

Marketing Strategy - Competitive Analysis

How This Document Is Organized

1	Summary	3
2	Competitor 1	4
3	Competitor 2	5
4	Competitor 3	6
5	Competitor 4	7
6	Competitor 5	8
7	Competitor 6	9
8	Competitor 7	10
9	Competitor 8	11
10	Competitor 9	12
11	Competitor 10	13
12	Competitor 11	14
13	Competitor 12	15
14	Competitor 13	16
15	Competitor 14	17
16	Competitor 15	18

Related Documents

1. Executive Summary
2. Market Opportunity
3. **Competitive Analysis (This document)**

4. Products and Services
5. Business Model
6. Intellectual Property
7. Financial Projections
8. Marketing, Sales, and Operations Plan
9. Deal Terms
10. Team

1 Summary

Feature\Competitor	Your Company	Competitor 1	Competitor 2	Competitor 3	Competitor 4	Competitor 5	Competitor 6	Competitor 7	Competitor 8	Competitor 9	Competitor 10	Competitor 11	Competitor 12	Competitor 13	Competitor 14	Competitor 15	Competitor 16	
Note: Actual competitor names, product names and features removed from this document to protect original company confidentiality. Your document would clearly list competitors & features																		
Advertising																		
Feature 1	😊	😊					😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊						
Feature 2	😊							😊		😊	😊							
Feature 3	😊																	
Feature 4	😊		😊				😊	😊		😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊
Feature 5	😊						😊		😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊
Feature 6	😊									😊	😊	😞						
Feature 7	😊									😊	😊							
Platform																		
Feature 8	😊	😞		😞		😞		😊	😊		😊							
Feature 9	😊	😊			😊		😊	😊			😊							
Feature 10	😊	😊	😊	😊		😊	😊				😊	😊	😊					
Feature 11	😊						😊	😊	😊					😊	😊	😊		
Feature 12	😊		😊				😊	😊										
Feature 13	😊	😊	😊	😊		😞	😊	😊			😊	😊						
Feature 14	😊	😊	😊	😊		😞	😊	😊	😞	😊	😞	😊	😊				😞	
Feature 15	😊	😊										😊	😊					
Feature 16	😊		😊			😊						😊	😊					
Development																		
Feature 17	😊				😊													
Feature 18	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊												
Feature 19	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊												
Feature 20	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊												
Feature 21	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊												
Feature 22	😊																	
Business																		
Feature 23	😊																	
Feature 24	😊	😞									😞	😞	😞					
Feature 25	😊	😊										😊						
Feature 26	😊																	
Feature 27	😊																	
Feature 28																		

2 Competitor 1

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 1 Founded: 2004 Location: Sausalito, CA	Last round: Series B; \$7.3 million; March 2006 Investors: Apax Partners, GRP Partners, Ignition Partners

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 1 Client: XML-based content player Scripting: Not supported. Markup content is displayed in pre-structured lists. Server: Middle-tier services for provisioning, data optimization, and reporting Tools: Eclipse-based development tool Content: Text, PNG images, formatted within pre-structured lists Installation: Downloadable as Java MIDlet

Strengths of Competitor 1	Potential threats from Competitor 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Time-to-market. Service launched in 2005. ■ Early adopter customer base as references. ■ Management experience in advertising. ■ Already ported to a large number of J2ME-enabled handset ■ Traction in funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Upcoming mWorks 2.0 expected to have scripting support. ■ Exclusive (or preferred) supplier relationships with agencies and customers.
Weaknesses of Competitor 1	How Company beats Competitor 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ User experience is rigid, requiring developers and content providers to display content using rudimentary text-based pre-defined lists. This limitation is fundamental to how the client is architected, which is limited by the display capabilities of J2ME (i.e. lcdui). ■ Response is slow as data must be downloaded while the application is active (does not support background processing) ■ Client is not programmable, so functionality is limited to markup display. Collection of intelligence is minimal, if at all. ■ Off-deck strategy positions mFoundry as a niche solution with respect to carriers ■ Requires costly consumer education and awareness, as model requires user to proactively download client software before downloading applications. ■ Unable to automatically update client software and applications. ■ Client can be easily removed as it is installed. Barrier to replacement is extremely low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Vastly superior user experience, in richness of application, responsiveness, and relevance of information presented drives consumer preference and carrier adoption. ■ Revenue share model integrated with carriers' business model makes Company much more attractive to carriers, giving preference to Company in terms of marketing efforts, deck placement, advertiser and developer pull, etc. These factors lead to much quicker and broader adoption compared to an off-deck solution such as mFoundry's, which ultimately leads to superior revenue generation. ■ Tight technology integration with carrier's handsets by embedding client software onto the handset will make replacement much harder than a downloadable solution. ■ New feature updates can occur much more easily and at a much faster pace, obsolescing mFoundry's as the platform evolves (this is by design of the platform).

3 Competitor 2

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 2 Founded: 2002 Location: San Francisco, CA	Last round: Series A; \$4 million; July 2006 Investors: Sequoia Capital Revenue: \$1 million

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 2 Client: Browser with keyword, site or geography specific engine Scripting: URL links Server: Middle-tier services for ad serving based on keyword, site or geography.

Strengths of Competitor 2	Potential threats from Competitor 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Time-to-market. Service launched in 2002. ■ Established internet market. ■ Management experience in advertising. ■ Traction in funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AdBrite has geographic ad delivery. ■ Established relationship with advertisers.
Weaknesses of Competitor 2	How Company beats Competitor 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Founder, Philip Kaplan, ran FuckedCompany.com—a web site dedicated to embarrassing the VC community during the collapse of the internet industry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AdBrite is committed to the internet ad market and will need to transition this market to a business models that works in the mobile market. ■ Company is founded by industry luminaries not industry critics. During the same time the Philip Kaplan was criticizing the .com industry, Company’s founders were inventing the technology driving the current boom.

4 Competitor 3

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 3 Founded: 2002 Location: Mountain View, CA	Last round: May 2006 (Value un-announced) Investors: Lightspeed, Morgenthaler Ventures, Rembrandt Venture Partners

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 3 Client: Scripting: Server: Ad server optimized for video ad delivery.

Strengths of Competitor 3	Potential threats from Competitor 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Deployed video server ■ Existing partnership and deals with Amp'd Mobile. ■ Existing Carrier deals with T-Mobile, Vodafone. ■ Existing market entry to deliver music videos on line. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rhythm creates significant noise making it difficult to view the large view requirements of the ad market. ■ Rhythm integrates ads into their mobile video making it difficult for third parties to gain access to Rhythm's ad market.
Weaknesses of Competitor 3	How Company beats Competitor 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Consumers not ready to pay for video on mobile phones. ■ Ad Server lacks infrastructure to drive ads to consumers. ■ Ad Server is video based making it to data intensive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Company is a potential partner with Rhythm. ■ Company understands business limitations of video in the mobile market both with concern to bandwidth consumption and carrier data network value. ■ Rhythm is trying to create a new media—mobile video—ads are a happy accident in this effort. Therefore, Rhythm lacks the big picture business plan that's going to make ads or mobile video work for the consumer at price points appropriate.

5 Competitor 4

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 4	Last round: \$2 million (\$1.136M), Series A, November 2005
Founded: 2004	Investors: Rustic Canyon Partners
Location: San Francisco, CA	

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 4
Client: Ad supported mobile ad content (launched September 5 th , 2005)
Server: RSS Content Aggregator

Strengths of Competitor 4	Potential threats from Competitor 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Company has a sexy brand. ■ Light weight content delivery mechanism based on Opera Mini. ■ RSS feed integrator with interstitials. ■ Partnership with Opera to deliver WAP content on mobile platform. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Partnership with Opera improves UI but Opera Mini is WAP based which is non-interactive.
Weaknesses of Competitor 4	How Company beats Competitor 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Focus is on making ads—not content—look sexy. ■ RSS foundation may slow the company in the more competitive markets. ■ Company lacks the larger business plan concept of having advertisers resolve the bandwidth and data network value issues carriers are faced with. ■ Companies main thrust is signing up RSS based content delivery. ■ Embracing partnership with Opera means moving away from RSS/ad integration work the company is based on. ■ Porting to new platforms is expensive and time consuming. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Business plan to deliver value across carrier data networks. ■ Company is looking at the big picture out of the box. They are not trying to shoe horn in the latest technologies due to lack of initial planning.

6 Competitor 5

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 5 Founded: 2004 Location: Mississauga, Ontario	Last round: Early Seed (soliciting seed funds from web) Investors:

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 5 Client: RSS Reader Scripting: Server:

Strengths of Competitor 5	Potential threats from Competitor 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ RSS Aggregator ■ Significant partnerships with Research in Motion, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Non-interactive content providers like this.
Weaknesses of Competitor 5	How Company beats Competitor 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ RSS Aggregation lacks barriers to entry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Superior user experience ■ Revenue share model integrated with carriers' business model. ■ Consumer subscription model. ■ Tight technology integration with carrier's handsets

7 Competitor 6

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 6 Founded: Location: Menlo Park, CA	Last round: IPO - GOOG Investors:

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 6 Client: J2ME (Google Maps Mobile), WAP (Mail, News, Web Search, Local Search, Google Personalized Home) and SMS (Google SMS).

Strengths of Competitor 6	Potential threats from Competitor 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Delivering successful Google internet applications to mobile devices. ■ Developed/localized ad market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Billions of Dollars to blow on this effort as the market emerges.
Weaknesses of Competitor 6	How Company beats Competitor 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ J2ME application requires extensive resources and porting to mobile device. ■ Embraced several technologies (J2ME, WAP (1.0 & 2.0) and SMS for different solutions. ■ Different products lack centralized coordination. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Revenue share model integrated with carriers' business model. ■ Consumer subscription model. ■ Tight technology integration with carrier's handsets ■ Google Mobile is a potential content provider for the Company platform. ■ Company can provide easy access to a Company enabled Google Maps Mobile that work more like the internet version, originates from a common code base and have increased usability, personalization and immediacy features.

8 Competitor 7

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 7 Founded: February 1994 Location: Sunnyvale, Calif.	Last round: IPO – YHOO April, 1996 Investors: Oracle, Apple, Atari, Cisco, Reuters and Softbank (1995)

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 7 Client: RSS based feeds (Yellow Pages, Finance, Weather, News, Movies, Sports, Restaurants, Entertainment, Driving Directions and People Search) and WAP to (Mail, Calendar, Address Book, Messenger and Auctions)

Strengths of Competitor 7	Potential threats from Competitor 7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Wide variety of services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Yahoo! Had millions of dollars to throw at this problem as the market develops.
Weaknesses of Competitor 7	How Company beats Competitor 7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Inferior UI to Google's wide variety of services. ■ Limited handset availability implies more than WAP access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Revenue share model integrated with carriers' business model. ■ Consumer subscription model. ■ Tight technology integration with carrier's handsets ■ Company gives Yahoo a platform for integrated services across a wider variety of handsets. ■ Company gives Yahoo the ability to brand a phone.

9 Competitor 8

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 8 Founded: Location: San Jose, CA	Last round: Self/Angle Investors:

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 8 Client: J2ME based Moible RSS aggregator

Strengths of Competitor 8	Potential threats from Competitor 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ They do some interesting things with RSS like graphics. ■ Interesting concepts on display – cheep gas, closest Starbucks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Could confuse plusmo with Company. Ok, I'm reaching here. ■ Good concepts like cheep gas and closest Starbucks make it sound like a competitor. However, the quality of these implementations is so poor that they could confuse the market.
Weaknesses of Competitor 8	How Company beats Competitor 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Techno-geeks backing projects like greasemonkey—a technology that allows users to change the scripting content of a browser page. ■ Some not so interesting concepts on display. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Ignore them and they're likely to implode. ■ Handle like an RSS Aggregator.

10 Competitor 9

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 9 Founded: 2005 Location: Hamburg, Germany; San Mateo, CA	Last round: Seed, Series A, Q1 2007. Investors: Self Funded. Rangar Kruse and Reese Jones. Looking for \$500K to sustain to Q1.

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 9 Client: RSS Aggregator delivering ads, C++ phone monitoring application

Strengths of Competitor 9	Potential threats from Competitor 9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ User profiles by choosing channels, location based applications, tracks mobile expenses, ■ Better demographics than the typical advertiser. ■ 4 carriers signed up for pilot in Europe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Good traction in Europe. ■ Demographics information to assist ad server makes this an interesting RSS Aggregator play.
Weaknesses of Competitor 9	How Company beats Competitor 9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Selling information gained by tracking users mobile communications habits may not work in the US although they seem to have gotten by-off in Germany (over 1000 users currently) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Smaato has not developed the complete infrastructure picture. ■ Revenue share model integrated with carriers' business model. ■ Consumer subscription model. ■ Tight technology integration with carrier's handsets

11 Competitor 10

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 10 Founded: June 2006 Location: Finland (?)	Last round: Investors: Nokia Ventures

Products & Technologies
Name: product 10 Client: RSS Aggregator with a Java/XML front end (AJAX?) for Nokia Simbian OS

Strengths of Competitor 10	Potential threats from Competitor 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cool look. ■ Nokia Name ■ Well organized developer community ■ Java/XML front end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Serious contender on Nokia and Simbian OS platforms.
Weaknesses of Competitor 10	How Company beats Competitor 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ RSS Biased ■ Limited to Simbian OS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Revenue share model integrated with carriers' business model. ■ Platform availability not limited to Simbian OS. ■ Applications are responsive, interactive, and intelligent. ■ Applications are able to gather information for users.

12 Competitor 11

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 11 Founded: August 2000 Location: Redwood City, CA	Last round: IPO - OPWV Investors: Founded by the merger of Software.com and Phone.com

Products & Technologies
Name: Over 35 products. Largely focused on provisioning mobile services. Client: Openwave® Mobile Integrated Dynamic Application System (MIDAS), an AJAX-based mobile client is product of interest.

Strengths of Competitor 11	Potential threats from Competitor 11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Good Tools. ■ Very focused on the Carrier's needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Serious contender for the built in market. ■ Expect OpenWave will compete fiercely to keep Company out of the built-in market.
Weaknesses of Competitor 11	How Company beats Competitor 11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lots of products. ■ No clear application or migration path. ■ Portability may be an issue. ■ No content developer integration programs. These are applications designed to be burned into the phone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Company provides a platform for content developers to ad features to existing phones. ■ Company provides resources for immediate and relevant advertising. ■ Company can supply on-the-fly application updates.

13 Competitor 12

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 12 Founded: 1985 Location: San Diego, CA	Last round: N/A Investors: Publicly listed company

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 12 Client: XML and scripting based UI front screen (storefront) customization tool Scripting: Trilet scripts (based on JavaScript) Server: Integration with marketOne and deliveryOne for storefront updates Tools: uiOne SDK Content: Text, images, SMIL, SVG Installation: Embedded with BREW-enabled handsets

Strengths of Competitor 12	Potential threats from Competitor 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Backed by Qualcomm ■ Time-to-market. Product launched in 2005 ■ Early adopter customer base – Sprint, O2, US Cellular, alltel, Telecom New Zealand ■ Strong solution for storefront customization ■ Can be bundled in stack ■ Rich client environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Repurposing storefront customization capabilities for widget development ■ Further penetration into the GSM carrier market with their engagement with O2 (this opportunity came about from acquisition of Trigenix in 2004 who established relationship with O2)
Weaknesses of Competitor 12	How Company beats Competitor 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Only focused on storefront customization at this time ■ Activities largely limited to the CDMA market, which is less than 20% of the overall mobile market ■ Many in the industry are wary of Qualcomm’s business practices and increasing dominance in the market, hence are looking for alternatives (e.g. Sprint, SK Telecom, and China Unicom all use Java to balance Qualcomm as a supplier) ■ Does not support capabilities to capture, report, and analyze usage behavior ■ Cross platform support of uiOne outside of the BREW stack is highly questionable (supports only one non BREW platform, which is a brought over as a legacy from pre-Trigenix acquisition) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Company can be deployed on multiple networks, including both GSM and CDMA, which translates to a much larger addressable market ■ The client software is designed to be portable on all mobile phone operating systems, which is a requirement for the majority of carriers ■ Company enables the development and deployment of complete applications, which is not a focus for uiOne ■ Company directly appeals to carriers, developers, and advertisers with a viable revenue share business model focused specifically on enabling context-sensitive mobile advertising

14 Competitor 13

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 13 Founded: Screen3 started in 2005 Location: Schaumburg, IL	Last round: IPO – MOT Investors: Publicly listed company

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 13 Client: RSS reader Scripting: None Server: Screen3 Server for provisioning and push feeds (from 4 th Pass acquisition) Tools: Internal only Content: Text, images Installation: Embedded with Motorola handsets

Strengths of Competitor 13	Potential threats from Competitor 13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Backed by Motorola ■ Time-to-market. Product launched in 2005 ■ Early adopter customer – Cingular ■ Can be bundled in stack ■ Can utilize existing RSS feeds ■ Runs in background, push based (on par with Company) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Possible evolution to include application capabilities, such as scripting and rich UI toolkits (chance is low, given how the client is currently architected)
Weaknesses of Competitor 13	How Company beats Competitor 13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Poor user interface ■ Information delivery is uni-directional with RSS feeds ■ RSS feeds do not support a full interactive application model ■ Works only on Motorola phones ■ No built-in advertising support in terms capturing usage preference and patterns, etc ■ Not context sensitive (e.g. location aware, integration with native applications, etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Company’s technology enables fully interactive applications, not just uni-directional ■ The client software is designed to be portable on all mobile phone operating systems (not just Motorola’s), which is preferred by carriers ■ Company enables the development and deployment of rich applications, which Screen3 cannot. ■ Company provides a much richer platform for deploying valuable advertising integrated with content.

15 Competitor 14

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 14 Founded: 2006 Location: Menlo Park, CA	Last round: \$3.6 million, Series A, September 2006 Investors: Sequoia Capital

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 14 Client: None Server: Ad Server with bidding engine for content type (portal, search, blog, download, news...)

Strengths of Competitor 14	Potential threats from Competitor 14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Growing fast: 2.5 million ad views. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Business model for AdMob is incompatible with Company's revenue share plans.
Weaknesses of Competitor 14	How Company beats Competitor 14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Only serves WAP based systems. ■ Very brute force auction site approach with few barriers to entry. ■ Advertiser must select channel, design ad and bid for access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Business model encourages developer and carrier involvement.

16 Competitor 15

Company	Funding
Name: Competitor 15 Founded: 2000 Location: Bellevue, WA	Last round: \$10 million, Series D, Jan 2005. Previous \$35 million raised in A-C rounds. Investors: Baker Capital, Cascadia, Intel, Northwest Ventures, OVP Venture Partners, The Spangler Group,

Products & Technologies
Name: Product 15 Client: Browserless client (proprietary) Server: (proprietary) Solutions: Mobile Advertising, Mobile Search and Mobile Entertainment

Strengths of Competitor 15	Potential threats from Competitor 15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Personalization ■ Usability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Similar Client Server Model.
Weaknesses of Competitor 15	How Company beats Competitor 15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No content developer partners. ■ Focused on delivering web content sites to mobile phone. ■ Lack of a content provider developer network. ■ Lack of justification of funds raised: MAP is 80 man-years of development, over 45 million dollars, and 28 patent applications. That's over ½ million per man year of development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Business model encourages developer, content provider and carrier involvement. ■ Company builds a community. ■ Open Source solutions build a community.

