SALES READINESS · BLUEPRINTPORTCO

SOURCE
HubSpot CRM
n = 5,895

Less than 4% of deals have been larger than $10K.

Limited experience with $10K+ ACV motion, long sales cycle and limited marketing-driven lead acquisition in larger ACV accounts creates risk with a rigorous pivot up-market

ALL TIME
All Deals
5,895 100%

TRAILING 12 MONTHS
Closed last 12 mo.
781 13%

ALL TIME
Deals > $10K
209 3.5%

ALL TIME
Deals > $20K
18 0.3%

COHORT → METRIC ↓	ALL TIME · N=5,895 **All Deals**	TTM · N=781 **Closed last 12 mo.**	ALL TIME · N=209 **Deals > $10K**	ALL TIME · N=18 **Deals > $20K**
WIN RATE	14.3% 843 won · 4,978 lost	9.5% 74 won of 781	11.0% 23 won · 161 lost · 25 open	22.2% 4 won · 11 lost · 3 open
AVG DAYS TO CLOSE	41d All-time average	63d +54% vs. all-time	121d 3× the all-time cycle	158d ~4× the all-time cycle
AVG DEAL SIZE	$4.7K SMB cluster	$4.2K Recent ACV trending lower	$16.3K Above $10K floor	$42.2K True $20K+ cohort
TOP LEAD SOURCES	Offline 51% Paid Search 17% Direct 15%	Offline 57% Organic 16% Direct 14%	Offline 64% Organic 13% Direct 11%	Offline 56% Direct 17% Organic 17%

SAMPLE SIZE

Only 18 deals over $20K in the entire CRM history — the institutional muscle for the new motion is thin.

CYCLE TIME

$10K+ deals take 3× longer to close. Forecast cadence and pipeline coverage need to stretch with it.

LEAD MIX

Larger deals lean even harder on offline sources (64%). Outbound and partner channels carry the weight, not paid.

Recommendations

For leadership review

Forcing a shift upmarket has risks.

Three GTM pivots to make, three risks to manage, three questions we still need to answer before committing the plan.

ACTION

01 GTM Pivots

01 Stop accepting opportunities below $10K.

02 Focus demand gen on high-ACV accounts.

03 Double down on offline & outbound channels.

WATCH

02 Risks

01 Revenue attainment may stall out for 1–2 quarters.

02 We may struggle to engage $10K+ prospects.

03 Comp plans built for a 41–day cycle won't fit a 121–day one.

DILIGENCE

03 Questions to answer

01 How effectively can we generate large-ACV opportunities with current resources?

02 Which reps have actually closed in the $10K+ band?

03 What's the right ICP at $10K+, and is our list aligned to it?

01

Audit methodology.

LAYER A · QUANTITATIVE

Field discipline & activity volume.

Counts, populated / unpopulated, days elapsed — pulled directly from HubSpot. Same answer regardless of who looks.

LAYER B · QUALITATIVE

Rubric-scored evidence in deal artifacts.

10 dimensions, 0–3 each, applied to emails, call summaries, notes, meetings. Every score cites a verbatim quote.

COHORT

132 deals

All 2026 new-business in the default pipeline; stratified across closed-won, closed-lost, late-stage open. **98.5%** within-1-point agreement on the calibration pass.

DOCUMENTED CAVEAT

Full call transcripts not exposed by the connector; we score from AI-generated `hs_call_summary` bodies. Transcript access would sharpen **Q5** and **Q6**.

Quality rubric

Q1–Q6 · 0–3 EACH

Q1 **Competitor specificity** Is the incumbent named? Is there deal-specific intel — renewal date, gap, switching trigger?

Q2 **Compelling-need articulation** Is the prospect's business problem named — and tied to dollars, deadline, or program?

Q3 **Stakeholder-intro asks** Did the rep explicitly request intros to other stakeholders, by name and role?

Q4 **Email prospect-orientation** Are emails tailored to this prospect's federal portfolio, NAICS, or recent awards — or templated?

Q5 **Objection handling** Were price / timing / consensus objections acknowledged, addressed, and reframed with evidence?

Q6 **Discovery depth** Did the rep capture the current workflow, the gap, and quantify it — with the current tool / process named?

Strategy rubric

S1–S4 · 0–3 EACH

S1 **Plan coherence across touches** Is there a visible sequence with named milestones, or is the activity reactive?

S2 **Tier discipline** Do line items, price_sheet, and email language all point to the same tier — with discounts justified?

S3 **Next-step commitment** Is the next step explicit, with named owner and decision criterion?

S4 **Multi-thread strategy** Are multiple stakeholders named and reached and engaged — not just CC'd?

03

Big uptick in > $7.5K ACV opens, declining win rate.

Cohort: deals created Jan 1 – May 14 of each year. Deals with no amount excluded. Win % = won ÷ opened (still-open counted as not-won).

BY ACV BUCKET

ACV BUCKET	OPENED '25	OPENED '26	Δ OPENED	WON '25	WON '26	WIN % '25	WIN % '26	Δ WIN %
$7,500 – $10,000	23	31	+8	5	2	21.7%	6.5%	−15.2 pts
> $10,000	6	50	+44	0	5	0.0%	10.0%	+10.0 pts

BY COMPANY_SIZE_CATEGORY · WITHIN ACV ≥ $7,500

SIZE CATEGORY	OPENED '25	OPENED '26	Δ OPENED	WON '25	WON '26	WIN % '25	WIN % '26	Δ WIN %
Sub-Micro	4	18	+14	1	1	25.0%	5.6%	−19.4 pts
Micro	2	13	+11	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0
Small	5	14	+9	1	2	20.0%	14.3%	−5.7 pts
Medium	12	28	+16	2	3	16.7%	10.7%	−6.0 pts
Large	3	4	+1	1	1	33.3%	25.0% (n=4)	−8.3 pts
Very Large	3	4	+1	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0
Total · ACV ≥ $7,500	**29**	**81**	**+52**	**5**	**7**	**17.2%**	**8.6%**	**−8.6 pts**

WHAT THE SIDE-BY-SIDE MAKES OBVIOUS

2.8×

More deals opened in the ACV ≥ $7,500 zone YoY (29 → 81) — but win rate roughly **halved** (17.2% → 8.6%).

More shots, lower hit rate. The motion expanded faster than the qualification did.

4.5×

Sub-Micro grew 4.5x (4 → 18) and converted at **a quarter of the 2025 rate** (25.0% → 5.6%).

Largest segment-level deterioration — the fastest-growing segment is the one we're worst at closing.

−15.2 pts

The **$7.5K – $10K band** is where the conversion problem is sharpest (21.7% → 6.5%).

This is the band where 3-package sends and tier-discipline gaps showed up most often in the qualitative scoring.

6 → 50

The **> $10K band** is genuinely new motion in 2026 — converting at 10%.

Fine for a new segment, but materially below where it needs to be to offset the small-band collapse.