

BRUSHTON DIAGNOSTIC

Strategy Analysis™

An enterprise expansion plan, evaluated against the standard the world's best firms would apply.

Subject	Document reviewed	Evaluation panel	Overall score
NorthBeam, Inc. (example) Series B B2B SaaS	Enterprise expansion plan Board deck, 18 pages	McKinsey, BCG, Bain MBB standard	2.7 / 4.0 Benchmark 3.8

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The plan is competent. It is not yet defensible.

2.7
out of 4.0

NorthBeam's enterprise expansion plan is well organized and commercially literate, and it would survive a first read in most boardrooms. Measured against the bar that **McKinsey, BCG, and Bain** would apply, it is exposed on the questions that decide enterprise outcomes: **why a mid-market winner wins upmarket, what the incumbents do in response, and whether the evidence behind the headline claims would hold under diligence.** Three of six parameters sit a full point below the standard. None is fatal. All are fixable before the plan reaches an investor, an acquirer, or an enterprise buying committee.

PARAMETER	YOUR SCORE	BENCHMARK	STANDING
Market dynamics	3.0	4.0	Exposed TAM is asserted, not built
Competitive position	2.0	4.0	Exposed No tested differentiation or response
Commercial model	3.0	3.0	At the bar Motion and pricing are sound
Evidence base	2.0	4.0	Exposed Claims rest on anecdotes
Executability	3.0	4.0	Exposed Resourcing trails the roadmap
Financial & value case	3.0	4.0	Exposed Enterprise CAC is unvalidated

The three moves that change the score

- Rebuild the market case bottom-up.** Replace the analyst TAM with a segment-level build from named accounts, realistic ASPs, and a defensible win-rate assumption. This lifts Market dynamics and de-risks the financial case in one stroke.
- Write the competitor's response for them.** Name the two incumbents who lose if NorthBeam wins, model what they do (bundle, discount, acquire), and show why the wedge survives it. This is the single largest point of exposure.
- Source every headline claim.** Convert six customer anecdotes into structured validation: win/loss interviews, a reference cohort, and a paper trail behind each number a buyer or diligence team will test.

Where the plan stands, parameter by parameter

Each parameter is scored on a four-point scale and benchmarked against the highest standard among the firms on the panel. "The bar" describes what those firms would expect. "What we found" reports what the plan actually does. "The move" is the specific, sequenced fix.

1 Market dynamics

3.0 / 4.0 benchmark Exposed

Your score

Benchmark

THE BAR

A bottom-up market built from segments, named accounts, realistic pricing, and an explicit read on timing: which tailwinds are real and which headwinds are being waved away.

WHAT WE FOUND

The plan opens with a \$14B TAM lifted from a single analyst report and a top-down "1% capture" path. The compliance-mandate tailwind is genuine and well argued. But the headwind that matters, incumbents bundling the same capability into renewals already on the table, is mentioned once and never sized.

THE MOVE

Rebuild the number bottom-up from the ~600 enterprise accounts that actually fit, with segment ASPs and a win rate you can defend. Size the bundling headwind explicitly and show the plan survives it.

2 Competitive position

2.0 / 4.0 benchmark Exposed

Your score

Benchmark

THE BAR

Differentiation that has been tested, not asserted: a clear wedge, a credible moat, and an explicit prediction of how each serious competitor responds when NorthBeam shows up in their accounts.

WHAT WE FOUND

The plan claims NorthBeam is "the only finance-native automation platform," a positioning the product team believes but the document never stress-tests. There is no competitor-response section at all. The implicit assumption is that two well-capitalized incumbents will watch a profitable segment erode and do nothing.

THE MOVE

Run a structured differentiation test against the three closest alternatives, then write the response playbook: what each incumbent does (bundle, undercut, acquire), and why NorthBeam's wedge holds for the 18 months it needs.

3 Commercial model

3.0 / 3.0 benchmark **At the bar**



THE BAR

A go-to-market motion matched to the buyer, pricing tied to value, and a credible path from the current motion to the one enterprise requires.

WHAT WE FOUND

This is the plan's strongest section. The land-and-expand logic is sound, the shift from self-serve to a sales-assisted motion is sequenced sensibly, and pricing is anchored to a quantified time-savings story. Channel leverage is the one soft spot: partners are named as a future lever but carry no targets.

THE MOVE

Hold the line here. Add a partner-sourced pipeline target so the channel lever is a commitment, not an aspiration.

4 Evidence base

2.0 / 4.0 benchmark **Exposed**



THE BAR

Every load-bearing claim traced to a source a diligence team would accept: structured interviews, win/loss data, cohort behavior, third-party validation.

WHAT WE FOUND

The enterprise thesis rests on six customer anecdotes, all from happy mid-market accounts, none from the enterprise segment the plan is built to win. The "92% would recommend" stat has no denominator. This is the gap most likely to unravel in a real diligence room.

THE MOVE

Stand up a reference cohort in the target segment, run ten structured win/loss interviews, and attach a source to every number on the summary slide before this document goes anywhere external.

5 Executability

3.0 / 4.0 benchmark

Exposed



THE BAR

A sequenced roadmap with named owners, resourcing that matches the ambition, and an operating model honest about what breaks first.

WHAT WE FOUND

The roadmap is well sequenced and has owners, which puts it ahead of most. The exposure is resourcing: the plan assumes an enterprise sales motion stood up in two quarters on a hiring plan that has not started, and it is silent on the implementation and security capabilities enterprise buyers will demand.

THE MOVE

Pull the enterprise GTM and security hires forward to gate the launch, and add the operating-model build (implementation, SOC 2, support tiers) as an explicit, resourced workstream.

6 Financial & value case

3.0 / 4.0 benchmark

Exposed



THE BAR

Full unit economics with stated assumptions, a quantified ROI, and sensitivity and downside cases that show the plan still works when the optimistic inputs do not.

WHAT WE FOUND

Unit economics are present and the LTV/CAC story is healthy, on mid-market numbers. The plan then applies mid-market CAC to enterprise, where sales cycles are 3x longer and the motion is unproven. There is a single base case and no downside. A sharp CFO finds this in ninety seconds.

THE MOVE

Build enterprise CAC from the actual motion, state every assumption, and add a downside case (longer cycles, lower win rate) that the plan still survives. That is what moves this to a 4.

HOW THIS ANALYSIS IS PRODUCED

Methodology & next steps

The Brushton Diagnostic evaluates a strategy document against the methodologies the world's most reputable strategy firms apply. The client selects an evaluation panel; the plan is scored on six parameters, each on a four-point scale, and benchmarked against the highest standard among the firms chosen. An AI-derived first pass maps the document against each firm's lens, and that analysis is then reviewed and enhanced by The Brushton Group before it reaches the client.

What you receive

A scored, benchmarked analysis like this one: an overall score, a parameter-by-parameter breakdown showing exactly where the plan meets the bar and where it is exposed, and a sequenced set of moves that raise the score, written to be acted on before the plan reaches the people who will judge it.

Two ways to begin

Take the twelve-question diagnostic for a fast read on where a plan stands, or upload your board deck, strategy memo, or growth plan for the document-grounded analysis shown here.

This is an illustrative sample.

NorthBeam is a fictional company and the figures are constructed to demonstrate the format and depth of a Brushton Diagnostic analysis. Your analysis is produced from your own document and held in strict confidence. To see your plan scored against the firms that would judge it, upload your collateral or schedule an introduction at thebrushtongroup.com.

Illustrative sample prepared by The Brushton Group. NorthBeam, Inc. and all figures her