**Step 2 (Beachhead Market Selection) Worksheet**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Beachhead Market Selection Worksheet** | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Academic and Research Institutions** | **Pharma and Biotech Institutions** | **Government and Public Research Agencies** | **Private R&D Organizations** |
| **Rating is Very High (best), High, Medium, Low, Show Stopper (worst)** | | | | |
| **1. Economically Attractive** | Medium (Lower per‐seat revenue but large volume) | Very High (High enterprise value, big ROI potential) | High (Large contracts but slower cycles) | High (Balanced pricing with agile spending) |
| **2. Accessible to Our Sales Force** | High (Reachable via academic networks) | Low (Long sales cycles and complex procurement) | Low (Rigid, bureaucratic channels) | Very High (Nimble decision-making and shorter cycles) |
| **3. Strong Value Proposition** | Very High (Accelerates publication and research impact) | Very High (Shortens drug development and cuts R&D costs) | High (Improves research outputs though with less urgency) | Very High (Boosts rapid innovation and competitive time-to-market) |
| **4. Complete Product** | High (Product fits academic research workflows with available integrations) | Medium (Needs additional compliance/regulatory modules) | Low (Requires full-scale security and government integration) | High (Modular platform fits well with agile R&D environments) |
| **5. Competition** | Medium (Competing against established tools, yet opportunity exists for differentiation) | Low (Niche players like specialized AI drug platforms create strong headwinds) | Low (Incumbent in-house solutions and contractors dominate) | High (More fragmented, with fewer dedicated alternatives) |
| **6. Strategic Value** | Very High (Provides credibility and a base for influential pilot projects) | Very High (Successful adoption offers strong industry validation) | High (Prestige and large contracts, though harder to secure) | High (Opens doors for rapid iteration and commercialization) |
| **7. Personal Alignment** | Very High (Aligns with academic backgrounds and research-driven innovation) | Medium (Requires deeper pharma domain expertise) | Low (Less synergy with the team’s expertise) | High (Fits with a culture of innovation and agile product development) |
| **Overall Rating** | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| ***Rating for Ranking is 1 (most attractive) to 4 (least attractive) – Key Factors is Most Important Contributor to the Ranking*** | | | | |
| **Ranking** | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| **Key Deciding Factors** | – Credibility and strong research impact – High personal alignment – Robust value proposition that fits current product strengths | – Very high economic potential – Significant ROI, but offset by tougher access and regulatory needs | – Attractive due to large-scale contracts – Strategic for prestige, yet hampered by bureaucratic sales channels and product gaps | – Excellent accessibility and product fit – Agile market with strong innovation potential |

**Explanation**

* Academic and Research Institutions are ranked as the top beachhead market (Rank 1) because they offer strong strategic value and personal alignment with our mission. Even though economic attractiveness per seat is moderate, the overall research impact, credibility, and network effects make them an ideal launchpad
* Private R&D Organizations come in second (Rank 2) because they are very accessible and their agile, innovation-driven nature complements our modular multi-agent system.
* Pharma and Biotech Companies (Rank 3) are very attractive from an economic standpoint and have a powerful value proposition. However, more complex sales cycles and the need for additional compliance features make them a secondary target.
* Government and Public Research Agencies (Rank 4) offer high contract values and prestige but are less accessible due to rigid procurement processes and the need for a more complete (security and compliance) product offering.