

Truth fidelity *in the forecast.*

How RevOps Leaders use MIQL to build a forecast model the executive team can actually defend.

The shift

Most RevOps teams maintain a forecast model that is technically sophisticated and operationally useless. The model accepts whatever stage and category the AE selects. The exec team reads the rollup and discovers, every quarter, that 30 percent of Commit deals slipped or compressed. RevOps gets blamed for inaccurate forecasts that they did not author.

MIQL changes the input. Instead of accepting AE-selected categories at face value, the forecast model requires evidence inputs at the deal level. Outcome is a binary CRM field with verbatim language. MAP completion rate is a number, not a status update. Cost of inaction is a required field above a deal-size threshold. Leadership engagement is auto-flagged when stale.

The forecast becomes auditable. The exec team stops asking 'why did Commit slip?' and starts asking 'why did this specific deal score 6 and get categorized as Commit?'. That is a different conversation, and a more durable one.

Your five system inspections

WHAT YOUR CRM AND PIPELINE TOOLING SHOULD BE CAPTURING

<i>O</i>	Outcome	Are buyer-articulated outcomes captured as binary CRM fields with verbatim language, not free-text the rep narrates over?
<i>M</i>	Maps	Does the pipeline view surface MAP completion rate and buyer-owned milestone participation, beyond last-activity date?
<i>I</i>	Insight	Can the dashboard distinguish deals where insight earned access from deals that came in cold via RFP, by deal source and engagement signal?
<i>Q</i>	Quantify	Is cost of inaction a required, numeric field on Best Case and Commit deals, with audit trail showing buyer validation?
<i>L</i>	Leadership	Does the forecast model auto-flag Commit deals where economic buyer engagement is unconfirmed at title-appropriate altitude?

Score your CRM today against this list. Most teams are at 1 or 2 for any given pillar. The work is to get to 5 out of 5.

The pipeline-quality bar

Forecast categories should follow the score, not the close date or the AE confidence.

Pipeline

Score 0 to 4. Deal exists in the system. Treat as ICP signal, not commit-eligible inventory.

Best Case

Score 5 to 6. Some structural pillars confirmed, others soft. Useful for upside calculation, not for commit math.

Most Likely

Score 7. Defensible in a forecast call but with documented gaps.

Commit

Score 8 or higher. All structural pillars at 2 with clear audit trail. The forecast survives a board read.

A deal that closes from Best Case is a positive surprise. A deal that misses from Commit is a forecast credibility event. The asymmetry matters. RevOps' job is to make the asymmetry visible to leadership before the close, not after.

Three operating moves for RevOps leaders

If Outcome capture is free-text: Build a structured outcome field on every opportunity record. Make it required at Best Case stage. Force the AE to paste verbatim language from the buyer. *Audit the field weekly. If the field reads like AE narration ('they want to grow'), reject it. If it reads like buyer language ('we need to reduce mean time to detect from 90 minutes to under 15 by EOQ'), accept it.*

If MAP is a checkbox, not a measurement: Replace the MAP checkbox with a percentage field that calculates from milestone-completion data. Surface the percentage in pipeline reports. *Deals with MAP completion under 60 percent should not be categorized above Best Case. Build that as a hard rule in the model, not a soft suggestion.*

If Leadership engagement decays silently: Build a 'days since EB engagement' field that auto-calculates from calendar and email signal. Flag any Commit deal where the value exceeds 30. *Send the flag to the AE manager weekly, not just the AE. The AE has a conflict of interest with that flag. The manager does not.*

Your Monday-ready system action

Pick one of the three operating moves above and ship it this week.

If you ship the structured outcome field, you have changed the forecast quality conversation by next quarter. If you ship the MAP percentage, you have changed how Best Case rolls up. If you ship the EB engagement flag, you have surfaced the single most predictive forecast risk that exists.

Any one of the three returns more value than a quarter of dashboard polish. Pick one. Ship. Move to the next one.

What you'll see in the data after 90 days

Three patterns surface within a quarter:

Forecast variance compresses. Commit-to-close ratio moves from 60-70 percent toward 80-90 percent. The exec team stops getting end-of-quarter surprises.

Stage and category alignment improves. AEs who used to categorize on close date proximity now categorize on score. The mismatch between stage and forecast category drops.

Coaching escalations become evidence-driven. Manager 1:1s pivot from 'how confident are you?' to 'why did this deal stay at 6 for two weeks?'. That question has actionable answers.

What this is not

MIQL does not replace your forecasting model. It does not replace your CRM. It does not require you to abandon MEDDPICC, MEDDIC, or any qualification framework already in use.

It is the evidence layer that turns your existing infrastructure from optimistic free-text into binary, defensible scores. The dashboard you already have, but with truth in it.