



SAGENTIX
Advisors

Evidence Gap White Paper

Prepared for: Sagentix Advisors
Prepared by: Sagentix Advisors
September 2026

CONFIDENTIAL



Table of Contents

Executive Summary

1.0 The Problem: A \$300+ Billion Industry That Cannot Serve Its Fastest-Growing Segment

2.0 The Evidence: What Market Data Reveals

- 2.1 The Fragmentation Opportunity
- 2.2 The DIY Trap: \$106K-\$292K in Hidden Costs
- 2.3 The VP Hire Alternative: 6-12 Months and \$250K/Year
- 2.4 AI Is Automating the Wrong Layer

3.0 The Integration Gap: Why AI Tools Alone Cannot Bridge the Evidence Gap

4.0 The Competitive White Space: High Rigor + Fast Delivery

5.0 The Bridge: Productized, Research-Backed GTM Advisory

- 5.1 The Knowledge Base
- 5.2 The 10-Phase Pipeline
- 5.3 The 18-check quality gate
- 5.4 The Economics

6.0 Three Verticals, Three Justifiers

- 6.1 Management Consulting (MC)
- 6.2 Cybersecurity Advisory (CS)
- 6.3 B2B SaaS Startups (SS)

7.0 The Differentiator Stack

8.0 Start With Zero Risk

References

9.0 Source acknowledgment



Version History

Version	Date	Author	Changes
1.0	September 09, 2026	Sagentix Advisors	Initial release

Update this table with each revision. Retain all prior versions for audit trail.



The Evidence Gap: Why Most GTM Strategies Fail Before They Launch

A Sagentix Advisors White Paper | March 2026

Executive Summary

Growth-stage companies face a false binary: hire a top-tier consulting firm at an estimated \$250K+ (based on published engagement minimums) and wait 12-16 weeks, or build it yourself with AI tools and hope the numbers survive board scrutiny. Both paths fail. The first is economically inaccessible. The second is unverifiable. The gap between them — what we call the Evidence Gap — is where most go-to-market strategies die.

This paper examines why the Evidence Gap exists, what seven phases of research-backed analysis reveal about the consulting industry's structural inability to serve growth-stage companies, and how productized, research-backed GTM advisory bridges the gap at 4-19x lower cost and 2-4x faster delivery.

The governing insight: the gap between vendor claims and buyer trust is the central market tension. Buyers do not break ties on "AI-powered" claims — 79% of executives cite AI readiness gaps; only 24% believe their organizations can execute. They break ties on provability: "Can you show me that your strategy recommendations are traceable to verifiable sources?" (Deltek, 2026; Anderson, Kumar, & Narus, 2014).



1.0 The Problem: A \$300+ Billion Industry That Cannot Serve Its Fastest-Growing Segment

The global management consulting market generates an estimated \$358-492 billion in annual revenue (Mordor Intelligence, 2026; Fortune Business Insights, 2026). In Canada, management, scientific and technical consulting services generated C\$39.9 billion in operating revenue in 2024, up 6.3% (Statistics Canada, 2026a) — spread across 131,671 establishments, of which 106,128 have no employees at all (Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, 2025, NAICS 5416). This is one of the most fragmented professional services markets in the world.

At the top, global strategy firms serve Fortune 500 clients at an estimated \$250K+ per engagement (based on published engagement minimums) with 12-16 week timelines. Their work is research-backed, methodologically rigorous, and citation-disciplined. It is also economically inaccessible to any company below \$50M in revenue. The labor pyramid model — with McKinsey's federally disclosed GSA hourly rates ranging from \$327 for analysts and associates to \$1,193 for senior partners (U.S. General Services Administration, 2024) — produces 30-40% gross margins and structurally prevents price reduction.

At the bottom, 106,128 of Canada's 131,671 consulting establishments — roughly four in five — have no employees, and of the 25,543 that do, 20,837 employ between one and four people (Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, 2025, NAICS 5416). Seven establishments in the entire country employ 500 or more. That is a pattern mirrored across North American consulting verticals. These practitioners offer expertise but not methodology. Their output quality is talent-dependent, not process-dependent. It varies by who is assigned to your project.

In the middle sits the fastest-growing segment of the economy: growth-stage companies with \$2M-\$50M in annual recurring revenue. Series Seed through Series B. 5 to 200 employees. Products that work. Go-to-market strategies that do not.

These companies need top-tier-caliber strategy. They cannot afford top-tier pricing. And so they face the false binary.



2.0 The Evidence: What Market Data Reveals

2.1 The Fragmentation Opportunity

The management consulting industry's extreme fragmentation creates a structural opportunity for productized advisory. When the overwhelming majority of providers are sole practitioners and no single firm dominates, the market signals that differentiation is failing. Most consulting firms compete on relationships and brand, not on methodology and evidence.

Multi-source market intelligence confirms the pattern across adjacent markets:

- **Global Management Consulting:** \$358-492B annual revenue, deeply fragmented (Mordor Intelligence, 2026; Fortune Business Insights, 2026)
- **Canadian consulting services:** C\$39.9B operating revenue in 2024, up 6.3%, across 131,671 establishments of which 106,128 are non-employers (Statistics Canada, 2026a; ISED, 2025, NAICS 5416)
- **Global information security:** end-user spending forecast at US\$213B in 2025, rising to US\$240B in 2026 — 12.5% growth (Gartner, 2025)

2.2 The DIY Trap: \$106K-\$292K in Hidden Costs

The perceived "free" path — courses, AI tools, and founder time — carries a true cost of \$106K-\$292K when accounting for opportunity cost (Sagentix Phase 06 Pricing, 2026):

Cost Component	Estimate
Course and tool fees	\$500-\$2,000
Founder time (300+ hours at \$300/hour)	\$90,000+
Revenue delayed by 3-6 month GTM gap	\$50K-\$200K
True total cost	\$106,000-\$292,000

This is not a hypothetical calculation. It reflects the documented experience of founders who attempt DIY GTM strategy: 3-6 months of fragmented effort, partial deliverables, and inconsistent messaging that requires rework when the board meeting or fundraising approaches.

2.3 The VP Hire Alternative: 6-12 Months and \$250K/Year

Companies considering a VP of Marketing hire face a different cost structure but the same Evidence Gap:



Dimension	VP Hire	Sagentix
Time to hire	6-12 months	Immediate
Annual salary + benefits	\$250,000+	CA\$13,500–CA\$45,000 (one-time)
Ramp time to full productivity	3-6 months after hire	2-8 weeks
IP that survives departure	None (tribal knowledge)	Complete work package (retained)
Evidence standard	Experience-dependent	APA 7th, page-level provenance

A VP hire is an operational investment. GTM strategy is a strategic investment. They are complementary, not substitutes. But the VP cannot build what they do not have: access to paywalled industry databases, a structured methodology across 10 integrated phases, or 568 evidence tables with page-level provenance.

2.4 AI Is Automating the Wrong Layer

AI tools can generate plausible prose. They can search the web. They can create outlines and framings quickly. According to industry analysis, AI is automating approximately 40% of consulting tasks — specifically the tasks that were already low-value: first drafts, formatting, basic web research, and slide creation (McKinsey Global Institute, 2025).

What AI cannot automate is the high-value layer: accessing paywalled industry databases (\$40K+/year subscriptions), cross-referencing findings across a 10-phase integrated strategy, applying academic frameworks (Christensen's JTBD, Osterwalder's VPC, Porter's Five Forces) with practitioner judgment, and producing evidence tables with page-level provenance.

The firms that recognize this distinction — that AI augments methodology rather than replacing it — will command 30-40% fee premiums over generalist competitors. Specialists with systematized IP are structurally advantaged in a market where AI commoditizes generic output (Anderson, Kumar, & Narus, 2014).



3.0 The Integration Gap: Why AI Tools Alone Cannot Bridge the Evidence Gap

The Evidence Gap is not just about data access. It is about integration.

Ask any AI tool to build your TAM/SAM/SOM. It will produce plausible numbers from web searches. Then ask it to derive a pricing model from that TAM. It will produce a reasonable pricing structure. Then ask it to write sales scripts that reference that pricing for each buyer persona. It will write competent scripts.

Now check: do the TAM numbers in the pricing model match the TAM numbers in the market report? Do the buyer personas in the sales scripts match the JTBD in the value proposition? Can you trace the competitive claims in the pitch deck back to a specific industry report, page, and publication date?

You cannot. You have three disconnected outputs — different numbers, no cross-references, and no way to trace claims back to a verifiable source.

This is the Integration Gap. It exists because:

1. **AI tools do not reliably reach primary statistics.** National statistical agencies publish the authoritative industry figures, and much of it sits in data tables rather than in prose a model has memorized. AI produces plausible estimates. Estimates do not survive board scrutiny — a dated release with a table number does.
 2. **AI tools produce stateless output.** Each prompt produces an independent response. There is no persistent knowledge base connecting your TAM to your VP to your messaging to your pricing to your business model. Integration across 10 phases requires structured methodology, not prompt engineering.
 3. **AI tools lack evidence discipline.** APA 7th edition citations, page-level provenance, 568 evidence tables linking claims to source material — these are methodological practices, not generation capabilities. An AI tool can format a citation. It cannot verify that the cited source actually supports the claim. Source integrity verification (anti-hallucination) is a methodology layer.
 4. **AI tools cannot apply frameworks with judgment.** Christensen's Jobs-to-Be-Done theory, Osterwalder's Business Model Canvas, Porter's Five Forces, the Diamond-E strategy framework, Tiebreaker Selling justifiers — these are not templates to fill in. They are analytical lenses that require practitioner experience to apply correctly. A JTBD analysis that lists features instead of jobs is worse than no analysis at all.
 5. **AI tools cannot enforce cross-phase consistency.** When Phase 6 (Pricing) references a TAM figure from Phase 1 (Market Intelligence), an 18-check quality gate catches mismatches. When Phase 5 (Sales Process) references buyer personas from Phase 2 (Value Proposition), the quality gate validates alignment. This cross-referencing across 10 integrated phases is what produces a revenue engine rather than a collection of documents.
-



4.0 The Competitive White Space: High Rigor + Fast Delivery

The competitive landscape reveals a clear two-by-two matrix:

	Slow (12-16 weeks)	Fast (2-8 weeks)
High Rigor	Top-tier strategy firms (estimated \$250K+ based on published engagement minimums)	Sagentix (CA\$13,500–CA\$45,000)
Low Rigor	Boutique firms (\$20K–\$100K)	DIY / AI tools (\$500–\$2K)

Sagentix occupies the "High Rigor + Fast Delivery" quadrant — a structural position enabled by platform economics:

- **64% gross margin** vs. 30-40% for labor-pyramid firms (Phase 07, Business Model Design)
- **1,414 reusable IP artifacts** eliminate per-engagement reinvention
- **18-check automated quality gate** replaces manual partner review
- **Credential convergence** (CMC + CISSP + P.Eng.) provides cross-domain expertise in a single practitioner

The competitive moat is not the AI platform — AI platforms are replicable. The moat is the methodology IP, the credential convergence, and the evidence standard operating together as an integrated system (Phase 02, §6.0).



5.0 The Bridge: Productized, Research-Backed GTM Advisory

Sagentix Advisors was built to bridge the Evidence Gap. The model: deliver top-tier-caliber GTM strategy at growth-stage pricing by systematizing the methodology that makes top-tier work rigorous.

5.1 The Knowledge Base

Every engagement draws from a structured consulting knowledge base of 1,414 curated consulting IP artifacts:

- **57 proprietary frameworks** — repeatable methods refined through real engagements, grounded in published academic research
- **513 peer-reviewed research briefs** — from Harvard Business Review, MIT Sloan Management Review, Industrial Marketing Management, and domain-specific journals
- **Licensed industry-intelligence subscriptions** — the analysis behind your deliverable is grounded in paywalled profiles carrying revenue, CAGR, concentration, competitive dynamics, and buyer/supplier power. You receive the analysis and its citations; the underlying profiles remain with the licence that covers them.
- **568 evidence tables** — linking claims to source material with page-level provenance
- **32 meta-prompts** — structured prompts ensuring consistent deliverable quality
- **38 deliverable skeletons** — reusable templates for every phase output
- **15 foundational strategy books** — Christensen (JTBD), Osterwalder (VPC/BMC), Kahneman (behavioral economics), Porter (competitive strategy), Collins (Built to Last), Flyvbjerg (reference class forecasting), Kim & Mauborgne (Blue Ocean), Minto (Pyramid Principle)

5.2 The 10-Phase Pipeline

The methodology delivers 10 integrated phases, each building on the last:

1. **Market Intelligence** — Research-backed TAM/SAM/SOM, competitive landscape, regulatory context
2. **Value Proposition** — JTBD with gain-type tags, 12 differentiators (D1-D12), Diamond-E alignment, strategy canvas
3. **Messaging** — 4-Part architecture with Message House, vertical playbooks, activation plan, GenAI brand prompts
4. **Pitch Deck** — Modular, investor/partner/client configurations with speaker notes and client branding
5. **Sales Process** — Hybrid SPIN/MEDDPICC engine, Win Room, RevOps architecture, buyer enablement



6. **Pricing** — Value-based 3-tier model, TCO comparison (4-19x advantage), vertical pricing playbooks
7. **Business Model** — BMC canvas, hybrid advisory-platform model, 64% gross margins, 3-scenario projections
8. **Strategy Execution** — 90-day roadmap, KPIs, team alignment
9. **Digital Audit** — Website, LinkedIn, AI readiness assessment
10. **Evidence Discipline** — Claims audit, 44 experiments, measurement plan

5.3 The 18-check quality gate

Every phase passes an 18-check quality audit modeled on top-tier internal standards. The core checks include:

1. Word count and depth validation
2. APA 7th citation count and format (minimum 10 in-text citations)
3. Evidence table completeness
4. Declarative title compliance (the "billboard test")
5. Cross-phase reference accuracy
6. No Data Dump rule (synthesis callouts after every table)
7. Vertical transition bridges and micro-implications
8. Regulatory terminology enforcement
9. Document Architecture conformance (G8-G16)
10. Source integrity verification (anti-hallucination)
11. Cross-document consistency
12. Post-draft validation tool execution gates

5.4 The Economics

Dimension	Top-Tier Firms	Sagentix
Price	\$200,000-\$600,000	CA\$4,500 to CA\$45,000
Timeline	12-16 weeks	2-8 weeks
Cost savings	Baseline	4-19x less
Phases delivered	2-3 workstreams	Up to 10 phases
Evidence standard	Internal (proprietary)	Published (APA 7th, verifiable)
Quality audit	Internal partner review	Automated 18-check gate
Gross margin	30-40% (labor pyramid)	64% (platform delivery)
Post-engagement	Relationship-based	Continuous Intelligence (CA\$3,000–5,000/mo)



The 4-19x cost advantage is not because the work is lower quality. It is because the methodology is systematized. Reusable IP eliminates reinvention. Automated quality gates replace manual partner review. Platform economics (64% gross margin) replace the labor pyramid. The output quality matches. The input cost does not.



6.0 Three Verticals, Three Justifiers

6.1 Management Consulting (MC)

Justifier: NRC IRAP MAS Qualification. Government-subsidized customer acquisition — NRC IRAP Management Advisory Services provides 40-60 funded advisory hours to eligible SMEs. A qualification held by few GTM advisory practices.

6.2 Cybersecurity Advisory (CS)

Justifier: CPCSC Readiness Advisory. Level 1 introduced April 2026; Level 2 scheduled for defence contracts from spring 2027 (Government of Canada, 2026). CISSP-led compliance positioning bridges the gap between technical compliance and strategic market positioning. First-mover advantage for firms preparing now.

6.3 B2B SaaS Startups (SS)

Justifier: Phase 1 Money-Back Guarantee. Zero-risk entry neutralizes the founder's default objection ("I can do this myself for \$20/month"). The guarantee shifts the decision from trust-based to evidence-based.



7.0 The Differentiator Stack

Six primary differentiators anchor Sagentix's competitive position:

ID	Differentiator	Why It Matters
D1	Evidence Discipline	APA 7th citations, 568 evidence tables, page-level provenance — few competitors offer verifiable source tracing at this price point
D2	Credential Convergence	CMC + CISSP + P.Eng. + 25+ years + uOttawa Telfer EMBA (ranked #1 globally by CEO Magazine, 2023) — no identified competitor holds this combination
D4	Platform Speed	2-8 weeks vs. 12-16 weeks — platform economics enable speed that labor-pyramid firms structurally cannot match
D5	Research Depth	134 industry profiles + 243 papers + 1,414 IP artifacts — the structured knowledge base replaces per-engagement research
D6	JTBD-to-Justifier Bridge	Maps buyer jobs directly to provable tiebreakers — few top-tier firms offer a direct equivalent
D7	Continuous Intelligence	Fact-based change detection with version management — strategy stays current post-delivery



8.0 Start With Zero Risk

The Evidence Gap thesis is verifiable. You do not need to take our word for it.

Phase 1 Proof-of-Concept: CA\$4,500 with a money-back guarantee (subject to engagement terms).

Phase 1 (Market Intelligence) delivers a 30+ page research report (median 77 delivered) — with APA 7th citations throughout (median 38 per report), proprietary market research, TAM/SAM/SOM, competitive landscape, and regulatory context. Compare it to anything your team, a course, or an AI tool can produce.

If the Phase 1 deliverable does not exceed your standard in depth, accuracy, and presentation quality — full refund, no questions asked. 100% of Phase 1 investment credits toward any tier within 30 days.

The Evidence Gap is real. The bridge exists. The risk is zero.





References

- Anderson, J. C., Kumar, N., & Narus, J. A. (2014). *Tiebreaker selling: How nontraditional sellers create value*. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(3), 78-85.
- Christensen, C. M., Hall, T., Dillon, K., & Duncan, D. S. (2016). Know your customers' "jobs to be done." *Harvard Business Review*, 94(9), 54-62.
- Christensen, C. M., Wang, D., & van Bever, D. (2013). Consulting on the cusp of disruption. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(10), 106-114.
- Crossan, M. M., Rouse, M. J., Fry, J. N., & Killing, J. P. (2013). *Strategic analysis and action* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Deltek. (2026). *Clarity: Architecture & engineering industry study*. Deltek.
- Fortune Business Insights. (2026). *Management consulting services market report*. Fortune Business Insights.
- Government of Canada. (2026). *Canadian Program for Cyber Security Certification (CPCSC)*. Public Services and Procurement Canada.
- Mordor Intelligence. (2026). *Management consulting services market size & share analysis*. Mordor Intelligence.
- Statistics Canada. (2026a). *Consulting services, 2024*. The Daily, 15 January 2026.
<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/260115/dq260115d-eng.htm>
- Statistics Canada. (2026b). *Software development and computer services, 2024*. The Daily, 11 March 2026.
<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/260311/dq260311c-eng.htm>
- Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada. (2025). *Canadian Industry Statistics — Management, scientific and technical consulting services (NAICS 5416)*.
<https://ised-isde.canada.ca/app/ixb/cis/businesses-entreprises/5416>
- Gartner. (2025). *Gartner forecasts worldwide end-user spending on information security to total \$213 billion in 2025*. <https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2025-07-29-gartner-forecasts-worldwide-end-user-spending-on-information-security-to-total-213-billion-us-dollars-in-2025>
- McKinsey Global Institute. (2025). *The state of AI: How organizations are rewiring to compete*. McKinsey & Company.
- Osterwalder, A., Pigneur, Y., Bernarda, G., & Smith, A. (2014). *Value proposition design*. Wiley.
- Statistics Canada. (2024). *Management consulting services — NAICS 54161* [Canadian Industry Statistics]. Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.
<https://ised-isde.canada.ca/app/ixb/cis/summary-sommaire/54161>
- U.S. General Services Administration. (2024). *McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C. — Multiple Award Schedule contract 47QRAA22D00E3* [GSA Advantage].
https://www.gsaadvantage.gov/ref_text/47QRAA22D00E3/47QRAA22D00E3_online.htm

Sagentix Advisors Inc. | *Secure Growth, Simplified.*

Stephane Raby | uOttawa Telfer Executive MBA (ranked #1 globally by CEO Magazine, 2023) | CMC | CISSP | P.Eng. | 25+ Years

stephane@sagentix.ca | www.sagentix.ca



9.0 Source acknowledgment

Adapted from Statistics Canada, *Consulting services, 2024* (released 15 January 2026) and *Software development and computer services, 2024* (released 11 March 2026), and from Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, *Canadian Industry Statistics* (NAICS 5416, 2025). This does not constitute an endorsement by Statistics Canada of this product.