GO-TO-MARKET & PRICING

What are TAM, SAM, and SOM?

TAM, SAM, and SOM establish a nested market sizing architecture that separates aggregate theoretical demand from operational go-to-market capacity.

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)
Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

PUBLISHED
2 September 2026

READING TIME
9 min

WORDS
1,970

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-are-tam-sam-som/

CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Total Addressable Market (TAM), Serviceable Addressable Market (SAM), and Serviceable Obtainable Market (SOM) constitute a disciplined, nested framework for commercial market sizing. When treated as uncritical pitch-deck figures, market estimates encourage reckless capital expenditure by conflating total potential demand with obtainable revenue. Grounded in industrial marketing economics and territory response modeling, this guide formalizes top-down and bottom-up estimation equations, analyzes operational conversion boundaries, works through an enterprise B2B vertical software scenario, and outlines an auditable protocol to connect market sizing directly to sales capacity planning and investor governance.

Keywords: Total Addressable Market · Serviceable Addressable Market · Serviceable Obtainable Market · Market sizing · Go-to-market planning

Total Addressable Market (TAM), Serviceable Addressable Market (SAM), and Serviceable Obtainable Market (SOM) constitute the standard analytical architecture for sizing commercial market opportunities. Rather than representing isolated figures, they form a disciplined nested hierarchy: TAM defines the theoretical ceiling of total demand, SAM isolates the portion reachable by the firm's current products and channels, and SOM establishes the realistic revenue obtainable within committed sales capacity and competitive boundaries.

In commercial practice, market sizing is routinely corrupted into speculative pitch-deck decoration. Executives often cite multi-trillion-dollar industry aggregates as proof of boundless opportunity, failing to recognize that market potential describes an environmental state, not an actionable business plan. Conflating aggregate market size with addressable customer demand leads directly to overhiring, premature scaling, and severe capital misallocation.

In commercial governance, rigorous market sizing connects corporate strategy with sales capacity reality. When leadership enforces auditable conversion filters between TAM, SAM, and SOM, commercial investments reflect achievable unit economics rather than macro-level fantasies.

How are TAM, SAM, and SOM formally defined and calculated?

Rigorous market sizing requires reconciling top-down industry data with bottom-up operational unit economics.

1. Total Addressable Market (TAM)

TAM represents the absolute annual revenue potential if a company achieved 100% market share across every potential customer worldwide who could theoretically benefit from the core solution category.

TAM = N total × ACV potential

Where N total is the total count of qualifying organizations or consumers globally, and ACV potential is the theoretical average annual contract value across full adoption.

2. Serviceable Addressable Market (SAM)

SAM represents the subset of TAM targeted by the firm's specific product capabilities, technical integrations, geographical distribution footprint, and regulatory licenses:

SAM = N target × ACV realized

Where N target = N total × Fit Factor × Geo Factor × Channel Factor, isolating accounts where the current offering delivers superior economic value over reference alternatives.

3. Serviceable Obtainable Market (SOM)

SOM (also termed Share of Market) represents the realistic revenue capture achievable within a defined 12-to-36-month planning horizon, strictly bounded by deployed salesforce headcount, quota capacity, and competitive friction:

SOM = min (SAM × Market Share Target , Reps × Quota Capacity × Attainment Rate)

Goodman (1972) sets out principles for measuring industrial markets and concedes the constraint that governs all of them: "it is usually necessary to rely on proxy data for most of the things a marketer would like to measure." He also keeps potential and forecast apart, potential being a measure of an environmental state and a forecast being

“conditional upon inputs of the various marketing decision variables.” Reliable market sizing therefore means parameterizing proxy data to a specification, not accepting a macro aggregate as a count.

Beswick and Cravens (1977) present “a multistage decision model” that treats the salesforce decision areas as one aggregate process, driven by “a response function which relates sales in a control unit to the many determinants of performance including potential, workload, company effort, salesman quality and experience, and prior sales history.” It is a model rather than a measured law, and workload is one determinant inside it. The planning consequence still follows: projecting revenue from unconstrained market potential ignores the response function altogether.

Darmon (2002) models customer-information management and territory size, and the mechanism is a competition for one scarce resource: information gathering and processing “and the effective contact time devoted to selling to clients and prospects on the other, vie for the limited time resources available to a salesperson.” What the paper supplies is “a simple statistical procedure for estimating the costs of information gathering and processing by a salesperson,” so the optimal territory is something a firm estimates rather than a constant anyone can quote.

Piercy et al. (1999) separate the pieces rather than merging them: sales organisation effectiveness is determined by “salesforce outcome performance and behavioural performance as well as by the use of a behaviour based control approach.” Read that way, an unrealistic market-potential target is a control problem, because it sets outcome expectations that behaviour cannot reach.

Figure 1 The market sizing filtration architecture

Filtration tier	Scope definition	Mathematical basis	Operational constraint governed
Total Addressable Market (TAM)	Global universe of theoretical demand	Total Universe × Potential ACV	Macro strategic category ceiling and venture scale
Product-Market Fit Filter	Excludes incompatible segments	Accounts meeting ICP specifications	Technical capability and feature parity
Serviceable Addressable Market (SAM)	Reachable target segments	Target Accounts × Realized ACV	Go-to-market distribution, sales channel, geography
Commercial Capacity Filter	Excludes accounts exceeding capacity	Active sales reps × Account coverage	Field bandwidth and marketing pipeline velocity
Serviceable Obtainable Market (SOM)	Committed 12—36 month revenue	Active Quota Reps × Attained Quota	Annual operating plan (AOP) and quota allocation
Unit Economics Validation	Marginal cash contribution	SOM × CMR − Sales Cost	Enterprise capital efficiency and margin sustainability

Author's commercial market sizing framework grounded in industrial market measurement and sales territory literature from Goodman (1972), Beswick and Cravens (1977), Darmon (2002), and Piercy et al. (1999).

Why do top-down market sizing models fail in commercial execution?

Companies commonly utilize two competing approaches to size markets: top-down secondary research and bottom-up unit economics modeling. The contrast between these methodologies explains why high-level TAM figures rarely materialize as revenue.

Table 2 Why do top-down market sizing models fail in commercial execution?

Dimension	Top-Down Sizing (Analyst Research)	Bottom-Up Sizing (Unit Operations)
Primary data source	Third-party industry analyst reports (Gartner, IDC)	Company CRM data, firmographic registries, lead lists
Core calculation logic	Applies speculative percentage haircut to macro industry	Multiplies verified account counts by realized deal size
Addressable boundaries	Assumes universal product compatibility	Excludes accounts lacking required integrations or scale
Sales capacity constraint	Ignored; assumes infinite commercial execution	Directly bounded by sales rep ramp, quota, and deal velocity
Competitive displacement	Assumes greenfield capture	Models incumbent switching costs and contract lock-ins
Decision relevance	Useful for venture capital storytelling	Mandatory for territory design, hiring, and revenue quotas
Typical failure mode	Massive overestimation of reachable revenue	Can be overly conservative if new channels are omitted

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

Understanding the bridge between market demand and pricing architecture is critical. As established in What is Value-Based Pricing?, potential contract value depends on the customer's next best alternative and willingness to pay, not on macro industry spend totals.

Worked commercial example: B2B vertical compliance software

Consider a high-growth software vendor building specialized regulatory compliance software for clinical laboratories. The company plans its three-year commercial expansion plan.

1. Calculating Total Addressable Market (TAM)

- Total registered healthcare diagnostic facilities globally: 200,000.
- Maximum theoretical software suite price: $50,000 per year.
- Top-Down Unconstrained TAM: 200,000 × 50 , 000 =10,000,000,000 ($10 Billion).

2. Applying filters to isolate Serviceable Addressable Market (SAM)

- Geography Filter: Currently licensed and certified only in North America (40,000 labs = 20% of global total).

- Scale / ICP Filter: Laboratories with more than 10 technicians possessing required budget (12,000 labs = 30% of North America).
- Integration Filter: Laboratories using supported LIMS database systems (9,600 labs = 80% of qualified labs).
- Realized Annual Contract Value (ACV): $25,000 based on standard tier pricing.
- Calculated SAM: 9,600 qualified labs × 25 , 000 A C V =240,000,000.
- While TAM was 10 bi l l i o n , t h er e a l a dd r ess ab l eo pp or t u ni t y t o d a y i s240 million.

3. Calculating Serviceable Obtainable Market (SOM) via sales capacity

The company plans to deploy a field sales team over the next 24 months:

- Deployed Account Executives (AEs): 12 fully ramped sales reps.
- Annual Quota per AE: $800,000 in new Annual Recurring Revenue (ARR).
- Expected Quota Attainment: 75% on average.
- Effective Sales Capacity: 12 AEs × 800 , 000 USD × 75% = 7 , 200 , 000 USD new ARR per year.
- Existing Customer Base ARR: $12,800,000.
- **Serviceable Obtainable Market (Cumulative SOM Target at Year 2): 20 , 000 , 000 * * (co mbinin g t h e12.8M existing customer baseline with $7.2M in annual new capacity capture).

Under naive top-down planning, capturing 1% of the 10 bi l l i o n T A M w o u l d im pl y a100 million revenue target. However, bottom-up capacity modeling reveals that the entire serviceable market in North America is only 240 mi l l i o n , an dd e pl oy in g 12 q u o t a − b e a r in g s a l esr e p sc an c a pt u r e a t m os t7.2 million in incremental ARR per year.

Connecting this reality to unit economics is paramount. As detailed in What is CAC? and What is Contribution Margin?, funding sales quotas against inflated market targets inflates customer acquisition costs and destroys marginal contribution.

Which operational miscalculations undermine market sizing?

Table 3 Which operational miscalculations undermine market sizing?

Miscalculation	Root cause	Strategic failure	Corrective protocol
The 1% market share fallacy	Projecting revenue by taking an arbitrary sliver of a huge TAM	Produces ungrounded forecasts decoupled from sales capacity	Build bottom-up models bounded by sales rep quotas
Conflating TAM with SAM	Treating all industry participants as qualified prospects	Hires sales reps in regions where the product lacks fit	Segment SAM by technical compatibility and geography
Ignoring incumbent switching costs	Assuming satisfied prospects will readily abandon incumbents	Severely overestimates pipeline conversion velocity	Discount SAM by contractual lock-in and replacement friction
Static market sizing	Treating TAM as a fixed number rather than an evolving space	Misses regulatory shifts and technological obsolescence	Update market sizing models annually based on win-loss data
Omitting customer willingness to pay	Assuming all accounts will pay premium enterprise prices	Misprices offerings across low-tier and enterprise segments	Parameterize ACV tiers across discrete account bands

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

What auditable protocol establishes market sizing governance?

1. Build a verified bottom-up account registry. Extract firmographic data from verified commercial databases to count distinct legal operating entities within targeted industrial sectors.
2. Define explicit Ideal Customer Profile (ICP) boundaries. Document mandatory technical, operational, and regulatory criteria an account must possess to realize positive differentiated value.
3. Isolate SAM through multi-layer qualification filters. Deduct accounts outside targeted geographies, lacking integration prerequisites, or below minimum revenue thresholds from the TAM registry.
4. Audit incumbent contract durations. Survey prospects to determine competitor market share and average contract expiration cycles to establish annual addressable turnover.
5. Synchronize SOM with salesforce capacity. Model obtainable revenue as a direct mathematical function of fully ramped sales rep headcount, territory workload capacity, and historical quota attainment, grounded in Beswick and Cravens (1977).

1. Balance territory potential across sales pods. Design sales territories with equal serviceable potential to maintain commission equity and prevent rep turnover, following Piercy et al. (1999).
2. Reconcile financial plans against bottom-up capacity. Refuse board-level revenue plans that exceed realistic SOM capture rates without corresponding investments in sales capacity.

Where are the empirical limits of market sizing?

Market sizing is a strategic planning framework for capital allocation, not a deterministic crystal ball. In nascent technological categories creating entirely new operational behaviors, historical market data does not exist, rendering traditional TAM calculations speculative.

Furthermore, markets are dynamic systems. Competitors react aggressively to vendor expansion, macroeconomic downturns compress buyer IT budgets, and product line extensions expand addressable boundaries. Executives must treat market sizing models as living operational calibrations rather than permanent corporate fixtures.

The academic foundations of this framework derive from industrial market measurement and sales territory design literature, specifically Goodman (1972), Beswick and Cravens (1977), Darmon (2002), and Piercy et al. (1999). The filtration models, worked industrial calculations, and operational protocols represent the author's synthesis for rigorous commercial execution.

Beswick, C. A., & Cravens, D. W. (1977). A multistage decision model for salesforce management. Journal of Marketing Research, 14(2), 135-144. DOI

Darmon, R. Y. (2002). Salespeople's management of customer information: Impact on optimal territory and sales force sizes. European Journal of Operational Research, 137(1), 162-176. DOI

Goodman, C. S. (1972). Measuring industrial markets: Uses and limitations of available data for market measurement. Industrial Marketing Management, 3, 279-293. DOI

Piercy, N. F., Cravens, D. W., & Morgan, N. A. (1999). Relationships between sales management control, territory design, salesforce performance and sales organization effectiveness. British Journal of Management, 10(2), 95-111. DOI

END OF ESSAY

HOW TO CITE THIS ESSAY

Isoglu, S. (2026, September 2). What are TAM, SAM, and SOM? Sinan Isoglu. https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-are-tam-sam-som/

KEEP READING

Go-to-market & pricing

TAM is not a budget

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/tam-is-not-a-budget/

Go-to-market & pricing

Revenue management versus dynamic pricing

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/revenue-management-versus-dynamic-pricing/

Go-to-market & pricing

Go-to-market strategy is a resource-allocation system

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/go-to-market-strategy-is-a-resource-allocation-system/

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)
Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher