Closing Foundry.

What Mid-Market B2B Sales Actually Requires

Mid-market sales teams often inherit the wrong playbook. They run SMB tactics on deals that are too complex for them, or they borrow enterprise process on accounts that move too quickly for it.

Written by
Charles Talbot
Founder

Reviewed by
Douglas Mancini
Senior Operating Partner

Published 6 Apr 2026 Read time 9 min read

Key Points

- Sales calls with clearly defined objectives have a 20% higher success rate in advancing deals (Gong)
- Multi-threaded deals are 2.3x more likely to close than single-threaded ones (Gong)
- Deals using a Mutual Action Plan achieve a 26% higher win rate than those without (Outreach.io)
- Reps following a formal sales methodology with consistent coaching attain quota at 73% vs 50-60% otherwise (CSO Insights/Gartner)
- Targeted opportunity coaching increases rep performance by up to 19% (CEB/Gartner)
- Top 10% of reps are 3x more likely to regularly involve internal specialists on deals (Bain)

Mid-market sales teams often inherit the wrong playbook. They run SMB tactics on deals that are too complex for them, or they borrow enterprise process on accounts that move too quickly for it. The result is a motion that feels perpetually slightly wrong: too slow to be nimble, too shallow to win complex deals. Understanding what mid-market actually requires means accepting that it occupies a distinct category, not a midpoint between two extremes.

The mid-market trap

The defining characteristic of mid-market buying is diffusion. Decisions are rarely made by one person. A typical mid-market deal involves two to five stakeholders: a VP who initiated the search, an IT lead who needs to sign off on integration, a finance contact reviewing the contract, and possibly an end-user team that has strong opinions. Each has different priorities. Each has informal veto power.

The rep who treats this as a single-person deal, building one relationship with one champion and hoping they carry it, is building on sand. When that champion is in back-to-back meetings for two weeks, the deal stalls. When procurement raises concerns the champion didn't anticipate, the deal stalls. When a competitor gets access to the finance lead the rep has never spoken to, the deal dies.

The research is unambiguous on this. McKinsey found that effectively communicating value to multiple stakeholders raises win rates by approximately 20%. Gong's analysis of deals over £50,000 found that multi-threaded deals were 2.3 times more likely to close than single-threaded ones. That isn't a marginal edge. That is a structural difference in outcome.

Discovery has to go deeper than it does in SMB

In SMB, a sharp discovery call lasts 20 to 30 minutes and gets to the core problem quickly. In mid-market, a genuine discovery process spans multiple meetings and multiple stakeholders, and it has to surface different kinds of information from each.

The technical evaluator needs to know whether the solution integrates with existing infrastructure. The VP cares about strategic outcomes and time-to-value. The finance contact wants to understand pricing structure, renewal terms, and what happens if the business scales. The end-user team wants to know whether it makes their job easier or harder. If a rep conducts the same generic discovery conversation with all of them, they're producing one answer to five different questions.

Gong research found that sales calls with clearly defined objectives, where the rep enters with a specific goal for that particular conversation with that particular person, have a 20% higher success rate in moving deals forward than calls run as open-ended conversations. Preparation matters. So does the discipline to treat each stakeholder engagement as its own exercise in understanding, not a repeat performance of the same pitch.

Mid-market buyers also expect sellers who understand their business context as well as their product category. Mike Kunkle's work on buyer-centric selling identifies this precisely: when a rep satisfies each stakeholder's "exit criteria" at each stage, giving them what they actually need to feel confident moving forward, win rates improve substantially. That is a discipline of preparation and personalisation that most mid-market teams apply inconsistently at best.

Multi-threading is a behaviour, not a strategy

It's easy to agree with the principle of multi-threading. It's harder to make it a consistent behaviour across a sales team. Most reps default to their most responsive contact and avoid the awkwardness of asking for introductions to others in the organisation. That default behaviour is precisely what the

research says loses deals.

The Gong finding bears repeating: in deals above £50,000, multi-threaded opportunities were 2.3 times more likely to close. Multi-threading means having the right conversations with the right people before a competitor does, or before a decision gets made at a level the rep has no visibility into.

For sales teams, the practical standard is this: no mid-market opportunity above a certain threshold should progress past qualification without contact established at two or more stakeholder levels. That is a policy, not a guideline. It needs to be enforced in pipeline reviews, not suggested in training.

Top-performing reps do this instinctively. Average reps do it when reminded. The difference is whether the manager asks "who else in this account are you talking to?" every single time they review a deal, or only when something has already gone wrong.

Mutual Action Plans are the single most underused tool in mid-market

Outreach.io's analysis of hundreds of B2B deals found that opportunities where the account executive engaged the buyer with a Mutual Action Plan had a 26% higher win rate than those without one. Deals with MAPs also closed faster on average, because key steps, including security reviews, legal approvals, and business case sign-offs, were planned in advance rather than discovered as surprises at the end of the cycle.

A MAP isn't a complex document. It's a shared project plan that both parties agree to: what happens, who owns it, and by when. The discipline of creating one forces clarity on both sides. It surfaces the buyer's internal process. It identifies stakeholders the rep may not have known were involved. It creates a shared definition of what "done" looks like.

Most mid-market reps have heard of MAPs. Few use them consistently. The reasons given are usually that the buyer "seems casual" or "it would feel premature." But casual buyers who aren't serious don't co-create action plans with you, which makes the MAP itself a qualification signal. Buyers who engage with the plan are buyers who are genuinely moving toward a decision.

For mid-market teams, the standard should be: every deal above a defined size or complexity has a MAP. Not as a request from the rep, but as a mutual expectation baked into how the engagement is run from the start.

Formal methodology separates average teams from consistent ones

CSO Insights research tracked quota attainment across organisations with different levels of sales process rigour. Salespeople following a defined methodology with consistent manager reinforcement achieved quota at 73%. Those without a formal process landed between 50 and 60%. That isn't a slight variance. It's the difference between a team that delivers and one that consistently falls short.

What the research actually shows isn't that any specific methodology is magic. It is that having clear, agreed criteria at each stage: what a qualified opportunity looks like, what evidence is required to progress a deal, and what constitutes a genuine close plan. This dramatically improves consistency.

Reps make fewer assumptions. Deals don't languish in ambiguous stages for weeks. Managers can have substantive coaching conversations because there is a shared framework to refer to.

MEDDIC, Challenger, SPIN, and similar frameworks all work because they force reps to answer specific questions about a deal rather than relying on gut feel. The methodology itself matters less than whether it is actually used, inspected, and reinforced by management week after week.

Opportunity coaching is where managers earn their impact

CEB/Gartner research identified that targeted opportunity coaching, where a manager works with a rep on the specific strategy for a specific deal, increases rep performance by up to 19%. That isn't general skills coaching. It's a manager sitting down before a key meeting and asking: who are we trying to influence, what do they need to hear, what is the risk we are trying to mitigate, and what happens if this call doesn't go well?

LevelEleven's research on sales performance found that managers spending meaningful time coaching opportunities, rather than primarily selling themselves or just reviewing pipeline status, had win rates 8.2% higher on forecasted deals and 5% higher overall revenue attainment. The manager's job at this level isn't to close deals. It's to make reps capable of closing them.

The best mid-market managers run structured deal clinics: regular sessions where deals above a threshold are reviewed in depth, stakeholder maps are challenged, competitive positioning is stress-tested, and next steps are planned rather than assumed. They also build peer learning: when a rep closes a complex deal, the whole team should understand how and why it closed.

Internal collaboration determines ceiling

Bain's analysis of B2B sales performance found that the top 10% of reps were 3 times more likely to regularly involve internal specialists on their deals, including solutions engineers, product specialists, legal, finance, or marketing, compared to average performers. They were also twice as likely to collaborate with peer reps on overlapping accounts.

Individual accountability still applies. Mid-market deals are won by the best collective answer to the buyer's questions, not by the rep who knows the most. A technical objection handled by a solutions engineer in a focused 30-minute session closes faster than the same objection handled by a rep doing their best over three email exchanges.

CRM tools facilitate this, but only if reps actually use them as collaboration infrastructure rather than as a reporting requirement. Academic research on CRM utilisation confirms that full adoption positively impacts sales effectiveness, not because the system is valuable in isolation, but because it enables the internal coordination that mid-market deals require.

What needs to change

Mid-market sales improvement comes from systematic behaviour change at the team level. The behaviours that lift win rates, including disciplined discovery, deliberate multi-threading, Mutual Action Plans, formal qualification, and consistent opportunity coaching, are all observable, coachable, and measurable. None of them require exceptional talent. They require process, management accountability, and consistent reinforcement.

The teams that improve in mid-market are the ones that stop relying on their best reps to figure it out and start building the conditions where average reps execute well. That is a management and systems problem before it is a hiring problem.

If you're leading a mid-market revenue function and want to put this infrastructure in place, **our approach** is built for exactly this: the methodology, the deal management framework, and the management rhythms that make consistent performance achievable across the whole team. See how it works.

Further reading

Enterprise Sales: What Changes When You Move Upmarket How the skills and process requirements shift as deal complexity and committee size increase.

7 Steps to Win Buying Group Consensus and Cut Deal Slippage A structured approach to multi-stakeholder engagement that reduces late-stage deal loss.

MEDDPICC, Explained: A Practical Guide for Founders and Sales Leaders The qualification framework that gives mid-market teams a consistent standard for deal review.

Sales Qualification: The Standard That Separates Pipeline From Forecast How to build a qualification standard that reps follow and managers can inspect.

How to Build a Repeatable, Buyer Centric Sales Process The discovery and engagement framework that mid-market deals require across multiple stakeholders.

Related terms

- AE (Account Executive): The quota-carrying sales rep responsible for closing new business.
- Mutual Action Plan: A shared timeline agreed with the buyer that maps steps to a decision date.
- Quota Attainment: The percentage of a rep's or team's quota that has been achieved.
- Multi-Threading: Engaging multiple stakeholders at a prospect to reduce single-point-of-failure risk.
- Discovery Call: The structured conversation used to uncover prospect needs and fit.
- Sales Process: A defined sequence of steps that guides reps from first contact to close.
- Business Case: The documented justification for a purchase, including ROI and strategic rationale.

- Buying Group: The set of individuals who collectively influence or make a purchase decision.

Related service: Strategic Sales Enablement
Source: https://www.closingfoundry.com/insights/what-mid-market-b2b-sales-requires