

For revenue teams buying in a consolidating market

2026 Revenue Enablement Buyer's Guide

A buyer's guide and RFP scorecard for first-time buyers, platform switchers, and teams caught in the consolidation wave.

How to use this guide

Every vendor can make a polished demo look convincing. Use this guide to identify the problem you need to solve, test whether each platform can serve both your reps and their agents, and score the finalists against evidence instead of just claims.

1	The enablement market has changed	3	5	Five architecture requirements	20
2	Test features and adoption	6	6	The scorecard	25
3	Start with your purchase driver	10	7	Make the call	32
4	The four ways legacy platforms fail	14			

1 The enablement market **has changed**

Three forces are driving transformation of the revenue enablement market: the rise of AI agents as first-class users, the limitations of the legacy portal model, and a wave of vendor consolidation. Together they change how you should evaluate solutions.

Three forces, and each one complicates vendor selection

1

Agents became users

AI transformation has accelerated, and agents and agentic workflows are becoming first-class users of your enablement platform, drawing on the same GTM knowledge your reps do.

2

The legacy portal is failing

The architecture that has dominated the category since 2011 has not kept pace with the needs of revenue teams for support in the flow of work, fully integrated AI, and rep adoption at scale.

3

Consolidation narrowed the field

The merged companies are trading innovation for market position while their roadmaps turn inward and your choices narrow.

Agents change what you are buying

Your reps draw on the platform's GTM knowledge, and so do the AI agents that draft their follow-ups, answer their questions, and assemble their deal rooms. Both pull from one body of knowledge, and if that knowledge is wrong they both can fail.

Revenue teams now work alongside AI agents. A platform that only serves reps leaves the AI tools they rely on without a trusted source of knowledge. A structured, governed knowledge system is critical for both.

The GTM team is mixed-mode now. Your reps and their agents draw on the same GTM knowledge, and if that knowledge is wrong they both fail. **You are buying for both users.**

The time of legacy portal-only solutions **is ending**

The challenges with portal-only architecture

Legacy portals create the same problems: clunky interfaces reps don't use, synced-only content strategies, painful tagging and taxonomy administration, information that goes stale faster than teams can refresh it, and training disconnected from how reps actually sell.

Adding AI on top does not fix the underlying architecture. Agents grounded in the same neglected content inherit its gaps and outdated information at scale.

THE TIMING QUESTION

During a merger, vendors may push for longer renewals before the combined roadmap is clear. Keep terms short until you understand which platform will continue, how migration will work, and what will happen to pricing and support. Large SaaS integrations often take 18–24 months, which can slow new product development during that period.

Consolidation changes the timing of your decision

Highspot and Seismic agreed in February 2026 to merge, bringing together two of the category's biggest names. Although the deal has not closed, buyers should now evaluate the combined roadmap, and integration timelines, rather than either platform in isolation.

What comes after the portal?

What comes next is a full and integrated AI-first enablement platform built on a governed knowledge system, one that connects content, learning, coaching, analytics, buyer experience, and actions in the flow of work for reps and AI agents. The rest of this guide is the framework for finding it: what to look for, what to avoid, and how to score it.

Use the included scorecard to run with your team. By the end you will know how to run an evaluation that holds up under scrutiny from procurement, IT, and revenue leadership.

2 Build an evaluation that tests features **and adoption**

The fastest way to buy the wrong platform is to let polished demos and long feature lists stand in for the real test: will it reps use it, and can agents scale with it?

Involve the **right stakeholders**

An effective evaluation draws input from the people who will use, implement, administer, govern, and champion the platform. They do not all need a seat on the formal buying committee or a place in every vendor meeting, but each should validate the requirements, risks, and measures of success in their area. Leaving any of these stakeholders out can lead to late objections or shifting requirements that complicate or derail the process.

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	WHAT THEY SHOULD VALIDATE
Sales reps and CSMs	If they will not use it daily, nothing else matters.
Managers and leadership	Their reinforcement in coaching and pipeline reviews predicts adoption better than any feature.
Enablement and L&D	Own onboarding, training, and reinforcement effectiveness.
SMEs and content creators	Need authoring, updating, and publishing to be fast and low-friction.
Revenue operations and AI owners	Judge process and CRM change management, and own the agent stack: grounding quality, MCP and permission posture, and what agents can draw from the platform.
Marketing	Verify alignment on brand, messaging, buyer-facing content and competitive intelligence.
Product	Ensure clean distribution of launches, roadmap changes, and release notes.
IT and security	Validate compliance, data security, and readiness for AI-driven features.

Test adoption for **three audiences**

Will reps use it? Will managers reinforce it? Can AI agents retrieve knowledge they can trust? If any answer is no, the platform is unlikely to deliver lasting value.

1 Will your reps use it?

Reps adopt platforms that reduce friction and make accurate information easier to access in the tools they already use. Evaluate the steps required to find and apply content, the speed and relevance of results, and whether the experience improves on existing workarounds.

2 Will managers reinforce it?

Manager reinforcement is a key driver of sustained adoption. Managers need useful insights they can apply in coaching, one-on-ones, and pipeline reviews. Include them early to confirm the platform supports existing management routines and provides information they can act on.

3 Can your agents ground in it?

AI agents depend on reliable access to the platform's knowledge. Test whether they can retrieve current, approved information on demand while respecting user permissions. The team responsible for your AI stack should validate the quality of the response, its source, and the governance applied to it.

SIDEBAR

The three forms of adoption

Rep adoption

Measured in logins, daily active use, time-to-answer, and rep confidence in the content. Adoption declines if the platform creates more friction than existing workarounds.

Manager reinforcement

Measure whether managers use platform data in coaching, pipeline reviews, and performance conversations. Sustained reinforcement depends on insights that are timely, relevant, and actionable.

Agent grounding

Test whether AI tools and agents can retrieve current, approved knowledge while respecting permissions and source controls. Evaluate retrieval accuracy, source citation, and auditability.

Build an **evaluation grid**

Use a consistent framework to compare vendors against your business priorities. The evaluation grid has three components, each represented in the scorecard in Section 6.

PART ONE

Problems and metrics

Define your three highest-priority problems and how you will measure progress. Document leading indicators, business outcomes, adoption metrics, your current baseline, and targets at 90 and 180 days.

PART TWO

Must-haves, validated live

Identify three to five capabilities required to address those problems, then validate each one in a live demo or pilot. Vendors should be able to demonstrate capabilities with real data and use cases.

PART THREE

Weights and scores

Assign weights to the criteria based on their importance, then have each stakeholder score every platform from 1 to 5. Weighting prevents strength in a lower-priority area from obscuring gaps in the capabilities that matter most.

The order matters

Start with business problems and measures of success before defining required capabilities. A feature-led evaluation rewards breadth; an outcome-led evaluation tests whether the platform can improve the metrics that matter to your organization.

Require finalists to provide hands-on access to the platform that your team can test. If a vendor will not support a live test, factor that into your evaluation.

3 Start with your **purchase driver**

Your evaluation priorities depend on why you are entering the market. Identify the profile that best fits your organization, document its primary purchase driver in Step 1 of the scorecard, and use it to define your requirements.

First-time buyer

Page 11

Platform replacement

Page 12

Vendor merger or
consolidation

Page 13

The first-time buyer

Demand capability without complexity

PURCHASE DRIVER

Fast time to value: a complete enablement platform that reps can learn quickly, administrators can manage efficiently, and AI agents can use as a governed source of knowledge.

First-time buyers are often presented with a false choice: a simple tool they will quickly outgrow or a broad platform their teams struggle to learn and adopt. A modern enablement platform should provide both depth and usability.

Evaluate the capabilities required to support your full enablement program including content management, structured knowledge, learning, AI-assisted creation, brand governance, analytics, digital sales rooms, and workflow integrations. Weight those capabilities alongside learnability, administrative effort, and time to value.

THE TRAP

Accepting complexity as the price of capability

Feature breadth matters, but those capabilities should operate as one unified platform. Disconnected modules and workflows, along with extensive configuration, increase the burden on reps and administrators without necessarily improving business outcomes.

- Can the platform support content, learning, governance, analytics, and AI-assisted creation in one connected experience?
- Can a new rep complete common tasks with minimal instruction?
- How much implementation and ongoing administrative work is required from enablement, IT and RevOps?

The platform-replacement buyer

Avoid replacing one legacy portal with another.

PURCHASE DRIVER

Higher adoption and business impact: a complete enablement platform that removes the friction limiting adoption today, reduces administrative effort, and connects enablement activity to business results.

Replacing a platform should begin with a clear assessment of why the current one failed. Low adoption, disconnected modules, difficult administration, challenging tagging and taxonomy, and weak AI tooling may be at the root of a platform's limitations.

The new platform should improve user experience and deliver required capabilities without increasing complexity or content debt.

DIAGNOSE BEFORE YOU SHOP

Identify the causes of low adoption

Identify product limitations to ensure they are addressed in the evaluation.

Check that it works inside the rep's workflow

Legacy portal-only solutions, or fragile CRM integrations, lead to the same low adoption.

Look for unified analytics

Across training, content, digital sales rooms, and outcomes.

Evaluate future readiness

With AI grounded in your knowledge rather than bolted on.

Include previous non-adopters

The reps and leaders who were not satisfied with the previous platform. Their buy-in will be required for any new solution.

The buyer navigating consolidation

Use your renewal to reduce your exposure.

PURCHASE DRIVER

Risk: a merger may change your platform's roadmap, support model, and pricing. The terms of your next renewal will determine how much flexibility you retain.

On February 12, 2026, Highspot and Seismic agreed to merge, the largest consolidation the enablement category has seen. The deal has not closed yet, but the precedent for what follows has already run its course elsewhere. Consolidation creates uncertainty beyond the current product. Buyers need to understand the combined roadmap, which capabilities and platforms will continue, what migration may be required, and what protections they will have if the product or commercial model changes.

Large SaaS mergers of this size typically take 18 to 24 months to work through once they close, and during that window product teams shift their focus to integration work, which can slow new development.

PROTECTIONS AT RENEWAL

Gartner analysts Doug Bushée and Bill Yetman **recommended four protections** for customers of the merging vendors.

- Keep renewals to one year
- Demand price and opt-out protections
- Secure your data egress rights
- Diversify with AI-native vendors

RECENT MERGERS

APR 2025 → OCT 2025

Vector Capital acquired Bigtincan, then **completed its acquisition of Showpad** that October. The combined company operates under the Showpad brand, with a new CEO named at close.

AUG 2025 → DEC 2025

Clari and Salesloft ran the same course, announced in August and **closed that December**, also with a new CEO at close.

FEB 2026 → PENDING

Highspot and Seismic. **Announced but not closed.** Renewals are key point of leverage. Buyers can use it to evaluate the combined roadmap and negotiate appropriate protections before committing longer term.

CONSOLIDATION-TRACK ROUTE

For the full renewal questionnaire, contract-protection language, and the merger timeline in detail, use Spekit's consolidation checklist: **What Market Consolidation Means for Revenue Enablement Buyers**. Bring it to the renewal conversation alongside the scorecard in Section 6.

4 The four ways legacy platforms **fail**

Legacy platforms were architected for a world where the best vision of enablement was a static, centralized portal. These are their common limitations.

What buyers of traditional platforms **report**

Most legacy platforms were designed in the early 2010s. Their customers now report challenges with content utilization, adoption, and user experience.

90.3%

of enablement and marketing teams believe less than 60% of their internal content is ever used.

55.2%

cite low adoption as a reason for switching platforms.

50.8%

cite poor user experience.

Source: Spekit & Sales Enablement Collective, *Impact of Enablement* report, a survey of sales enablement professionals, excluding Spekit customers

Poor **usability** and content **discovery**

Static navigation slows access to the right content.

Traditional platforms rely on static folders and browse-based navigation that never evolved past a basic Google Drive. Reps go straight to a search bar or expect an answer delivered in the flow of work. When systems makes reps browse, search and hunt for answers instead, they stop opening it.

An agent has no workaround to switch to: it will retrieve whatever the broken content discovery returns.

The in-the-flow integrations these vendors have added are often built as CRM field mappings and custom configuration, so any change to a field or a workflow means RevOps or IT rework while the enablement team waits in the queue.

"A very expensive version of
Google Drive."

Daniel Kennedy, VP of RevOps, Uberall

ASK EVERY VENDOR

Do reps leave their workflow to get content, or does it appear where they work?

Which tools are supported out of the box, and what configuration is required?

Can you show a rep preparing for a call and automatically seeing the right case study or template, with no manual tagging?

WHAT A MODERN PLATFORM MUST PROVE

A modern platform should deliver content and guidance in the tools reps already use, use deal context to surface relevant assets, and provide a direct path from discovery to buyer-facing action.

Rigid folders and **content decay**

Static documents make routine updates difficult to distribute

Difficult content management is the top reason buyers give for switching platforms, and the underlying architecture is a major contributor. Traditional systems store knowledge in static folders and long, monolithic documents like the 120-page playbook, or the dense PDF. Updating one change means blasting the whole document out again and hoping reps find the right section.

Content decays by becoming stale and gets duplicated, especially when team or segment variants, like SMB and enterprise, live in the same file. Reps wade through irrelevant sections or may miss the update entirely, and agents drawing on the same file treat the stale version as the truth.

60.1%

cite difficult content management as a reason for switching platforms.

48.8%

believe more than 40% of their content needs refreshing.

ASK EVERY VENDOR

Can we break long documents into reusable components used across different experiences without duplication?

How does the platform show us what content is stale and prevent decay?

Show me the governance: how do you archive outdated blocks and make sure only current content reaches a rep or an agent?

Source: Spekit & Sales Enablement Collective, *Impact of Enablement* report

WHAT A MODERN PLATFORM MUST PROVE

A modern platform should structure knowledge into reusable components, prevent unnecessary duplication, and provide governance that keeps published content current. Ask vendors to demonstrate freshness scoring, content-age reporting, and recommended update or archive actions. Then ask whether a single source edit can update every guide, Learning Path, and digital sales room in which the content appears.

Disconnected modules

A shared login does not create a unified platform.

Comprehensive capability is not the problem. Fragmentation is. Buyers should expect content, learning, analytics, coaching, and AI to operate on shared knowledge, permissions, and data model. Many CMS, LMS, and KMS vendors expanded their capabilities through acquisition. The question is whether the resulting modules operate as one platform or remain disconnected.

Showpad acquired LearnCore in 2018, Seismic acquired the LMS platform Lessonly in 2021, and the pattern of CMS vendors buying LMS capability and LMS vendors buying CMS capability ran across the category. The Highspot-Seismic merger agreement continues the category's broader consolidation trend.

When modules remain disconnected, reps move between different experiences and administrators cannot get a unified view of content, learning, engagement, and outcomes. Separate knowledge and permission models can also surface conflicting information to reps, AI agents, and buyers.

ASK EVERY VENDOR

Which capabilities were acquired, and how are their data, permissions, analytics, and user experiences unified?

Do content, training, and analytics share one UI and one admin dashboard?

Can I see, in one place, content engagement, training completion, and how permissions and versioning are managed across all of it?

WHAT A MODERN PLATFORM MUST PROVE

A modern platform must prove that content management, learning, AI-assisted creation, analytics, and buyer-facing workflows operate through one interface, one governance model, and one shared body of knowledge.

AI bolted onto **legacy architecture**

Garbage in, garbage out — at machine speed.

Every legacy vendor now sells AI, so the evaluation question is architectural: where does the AI sit? The bolt-on pattern puts AI features on top of the portal-era content store that gives you AI search over the same stale library, a copilot stitched onto each acquired module.

Built that way, the AI inherits the first three failures at once: it retrieves from the folders nobody curates, through modules that share no common governance or permissions, and it delivers the result with the same confidence whether the source was approved last week or abandoned three years ago.

When an agent answers wrong, the instinct is to reach for a better model — but the knowledge underneath the model decides whether the answer is right, and a bolt-on layer has no way to know what is current, approved, or permitted.

An AI-first platform is built the other way around: **a governed knowledge system at the core**, with reps' tools and agents both drawing from it. The five architecture requirements in the next section test for exactly that.

ASK EVERY VENDOR

Where does your AI retrieve from, and how does it know a document is current and approved?

Can an answer cite its governed source and show that it's current and approved?

Do the AI features across your modules share one governance and permission model?

WHAT A MODERN PLATFORM MUST PROVE

AI answers grounded in governed knowledge and traceable to a current, approved source; permissions honored in retrieval; and the same governed context available to reps in their tools and to agents over an open protocol.

5 Five architecture requirements for your reps **and their agents**

Every legacy vendor will tell you their AI is built in, so the evaluation needs checks that separate architecture from claim. Each of the five is demandable in a demo, and each belongs in your scorecard.

Requirements 1 and 2

① Treat GTM knowledge as **governed infrastructure**

A real knowledge layer does more than store and search. It has to author the knowledge, control who can see it, approve it before it ships, deliver it where your reps and their agents work, and flag what has gone stale. It should be a unified system, so that whatever reaches a rep or an agent is current, accurate, scoped to that user's permissions, and version-controlled.

A static content library cannot provide this level of governance.

CHECK IT LIVE

Ask to see the same governed answer served to a rep and to an agent, a permission honored, and a stale entry flagged and corrected in front of you.

② Use AI to accelerate content creation and maintenance

GTM knowledge changes faster than teams can keep current by hand. Manual authoring falls behind the moment a price, a competitor, or a message changes. The platform should automate creation, maintenance and curation, and empower teams to build on existing knowledge rather than recreate from scratch. Content should be reused intelligently throughout the system, both in creation and distribution.

When creation is governed and AI-powered, the first draft begins within approved brand and messaging.

CHECK IT LIVE

Ask to author a piece of content in the platform and watch the governance apply as you write, then push a correction and see where it lands.

Requirements 3 and 4

③ Apply **brand governance** during content creation

Buyers experience your company through the content your reps and agents put in front of them, and that experience is only as strong as it is consistent. A brand system built into the platform applies your brand and messaging standards as content is produced, so everything a rep assembles or an agent generates arrives on message and looking right. And it makes that content faster to produce because no one starts from a blank page.

Volume makes this urgent: an agent generates buyer-facing content faster than any review cycle can catch the piece that undercuts your message.

CHECK IT LIVE

Ask to see brand and messaging standards applied at the moment content is created, not as a review step bolted on afterward.

④ Integrate across **enablement and action**

Knowledge, coaching, and buyer-facing execution like deal rooms belong in one connected system. Every vendor will say yes to that, so make it checkable. The rep, the agent, and the deal room should prove they draw from the same governed source.

When they can't, a buyer will read one claim in the deal room while the rep says something else on the call, and the contradiction causes friction in the deal.

CHECK IT LIVE

Ask the vendor to show the rep view, the agent, and the deal room all resolving the same question to the same governed answer.

5 Insist on **MCP access** so it connects to your whole stack

You should be able to connect the knowledge system to your own stack through the open MCP protocol and watch an agent pull governed, current context out of it live in the evaluation. The test is whether an outside agent, connected through the protocol you already use, gets the same governed answer with the same permissions your reps get.

MCP should support both retrieval and creation. AI agents should be able to draw on governed knowledge, create content within approved messaging and brand standards, and write that content back to the platform for approval, versioning, and distribution. Ask vendors to demonstrate the complete workflow, including how permissions and governance are maintained from creation through publication.

CHECK IT LIVE

Connect a client you already run and confirm it retrieves current, permissioned knowledge on demand.

Claude

ChatGPT

Glean

Copilot

Gemini

Custom agents

Open access should not mean ungoverned access. MCP should carry the platform's existing permissions, source controls, and approval standards into the connected AI experience.

VERIFY THE COMPLETE WORKFLOW

Evaluate retrieval, creation, and governance as a single workflow. The agent should pull permissioned knowledge, create content within approved messaging and brand standards, and return it to the platform with ownership, versioning, and approval controls intact.

AI is only as good as the knowledge behind it

Spekit is a full revenue enablement platform built on a governed knowledge layer. It combines content management, structured knowledge, Learning Paths, AI-assisted content creation, Brand Studio, analytics, digital sales rooms, and in-flow delivery in one platform. Native integrations with Salesforce, Gong, and Slack bring knowledge and guidance into the tools reps already use, while MCP makes the same governed knowledge available to AI agents.

Because these capabilities share one foundation, **GTM Knowledge Engine 2.0**, teams do not have to manage separate content, permissions, or analytics models for each workflow. Reps and AI agents work from a consistent source, while enablement retains governance as the program expands.

Together, these capabilities satisfy the architectural requirements above without sacrificing the breadth expected of a complete enablement platform.

OPEN PROTOCOL

An MCP server connects the governed knowledge layer to Claude, ChatGPT, Glean, Copilot, Gemini, and custom agents.

GOVERNED CREATION

AI content creation runs through Brand Studio, Templates, and an AI Content Builder that applies your brand and messaging standards as content is made.

GOVERNANCE ANALYTICS

Dashboard Agent and content-performance analytics include freshness scoring that shows what is current and what has gone stale.

FULL ENABLEMENT PLATFORM

Content management, structured knowledge, Learning Paths, digital sales rooms, governance, and analytics operate within one platform.

6 The scorecard

Apply the framework in four steps to create a decision you can explain to procurement, IT, and revenue leadership. Complete the worksheets individually, then compare results with your team.

1 · Requirements

2 · Questions

3 · Weights

4 · Comparison

Four steps for an **effective evaluation**

Use the tables below as you work through the four steps of the evaluation to determine a weighted score for each vendor.

STEP 1 Document your requirements

Name your top three problems, the metrics that prove impact, your baseline today, and your target at 90 and 180 days. Then list the three to five must-haves you will validate in a pilot.

STEP 3 Weight the criteria

Assign a weight to each criterion so the final score reflects what actually drives your success, then have each stakeholder score 1 to 5 within it.

STEP 2 Select your questions

Choose the questions that matter for your top problems and mark each vendor's answer. Score only what ties back to Step 1.

STEP 4 Compare vendors

Roll the weighted scores into one comparison and pick the finalist from the totals. Run the must-haves through a live pilot before you sign.

Problems and metrics

Team _____ Date _____

PROBLEM	LEADING METRIC early signal	LAGGING METRIC business outcome	ADOPTION METRIC	BASELINE (NOW)	TARGET 90 DAYS / 180 DAYS
<i>e.g. slow rep ramp</i>	<i>Time to first opportunity; onboarding milestones on time</i>	<i>Ramp to quota; new-hire retention</i>	<i>Onboarding completion; views per rep; search-to- answer under 30s</i>		
<i>e.g. low content usage and trust</i>	<i>Content retrieval time; search success rate; % refreshed monthly</i>	<i>Win rate with vs. without content; deal cycle time</i>	<i>Content views and shares per deal; content- confidence survey</i>		
<i>e.g. inconsistent process adoption</i>	<i>Stage hygiene; required- field completion; manager reinforcement cadence</i>	<i>Forecast accuracy; slippage; quota attainment</i>	<i>Playbook opens in CRM; change-comms engagement</i>		

Must-have capabilities to validate in a pilot

Identify three to five capabilities, each tied to problems from the previous page

CAPABILITY (NON-NEGOTIABLE)	WHY IT IS CRITICAL	DAY 1?	VALIDATION TEST IN DEMO OR PILOT	OWNER / SIGN-OFF
<i>e.g. AI access in CRM / email / chat</i>	<i>Cuts time-to-answer; drives adoption</i>	Y / N	<i>Rep finds the right content to share after a call in under 30s, from email</i>	
<i>e.g. agent grounding via MCP</i>	<i>Every AI tool draws on governed, current knowledge</i>	Y / N	<i>Connect an agent and watch it return a permissioned, current answer</i>	
<i>e.g. external sharing / deal rooms</i>	<i>Buyer engagement; content-impact tracking</i>	Y / N	<i>Create a deal room in under 2 min; track opens</i>	
		Y / N		
		Y / N		
		Y / N		
		Y / N		
		Y / N		

Question shortlist and scores

Score each vendor 1 to 5. Leave a box blank until the capability has been demonstrated live.

REQUIREMENT	CATEGORY	VENDOR A	VENDOR B	VENDOR C
Content and guidance appear in the tools reps already use	Contextual delivery			
AI finds the right asset from live deal context, no manual tagging	Contextual delivery			
One click from finding content to email or deal room	UX and workflow			
Knowledge structured as reusable blocks, no duplication	Content governance			
Freshness scoring and stale-content detection	Content governance			
One UI and one admin dashboard across content, training, analytics	UX and consistency			
Cross-module analytics tied to revenue outcomes	Analytics			
Brand and messaging standards applied as content is created	Content creation			
AI answers cite a current, approved, governed source	AI architecture			
One governance and permission model behind every AI feature	AI architecture			
MCP access; an outside agent pulls governed, permissioned knowledge live	Integration			
Rep, agent, and deal room resolve to the same governed source	Integration			
SSO, security posture, and AI-readiness confirmed by IT	Vendor info and security			
Contract terms: price caps, opt-out, data egress, AI-training data use	Pricing and contract			

Weighted criteria

Agent readiness included because it's easy to overlook.
Replace or re-weight these based on the problems
documented in Step 1.

CRITERION	HOW YOU WILL JUDGE IT	WEIGHT %	VENDOR A	VENDOR B	VENDOR C
Ease of use / UX	Reps find answers in under 30s; managers reinforce easily				
Agent-readiness	Agents draw governed, current, permissioned knowledge via MCP				
Integration footprint / IT lift	Hours to integrate; SSO; security posture				
Content governance	Structure, freshness, decay prevention, version control				
Platform capabilities	Content management, structured knowledge, training, AI content creation, analytics, integrations, and digital sales rooms				
Pricing / scalability	Time-to-value; total cost now and year 2; admin hours; merger-era contract protections				
Total		100%			

Vendor comparison

Validate findings and scoring with live pilots

	VENDOR A	VENDOR B	VENDOR C
Weighted score (from Step 3)			
Must-haves validated in pilot (of total)			
Reps would use it daily (rep vote)			
Managers would reinforce it (manager vote)			
Agents grounded successfully via MCP (Y/N)			
Contract protections secured (Y/N)			
Decision			

7 Make the call

Use the weighted scores to identify the strongest candidate, then confirm adoption, technical fit, and must-have capabilities in a live pilot.

Pick the tool your **team** adopts

CUSTOMER PROOF



InMoment faced this decision when its enablement platform had become a content repository with limited analytics. Jenna Siegel, Senior Director of Revenue Enablement, moved the team from Highspot to Spekit.

39

days, signature
to rollout

92%

license utilization
in the first 30
days

84%

extension usage
in the first 30
days

"Spekit knows what you need **before you know you need it."**

An InMoment rep's verdict after the migration.

Adoption is the verdict on any platform, and it comes in two forms: **whether your reps open it, and whether your agents can trust what they pull from it.**

The platform you pick this year serves two users, and both depend on the same governed knowledge. Lead with your problems and the metrics that prove impact, weight the criteria, and validate the must-haves in a live pilot where you can watch an agent pull governed, current context out of the platform yourself.

When you are ready to move, Spekit's **Enablement Migration Guide** walks you through leaving a legacy platform without losing momentum: migration planning, a rollout that earns rep buy-in, and the change management that makes the new platform stick.

NEXT STEPS

Take three things into your next vendor call

See Spekit in action →

Book a demo and see how a modern, AI-first enablement platform matches up to your requirements.

www.spekit.com/demo

Get the Enablement Migration Guide →

Leave a legacy platform without losing momentum.

www.spekit.com/switch-kit

Facing a Highspot or Seismic renewal? →

Start with the consolidation checklist.

www.spekit.com/merger-questions



Spekit is the governed knowledge layer that grounds your reps and their agents with Enablement in the Flow of Work®.

spekit.com