

A useful idea ends with a buyer test.

SaaS Opportunity Playbook

Global edition - complete three-brief sample. Research checked 21 October 2026.

Study a real product, isolate one workflow and decide what evidence would make you build - or stop. These are independent research hypotheses, not proven demand or revenue forecasts.

Inside this sample

Neophyte - Catch signup failures before your next release

[Read the shareable brief](#)

Superdraft - Turn a timely campaign signal into a reviewable draft

[Read the shareable brief](#)

Tally - Help a niche team act on the forms it already collects

[Read the shareable brief](#)

Use it in three steps

- Choose a buyer group you can actually reach.
- Check the sources and existing alternatives; mark what is unknown.
- Run the small manual test before asking a coding assistant to build.

Working files

[Comparison worksheet \(.csv\)](#)

[Interview and validation workbook \(.md\)](#)

The planned full edition contains 15 briefs at a proposed one-time price of \$9 USD. It is in preparation and not for sale. This free sample contains three completed briefs, with no email required.

Neophyte / research brief

Catch signup failures before your next release

Buyer and workflow

Founders and product teams at self-serve SaaS companies

Neophyte describes an agent that signs up, verifies its account and explores a first-run experience. That suggests a workflow worth investigating: checking the path from registration to a first useful result.

Opportunity hypothesis

A release check for one onboarding path, reviewed by a human before anyone is alerted.

Assumption: Small teams have repeated first-run failures that existing automated tests miss, and will share a safe test environment. This has not been established by buyer interviews.

Existing alternatives

Neophyte: Agent-led onboarding walkthrough. Public price was not verified.

<https://neophyte.run/>

Checkly: Browser and API monitoring with published plan tiers and usage limits. Compare a scripted check against the proposed exploratory workflow.

<https://www.checklyhq.com/pricing>

Pricing and business model to test

Try to sell one manually reviewed check before choosing subscription pricing. Ask what the team already spends on testing; a competitor price is not evidence of your buyer's budget.

Evidence limits

Revenue, paid customer count, current pricing and buyer demand for our proposed niche are unverified.

Revenue figures have not been verified for this sample. A price page is not evidence of revenue. Our proposed niche has not been validated by buyer interviews.

Neophyte / your test and build scope

First version

- Accept a staging URL and an owner-approved test account.
- Run one agreed signup-to-first-result path and capture the point of failure.
- Return a reproducible report with screenshots and a human review step.

Non-goals

No unrestricted agents on customer production systems, automated billing actions, general QA platform or conversion-lift promise.

Reach the first five buyers

Identify five self-serve SaaS teams you can reach personally. Ask the owner to show their last onboarding change, how it was checked and any resulting support work. Offer a supervised walkthrough on staging.

48-hour test

Within 48 hours, interview five owners and run two consented staging walkthroughs. Record setup time, false alarms and whether the finding changes a real release decision.

Continue if

Continue if two owners share a staging workflow and one agrees to a clearly scoped paid follow-up. These are pilot decision rules, not market benchmarks.

Pause if

Pause if existing tests catch every useful finding, access is too sensitive, or owners will not repeat the check after a release.

Build handoff after validation

Build a staging-only onboarding report tool. Inputs: approved URL, agreed path, test account. Output: ordered steps, evidence, suspected failure and human review status. Require explicit permission, redact credentials, cap run time and prevent billing or destructive actions. Start with manual execution; automate only after repeat demand.

First-party sources - checked 21 October 2026

Official product description - <https://neophyte.run/>

Superdraft / research brief

Turn a timely campaign signal into a reviewable draft

Buyer and workflow

Lifecycle marketers at small ecommerce brands

Superdraft presents a workflow that matches brand-relevant events with editable email ideas. The product observation is the signal-to-draft workflow; demand for a narrower offering still needs testing.

Opportunity hypothesis

A campaign briefing desk for one product category, with the event, reasoning and draft shown together.

Assumption: A specific type of brand misses useful campaign moments and would prefer a focused briefing over its current planning process. Brands may already solve this adequately.

Existing alternatives

Superdraft: Brand signals and reviewable email drafts. A current public price was not verified.

<https://www.superdraft.ai/>

Klaviyo: An adjacent email marketing platform with contact- and channel-dependent pricing. Ask whether the existing campaign tools already cover the job.

<https://www.klaviyo.com/pricing>

Pricing and business model to test

Price a bounded manual campaign-brief pilot with the marketer after learning their planning cost. Do not treat a campaign platform subscription as spending available to a new add-on.

Evidence limits

Revenue, paid customer count, conversion lift and demand for our category-specific hypothesis are unverified.

Revenue figures have not been verified for this sample. A price page is not evidence of revenue. Our proposed niche has not been validated by buyer interviews.

Superdraft / your test and build scope

First version

- Let a marketer enter a brand, product category and approved seasonal events.
- Prepare three campaign briefs with a source, suggested angle and editable draft.
- Capture an approve, reject or revise decision and export plain text.

Non-goals

No email sending, audience scraping, deliverability platform, sales attribution or unattended brand publishing.

Reach the first five buyers

Find five marketers serving the same product category. Ask each to walk through last week's campaign planning and show a missed or rejected idea. Offer three briefs based only on information they authorize you to use.

48-hour test

In 48 hours, interview five marketers and manually produce three briefs for two consenting brands. Track which drafts are used, how much editing is needed and the time saved against their usual approach.

Continue if

Continue if two marketers use a brief in a real planning decision and one commits to a paid second batch with a defined delivery date.

Pause if

Pause if the existing calendar and email tools are sufficient, the ideas are generic, or checking the signals costs more time than it saves.

Build handoff after validation

Create an approval inbox for campaign briefs in one ecommerce category. Each brief needs a source URL, observed date, brand fit explanation, editable copy and decision log. Export text only. Mark speculative events, require human approval and do not connect a sending provider in the first version.

First-party sources - checked 21 October 2026

Official product workflow - <https://www.superdraft.ai/>

Adjacent platform pricing - <https://www.klaviyo.com/pricing>

Tally / research brief

Help a niche team act on the forms it already collects

Buyer and workflow

Small service teams collecting repeat client intake

Tally offers a document-style form builder with a free tier and paid upgrades. Instead of another general form builder, investigate what a narrow team must do after a response arrives.

Opportunity hypothesis

A client-intake review queue for one service niche, layered on top of an existing form.

Assumption: Teams repeatedly chase incomplete submissions and move data between tools. The frequency and cost of this work must be observed; the existence of forms does not establish a gap.

Existing alternatives

Tally: Free forms within fair-use limits, plus paid Pro and Business upgrades. Currency, billing interval and current price should be checked on the page.

<https://tally.so/pricing>

Tally integrations: Existing integrations and automation may solve the handoff. Test this before building a separate queue.

<https://tally.so/help/integrations>

Pricing and business model to test

Offer a small fixed-scope setup pilot only if recurring handoff work is demonstrated. Free forms and existing integrations make a generic paid replacement difficult to justify.

Evidence limits

No revenue figure has been verified for this brief. Willingness to pay for the proposed handoff tool is untested.

Revenue figures have not been verified for this sample. A price page is not evidence of revenue. Our proposed niche has not been validated by buyer interviews.

Tally / your test and build scope

First version

- Import a CSV from an owner-controlled form; avoid live credentials in the first test.
- Flag missing required information using rules the team supplies.
- Show an owner-reviewed follow-up draft and a clear ready-for-review state.

Non-goals

No new form editor, automated sensitive-data collection, CRM replacement, automatic client messages or regulated eligibility decisions.

Reach the first five buyers

Speak with five studio operations owners. Ask them to trace the last three submissions from arrival to project readiness. With permission, use redacted sample rows to measure missing information and manual touches.

48-hour test

In 48 hours, map five workflows and manually triage ten redacted submissions for two teams. Compare the queue with a simple spreadsheet and their existing automation.

Continue if

Continue if two teams show the same repeated handoff and one commits to a paid pilot with a measurable reduction in manual touches.

Pause if

Pause if built-in integrations solve the work, volumes are too low, or handling the data would require disproportionate security work.

Build handoff after validation

Build a CSV-based intake review queue for a single service niche. Inputs: redacted rows and owner-defined completeness rules. Output: missing fields, review status and editable follow-up draft. Keep data local for the pilot, provide delete/export actions and require approval before any message is sent.

First-party sources - checked 21 October 2026

Official form builder - <https://tally.so/>

Official plans - <https://tally.so/pricing>

Official integrations - <https://tally.so/help/integrations>

Make the decision explicit.

Use these prompts with one brief. Copy the editable workbook for repeated use.

Buyer access

Who will show you the last time they did this workflow? Name the role and a way to reach five people.

Notes: _____

Observed problem

What steps, delays, manual touches and current tools did you actually observe? Separate these from your assumptions.

Notes: _____

Alternative check

Could existing software or a simple spreadsheet solve it? Record the tool, cost, billing interval and check date.

Notes: _____

Smallest test

What outcome can you deliver manually in 48 hours, using consented or redacted data?

Notes: _____

Decision conditions

Write the continue and pause conditions before the test. A compliment is weaker evidence than access, time or a paid pilot.

Notes: _____

Commitment

Who agreed to do what, by when, at what price if applicable? Do not infer willingness to pay.

Notes: _____

Build scope

Only after the test: one buyer, one workflow, inputs, output, acceptance criteria, non-goals and data boundaries.

Notes: _____

Corrections and support

hello@what2build.com | Curated by Vamshi Creates. Product facts can change. Recheck linked sources before making a decision.