

Guidance Report

Extended Guidance Report

Your roadmap to stronger adoption outcomes

About This Report

This guidance report has been generated by Adoptic, a research-governed expert system that analyses over 70 research-substantiated causal variables of innovation adoption success and failure. This report highlights a curated set of 22 key variables across five factors: Desirability, Adoptability, Feasibility, Viability, and Psychosocial. Addressing these variables early in development significantly reduces the risk of failure.

Disclaimer

This report is based solely on the content of the documents provided. It is not an opinion about your business concept or accomplishments. All projects must overcome challenges. Proactively addressing these adoption variables does not guarantee success, but can significantly reduce risk. The guidance is based on research and generated by an automated assessment framework.

Contents

DESIRABILITY & ADOPTABILITY

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Overview | | | | | | 3 |
| D1. Customer, User, Beneficiaries | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 4 |
| A1. First-hand Experience with Context of Use | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 6 |
| D3. Sub-niche Targeting | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 8 |
| D2. Value Proposition Resonance | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 10 |
| A2. Context-of-use Validation | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 12 |
| A3. Customer Relationships | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 14 |

FEASIBILITY

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Overview | | | | | | 16 |
| F1. Technical/Scientific Feasibility | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 17 |
| F2. Technical/Scientific Dependencies | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 19 |
| F3. Third Party Dependency | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 21 |
| F4. Partnership Planning | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 23 |

VIABILITY

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Overview | | | | | | 25 |
| V1. Project Champions | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 26 |
| V2. Resource Commitment | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 28 |
| V3. Assumption Awareness | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 30 |
| V4. Necessary Skills and Capabilities | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 32 |
| V5. Communication Skills | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 34 |
| V6. Essential and Committed Resources | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 36 |
| V7. Strategic Dependency | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 38 |

PSYCHOSOCIAL

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Overview | | | | | | 40 |
| P1. Definition of Success | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 41 |
| P2. Roles and Responsibilities | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 43 |
| P3. Strategic Alignment | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 45 |
| P4. Supporting Initiative | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 47 |
| P5. Relationship Building | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | 49 |

Score Key: ■ 0 ■ 0-1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4-5

Desirability & Adoptability

The customer-focused factors.

50%

of companies fail because customers don't want or won't buy what they offer. This could be because the product wasn't desirable or it wasn't adoptable. Both factors require understanding your customers, users, and beneficiaries within their specific context.

Desirability


Desirability is about what customers want. But wanting something is not the same as buying it or using it. A product can be highly desirable yet fail because people are impeded from acting on their desires.

Adoptability


Adoptability is about whether people will actually adopt and use your offering. Many desirable and feasible products fail because they cannot be purchased, integrated, or used as intended, or because there are psychosocial barriers to decisions to adopt and use.

Variables

D1. Customer, User, Beneficiaries



A1. First-hand Experience




D3. Sub-niche Targeting




D2. Value Proposition Resonance



A2. Context-of-use Validation



A3. Customer Relationships



Reflection

Think about your own behavior: How many products have you said you wanted but never bought? How many apps have you downloaded but never used? Your customers face the same gap. Which of these variables do you think are most immediately relevant to your project?

D1. Customer, User, Beneficiaries

DESIRABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Adoption cannot occur without specific individuals who pay for the offering (customer), use it (user), and benefit from its use (beneficiary)—these may be the same person or three different people. Critically, organizations and groups never adopt anything; specific individuals within them make adoption decisions based on their personal value perceptions. You must know these individuals by name or specific role, understand what value they perceive in your offering compared to alternatives, and have evidence they are willing to invest time or money to obtain that value.

CURRENT LEVEL

2 /5



Assessment Finding

The final score is 2 based on one piece of relevant evidence at level 2 that identifies users as specific individuals (analysts, investigators, and operational staff). However, most evidence was marked as tangential because it identifies organizations as customers and beneficiaries, which directly contradicts the variable's explicit requirement that only specific individuals within organizations can be customers, users, or beneficiaries. The application partially addresses the CUB variable by correctly identifying individual users but fails to properly identify individual customers and beneficiaries.


Recommended Guidance

Initial consideration of this variable is evident. To strengthen your position, address the following questions:

- What 3-5 specific individuals (with job titles or roles) might be the actual users of what you're creating?
- What specific individuals (with job titles or roles) will make the decision to purchase or adopt your offering?
- What specific first-hand evidence do you have from potential customers that they will pay for what you're offering?
- Are the customer, user, and beneficiary the same person or different people? Can you name each specifically?

D1. Customer, User, Beneficiaries

DESIRABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 Multiple purchase orders obtained where adoption decision was made in market context.

Level 4 One or more purchase orders obtained but decision context may deviate from typical market.

Level 3 Non-binding expression of intent to purchase plus explicit adoption requirements that can be satisfied.

Level 2 **CURRENT**

Known and clearly differentiated customer, user, and beneficiary with substantial market research.

Level 1 Clear view of who customer, user, beneficiary are as a collective or set of related individuals.

Level 0 Don't know or have not considered who the customer, beneficiary, user might be.

A1. First-hand Experience with Context of Use

ADOPTABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

What users say they need often differs dramatically from what they actually need when observed in their real environment, making first-hand experience in the context of use essential for designing solutions that will be adopted. This variable is not about experience using your product—it's about your team's direct, hands-on experience in the environment where users work, observing their workflows, constraints, social dynamics, and actual behaviors over time. Adoption depends on perceived usefulness and ease of use in context, and you cannot reliably design for a context you haven't personally experienced.

CURRENT LEVEL

2 /5



Assessment Finding

The final score of 2 is supported by three pieces of relevant evidence showing that team members obtained explicit details on both requirements and contextual factors from a prospect customer/user (██████). The detailed feedback covers operational context, technical requirements, and benefit expectations, meeting Level 2 criteria. However, there is no evidence of first-hand understanding or extensive direct observation that would qualify for Level 3 or higher.


Recommended Guidance

Initial consideration of this variable is evident. To strengthen your position, address the following questions:

- Have any team members previously worked in a role similar to your intended users, or spent significant time embedded in their environment?
- What have you observed about how users currently address the problem—workarounds, constraints, and contextual factors?
- What differences exist between what users tell you they need versus what you've observed them actually doing?
- What contextual factors in the users' environment will affect whether and how they adopt your offering?

A1. First-hand Experience with Context of Use

ADOPTABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 Multiple people with direct first-hand experience in the proposed context of use.

Level 4 The team member with direct experience is responsible, continuously involved in development decisions.

Level 3 Team includes someone who has significant experience in the proposed context of use.

Level 2 **CURRENT**

Use cases are identified based on observations conducted in the user environment.

Level 1 User research conducted via interviews but limited direct observation in context.

Level 0 No evidence of consideration.

D3. Sub-niche Targeting

DESIRABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Widespread adoption rarely happens all at once—it occurs when larger populations observe smaller niche populations adopt without suffering negative consequences to status, belonging, or capability. Identifying and sequencing sub-niche markets allows you to target early adopters with high need intensity and lower adoption barriers, creating visible proof of successful adoption that reduces uncertainty for subsequent niches. Success in one niche doesn't guarantee success in others—characteristics that drive adoption in your initial niche may not transfer to broader markets, making it critical to identify what is niche-specific versus generalizable.

CURRENT LEVEL

5 /5



Assessment Finding

The application achieves Level 5 through comprehensive documentation of multiple distinct niche populations with clearly different value profiles and drivers of demand. Two pieces of evidence directly support this: the identification of primary customer segments (government agencies, critical infrastructure operators, etc.) and the detailed breakdown of eight specific application areas, each with unique use cases and value propositions. However, the evidence focuses primarily on documenting niche populations rather than methods for targeting them or ensuring visibility between niches, which represents the complete Level 5 requirement.

Recommended Guidance

Good progress has been made on this variable. To further strengthen your position, consider the following questions:

- What distinct sub-populations exist within your broader target market, and what makes each different in terms of needs or willingness to adopt?
- For each sub-niche, what specifically makes them different—drivers of demand, intensity of need, risk tolerance, or requirements for adoption?
- Which sub-niche populations have the highest need intensity, making them most likely to adopt early despite uncertainty?
- What characteristics of your target early niche might be unique and NOT transferable to broader markets?

D3. Sub-niche Targeting

DESIRABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5

CURRENT

Validated cascade effect: success in initial niche demonstrably reduced adoption barriers for subsequent niches.

Level 4 Strong adoption in initial niche with clear evidence of observation by subsequent target niches.

Level 3 Initial niche identified with validated characteristics; mechanism for cascade effect theorized.

Level 2 Multiple potential niches identified with differentiated characteristics documented.

Level 1 General awareness of market segmentation but niches not specifically identified or characterized.

Level 0 No consideration of sub-niche targeting, market segments, or market sequencing strategy.

D2. Value Proposition Resonance

DESIRABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

A value proposition only matters if it resonates with actual customers in their real decision-making context—not in research settings or hypothetical scenarios. Resonance means customers immediately understand the value, perceive it as clearly superior to alternatives, and are willing to pay the price you're asking. The test is not whether customers agree your offering is good, but whether they reach for their wallet. Value propositions must be validated through actual purchase behavior or credible purchase intent, not just positive feedback or stated interest.

CURRENT LEVEL

3 /5



Assessment Finding

All three pieces of evidence are directly relevant to value proposition validation with prospective market members. The quotes demonstrate industry feedback validating the problem and capability, specific operator feedback calling the project "promising" with identified benefits, and a transport coordinator articulating concrete value propositions. However, none of the validation occurred in the context of actual purchase decision-making, which would be required for Level 5.

Recommended Guidance

Good progress has been made on this variable. To further strengthen your position, consider the following questions:

- When prospective customers hear your value proposition, what specific words or phrases do they repeat back that indicate understanding?
- Have you tested your pricing with actual customers who had authority and means to purchase—what was their reaction?
- What specific evidence shows that prospects perceive your benefits as clearly superior rather than marginally better?
- What is the maximum price your target market has demonstrated willingness to pay for solutions in this category?

D2. Value Proposition Resonance

DESIRABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 Multiple customers have purchased based on a single value proposition in real market conditions.

Level 4 One or more purchases obtained with documented evidence that a single value proposition drove decision.

Level 3

CURRENT

Strong positive response from qualified prospects with specific elements of resonance identified.

Level 2 Value proposition tested with target customers; feedback collected and iterations made.

Level 1 Value proposition articulated but not yet validated with actual target customers.

Level 0 No clear value proposition defined or no testing with potential customers.

A2. Context-of-use Validation

ADOPTABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Offerings must work in the real context where users will actually use them—not in controlled demonstrations or ideal conditions. Context includes physical environment, time pressures, distractions, competing priorities, social dynamics, organizational constraints, and user capabilities. An offering that seems easy in a demo may be frustrating or impossible in real conditions. Context-of-use validation requires observing actual users attempting to obtain benefits from your offering in their real environment, identifying difficulties, and iterating until the offering genuinely fits context.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

All supported evidence was marked as tangential because none directly addressed context-of-use validation regarding ease of use, user perception of difficulty, or actual user interaction with the solution. The quotes focus on problem validation and perceived benefits rather than usability assessment or user experience validation in the context of use, which is what this variable specifically measures.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- Have you observed actual users attempting to use your offering in their real environment—not a controlled demonstration?
- What specific difficulties did users encounter when using your offering in context?
- When users describe ease or difficulty, what exact words do they use—do these differ from how your team describes it?
- For users who initially found your offering difficult, how long until they perceived it as easy?

A2. Context-of-use Validation

ADOPTABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 — Extended real-world use by multiple users with documented ease of use, minimal support, and evidence that intended benefits were delivered.

Level 4 — Successful use in real context by early users with identified improvements implemented.

Level 3 — Observed use in real context with specific usability issues identified and being addressed.

Level 2 — Real-world context-of-use testing planned or beginning.

Level 1 — Actual context of use identified.

Level 0 CURRENT

No evidence of consideration.

A3. Customer Relationships

ADOPTABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Customer relationships are not merely contacts or leads—they are demonstrated commitments where prospective customers have invested their own time, resources, or reputation in supporting your project. The depth of relationship is measured by what customers have actually done, not what they've said. Deep relationships survive mistakes and pivots; shallow relationships evaporate when difficulties arise. Building genuine customer relationships requires moving from initial contact to tangible commitment to active collaboration over multiple interactions.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

While the application shows evidence of some customer interactions (feedback from ██████████ at ACFS and "early industry feedback"), none of the evidence demonstrates the tangible commitments of time or resources required for higher levels. The evidence shows basic customer contact and feedback collection, but falls short of the relationship depth and commitment levels required for Levels 1-5. The relevant evidence only supports that some customer relationships exist beyond complete absence, but not at the level of tangible commitments required for Level 1 or higher.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- Name specific prospective customers who have committed their own time, resources, or reputation to supporting your project.
- What tangible evidence of commitment have these prospects provided—agreements, prepayments, dedicated time, or endorsement?
- Which customers allowed you access to their real operations for testing, and what did they risk by doing so?
- If you made a significant mistake, what evidence suggests your customer relationships would survive?

A3. Customer Relationships

ADOPTABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 — Multiple deep relationships with tangible commitments, influence, and demonstrated resilience.

Level 4 — Several committed relationships with evidence of investment (time, resources, reputation).

Level 3 — Active relationships with multiple touchpoints, specifically including the buying decision maker.

Level 2 — Buying decision maker is definitively identified.

Level 1 — Consideration of who the buying decision maker is.

Level 0

CURRENT

No meaningful customer relationships established.

Feasibility

Can it be built? Dependencies, partnerships, and technical reality

25%


of startups fail because they lack the right team or encounter insurmountable challenges in producing, distributing, or supporting their true offering. Feasibility isn't just about whether something can be built—it's about dependencies, partnerships, and technical realities that determine whether your solution is achievable.

Feasibility concerns whether your project can actually be executed. This includes understanding third-party dependencies, securing necessary partnerships, managing technical dependencies, and validating that your technical approach is sound. Many projects fail not because the idea was bad, but because execution proved impossible given real-world constraints.

The Question:

"Can we actually build and deliver this?"

Variables:



F1. Technical/Scientific Feasibility

FEASIBILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Beyond dependencies on external technology, your own technical or scientific approach must be sound. Feasibility concerns whether your solution can actually work as intended—whether the underlying science is valid, the engineering is achievable, and technical risks have been identified and can be managed. This requires honest assessment of what has been proven versus what is assumed.

CURRENT LEVEL

3 /5



Assessment Finding

The final score is 3 based on relevant evidence showing the technology is at "prototype design and early implementation stage," which demonstrates validation in controlled/laboratory conditions. Additional relevant evidence supports lower levels, including proof-of-concept work (Level 2) and established theoretical foundations (Level 1). The preliminary score of 1 was too conservative as it failed to recognize that prototype stage represents laboratory validation rather than just theoretical possibility.

Recommended Guidance

Good progress has been made on this variable. To further strengthen your position, consider the following questions:

- What technical or scientific capabilities, technologies, or knowledge must exist for your offering to work as intended?
- What evidence demonstrates that these technical/scientific requirements are achievable with current knowledge and technology?
- What technical risks or uncertainties could prevent your solution from working as expected?
- What testing or validation have you conducted to verify technical feasibility?

F1. Technical/Scientific Feasibility

FEASIBILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 — Technical feasibility demonstrated through production deployment and market validation.

Level 4 — Feasibility proven through prototype testing in realistic conditions.

Level 3 — **CURRENT**
Technical approach validated in controlled testing; key risks identified.

Level 2 — Preliminary technical validation with proof-of-concept results.

Level 1 — Technical approach defined but not yet validated.

Level 0 — Technical feasibility not assessed or significant unknowns remain.

F2. Technical/Scientific Dependencies

FEASIBILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Your offering may depend on technical or scientific capabilities, platforms, knowledge, or infrastructure that you don't control. These dependencies differ from third-party business relationships—they concern whether the underlying technology or science exists, works reliably, and can scale. Understanding these dependencies means knowing what must be true technically for your solution to work, and what happens if those technical foundations change or fail.

CURRENT LEVEL

1 /5



Assessment Finding

All three pieces of evidence are directly relevant to technical dependencies and support Level 1, which requires that "Dependencies have been considered and research conducted to affirm perception that dependencies are mitigated easily." The quotes show explicit consideration of hardware dependencies (quantum processors), deployment dependencies, and theoretical foundation dependencies, with clear statements about how these are mitigated or accessible.


Recommended Guidance

Initial consideration of this variable is evident. To strengthen your position, address the following questions:

- What technical or scientific technologies, tools, platforms, or knowledge does your offering depend on for production, distribution, or use?
- What dependencies have you validated through actual use in production—not just laboratory or demonstration environments?
- What technical dependencies create barriers to adoption for certain customer segments or use cases?
- What dependencies are outside your direct control? What would happen if they changed or became unavailable?

F2. Technical/Scientific Dependencies

FEASIBILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 All technical dependencies validated at scale with proven reliability.

Level 4 Key dependencies tested in production; scaling path validated.

Level 3 All technical dependencies mapped with plans for validating all, some production testing complete.

Level 2 Technical dependencies identified; laboratory validation underway.

Level 1

CURRENT

Some technical dependencies recognized but not systematically assessed.

Level 0 Technical or scientific dependencies not mapped or considered.

F3. Third Party Dependency

FEASIBILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Your project's success depends not just on what you control, but on what others must provide. Third party dependencies include suppliers, platform providers, distribution channels, and complementary product/service providers whose cooperation or products are necessary for your offering to reach and serve customers. Understanding these dependencies means identifying who could say 'no' and stop your project, what alternatives exist, and what incentives align or misalign their interests with yours.

CURRENT LEVEL

1 /5



Assessment Finding

The final score of 1 is supported by three pieces of relevant evidence that demonstrate some consideration and documentation of dependencies. All three quotes directly address third party dependencies by discussing the system's reliance on quantum simulators and the deliberate avoidance of quantum hardware dependencies for early deployment. This shows the project has identified and considered key dependencies, meeting the level 1 requirement of "some consideration and documentation of dependencies."


Recommended Guidance

Initial consideration of this variable is evident. To strengthen your position, address the following questions:

- Walk through your entire value chain from raw materials/inputs to final customer use. At each step, what entities do you depend on?
- For your customers to USE your offering (not just buy it), what other products, services, platforms, or capabilities must they already have or adopt first?
- For each major third party you depend on, ask: What's in it for them? What strategic reasons do they have to WANT your project to succeed?
- For your three most critical third-party dependencies, what is your contingency plan if that party's product or service suddenly became unavailable, doubled in price, or changed terms unfavorably?

F3. Third Party Dependency

FEASIBILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 All critical dependencies secured with contracts; alternatives validated for each.

Level 4 Key dependencies secured with formal agreements; contingency plans documented.

Level 3 All dependencies systematically identified with clear understanding of each entity's incentives.

Level 2 Major dependencies identified with clear consideration of specific entities (e.g. suppliers).

Level 1

CURRENT

Some consideration of dependencies is evident within the text.

Level 0 Third party dependencies not considered or mapped.

F4. Partnership Planning

FEASIBILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Partnerships are not just nice-to-have relationships—they often represent critical inputs without which your project cannot proceed. Effective partnership planning means identifying necessary partners, establishing relationships with decision-makers, understanding mutual value exchange, and securing commitments that go beyond goodwill to documented agreements with specific terms.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

No evidence was found to be directly relevant to partnership planning and input certainties. The quotes discuss competitive alternatives and mentorship services, but do not address the identification, assessment, or securing of essential partnerships needed for project success such as suppliers, distributors, channels to customers, or other necessary commercial relationships. The variable requires evidence of considering the commercial ecosystem and necessary partnerships, which is not demonstrated in the provided quotes.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- For each partner you've identified as 'necessary,' what actual relationship do you have with a specific named individual in that organization who has decision-making authority?
- Have you received any written commitments from partners—contracts, letters of intent, price quotes, MOUs with specific terms—or are relationships based on verbal expressions of interest?
- For each key partner, what outcome do they desire from the partnership? Have you explicitly discussed what success looks like for them?
- What partnerships fall into the category of 'project cannot proceed without them'? What is your backup plan if that partnership doesn't materialize?

F4. Partnership Planning

FEASIBILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 — All necessary partnerships secured with documented agreements and clear mutual value.

Level 4 — Key partnerships formalized; backup options identified for critical dependencies.

Level 3 — Active relationships with key partners; terms under discussion.

Level 2 — Partners identified with initial contact established.

Level 1 — Partnership needs recognized but relationships not yet established.

Level 0

CURRENT

No consideration of partnerships, partnership planning, or input certainties.

Viability

Will it survive? Income exceeds costs, resources, skills, and organizational sustainability.

50%

of startups fail because they can't secure the necessary capital to pay their bills. Viability concerns committed resources, necessary staff with necessary skills, business model, pricing/cost structure, and strategic positioning to survive and grow.

Viability concerns whether your project can sustain itself over time. This includes having committed resources, the right staff with the right skills, pricing/cost parameters, awareness of assumptions, effective communication, and strategic positioning within your ecosystem.

The Question:

"Will this project survive and sustain itself?"

Variables:



V1. Project Champions

VIABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Projects don't champion themselves—they require individuals who prioritize the project's success above competing demands and who will fight for the project when obstacles arise. A true champion isn't just supportive; they take personal responsibility for project success, defend it against organizational resistance, and invest their own reputation and effort when the project is threatened.

CURRENT LEVEL

4 /5



Assessment Finding

The final score is 4 based on relevant evidence showing the individual can dedicate "10+ hours a week" to transforming ideas into commercially valuable innovations. This demonstrates prioritizing project tasks above other professional commitments, which meets Level 4 requirements. While there were multiple quotes about time commitment, only those that directly addressed project prioritization were considered relevant to the Project Champions variable.

Recommended Guidance

Good progress has been made on this variable. To further strengthen your position, consider the following questions:

- What team member prioritizes this project's meetings and deadlines over all other professional commitments?
- What team member self-identifies so strongly with this project that they would feel personally responsible if it failed?
- When obstacles arise, who refuses to let the project die, regardless of institutional resistance?
- If the project champion left the organization tomorrow, what would happen to the project?

V1. Project Champions

VIABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 Multiple dedicated champions with demonstrated commitment through adversity and with a documented succession plan.

Level 4 **CURRENT**
Strong champion who has defended project against significant challenges.

Level 3 Identified champion with clear commitment.

Level 2 Someone shows champion potential but commitment not yet explicitly established.

Level 1 Project has supporters but no clear champion who prioritizes it.

Level 0 No project champions identified.

V2. Resource Commitment

VIABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Verbal support and formal resource allocation are different things. Resource commitment means that specific funding, staff time, equipment, and facilities have been formally allocated to your project with documented evidence—not just promises. Understanding resource commitment also means knowing who has authority to reallocate those resources and what circumstances might trigger reallocation.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

The final score is 0 because no evidence was found to be directly relevant to the Resource Commitment variable. The only supported evidence discusses the absence of a commercial partner, which is tangential to whether necessary project resources have been assessed or committed by stakeholder organizations. Level 0 requires evidence that resource commitment "has not been assessed or considered" - but the quote doesn't directly address whether resource commitment assessment occurred.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- What specific resources (funding, staff time, equipment, facilities) have been formally allocated to this project?
- What evidence do you have of this allocation beyond verbal commitments?
- What executives have the authority to reallocate or remove the resources committed to your project?
- In the past 2-3 years, what projects in your organization have had resources reallocated mid-project? What led to that?

V2. Resource Commitment

VIABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

- Level 5 — Financial resources secured with multi-year commitments and contingency reserves.
- Level 4 — Formal financial resource allocation with documented commitments through project completion.
- Level 3 — Financial resources allocated/acquired for current phase with clear path to securing future funding needs.
- Level 2 — Undocumented agreements to provide some financial resources.
- Level 1 — Explicit consideration of total financial resources required for project sustainability.

Level 0 CURRENT
No consideration of total financial resources required for project sustainability.

V3. Assumption Awareness

VIABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Every project is built on assumptions—about markets, technology, partners, and resources. Assumption awareness means maintaining a documented list of assumptions, understanding the impact if each proves false, actively testing high-risk assumptions, and having triggers that alert you when assumptions need revisiting.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

The final score is 0 because only one piece of evidence was found to be directly relevant, and it supports level 0. The two level 1 arguments were marked as tangential because they describe technical characteristics rather than demonstrating explicit assumption management, team awareness of assumptions, or understanding of cost implications. The level 0 evidence directly shows the application lacks discussion of project assumptions, which aligns with the variable's requirements.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- Where is your documented list of assumptions? When was it last reviewed?
- For each of your top five assumptions, what would be the cost if it proved false tomorrow?
- What triggers or monitoring systems alert you when conditions change that invalidate assumptions?
- Which assumptions have you tested through evidence rather than discussion?

V3. Assumption Awareness

VIABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 — Systematic assumption management with regular testing and documented learnings.

Level 4 — Key assumptions documented and tested; monitoring systems in place.

Level 3 — Major assumptions identified with testing plans; some validation complete.

Level 2 — Assumptions being documented; testing beginning.

Level 1 — Some awareness of assumptions but not systematically tracked.

Level 0 CURRENT
Assumptions not identified or managed.

V4. Necessary Skills and Capabilities

VIABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Successful projects require the right skills at the right time—technical expertise, business capabilities, interpersonal skills, and domain knowledge. Understanding skill needs means mapping every capability required from current state to successful adoption, identifying gaps, and having concrete plans to fill them.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

All supported evidence was marked as tangential because none of the quotes directly address the team's awareness of necessary skills, their current capabilities, or how skill gaps will be addressed. The quotes discuss theoretical foundations in literature, planned activities, and technical terminology, but do not provide evidence about the team's skill assessment or capability planning as required by this variable.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- List every distinct skill required from current state to successful adoption. Which are not currently on your team?
- For each skill gap, name the specific person or organization you would contact to fill it.
- What technical expertise is genuinely scarce? What's your backup if primary sources become unavailable?
- Which team members actively pursue relevant learning and skill development?

V4. Necessary Skills and Capabilities

VIABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

- Level 5 — No gaps in skill or capability are left, solution in place, all are addressed.
- Level 4 — Critical skills covered, all gaps in the process of being addressed.
- Level 3 — Skills mapped; a specific plan to resolve all identified gaps.
- Level 2 — Necessary skills and capability systematically identified with some clear path to address gaps.
- Level 1 — Necessary skills and capabilities identified and gaps in team-skill explicitly identified.

Level 0 CURRENT
No consideration of necessary skills and capabilities.

V5. Communication Skills

VIABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Projects require persuading stakeholders, negotiating with partners, and communicating with customers. Effective communication means the ability to build cases with evidence, change minds through persuasion rather than authority, and listen to extract useful information from conversations.

CURRENT LEVEL

1 /5



Assessment Finding

The final score of 1 is based on two pieces of relevant evidence that demonstrate "clear and documented consideration of need for effective communication." Specifically, the application acknowledges the need for NewQ mentorship to "shape a quantum-appropriate commercial narrative" and ensure clear articulation of value propositions, which directly addresses consideration of communication strategy needs with stakeholders and adopters. Most other evidence was tangential, focusing on validation needs or feedback receipt rather than explicit communication strategy consideration.


Recommended Guidance

Initial consideration of this variable is evident. To strengthen your position, address the following questions:

- Describe when a team member successfully changed a stakeholder's position through evidence and persuasion.
- When did the team change a major decision based on a minority view? What was the decision?
- Which team member can communicate with and persuade stakeholders, partners, AND customers?
- What's your team's track record when gut instinct conflicted with evidence?

V5. Communication Skills

VIABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 Repeatedly demonstrated effective communication to diverse audiences.

Level 4 A track record of successful stakeholder and partner communications.

Level 3 Specific team-members are responsible for various forms of communication and the project has demonstrated iterative improvement in multiple forms of audience-specific communication.

Level 2 Systematic consideration of audiences and their respective communication requirements.

Level 1

CURRENT

Some consideration of different groups with whom communication is necessary, and some consideration of the diverse forms of communication required for these different groups (e.g. pitches, websites, investor documents, marketing documents, white papers, technical specifications).

Level 0 No consideration of the importance of effective communication to different necessary audiences (including internal team communications, external stakeholder communications, and customers, users, and beneficiaries).

V6. Essential and Committed Resources

VIABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Beyond financial capital, projects require diverse resources: people with specific expertise, key relationships, infrastructure, facilities, and specialized capabilities. Each essential resource needs clear commitment—documented, verbal, or assumed—and understanding of what happens if that commitment doesn't materialize.

CURRENT LEVEL

1 / 5



Assessment Finding

The final score of 1 is supported by two pieces of relevant evidence showing stakeholder verbal commitments: a specific time allocation of "10+ hours a week" and a declaration of being "Highly committed" to investing time and effort. These demonstrate the Level 1 requirement of stakeholders making verbal commitments and documenting necessary requirements, though they fall short of the documented commitment through to project completion required for higher levels.


Recommended Guidance

Initial consideration of this variable is evident. To strengthen your position, address the following questions:

- What essential resources beyond financial capital does your project require—people, relationships, infrastructure, capabilities?
- What resources are not necessary yet but will become necessary as your project progresses?
- For each essential resource, what type of commitment exists—documented, verbal, assumed, or none?
- For each person with essential resources, have you asked about their willingness to contribute?

V6. Essential and Committed Resources

VIABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

- Level 5 All essential resources committed with documented agreements and backup options.
- Level 4 Critical resources secured; remaining needs identified with clear acquisition path.
- Level 3 Essential resources systematically identified with some commitments obtained and backup options identified.
- Level 2 Essential resources systematically identified with potential sources.
- Level 1** CURRENT
Some essential resources identified with potential sources, commitments unclear.
- Level 0 Resource needs not considered.

V7. Strategic Dependency

VIABILITY

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Your project exists within an ecosystem where powerful entities may support or oppose you. Strategic dependency means understanding who could block your access to markets, resources, or customers—and what leverage or alternatives you have. This includes competitors, regulators, platform owners, and industry incumbents.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

All supported evidence was marked as tangential because the quotes discuss competitive landscape and product positioning rather than strategic dependency analysis. The variable requires analysis of agents or organizations who could resist adoption, benefit from non-adoption, or lock the applicant out of critical business networks - none of the quotes address these strategic dependency concerns directly.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- Map your complete ecosystem from suppliers to end users—where could a single entity deny you access?
- Which existing players would be harmed by your success? What power do they hold?
- Are any essential suppliers or platforms also serving competitors who might pressure them?
- What exclusive relationships or agreements could block your access to necessary resources?

V7. Strategic Dependency

VIABILITY



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 Ecosystem fully mapped; strategic position secured with multiple alternatives.

Level 4 All strategic dependencies identified, mitigation strategies in place.

Level 3 Detailed, complete, thorough ecosystem map with analysis of key players, forces, and relationships.

Level 2 Initial ecosystem analysis complete; vulnerabilities and strategic realities identified.

Level 1 Some awareness of strategic landscape but not systematically analyzed/mapped.

Level 0 CURRENT
Strategic dependencies and ecosystem dynamics not considered.

Psychosocial

Will the team succeed? (Will stakeholders work together?) Alignment, relationships, and team dynamics.

23%

of startups fail due to team problems and external psychosocial barriers. The psychosocial factors—alignment, relationships, clear roles, and healthy team dynamics—often determine whether a technically sound project succeeds or fractures under pressure.

Psychosocial factors concern the human dynamics that enable or undermine projects. Strategic alignment ensures everyone is pulling in the same direction. Clear success definitions prevent conflict. Defined roles prevent confusion. Relationship capabilities enable partnerships. And supporting initiative creates the psychological safety needed for innovation.

The Question:

"Will the team work together effectively?"

Variables:



P1. Definition of Success

PSYCHOSOCIAL

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Different stakeholders define success differently—team members seek career advancement, sponsors want strategic outcomes, customers need problems solved. When these definitions conflict, projects fracture. Success alignment means explicitly documenting what success means for each party and surfacing conflicts before they derail the project.

CURRENT LEVEL

1 /5



Assessment Finding

The application shows evidence of at least one individual's definition of success through a direct question about personal success criteria and the response "Slightly important" regarding adoption of ideas. This constitutes "some definitions of success" as required for Level 1, but there is no evidence of collective alignment, stakeholder definitions, or confirmation of achievability. The other quotes about project outcomes and capabilities are tangential as they describe what the project will do rather than explicit success definitions.


Recommended Guidance

Initial consideration of this variable is evident. To strengthen your position, address the following questions:

- Can each team member articulate in writing what personal success looks like for them through this project?
- Have you documented the sponsoring organization's definition of success separately from technical success criteria?
- When you compare each individual's definition against project goals, which become impossible if the project succeeds?
- What process have you used to surface and discuss potential conflicts between stakeholder definitions?

P1. Definition of Success

PSYCHOSOCIAL



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 All team members, the project, and all stakeholders definitions of success are documented and aligned with no incompatibilities.

Level 4 All stakeholder definitions of success have been validated.

Level 3 Stakeholder definitions of success have been considered but not validated.

Level 2 Team members have created and evaluated their own definitions of success, team member and project definitions are compatible.

Level 1 CURRENT

There is a definition of project success.

Level 0 Explicit definitions of success have not been considered.

P2. Roles and Responsibilities

PSYCHOSOCIAL

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Clear roles prevent confusion, dropped tasks, and interpersonal conflict. Everyone should know who leads, who decides, and who is accountable for what. This includes understanding not just formal assignments but whether responsible parties have the authority and resources to fulfill their responsibilities.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

No supported arguments with quotes were provided for this variable. Without any evidence to assess for relevance, the score remains 0, indicating that no decision-making process or leadership structure has been documented or identified in the application materials.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- Would each team member describe the same person as the project leader?
- For critical activities, who specifically is responsible? Have they explicitly accepted?
- What documented decision-making process exists for resolving disagreements?
- Which essential activities have no clearly assigned owner?

P2. Roles and Responsibilities

PSYCHOSOCIAL



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 All roles documented, accepted, and regularly reviewed with clear decision processes.

Level 4 Key roles clearly assigned; decision-making processes established.

Level 3 Major responsibilities assigned; some documentation in place.

Level 2 Initial role discussions; primary responsibilities identified.

Level 1 Informal understanding of roles but not explicitly documented.

Level 0

CURRENT

Roles and responsibilities unclear or not discussed.

P3. Strategic Alignment

PSYCHOSOCIAL

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Your project must align with the strategies of sponsor and stakeholder organizations. Misalignment creates friction, resource competition, and ultimately abandonment. Understanding alignment means knowing each stakeholder's actual strategy (not assumed), how your project fits within it, and what happens when priorities conflict.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

No evidence was found to be directly relevant to stakeholder organizational strategies or their alignment. All quotes discuss operational aspects, organizational identification, or technical validation, but none address whether stakeholder strategies are clear, have been considered, or are aligned with the project outcomes. The absence of any discussion about stakeholder strategic alignment suggests this aspect has not been considered, supporting a score of 0.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- What is your project's strategy in 2-3 sentences? Would each team member say the same thing?
- What are the specific strategies of each sponsor/stakeholder organization? What's your source?
- Do individual stakeholders have a shared understanding of their organization's strategy?
- Do any stakeholder strategies compete with or conflict with each other?

P3. Strategic Alignment

PSYCHOSOCIAL



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 Every member of stakeholder organisations know what their strategy is, are committed to it, and their strategy is aligned with your strategy, and your project is a confirmed strategic priority for stakeholders.

Level 4 Understanding of all stakeholder strategies are verified, assumptions have been eliminated.

Level 3 Everyone internal knows and is committed to the team strategy, stakeholder strategies are known and there is alignment between team strategy and stakeholder strategy.

Level 2 Awareness of stakeholder strategies is demonstrated with some consideration of alignment between team strategy and stakeholder strategy.

Level 1 Internal/team strategy is articulated and all team members share a cohesive understanding of the team strategy.

Level 0

CURRENT

Stakeholder strategies and internal/team strategy not considered.

P4. Supporting Initiative

PSYCHOSOCIAL

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Healthy teams encourage initiative—people identify problems and take action without waiting for direction, and ideas are judged on merit rather than source. Supporting initiative means creating psychological safety for team members to take risks, challenge assumptions, and advocate for positions with evidence.

CURRENT LEVEL

0 /5



Assessment Finding

No supported arguments with quotes were provided for this variable. Without any evidence to evaluate for relevance, the score remains 0, indicating that team dynamics regarding adopting ideas and opinions of different members has not been considered or documented in the available materials.


Recommended Guidance

This variable has not yet been considered. To increase your project's chance of success, address the following questions:

- In the last month, which team members identified problems and took action without direction?
- When did the team adopt an idea from someone other than the leader? What led to adoption?
- When team members disagree, does one person's view consistently prevail?
- How does your team handle situations where someone invested effort in an approach that evidence suggests abandoning?

P4. Supporting Initiative

PSYCHOSOCIAL



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5 Evidence of effective idea sharing, assistance-giving and a culture of individual initiative, evidence that the culture and leadership is effective at encouraging ideation and self-initiated action, systems in place to acknowledge and reward ideation, communication, and initiative, assistance-giving, and honesty with peers and superiors.

Level 4 Well articulated self-awareness of team project culture and its impact, evidence of differences of opinion, healthy debate. People feel safe to voice disagreement or have reliable channels through which to express concern.

Level 3 Generally supportive, some indication of idea-sharing, initiative taking, some consideration of systems to support initiative, ideation, assistance-giving, some self awareness of culture.

Level 2 Some evidence of team members assisting each other and sharing valuable information with each other to facilitate initiative and constructive action.

Level 1 Some indicators of individual initiative and no indicators of dictatorship.

Level 0

CURRENT

Evidence that team members only act upon the direct instruction of one specific team member, and/or no evidence of individual initiative or leadership within the team.

P5. Relationship Building

PSYCHOSOCIAL

What this variable is (and why it matters)

Projects succeed through relationships—with partners, customers, stakeholders, and team members. Relationship building capability means having the skills and experience to establish trust, navigate power imbalances, work across cultural boundaries, and maintain relationships through difficulties.

CURRENT LEVEL

5 /5



Assessment Finding

The score of 5 is supported by two pieces of relevant evidence demonstrating established capability to work with others and establish mutually beneficial relationships. The detailed industry feedback from [REDACTED] and the validation from early industry engagement both show the applicants have successfully built relationships with external stakeholders who are willing to provide constructive, detailed feedback on their proposed work.

Recommended Guidance

Good progress has been made on this variable. To further strengthen your position, consider the following questions:

- What is your team's track record of establishing productive partnerships? Name three successful collaborations.
- Have key team members experienced significant partnership breakdowns? What were the root causes?
- What relationship-building experience do team members bring from previous roles?
- When entering a new partnership, what practices do you follow to set expectations?

P5. Relationship Building

PSYCHOSOCIAL



Evidence Levels

What informed the scoring for this variable

Level 5

CURRENT

Strong track record of successful relationship-building across diverse contexts. Strong evidence of activities or actions that foster, deliver, or maintain relationships.

Level 4 — Clear evidence of maintaining and growing initiated relationships, and/or evidence of actions taken towards the maintenance, growth, and initiation of relationships.

Level 3 — Clear evidence of initiating new relationships.

Level 2 — Clear consideration of necessary relationships and indicators of actions to initiate relationships.

Level 1 — Clear consideration of necessary relationships.

Level 0 — There is nothing to indicate awareness and consideration of the importance of personal relationships, nor any indications of activities to foster and maintain relationships.