GTMara

GTM Diagnostic Report

Prepared for Northstar Labs · 2026-07-13 · Order cc75a52d-9a53-429e-aa09-ba291ebb8ebd

---

Executive Summary

Northstar Labs, your biggest bottleneck is not top-of-funnel volume; it is conversion drag caused by a narrative that is still "Too founder-led / hard to explain," which shows up as leads who do not book calls and calls that do not become opportunities.

Your second bottleneck is qualification discipline: you said lead quality is mixed, your ICP is only "Somewhat clear," and HubSpot has partially defined lifecycle stages with no lead scoring, so bad-fit leads and good-fit leads are entering the same motion.

Your third bottleneck is execution hygiene: "Follow-up is inconsistent" and "CRM / data is messy," which means even the right mid-market prospects are getting lost between first touch and next step.

Fixing these three issues will let you turn your strongest-fit buyers — especially referrals from 51–1000 employee teams with a real manual-handoff problem — into a more predictable pipeline and better conversion.

Your GTM System Today

Northstar Labs sells a SaaS product: a "Workflow automation platform that helps mid-market operations teams connect their tools and eliminate manual handoffs." In your own words, you "replace brittle spreadsheets and one-off Zaps with reliable, governed automations."

Your market is mid-market, with best-fit company sizes at **51–200 employees** and **201–1000 employees**.

The roles you sell to today are **RevOps / Operations** and **Product / Tech leaders**.

Your current lead sources are:

- **Outbound email**
- **Website / organic search**
- **Events / webinars**
- **Referrals**

The most reliable channel is **Referrals**, but your current lead quality is mixed. You know your better leads tend to have:

- a clear problem
- the right company size
- decision-maker involvement
- relevant tools already in place

You also already know your bad-fit patterns:

- too small
- just researching
- no clear problem
- too enterprise / too complex

Operationally, you run in **HubSpot**, but data is **very messy**, lifecycle stages are only **partially** defined, and you are using **no lead scoring**. Your stated goal for this diagnostic is simple and correct: **better conversion**.

Where Your System Leaks

1. Your message is not translating pain into urgency

What is breaking:

- Prospects can understand the category, but they are not feeling enough urgency to act now.
- Your own diagnosis says the messaging is "Too founder-led / hard to explain."
- Your most common objection is "Not urgent enough."

Evidence from your answers:

- Leads do not book calls.
- Calls do not turn into opportunities.
- The offer is strong, but it is still being presented as a product explanation instead of a business problem with a deadline.
- You sell replacement of "brittle spreadsheets and one-off Zaps," but the prospect is not yet seeing the cost of leaving those in place.

Why this matters:

- For a €20k–€100k deal with a 1–3 month sales cycle, buyers do not move because automation is interesting; they move because operational risk, handoff failure, or governance pain has become expensive enough to fix.
- If your story stays product-first, your funnel fills with people who agree the platform is useful but do not prioritize it this quarter.

Cost of leaving it unfixed:

- More calls with curious but inactive buyers.
- More "follow up in a few months" outcomes.

- Lower opportunity conversion from organic, webinar, and outbound-sourced leads.
- Founder dependence, because only the founder can fully explain the value in a live call.

2. Your qualification system is too loose for the deal size you are chasing

What is breaking:

- Northstar Labs does not yet have a tight, enforced definition of who deserves immediate sales attention versus nurture or disqualification.
- Right now, lead quality is "mixed" because your ICP is only "Somewhat clear," and there is no lead scoring in HubSpot.

Evidence from your answers:

- High-quality lead signals are already known: clear problem, target company size, decision-maker, relevant tools.
- Bad-fit signals are already known: too small, just researching, no clear problem, too enterprise / too complex.
- Yet those signals are not operationalized anywhere because lifecycle stages are only partially defined and scoring is not in use.

Why this matters:

- A mid-market motion to **RevOps / Operations** and **Product / Tech leaders** is not forgiving. The same demo request can mean "we need this now" or "we are browsing automation tools."
- Without structured qualification, AEs or founders treat all inbound and event leads roughly the same, which lowers speed and wastes attention on weak accounts.

Cost of leaving it unfixed:

- Time gets spent on accounts outside 51–1000 employees.

- Too-small and too-enterprise leads keep contaminating conversion data.
- True high-intent referrals do not get the fast-lane treatment they deserve.
- You cannot reliably explain why calls fail to become opportunities because the input quality is not controlled.

3. HubSpot is not governing your sales motion, so good leads are leaking out in follow-up

What is breaking:

- Your internal GTM process has the same issue your product solves for customers: unreliable handoffs.
- You sell "reliable, governed automations," but your own GTM handoffs are currently governed loosely.

Evidence from your answers:

- "Follow-up is inconsistent"
- "CRM / data is messy"
- Lifecycle stages are only partially defined
- No lead scoring in use
- Primary goal is better conversion, not more leads

Why this matters:

- In a 1–3 month sales cycle, inconsistency kills momentum. If a strong referral waits days for follow-up, or if a webinar lead gets no clear next step, urgency decays fast.
- Messy HubSpot data also makes it impossible to learn by source, persona, or objection. You cannot fix what you cannot see cleanly.

Cost of leaving it unfixed:

- Slower response times to high-intent leads

- Missed next steps after first calls
- Poor rep accountability
- No clean reporting on where opportunities are actually being lost

4. You are under-leveraging your best channel: referrals

What is breaking:

- Your best-performing channel is **Referrals**, but it does not appear to be the system you are organizing your motion around.
- Instead, referrals sit beside outbound email, website / organic search, and events / webinars as one of several channels.

Evidence from your answers:

- You explicitly said **Referrals** are your most reliable channel.
- You also said quality is mixed overall, which suggests your most trusted signal is not being separated and accelerated.
- There is no mention of source-specific routing, source-specific follow-up, or source-specific messaging in HubSpot.

Why this matters:

- Referrals are often the closest thing to pre-qualified demand. In your motion, they are more likely to come with context, urgency, and existing trust.
- When referrals are processed through the same messy system as generic inbound or low-intent webinar signups, you flatten your best source into average performance.

Cost of leaving it unfixed:

- You miss the highest-converting slice of pipeline.

- Referrals do not compound because there is no deliberate referral loop.
- Lower-confidence channels carry too much of the burden for opportunity creation.

5. You are not yet selling cleanly to the buying unit

What is breaking:

- Your two core buyer groups — **RevOps / Operations** and **Product / Tech leaders** — do not buy for the same reason, even if they end up buying the same product.
- If the first call does not map the pain to the right stakeholder, the opportunity stalls.

Evidence from your answers:

- Calls do not turn into opportunities.
- Relevant tools are one of your strongest high-quality signals.
- Your offer has both workflow pain language and governance / reliability language, which likely resonate differently across roles.

Why this matters:

- RevOps / Operations cares about manual handoffs, throughput, and dependency on spreadsheets.
- Product / Tech leaders care about reliability, governance, and reducing one-off tooling sprawl.
- A single founder-led pitch can blur these and create agreement without commitment.

Cost of leaving it unfixed:

- Stakeholders nod, but no internal champion emerges.
- Calls stay exploratory instead of becoming scoped buying conversations.
- Deals stall because the operational user and technical approver never both see the value in their own terms.

Best-Fit Audience & ICP Definition

For Northstar Labs, the best-fit ICP is not "mid-market companies that need automation." That is too broad and is exactly why quality feels mixed. Your real best-fit buyer is narrower.

Best-fit firmographics

- **Company size: 51–200 employees** and **201–1000 employees**
- **Market type: Mid-market**
- **Operational profile:** teams with enough process complexity that manual handoffs now create visible drag, but not so much enterprise complexity that every workflow change becomes a six-month architecture project
- **Tool environment:** they already use multiple relevant tools and feel the pain of stitching them together through spreadsheets or fragile one-off automations

Best-fit roles

- **Primary buyer: RevOps / Operations**
- **Secondary buyer / approver: Product / Tech leaders**
- **Best-case buying unit:** an operations owner with a real process bottleneck plus a technical stakeholder who cares about governance and reliability

Qualification criteria for good-fit opportunities

A lead should be treated as best-fit when most of these are true:

- They are in your target size bands: **51–200** or **201–1000**
- They can describe a specific broken handoff, manual workflow, or automation reliability issue
- They currently rely on spreadsheets, disconnected tools, or "one-off Zaps"

- A decision-maker or clear process owner is involved early
- They already use a meaningful stack of tools that needs coordination
- The problem is active enough to buy within your **1–3 month** sales cycle
- The account is operationally complex enough to need governance, but not "too enterprise / too complex"

Disqualifiers

These should be routed to nurture or closed-lost early:

- **Too small**
- **Just researching**
- **No clear problem**
- **Too enterprise / too complex**
- No internal owner for the workflow problem
- Interest in automation generally, but no pain tied to handoffs, governance, or reliability

Your strongest-fit wedge

The sharpest entry point for Northstar Labs is:

- mid-market operations teams
- with real handoff friction
- already cobbling together workflows through spreadsheets or fragile automations
- now feeling the cost of unreliability enough to prioritize a governed solution

That wedge is much stronger than a broad "workflow automation platform" story.

Buyer Personas

Persona 1 — RevOps Fixer

- **Name & Role:** Head of RevOps / Revenue Operations Manager
- **Day-to-Day Reality:** Owns funnel and process performance across multiple tools; constantly fire-fights broken handoffs, spreadsheet workarounds, and manual updates.
- **Goals:** Reduce manual work, improve process reliability, create cleaner handoffs, scale operations without adding headcount.
- **Pains:** Brittle spreadsheets, one-off Zaps, inconsistent process execution, teams blaming each other when records or tasks fall through.
- **Buying Triggers:** A recurring handoff failure, team growth from 51–200 toward more complexity, leadership pressure to improve efficiency, auditability concerns.
- **Where they spend time:** Website / organic search for solutions, events / webinars focused on ops efficiency, referrals from peers.
- **Objections:** "Not urgent enough," fear of another tool rollout, concern that current workarounds are "good enough."
- **Actionable Insight:** Sell the cost of delay in operational terms: missed handoffs, hidden manual hours, and process risk — not just automation features.

Persona 2 — Operations Leader Under Scale Pressure

- **Name & Role:** VP Operations / Director of Operations
- **Day-to-Day Reality:** Responsible for scaling cross-functional processes while teams outgrow manual coordination and spreadsheet-based oversight.

- **Goals:** Eliminate operational bottlenecks, make workflows consistent, reduce dependence on tribal knowledge, support growth without chaos.
- **Pains:** Manual handoffs between teams, inconsistent execution, opaque workflows, inability to govern how tools interact.
- **Buying Triggers:** New systems added to the stack, repeated cross-team breakdowns, faster growth, board or leadership pressure for efficiency.
- **Where they spend time:** Referrals, industry events / webinars, selective organic search when a problem becomes visible.
- **Objections:** Worry that fixing workflow issues can wait until next quarter; concern about adoption across teams.
- **Actionable Insight:** Use role-specific proof that Northstar Labs replaces "brittle spreadsheets and one-off Zaps" with a system leaders can trust across teams.

Persona 3 — Product / Tech Governance Owner

- **Name & Role:** Product leader, Engineering manager, or Tech lead involved in systems decisions
- **Day-to-Day Reality:** Asked to support business workflows without letting the tool stack become fragile, undocumented, or impossible to maintain.
- **Goals:** Reliable integrations, governed automations, less technical debt from ad hoc processes, fewer interruptions from business-side workarounds.
- **Pains:** One-off automations breaking silently, unclear ownership, security or governance concerns, business teams building fragile systems outside technical standards.
- **Buying Triggers:** Existing automations failing, scaling pains in a 201–1000 employee environment, need for more controlled workflow ownership.

- **Where they spend time:** Referrals from internal stakeholders, direct outbound email when the message is technical enough, technical review after ops has interest.
- **Objections:** Skepticism of no-code or business-led automation, concern about governance, belief that current tooling stack should be enough.
- **Actionable Insight:** Lead with reliability and governance for this persona, not speed alone; they buy the "reliable, governed automations" part of your promise.

Lead Behavior: High- and Low-Intent Signals

For Northstar Labs, intent is best judged by a combination of **source**, **pain clarity**, **role**, and **urgency**.

High-intent signals

- A **referral** lead who comes in with context from a peer, customer, or partner
- Any lead from **51–200** or **201–1000** employee companies
- Form fills or email replies that mention manual handoffs, spreadsheet dependency, broken workflows, or unreliable automations
- Prospects who use relevant tools already and can explain why those tools are not connecting cleanly
- A **RevOps / Operations** leader who books quickly after first touch
- A **Product / Tech leader** joining the first or second call, showing technical seriousness early
- Webinar attendees who ask a concrete question and take a next step, not just attend
- Organic leads who describe a problem in business language, not generic curiosity about automation
- Anyone who can articulate why fixing this matters inside the next **1–3 months**

Medium-intent signals

- Outbound email replies that acknowledge the problem but do not commit to a meeting

- Webinar attendees who engage but cannot tie the issue to a specific workflow
- Inbound leads from target-size accounts without decision-maker involvement yet
- Prospects who have the right stack and size, but the pain is still emerging

Low-intent signals

- Leads that are **too small**
- Leads that are **too enterprise / too complex**
- People who are **just researching**
- Prospects with no clear problem beyond "we are looking at automation tools"
- Webinar signups with no follow-up engagement
- Outbound replies that say some version of "interesting, not for now"
- Contacts who are not owners, influencers, or approvers in the workflow
- Accounts that do not currently rely on multiple relevant tools, so the handoff problem is weak

How to use this in your motion

- **Referrals:** route directly to same-day human follow-up
- **Website / organic search:** prioritize based on pain language in the form, not just source
- **Events / webinars:** only promote to sales when there is a clear pain statement or booked next step
- **Outbound email:** require positive signal beyond reply rate — pain, fit, and role alignment

---

Lead Scoring Model

Northstar Labs should use a scoring model that reflects your **€20k–€100k** deal size and **1–3 month** sales cycle. That means scores should prioritize clear pain and buying readiness, not shallow engagement.

Signal	Points	Rationale
Referred lead	25	Referrals are your most reliable channel and usually arrive with trust already built.
Company size 51–200	15	Strong stated fit for your mid-market motion.
Company size 201–1000	20	Also stated fit, with higher likelihood of meaningful workflow complexity.
Too small account	-25	Explicit bad-fit signal from your answers.
Too enterprise / too complex	-20	Explicit bad-fit signal; likely longer, misaligned motion.
Role = RevOps / Operations	20	Primary buyer most directly attached to workflow pain.
Role = Product / Tech leader	12	Important stakeholder, but often secondary unless governance pain is active.
Decision-maker involved	15	One of your stated high-quality signals.
Mentions manual handoffs, spreadsheets, or broken workflows	20	Strong fit with your core offer and urgency narrative.
Mentions replacing one-off Zaps / unreliable automations	18	Direct match to your offer description.

Already uses relevant tools	10	One of your stated high-quality signals; indicates real integration context.
Books a call within 7 days	15	Strong readiness indicator in a 1–3 month cycle.
Multi-stakeholder attendance on first/second call	10	Suggests internal seriousness and real buying motion.
Webinar attendee who asks a concrete question	8	Better than attendance alone; shows pain formation.
Organic lead with detailed problem description	12	High signal when paired with pain clarity.
Outbound reply with specific workflow problem	10	Positive intent beyond courtesy engagement.
"Just researching"	-20	Explicit low-intent signal from your answers.
No clear problem identified	-20	Explicit bad-fit signal.
Says "not urgent" or timeline beyond 90 days	-15	Reflects your most common objection and weak near-term conversion.
No-show / no response for 14 days	-15	Momentum loss in a short sales cycle.

Score thresholds

- **70+ = Sales Priority**- Same-day follow-up in HubSpot

  - AE or founder-led first response

  - Move toward discovery with explicit pain/timeline qualification

- **45–69 = Qualify Fast**- Review within 24–48 hours

  - SDR/AE confirms pain, company size, role, and urgency

  - Either promote to sales priority or place in structured nurture

- **Below 45 = Nurture or disqualify**- Do not force these into active pipeline

  - Route by source and reason: webinar nurture, early-stage education, or close-lost bad fit

Non-negotiable rule

No lead should become an opportunity in HubSpot without:

- target company size
- role
- pain identified
- urgency window
- next step booked

That rule alone will improve data quality and opportunity conversion analysis.

Segmentation & Campaigns

Northstar Labs should segment by the variables already proven in your answers, not by vanity attributes.

Core segmentation

1. **By role**- **RevOps / Operations**

   - **Product / Tech leaders**

2. **By fit**- **Best fit:** 51–1000 employees, clear problem, relevant tools, decision-maker involved

   - **Borderline fit:** right size but weak urgency or unclear ownership

   - **Bad fit:** too small, just researching, no clear problem, too enterprise / too complex

3. **By source**- **Referrals**

   - **Website / organic search**

   - **Events / webinars**

   - **Outbound email**

Campaign 1: Urgency Reframe Campaign

Tied leak: messaging does not create urgency.

Who it targets:

- Website / organic search leads
- Outbound email prospects
- Webinar follow-up contacts

What it does:

- Reframes your product from "workflow automation platform" into the business cost of manual handoffs and unreliable automation.
- Uses the language prospects already understand: spreadsheets, handoffs, one-off Zaps, governance.

Why this relieves the leak:

- It directly attacks the "Not urgent enough" objection by showing operational cost and risk, not just features.
- It reduces founder dependence because the story becomes easier for the team to repeat.

Campaign 2: Referral Fast-Lane Campaign

Tied leak: referrals are your best channel but under-systemized.

Who it targets:

- All referral leads
- Happy customers, partners, and close contacts who can generate more referrals

What it does:

- Creates a dedicated HubSpot path for referred leads
- Enforces same-day follow-up
- Captures referral source and relationship context
- Includes a lightweight referral ask after successful calls or wins

Why this relieves the leak:

- It protects your highest-converting source from getting buried in messy data and inconsistent follow-up.
- It increases the share of pipeline coming from your most reliable channel.

Campaign 3: Re-Qualification and Nurture Campaign

Tied leak: mixed-quality leads are being over-handled by sales.

Who it targets:

- Webinar attendees
- Early-stage organic leads
- Low-scoring outbound responders

What it does:

- Separates problem-aware leads from curiosity-driven leads

- Uses HubSpot scoring and lifecycle rules to route by intent
- Nurtures "just researching" contacts without forcing them into active opportunity stages

Why this relieves the leak:

- It protects sales capacity for high-fit accounts in the €20k–€100k range.
- It makes conversion metrics cleaner by removing bad-fit noise from pipeline reporting.

Next-Best Actions

These are the highest-leverage moves for Northstar Labs in the current stack: **HubSpot**, **outbound email**, **website / organic search**, **events / webinars**, and **referrals**.

1. Turn your message into a repeatable pain narrative

Why first:

- Your biggest visible objection is "Not urgent enough."
- Your current story is "Too founder-led / hard to explain."

What to do:

- Build two role-specific message tracks:- **RevOps / Operations:** eliminate manual handoffs, spreadsheet dependency, and process breakage

  - **Product / Tech leaders:** replace fragile one-off automations with reliable, governed systems
- Make every call and sequence answer:1. what is breaking now

  2. what it costs to leave in place

  3. why Northstar Labs is safer than patchwork workflows

2. Rebuild HubSpot around qualification, not just contact storage

Why second:

- "CRM / data is messy" and lifecycle stages are only partially defined.
- Without this, conversion improvement will remain anecdotal.

What to do:

- Define lifecycle stage entry/exit criteria
- Add scoring
- Require key fields before opportunity creation
- Create source-specific follow-up SLAs

3. Give referrals their own motion

Why third:

- Referrals are your most reliable channel.
- They should not be treated like generic inbound.

What to do:

- Create a referred-lead workflow in HubSpot
- Same-day outreach from AE/founder
- Track who referred them and what problem was mentioned
- Ask for one new referral at post-win and post-success moments

4. Standardize follow-up by source

Why fourth:

- "Follow-up is inconsistent" is causing avoidable leakage.
- Each source enters with different context and should not get the same cadence.

What to do:

- Referrals: fast, human, contextual
- Organic: pain-confirming qualification
- Webinars: engagement-based follow-up
- Outbound: problem-confirming reply handling

CRM fields to create in HubSpot

- **Primary Pain** — *Dropdown* — Capture whether the issue is manual handoffs, spreadsheet dependency, unreliable automations, governance, or no clear problem.
- **Urgency Window** — *Dropdown* — Track now / this quarter / later / no timeline to surface "Not urgent enough."
- **Decision-Maker Involved** — *Checkbox* — Separate interest from buying readiness.
- **Buying Role** — *Dropdown* — Distinguish RevOps / Operations from Product / Tech leaders.
- **Company Size Band** — *Dropdown* — Enforce 51–200, 201–1000, too small, too enterprise.
- **Relevant Tools in Use** — *Multi-select* — Confirm stack complexity and integration context.
- **Lead Source Detail** — *Dropdown* — Differentiate referral, website / organic search, events / webinars, outbound email.
- **Referral Source Name** — *Single-line text* — Preserve context for your best channel.
- **Qualification Status** — *Dropdown* — Best fit, nurture, disqualified.
- **Disqualification Reason** — *Dropdown* — Too small, just researching, no clear problem, too enterprise / too complex.
- **Next Step Date** — *Date* — Force follow-up accountability.
- **Opportunity Readiness Score** — *Number* — Operationalize the scoring model.

30-Day Priority Plan

Week 1 — Diagnose the last 30–50 leads and clean the foundations

- **Owner: GTM lead**- Pull the last 30–50 leads from HubSpot across **outbound email**, **website / organic search**, **events / webinars**, and **referrals**.

  - Tag each one by source, company size, role, objection, and outcome.

  - Goal: verify exactly where leads stop — no booking, no-show, no opportunity, no follow-up.

- **Owner: Founder + GTM lead**- Review 10 lost or stalled calls and rewrite the core story around the prospect's pain, not the platform.

  - Build two simple talk tracks: one for **RevOps / Operations**, one for **Product / Tech leaders**.

  - Goal: fix the "Too founder-led / hard to explain" problem at the root.

- **Owner: HubSpot admin / RevOps**- Define lifecycle stages with explicit entry/exit rules.

  - Make fields required for new qualified leads: company size band, buying role, lead source detail, primary pain, next step date.

  - Goal: stop "CRM / data is messy" from continuing.

- **Owner: Sales lead / AE**- Set response-time SLAs:

  - referrals: same day

  - organic demo/contact leads: within 24 hours

  - webinar high-intent leads: within 24 hours

  - outbound positive replies: within same business day

  - Goal: eliminate inconsistent follow-up on your highest-intent leads.

Week 2 — Build the qualification engine in HubSpot

- **Owner: HubSpot admin / RevOps**- Implement the lead scoring model in HubSpot using the signals already in your answers.

  - Add negative scoring for **too small**, **just researching**, **no clear problem**, and **too enterprise / too complex**.

  - Goal: separate best-fit from bad-fit before sales time is spent.

- **Owner: GTM lead**- Create qualification criteria for when a contact becomes an opportunity:

  - right company size

  - pain identified

  - urgency window known

  - decision-maker involved or mapped

  - next meeting booked

  - Goal: improve call-to-opportunity conversion quality.

- **Owner: Marketing**- Update website / organic forms to capture:

  - primary pain

  - company size band

  - role

  - urgency window

  - Goal: make inbound leads easier to route and score.

- **Owner: Sales lead**- Create source-specific follow-up sequences:

  - referral follow-up

  - organic inbound qualification

  - webinar follow-up

  - outbound reply handling

  - Goal: remove generic follow-up from different lead contexts.

Week 3 — Launch targeted conversion plays

- **Owner: Founder + Marketing**- Launch the urgency reframe campaign across website copy, outbound email, and webinar follow-up.

  - Use your strongest proof language: replacing "brittle spreadsheets and one-off Zaps" with "reliable, governed automations."

  - Goal: answer "Not urgent enough" before and during the first call.

- **Owner: Sales lead / AE**- Start using role-specific discovery:

  - **RevOps / Operations:** ask about handoffs, manual work, reporting gaps, broken workflows

  - **Product / Tech leaders:** ask about reliability, governance, ownership, and automation sprawl

  - Goal: improve call-to-opportunity conversion by matching pain to buyer.

- **Owner: Founder / Customer Success / Partnerships**- Launch a lightweight referral program:

  - identify 10–15 warm supporters

  - ask for introductions to mid-market ops leaders with active workflow pain

  - log referral source in HubSpot

  - Goal: increase share of pipeline from your most reliable source.

- **Owner: HubSpot admin**- Build a dashboard by source and stage:

  - lead-to-booked-call rate

  - booked-call-to-opportunity rate

  - follow-up SLA compliance

  - disqualification reasons

  - Goal: see whether the real leak is message, fit, or process.

Week 4 — Tighten based on live data

- **Owner: GTM lead**- Review all Week 2–3 leads by score and outcome.

  - Identify whether high-scoring leads are converting better than low-scoring ones.

  - Goal: validate or adjust the scoring model.

- **Owner: Sales lead**- Review every stalled deal and mark the primary reason:

  - no urgency

  - wrong role

  - unclear pain

  - no decision-maker

  - bad fit

  - Goal: make call-to-opportunity failure diagnosable, not anecdotal.

- **Owner: Marketing**- Double down on the best-performing message by source:

  - outbound email subject and first-line hooks

  - webinar CTA

  - website form framing

  - Goal: increase booked-call conversion from non-referral channels.

- **Owner: Founder + GTM lead**- Hold a 60-minute pipeline review focused only on three questions:

  1. Which leads matched your real ICP?

  2. Which objections repeated most often?

  3. Where did follow-up fail inside HubSpot?

  - Goal: turn this into a repeatable operating cadence.

What success should look like after 30 days

- Cleaner HubSpot records with required qualification fields populated
- Referrals moved faster than other sources
- Fewer bad-fit leads entering active sales stages

- More consistent follow-up across website, webinars, outbound, and referrals
- A measurable lift in booked-call and call-to-opportunity conversion on leads that match your 51–1000 employee ICP

The key point is this: Northstar Labs does not have a demand problem first. You have a **translation, qualification, and process-governance problem**. Once those are fixed, better conversion becomes much more achievable inside the motion you already have.