

Customer and Market Framing

The Customer and Market Framing template produces the ICP (Ideal Customer Profile) for a specific capability identified in c10-capability-inventory. It forces explicit separation between the target user (who works with the product daily), the economic buyer (who signs the contract), and the budget owner (whose line item funds it) — three roles that are frequently conflated and almost never the same person in a govtech or enterprise sale. Without this separation, go-to-market motion defaults to pitching the wrong person with the wrong message. Outputs from this template feed c10-revenue-model-design (pricing model selection) and c10-gtm-architecture (sales motion and pilot design).

Fillable Template

```
icp_id: <kebab-case, e.g., fl-special-district-clerk>
capability_ref: <capability_id from c10-capability-inventory>
version: <semver>
last_reviewed: <ISO date>
```

```
# ■■ Target User ██████████  
target_user:  
    role: <job title or function>  
    org_type: <e.g., FL special district, county municipality, AI-first consulting firm>  
    day_one_pain: >  
        <two to three sentences describing the specific frustration they feel before  
            your product exists; cite observable symptoms – time lost, error rate,  
            manual steps, compliance risk>  
    current_workaround: <what they do today; be specific>  
    success_state: >  
        <what their day looks like after adopting the capability; must be  
            measurable – cite a time saving, error reduction, or audit outcome>  
    technical_sophistication: <low | medium | high>  
    change_resistance: <low | medium | high>  
    change_resistance_notes: <why they resist or embrace change>
```

```
# ■ Economic Buyer ██████████  
economic_buyer:  
    role: <title; the person who can approve the purchase>  
    org_type: <same or different from target_user org_type>  
    primary_motivation: <cost reduction | risk reduction | revenue growth | compliance | mission>  
    buying_trigger: >  
        <the event or condition that causes them to start looking for a solution  
            right now; e.g., audit finding, new statute, headcount freeze, grant window>  
    objection_primary: <the single most common objection they will raise>  
    objection_response: <how the offer defuses it; cite evidence or proof-of-value>
```

[illegible][illegible]

[illegible]

Worked Example — Stormwater Pre-Screener ICP

The following ICP targets the initial beachhead for the stormwater-permit-prescreener capability. All dollar figures are (illustrative).

```
icp_id: fl-special-district-engineer-review-reduction
capability_ref: stormwater-permit-prescreener
version: 0.1.0
last_reviewed: 2026-05-29

target_user:
  role: District Clerk / Permit Intake Specialist
  org_type: Florida independent special district (water management / community development)
  day_one_pain: >
    Receives 8-15 permit applications per week; spends 2-4 hours per application
    manually pulling the applicable FDEP rule citations, checking the parcel
    GIS layer, and deciding whether to route to engineer review or return to
    the applicant. A missed citation or a wrong route extends the review cycle
    by days and creates audit risk under FS Chapter 119 [VERIFY].
  current_workaround: >
    Paper checklist maintained in a shared drive; citations checked manually
    against the FDEP online rule viewer; routing decision made by senior clerk
    judgment.
  success_state: >
    Triage time per application drops from 2-4 hours to under 30 minutes;
    engineer-agreement rate on routing stays above 92%; FS Chapter 119 audit
    trail is machine-generated rather than manually assembled (illustrative).
  technical_sophistication: low
  change_resistance: medium
  change_resistance_notes: >
    Clerks are skeptical of AI accuracy on citations; adoption requires a
    side-by-side pilot showing the agent matches senior-clerk decisions on a
    labeled holdout set.

economic_buyer:
  role: District Manager / Executive Director
  org_type: Florida independent special district
  primary_motivation: risk reduction
  buying_trigger: >
```

FDEP compliance review or an audit finding that flags inconsistent triage documentation; alternatively, a headcount freeze that makes manual triage unsustainable at current application volume.

objection_primary: >

"We can't have AI making compliance decisions – what if it cites the wrong statute?"

objection_response: >

The agent never makes a compliance determination autonomously. It drafts a triage recommendation with citations; a clerk reviews and approves before any applicant-facing output is emitted. The expert-review boundary defined in t7-risk-expert-review-plan is enforced at the HITL gate. Every action is logged to a FS Chapter 119-compatible audit trail.

budget_owner:

role: District Manager (same as economic buyer in small districts)

budget_line: Operations / administrative technology

budget_cycle: FL fiscal year Oct 1 – Sep 30; decisions typically lock in Q4 (Jul-Sep)

typical_spend_range_usd: "\$8,000-\$25,000 / year for comparable workflow tools (

illustrative)"

grant_funding_eligible: maybe

grant_sources: >

FL DEP Resilient Florida Program [VERIFY grant eligibility for admin tools];

ARPA Stormwater set-aside if district has unspent allocation [VERIFY].

market_sizing:

beachhead_segment: >

FL independent special districts with stormwater or water management authority, annual permit volume 50-300 applications, staff of 3-15.

beachhead_account_count: "20-40 districts (illustrative; FL has ~1,700 independent special districts [VERIFY])"

expansion_path: >

After two successful beachhead pilots with published proof-of-value scorecards, expand to county municipalities using FDEP delegated authority, then to other permit types (building, environmental resource).

tam_notes: >

FL alone has ~1,700 independent special districts [VERIFY]; nationwide, special districts number ~90,000 [VERIFY per Census of Governments].

Not all have stormwater authority, but the compliance-moat and audit-trail model generalizes to any rule-bound intake workflow (illustrative).

competitive_context:

current_alternatives:

- name: Manual clerk checklist (shared drive / paper)

why_inadequate: >

No audit trail, inconsistent rule application, does not scale, relies on senior-clerk tenure knowledge.

- name: Generic workflow automation (e.g., Microsoft Power Automate)

why_inadequate: >

No FL-specific rule awareness, no FDEP citation engine, no HITL gate for expert-review-required determinations.

switching_friction:

- Staff retraining (low – UI designed for non-technical clerks)

- Data migration (minimal – no legacy database)

- Procurement cycle (medium – requires district board approval for new vendors)

moat_alignment: >

The compliance-moat (FDEP rule layer, FS Chapter 119 audit trail, and the jurisdiction-specific logic encoded via t7-govtech-package) is the primary switching friction driver. A competitor replicates the UI in weeks; replicating the validated rule mapping and audit compliance takes months.

urgency:

urgency_level: medium

urgency_driver: >

FDEP compliance review cycles, increasing application volume from post-hurricane rebuild and coastal development pressure on the 30A corridor, and growing clerk turnover that fragments institutional rule knowledge.

urgency_decay: >

Urgency is durable but not acute; buying windows open at audit findings and budget-cycle Q4. Pipeline must be maintained year-round rather than

waiting for a single trigger.

Usage Notes

Produce one ICP per distinct buyer segment, not one ICP per capability. A single capability may serve two segments (e.g., county government and private permitting consultants) that require entirely separate ICPs. The `icp_id` is referenced by `c10-revenue-model-design` to match pricing models to buyer types. Never conflate `target_user` and `economic_buyer` fields — the person who benefits is almost never the person who pays, and messaging that addresses only one will fail with the other. Revisit this template after every pilot: the most reliable ICP update source is a structured win/loss debrief, not internal assumption.