alore

INTERNAL PLAYBOOK
EDITION 01 · 2026

ALORE · OUTBOUND FIELD MANUAL

Cold Email Writing *Philosophy & Process*

A practical internal playbook for B2B outbound.

> *A cold email is not a miniature brochure. It is a tightly argued reason for one relevant buyer to reply.*

5 MARKETING | 5 HR / RECRUITMENT | 5 IT SERVICES

PROBLEM FIRST. SERVICE SECOND.

COMPILED BY **ALORE**
STOP CHASING. START BOOKING.

THE CORE IDEA

A cold email is not a miniature brochure. It is a tightly argued reason for one relevant buyer to reply.

This version contains 15 anonymised examples: 5 Marketing, 5 HR / Recruitment, and 5 IT Services.

CONTENTS

01 **The Philosophy** 03
Eight principles that decide whether a cold email earns a reply.

02 **The Process** 04
From offer to sequence, in eleven front-loaded steps.

03 **The Construction Framework** 05
How a single email is built, line by line.

04 **Sequence Architecture** 06
Five intelligent reasons to respond, not one email five times.

05 **Pre-Send Quality Checklist** 07
Twelve questions every email must pass before it ships.

06 **Fifteen Anonymised Examples** 08
Marketing, HR and IT sequences with the logic intact.

07 **The Standard to Hold** 16
What a 10 out of 10 cold email is really doing.

01 | The Philosophy

SECTION 01

Eight principles that decide whether a cold email earns a reply. Each one is a thinking discipline before it is a writing one.

P01

Problem first, service second.

The first job is to make the prospect recognise a problem that already matters. The service earns attention only after that recognition.

P02

One email, one argument.

Do not stack every capability into one message. Use one pain, one mechanism, one proof point and one next step.

P03

Relevance beats cleverness.

A smart line is useful only if the reader can immediately connect it to a business pressure, workflow problem or commercial consequence.

P04

Proof should do work.

Use proof to reduce disbelief: a result, before-and-after state, speed, cost structure, case study or operational fact.

P05

Specificity creates credibility.

Concrete language is stronger than adjectives. "Bug fixes and releases keep delaying roadmap work" is stronger than "increase engineering efficiency."

P06

The CTA should match the stage.

Early emails invite a low-friction conversation. Later touches can be more direct. The CTA should always connect to the problem discussed.

P07

Follow-ups need new information.

A follow-up is not "checking in." Each touch should introduce a new problem, proof point, objection, economic argument or use case.

P08

Sound like a peer, not a campaign.

Direct, consultative and grounded. Short paragraphs, active voice, natural phrasing, no pitch-deck language.

WHAT THE WRITING SHOULD FEEL LIKE

- Direct without being abrupt
- Consultative without sounding vague
- Slightly provocative when the claim is defensible
- Commercial rather than feature-heavy
- Easy to skim in 15-20 seconds
- Confident without invented certainty or inflated claims

WHAT TO AVOID

- Pleasantries that delay the point
- Generic capability dumps
- Jargon and pitch-deck phrases
- Overclaiming outcomes that the evidence does not support
- Poetic metaphors that make the business case less clear
- Fake urgency, manufactured FOMO, or "just following up" emails
- Long CTAs that ask the prospect to do too much

02 | SECTION 02 The Process

From offer to sequence, in eleven front-loaded steps.

WHY FRONT-LOADED

The process is intentionally front-loaded. Most weak cold emails are not writing failures; they are thinking failures that happened before the first sentence was written.

1. **Define the commercial offer**

   What exactly can we sell, to whom, in what scope, and with what constraints? Separate what is proven from what is merely possible.

2. **Choose the ICP and buying role**

   Define industry, company size, geography, maturity, role, responsibility and likely buying context.

3. **Map the pre-state**

   What is happening today? Where does work stall? What is expensive, slow, risky, confusing or repetitive?

4. **Define the post-state**

   What changes after the problem is solved? Use an operational or commercial outcome the reader can picture.

5. **Map mechanism and proof**

   How do we create the post-state, and what evidence makes that believable? Match proof to the specific claim.

6. **Create the problem-solution grid**

   List the strongest problem statements and map each to a credible solution angle, proof point and consequence.

7. **Choose sequence angles**

   Assign one angle per email. The sequence should progress rather than repeat: cost, delay, risk, missed growth, proof, objection, close.

8. **Write the email skeleton**

   Subject -> problem -> consequence -> mechanism / proof -> low-friction CTA. Then remove anything that does not support the argument.

9. **Run the credibility pass**

   Check every number, case study, comparison and causal claim. If evidence is weak, soften the claim rather than bluff.

10. **Run the human pass**

    Read it aloud. Remove corporate language. Break long paragraphs. Make sure the CTA sounds like something a person would actually ask.

11. **Launch, learn, revise**

    Judge copy on enough volume. Track positive replies and meetings, not vanity metrics alone. Change one variable at a time when possible.

03 | SECTION 03

The Email Construction Framework

How a single email is built, line by line, and when to break the word count.

> LENGTH: A DISCIPLINE, NOT A RELIGION
>
> A 90-100 word target is useful when it forces clarity. It becomes harmful when filler is added just to hit a number. If the argument is complete in 70-85 words, stop. If a complex proof point needs 105 words, clarity matters more than arithmetic.

CORE CONSTRUCTION RULES

The anatomy of one email

SUBJECT	Create curiosity around a real problem, consequence, number, tension or contrast. Usually 40-50 characters is a useful discipline, not a law.
OPENING	Start at the problem. Skip "hope you are well" unless context genuinely calls for it.
PROBLEM	Describe one recognisable operational or commercial friction. Specific beats dramatic.
CONSEQUENCE	Show what the friction costs: time, money, roadmap capacity, conversion, risk, attention or missed growth.
MECHANISM	Explain how you address it in plain language. Do not hide behind category labels.
PROOF	Use one relevant proof point. A strong before-and-after or concrete operating fact is better than five logos.
CTA	Ask for a small next step tied to the problem. "Worth comparing?" is often stronger than "Can I show you our platform?"

SUBJECT-LINE RULES

Win the open without writing a cheque you cannot cash

- Prefer a problem, tension, number, contrast or unexpected question.
- Avoid spammy hype and empty adjectives.
- Do not make a promise the body cannot defend.
- Keep it readable on mobile.
- The subject wins the open; the body must immediately cash the cheque.

04 | Sequence Architecture

SECTION 04

Five intelligent reasons to respond, not one email sent five times.

> THE SEQUENCE TEST
>
> A sequence should feel like five intelligent reasons to respond, not one email sent five times.

Email 1	**Primary pain** Lead with the most expensive or urgent problem.
Email 2	**Alternative pain** Show a different failure mode or operational bottleneck.
Email 3	**Economics** Make the cost, waste, ROI or resource trade-off tangible.
Email 4	**Proof / use case** Show how the problem was solved in a comparable situation.
Email 5	**Objection / capacity** Address the reason they may not act: in-house team, budget, timing, competing roadmap or switching cost.
Email 6+	**Close the loop** Be polite and direct. Give the prospect an easy way to say yes, no or later.

THE PROGRESSION



The sequence should progress, not repeat.

05

SECTION 05

Pre-Send Quality Checklist

Twelve questions every email must pass before it ships.

- [ ] Is this written for a specific buyer, or merely for an industry?
- [ ] Is there only one primary argument?
- [ ] Is the proof directly related to the problem in this email?
- [ ] Does the reader understand the business consequence of doing nothing?
- [ ] Does this email add a new reason to respond compared with the previous touch?
- [ ] Does it sound human when read aloud?
- [ ] Does the first screen contain a real problem, not an introduction to us?
- [ ] Can every claim be defended?
- [ ] Have we explained the mechanism in plain English?
- [ ] Is the CTA small, clear and relevant to the problem?
- [ ] Can any sentence be removed without losing meaning? If yes, remove it.
- [ ] Would a smart prospect feel informed rather than manipulated?

Run every email through all twelve. **If one answer is no, it is not ready to send.**

06 | Fifteen Anonymised Examples

SECTION 06

Marketing, HR and IT sequences with the campaign logic intact and the identities removed.

ABOUT THESE EXAMPLES

These examples preserve the underlying campaign logic while removing company names, client names, links and identifying details. Numbers are retained only where they are part of the commercial structure of the example.

HOW TO READ EACH EXAMPLE

Every card follows the same anatomy

LABEL
Which sequence and which touch this is, with the single angle it carries.

PROBLEM
The pre-state. One recognisable friction the buyer already feels.

ANGLE
The solution angle, matched to the problem and nothing wider.

SUBJECT
The hook. A real tension, number or question, not hype.

BODY + CTA
One argument, one proof, one small next step tied to the problem.

{{VARIABLES}}
Merge fields to personalise at send: {{FirstName}}, {{Company}}, {{Sender}}.

A Marketing / Branding Services 5 EMAILS

Source pattern: branding and creative-services outreach. Each email isolates one market-facing brand problem.

MARKETING · EMAIL 1 — CONSISTENCY GAP

PROBLEM
Inconsistent identity across channels.

ANGLE
One brand system across packaging, digital and retail.

SUBJECT

Is your brand telling two different stories?

Hi {{FirstName}},

When customers meet your brand online, on packaging and in retail, do they recognise the same company - or three different versions of it?

One consumer brand we worked with had exactly that problem. The product was consistent; the identity was not.

We built one system across logo, packaging and visual guidelines so every touchpoint reinforced the same story.

If consistency across channels is making the brand harder to recognise, would a quick conversation next week be useful?

Best,
{{Sender}}

MARKETING · EMAIL 2 MESSAGE CLARITY

PROBLEM

The product promise and brand meaning are misaligned.

ANGLE

Reposition the story around the reason customers actually care.

SUBJECT

Does your brand actually say what it means?

Hi {{FirstName}},

A strong product can still lose if the story around it is wrong.

One personal-care brand we worked with was positioned around a functional benefit, while the real reason customers valued it was emotional: care and protection. The packaging never made that connection.

We rebuilt the message and design system around the value customers were actually buying.

Clearer positioning made the brand easier to understand, remember and choose.

If your product is stronger than the story around it, would it be useful to compare notes next week?

Best,
{{Sender}}

MARKETING · EMAIL 3 SHELF IMPACT

PROBLEM

A good product disappears in a crowded category.

ANGLE

Improve hierarchy, storytelling and premium cues.

SUBJECT

Is your packaging working hard enough?

Hi {{FirstName}},

A strong product can still disappear on a crowded shelf if the packaging looks like everyone else.

A consumer brand we worked with had that problem: good products, weak shelf distinction.

We rebuilt the packaging system around clearer hierarchy, stronger storytelling and consistent premium cues across the range.

The goal was not simply to make it prettier. It was to make the product easier to notice, understand and choose.

If packaging is doing less selling than the product deserves, would a short conversation next week be useful?

Regards,
{{Sender}}

MARKETING · EMAIL 4 POSITIONING

PROBLEM

The brand competes on features because its position is unclear.

ANGLE

Define who it is, why it matters and how to express that consistently.

SUBJECT

Strong products struggle without clear positioning

Hi `{{FirstName}}`,

Two brands can offer solid products and still become interchangeable in the buyer's mind.

We saw this with consumer businesses whose packaging and communication listed features but never established a distinct position.

We helped define who each brand was for, the value it should own, and how that position should appear consistently across packaging and communication.

That moved the conversation away from feature comparison and toward a clearer reason to choose the brand.

If positioning is something you're rethinking this year, would a quick call be useful?

Best,
`{{Sender}}`

MARKETING · EMAIL 5 BRAND VALUES

PROBLEM

Strong brand values exist internally but remain invisible to customers.

ANGLE

Make those values tangible in the buying experience.

SUBJECT

Do customers see what your brand stands for?

Hi `{{FirstName}}`,

Many brands have a strong internal story that customers never actually see.

One heritage-led consumer brand had distinctive values, but its packaging and communication left those values buried. To the buyer, it competed mostly on product features.

We brought the brand story into the parts customers could recognise: packaging, language, visual cues and the overall purchase experience.

That gave buyers a reason to connect with the brand beyond function alone.

If your values are stronger than what customers currently see, would it be worth a short conversation?

Best,
`{{Sender}}`

B HR / Specialist Recruitment 5 EMAILS

Source pattern: specialist recruitment outreach. The sequence alternates hiring economics, speed and technical-fit problems.

HR · EMAIL 1 — HIRING ECONOMICS

PROBLEM	ANGLE
Percentage-based recruitment fees compound quickly.	Make the economic trade-off visible.

SUBJECT

The hidden math of hiring costs

Hi {{FirstName}},

Here is the hiring math many teams never put on one page.

Hire five engineers at INR 30L CTC each and an 8.33% agency fee crosses INR 12L.

A flat-fee model changes that equation materially - without changing the roles you need to fill.

That difference can fund another hire, extend runway or put budget back into product.

The point is not to hire cheaply. It is to stop paying a percentage simply because the salary is higher.

Would it be useful to run the math against your current mandates?

Regards,
{{Sender}}

HR · EMAIL 2 — SPEED

PROBLEM	ANGLE
Open roles delay product work.	Connect hiring speed to roadmap consequences.

SUBJECT

Struggling to close technical roles fast?

Hi {{FirstName}},

Product delays are not always engineering problems. Sometimes the roadmap is waiting for the people needed to build it.

Technical hiring slows when:

- recruiters miss the stack nuance
- profiles take too long to screen
- candidates disappear midway

Our recruitment team focuses on specialist technology roles and can move vetted, stack-aligned profiles quickly instead of sending volume resumes.

If one or two open roles are holding back a sprint or delivery milestone, would a 15-minute conversation be useful?

Regards,
{{Sender}}

HR · EMAIL 3 COST CONTROL

PROBLEM

Percentage fees rise with salary, not necessarily recruiting effort.

ANGLE

Introduce a more predictable fee structure.

SUBJECT

Why should an easy hire cost a percentage?

Hi {{FirstName}},

Most agency hiring still runs on the same formula: a percentage of CTC, whether the role is difficult, straightforward, urgent or already well-defined.

That makes hiring cost rise with salary - not necessarily with recruiting effort.

A fixed-fee model gives teams something simpler: predictable cost per hire and clearer headcount planning.

For teams making several technology hires, that can materially change how far the same budget goes.

If you are planning multiple hires this quarter, would it help to compare the two models against your numbers?

Best,
{{Sender}}

HR · EMAIL 4 TECHNICAL SCREENING

PROBLEM

Generalist recruiters struggle with specialist technical roles.

ANGLE

Use stack-aware screening before profiles reach the hiring team.

SUBJECT

When in-house recruiting hits a ceiling

Hi {{FirstName}},

In-house teams are often excellent at volume hiring but hit friction when the role becomes deeply technical.

The symptoms are familiar:

- polished resumes that do not match the stack
- recruiters unable to challenge technical claims
- interviews spent discovering basic mismatches

A specialist technology recruiter should reduce that load before a profile reaches your engineering team.

We focus on roles across backend, cloud, DevOps, AI and data, with screening tied to the actual brief.

If your team is getting resumes but not enough interview-worthy candidates, worth a quick call?

Regards,
{{Sender}}

HR · EMAIL 5 SUMMARY VALUE

PROBLEM

Speed, technical fit and predictable cost can coexist.

ANGLE

Summarise the operating model without adding another generic capability list.

SUBJECT

Hiring fast doesn't have to cost more

Hi {{FirstName}},

The choice in technical hiring should not be between speed, quality and cost control.

Teams come to us when they need:

- backend and cloud engineers who match the actual stack
- DevOps talent that can contribute without months of handholding
- AI and data candidates screened beyond keywords

The model is straightforward: specialist screening, fast profile movement and a predictable fee structure.

No resume dumping. No percentage surprise because the candidate earns more.

If you have an open technology mandate, you will know quickly whether this fits. Worth a short conversation?

Best,
{{Sender}}

C IT Services / Managed Engineering 5 EMAILS

Source pattern: managed engineering / IT services. The offer is framed around ownership of defined work rather than generic outsourcing.

IT SERVICES · EMAIL 1 OWNERSHIP AFTER LAUNCH

PROBLEM

Keeping a product running consumes capacity needed for growth.

ANGLE

Transfer a defined engineering responsibility without giving up product control.

SUBJECT

Who owns your product after launch?

Hi {{FirstName}},

When the product is the business, keeping it running can consume the same engineering capacity needed to grow it.

A managed engineering partner can take specific work off the team's plate - with agreed scope, clear delivery responsibility, implementation and handover.

Your team still sets product priorities. The external team owns the engineering work that needs to get done.

Is there a specific area of product engineering or maintenance at {{Company}} that needs to move forward but keeps competing with the roadmap?

Best,
{{Sender}}

IT SERVICES · EMAIL 2 — ROADMAP CAPACITY

PROBLEM

Maintenance crowds out new development.

ANGLE

Take defined run-and-change work off the core team.

SUBJECT

Is maintenance eating your roadmap?

Hi {{FirstName}},

A common problem with growing products is that maintenance gradually becomes the roadmap.

Bug fixes, releases, support and production issues keep the team busy while new features, integrations and AI initiatives wait.

A managed engineering partner can own defined work - from reliability and maintenance to releases, integrations and feature delivery - while the internal team stays focused on product priorities.

Is there an engineering initiative at {{Company}} that is currently waiting for capacity?

Best,
{{Sender}}

IT SERVICES · EMAIL 3 — RUN COST

PROBLEM

Engineering headcount is only part of product run-cost.

ANGLE

Baseline architecture, cloud, tooling, vendors, support and risks before deciding what to change.

SUBJECT

How much does your product really cost to run?

Hi {{FirstName}},

Product run-cost is usually more than engineering headcount.

Cloud, infrastructure, tooling, vendors, support and maintenance all contribute to the actual cost of keeping a product running.

A useful starting point is to baseline the architecture, costs, risks and operating model - then identify the engineering work that would materially improve reliability, cost or delivery speed.

That turns a broad 'managed services' discussion into specific work with a business case.

Would a 45-minute discussion around the current state be useful?

Best,
{{Sender}}

IT SERVICES · EMAIL 4 — DEFINED PROJECT

PROBLEM

The issue is often capacity, not capability.

ANGLE

Give one bounded initiative to a partner who owns implementation and delivery.

SUBJECT

A defined project, owned through delivery

Hi `{{FirstName}}`,

Sometimes the problem is not the engineering team. It is simply having enough capacity to finish a specific initiative.

That might be a cloud migration, release automation, production reliability work, a security implementation, an AI feature or a customer integration.

The cleanest model is to define the scope, assign one party responsibility for implementation, and make the change visible at handover.

Is there a project at `{{Company}}` that needs to get done but keeps losing priority to the existing roadmap?

Best,
`{{Sender}}`

IT SERVICES · EMAIL 5 — LOW-RISK ENTRY

PROBLEM

Avoid selling a broad managed-services contract first.

ANGLE

Start with one bounded priority and prove delivery.

SUBJECT

Could we identify one project to move forward?

Hi `{{FirstName}}`,

Rather than starting with a broad managed-services proposal, a better first step is often one defined engineering priority.

Agree the scope. Own implementation. Hand over the completed work with a clear view of what changed.

That gives your team extra delivery capacity without adding another layer of coordination or committing to a vague long-term programme.

If there is one engineering priority that keeps slipping because your internal team is already fully allocated, would you be open to a 45-minute conversation around that project?

Best,
`{{Sender}}`

07 | The Standard to Hold

SECTION 07

What a 10 out of 10 cold email is really doing.

The best cold email does not try to sound impressive. It tries to make the prospect think: "Yes, that is a problem I recognise, and this person seems to understand it."

Truth	BEFORE	persuasion	**Buyer problem**	BEFORE company description
Specific	BEFORE	clever	**One strong argument**	BEFORE five weak benefits
Proof	BEFORE	adjectives	**Conversation**	BEFORE demo
Learning	BEFORE	premature optimisation		