

Have you noticed that a few biopharmaceutical companies and brand teams consistently launch successful products, beat analysts' projections and effectively counter competitors? And many other companies and brand teams—despite offering good products—often have failed launches, routinely miss sales projections and are usually outmaneuvered by rivals? The biopharma industry has transitioned from the growth or Commercial Stage (“Pharma 1.0”) to the mature or Competitive Stage of its lifecycle. This transition demands a wholly different approach to competing called “Pharma 2.0.”

Winning companies have embraced the highly successful and leading-edge Pharma 2.0 mindset, strategic framework and winning actions, while losing companies cling to outdated, ineffective Pharma 1.0 marketing toolsets and promotional tactics. Take the following questionnaire to determine if your company is Winning, Competing, Participating or Spectating in Pharma 2.0.

You can answer these brief questions from the perspective of your firm, franchise or brand team. Focus on your major product(s). Check each box that applies, then follow the directions at the end of the quiz (See page 65). The Pharma 2.0 capabilities are noted in bold at the beginning of each question.

Pharma 2.0 Competitive Questionnaire

Game Changing: Do each of your key brand teams identify and implement a single, overarching game-changing or market-shaping strategy to win vs. trying to win by differentiating your product?

Are You Winning or Losing in Pharma 2.0?

Answer 12 key questions to determine if your brand team is leveraging today's winning competitive strategies and actions

Product Launch 2.0: In drug launches, does your company or brand team seek to win the Pre-Launch Years (beginning three or more years before launch) with an election-style strategic communication campaign vs. seeking to win the Launch Year with a tactical and promotional military-style campaign?

Product Counter-Launch 2.0: Does your company regularly prepare and conduct counter-launches early in the Pre-Launch phase to preempt major competitors' product launches?

Election Campaign Platform 2.0: Do your brand teams prepare and communicate a concise, consistent “election campaign platform”—similar to a Presidential campaign approach—for each major brand?

Product Positioning 2.0: Do the brand teams for your company's major products position their products with four words or less and avoid the use of lengthy “product positioning statements?”

Multi-Level Competition: Does your company require that all key brand plans include ways to win not only at the brand level but also at the franchise, portfolio and corporate levels?

Competitive Conference Management: Do your key brand teams annually seek to win the one or two “Super Conferences” (for example, meetings conducted by the American Society of Clinical Oncology, American Diabetes Association, European Commit-

tee for the Treatment and Research in Multiple Sclerosis, etc.) in their respective therapeutic areas by preparing and executing plans to win during the Pre-, At-, and Post-Conference Phases.

Competitive Trial Management: Do your major brand/franchise teams regularly prepare communication plans for their and their competitors' key clinical studies?

War Games 2.0: For your company's major products, do brand/franchise teams conduct at least twice annually the newer “Competitive Simulations,” including senior corporate management, and identifying only three to five winning, executable actions vs. conducting traditional war games which exclude top management and identify either numerous competitive insights and/or promotional tactics?

Braneric Competition: Do your brand plans prior to launch include strategies and actions for competing against generic competitors vs. waiting a few years before patent expiration to address generics?

Payer Competitors: Does your company or brand team recognize payers as a third-type of competitor (“Budget Competitors” seeking the same budget dollars as biopharma companies) and have specific approaches to deal with payers not only as customers but also as competitors?

Continued on Page 65

Continued from Page 53

Competitive Training 2.0: Does your company provide basic and advanced Pharma 2.0 competitive training annually for the non-sales professionals that are members of extended brand teams (e.g., marketing, marketing research, medical affairs, account management, marketing research, public affairs/communications, competitive intelligence, payer professionals, public policy, clinical research, business development, legal and regulatory professionals, etc.)?

Directions: Count the number of checked boxes. See your company's or brand team's relative competitive rating ahead.

10-12 checked boxes: **Winning Pharma 2.0 Company.** Congratulations! Your company is leveraging the Pharma 2.0 framework and is excelling at an extremely high level of competitive competence. Focus on developing one new Pharma 2.0 capability.

7-9 checked boxes: **Competitive Pharma 2.0 Company.** Nice job! Your company outperforms some of its peers on a regular basis. See if you can adopt two or more additional Pharma 2.0 capabilities, such as Competitive Conference Management or Competitive Trial Management, to reach the next competitive level. Make sure your company is conducting Competitive Simulations on a regular basis against leading competitors to learn Pharma 2.0 best practices.

4-6 checked boxes: **Participating Pharma 1.0 Company.** Unfortunately, your company needs to improve dramatically to start winning. Identify two or more areas where your firm can readily adopt winning Pharma 2.0 approaches, such as Product Launch 2.0, Product Counter-Launches or Election Campaign Platform 2.0. To enhance your competitiveness, seek Pharma 2.0 Competitive Training for your non-sales professionals.

1-3 checked boxes: **Spectating Pharma 1.0 Company.** Your company needs to overhaul its corporate approach to competing. Senior management and therapeutic leaders need to take the lead by offering fundamental Pharma 2.0 Competitive Training for all non-sales professionals. **PE**

STAN BERNARD, a member of Pharm Exec's Editorial Advisory Board, is President of Bernard Associates LLC, a global pharmaceutical industry competition consulting firm. He can be reached at SBernardMD@BernardAssociatesLLC.com

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION
(Requester Publications Only)
(Required by 39 USC 3685)

1. Publication Title: Pharmaceutical Executive			
2. Publication Number: 0279-6570			
3. Filing Date: 09/30/2016			
4. Issue Frequency: Monthly			
5. Number of Issues Published Annually: 12			
6. Annual Subscription Price (if any): \$70.00			
7. Complete Mailing Address of Known Office of Publication: 131 West First Street, Duluth, St. Louis County, Minnesota 55802-2065 Contact Person: Rochelle Ballou Telephone: 218-740-7205			
8. Complete Mailing Address of Headquarters or General Business Office of Publisher: 2 Penn Plaza, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10121.			
9. Full Names and Complete Mailing Addresses of Group Publisher: Mike Tessalone, 485 F Route 1 South, Suite 210, Iselin, NJ 08830-3009 Editor-In-Chief: William Looney, 2 Penn Plaza, 15th floor, New York, NY 10121 Managing Editor: Michael Christel, 485 F Route 1 South, Suite 210, Iselin, NJ 08830-3009			
10. This publication is owned by: Advanstar Communications Inc., 2 Penn Plaza, 15th Floor, New York, NY 10121. The sole shareholder of Advanstar Communications Inc. is: Rocket Holdings, Inc., 1983 Marcus Ave., Suite 205, Lake Success, NY 11042.			
11. Known Bondholders, Mortgages, and Other Security Holders Owning or Holding 1 Percent or More of Total Amounts of Bonds, Mortgages, or Other Securities. If none, check box. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None			
12. Does Not Apply			
13. Publication Title: Pharmaceutical Executive			
14. Issue Date for Circulation Data Below: August 2016			
15. Extent and Nature of Circulation			
	Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 Months	No. Copies of Single Issue Published Nearest to Filing Date	
A. Total Number of Copies	14,803	14,816	
B. Legitimate Paid and/or Requested Distribution			
1. Outside County Paid/Requested Mail Subscriptions Stated on PS Form 3541	10,325	11,693	
2. In-County Paid/Requested Mail Subscriptions Stated on PS Form 3541			0
3. Sales Through Dealers and Carriers, Street Vendors, Counter Sales, and Other Paid or Requested Distribution Outside USPS	113	54	
4. Requested Copies Distributed by Other Mail Classes Through the USPS	0	0	
C. Total Paid and/or Requested Circulation (Sum of 15b (1), (2), (3), and (4))	10,439	11,747	
D. Non-requested Distribution			
1. Outside County Non-requested Copies Stated on PS Form 3541	3,537	2,337	
2. In-County Non-requested Copies Stated on PS Form 3541	0	0	
3. Non-requested Copies Distributed Through the USPS by Other Classes of Mail	0	0	
4. Non-requested Copies Distributed Outside the Mail	495	401	
E. Total Non-requested Distribution (Sum of 15d (1), (2), (3) and (4))	4,032	2,738	
F. Total Distribution (Sum of 15c and e)	14,471	14,485	
G. Copies not Distributed	332	331	
H. Total (Sum of 15f and g)	14,803	14,816	
I. Percent Paid and/or Requested Circulation	72.13%	81.10%	
16. Electronic Copy Circulation.			
*If you are not claiming electronic copies, skip to line 17			
17. Publication of Statement of Ownership for a Requester Publication is required and will be printed in the October issue of this publication.			
Name and Title of Editor, Publisher, Business Manager, or Owner: Christine Shappell, Audience Development Director			
Signature:			
Date: 9/30/16			
I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.			