each unique environment it is deployed into
Compliance	Detection of compliance related activity	 Ability to detect compliance policy violations such as unauthorized usage of GenAl tools
		 Ability to create edit custom compliance models

Aspect	Description	Key points to consider
Encrypted traffic analysis	Can identify anomalous and suspicious activity in encrypted network traffic	 Proven ability to detect both known and novel threats in encrypted traffic without requiring decryption
Decryption	Decryption of encrypted network traffic	 Ability to decrypt network traffic if desired, e.g. for compliance purposes Native and third- party decryption options Not reliant on decryption to detect anomalous and malicious behavior
Inbound and lateral network traffic analysis	Analyzes both North-South and East-West network traffic	 Does the vendor analyze incoming network traffic for various threats to prevent security breaches Does the vendor analyze internal network traffic to detect and respond to threats within the organization such as lateral movement and insider threats
Retention	Storage of network traffic, events and other associated metadata Retains raw network traffic and metadata for retrospective analysis and to ensure compliance with legal requirements	 Retains raw network traffic and metadata for retrospective analysis and to ensure compliance with legal requirements
Asset visibility	Identification and management of network entities	 Automatically discovers and maps network assets in a single location Ability to view detailed asset information and network activity logs for each device Automatic and manual tagging of devices for easy identification, search and management

Threat detection

Aspect	Description	Key points to consider
Detection models	Al models to detect suspicious and malicious activity	 Wide variety of stock detection models to cover both security and compliance use cases
		 Ability to view, edit and customize all models directly in the UI, without requiring additional development, vendor support or external connectivity
		 Ability to create entirely custom models to support specific use cases such as compliance or edge cases outside of the standard model deck
Novel threat	Uses Al-driven anomaly detection	Proven protection against threats such as:
detection	to spot emerging or zero-day attacks with no prior indicators.	Novel ransomware and new variants
	·	Zero-day vulnerabilities
		Insider threats
		Misuse of legitimate tools
		■ Not reliant on:
		Threat intelligence feeds
		Comparing data across other customer environments
		Rules or signatures
		CVE ingestion
		Vendor should provide at least 3 documented and detailed examples of the technology detecting zero-day threats before they are publicly disclosed, without relying on rules, signatures, training data, or any prior assumptions
Known threat	Matches anomalous activity	Detection of known threats such as ransomware and malware
detection	indicative of known threats	 Can ingest and use threat intelligence feeds if desired
Existing compromises	Detection of pre-existing threats and compromises in an environment	Identification of unusual behavior in relation to similar devices and peer groups
	in an environment	 Identification of suspicious activity indicative of existing compromise
Account takeover & lateral movement	Detects compromised accounts	■ Does the product analyze internal network traffic for anomalies?
iaterai movement	moving across systems to escalate access and control.	Can it correlate network activity with compromised credentials or session hijacking?
		 Analysis of inbound, outbound, and lateral network flow
		Behavioral modeling to identify anomalous communication patterns
		Simulations of high-fidelity events
		■ Cross-domain correlation across network, endpoints, identity, SaaS, etc
C2	Identifies malicious command-	Can the vendor detect:
communications	and-control traffic, even when hidden in DNS, HTTPS, or other	Beaconing patterns (regular interval callbacks)
	common protocols.	■ Use of uncommon protocols (e.g., DNS tunneling, ICMP-based C2)
		Connections to known malicious IPs/domains
		■ Encrypted C2 over non-standard ports or unexpected services

Aspect	Description	Key points to consider
Malware and	Detects the transfer of malicious files or code across the network before execution.	Can the vendor detect signs of:
payload delivery		Malicious file transfers (via SMB, FTP, HTTP)
		 Suspicious executable transfers or dropped payloads
		■ Delivery via uncommon or deprecated protocols (e.g., TFTP, Telnet)
Insider threat be-	Flags unusual activity by authorized	Can the vendor detect signs of:
havior / legitimate credential abuse	users that could indicate malicious intent or negligence.	■ Privilege abuse
	Detects misuse of valid credentials,	 Unusual data access or transfer
	whether stolen or willingly shared	 Abnormal authentication of session behavior
		■ Data transfers/exfiltration to unknown or untrusted external hosts
		■ Large outbound transfers to rare or new external destinations
		■ Data sent over covert channels (DNS, HTTPS to unknown domains)
		 Unusual protocol usage (e.g., FTP/SFTP from endpoints that don't normally use it)
		■ Timing anomalies to evade DLP (e.g., trickling)
CVE exploitation	Taking advantage of known vulnerabilities in systems, services, or applications.	■ Detection of anomalous activity across network entities, such as:
		Unusual login activity
		Anomalous data transfers
		Connections to rare endpoints
		Unusual internal network scanning
		SMB reconnaissance
		Lateral movement
		Privilege escalation
Suspicious scanning & reconnaissance	Identifies probing and mapping of network assets that often precede an attack.	Detection of internal network scanning and reconnaissance techniques
Data exfiltration	Alerts on unauthorized movement	Detection of connections to rare endpoints
detection	of sensitive data to external or cloud destinations, even if encrypted.	Detection of connections and uploads to file sharing sites such as WeTransfer, Dropbox, etc.
	,,	Detection of large internal downloads or anomalous connections to internal locations

Triage and investigation

Aspect	Description	Key points to consider
Automated triage	Elimination of manual triage and investigation work that commonly leads to alert fatigue	 Automated triage and investigation of network events to surface only the most anomalous and interesting activity
		Technology learns by itself to continually update its understanding of normal
		 Does not require human intervention, prompting or scripting
Alert prioritization and management	Prioritizes alerts based on criticality	 Automatically prioritizes alerts to surface the most critical activity for human analysts
		 Categorizes alerts from critical to informational and compliance
		Can assign alerts to specific users
		 Can view and manage alerts via a mobile app, as well as via a browser
		 Can connect to third-party solutions e.g. ServiceNow, Jira
Alert correlation	Correlation of multiple related alerts into single incidents	 Correlation of alerts from within the vendor's own platform, such as NDR OT and email
		Correlation of alerts from third-party technologies including:
		EDR/XDR
		SASE and ZTNA
		SaaS applications
		 Grouping of multiple, related alerts to surface genuine incidents, without human interaction
AI-led investigations	End-to-end investigations performed autonomously by an agentic AI system that is not GenAI -based	 Automatically combines relevant alerts into incidents, either existing or creates a new one, and escalates critical cases for human review.
		 Agentic Al performs investigations to the quality of a Level 2 SOC analyst
		 No reliance on prompt-based chatbots, GenAl or human intervention
		 Investigations can be triggered manually or automatically by external sources
		 Full reports are generated for each incident, showing a timeline and clear explanation of the investigation process completed by the AI
		 Available to all customers, not just specific licensing tiers or as part of a managed service
Threat hunting and	Additional capabilities to support	 Ability to download and analyze PCAPs manually if desired
advanced analysis	threat hunting, deeper investi- gations, forensic analysis and incident response.	 Advanced searching and analysis of network traffic using simple queries with the ability to create and save custom queries
	·	 Ability for advanced users to use complex query syntax and build complex structured searches
		 Advanced search functionality is included as part of the core product capabilities and does not require an additional license, incur an additional cost or require external connectivity

Containment and response

Aspect	Description	Key points to consider
Autonomous	Autonomously takes the best course of action to respond to threats	■ Functions 24/7, autonomously and at machine speed
response		 Can choose and apply the most effective response action itself without human interaction
		 Can autonomously escalate the severity of response actions as a threat evolves
		 Can be configured to require human confirmation before taking a response action if desired
		Can be configured by subnet, times, days, etc.
		 Can fully customize response models and parameters in detail
		Does not rely on static rules, signatures
		 Has proven examples of containing novel, known and insider threats at the earliest stages
Native response	Ability for the vendor to deliver response actions natively without relying on any third-party technologies	 Can natively respond to network threats without an EDR or firewall integration
		 Can deliver targeted actions to block specific traffic without causing business disruption
		 Can enforce only what is considered normal activity for a network entity, while blocking everything else
		 Can also be applied based on what is considered normal for a peer group of devices
		 Can operate in flat networks with little to no segmentation
Third-party response	Ability to integrate with third-party technologies to enhance native	 Can integrate with third-party solutions to extend response action capabilities including:
	response capabilities	■ EDR/XDR solutions
		■ Firewalls
		 Microsoft 365 and Entra ID
		■ SIEM and SOAR
Threat containment	Stopping threats from progressing at the earliest stages	 Can act at the earliest signs of threatening activity, rather than waiting for an EDR alert or manual investigation to take place
		 Contains threatening or suspicious behavior without disrupting normal business activity
		 Containment duration can be extended where required to give analysts time to react
		 Can be used to autonomously quarantine any new network entities that are not recognized

Additional functionality

Aspect	Description	Key points to consider
Reporting	Enhances NDR value by turning detection data into clear, prioritized reports that support security operations and cyber compliance	 Can generate specific reports for compliance adherence over time, such as PCI-DSS, GDPR, HIPAA, ISO 27001, NIST, SOC2, MITRE ATT&CK, IEC 62443
Continuous threat and exposure management (CTEM)	Complements NDR by proactively identifying and reducing vulnerabilities, plus displaying attack paths that attackers could exploit	 Generates unique, specific risk scoring for your specific environment, rather than general claims about patch latency or CVE risk Prioritized view for cyber risk discovery to address the users, devices, and unless billion which page the most severe comprehies risk.
	in the network	 and vulnerabilities which pose the most severe compromise risk Evaluates the potential impact to affected assets during incidents and enables more effective response along the most critical attack paths
Incident readiness and recovery	Supports testing, refinement and validation of incident response	Does the vendor provide simulations that reflect your specific architecture, configurations, and tech stack?
	capabilities	Can the solution simulate live, realistic incidents across our actual environment — including cloud, SaaS, and OT infrastructure — not just tabletop scenarios?
		Does the system support adaptive or dynamic playbooks that evolve with our environment (e.g., post-cloud migration or M&A activity)?
		What are the licensing, resource, and skill dependencies for setup and ongoing management?
Attack surface management	Informs NDR by mapping external -facing assets and exposures,	Does the solution use AI techniques to automatically discover unknown or shadow assets without needing IP ranges or seed data?
	helping prioritize detections tied to high-value or high-risk systems.	Can it detect assets associated with your brand across third-party domains, cloud instances, and IoT infrastructure?
	systems.	Does it continuously crawl and monitor your digital footprint to identify new or changing exposures?
		Is it capable of detecting zero-day or high-impact vulnerabilities without relying on periodic scanning?
		 Can it detect unauthorized or unmonitored domains, services, and assets created outside central IT governance?
		Does it account for supply chain and brand abuse risks, including phishing domains or spoofed infrastructure?
		Does the ASM solution enhance other NDR capabilities (e.g., spoofed domain defense, endpoint context, Al Analyst correlation)?
		Can it provide a unified view when paired with internal telemetry and other risk management tools?
Email security	Integration of email security with NDR	 Ability to automatically correlate cross-domain threats from the inbox with subsequent network activity
		• Are the tools working together to inform more accurate threat detections and faster investigations?
		Provides a defense-in-depth approach from the inbox to the network

BONUS SECTION

How to evaluate Al

Al is being positioned as a silver bullet in cybersecurity, but most security teams are left wondering what's actually under the hood. Many tools claim to use Al yet often rely on just supervised machine learning or generative Al models, which are only effective in narrow, well-defined scenarios and lack the ability to detect novel threats.

When evaluating NDR solutions that use Al, it's essential not to rely solely on the output of a single model or one type of Al (such as generative-Al based LLMs). This will only deliver limited outputs and may generate incomplete or biased results.

This challenge is further compounded by the rise of Al-powered threats, which demand more adaptive and intelligent defenses. Unfortunately, without a clear way to evaluate these capabilities, organizations risk falling behind, or worse, being caught off guard.

The truth is, not all Al is created equal. To be effective, Al in cybersecurity needs to go beyond buzzwords and integrate multiple advanced techniques that work together to address the complexity of modern threats. And security professionals need to understand what types of Al are being used for what use cases to in order to evaluate the Al's effectiveness against their organizational needs and build a stronger security posture.

Attack-centric





This diagram shows a comparison between Al-based security tools that leverage business data to detect anomalies in behavior and tools that are trained on historical attack data to catch threats.

To help you we have created three separate guides to Al in cybersecurity that will help you in every step of your adoption journey:

Deep dive into the application of Al in cybersecurity

Download the Al Arsenal Whitepaper to explore how Al models can be applied to cybersecurity, and how Darktrace's Self-Learning Al layers multiple techniques to deliver proactive, resilient threat defense.



Evaluate AI-based security solutions

Download the CISO's Guide to Buying AI Whitepaper. This white paper looks at how buyers should approach purchasing AI-based solutions. It outlines key considerations for each stage of the AI adoption journey, specific questions to ask vendors, and what to look for in the responses.

Learn more 7



Evaluate how advanced your organization is in their Al maturity journey

Download the Al Maturity Model Whitepaper. This paper gives a full deep dive into Darktrace's Al Maturity Model – the only available framework capable of guiding CISOs and cybersecurity department leaders to understand, evaluate, strategize, and advance their progress in Al adoption.

Learn more 7





The Evaluation Process

■ Step 01:

Commercial evaluation

The first phase is a commercial evaluation or discovery process.

This involves assessing whether a potential solution aligns with your organization's needs - not just in terms of core capabilities, but also in how it fits your workflows, operational model, and overall value expectations.

Here are our recommendations for what to consider during the process:



Engage with vendors

Maintain open lines of communication with your vendors throughout the evaluation process. Work with them to identify and understand any performance discrepancies. This collaborative approach allows you to test the team's responsiveness while addressing any issues promptly and ensures that you are making an informed decision based on accurate data.



Factor in people and partnerships

Consider the human elements that can significantly impact your experience with the solution. Evaluate the local presence of the vendor and the depth of their account management team, including any relationship with your existing Managed Security Services Provider (MSSP) if relevant. Strong partnerships and accessible support can be crucial for long-term success and satisfaction.



Compare similar licensing

Ensure that you are comparing solutions with similar licensing packages. Some vendors offer different packages that may not provide equal capabilities. Be aware of which features are included to ensure a fair comparison, as well as any added-value capabilities.



Think about post-purchase support

Ensure the vendor offers robust post-purchase support, including regular updates, training and certifications, events, and responsive customer service. Read reviews from other customers and industry analysts such as Gartner to determine if customers recommend and see value from the vendor over time, not just during the trial and onboarding phases.

Technical evaluation

The second key step is the technical evaluation, where it's essential to involve the day-to-day users of the product.

This discovery process helps determine how well a solution meets your organization's performance, usability, and integration requirements. It also allows you to assess critical aspects such as deployment architecture, detection efficacy, use of AI, policy enforcement, and compatibility with your existing infrastructure.

Here are the key factors to consider when performing a technical evaluation:



Evaluate based on optimal performance data

Ensure you assess your chosen solution once it has been fully deployed. This is especially true with solutions that use unsupervised machine learning and therefore have an initial learning curve. Engage with your vendor to confirm this and understand the true potential of each solution under ideal conditions, including the deployment of any integrations that you require.



Evaluate the learning curve

Assess not only the detection capabilities at a single point in time but also the rate of improvement and maturity over time. This will give you a more accurate picture of the solution's long-term precision.



Al models and fine-tuning capabilities

Ensure the vendor provides complete transparency in their Al modeling and capabilities. You should be able to customize the detection and response models to make any finer adjustments to suit your needs, plus the ability to create custom models for specific use cases that are not covered in the vendor's default model library.



Clear and transparent explanations

Every detection, investigation and response action should come with a transparent explanation. Understand what detection models were triggered, the corresponding logic behind any automated investigation and a detailed list of response actions taken. This transparency is crucial for trust and effective evaluation.



Combine qualitative and quantitative analysis

Go beyond Al marketing claims by combining both qualitative and quantitative analyses of the solution's capabilities in your specific environment. Assess elements such as visibility, detection accuracy and overall usability, plus quantifiable metrics that you can compare against your existing workflows such as triage and investigation time, total incidents generated, and mean time to respond.



Compare threats consistently

Different vendors may classify threats in various ways, which can lead to inconsistencies in your evaluation. Ensure that you are comparing equivalent metrics by seeking clarification from your vendor when necessary. This will help you make a fair and accurate comparison.



Do not evaluate all false positives equally

Understand that a 'false positive' may be defined differently across the solutions you're evaluating. For example, business-centric tools that use anomaly-based detection will raise alerts for activity that is considered anomalous. They are legitimate detections, but anomalous does not always equal 'malicious' and therefore does not meet the traditional definition of a false positive. Solutions that use AI for anomaly-detection will operate just like a skilled human analyst - flagging suspicious activity based on the data available, then using that as context for further investigation and response. Take the time to understand the context and impact of false positives within each solution to make a more informed evaluation, and if you're not sure, ask your vendor how they define false positives. Test how easy it is to acknowledge alerts that are not considered interesting or of genuine concern to your team.

Conclusion



