Prepare a licensing value evidence brief

Organize the asset, buyer-use evidence, rights constraints and preparation work needed for an assessment, without generating an unsupported price.

A company-size model cannot establish a price

Use this when a company wants to investigate licensing potential but lacks a defined basis for valuing the opportunity. Headcount and years retained do not establish which records exist, what rights can be granted or whether a buyer needs them. This resource therefore does not calculate a market price.

Gather an asset description, evidence of a relevant buyer task, known restrictions and the work needed to prepare or maintain a contribution. A written proposal is evidence of its specific terms, not proof of general market value.

Identify which evidence would change the decision

Keep observations separate from assumptions. A verified workflow link may make an evaluation possible; an uncertain retention claim needs a system-owner check. Record the next check and the decision it informs.

Commercial alternatives become comparable only when records, permitted uses, exclusivity, term, acceptance and work are clear. Establish those boundaries before treating a quoted amount as a benchmark.

Use the output to scope an assessment

The brief records current evidence and its gaps. It helps an adviser or internal decision owner decide whether to research demand, clarify authority, narrow the contribution or request a written proposal. It does not fill gaps with a modelled dollar range.

Without credible buyer-use evidence, the next task may be research. With unclear rights, the relevant authority question may come first. Those are useful conclusions even when there is no price to report.

What you will take away

An evidence brief separating known facts, use hypotheses, restrictions and next checks. It contains no generated price.

Keep a high-level description in this document. Do not attach raw records, personal details, credentials or confidential contract text. Completing it grants no authority to disclose or license data.

Worksheet

Record what is known and mark what needs confirmation. Unknown is useful information when it is attached to a specific next check.

Proposed asset and contribution

Describe records, period and proposed scope.

Buyer task or use hypothesis

Distinguish an observed requirement from an idea.

Evidence already available

Describe checks or written requirements actually seen.

Rights and scope constraints

List restrictions or authority questions.

Preparation and continuing work

Describe work, dependencies and who can estimate it.

Next check and decision

Name a check that would change the commercial decision.

Who should verify this brief?

Name the responsible role and the check, rather than assuming that a completed form establishes accuracy or authority.

Filled example

Fictional internal planning example. It illustrates the level of description, not a claim about Avelence clients or a source company.

Proposed asset and contribution

A historical contribution of linked operational cases

Buyer task or use hypothesis

Potential outcome-evaluation use; buyer requirement unverified

Evidence already available

Record families confirmed; linkage completeness untested

Rights and scope constraints

Third-party attachments excluded pending review

Preparation and continuing work

System owner must estimate linkage checks and repeatable preparation

Next check and decision

Confirm outcome links before researching a defined buyer requirement

Turn a value question into an evidence question

A company has a long-running archive but does not know whether complete decisions and outcomes are connected. Instead of assigning value from archive age, the brief records the intended task, uncertain links and the system-owner check needed. A possible contribution can then be discussed with its limits visible.

Before acting on the document

1. Identify the evidence that would change the commercial decision.

2. Research the buyer-use hypothesis before treating it as demand.

3. Compare written proposals only after defining rights, preparation and acceptance.

Limits

This is an evidence-organizing method, not a valuation model, quote or buyer commitment.

This brief does not use headcount to estimate a price. Actual proposals require defined rights, work and counterparties.

Sources and scope

W3C PROV Overview. Supports documenting how information was produced; not a valuation standard.

https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-overview/

Resource revision: AVE-42, 3 November 2026. Prepared for editorial review. This revision does not change permissions, make a buyer commitment or establish a market price.