

# Novendor.ai Public Positioning and Competitive Evaluation

## Executive summary

**Novendor's public positioning is built around a contrarian but coherent thesis:** businesses should stop "running vendors" and instead **own the execution layer**—the workflow logic, data contracts, approvals, and audit trails that sit underneath typical SaaS "convenience" features. This framing is reinforced by its "SaaS iceberg" concept (value is "below the waterline") and a "Shift" narrative from tool sprawl → governed execution engines. <sup>1</sup>

**Packaging is currently "consulting engagements," not a conventional SaaS plan.** The site offers three primary public offers—Operational Assessment, AI Concierge, and Legacy SaaS Migration—with unusually crisp deliverables (especially for the Assessment), but **no published pricing** and minimal visible proof (e.g., case studies, quantified outcomes, security posture). <sup>2</sup>

**Target audience cues are explicit and consistent:** company-size segments from small teams to enterprise, industries including healthcare admin ops, legal ops, finance, real estate investment, and construction/PDS, and "primary system concerns" spanning CRM/ERP/ticketing/BI/document mgmt—suggesting an ops/finance/IT buyer in multi-system environments experiencing tool sprawl and reconciliation work. <sup>3</sup>

**Competitor context (from primary sources):** - 8090 Solutions Inc. <sup>4</sup> positions "Software Factory" as an AI-native SDLC orchestration platform for "multiplayer" collaboration (PM/design/engineering/QA), with formal modules (Refinery/Foundry/Planner/Validator) and explicit seat + token usage governance in its admin docs. <sup>5</sup>

- MQLFlow <sup>6</sup> is positioned as a UK-based AI automation services agency targeting small businesses, with notably **transparent published pricing** ("From £...") across packages and "popular solutions." <sup>7</sup>

**Assumptions and constraints (explicit):** - No Novendor PDFs or public docs were discoverable from the fetched pages; the analysis is based on publicly accessible pages on novendor.ai and competitor public pages/docs. <sup>8</sup>

- Novendor's `/capabilities/` page returned no readable content in this browsing environment (likely JS-rendered), so capability claims are limited to pages that render as text. <sup>9</sup>

- 8090's specific \$/seat pricing is **not published in the 8090 primary sources cited below** (their docs clearly describe seats + token usage, but not \$ amounts); any dollar figures referenced for 8090 are labeled as third-party reporting. <sup>10</sup>

# Pricing and packaging

## Published pricing and packaging signals

**Novendor (public site):** - “Consulting engagements” framing is explicit on the homepage; no price list or tiers are published. <sup>11</sup>

- Public “offers” (functional packages) are: - Operational Assessment (audit of “motion, tooling, and data contracts” with enumerated deliverables and outputs). <sup>12</sup>

- AI Concierge (a 3–4 week pilot: “answers questions and does small tasks,” vendor-neutral, with approvals/logging/boundaries; includes “tools...with tradeoffs and pricing”). <sup>13</sup>

- Legacy SaaS Migration (consolidate SaaS sprawl into an internal system; emphasizes parallel-run first, rollback; and names common migration targets like CRM, ticketing, doc mgmt). <sup>14</sup>

**8090 (primary sources):** - Pricing dollars are not posted in the cited docs, but the admin docs show a **seat model** and **token consumption/cost visibility**: - Admins can view token usage and costs at org level and drill down by project/user/model/agent. <sup>15</sup>

- Billing: admins can view and change seat allocation; seat changes take effect immediately. <sup>16</sup>

- Organizations have fixed seat limits enforced by the system. <sup>17</sup>

- Their changelog notes integrated Stripe billing and requiring plan selection before access (a packaging/monetization signal). <sup>18</sup>

- **Third-party pricing disclosure (use cautiously):** a research write-up claims \$200/seat/month + token-based usage for a Team plan and custom Enterprise pricing. <sup>19</sup>

**MQLFlow (public site):** - Transparent service pricing is published on-site, including: - Automation Strategy “From £3,200” - Automation Set-Up “From £800” - Retained Services “From £200/month” - “Popular solutions” starters: AI Agents “From £4,000,” Live Data Dashboards “From £2,400,” Personalised Outreach “From £1,200” - Day rate of £800 and excludes software usage fees (where applicable). <sup>20</sup>

## Pricing/packaging comparison snapshot

Provider	Public packaging type	Published prices?	Pricing mechanics (observed)	Sales motion implied
Novendor	Productized consulting + build engagements (Assessment, AI pilot, migration)	No	Not disclosed; assessment/pilot/migration scopes described	High-touch consultative (book call → scoping session) <sup>21</sup>
8090	SaaS platform (SDLC orchestration)	Not in primary docs	Seats + token usage/cost visibility; enforced seat limits; Stripe billing + plan required	SaaS signup + admin governance; likely enterprise-assisted <sup>22</sup>
MQLFlow	Services agency	Yes (GBP)	“From £” packages + day rate; scope-dependent; excludes software fees	Service inquiry → project delivery/retainer <sup>20</sup>

## Recommended transparent alternative packages for Novendor

Novendor's site already has strong "what you get" clarity for the Operational Assessment and AI Concierge; the missing piece is **buyer-risk clarity** (price bands, scope limits, and what "done" means). <sup>23</sup>

Below is a **recommended packaging model** that preserves Novendor's "owned execution layer" thesis while making procurement easier. These are **proposed** packages (not published by Novendor).

Proposed package	Target buyer stage	Includes (buyer-visible deliverables)	Typical timeline	Suggested price strategy
Assessment Sprint	"Is this real?" / pre-budget	Current-state workflow map + tool inventory; bottleneck/rework scorecard; data contract recommendations; ROI estimate; cutover & rollback strategy; versioned capability backlog	1–2 weeks (align to the "fast audit" promise) <sup>12</sup>	Publish a fixed range (e.g., "\$X–\$Y depending on business units reviewed"), with clear scope caps (N workflows, N systems)
Concierge Pilot	"Show me value without a platform swap"	One narrow concierge that answers + cites sources and escalates; data redaction/exclusion plan; approvals/logging/guardrails; tool shortlist w/ tradeoffs	3–4 weeks (matches site claim) <sup>24</sup>	Fixed pilot fee + optional monthly support; explicitly separate vendor software costs from Novendor fee
Migration Wave	"Replace one SaaS category safely"	Parallel-run + rollback; data contract map; sprint plan w/ risk checkpoints; targeted replacement of one system domain (e.g., ticketing or CRM workflows)	6–12+ weeks depending on domain (site shows phases) <sup>25</sup>	Publish "starting at" + forcing function: price per domain/workflow; optional success fee tied to license reduction
Managed Execution Ops	"Keep it governed"	Ongoing monitoring, change control, audit evidence production, exception backlog triage, quarterly "iceberg" review of tooling sprawl	Monthly	Publish tiered retainer (S/M/L) tied to workflow count + SLA needs

This packaging directly counters a key competitor advantage: MQLFlow turns services into a price card, reducing uncertainty. <sup>20</sup>

It also borrows a helpful clarity pattern from 8090's seat and usage governance (buyers like predictable control surfaces, even when usage-based costs exist). <sup>26</sup>

## Feature comparison

### Novendor capability map (from primary pages)

**Operational Assessment** deliverables are unusually explicit: workflow map + tool inventory; bottleneck/rework scorecard; data contract recommendations; cutover plan; ROI estimate; plus outputs like capability backlog (versioned), control points/evidence plan, ETL rules to certify, rollback/replay strategy. <sup>12</sup>

**AI Concierge** emphasizes: - “answers questions and does small tasks” using internal sources (SOPs, tickets, contracts, policies), - “vendor-neutral” tool selection (code helper, doc answerer, safe “doer”), - safety via approvals/logging/boundaries, - a narrow pilot shipped in “3–4 weeks.” <sup>13</sup>

**Legacy SaaS Migration** emphasizes: - replacing SaaS sprawl with an internal system, - common targets (CRM, PM, support ticketing, doc mgmt, accounting extensions), - parallel-run first, no big-bang cutovers, rollback capability, - phased approach with approximate durations. <sup>14</sup>

### Cross-competitor feature matrix

The table below maps “what the buyer gets” at a functional level (not code-level implementation).

Capability	Novendor	8090	MQLFlow
Process/ requirements capture	Operational Assessment inventories workflows/tools and produces versioned backlog	Refinery creates structured requirements docs as “single source of truth”	“Automation Strategy” package: strategy + optimization (service-based)
Architecture/ specs & contracts	“Data contract recommendations” and target system design language	Foundry creates “Blueprints” as definitive technical specs; detects drift	Typically delivered ad hoc in project scoping (agency)
Task/work execution planning	Capability backlog + migration sprint plans	Planner generates “Work Orders” with upstream context and optional implementation plan	“Automation Set-Up” builds workflows; “Retained Services” iterates
Feedback loop / issues to tasks	Implied via governance and “control points + evidence plan” (not a productized feedback ingest described)	Validator captures user feedback and generates GitHub/Jira issues; Slack alerts	Not productized; can integrate tools (agency delivery)
Governance and audit	“Approvals...logging... boundaries” for concierge; “auditable workflows,” “audit trails,” rollback/replay	Org roles, permissions; seat + usage governance; module workflows; drift detection	Depends on client tooling; not framed as core product governance

Capability	Novendor	8090	MQLFlow
Replacement vs integration stance	Strong “replace SaaS sprawl” / “own the operating system” framing	Orchestrates SDLC; not focused on replacing enterprise SaaS	Integrates existing apps; sells automation on top (Zapier + services)

**Primary-source basis for each row:** Novendor pages (home/What We Do/Operational Assessment/AI Concierge/Legacy SaaS); 8090 docs (Refinery/Foundry/Planner/Validator + admin usage/org management); MQLFlow site (pricing + services). <sup>27</sup>

## Positioning analysis

### Novendor’s POV and tone

Novendor’s positioning is **operator-led, anti-bloat, governance-first**: - Headline promise: “Run Your Business, Not Your Vendors,” explicitly framed as consulting engagements to reduce reliance on third-party software. <sup>11</sup>

- Foundational claim: they “build owned execution systems” that turn fragmented ops into “structured, auditable workflows,” emphasizing control/continuity/auditability. <sup>28</sup>

- “Shift” narrative: operations moving from scattered SaaS workflows to a “unified execution engine with governed automation,” with a timeline from tool sprawl → hidden tax (manual reconciliation) → central data → automation layer → execution engine. <sup>29</sup>

- “SaaS iceberg” narrative: SaaS pricing is justified “below the waterline” (process ownership, accountability, exception handling, audit trails, change control, role clarity), not just surface “features/UI/integrations/dashboards.” <sup>30</sup>

- AI messaging is intentionally anti-hype: “No jargon. No platform replacement.” “Less ‘AI theater’.” Safety is defined as approvals/logging/boundaries. <sup>13</sup>

- “We are not” positioning rejects three common buckets: generic SaaS platform, staff augmentation, digital transformation consultancy; instead they “design and implement modular execution layers.” <sup>31</sup>

### Strengths of the messaging

**The story is differentiated and internally consistent** (iceberg → shift → owned execution → governed automation). A buyer can trace the logic across pages without confusion. <sup>32</sup>

**The language is buyer-native** (tools, handoffs, approvals, audit log, exceptions) and reduces AI skepticism by emphasizing reviewability over “autonomy.” <sup>33</sup>

**The Operational Assessment page provides unusually specific deliverables** compared to many consultative offers, which can reduce perceived risk. <sup>12</sup>

### Weaknesses and likely buyer friction

**“Consulting engagements” is explicit—this can depress conversion for buyers who want a product.** Novendor also explicitly says it is not a “generic SaaS platform,” which may narrow appeal (intentionally) but also makes it harder for buyers to categorize the purchase. <sup>34</sup>

**The “owned operating system” claim is powerful but abstract without proof artifacts.** From the pages reviewed, there are no surfaced case studies, customer logos, or quantified outcomes on Novendor’s own site pages we accessed. (This is an observation of absence in the fetched pages, not a claim that none exist anywhere.) <sup>35</sup>

**The anti-vendor stance creates a predictable objection:** buyers may worry about long-term maintenance burden of internal systems—especially in regulated industries—unless Novendor clarifies support, security posture, and operational ownership model. Novendor expresses governance values (“audit trails,” “approvals,” “review points”), but does not present a public “security & compliance” page in the navigated set. <sup>36</sup>

## Competitive positioning contrasts

- 8090’s messaging frames the problem as “fragmented documentation” and “tribal knowledge” slowing enterprise software development and positions itself as “AI-native SDLC orchestration” with “multiplayer” collaboration; this is spiritually similar to Novendor’s “institutional memory” and governance themes, but aimed at software teams rather than ops execution replacement. <sup>37</sup>
- MQLFlow’s messaging is value/ROI-forward for small businesses and uses urgency hooks (including a quote attributed to Sam Altman <sup>38</sup> ) alongside transparent pricing; it is less about ownership and more about practical automation delivery. <sup>7</sup>

## Target audience and ICP

### Personas implied by Novendor’s site

The strongest “who this is for” signals come from the contact form, industry framing, and “primary system concerns” taxonomy:

- **Operational leaders / operators:** the overall narrative is operational execution (approvals, audit log, exception handling, reconciliation). <sup>39</sup>
- **Finance/controls stakeholders:** “finance” use cases include “close controls, reconciliations, and exception approvals.” <sup>40</sup>
- **IT / systems owners:** the inquiry form explicitly asks for “primary system concerns” across CRM/ERP/ticketing/BI/marketing automation/document management and objectives like “build internal tools,” “consolidate data sources,” and “reduce vendor lock-in.” <sup>41</sup>
- **Compliance-heavy operators:** the About page names “compliance heavy operations” and multi-system environments where work is split across spreadsheets, legacy platforms, and vendor tools. <sup>42</sup>

## Company sizes and industries

**Company size bands** (self-reported in the contact form) span: - 1–10, 11–50, 51–200, 201–500, 501–1000, 1000+ employees. <sup>41</sup>

**Industries explicitly highlighted** as good fits include: - Healthcare (admin ops), legal ops, finance, real estate investment, construction/PDS. <sup>40</sup>

The contact form also lists broader industry categories (professional services, healthcare, manufacturing, technology, finance & insurance, real estate, education, retail, other). <sup>41</sup>

## Buying triggers and pain signals (evidence-based)

From Novendor's own framing, likely triggers include: - **Tool sprawl** and fragmented workflows (explicitly described as "tool sprawl" and "scattered SaaS workflows"). <sup>43</sup>

- **Hidden tax / reconciliation work** (manual reconciliation becomes the job). <sup>44</sup>

- **Rising SaaS costs and vendor lock-in** (locked into costly subscriptions that constrain workflows and lock up data). <sup>45</sup>

- **AI enablement pressure** but skepticism about hype ("Less 'AI theater'," "No platform replacement"). <sup>46</sup>

## Gaps and exploit opportunities

The items below are prioritized by (a) how directly they follow from public evidence and (b) how actionable they are for a competitor (or for Novendor to strengthen).

### Pricing opacity and procurement friction

**Gap:** No published pricing or even "starting at" ranges; the motion is call-driven. <sup>47</sup>

**Exploit play:** Compete with **transparent packages** (clear scope caps, "what's included," optional SLAs). Borrow MQLFlow's "From £..." clarity—buyers do respond to it. <sup>20</sup>

### Limited public proof and quantified outcomes

**Gap:** Novendor's pages articulate outcomes (control/continuity/auditability; ROI estimate in assessment), but do not surface case studies or customer proof in the reviewed pages. <sup>48</sup>

**Exploit play:** Publish "before/after" benchmarks (cycle time, rework rate, license reduction) and show artifacts (audit log screenshots, rollback plan template). If you're a competitor, lead with proof and ask: "Where can I see the outputs?" <sup>49</sup>

### Ambiguity between SaaS vs productized service

**Gap:** The site calls the offer "consulting engagements" and explicitly says it is not a generic SaaS platform, which can reduce appeal for product-seeking buyers. <sup>34</sup>

**Exploit play:** Position your offering as **product-first with optional services**, emphasizing time-to-value and predictable scope. If Novendor is in the deal, frame them as "custom build consultancy" vs your "repeatable product."

### Integrations and technical surface area not publicly specified

**Gap:** Novendor describes outcomes and governance patterns, but does not publish an integrations catalog (connectors, supported systems, bidirectional sync, audit evidence export formats) in the reviewed pages. <sup>50</sup>

**Exploit play:** Win by being concrete: "connects to X/Y/Z," with fast setup guides and prebuilt templates. (This mirrors why 8090's docs are effective: they enumerate modules and admin controls.) <sup>51</sup>

## Security, compliance, and SLA posture not surfaced

**Gap:** Novendor emphasizes auditability and governance, but the reviewed pages don't provide buyer-ready security collateral (SOC 2, SSO, data retention, incident response, SLAs). <sup>52</sup>

**Exploit play:** If you're competing, lead with a security one-pager and procurement checklist. If you're strengthening Novendor, add a "Security & Governance" page and standard enterprise controls aligned with the governance-first narrative.

## Monitoring and continuous optimization not productized

**Gap:** Novendor promises "Run...with traceable approvals, logs, and outcomes," but does not describe an always-on monitoring/alerting product layer (drift detection, anomaly alerts, KPI regression warnings) akin to how 8090 productizes drift/feedback loops (Foundry drift detection; Validator feedback → tasks). <sup>53</sup>

**Exploit play:** Sell "always-on governance" as a product: continuous controls monitoring + exception queues + audit evidence generation.

## Predictable AI usage controls and cost governance

**Gap:** Novendor's AI Concierge is vendor-neutral and references tool pricing tradeoffs, but does not publicly describe a durable usage/cost governance model for AI tooling (budgets, caps, reporting). <sup>24</sup>

**Exploit play:** Compete with explicit "AI spend controls," modeled after 8090's "token consumption and related costs" visibility and admin drilldowns. <sup>54</sup>

## Narrow "pilot" definition and expansion mechanics

**Gap:** The AI Concierge is explicitly "one narrow concierge" shipped in 3–4 weeks; the site does not describe a standardized expansion roadmap (from one concierge/workflow to many) beyond the general "Expand" step in the execution lifecycle. <sup>55</sup>

**Exploit play:** Offer a "workflow ladder": Day 0 pilot → Day 30 second workflow → Day 90 standardized governance across domains, with explicit metrics and checkpoints.

## Funnel and offer recommendations

### One-page funnel map

Below is a funnel design aligned to Novendor's existing narrative (iceberg → shift → assessment → pilot → migration) and tailored to avoid buyer fatigue by sequencing from diagnosis to proof to expansion. <sup>56</sup>

flowchart LR

A[Problem Awareness: SaaS iceberg + hidden tax] --> B[Self-Diagnosis: Quick Assessment]

B --> C[Working Session: 30-min scoping]

C --> D[Paid Assessment Sprint]

D --> E1[Path A: AI Concierge Pilot]

D --> E2[Path B: Migration Wave]



E1 --> F[Expansion: More workflows + governed automation]  
 E2 --> F

### Stages, CTAs, assets, KPIs

Funnel stage	Goal	Primary CTA	Core assets to ship	KPIs to track
Awareness	Create urgency around “hidden tax” and governance	“Take the Quick Assessment”	SaaS Iceberg explainer; Shift map posts; “Reconciliation Tax” teardown	Post reach → site visits; assessment start rate <sup>57</sup>
Self-diagnosis	Turn interest into qualified leads	“Get your score” → “Scope the assessment”	Interactive “1 of 8” assessment; score output email	Completion rate; meeting booked rate <sup>58</sup>
Working session	Qualify and shape scope	“30-minute working session”	Call script: map workflows, systems, approvals, risk	Call→paid assessment conversion <sup>58</sup>
Paid Assessment	Create belief + roadmap	“Approve Assessment Sprint”	Deliverables already defined on-site	Assessment margin; time-to-delivery; N workflows mapped <sup>59</sup>
Pilot or Migration	Produce first measurable win	“Start pilot / plan migration wave”	Pilot concierge; migration plan with parallel-run	Time-to-first-value; adoption; risk issues found early <sup>60</sup>
Expansion	Institutionalize the execution layer	“Add next workflow”	Workflow ladder, governance playbook, quarterly reviews	Workflow count growth; license reduction; cycle-time improvement

### 30-day LinkedIn calendar tailored to Novendor’s POV

This calendar assumes one high-quality post per weekday (20 posts) plus optional lighter weekend posts. The sequencing builds **Problem → Diagnosis → Method → Proof → Offer**, aligned to Novendor’s “iceberg/shift/assessment” narrative. <sup>61</sup>

Note: Topics are written in Novendor’s tone (operator-first, anti-theater). If you are a competitor, this same arc can be inverted: “Ownership without custom rebuild” + “Transparent controls.”

Day	Post type	Topic	Main CTA
1	POV	"The SaaS iceberg: what you're <i>actually</i> paying for"	Quick Assessment <sup>62</sup>
2	Story	"The hidden tax: when reconciliation becomes the job"	Comment "ICEBERG" for checklist <sup>63</sup>
3	Framework	"Tool sprawl isn't the issue—governance is"	Quick Assessment <sup>43</sup>
4	Tactical	"5 signals your workflow logic lives in people's heads"	Book working session <sup>58</sup>
5	Contrarian	"Dashboards don't answer the real question (most of the time)"	Ask for template <sup>24</sup>
6	Light (optional)	"Ask me what tools you're paying for below the waterline"	DM
7	Light (optional)	"Sunday prompt: where do exceptions go to die?"	Comment
8	POV	"The Shift: tool patching → planned execution engines"	Quick Assessment <sup>29</sup>
9	Breakdown	"What 'owned execution layer' means in plain English"	Assessment Sprint <sup>64</sup>
10	Tactical	"Data contracts: the missing layer between tools and trust"	Request Assessment <sup>59</sup>
11	Story	"A time rollback capability prevented a bad cutover"	Book call <sup>65</sup>
12	Contrarian	"Vendor lock-in is often <i>process</i> lock-in"	Ask for diagnostic <sup>66</sup>
13	POV	"Why AI should strengthen governance (not blur ownership)"	Concierge pilot <sup>67</sup>
14	Light (optional)	"Weekend audit: list every approval you do in DMs/threads"	Comment
15	Framework	"Concierge in 3 layers: answerer, doer, reviewer"	Pilot scope session <sup>24</sup>
16	Tactical	"How to stop 'Ask Bob' as a system dependency"	Pilot <sup>24</sup>
17	POV	"No platform replacement: how to pilot in the tools you already use"	Pilot <sup>24</sup>
18	Objection-handling	"Isn't building internal systems too expensive?" (ROI logic)	Assessment Sprint <sup>68</sup>

Day	Post type	Topic	Main CTA
19	Proof format	"What you get from an Operational Assessment (deliverables list)"	Request Assessment <sup>59</sup>
20	Recap	"Week recap: 3 ways SaaS hides the real cost"	Quick Assessment <sup>62</sup>
21	POV	"Common migration targets (and why parallel-run matters)"	Migration session <sup>14</sup>
22	Tactical	"Parallel-run checklists: evidence before cutover"	Request Assessment <sup>69</sup>
23	Story	"The moment 'tool sprawl' became a governance risk"	Book working session <sup>43</sup>
24	POV	"Why 'Excel-as-UI' is a signal, not a sin"	Assessment Sprint <sup>59</sup>
25	Offer	"Pick one workflow to pilot (industry examples)"	Start assessment <sup>70</sup>
26	FAQ	"What does 'vendor-neutral AI' actually include?"	Pilot <sup>24</sup>
27	Synthesis	"From tool sprawl to governed execution: the 5-step model"	Assessment Sprint <sup>71</sup>
28	Light (optional)	"Weekend: share your most painful approval loop"	Comment
29	Proof format	"What 'auditability' looks like: decision rights + logs"	Book intro <sup>72</sup>
30	Close	"If you're renewing 5+ tools this quarter—do the iceberg audit first"	Quick Assessment <sup>62</sup>

### Mermaid timeline for the content arc

```

ganttt
  title 30-day content arc (Problem → Diagnosis → Method → Proof → Offer)
  dateFormat YYYY-MM-DD
  axisFormat %b %d
  section Week 1
  Iceberg + hidden tax (problem awareness) :a1, 2026-02-13, 7d
  section Week 2
  Shift + owned execution layer (reframe) :a2, 2026-02-20, 7d
  section Week 3
  Governance-first AI Concierge (method) :a3, 2026-02-27, 7d
  section Week 4
  Proof formats + offers (assessment/pilot/migration) :a4, 2026-03-06, 7d

```

## Competitive battlecard

This is written **as if you are the competitor selling against Novendor**. Every point is grounded in Novendor's public framing and the predictable objections it creates.

### What Novendor will say (and how to counter)

**Novendor claim:** "Own your operating system / execution layer; stop buying tools." 73

**Your counter-position (safe, non-defamatory):** "You can reduce vendor dependence *without* a custom rebuild—use a standardized platform with exportable logic, clear integrations, and predictable outcomes."

**Novendor claim:** "No platform replacement" for AI concierge pilots. 24

**Counter:** "Great—we integrate too, but we also provide a repeatable product layer so you don't re-buy the same 'pilot' repeatedly."

**Novendor claim:** "Governed automation: approvals, logging, boundaries." 74

**Counter:** "We provide governance plus enterprise-grade controls (SSO, audit logs export, role-based permissions, SLAs)—with published security posture."

(Use this only if your product actually has these controls.)

### Competitive wedge bullets (what to say in sales)

- **Pricing clarity:** Novendor does not publish pricing; we do (or at least publish ranges and scopes). 75
- **Product vs services:** Novendor is explicitly consulting engagements and explicitly "not a generic SaaS platform"; we are product-first and implement faster. 34
- **Speed to measurable value:** Novendor's AI pilot is 3–4 weeks; if you can deliver faster, lead with it (and quantify). 24
- **Proof surface:** ask where the buyer can see outputs, examples, or quantified outcomes; if your company has proof, show it early. 49
- **Integration specificity:** Novendor lists broad tool categories and migration targets but doesn't publish an integration catalog in the fetched pages; compete with concrete connectors and templates. 76

### Objection handling scripts

- **"We want to own our system, not rent SaaS."**

Response: "Ownership is about control of data and logic. We can deliver portability and control without creating a long-term maintenance burden—especially helpful in compliance-heavy environments." (Tie back to their worry; Novendor's story primes this worry.) 77

- **"Novendor is vendor-neutral; we don't want an AI platform swap."**

Response: "Agreed. Vendor-neutral shouldn't mean 'new project every time.' We standardize the governance and monitoring layer so every new workflow doesn't restart from zero." 55

## Trap questions to ask when Novendor is in the deal

These are fair “buyer diligence” questions implied by Novendor’s own claims: - “Can you show a sample of the **audit trail** and how it’s exported for compliance?” <sup>72</sup>

- “What does **rollback + replay** look like in practice—what’s the evidence plan?” <sup>78</sup>

- “After the 3–4 week concierge pilot, what’s the standardized path to expand to 5–10 workflows?” <sup>55</sup>

- “What is the pricing and scope cap for the assessment/pilot (so procurement can evaluate)?” <sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> <sup>4</sup> <sup>8</sup> <sup>11</sup> <sup>21</sup> <sup>27</sup> <sup>34</sup> <sup>35</sup> <sup>47</sup> <sup>75</sup> Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/>

<sup>3</sup> <sup>41</sup> <sup>76</sup> Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/contact/>

<sup>5</sup> <sup>37</sup> Introduction | Docs | 8090

<https://www.8090.ai/docs/general/introduction>

<sup>6</sup> <sup>31</sup> <sup>42</sup> <sup>67</sup> <sup>77</sup> Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/about/>

<sup>7</sup> <sup>20</sup> Best AI Automation Agency UK | MQLFlow

<https://mqlflow.com/>

<sup>9</sup> Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/capabilities/>

<sup>10</sup> <sup>15</sup> <sup>16</sup> <sup>22</sup> <sup>26</sup> <sup>54</sup> Usage & Billing | Docs | 8090

<https://www.8090.ai/docs/administration/usage>

<sup>12</sup> <sup>23</sup> <sup>49</sup> <sup>58</sup> <sup>59</sup> <sup>68</sup> <sup>78</sup> Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/operational-assessment/>

<sup>13</sup> <sup>24</sup> <sup>46</sup> <sup>55</sup> <sup>60</sup> <sup>74</sup> Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/ai-concierge/>

<sup>14</sup> <sup>25</sup> <sup>45</sup> <sup>65</sup> <sup>66</sup> Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/legacy-saas/>

<sup>17</sup> Organization Management | Docs | 8090

<https://www.8090.ai/docs/administration/organizations>

<sup>18</sup> Changelog | Docs | 8090

<https://www.8090.ai/docs/resources/changelog>

<sup>19</sup> 8090 Solutions (Software Factory) | Ry Walker Research

[https://rywalker.com/research/8090-software-factory?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://rywalker.com/research/8090-software-factory?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>28</sup> <sup>36</sup> <sup>38</sup> <sup>48</sup> <sup>50</sup> <sup>52</sup> <sup>53</sup> <sup>64</sup> <sup>71</sup> <sup>72</sup> <sup>73</sup> Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/what-we-do/>

<sup>29</sup> <sup>33</sup> <sup>39</sup> <sup>43</sup> <sup>44</sup> <sup>63</sup> Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/shift/>

30 32 56 57 61 62 Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/saas-iceberg/>

40 69 70 Novendor

<https://novendor.ai/industries/>

51 Refinery | Docs | 8090

<https://www.8090.ai/docs/modules/refinery>