A crosslists Case Study

Performance Outweighs Position in a Multi-Source Prospecting Data Waterfall

Despite sitting behind a contractually protected vendor, Crosslists contributes approximately 50% more records than the primary source—and, according to the client, would increase its contribution to over 30% should that vendor be removed.

THE SITUATION

A leading national internet/cable provider sources new business acquisition data through a multi-provider waterfall – a fixed-order stack of vendors used to build its prospect files. One provider sits at the top of that stack by contractual requirement, unrelated to its performance. Crosslists holds the second position, without a contract securing that spot – so every record it contributes to the database has to be earned rather than guaranteed.

That structure creates a real test. In a waterfall, position determines opportunity: the first source delivers every record before any other source, and every lower ranked source does not get credit for records already contributed by others. A source with no guaranteed rank has no such advantage – it has to prove its value on every single record it contributes.

HOW CROSSLISTS COMPETES

Crosslists operates inside the client's existing waterfall as an unprotected, non-mandated source – one that has to outperform to matter.

NO POSITIONAL LEVERAGE - Unlike the primary contracted source, Crosslists holds its place on merit, not contract.

GAP-FILLING BY DESIGN - In a waterfall, downstream sources only contribute what upstream sources miss. Crosslists' share comes entirely from records the primary source failed to deliver.

SITUATION AT-A-GLANCE

Crosslists contributes to a multi-source waterfall database where top supplier position is contractually dictated. Based on that structure:

▲ **15%**
CROSSLISTS CONTRIBUTION RATE

+ **50%**
MORE THAN THE CONTRACTED PRIMARY SOURCE

→ **30%+**
PROJECTED RATE IF CONTRACTED SOURCE IS DROPPED

WHY THIS MATTERS

> *Same creative. Same offer. Same channel. Same cadence. The only variable was which data source found the record first — which isolates the result to one cause: Crosslists covers more of the record universe than the vendor holding the contractually mandated top position.*

THIS CREATED A NATURAL COMPARISON - Nothing else in the program changed, which means the result isolates one cause: coverage, not circumstance.

POSITION INFLUENCES CONTRIBUTION RATE MORE THAN COVERAGE - The contractually mandated source's 10% rate is inflated by its primary position. Crosslists' percentage comes without the advantage of mandated positioning. The real coverage gap between the two is likely wider than the numbers suggest.

THE GAP IS STRUCTURAL, NOT LUCKY - Every record that Crosslists contributes is one that the contractually positioned source did not deliver. That is the result of a persistent difference in coverage. Not a one-time occurence.

THE UPSIDE COMPOUNDS - If the client were to remove the contractually mandated source, Crosslists would not merely keep its current average contribution rate – it is projected to absorb the gap and become the leading contributor in the entire vendor stack.

THE BIGGER PICTURE

This case study exhibits the need for high-performing marketing data across every position of a client's sourcing stack - not just the top of it.

Our data is built to perform from every position in a waterfall: continuously refreshed, verified for accuracy, and deployed without requiring a pre-negotiated contract to protect its position – it stands on its own.

For marketers, agencies and platforms managing multi-source programs, that's the real takeaway: a waterfall built around contracts protects legacy vendors. A waterfall built around performance, delivers real results.

crosslists
www.crosslists.com
PO Box 23512 Overland Park, KS 66283
816.697.3306
Follow us