Consultant COLD email

List:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/19JFtY9EUjNNbDuoyZmEa8hW2B2tVumekV0gxiPnbY4c/edit?gid=0#gid=0

Small Group — AI/Automation Consultant Sequences

> **ICP:** AI & Automation Consultants **Three sequences, three pain point angles Variable:** `{{first_name}}` **Positioning:** Execution layer for consultants. Not a dev shop. **Word count target:** 40–65 words per email **CTA style:** Micro-commitment first. No calendar link until Step 8. **Testimonial:** Liam, Promptable — $20–30K/month, still working together

---

SEQUENCE A — Money Left on the Table

> **Pain:** Implementation revenue going to agencies and freelancers while the consultant only captures the strategy fee

---

Step 1 — Day 0 | Cold Send

Subject: after strategy comes this

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Quick pattern I see with AI consultants.

Strategy sells easily.

Then the client asks:
"Can you build it too?"

That implementation usually goes to a freelancer
or agency — and the consultant keeps only the strategy fee.

We work as the execution layer behind consultants
so they capture that revenue too.

Liam at Promptable added $20–30K/month this way.

Does implementation come up in your projects?

Chandan
Small Group
```

> **Laws:** Law 1 (loss framing — revenue elsewhere), Law 2 (pattern interrupt), Law 6 (curiosity gap), Law 7 (social proof), Law 8 (specificity), Law 21 (fast hook), Law 22 (one idea), Law 23 (question CTA), Law 24 (short), Law 47 (problem before solution)

Step 2 — Day 4 | Not Opened

Subject: *(blank — thread reply)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Quick bump in case this got buried.

When clients ask for implementation after strategy —
```

```
do you usually build it yourself
or pass it to freelancers?

Curious how you're handling that today.

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 3 (mere exposure), Law 22 (one idea), Law 23 (question CTA), Law 24 (short), Law 28 (micro-commitment)

Step 3 — Day 9 | Not Opened

Subject: strategy vs delivery

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Selling strategy is straightforward.

What happens after is where most consultants
leave money on the table.

Clients want someone to build the systems —
and that budget usually goes somewhere else.

We act as the execution layer behind consultants.

Revenue share. White-label if needed.

Is that a gap you're navigating?

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 2 (pattern interrupt — new subject), Law 6 (curiosity gap), Law 22 (one idea), Law 23 (question CTA), Law 47 (problem before solution)

Step 4 — Day 14 | Not Opened

Subject: *(blank)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

I'll assume this isn't relevant and close the loop.

If implementation revenue ever becomes something
you want to capture, feel free to reach out.

Chandan
Small Group
```

> **Laws:** Law 30 (easy out), Law 48 (relationship over transaction)

Step 5 — Day 3 After Open | Opened, No Reply

Subject: *(blank — thread reply)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Happy to give a bit more context.

How consultants usually structure it:

→ You bring the client + strategy
→ We handle execution (AI systems, automations)
→ Revenue share — 30–50% to you
→ White-label or direct intro

Liam at Promptable scaled to $20–30K/month
without hiring a dev team.

Does this match how you work today?

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 4 (reciprocity — model clarity), Law 7 (social proof), Law 8 (specificity), Law 25 (bullets), Law 28 (micro-commitment CTA)

Step 6 — Day 7 After Open | Opened, No Reply

Subject: quick example

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Most consultants we work with already have
the client relationships.

They just needed a reliable execution arm.

Liam put it simply:

Speed and quality let him take on more projects
without building a team.

That's how he reached $20–30K/month.

Is there a specific project type where
a build team would help?

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 7 (social proof), Law 8 (specificity), Law 23 (question CTA), Law 45 (trigger-based relevance)

Step 7 — Day 12 After Open | Opened, No Reply

Subject: *(blank)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

No worries if timing isn't right.

If capturing implementation revenue ever
becomes a priority, feel free to reach out.

Chandan
Small Group
```

> **Laws:** Law 30 (easy out), Law 48 (relationship close)

Step 8 — Day 2 After Click | Clicked

Subject: *(blank — thread reply)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Saw you checked this out.

Happy to walk through how the revenue-share model
works and whether it fits how you run projects.

15 minutes this week?

Chandan
[INSERT CALENDLY LINK]
```

> **Laws:** Law 5 (commitment consistency), Law 28 (frictionless CTA) **Note:** First calendar link in the sequence — prospect has shown intent by clicking.

SEQUENCE B — Freelancer Reliability

> **Pain:** Inconsistent freelancers making delivery unpredictable and putting the consultant's reputation at risk

---

Step 1 — Day 0 | Cold Send

Subject: when freelancers disappear

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Almost every AI consultant has a version of this.

Project scoped. Client excited.

Then the freelancer disappears halfway through
and you're the one answering for delivery.

We work as the permanent execution team
behind consultants — same team every project.

Liam at Promptable scaled to $20–30K/month
once he stopped relying on freelancers.

Has this happened on a project before?

Chandan
Small Group
```

> **Laws:** Law 1 (loss framing — reputation), Law 2 (pattern interrupt), Law 7 (social proof), Law 8 (specificity), Law 21 (story hook), Law 22 (one idea), Law 23 (question CTA), Law 24 (short)

Step 2 — Day 4 | Not Opened

Subject: *(blank — thread reply)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Quick bump in case this got buried.

Do you usually use freelancers when clients
ask for implementation?

Curious how that's working for you
on deadline-sensitive projects.

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 3 (mere exposure), Law 23 (question CTA), Law 24 (short), Law 28 (micro-commitment)

Step 3 — Day 9 | Not Opened

Subject: delivery matters

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Freelancers work well — until they don't.

Missed timelines. Inconsistent quality.

And the client sees it as your responsibility,
not the freelancer's.

We work as a consistent execution team
behind consultants.

Same team. Every project. Revenue share.

Worth exploring?

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 1 (loss framing — reputation risk), Law 2 (pattern interrupt), Law 22 (one idea), Law 23 (soft CTA), Law 24 (short)

Step 4 — Day 14 | Not Opened

Subject: *(blank)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

I'll close the loop here.

If delivery reliability ever becomes
a challenge on a project,
feel free to reach out.

Chandan
Small Group
```

> ❝ **Laws:** Law 30 (easy out), Law 48 (relationship over transaction)

Step 5 — Day 3 After Open | Opened, No Reply

Subject: *(blank — thread reply)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Happy to share more context.

What consultants usually value:

→ Same team every project – no re-onboarding
→ Fast feedback loops – no waiting days for replies
→ Multiple builds running in parallel
→ Revenue share – aligned with your outcome
```

```
White-label or direct intro, your call.

Does this match something you're dealing with?

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 4 (reciprocity), Law 22 (one idea), Law 25 (bullets), Law 28 (micro-commitment CTA)

Step 6 — Day 7 After Open | Opened, No Reply

Subject: what consultants tell us

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Liam at Promptable described it best.

Having one consistent build team meant
projects moved faster and clients
felt confident in delivery.

That's what allowed him to reach
$20–30K/month in projects.

Is there a project type where delivery
has been difficult to manage?

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 7 (social proof — direct testimonial angle), Law 8 (specificity), Law 23 (question CTA)

Step 7 — Day 12 After Open | Opened, No Reply

Subject: *(blank)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

No worries if timing isn't right.

If you ever need a reliable build team
behind your consulting work,
feel free to reach out.

Chandan
Small Group
```

> **Laws:** Law 30 (easy out), Law 48 (relationship close)

Step 8 — Day 2 After Click | Clicked

Subject: *(blank — thread reply)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Saw you checked this out.

Happy to walk through how we support
consultants on the execution side.

15 minutes this week?

Chandan
[INSERT CALENDLY LINK]
```

> **Laws:** Law 5 (commitment consistency), Law 28 (frictionless CTA)

SEQUENCE C — Scaling Ceiling

> **Pain:** Can't take on more projects because build capacity doesn't scale

---

Step 1 — Day 0 | Cold Send

Subject: the project you couldn't take

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Most AI consultants hit this moment.

Great client. Real opportunity.

But no reliable team to execute it
at the speed the client expects.

So the project either stretches thin
or goes elsewhere.

We work as the execution layer behind consultants
so they can take on more projects.

Liam at Promptable scaled to $20–30K/month
without hiring.

Does capacity ever limit your projects?

Chandan
Small Group
```

> **Laws:** Law 1 (loss framing — missed revenue), Law 6 (curiosity gap), Law 7 (social proof), Law 8 (specificity), Law 21 (hook), Law 22 (one idea), Law 23 (question CTA), Law 24 (short)

Step 2 — Day 4 | Not Opened

Subject: *(blank — thread reply)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Quick bump in case this got buried.

When clients ask for implementation —

do you usually have the capacity to take it on,
or does it end up going elsewhere?

Curious how you're handling that.

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 3 (mere exposure), Law 23 (question CTA), Law 24 (short), Law 28 (micro-commitment)

Step 3 — Day 9 | Not Opened

Subject: scaling without hiring

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Most consultants solve build capacity
by hiring developers or finding freelancers.

Hiring is slow.
Freelancers vary.

We work as an embedded execution team
for consultants — available when needed,
revenue share so we're aligned with your outcome.

Liam scaled to $20–30K/month this way.
```

```
No new hires.

Is scaling projects something you're thinking about?

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 1 (loss framing), Law 2 (pattern interrupt), Law 7 (social proof), Law 8 (specificity), Law 47 (problem before solution)

Step 4 — Day 14 | Not Opened

Subject: *(blank)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

I'll assume this isn't relevant and close the loop.

If capacity ever becomes the constraint
on your projects, feel free to reach out.

Chandan
Small Group
```

> **Laws:** Law 30 (easy out), Law 48 (relationship over transaction)

Step 5 — Day 3 After Open | Opened, No Reply

Subject: *(blank — thread reply)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Happy to share how the model works.

→ You bring the client + strategy
→ We handle execution (AI systems, automations)
```

```
→ Large team — multiple builds in parallel
→ Revenue share — 30–50% to you
→ White-label optional

You take on more projects. We build them.

Does this match where you're hitting limits?

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 4 (reciprocity), Law 25 (bullets), Law 28 (micro-commitment CTA)

Step 6 — Day 7 After Open | Opened, No Reply

Subject: how Liam scaled

```
Hi {{first_name}},

When Liam at Promptable started working with us,
he was early in his consulting journey.

By having a build team behind him,
he took on projects he couldn't have handled solo.

That's how he reached $20–30K/month
without hiring.

Is taking on more projects something
you're planning this year?

Chandan
```

> **Laws:** Law 7 (social proof — scaling angle), Law 8 (specificity), Law 23 (question CTA)

Step 7 — Day 12 After Open | Opened, No Reply

Subject: *(blank)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

No worries if timing isn't right.

If scaling without hiring ever becomes
a priority, feel free to reach out.

Chandan
Small Group
```

> **Laws:** Law 30 (easy out), Law 48 (relationship close)

Step 8 — Day 2 After Click | Clicked

Subject: *(blank — thread reply)*

```
Hi {{first_name}},

Saw you checked this out.

Happy to walk through how we help
consultants scale their build capacity.

15 minutes this week?

Chandan
[INSERT CALENDLY LINK]
```

> **Laws:** Law 5 (commitment consistency), Law 28 (frictionless CTA)

Smartlead Settings

Setting	Value
Send window	Mon–Thu, 9am–1pm IST
Daily limit	30–50/inbox
Track opens + clicks	ON
Reply stops sequence	YES
Unsubscribe link	ON

Before Importing — Checklist

- [ ] Confirm Liam / Promptable is okay to name publicly
- [ ] Add Calendly link to Step 8 in all three sequences
- [ ] Confirm revenue split range (30–50% used here — adjust if needed)
- [ ] Split list into three equal buckets — one per sequence
- [ ] After 4 weeks compare open + reply rates to find winning pain angle
- [ ] Do NOT add fake personalization at the top — only personalise if doing genuine manual research

---

What Each Sequence Tests

Sequence	Pain Angle	Win signal
A — Money Left on Table	Implementation revenue going elsewhere	Prospect asks "how does the revenue share work?"
B — Freelancer Reliability	Bad freelancers damaging delivery and reputation	Prospect says "yes this has happened"
C — Scaling Ceiling	Can't take on more without hiring	Prospect asks "how many projects can you handle?"

Version History

Version	Key Change
v1	First draft — too long, wrong CTA logic for angels

Version	Key Change
v2	Rebuilt with law annotations, split tracks
v3	Shorter emails, micro-CTAs, "execution layer" positioning
v4 (this)	Faster hooks, sharper subject lines, better scan flow, stronger breakup lines

---

Revision #1
Created 2026-03-18 14:55:03 UTC by Chandan Kumar
Updated 2026-03-18 14:57:13 UTC by Chandan Kumar