SDI ScienceDocs Inc.
Research • Funding • AI Strategy • Est. 2004

Technology-to-Market Gap Analysis

A practical worksheet for identifying the gaps between a promising technology and a fundable, testable, market-ready opportunity.

Purpose

Use this template to evaluate whether a technology, invention, prototype, research output, software concept, or university spinout opportunity is ready to move toward customers, funding, pilots, licensing, commercialization, or launch. The goal is to convert technical promise into a clear set of market-facing gaps and next actions.

1. Opportunity Snapshot

Technology / Project Name		**Prepared By**	
Organization / Team		**Date**	
Primary Application		**Target Market**	
Development Stage	☐ Concept ☐ Prototype ☐ Pilot ☐ Launch-ready	**Funding Stage**	☐ Pre-funding ☐ SBIR/STTR ☐ Seed ☐ Partner-funded
Intended Customer		**Primary User**	
Commercialization Pathway	☐ Product ☐ Service ☐ License ☐ Spinout ☐ Partnership	**Time Horizon**	☐ 0-6 mo ☐ 6-18 mo ☐ 18+ mo
Overall Readiness Impression	☐ Early exploration ☐ Needs validation ☐ Pilot-ready ☐ Commercialization-ready	**Priority Level**	☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

2. Scoring Guide

Score	Meaning	How to Interpret
0	Major gap / unknown	Little evidence is available. This area may block funding, licensing, partnership, or pilot activity.
1	Early or weak evidence	Some thinking exists, but assumptions still require validation or documentation.
2	Moderate readiness	Evidence is emerging, but the team needs stronger proof, plans, or execution details.
3	Strong readiness	The team has credible evidence, a clear plan, and a defensible rationale for next steps.

3. Gap Assessment Checklist

A. Problem, User, and Market Fit

Gap / Evidence Question	Score 0-3	Evidence Source	Notes / Next Action
The problem is clearly defined in the language of the target user or customer.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The target user, buyer, payer, or decision-maker is specific enough to guide discovery.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
There is evidence that the problem is frequent, costly, urgent, risky, or strategically important.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
Current alternatives, workarounds, manual processes, or competing solutions are documented.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The team can explain why the current alternatives are insufficient.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
Early interviews, conversations, letters of support, or market signals support the opportunity.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		

B. Technology and Productization Readiness

Gap / Evidence Question	Score 0-3	Evidence Source	Notes / Next Action
The scientific or technical basis is credible and can be explained to non-specialist stakeholders.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
Core performance claims are supported by data, experiments, literature, prototypes, or simulations.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The technology can be translated into a usable product, service, workflow, platform, or license package.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
Known technical risks, performance limits, reliability concerns, or scalability constraints are documented.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The team understands what must be built before a pilot, customer test, or license discussion.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
Integration requirements, usability needs, documentation, and support needs have been considered.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		

C. Differentiation, IP, and Competitive Position

Gap / Evidence Question	Score 0-3	Evidence Source	Notes / Next Action
The team can describe what is new, better, faster, cheaper, safer, or more useful about the approach.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
Competing technologies, products, services, research approaches, or substitute workflows are identified.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
IP ownership, invention disclosure, patent status, data rights, or licensing constraints are understood.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The technology has a defensible advantage beyond general technical novelty.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The team can explain why a customer, partner, licensee, or funder would care about the advantage.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		

D. Business Model, Funding, and Commercialization Fit

Gap / Evidence Question	Score 0-3	Evidence Source	Notes / Next Action
A plausible commercialization pathway has been identified: product, SaaS, service, license, spinout, or partnership.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The likely buyer, payer, procurement route, or adoption decision process is understood.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The team has a basic view of market size, segment priorities, and early adopter profile.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The next funding pathway is plausible: SBIR/STTR, foundation, translational grant, seed capital, strategic partner, or internal investment.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The milestones needed for the next funding or partnership step are specific and measurable.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
Commercialization assumptions can be tested through low-cost discovery before major investment.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		

E. Regulatory, Evidence, Adoption, and Implementation Fit

Gap / Evidence Question	Score 0-3	Evidence Source	Notes / Next Action
Potential regulatory, compliance, privacy, safety, quality, reimbursement, or procurement issues have been screened.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The team understands what evidence will be needed to convince users, buyers, payers, or partners.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
Pilot or demonstration requirements are realistic and connected to stakeholder priorities.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
Workflow, training, implementation, and adoption barriers have been considered.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		
The organization has access to the people, data, partners, and technical capacity needed for the next step.	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		

4. Gap Summary Scorecard

Readiness Area	0-3 Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Gap Severity	Owner / Due Date
Problem / User Fit		☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		☐ Low ☐ Med ☐ High	
Technology / Productization		☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		☐ Low ☐ Med ☐ High	
Differentiation / IP		☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		☐ Low ☐ Med ☐ High	
Market / Business Model		☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		☐ Low ☐ Med ☐ High	
Funding / Milestones		☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		☐ Low ☐ Med ☐ High	
Regulatory / Evidence / Adoption		☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3		☐ Low ☐ Med ☐ High	

5. Highest-Priority Gaps

Gap / Missing Evidence	Why It Matters	Evidence Needed	Owner	Target Date

6. Assumption Testing Plan

Key Assumption	Test Method	Evidence / Data Source	Success Signal	Risk if Wrong	Next Action

7. 30 / 60 / 90-Day Action Plan

Period	Priority Activities	Deliverable / Evidence	Owner(s)	Decision Point
0-30 Days				
31-60 Days				
61-90 Days				

8. Go / No-Go / Rework Decision

SDI ScienceDocs Inc.
Research • Funding • AI Strategy • Est. 2004

Recommended Decision	☐ Continue exploration ☐ Seek funding ☐ Prepare pilot ☐ Pursue licensing/partnering ☐ Rework concept ☐ Pause
Rationale	
Immediate Next Step	
Decision Owner / Date	

ScienceDocs Support

Need help applying this tool? ScienceDocs supports commercialization strategy, change management, AI adoption, grant strategy, SBIR/STTR planning, technology transition, and operational optimization for research teams, startups, university spinouts, and innovation-driven organizations.