

FOUNDER BRIEFING PACK

Foundry EAM / Max Connect

Interview analysis, survey evidence, and GTM
recommendations for the founding team · Foundry
EAM naming direction

Prepared for: Foundry EAM / Max Connect founding
team

Prepared: 2026-09-
04

Contents

1. Executive briefing
2. Interview analysis
3. Survey analysis
4. GTM ideas

Prepared from the Max Connect source room, NotebookLM corpus, Andrew/Rich/Hadrian founding-team interview notes, survey responses, and existing competitor analysis. Founding-team-facing; not public collateral.

Executive briefing

CORE DIRECTION

Independent asset intelligence

Use Maximo/MAS as the first wedge, but do not become another Maximo SI.

FIRST SELLABLE PRODUCT

Paid diagnostic

A short value/readiness assessment that produces a roadmap, scorecard and business-case evidence.

SURVEY EVIDENCE

26 responses

Pain clusters around data quality, process disconnect, maturity, change, roadmap and ROI proof.

IMMEDIATE CHANNEL

Warm follow-ups

21 survey respondents are open to follow-up, creating a practical validation and sales route.

The emerging opportunity is to help asset-heavy organisations identify where Maximo/MAS value is trapped, what to fix first, and how to move forward without vendor hype or unnecessary programme overhead.

Recommended next decision: agree the first diagnostic to test in the next 30 days — likely an *Asset Intelligence Diagnostic: Maximo/MAS Value and Readiness Sprint*.

Foundry EAM / Max Connect — Interview analysis for the founding team

Date: 2026-09-04

Audience: founding team

Status: founding-team-facing draft, not public pack copy

Working name: Foundry EAM is now the preferred naming direction; `www.foundry-eam.com` is the corrected target domain. Max Connect remains the evidence-history handle until the founding team confirms registration/DNS and legal availability.

Sources used

- Rich Barber / Ant interview notes — Rich | Ant - 2026/07/24 16:29 BST - Notes by Gemini , NotebookLM source 854c3c8e-dea8-4fb8-bda3-eb2a17649fcd .
- Andrew Carrie / Ant interview notes — MaxConnect - 2026/07/27 16:28 BST - Notes by Gemini , NotebookLM source 88a102aa-a89a-48eb-8e20-ed930b18a1c4 .
- Hadrian / earlier interview note — 2026-07-16-max-connect-interview-notes-by-gemini.pdf , NotebookLM source 8d9b797b-91a5-412a-9220-cacba9d1fa1c .
- Existing Max Connect competitor analysis and source-room material in the truth repo.

Executive readout

The interviews have moved the proposition forward. The shared direction is no longer “start a Maximo implementation consultancy”. The strongest emerging shape is:

An independent asset-intelligence and EAM advisory business that helps Maximo/MAS-heavy organisations work out what to do next, where value is trapped, what should be fixed first, and which delivery route is credible — supported by lightweight discovery products, evidence-led assessment tools, and eventually recurring software/agent products.

Rich and Andrew agree on the underlying opportunity but emphasise different parts of it.

- Rich anchors the business in **trust, honesty, end-user protection, discovery and pragmatic problem-solving**.
- Andrew anchors it in **asset intelligence, independence, scalable tooling, SAMP/ISO-led artefacts, ARR and a more ambitious productised model**.
- Hadrian’s value in the founding-team mix is not “another technical validator”; it is the bridge between Maximo/asset-management reality, enterprise value language, and a credible proposition that can stand in front of senior buyers.

The strongest current direction is a staged model:

1. **Entry wedge:** quick, paid discovery / maturity / readiness assessment.
2. **Core advisory layer:** asset-intelligence roadmap, SAMP/ISO 55001-aligned planning, Maximo/MAS improvement prioritisation, business-case support.
3. **Delivery orchestration:** help clients get the right work done through the right partner ecosystem, with Max Connect acting as independent custodian rather than generic SI.
4. **Product layer:** reusable assessment tooling, dashboards, monitoring, configuration guardrails, and eventually annual-recurring products or agent-assisted services.

What Rich said, in proposition terms

1. The business exists because users do not get honest help

Rich's clearest signal is that many Maximo users are under-served because they manage Maximo alongside a day job and do not have the time, internal capability or honest external support to get full value from it.

The repeated language is: truth, honesty, relevance, straight-talking, and not overselling.

Implication:

- The company should not lead with "we implement Maximo".
- It should lead with "we help you understand what is really going on, what Maximo/MAS can and cannot do for you, and what action is worth paying for."

This gives the proposition a trust-based wedge that is different from a partner or SI pitch.

2. Discovery is the natural first paid product

Rich supported a lightweight discovery/assessment entry point. The range discussed was roughly **£5k–£10k** as a hook fee to solve an immediate problem or create a costed/time-based plan.

The point is not to sell discovery for its own sake. The point is that it gives clients:

- clarity on the real problem;
- a business case or costed plan;
- proof of whether an idea is feasible;
- confidence before they commit to larger change;
- a low-risk way to experience Max Connect's honesty.

Implication:

- First commercial packaging should probably be a clear, fixed-scope diagnostic rather than open-ended consulting.
- It should be short, useful and easy to buy.
- It should protect against scope creep by stating what it will and will not solve.

3. The target customer is the middle of the market / long-term operators

Rich does not describe the ideal client as the biggest enterprise transformation buyer. He points toward the "middle ground": people who live with Maximo for years and need practical help to make it work better.

This includes:

- Maximo owners who have inherited responsibility;
- maintenance/operations people who understand pain but not always the business case;
- teams who rely on partners but suspect they are not getting straight answers;
- organisations that have upgraded but do not know what to do next;
- organisations stuck before upgrade because the decision is unclear.

Implication:

- The GTM should not only target the C-suite.
- It needs a bottom-up route through user/community trust, plus a business-case artefact that lets operators escalate the case internally.

4. The offer must stay values-led

Rich is explicit that the business should retain the ability to turn down wrong-fit work. This matters commercially because a “vehicle that needs to be fed” becomes indistinguishable from every other consultancy.

Implication:

- Founder alignment should include kill criteria: what work will Max Connect refuse?
- Brand should make the no-nonsense, independent stance visible.
- The business should avoid becoming dependent on generic resource augmentation.

What Andrew said, in proposition terms

1. Andrew moves the frame from Maximo consultancy to asset intelligence

Andrew's strongest phrase is **asset intelligence consultancy**. That matters. It moves the business away from a narrow Maximo brand and toward a buyer problem: making better decisions about assets, data, systems, work, risk and value.

Andrew also argues that the business should remain **agnostic** rather than exclusively aligned to Maximo.

Implication:

- “Max Connect” may be the wrong name because the market is already full of “Max” businesses and because a Maximo-only name may constrain the future.
- The first beachhead can still be Maximo/MAS because that is where the team has unfair insight.
- The long-term category should be asset intelligence / EAM decision support, not Maximo implementation.

2. Andrew sees a market gap between small specialists and large SIs

Andrew names competitors across tiers: Max Logic, Max Iron/Max Ion, MACS/MECS EU, Naviam/BPD Zenith, Cohesive, Arcadis, Capgemini, Accenture, KPMG.

His point is that small players exist, then the market jumps to larger, heavier consultancies. Large firms are too slow, bureaucratic or programme-oriented for many smaller but valuable client needs.

Implication:

- Max Connect should avoid trying to outmuscle Cohesive/Naviam/Capgemini as a delivery SI.
- The opportunity is in the work large firms do not want or handle badly: early diagnosis, roadmap, business case, improvement prioritisation, buyer-side assurance, and practical tooling.

3. Andrew introduces a more ambitious scale model

Andrew imagines an eventual business with around **30 dedicated experts** as a credible expert shopfront, with a product/ARR layer behind it.

The consulting team creates the expertise, relationships and real-world evidence. The software layer scales the repeatable parts.

Implication:

- Consultancy is not the end state; it is the learning engine and credibility layer.
- Tooling should not wait until the consultancy is mature. Tooling should be developed from the beginning where it helps discovery, scoring, reporting and repeatability.
- Product strategy should emerge from repeated client problems, not from speculative SaaS.

4. Andrew's strongest product direction is not "write reports faster"; it is reimagining the artefact

Andrew talks about SAMP / ISO 55001 / strategic asset-management planning artefacts and warns against static documents that get signed off and then sit in a drawer.

Ant's maturity-assessment tooling resonated because it turns discovery into a living benchmark: roles, evidence, scores, opportunities, deltas, and next actions.

Implication:

- Max Connect should productise living assessment and roadmap artefacts.
- A compelling first product could be an "Asset Intelligence Readiness / Roadmap" tool that generates consultant-grade reports but remains alive over time.
- The differentiator is not "AI writes a PDF"; it is "the assessment becomes an operational decision layer".

5. Andrew's commercial model is value-linked

Andrew gives an example where reducing inspections on a remote oil rig could save £100k+ annually, making a £50k annual product or service fee plausible if the evidence trail proves savings.

Implication:

- Small discovery work can be sold to operators.
- Larger recurring value must be justified through quantified asset, maintenance, risk, inspection, downtime or operational savings.
- The offer should create a value-evidence trail from day one.

Where Rich and Andrew agree

1. Do not be another Maximo SI

Both point away from generic implementation. Rich says the business should not be “another Maximo installer”. Andrew says pure deploying/executing is a race to the bottom.

Working conclusion:

Max Connect should not sell itself as a Maximo implementation house. It should sell independent asset/EAM clarity, then selectively deliver or orchestrate the work that follows.

2. Discovery is the first commercial wedge

Both converge on initial diagnosis/discovery as the easiest entry point.

The discovery wedge should produce tangible outputs:

- current-state assessment;
- pain/risk map;
- value opportunity map;
- priority roadmap;
- business-case inputs;
- stakeholder alignment view;
- quick wins;
- delivery options.

3. The team's advantage is trust plus lived experience plus tooling

The interviews support a three-part edge:

1. trusted Maximo/community access and credibility;
2. deep practical understanding of asset-management and Maximo/MAS reality;
3. ability to turn discovery into repeatable tooling and sharper client artefacts.

4. Client pain is often not “we need a system”; it is “we do not know how to extract value from the system we already have”

This is a better market problem than “upgrade to MAS”. It includes upgrade decisions, but is broader.

Where Rich and Andrew differ

Rich is more grounded in immediate trust and usefulness

Rich's version is closer to:

- help users;
- tell the truth;
- solve real problems;
- keep it affordable;
- stay authentic;

- avoid becoming a hungry consultancy machine.

This is valuable because it protects the brand and gives the first wedge emotional credibility.

Andrew is more explicit about scale and category

Andrew's version is closer to:

- independent asset intelligence;
- 30-person expert consultancy;
- ARR/product layer;
- SAMP/ISO/roadmap artefacts;
- quantified savings;
- tooling-enabled self-service/configuration guardrails.

This is valuable because it gives the business a larger ambition and a path beyond day-rate consulting.

Combined implication

The proposition should combine both:

Rich gives the business its trust posture. Andrew gives it its scalable category and commercial ambition.

Hadrian's role in the founding team should be to help turn the shared Rich/Andrew/Ant evidence into a credible enterprise proposition, not to make this a one-person decision.

Emerging proposition options

Option A — Independent Maximo/MAS discovery and readiness

What it is: a focused diagnostic for organisations stuck on Maximo/MAS upgrade, value extraction, roadmap or partner choice.

Why it works: easiest to understand from current network and evidence.

Risk: may trap the business in a Maximo-only frame and compete too closely with partners.

Option B — Asset Intelligence Readiness Assessment

What it is: a broader asset-management maturity/value assessment using Maximo/MAS as one lens, not the whole category.

Why it works: aligns with Andrew's "asset intelligence" language and Ant's maturity/reporting tooling.

Risk: needs sharper buyer language and proof that clients will buy it before they know they need it.

Option C — Buyer-side EAM roadmap and partner assurance

What it is: Max Connect helps asset-heavy organisations decide what to do, build business cases, choose/brief partners, and govern delivery.

Why it works: avoids direct SI competition and leverages independence.

Risk: must prove enough authority to influence procurement and senior budgets.

Option D — Productised SAMP / ISO 55001 / asset roadmap engine

What it is: a tooling-led way to create and maintain living strategic asset-management plans, asset information plans, and improvement roadmaps.

Why it works: strongest differentiated product idea from Andrew.

Risk: more complex to sell; needs a narrow first use case.

Recommended synthesis

The strongest near-term proposition is not one of these alone. It is a sequence:

1. **Paid diagnostic:** Asset Intelligence / Maximo Value Discovery.
2. **Client artefact:** living roadmap, scorecard, evidence pack, business-case view.
3. **Follow-on work:** advisory, partner selection, implementation support, data/workflow/productivity improvements.
4. **Product loop:** turn repeated findings into tools: assessment engine, dashboards, configuration guardrails, value tracking.

Suggested language for founding-team discussion

We are not trying to become another Maximo SI. The interviews point to an independent asset-intelligence business that starts with Maximo/MAS because that is where the team has trust and evidence. The first sellable product should be a paid discovery/readiness assessment that gives clients clarity, a roadmap and a business case. The longer-term opportunity is to productise that assessment into living tools, dashboards and guardrails that create recurring revenue and make the consultancy scalable.

Key decisions still needed

1. **Name/category:** confirm Foundry as the new trading/product name, keep Max Connect as an internal/evidence handle, or test alternatives?
2. **First wedge:** Maximo/MAS readiness, asset intelligence maturity, SAMP/ISO roadmap, or buyer-side partner assurance?
3. **Initial price point:** £5k–£10k lightweight diagnostic, £15k–£25k fuller assessment, or both?
4. **Target buyer:** operations/maintenance route-in, senior asset-management/CTO route-in, or dual path?
5. **Partner stance:** independent advisory only, delivery orchestration, or selective implementation?
6. **Product ambition:** when do we start building reusable tooling into the offer?

Recommended next founding-team workshop

A useful 90-minute workshop should answer:

1. If we had to describe the business in one sentence, what is it?
2. What buyer problem are we willing to own first?
3. What first paid diagnostic can we sell within 30 days?
4. What does the client receive at the end?
5. What proof do we need from survey respondents or known clients?
6. What work will we refuse?
7. What role does each partner play in selling, diagnosis, delivery, tooling and governance?
8. Does Foundry give us enough room to grow beyond Maximo while still letting the EAM wedge make sense?

Foundry EAM / Max Connect — MAS Unlocked 2 survey analysis for the founding team

Date: 2026-09-04

Audience: founding team

Status: founding-team-facing draft, not public pack copy

Survey source: MAS Unlocked 2 Survey Responses – Form Responses 12-07.csv / NotebookLM source MAS Unlocked 2 Survey

Response count: 26

Executive readout

The survey provides strong customer/community evidence that the opportunity is not simply “help people migrate to MAS”. The sharper signal is:

Maximo/MAS customers are struggling to convert existing system investment into operational value because of poor data quality, weak process alignment, unclear requirements, insufficient business maturity, and lack of practical internal capability.

The survey supports the same direction as the interviews: a buyer-side / user-side diagnostic and roadmap offer, with a strong emphasis on data, maturity, business case, change management and practical adoption.

The most important numbers:

- **26 responses.**
- **23/26** are either already on MAS or planning migration within 12 months.
- **20/26** selected poor data quality as a top asset-management pain point.
- **16/26** selected disconnect between the system and real-world processes.
- **13/26** selected business not mature enough as a major hurdle to implementing change.
- **12/26** selected real-life use cases to support the business case as a missing ROI link.
- **12/26** selected comprehensive change management and training as a missing ROI link.
- **11/26** selected strategic roadmap/planning as a missing ROI link.
- **21/26** said yes to follow-up virtual coffee / sounding-board activity.

This is meaningful because it points to active demand for a practical, consultative, evidence-led offer. It also gives the team named-account follow-up routes.

Respondent profile

Industries

The survey skews heavily toward asset-heavy sectors where Maximo value should matter:

Sector	Mentions
Energy & Utilities	17
Transportation	4
Government	3
Research & Public Sector	3
Pharmaceuticals & Biotechnology	3
Chemicals & Petrochemicals	2
Maximo Business Partner	1
Facilities Management	1
Food & Beverage	1
Logistics & Supply Chain	1
IT services	1
Renewables	1

Note: this is a multi-select style field, so counts can exceed 26.

Implication

The strongest initial vertical language should probably be asset-heavy, regulated, reliability-sensitive environments:

- energy;
- utilities;
- transport;
- infrastructure;
- pharma / validated environments;
- public-sector asset estates.

This fits Andrew's asset-intelligence framing better than a narrow software-service framing.

Maximo/MAS maturity and timing

Current version

Version state	Responses
MAS 9.x	13
Maximo 7.6x	10
MAS 8.x	2
Not sure	1

MAS migration plan

Plan	Responses
Already migrated	15
Within 12 months	6
1–2 years	5

Implication

The market is split between:

1. **Already migrated but not fully realising value.**
2. **Still on 7.6x and facing decision/risk/roadmap pressure.**
3. **Near-term migration planners needing clarity, sequencing and business case.**

This supports two adjacent first offers:

- **Post-MAS Value Realisation Diagnostic** — for organisations that have moved but are not getting the benefits.
- **MAS Readiness / Roadmap Diagnostic** — for organisations still deciding or preparing.

The survey suggests the first may be just as important as the second. Migration alone is not the value event; the value event is adoption, data/process alignment and operational use.

Priority MAS capabilities

Top selected modules/capabilities:

Capability	Responses
Manage	15
Health	13
Mobile	13
Monitor	10
Schedule	10
AI	7
Visual Inspection	6
Predict	5
MREF	3
Assist	1

Interpretation

There is strong interest in practical operational extensions, not just the core system:

- Manage remains the anchor.
- Health and Mobile are the most obvious near-term value expansion points.
- Monitor and Schedule also have significant demand.
- AI is present but not dominant; it should be framed as practical augmentation, not AI theatre.

GTM implication

Lead with operational value language:

- asset health;
- mobile execution;
- scheduling/productivity;
- reliability insight;
- maintenance workflow improvement;
- better use of data already inside Maximo.

Avoid leading with generic "AI transformation". AI should be used as a mechanism inside assessment/reporting/tooling, not as the headline unless a specific buyer problem demands it.

Top pain points

Pain point	Responses
Poor data quality	20
Disconnect between system and real-world processes	16
System performance/speed	9
Low user adoption / difficult interface	7
Lack of mobile capability	7
Reporting limitations	4
AppPoints	3

Additional single-response pain points included business process variations, cloud solutions, Red Hat, scheduler capability, and uncertainty about how to use existing Maximo licence capability.

Interpretation

The dominant problem is not one module. It is the operating layer around the system:

- data is not trusted;
- process in Maximo does not match real work;
- users do not adopt the system because it does not fit their world;
- reporting and insight are limited because the data/process foundation is poor;
- organisations struggle to know what to do next.

This strongly supports an assessment-led offer. A pure implementation offer would miss the upstream causes.

Biggest hurdles to implementing new features/change

Hurdle	Responses
Business not mature enough	13
Required data not available	11
Unclear business requirements	10
Budget constraints	10
Resistance to change from end-users	9
Lack of internal technical expertise	6
Complex legacy integrations	6
Training	5

Additional responses included strict quality/validation, avoiding over-specified “bells and whistles”, IT reluctance to change vanilla Maximo, and process alignment.

Interpretation

This is one of the strongest survey sections for Max Connect.

Customers are not just asking for configuration. They are describing blockers that sit before configuration:

- maturity;
- data readiness;
- requirement clarity;
- budget case;
- change readiness;
- technical confidence;
- governance.

These are exactly the things an independent advisory/discovery business can diagnose and package into an actionable roadmap.

Advanced capabilities currently used or explored

Capability	Responses
Mobile execution	15
None of the above	8
AI / Predictive analytics	7
IoT integration	5
AI agents	5
Spatial/GIS integration	5
AI assistant	4
Inventory optimisation	4
Automated scheduling	3

Interpretation

There is curiosity and some exploration, but the market is not uniformly advanced. A large enough segment is still at “none of the above” to suggest that a maturity/roadmap entry point is necessary.

Implication

Do not assume customers are ready to buy advanced AI/agent products immediately. Instead:

1. diagnose maturity;

- 2. identify where advanced capability could produce value;
- 3. show the data/process prerequisites;
- 4. create a staged roadmap;
- 5. productise repeatable parts after proof.

Missing link to ROI

Missing link	Responses
Real-life use cases to support initial business case	12
Comprehensive change management & training	12
Strategic roadmap/planning	11
Better workflow design	8
System upgrades/development	7

Interpretation

This is very strong evidence for the Max Connect proposition.

The missing ROI link is not “more features”. It is:

- evidence for the business case;
- change and adoption support;
- strategic roadmap;
- workflow redesign;
- targeted upgrades/development.

This supports a founder-facing claim:

Customers need a practical bridge between MAS capability and business value.
The bridge is not just technical implementation; it is evidence, roadmap, change, workflow and confidence.

Follow-up willingness

Follow-up answer	Responses
Yes	21
Happy to do a quick 1-on-1 review	11
Interested in joining a peer group workshop	10
Not at this time	5
Prefer survey results at December event	5

Interpretation

This is a live GTM asset. The survey is not only evidence; it is a follow-up pipeline.

The immediate commercial opportunity is not to cold-launch a proposition. It is to run structured follow-up coffees / peer workshops and use those conversations to validate the first diagnostic offer.

Topic requests / qualitative signals

Recurring qualitative themes include:

- Scheduler / Health / Manage / work management;
- business user access vs provider access;
- what customers can safely do themselves without risking the system;
- reducing change-request cost;
- condition-based maintenance;
- large-scale asset data management;
- managing data capture and keeping asset data up to date;
- asset replacement;
- Red Hat/OpenShift and application updates;
- real case studies and examples from MAS Unlocked.

Interpretation

Several responses point directly at Andrew's "self-service with guardrails" idea:

Customers want to know what they can safely do themselves and where they still need provider/partner help.

This is a strong wedge for independent advisory and tooling:

- safe self-service readiness;
- provider-dependence reduction;
- data quality/actionability;
- governed configuration/change;
- business-case evidence.

Segment opportunities

Segment 1 — Already migrated, value not realised

Signals:

- 15 already migrated;
- high pain around data quality and process disconnect;
- interest in Manage, Health, Mobile, Monitor, Schedule.

Likely offer:

MAS Value Realisation Diagnostic

Outputs:

- value leakage map;
- adoption/process fit assessment;
- data quality and reporting readiness view;
- module-priority roadmap;
- quick-win improvement backlog;
- business-case evidence.

Segment 2 — 7.6x / pre-MAS decision-makers

Signals:

- 10 still on Maximo 7.6x;
- 11 planning over 12 months or within 1–2 years;
- budget and requirements uncertainty.

Likely offer:

MAS Readiness and Decision Roadmap

Outputs:

- upgrade risk/decision map;
- readiness score;
- AppPoints/licensing questions;
- data/process prerequisites;
- stakeholder alignment pack;
- partner/procurement brief.

Segment 3 — Operators with underused functionality

Signals:

- users want better workflow, mobile, health, data capture, reporting;
- “what can we do ourselves vs provider” appeared in qualitative responses.

Likely offer:

Maximo Self-Service with Guardrails Assessment

Outputs:

- what can be configured safely internally;
- what should remain partner-led;
- cost-of-change reduction opportunities;
- governance model;
- training/adoption plan.

Segment 4 — Asset data and reliability improvement

Signals:

- poor data quality is the top pain;
- asset data topics requested explicitly;
- Health/Mobile/Monitor interest is high.

Likely offer:

Asset Data to Asset Insight Sprint

Outputs:

- asset data quality profile;
- priority data fixes;
- health/mobile/reporting use cases;
- operational dashboard concept;
- evidence trail for ROI.

Recommended founder-level interpretation

The survey validates the problem space more than any single offer. It says:

1. Customers are in or approaching MAS, but value realisation is uneven.
2. Data quality and process mismatch are the loudest operational pains.
3. Change is blocked by maturity, unclear requirements, budget and resistance.
4. Customers need evidence and real examples to support business cases.
5. There is willingness to continue the conversation.

This points to a business that should sell clarity and momentum before selling implementation.

Suggested follow-up actions

1. Run 8–10 structured follow-up coffees

Prioritise respondents from:

- Energy & Utilities;
- Transportation;

- organisations already on MAS 9.x but reporting data/process pain;
- organisations still on 7.6x with a near-term migration timeline;
- respondents who selected both "business not mature enough" and "strategic roadmap/planning".

2. Use one consistent follow-up script

Questions should test:

1. What is the most expensive Maximo/MAS problem you have right now?
2. Is the blocker data, process, people, partner, budget or platform?
3. What have you already tried?
4. What would make a business case credible internally?
5. Who owns budget for this?
6. Would a short independent diagnostic be useful?
7. What would it need to produce to be worth paying for?
8. What price would feel easy to approve?
9. Who else should be in the conversation?

3. Package a survey-backed first offer

Recommended first offer:

Asset Intelligence Diagnostic: Maximo/MAS Value and Readiness Sprint

Positioning:

For asset-heavy organisations using or moving to MAS who need to turn Maximo capability into measurable operational value.

Deliverables:

- evidence-backed current-state scorecard;
- data/process/adoption pain map;
- value opportunity map;
- module and roadmap recommendations;
- business-case evidence pack;
- immediate next-step plan.

4. Create a founding-team-ready slide/report pack

This survey report can become:

- 1-page executive summary;
- survey evidence section;
- proposition implications;
- follow-up plan;
- draft offer page.

Things not yet proven

The survey does not yet prove:

- exact willingness to pay;
- whether buyers prefer independent advisory vs partner delivery;
- which job title signs budget;
- whether a £5k–£10k diagnostic is too low, too high or right;
- whether customers will buy a broader asset-intelligence offer if Maximo is not in the headline;
- which vertical should be first.

These are the next validation targets.

Founding-team short version

The survey strongly supports an assessment-led proposition. Customers are not mainly saying “we need someone to install more Maximo”. They are saying data quality is poor, process and system reality are disconnected, business maturity and requirements are weak, and they need real use cases, change support and strategic roadmap/planning to realise ROI. That matches the interview direction: Max Connect/new name should start as an independent asset-intelligence diagnostic and roadmap business, using Maximo/MAS as the first wedge, then build repeatable tools and follow-on services around the recurring problems.

Foundry EAM / Max Connect — GTM ideas for the founding team

Date: 2026-09-04

Audience: founding team

Status: founding-team-facing draft, not public copy

Working name: Foundry EAM is the preferred naming direction; `www.foundry-eam.com` is the corrected target domain pending registration/DNS and legal checks.

Sources used

- Andrew Carrie interview notes, 2026-07-27.
- Rich Barber interview notes, 2026-07-24.
- Hadrian / July 16 interview note.
- MAS Unlocked 2 survey responses, 26 respondents.
- Existing competitor analysis covering small specialists, established Maximo/EAM SIs, and large SIs.

Executive readout

The GTM should not start with a broad “we are a Maximo consultancy” message. That puts the business into a crowded field against existing Maximo specialists and larger SIs.

The stronger wedge is:

Independent asset-intelligence diagnostics for Maximo/MAS-heavy organisations that need to turn system capability into measurable operational value.

The business should use Maximo/MAS as the first trust surface, but avoid trapping the brand in Maximo-only language. The category should be broader: asset intelligence, EAM value realisation, readiness, roadmap, and governed improvement.

Recommended GTM sequence:

1. Use the MAS Unlocked survey and network to book follow-up coffees.
2. Test a paid diagnostic offer with 5–10 warm prospects.
3. Use those diagnostics to generate evidence, repeatable artefacts and case studies.
4. Build a living assessment/reporting engine around the repeated patterns.
5. Expand from Maximo/MAS into broader asset-intelligence and EAM advisory.

Positioning thesis

Avoid this

"We implement Maximo."

Why not:

- crowded by established partners/SIs;
- lower differentiation;
- delivery-heavy and headcount-constrained;
- vulnerable to race-to-bottom pricing;
- contradicts both Rich and Andrew's strongest signals.

Prefer this

"We help asset-heavy organisations work out where Maximo/MAS and their asset-management operating model are leaking value — then give them the roadmap, evidence and guarded delivery path to fix it."

Short proposition

Independent asset-intelligence diagnostics for Maximo/MAS value realisation.

Slightly fuller proposition

For asset-heavy organisations using or moving to Maximo/MAS, we diagnose the gap between system capability and operational value, then produce a practical roadmap, business-case evidence and delivery path.

Naming implications

Andrew raised that "Max Connect" may be wrong because the market already contains many "Max" names and because a Maximo-coded name narrows the future.

The name should ideally signal:

- independence;
- asset intelligence;
- practical value realisation;
- evidence/truth;
- not just Maximo implementation.

Naming territories to explore

1. Asset intelligence

- Asset Intelligence Works
- Asset Signal
- Asset Clarity
- Asset Lens

- Asset North
- Intelligent Asset Co.

2. Evidence / truth / clarity

- Asset Truth
- Clear Asset
- Evidence Works
- Signal Works
- Proofline
- Value Signal

3. Roadmap / direction

- Asset Compass
- Asset Route
- Asset Roadmap Co.
- Northstar Assets
- Operating Compass

4. Maximo-adjacent but not Max-branded

- EAM Clarity
- EAM Signal
- SuiteSense
- Asset Suite Advisory
- Operational Asset Intelligence

Recommendation: keep “Max Connect” as a working/project name until the first paid diagnostic is sharper. Do not over-invest in naming before the offer is validated.

Buyer/problem segmentation

Segment A — Already migrated to MAS but not seeing value

Evidence:

- 15/26 survey respondents are already migrated.
- Top pains are poor data quality, system/process disconnect, adoption/interface, reporting and mobile capability.

Buyer language:

- “We upgraded but we’re not getting the value.”
- “We have MAS capability but the business is still working around it.”
- “We don’t know what to prioritise next.”

Offer:

MAS Value Realisation Diagnostic

Core deliverables:

- value leakage map;
- process/system fit review;
- data quality profile;
- adoption and mobile readiness review;
- module-priority roadmap;
- quantified quick wins.

Segment B — Still on 7.6x / deciding MAS path

Evidence:

- 10/26 respondents still run Maximo 7.6x.
- 11/26 plan migration within 12 months or 1–2 years.
- Survey blockers include budget constraints, unclear requirements and business maturity.

Buyer language:

- "We know we need to decide, but the path is unclear."
- "We need to understand risk, cost and value before committing."
- "We need a business case that isn't vendor hype."

Offer:

MAS Readiness and Decision Roadmap

Core deliverables:

- current risk assessment;
- readiness score;
- business-case inputs;
- dependency map;
- stakeholder alignment questions;
- partner/procurement brief.

Segment C — Operations/maintenance teams who need safe self-service

Evidence:

- Qualitative survey responses ask what business users can do themselves vs what providers must do.
- Rich emphasises users who manage Maximo as an add-on to their day jobs.
- Andrew sees future governance/guardrail tooling.

Buyer language:

- "We're too dependent on providers for small changes."
- "We want to move faster without breaking supportability."
- "We need to know what we can safely do ourselves."

Offer:

Self-Service with Guardrails Assessment

Core deliverables:

- safe/internal change catalogue;
- provider-dependence map;
- governance model;
- change-request cost-reduction opportunities;
- training/adoption plan.

Segment D — Asset data and reliability improvement

Evidence:

- 20/26 selected poor data quality.
- 16/26 selected system/process disconnect.
- Health, Mobile, Monitor and Schedule are high-priority modules.

Buyer language:

- "We cannot trust the data."
- "We cannot get the reporting/insight we need."
- "The system does not reflect real work."

Offer:

Asset Data to Insight Sprint

Core deliverables:

- data quality assessment;
- asset/process alignment view;
- reporting and dashboard priorities;
- Health/Mobile/Monitor readiness;
- evidence trail for ROI.

Recommended first offer

Name

Asset Intelligence Diagnostic

Subline:

A fast, independent assessment of where Maximo/MAS is leaking value and what to do next.

Who it is for

Asset-heavy organisations using or moving to Maximo/MAS who are facing:

- poor data quality;
- weak adoption;
- unclear roadmap;
- underused MAS modules;

- unclear business case;
- provider dependency;
- slow partner/SI response;
- uncertainty about upgrade/value sequencing.

Format

Two packaging options:

Lite diagnostic — £5k–£10k

Purpose: easy entry, fast clarity, one focused pain area.

Duration: 1–2 weeks.

Includes:

- intake call;
- source/document review;
- 3–5 stakeholder interviews;
- pain/opportunity map;
- immediate recommendation pack;
- 60-minute playback.

Best for:

- warm leads;
- operations teams with small budget;
- testing willingness to pay;
- proving Max Connect's style.

Full diagnostic — £15k–£25k

Purpose: stronger business case and roadmap.

Duration: 3–4 weeks.

Includes:

- document/system/process review;
- 6–10 stakeholder interviews;
- data/process/adoption scorecard;
- MAS module opportunity map;
- quick-win backlog;
- business-case evidence;
- partner/delivery route options;
- leadership playback.

Best for:

- senior stakeholder involvement;
- larger follow-on work;

- roadmap and budget decisions.

Outputs

Every diagnostic should produce reusable Max Connect assets:

1. Client-facing report.
2. Internal evidence pack.
3. Source-weighted opportunity map.
4. Repeatable anonymised patterns for future productisation.
5. Follow-on proposal or recommended partner route.

This satisfies the “sell our exhaust” principle: every engagement produces client value plus productised factory learning.

Channel strategy

1. Warm survey respondents

The strongest immediate channel is the MAS Unlocked respondent base.

Why:

- 21/26 agreed to some kind of follow-up.
- Survey already identifies their pain areas.
- They are in the Maximo/MAS community.
- The ask can be framed as helping shape December’s agenda, not a hard sell.

Recommended message:

Thanks for completing the MAS Unlocked survey. We’re doing a short follow-up with a few respondents to understand where Maximo/MAS is creating the most friction and what kind of independent support would be genuinely useful. Would you be open to a 20-minute conversation? We’ll share the anonymised findings back with you.

Goal:

- learn first;
- identify paid diagnostic candidates;
- build permission to share anonymised findings;
- sharpen the offer language.

2. User group / community authority

Rich’s network and user-group credibility are major assets, but there is a governance issue: the user group’s independence rules may need review if the business becomes commercial.

Recommended stance:

- keep community education separate from direct selling;
- publish useful anonymised insight, not sales collateral;
- invite voluntary follow-up for organisations wanting deeper help;
- update rule book to avoid conflict of interest.

3. Known partner/client contacts

Andrew mentioned the need to identify trial/pilot clients where a diagnostic or tool concept can be tested.

Use known relationships for:

- one free/discounted pilot only if there is clear permission to create a case study;
- otherwise sell a small diagnostic and use it to validate the price.

4. Competitor-gap positioning

Do not lead by attacking competitors. Lead by naming the gap:

Large SIs are built for programmes. Traditional Maximo partners are built for implementation and support. Many customers need something before that: independent clarity on what is worth doing, why, in what order, and with whom.

This positions Max Connect around the pre-SI/buyer-side decision layer.

GTM plays

Play 1 — Survey-backed insight report

Create a short external-facing version of the survey findings:

- top pains;
- biggest blockers;
- missing ROI links;
- what customers want from MAS Unlocked 2;
- invite to follow-up discussion.

Purpose:

- demonstrate insight;
- avoid hard selling;
- create warm conversations.

CTA:

If you want to benchmark your organisation against the survey findings, book a 20-minute review.

Play 2 — Benchmark review calls

Offer 20-minute calls to survey respondents.

Structure:

1. Your top survey pains.
2. How that compares to peers.
3. One question: would a short independent diagnostic be useful?
4. Ask what output would make it worth paying for.

Output:

- lead qualification;
- proposition validation;
- first sales language.

Play 3 — Fixed-price diagnostic beta

Offer 3–5 beta slots.

Positioning:

We're piloting a short independent Maximo/MAS value diagnostic with a small number of organisations before MAS Unlocked 2.

Price:

- free only if strategically necessary and case-study permission is explicit;
- otherwise £5k–£10k.

Output:

- evidence-based report;
- roadmap;
- follow-on recommendations.

Play 4 — Partner/SI shadow proposition

This is not “we replace your SI”. It is:

We help you brief, choose, challenge and govern the right delivery route.

Useful for clients who distrust partners or are stuck before procurement.

Play 5 — Living roadmap demo

Use Ant's maturity-assessment/reporting tool as a demo, but package it around asset intelligence rather than AI.

Message:

Instead of a static PDF that disappears into a drawer, we produce a living assessment: score, evidence, opportunities, owners, and progress over time.

This is a clear differentiator from ordinary consultancy reports.

Service ladder

Level 1 — Benchmark / review call

- 20 minutes.
- Free or community-led.
- Uses survey benchmark.
- Qualifies pain and buyer.

Level 2 — Lite diagnostic

- £5k–£10k.
- Narrow scope.
- Fast output.
- First paid trust-builder.

Level 3 — Full diagnostic / roadmap

- £15k–£25k.
- Multi-stakeholder.
- Scorecard + roadmap + business case.
- Creates follow-on work.

Level 4 — Advisory retainer / delivery custodian

- monthly retainer or project fee.
- Helps client execute roadmap.
- Coordinates partner ecosystem.
- Maintains independence.

Level 5 — Product / recurring tools

- annual subscription or usage-based.
- Assessment engine, dashboards, monitoring, configuration guardrails.
- Built from repeated diagnostic patterns.

Proof assets needed

Before selling hard, the team needs:

1. One-page proposition.
2. Diagnostic sample output.

3. Survey insight summary.
4. 3 anonymised pain examples.
5. Follow-up interview script.
6. Price test options.
7. Clear statement of what the business is not.
8. Founder role map.

Suggested first 30 days

Week 1 — Founder alignment

Decide:

- working name/category;
- first wedge;
- first price test;
- who sells, who delivers, who builds tooling;
- what work is out of bounds.

Output:

- founder one-pager;
- first diagnostic outline;
- survey insight summary.

Week 2 — Warm follow-ups

Contact 10–15 survey respondents / known contacts.

Goal:

- book 8–10 calls;
- test the problem language;
- identify 2–3 diagnostic candidates.

Week 3 — Offer test

Run calls and pitch a beta diagnostic where relevant.

Track:

- stated pain;
- buyer;
- budget route;
- desired output;
- price reaction;
- urgency.

Week 4 — First pilot/diagnostic

Deliver one diagnostic or simulated diagnostic using existing evidence.

Output:

- sample report;
- reusable assessment template;
- refined pricing;
- case-study candidate.

Suggested first 90 days

1. Complete 10–15 follow-up interviews.
2. Sell or pilot 2–3 diagnostics.
3. Build repeatable diagnostic template and scoring model.
4. Create first living roadmap prototype.
5. Clarify brand/name.
6. Produce one anonymised market insight report.
7. Decide whether the first product layer is:
 - maturity assessment;
 - asset data quality score;
 - SAMP/roadmap engine;
 - self-service/configuration guardrails;
 - value tracking dashboard.

Role map to discuss

This is intentionally provisional.

Rich

Likely strengths:

- community trust;
- Maximo user empathy;
- network access;
- authentic “mouthpiece” role;
- straight-talking credibility.

Likely GTM role:

- warm introductions;
- discovery calls;
- user pain validation;
- community insight and relationship trust.

Andrew

Likely strengths:

- strategic asset-management framing;

- competitor and market structure;
- enterprise asset-management language;
- product/ARR ambition;
- senior buyer route.

Likely GTM role:

- category definition;
- senior proposition;
- competitor/partner strategy;
- asset-intelligence roadmap design.

Hadrian

Likely strengths to clarify/use:

- Maximo/asset-management domain credibility;
- enterprise value-proposition judgement;
- buyer-language translation;
- technical/strategic assurance;
- connection between practical Maximo reality and board-level asset outcomes.

Likely GTM role:

- proposition stress test;
- diagnostic methodology credibility;
- senior-buyer framing;
- delivery assurance / value-chain mapping.

Ant

Likely strengths:

- discovery system design;
- tooling/productisation;
- evidence synthesis;
- report/pack creation;
- operating model and factory process.

Likely GTM role:

- diagnostic product design;
- living report/tooling layer;
- source-room/corpus/analysis pipeline;
- proposition and collateral production.

GTM risks

Risk 1 — Naming narrows the business

If the name is too Maximo-coded, the business may struggle to become asset-intelligence/EAM agnostic.

Mitigation:

- use Maximo/MAS as the first wedge, not necessarily the permanent brand category.

Risk 2 — Discovery becomes vague consulting

If the diagnostic is not productised, it may become open-ended workshop work.

Mitigation:

- fixed scope;
- fixed outputs;
- clear timebox;
- repeatable scoring model.

Risk 3 — Too much product too early

If the team tries to build a full software product before validating the repeated pain, it may waste time.

Mitigation:

- build internal tooling first;
- convert repeated patterns into product only after pilots.

Risk 4 — Conflict with user-group independence

Commercial activity linked to community trust must be handled carefully.

Mitigation:

- update rule book;
- keep community insight educational;
- separate direct commercial pitches from independent user-group activity.

Risk 5 — Selling to operators without budget

Operations users know pain but may not control budget.

Mitigation:

- give them a business-case artefact;
- create a dual-route GTM: bottom-up pain plus top-down value.

Recommended message hierarchy

Headline

Independent asset-intelligence diagnostics for Maximo/MAS value realisation.

Problem

Many asset-heavy organisations have invested in Maximo/MAS but still struggle with poor data, process disconnects, low adoption, unclear roadmap and weak business-case evidence.

Promise

We help you identify where value is trapped, what to fix first, and how to move forward without vendor hype or unnecessary programme overhead.

Proof

Survey evidence shows poor data quality, process mismatch, maturity, requirements, change and roadmap gaps are the main blockers to ROI.

Product

A short diagnostic that produces a scorecard, pain map, opportunity roadmap and business-case evidence.

Follow-on

Advisory, partner selection/governance, targeted improvement work, and eventually live tooling to track progress over time.

First collateral to create

1. **Founding-team briefing** — this report set.
2. **One-page external survey insight** — safe to share with respondents.
3. **Diagnostic offer page** — clear scope, outputs, price range.
4. **Sample report screenshots/mockup** — demonstrate living roadmap concept.
5. **Follow-up call script** — for survey respondents.
6. **Founder role map** — internal alignment.

Next decision

The immediate decision is not “what is the whole company forever?”

It is:

Which first diagnostic can we confidently test with warm Maximo/MAS contacts in the next 30 days?

Recommended answer:

Asset Intelligence Diagnostic: Maximo/MAS Value and Readiness Sprint

It is broad enough to include Andrew’s asset-intelligence ambition, specific enough to sell through the current Maximo/MAS network, and directly supported by the survey pain points.

Appendix: source provenance

This pack is synthesized from the Max Connect Drive/source-room and NotebookLM corpus. Private founder/interview notes are used as evidence for founder-facing analysis and should not be forwarded as public claims without review.

- Andrew Carrie interview notes — 2026-07-27.
- Rich Barber interview notes — 2026-07-24.
- Hadrian / July 16 interview note.
- MAS Unlocked 2 survey responses — 26 responses.
- Existing competitor analysis in the Max Connect truth repo.