ECOS™ Professional Commercialization Readiness Assessment

Client:	FreshSnap Living, Inc.
Product:	FreshSnap Produce Pods
Assessment Date:	September 2026
Status:	Confidential

Agent 4 — Executive Assessment Report Composer

ECOS™ PROFESSIONAL COMMERCIALIZATION READINESS ASSESSMENT

FreshSnap Produce Pods
FreshSnap Living, Inc.

Prepared For: Sarah Mitchell, Founder
Assessment Date: September 2026
Category: Household / Produce Preservation

CONFIDENTIAL — FOR ADDRESSEE USE ONLY

Space reserved for EISH branding/logo

CONFIDENTIALITY & ASSESSMENT DISCLAIMER

This report is confidential and prepared exclusively for the addressee. It is based on information supplied by the client, materials submitted through the ECOS™ intake process, and independent market research conducted as part of this engagement. Conclusions reflect the evidence available at the time of assessment and are subject to change as new evidence emerges. Estimates, projections, and assumptions contained in this report remain subject to further validation and should not be treated as guarantees of commercial outcome. This assessment constitutes commercial due diligence. It does not constitute legal, regulatory, accounting, tax, or investment advice, and should not be relied upon as a substitute for professional advice in those domains.

LETTER FROM EISH

This report presents the findings of the ECOS™ Professional Commercialization Readiness Assessment for FreshSnap Produce Pods. The purpose of this engagement is to determine the company's current commercial readiness, the strength of evidence supporting its core commercial assumptions, and the decision framework management should apply before committing further capital, inventory, or channel relationships.

This assessment integrates client-disclosed evidence, independent category and competitive research, and senior commercial judgment into a single evaluation. It is intended to answer one question directly: is this business ready to commercialize today, and if not, what must become true before it is?

The findings below should be read as a decision-support tool for the founder, prospective investors, and any board-level stakeholders evaluating whether to proceed, pause, or redirect this opportunity.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FreshSnap Produce Pods is a **prototype-stage consumer product** addressing a genuine and well-documented household problem — produce spoilage and food waste. The category is real, active, and already served by established competitors including Bluapple, Rubbermaid FreshWorks, and OXO GreenSaver. However, FreshSnap itself has **no finished saleable inventory, no completed commercial production run, no sales, no sell-through, no independent efficacy testing, no regulatory or compliance review, no product liability insurance, and no retailer or distributor evaluation.**

The company's core commercial promise — that FreshSnap meaningfully extends produce freshness through moisture and ethylene management — rests entirely on unvalidated design assumptions and observational feedback from a 32-household beta test. No controlled or independent testing has confirmed this claim. Because the refill-based business model depends on consumers perceiving and believing in this benefit repeatedly, this single unresolved question sits at the center of the entire commercial case.

Independent market research confirms that the underlying consumer problem is legitimate and that a produce-preservation category exists with confirmed price bands, established competitors, and consumer demand. It also confirms that FreshSnap is entering a **mature, competitive market**, not a greenfield opportunity — one where incumbents already hold review volume, retail shelf space, and consumer trust that FreshSnap has not yet earned.

Strongest evidence-supported positives: a clear, relatable consumer problem; a founder who is commercially realistic about the current stage of evidence; a starter price point ($14.99) that sits within observed category bands; and a refill format that is not without market precedent.

Greatest commercial risks: unproven core efficacy claims; an unproven refill/repeat-purchase model; incomplete unit economics; single-source dependency on the most critical component (the

active insert); absence of manufacturing, compliance, and insurance infrastructure; and a competitive category where trust and proof — not concept — determine success.

Decision implication: FreshSnap should not proceed to retail engagement, distributor outreach, scaled inventory commitment, or investment underwriting beyond controlled validation capital. The opportunity is not without merit, but it is **not yet commercially proven**, and the evidence gaps are foundational rather than cosmetic.

OVERALL COMMERCIAL READINESS DASHBOARD

COMMERCIAL READINESS SCORE (CRS): 36 / 100

COMMERCIAL CONFIDENCE INDEX (CCI): 30 / 100

CURRENT COMMERCIAL MATURITY: Prototype

OVERALL ASSESSMENT: FURTHER VALIDATION REQUIRED

Pillar Scores

Pillar	Score	Interpretation
Problem Validation	5/10	Problem is intuitive and category-confirmed, but FreshSnap-specific demand strength is unmeasured.
Solution Validation	3/10	Core efficacy unproven; no controlled or independent testing exists.
Customer Validation	3/10	Stated purchase interest only (24/32 beta households); zero actual transactions.
Product Clarity	5/10	Basic use is understandable, but consumers raised recurring questions about mechanism, safety, and replacement timing.
Product Differentiation	4/10	Convenience positioning is plausible but unproven against entrenched incumbents.
Brand Readiness	5/10	Visual/brand presentation outpaces underlying commercial proof.
Packaging Readiness	4/10 (ECOS Free Assessment: 45/100 "Developing")	Renders are developed; final dimensions, UPC, case pack, and compliance are unresolved.
Pricing Logic	3/10	Prices are directionally plausible but transactionally untested; wholesale margin is thin before full cost-to-serve.
Manufacturing Readiness	3/10	Prototype supplier identified; no commercial run, no audit, no verified capacity, no backup source.
Operational Readiness	2/10	Retail sales, distributor sales, Amazon/e-commerce, and customer service ownership are all vacant.

Pillar	Score	Interpretation
Financial Readiness	3/10	Capital is limited and staged; unit economics are materially incomplete.
Overall Commercial Readiness	**3.5/10 (36/100)**	Commercial potential exists; current evidence does not support scaled commercialization.

All scores above reconcile with the underlying ECOS™ scoring methodology and are preserved from the upstream assessment. The written narrative throughout this report agrees with these figures — no section should be read as more optimistic than the scores support.

CCI Interpretation: The Commercial Confidence Index of 30/100 is lower than the CRS because the overwhelming majority of material claims in this assessment are client-disclosed statements rather than independently verified evidence. No test reports, production records, supplier certifications, sales data, or compliance documentation were supplied. A moderate CRS combined with a low CCI means the opportunity may be directionally promising, but the evidence behind that promise remains thin.

PREVIOUS ECOS™ ASSESSMENT RECONCILIATION

The prior ECOS™ Free Assessment scored FreshSnap at **35/100 ("Early Stage," Confidence: Low)**, with a recommendation of "NOT READY — Foundational elements require development before commercialization."

This Professional Assessment, incorporating deeper client disclosure and independent market research, arrives at a closely aligned conclusion: **CRS 36/100, Further Validation Required.** The two assessments are directionally consistent — both identify unvalidated efficacy, absent compliance review, unverified manufacturing, and unproven refill economics as the central blockers to commercialization.

One material discrepancy requires correction. The Free Assessment scored **Consumer Safety Index at 80/100 ("Strong")**. Deeper diligence does not support this classification: FreshSnap has no professional US regulatory compliance review, no food-contact safety documentation, no product liability insurance, and no independently substantiated safety claims. This Professional Assessment does not preserve the "Strong" safety characterization and instead classifies consumer safety readiness as **unproven and a material open risk** (see Critical Evidence Gaps

and Commercial Gates below). This Professional Assessment supersedes the Free Assessment for all decision-making purposes.

INTEGRATED COMMERCIAL ASSESSMENT

Product & Consumer Problem

FreshSnap targets a real, well-established consumer frustration: produce spoiling before it can be consumed. Independent research confirms this is a legitimate and widely recognized household pain point, reflected in existing product assortment across major retail and e-commerce channels. The problem does not require category creation — consumers already understand it and already buy solutions for it.

FreshSnap proposes a compact, reusable pod with replacement inserts intended to manage moisture and ethylene. The concept is easy to explain in principle. In practice, beta participants raised recurring questions about mechanism, safety, produce-type applicability, and replacement timing — signaling that comprehension and trust, not the basic concept, are the primary barriers to adoption.

Core Claims & Evidence Status

FreshSnap can currently support only its **basic design and usage claims** — that it is reusable, and that it requires no batteries, electricity, or sprays. These are supported by prototype use.

Its **commercially essential claims** — that it manages moisture and ethylene, extends produce freshness, reduces spoilage, and that inserts remain effective for 30 days — are **not independently validated.** The client has explicitly confirmed this. Evidence supporting these claims currently consists of manufacturer design assumptions and observational feedback from a six-week, 32-household beta test in which several participants themselves questioned whether observed differences were attributable to the product or to normal variation in produce quality and storage conditions.

This is the single most consequential fact in this assessment. FreshSnap is not being sold as a container — it is being sold as a performance product. Until performance is proven, every downstream commercial assumption (pricing power, refill adoption, review quality, retailer interest) remains conditional.

Market & Competitive Position

Independent research confirms FreshSnap enters a **mature, populated category**, not an open market. Bluapple, Rubbermaid FreshWorks, and OXO GreenSaver are established, reviewed, and retail-distributed. Bluapple is visible on Walmart at $17.99 for a 2-pack with a 4.5/5 rating across 40 ratings. Rubbermaid FreshWorks carries over 8,600 five-star ratings referenced in third-party coverage. Refill-format precedent already exists (Nana Hats, Fresh & Fresh), meaning FreshSnap's refill model is not a novel concept the market must first learn to accept — but it is also not a differentiator by itself.

FreshSnap's claimed advantage — convenience and flexibility versus rigid containers — is a plausible positioning angle but remains **unproven relative to incumbents** who already possess brand trust, review density, and shelf familiarity. Independent evidence shows that consumer trust in this category is conditional on **visible, perceived results and simple use** rather than technical claims language alone. This reinforces the internal finding that FreshSnap must lead with proof, not convenience, to gain adoption.

Category validation exists. Product-specific validation does not. FreshSnap should not treat the attractiveness of the produce-preservation category as evidence that this specific product will succeed within it.

Pricing & Unit Economics

The proposed **$14.99 starter price** sits within an observed and credible category band (low-teens to mid-20s depending on format), lending it directional plausibility. However, this price has never been tested in an actual purchase environment — the supporting evidence is 24 of 32 beta households indicating they "would consider" purchasing, which is stated intent, not demonstrated willingness to pay.

The proposed **$7.99 refill pack** (six inserts) is similarly untested, and consumer support is explicitly conditional: 18 of 32 beta participants said they would "probably" purchase refills *if* the product consistently reduced waste — a performance condition that is itself unproven.

Current landed cost is estimated at **$4.45/unit**, but this figure **excludes duties/tariffs, inspection/testing, warehousing, fulfillment, Amazon fees, DTC shipping, returns, customer acquisition costs, retail allowances, and chargebacks.** Against a proposed wholesale price of approximately $7.50/unit, the margin cushion remaining after these excluded costs is currently unknown and could be materially thinner than the preliminary 45% gross-margin assumption suggests. **No fully loaded, channel-specific contribution margin model currently exists.**

Manufacturing & Supply Chain

A prototype manufacturer (Shenzhen GreenLife Products Co., Ltd.) has been identified, but **no commercial production run has occurred.** Stated capacity of approximately 50,000 units/month is manufacturer-reported and independently unverified. No supplier audit, ISO certification, or quality-system documentation has been supplied.

The **active insert — the component most central to the product's core function claim — is single-sourced, carries the longest lead time (6–8 weeks), and has no qualified backup supplier.** This is the most significant operational vulnerability in the business: if this single source is disrupted, FreshSnap cannot produce a functionally equivalent product.

Operational & Team Readiness

The founder/ownership team currently holds most functional responsibility, which is reasonable at this stage. However, **retail sales, distributor sales, Amazon/e-commerce, and customer service currently have no capable owner appointed.** No complaint-handling process, CAPA process, lot-traceability system, or recall procedure exists. These gaps are material because even a validated product can fail commercially without operational infrastructure to support launch.

Regulatory, Compliance & IP

No professional US regulatory compliance review has been completed for claims, packaging, or food-contact materials. No product liability insurance is in place. IP protection is limited to a claimed "proprietary formulation" with no patents, applications, trademarks, or licensing documentation currently available. These represent open, unresolved risk — not merely items for future development.

Financial & Investment Position

Available capital is $25,000–$100,000 over 12 months, with a further $100,000–$250,000 potentially available but **not committed** and contingent on validation milestones. The founder has indicated comfort with an initial $25,000–$35,000 commitment before proven sell-through, which reflects a disciplined and appropriately cautious capital posture given the evidence gaps identified throughout this report.

COMMERCIAL STRENGTHS

1. The consumer problem is real and independently confirmed.
Evidence: Produce spoilage and food waste are established, well-documented household

frustrations; the category already sells across major retail and e-commerce channels. Confidence: High (category-level), Medium (product-specific relevance).

2. The founder demonstrates unusual commercial realism.
Evidence: Intake responses consistently and accurately disclose the absence of proof rather than overstating readiness. Commercial significance: Reduces the risk of premature scaling and supports disciplined capital deployment. Confidence: High.

3. The proposed starter price is directionally credible.
Evidence: $14.99 sits within observed competitive price bands ($10–$30 depending on format). Commercial significance: Removes pricing architecture as an immediate blocker, pending transactional validation. Confidence: Medium-High.

4. The refill format has category precedent.
Evidence: Comparable refill/replaceable formats exist in market (Bluapple refills, Nana Hats, Fresh & Fresh). Commercial significance: The refill concept itself is not a barrier to market acceptance, though FreshSnap-specific refill behavior remains unproven. Confidence: Medium.

COMMERCIAL WEAKNESSES

1. Core performance claims are unsubstantiated.
The product's central commercial rationale — freshness extension, ethylene/moisture management, 30-day insert efficacy — has not been tested independently or under controlled conditions. Consequence: Undermines conversion, review quality, and refill repurchase simultaneously. Evidence confidence: High (regarding the absence of substantiation).

2. No transactional demand evidence exists.
All purchase interest is stated intent from a non-obligated beta test. Consequence: The business cannot currently distinguish genuine demand from conceptual curiosity.

3. Unit economics are materially incomplete.
Multiple cost categories affecting contribution margin remain unquantified. Consequence: The proposed wholesale price may not be viable once fully loaded costs are known.

4. Manufacturing and supply chain carry concentrated risk.
No commercial production run, no supplier audit, and single-source dependency on the most critical component. Consequence: Direct risk to product quality, delivery timing, and scale credibility.

5. Operational infrastructure for launch does not yet exist.
Retail, distributor, Amazon/e-commerce, and customer service ownership are vacant; no complaint or recall process exists. Consequence: Execution risk independent of whether the product itself validates.

6. Regulatory, safety, and IP exposure remain open.
No compliance review, no insurance, no defensible IP documentation. Consequence: Claims and liability risk could surface immediately upon commercial launch.

COMMERCIAL RISKS

Risk	Severity	Confidence
Core efficacy claims fail to hold up under real-world or controlled testing	**CRITICAL**	High
Consumers cannot perceive enough benefit to justify recurring refill purchase	**CRITICAL**	Medium-High
Fully loaded unit economics eliminate viable contribution margin	**CRITICAL**	Medium-High
Active insert single-source disruption halts production	**HIGH**	High
Manufacturer capacity/quality claims prove overstated	**HIGH**	Medium
Unsubstantiated claims create regulatory or retailer rejection risk	**HIGH**	High
Product liability exposure with no insurance in place	**HIGH**	High
Premature retail/distributor engagement damages credibility	**MODERATE**	Medium-High
Competitive substitution from entrenched, better-reviewed incumbents	**MODERATE**	High
Capital depletion before demand is proven	**MODERATE**	Medium

COMMERCIAL OPPORTUNITIES

Category opportunity: Produce preservation is a proven, actively purchased category with confirmed consumer demand and multiple viable price bands. This is evidence-supported at the category level.

Product-specific opportunity: *Conditional.* If efficacy validates and refill economics prove acceptable, FreshSnap's compact, no-transfer format may offer genuine convenience advantage over rigid container systems. This remains unproven and should not be treated as established.

Channel opportunity: DTC/Amazon may serve as legitimate, lower-risk validation environments to generate real purchase and repeat-behavior data before committing to retail or distributor relationships — provided claims, economics, and operational ownership are addressed first.

Operational/economic opportunity: The founder's staged capital approach and disciplined validation instinct materially reduce the risk of premature overinvestment relative to typical early-stage commercialization patterns.

EVIDENCE & CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

Critical Evidence Gaps

- **Independent efficacy testing** — absent entirely; core value proposition unproven.
- **Food-contact safety and regulatory compliance documentation** — not completed.
- **Fully loaded, channel-specific contribution margin model** — does not exist.
- **Commercial production run data** — no run has occurred.
- **Transactional demand and refill repurchase evidence** — none exists; all interest is stated, not observed.

Important Evidence Gaps

- Supplier audit, certification, and quality-system documentation.
- Backup supplier qualification for the active insert.
- Final packaging specifications (UPC, case pack, retail dimensions, compliance review).
- Product liability insurance.
- IP documentation (patents, trademarks, licensing).
- Lot traceability, complaint-handling, and recall procedures.

Supporting Evidence Gaps

- Competitive head-to-head performance testing.
- Founder/team capability documentation.
- Digital asset and landing page conversion data.

Evidence classification summary: The overwhelming majority of claims in this assessment are **client-reported (C)** or **assumed/inferred (A)**. Independent external research (Agent 2 findings) validates the **category** but does not and cannot validate **FreshSnap's specific product performance.** No verified (V) commercial evidence — sales records, purchase orders, test reports, or supplier certifications — currently exists.

FIVE COMMERCIAL GATES

GATE 1 — Core Efficacy Substantiation

What must become true: Controlled or independent testing must confirm FreshSnap materially manages moisture/ethylene and extends produce freshness in a measurable, repeatable way.

Current status: Unproven. Evidence limited to manufacturer design assumptions and unstructured beta observation.

Why it matters: Every downstream commercial assumption — pricing power, refill adoption, review quality, claims eligibility — depends on this being true.

Evidence required to clear the gate: Documented controlled-condition or independent laboratory testing results demonstrating measurable freshness extension versus a control.

Decision consequence: Without this, no claims can be safely commercialized and no further capital should be committed to inventory or launch marketing.

GATE 2 — Fully Loaded Unit Economics

What must become true: A complete, channel-specific contribution margin model must be built incorporating duties, inspection, warehousing, fulfillment, marketplace fees, returns, CAC, and retail allowances.

Current status: Incomplete. Current $4.45 landed cost estimate excludes multiple material cost categories.

Why it matters: A product can generate sales and still be commercially unviable if true contribution margin is inadequate, particularly at the proposed $7.50 wholesale price.

Evidence required to clear the gate: Verified freight, duty, fulfillment, and channel-fee quotations incorporated into a complete margin model by channel.

Decision consequence: Determines whether wholesale and DTC pricing architecture is viable before any inventory scale-up.

GATE 3 — Paid Demand & Refill Repurchase Validation

What must become true: Real, paid transactions — not stated intent — must demonstrate that consumers will purchase the starter pack and subsequently repurchase refill inserts.

Current status: Zero transactions to date. All evidence is stated purchase intent from a non-obligated beta test.

Why it matters: The business model depends on recurring insert revenue; this cannot be assumed from conceptual interest.

Evidence required to clear the gate: A controlled DTC/Amazon pilot generating documented first-purchase conversion and refill repurchase rates.

Decision consequence: Determines whether the recurring-revenue business model is commercially real.

GATE 4 — Commercial Manufacturing Proof

What must become true: A completed commercial-scale production run demonstrating consistent quality, yield, cost, and lead time, alongside verified supplier quality systems.

Current status: No commercial run has occurred; capacity and quality systems are self-reported by the manufacturer and unverified.

Why it matters: Prototype capability does not equal reliable commercial-scale production; failure here risks defects, delays, and retailer/consumer trust damage.

Evidence required to clear the gate: Independent supplier audit, completed production run data, and third-party pre-shipment inspection results.

Decision consequence: Determines whether FreshSnap can reliably fulfill orders at the scale required for any channel beyond small controlled tests.

GATE 5 — Regulatory, Safety & Claims Compliance

What must become true: A professional US regulatory review of claims, packaging, and food-contact materials must be completed, and product liability insurance must be secured.

Current status: No compliance review completed; no insurance in place; claims remain unsubstantiated.

Why it matters: Unsupported claims and absent insurance expose the company to regulatory, retailer, and consumer liability risk immediately upon commercial launch.

Evidence required to clear the gate: Completed regulatory/compliance opinion and active product liability coverage.

Decision consequence: This gate must clear before any commercial claim is publicly used or any unit is sold.

SECONDARY READINESS PRIORITIES

- **Active insert supply concentration:** Qualify a secondary source or document a credible contingency plan given the 6–8 week lead time and single-source status.
- **IP clarity:** Determine what is genuinely protectable ("proprietary formulation" currently has no supporting documentation).
- **Operational ownership:** Assign accountable owners for Amazon/e-commerce and customer service before any paid launch.
- **Packaging finalization:** Resolve UPC, case pack, dimensions, and replacement-cycle communication (no current end-of-life indicator for inserts).
- **Founder/e-commerce capability clarification:** Reconcile prior assessment's characterization of founder e-commerce experience with the currently vacant e-commerce ownership role.
- **Complaint and recall infrastructure:** Establish minimum viable processes appropriate for a food-adjacent consumer product before any commercial sale.

ECOS™ GO / HOLD / STOP FRAMEWORK

GO

Continued or increased commercialization investment becomes reasonable when the following evidence exists (founder-defined thresholds preserved where supplied):

- **FOUNDER-DEFINED THRESHOLD:** 5,000–10,000 units sold through Amazon/DTC or a controlled retail test, with positive customer feedback/reviews and acceptable return rates.
- **FOUNDER-DEFINED THRESHOLD:** Gross margin remaining above 50%, with a credible path to positive contribution margin as volume increases.
- **ECOS RECOMMENDED THRESHOLD:** Independent or controlled efficacy testing confirming the core freshness claim.
- **ECOS RECOMMENDED THRESHOLD:** Completed regulatory/compliance review and active product liability insurance in place.
- **ECOS RECOMMENDED THRESHOLD:** Verified commercial production run demonstrating consistent quality and cost.

HOLD

Controlled validation may continue, but the company should **not** materially increase inventory, retail commitments, marketing spend, hiring, or distributor engagement, while:

- Efficacy testing, compliance review, and fully loaded economics remain incomplete.
- No commercial production run has occurred.
- Refill repurchase behavior remains unobserved.

STOP / REASSESS

FOUNDER-DEFINED THRESHOLD: The founder should stop investing if real-world sales fail to demonstrate repeatable consumer demand after a reasonable market test — specifically: consistently weak sell-through despite varied marketing approaches, poor reviews or evidence that consumers do not understand or value the product, excessive returns/performance issues, or economics that cannot sustain gross margins above approximately 50%.

ECOS RECOMMENDED THRESHOLD: Reassessment should also be triggered if independent efficacy testing fails to substantiate core claims, or if the active insert supply cannot be secured through a qualified backup source.

CURRENT STATUS: HOLD

FreshSnap should not be rejected outright — the problem is real and the founder's evidence discipline is a genuine asset — but current evidence does not support a GO decision. Controlled, milestone-based validation spending is appropriate; inventory scale-up, retail outreach, and distributor engagement should wait until the Five Commercial Gates show material progress.

EISH SENIOR PARTNER COMMERCIAL OPINION

If this were our own capital, the single greatest concern is not the product concept — it is that **FreshSnap is asking consumers to trust an invisible mechanism with a recurring cost attached, and nothing currently proves that mechanism works.** A compact reusable pod is a reasonable idea. A pod that requires consumers to believe, without evidence, that it is meaningfully extending the life of their groceries — and then pay again in 30 days for a refill — is a much harder sell than the founder's beta feedback suggests. Beta participants themselves could not distinguish product effect from ordinary produce variation. That is not a messaging problem. That is an unresolved product-truth problem.

What makes this worth continuing to investigate is the founder. Most early-stage commercialization failures we see stem from founders who mistake enthusiasm for evidence. This founder does the opposite — the intake responses are unusually precise about what is not yet known. That discipline, paired with a real and recognizable consumer problem and a starter price that is not out of step with the category, is enough to justify continued, tightly controlled validation spending. It is not enough to justify inventory scale, retail conversations, or outside capital deployment today.

What we would refuse to fund right now is any commitment beyond the current $25,000–$35,000 validation tranche the founder has already identified as appropriate. We would not fund a 5,000-unit commercial production run, a retail pitch, or a distributor conversation. The manufacturing side alone — a single unaudited overseas supplier, a single-sourced active insert with an 6–8 week lead time and no backup, and self-reported capacity that has never been demonstrated — is reason enough to withhold scale capital independent of the demand question.

The most vulnerable founder assumption is the belief, embedded in the 12-month success target, that DTC/Amazon can move from zero to $250,000 in revenue and 20,000–25,000 units within a year on the strength of a product whose central claim has never been tested. That target is not unreasonable as an ambition, but it is currently unsupported by any evidence chain that leads from today's prototype to that outcome.

The single missing piece of evidence that would most change our opinion — in either direction — is a **controlled efficacy test with a real comparison condition.** If FreshSnap demonstrably

outperforms "no product" and ideally outperforms a named competitor, the entire risk profile of this assessment shifts: claims become defensible, refill logic becomes credible, and a modest DTC pilot becomes a reasonable next step. If it does not, no amount of brand polish, positioning work, or channel sequencing will make this a viable business, because the product will not do the one thing it is being sold to do.

The commercial reality today is this: FreshSnap is a credible hypothesis, not yet a business. The problem is real, the founder is capable of running a disciplined validation process, and the category has room for a well-proven entrant. But "well-proven" is the operative phrase, and FreshSnap has not yet earned it.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

FURTHER VALIDATION REQUIRED

(Preserved maturity descriptor: Prototype)

This classification reflects a CRS of 36/100, a CCI of 30/100, and a pillar profile in which every major readiness dimension — product, pricing, manufacturing, operations, compliance — shows either "At Risk" or "Developing" status. No pillar score, evidence finding, or Commercial Gate in this report contradicts this classification. FreshSnap should not proceed to retail, distributor, or scaled inventory commitment until material progress is demonstrated against the Five Commercial Gates above.

SCOPE OF THIS ASSESSMENT

This assessment identifies what is working, what is weak, what is missing, what remains unproven, what matters commercially, and what evidence should exist before FreshSnap commits further capital or pursues retail, distributor, or scaled channel relationships.

It intentionally does not provide a detailed commercialization strategy, implementation timeline, testing protocol design, vendor selection, marketing campaign plan, retail pitch materials, or a step-by-step launch roadmap. Those deliverables belong to a separate execution-focused engagement.

THE NEXT STAGE

Organizations seeking to move from assessment into detailed execution planning — including validation study design, compliance engagement sequencing, and channel launch planning — may pursue a separate ECOS™ Commercialization Blueprint engagement. This report does not include pricing or scope for that engagement.

ECOS™ COMMERCIAL DECISION CARD

PRODUCT: FreshSnap Produce Pods
COMPANY: FreshSnap Living, Inc.

COMMERCIAL READINESS SCORE: CRS 36/100
COMMERCIAL CONFIDENCE INDEX: CCI 30/100
CURRENT MATURITY: Prototype
OVERALL VERDICT: Further Validation Required

INVEST FURTHER TODAY?
Limited Validation Capital Only
Fund efficacy testing, compliance review, and economics modeling — not inventory or launch marketing.

SCALE INVENTORY?
No
No commercial production run, verified capacity, or demand evidence exists to justify scale.

APPROACH MAJOR RETAIL?
No
Retailers already carry proven, reviewed alternatives; FreshSnap has no proof to offer them yet.

APPROACH DISTRIBUTORS?
No
Wholesale economics, production reliability, and compliance are all unresolved.

DTC / AMAZON?
Controlled Validation Only
Useful as a proof-generation environment once claims, economics, and operational ownership are addressed — not yet ready for scale spend.

BIGGEST COMMERCIAL UNKNOWN:
Whether consumers will perceive enough real freshness benefit to justify repeat refill purchases.

BIGGEST PRODUCT RISK:
Core efficacy claims (moisture/ethylene management, freshness extension) remain unsubstantiated by any controlled or independent testing.

BIGGEST FINANCIAL RISK:
Fully loaded unit economics are incomplete; the $7.50 wholesale price may not sustain viable margin once excluded costs are added.

STRONGEST COMMERCIAL ASSET:
A real, well-understood consumer problem combined with a founder who accurately recognizes the current evidence gaps.

NEXT CAPITAL GATE:
Independent/controlled efficacy testing results confirming (or disconfirming) the core freshness claim.

TOP 3 ACTIONS BEFORE FURTHER COMMITMENT:

1. Commission independent or controlled efficacy testing of the core freshness claim.
2. Complete a professional regulatory/compliance review and secure product liability insurance.
3. Rebuild the unit economics model with fully loaded, channel-specific costs before any inventory commitment.

GO / HOLD / STOP STATUS: HOLD