Competition: customer complaints and features

Copiloto Aero — AI quoting cockpit for aerospace suppliers: reads requests and drawings, prepares the quote with the company's pricing engine, and the analyst approves every section.

Analysis by Menteia's research agent on October 28, 2026, based on public reviews (G2, Capterra, Trustpilot, app stores, forums, Mexican regulators CONDUSEF/PROFECO and press). Complaints are paraphrased and each theme cites its sources.

Competitors analyzed

- Paperless Parts · Global
- Xometry (marketplace con cotización instantánea) · Global
- Protolabs / Protolabs Network · Global
- aPriori · Global
- JobBOSS² (ECI) · Global
- ProShop ERP · Global
- SAP CPQ / Epicor Kinetic (ERP-CPQ) · Global
- CADDi Drawer · Global
- Cotización manual con Excel + correo (status quo en proveedores mexicanos) · Local

Most frequent complaints and pain points

1. Long, complex, costly implementation

Users report months-long rollouts requiring significant IT resources and costly customization; aPriori's G2 averages show ~6 months to implement and ~18 months to ROI.

Frequency: High · *Competitors:* SAP CPQ, aPriori, Epicor Kinetic *Sources:* G2 – SAP CPQ reviews · G2 – aPriori (tiempo de implementación y costo percibido) · TrustRadius – aPriori review

2. Steep learning curve, not intuitive

Recurring feedback that proficiency takes a long time, admin interfaces feel dated, and the system is unintuitive for new users.

Frequency: High · *Competitors:* SAP CPQ, Epicor Kinetic, ProShop ERP, aPriori *Sources:* G2 – SAP CPQ (curva de aprendizaje) · G2 – Epicor Kinetic reviews · Capterra – ProShop ERP reviews

3. High, opaque pricing

Vendors don't publish prices ("contact vendor"), add-on modules cost extra, and some users cite cost as their main dislike.

Frequency: High · *Competitors:* Paperless Parts, aPriori, SAP CPQ, ProShop ERP, JobBOSS² *Sources:* G2 – Paperless Parts pricing (no publicado) · Capterra – Paperless Parts (precio: contactar al proveedor) · G2 – SAP CPQ (costo y módulos extra)

4. Instant quoting fails on 2D drawings and tight tolerances

Instant engines rely on the 3D model; 2D drawings, tight tolerances or special materials push parts to manual review, which takes hours to days and doesn't guarantee a quote.

Frequency: High · *Competitors:* Protolabs, Xometry *Sources:* Protolabs – los archivos 2D requieren revisión manual (~24 h) · Xometry – por qué una pieza requiere cotización manual · Trustpilot – Xometry (lentitud en piezas complejas)

5. Inconsistent pricing between quote and order or on repeats

Customers report prices rising after manual review, or identical repeat orders costing far more than the first, without clear explanation.

Frequency: Medium · *Competitors:* Xometry, Protolabs Network *Sources:* Trustpilot – Xometry reviews · Trustpilot – Protolabs Network (hubs.com)

6. Rigid integration outside own ecosystem

Users cite little flexibility integrating with third-party systems, and customizations that break or complicate version upgrades.

Frequency: Medium · *Competitors:* SAP CPQ, JobBOSS², Epicor Kinetic *Sources:* G2 – SAP CPQ (integración con plataformas no SAP) · GetApp – Epicor ERP (personalización complica actualizaciones)

7. Automated costing that misses actual cost

Some users report gaps between estimated and actual cost on certain parts; vendors themselves acknowledge automated estimation of machined parts is hard.

Frequency: Medium · *Competitors:* aPriori, Xometry, Paperless Parts *Sources:* SoftwareFinder – aPriori reviews (brecha estimado vs real) · Paperless Parts Tech Blog – por qué es difícil estimar piezas maquinadas

8. Functional gaps: historical search and limited scope

Users ask for partial drawing-number search and highlighting of what matched; focused quoting tools lack functions a full ERP has.

Frequency: Medium · *Competitors:* Paperless Parts, CADDi Drawer, ProShop ERP *Sources:* Capterra – Paperless Parts (le falta funcionalidad frente a otros) · Capterra – CADDi Drawer reviews (búsqueda parcial de número de plano)

9. Slowness and bugs

Users report slow performance, slow reports and software bugs, attributed to complex configurations or large catalogs.

Frequency: Medium · *Competitors:* Epicor Kinetic, SAP CPQ *Sources:* G2 – Epicor Kinetic (lentitud y bugs) · G2 – SAP CPQ (lentitud con catálogos grandes)

Features: what we have and what we are missing

Feature	Status	Priority	Phase	Note
Generic pricing-engine connector (multi-tenant)	Missing	High	Months 1–6	Today it depends on the anchor client's third-party engine (NATALIA); without this it can't be sold to another company.
Savings metrics: hours per quote, quotes/month and win rate	Missing	High	Months 1–6	Listed as pending; it is the sales argument vs ERP/CPQ and proof of fast ROI.
Manufacturing ERP integration (e.g. JobBOSS², Epicor, SAP)	Missing	High	Months 7–12	On roadmap (2 ERPs in months 7–12); competitors link quote → order → invoice.
Outside-process supplier quoting (treatments, finishes, material)	Missing	Medium	Months 7–12	Shop quoting tools often request subcontractor prices in-flow; not in the product today.
Own costing module for companies without a pricing engine	Missing	Medium	Months 13–18	On roadmap (months 13–18); needed to sell to companies quoting in Excel.
3D CAD geometry analysis to estimate machine time	Missing	Low	Months 13–18	Table stakes for Paperless Parts and aPriori; secondary for Tier 2/3 suppliers that receive 2D drawings.
Conversational interface with no learning curve (text and voice)	Partial	High	Months 1–6	Open WebUI cockpit lets users ask and adjust by text or voice; adoption time with users outside the anchor client is not yet measured.
Aerospace-grade security and compliance (dedicated server, ITAR/AS9100-style controls)	Partial	High	Months 1–6	Audit log exists; hardening (phase F8) and dedicated server are pending.
Drawing requirement risk flags (tolerances, material, finishes)	Partial	High	Months 1–6	Triage already catches part-number discrepancies; explicit flagging of tight tolerances and special specs is missing.
Win/loss analytics and margin dashboard	Partial	Medium	Months 7–12	Command center exists; quote → order tracking and loss analysis are missing.
Historical search by partial drawing number and shape similarity	Partial	Medium	Months 7–12	Search is semantic/text; image or geometry-based drawing search, CADDi's strength, is missing.

Feature	Status	Priority	Phase	Note
Quoting from 2D drawings and email, no 3D model required	We have it	—	—	Each RFQ email becomes a session; vision triage reads the drawing. Targets exactly where instant quoting falls back to manual review.
Traceable pricing-engine figures (zero LLM numbers) and human gates	We have it	—	—	Answers distrust from inconsistent pricing: every number has its source and the analyst approves technical, price and send.
Similar historical quote search	We have it	—	—	929 quotes and 4,600 line items from the anchor client as knowledge base (pgvector); gives consistency on repeat orders.
Layers on existing email and CRM (Pipedrive) instead of replacing them	We have it	—	—	Avoids long ERP/CPQ rollouts; IMAP/SMTP and Pipedrive integration already in production.
Published, simple pricing (US$1,500/month per company)	We have it	—	—	Contrasts with competitors' unpublished pricing; the US$8–15k implementation fee remains a barrier to watch.

To the roadmap

Months 1–6

- **Conversational interface with no learning curve (text and voice)** (partial, high): Open WebUI cockpit lets users ask and adjust by text or voice; adoption time with users outside the anchor client is not yet measured.
- **Generic pricing-engine connector (multi-tenant)** (missing, high): Today it depends on the anchor client's third-party engine (NATALIA); without this it can't be sold to another company.
- **Savings metrics: hours per quote, quotes/month and win rate** (missing, high): Listed as pending; it is the sales argument vs ERP/CPQ and proof of fast ROI.
- **Aerospace-grade security and compliance (dedicated server, ITAR/AS9100-style controls)** (partial, high): Audit log exists; hardening (phase F8) and dedicated server are pending.
- **Drawing requirement risk flags (tolerances, material, finishes)** (partial, high): Triage already catches part-number discrepancies; explicit flagging of tight tolerances and special specs is missing.

Months 7–12

- **Manufacturing ERP integration (e.g. JobBOSS², Epicor, SAP)** (missing, high): On roadmap (2 ERPs in months 7–12); competitors link quote → order → invoice.

- **Win/loss analytics and margin dashboard** (partial, medium): Command center exists; quote → order tracking and loss analysis are missing.
- **Historical search by partial drawing number and shape similarity** (partial, medium): Search is semantic/text; image or geometry-based drawing search, CADDi's strength, is missing.
- **Outside-process supplier quoting (treatments, finishes, material)** (missing, medium): Shop quoting tools often request subcontractor prices in-flow; not in the product today.

Months 13–18

- **Own costing module for companies without a pricing engine** (missing, medium): On roadmap (months 13–18); needed to sell to companies quoting in Excel.
- **3D CAD geometry analysis to estimate machine time** (missing, low): Table stakes for Paperless Parts and aPriori; secondary for Tier 2/3 suppliers that receive 2D drawings.

Conclusion

The market complains about two extremes: expensive ERP/CPQ that is slow to implement and hard to learn, and instant quoters that give up on 2D drawings with tight tolerances and price inconsistently. Copiloto Aero targets exactly that gap (2D drawings by email, traceable figures, human at every gate, on top of the existing CRM). Its biggest gap is being single-tenant today: without a generic pricing-engine connector, documented savings metrics and ERP integration it can't scale beyond INDUMET.