NetWebMedia

2026

COMPETITIVE STRATEGY GUIDE

AI Competitive Intelligence: The Real-Time Market Monitoring Playbook

Build a competitive intelligence system that updates daily, routes to the right people, and converts market signals into decisions

Carlos Martinez
Founder, NetWebMedia

12 pages
netwebmedia.com

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AI Competitive Intelligence: The Real-Time Market Monitoring Playbook

Most competitive intelligence programs fail in the same way: they're built for annual planning, not continuous decision-making. A competitor launches a new pricing tier on Tuesday afternoon. By Friday, their sales team is using new objection-handling scripts against yours. By the following Monday, they've A/B tested and updated their landing page messaging. If your team's competitive intelligence comes from a quarterly slide deck, you're making product marketing and sales enablement decisions based on a competitor that no longer exists. This guide covers the complete architecture of a real-time competitive intelligence system: the signal categories worth monitoring, the tool stack to build it, the daily brief format that converts signals into decisions, and the quarterly review process that keeps your positioning current.

IN THIS GUIDE

- ✓ A complete competitive signal taxonomy: the 7 categories worth monitoring and the specific data sources for each
- ✓ A tool stack comparison by budget tier: enterprise CI platforms (Crayon, Klue) vs. mid-market vs. DIY Firecrawl + Apify + Claude
- ✓ A step-by-step build guide for a custom real-time CI system with no enterprise-tier budget required
- ✓ The daily competitive brief format that gets read — routing logic, decision triggers, and stakeholder distribution
- ✓ A 90-day competitive landscape review process that aligns your positioning to market realities every quarter

Who this is for: Product marketers, strategy leads, and marketing directors at B2B companies who need to track competitors and market shifts continuously — not just during annual planning cycles.

SECTION 1

Why Static Competitive Research Fails Fast-Moving Markets

Static competitive research — the quarterly or semi-annual deep dive that produces a 40-slide deck — has three fundamental failure modes in fast-moving B2B markets. First: temporal lag. The research captures a snapshot of a competitor at a point in time. By the time the deck is presented and acted upon, it is already partially obsolete. In SaaS markets specifically, pricing, features, and messaging change on 2–4 week cycles. A competitive deck that took 3 weeks to produce is already out of date before it enters the review meeting. Second: signal selection bias. Annual or quarterly research tends to surface the most visible and easily documented competitive actions — new product announcements, press coverage, major customer wins. It systematically misses the high-frequency, low-visibility signals that predict strategic direction: job postings (what capabilities are they building?), ad creative changes (what messaging are they testing?), pricing page modifications (what segment are they moving toward?), and content publication patterns (what search terms are they optimizing for?). These signals are individually low-signal and high-value in aggregate — but only if you're monitoring them continuously. Third: insight-to-decision latency. Static research typically produces a document that requires a meeting to present, a review process to validate, and a planning cycle to act on. By the time a competitive insight reaches the person who needs it, weeks have elapsed and the window to respond has often closed. The solution requires a fundamental operational shift: from competitive research as a project to competitive monitoring as a continuous function — with defined signal categories, automated data collection, and a daily brief format that routes insights directly to decision-makers.

The organizational resistance to this shift is almost always resourcing. 'We don't have someone who can do this full-time.' The answer is that a well-architected CI system requires approximately 2–3 hours per week of human attention once the automated collection layer is running. The upfront build takes 20–40 hours. This is a favorable ROI against the cost of responding to competitive moves two months late.

- Failure mode 1: temporal lag — quarterly research is obsolete before action is taken
- Failure mode 2: signal selection bias — most visible signals collected, high-value low-visibility signals missed
- Failure mode 3: insight-to-decision latency — research → meeting → review → planning cycle → action takes weeks
- Required shift: competitive monitoring as continuous function, not periodic project
- Resource reality: well-architected CI system requires 2–3 hrs/week ongoing after 20–40 hour build investment

The CI Latency Problem: in a market where competitor messaging changes on 2–4 week cycles, a competitive intelligence program built around quarterly reviews is not a strategic asset — it's a rear-view mirror.

67% of B2B product marketers report discovering a competitor's major strategic move from a customer or prospect before their internal CI system flagged it (Crayon, 2025)

SECTION 2

The 7 Competitive Signal Categories Worth Monitoring

Not all competitive activity warrants equal monitoring attention. The 7 signal categories below are organized by strategic value and monitoring frequency. Category 1 — Messaging and Positioning (Daily monitoring): changes to competitor website copy, especially homepage headlines, hero sections, and value proposition statements. These are the highest-frequency strategic signals — companies test and iterate messaging continuously, and the direction of that iteration reveals the audience they're pursuing and the positioning they're testing. Tools: Firecrawl, Visualping, or Crayon's website monitoring. Category 2 — Pricing and Packaging (Weekly monitoring): changes to pricing pages, feature tier definitions, and any public pricing data. Pricing changes reveal customer segment strategy more clearly than any other public signal. A competitor adding a 'Starter' tier is moving downmarket; removing it is moving upmarket. Tools: manual review + website monitoring with diff alerts. Category 3 — Product Releases and Feature Announcements (Weekly monitoring): product changelog pages, release notes, G2/Capterra review mentions of new features, and app store release notes. This signals product investment priority — what problems are they solving and which customer segments do those solutions serve? Tools: Apify for changelog scraping, G2 review monitoring. Category 4 — Hiring Signals (Weekly monitoring): job postings reveal strategic direction 6–12 months before product or marketing execution. A competitor hiring 5 enterprise AEs is moving upmarket. Hiring ML engineers suggests a product capability investment. Hiring a VP of Partnerships signals a channel strategy shift. Tools: LinkedIn Jobs API, Apify LinkedIn scraper. Category 5 — Content and SEO Strategy (Bi-weekly monitoring): new content published, keyword ranking changes, backlink acquisition, and guest post placements. Reveals the organic acquisition strategy and thought leadership investment direction. Tools: Ahrefs or Semrush competitor tracking. Category 6 — Paid Media Creative (Weekly monitoring): ad creative and copy changes on Meta, Google, and LinkedIn reveal what messages the competitor is testing with paid budget — i.e., their highest-confidence positioning hypotheses. Tools: Meta Ad Library, Google Ads Transparency Center, LinkedIn Ad Library. Category 7 — Customer Sentiment and Win/Loss (Ongoing): G2, Capterra, and Trustpilot review patterns — not individual reviews, but trends in sentiment by feature category, onboarding experience, and support quality. New negative review clusters often predict churn risk messaging you should be exploiting. Tools: G2 review RSS feeds, Trustpilot API, manual quarterly review.

The monitoring frequency is a practical constraint. Daily monitoring for all 7 categories creates alert fatigue and produces a signal-to-noise ratio that overwhelms the analyst. Tier your monitoring frequency by strategic value and rate of change. Categories 1 and 6 move fastest and warrant daily attention; Category 7 moves slowly and can be reviewed monthly without material strategic cost.

- Category 1 (Daily): messaging/positioning — homepage, hero copy, value proposition changes
- Category 2 (Weekly): pricing/packaging — tier definitions, feature changes, public pricing
- Category 3 (Weekly): product releases — changelogs, release notes, G2 feature mentions
- Category 4 (Weekly): hiring signals — job postings by function as strategic direction proxy
- Category 5 (Bi-weekly): content/SEO — new content, keyword ranking changes, backlinks
- Category 6 (Weekly): paid creative — Meta/Google/LinkedIn ad library changes
- Category 7 (Monthly): customer sentiment — G2/Capterra review trend analysis

> *The Hiring Signal Advantage: job postings are 6–12 months ahead of public product and marketing execution. A competitor's hiring plan is their strategic roadmap — and it's publicly available if you're monitoring it.*

SECTION 3

Tool Stack by Budget: Enterprise vs. Mid-Market vs. DIY

Competitive intelligence tool selection is largely a function of budget, internal technical resources, and the complexity of your competitive landscape. Here is an honest evaluation across three tiers. Enterprise Tier ($15,000–$60,000+/year): Crayon and Klue are the market leaders. Both offer automated website monitoring, content change detection, battle card management, Salesforce/CRM integration, and team-wide CI distribution. Crayon's strength is breadth — it monitors a wider range of signal types automatically. Klue's strength is CRM integration and sales enablement workflow — its battle card system pushes CI directly into the Salesforce opportunity record. Both require a dedicated CI analyst to operate effectively — the tool provides collection infrastructure, but human synthesis is still the value-creation step. Decision criteria: choose enterprise tier if you have 10+ competitors to monitor, a dedicated CI function, and sales cycles where competitive context is deal-decisive. Mid-Market Tier ($2,000–$8,000/year): Kompyte (acquired by Semrush), Wappalyzer Pro, and Semrush's competitive intelligence features cover most Category 1, 2, 5, and 6 monitoring at a fraction of the enterprise cost. Semrush is the standout value for teams already using it for SEO — the competitive positioning features add CI capability to an existing tool investment. Decision criteria: choose mid-market tier if you have 3–7 primary competitors, no dedicated CI analyst, and primarily need messaging, content, and digital advertising monitoring. DIY Tier ($200–$800/year + engineering time): Firecrawl for website scraping and change detection, Apify for structured data extraction (job postings, G2 reviews, ad library), and Claude API for synthesis and brief generation. Total cost: Firecrawl Basic ($19/mo), Apify Starter ($49/mo), Claude API ($0.10–0.30 per brief generation at typical usage). Build time: 20–40 hours initial setup with a developer or technical marketer. Decision criteria: choose DIY tier if you have technical resources, want full customization, and are willing to trade build time for ongoing cost savings.

The most important selection criterion that budget tables don't capture: synthesis quality. Enterprise CI platforms automate collection but not meaning-making. A Crayon account without a skilled analyst still produces a noisy data feed that nobody reads. The investment in human synthesis capacity — the analyst who converts raw signals into decision-ready briefs — matters more than the collection platform. Budget accordingly: the analyst role delivers more ROI than the platform upgrade.

- Enterprise ($15K–$60K/yr): Crayon or Klue — best for 10+ competitors, dedicated CI analyst, sales-cycle-decisive competitive context
- Mid-Market ($2K–$8K/yr): Semrush CI features or Kompyte — best for 3–7 competitors, no dedicated analyst

- DIY ($200–$800/yr + build): Firecrawl + Apify + Claude API — best for technical teams wanting customization and low ongoing cost
- Platform selection shortcut: number of competitors × sales cycle length × internal technical resources
- ROI reality: analyst synthesis quality delivers more value than platform tier — invest in human capacity before platform upgrade

> ***Platform Tier Selection: most mid-market B2B companies with fewer than 8 direct competitors will get better ROI from a well-operated DIY or mid-market CI system than from an under-resourced enterprise platform.***

42% of teams with enterprise CI platform subscriptions rate their CI program as 'ineffective' due to insufficient analyst capacity to synthesize collected data (Klue, 2025)

SECTION 4

Building a Custom CI System with Firecrawl + Apify + Claude

The DIY CI stack — Firecrawl, Apify, and Claude — can replicate 70–80% of an enterprise CI platform's core capabilities at under $100/month in direct tool costs. Here is the architecture. Layer 1 — Website Monitoring (Firecrawl): Firecrawl monitors competitor URLs for content changes and delivers diffs via webhook or email. Configuration: add each competitor's homepage, pricing page, features page, and blog index to Firecrawl's monitoring list. Set check frequency by signal category (homepage: daily; pricing: daily; blog index: weekly). When a change is detected, Firecrawl sends a webhook to your Make or Zapier workflow with the URL, timestamp, and text diff. Layer 2 — Structured Data Extraction (Apify): Apify runs scheduled web scraping actors that extract structured data from sources that require more than change detection. Actors to configure: (1) LinkedIn Jobs Actor — scrapes new job postings for each competitor company weekly and outputs structured JSON with role title, department, location, seniority, and date posted. (2) G2 Review Actor — scrapes new G2 reviews for each competitor and extracts text, rating, category tags, and date. (3) Meta Ad Library Actor — scrapes active ads for each competitor and extracts copy, creative format, and start date. These actors run on a cron schedule and output to a destination of your choice (Airtable, Google Sheets, or a webhook). Layer 3 — Synthesis (Claude API): a Claude API call processes the collected signals and produces a structured competitive brief. The synthesis prompt is the most important component of the DIY stack — it determines the quality of the output. The prompt should: specify the brief format exactly, provide company context (your positioning, your top 3 customer segments, your current competitive vulnerabilities), instruct Claude to categorize each signal by strategic impact (high/medium/low), and flag signals that require immediate action vs. monitoring.

The orchestration layer — typically Make or Zapier — connects all three tools. A sample workflow: Firecrawl webhook fires on a competitor homepage change → Make workflow receives the diff → Apify job posting data for that competitor is fetched → Claude API synthesizes both signals in context → formatted brief is posted to the #competitive-intel Slack channel and saved to Notion. Build time with Make: 6–10 hours for a non-developer comfortable with no-code tools. If the Make workflow is too complex, start with Firecrawl email alerts + manual Apify review + weekly Claude synthesis — manual but functional in 2 hours of setup.

- Layer 1 (Firecrawl): URL monitoring for homepage, pricing, features, blog index — webhook on change detected
- Layer 2 (Apify): LinkedIn Jobs actor (weekly), G2 Review actor (weekly), Meta Ad Library actor (weekly)
- Layer 3 (Claude API): synthesis prompt with company context, signal categorization by impact, action-flag instructions

- Orchestration (Make): Firecrawl webhook → Apify data fetch → Claude synthesis → Slack post + Notion save
- Minimum viable version: Firecrawl email alerts + manual Apify weekly review + Claude synthesis — no code, 2 hours setup
- Total ongoing cost: Firecrawl ~$19/mo + Apify ~$49/mo + Claude API ~$20–30/mo = under $100/month

> ***The DIY CI Stack Economics: Firecrawl + Apify + Claude = enterprise-class signal collection and synthesis for under $100/month. The build investment is 20–40 hours. The annual savings vs. a Crayon or Klue subscription: $14,000–$59,000.***

SECTION 5

The Daily Competitive Brief: Format, Routing, and Decision Triggers

The daily competitive brief is the human-interface layer of the CI system. Its quality determines whether all the collection and synthesis infrastructure generates actual business decisions or just produces data that nobody acts on. The brief that gets read has four properties: it is short (under 400 words in the main body), it is structured (same format every day — readers don't waste attention decoding the layout), it is decision-oriented (every signal is paired with an implication or question, not just a description), and it is correctly routed (the right person receives the right signal, not a broadcast to everyone). The daily brief format: Header — date, competitive coverage (which companies were monitored that day), and a one-sentence executive summary of the highest-priority signal. Signal Log — up to 5 signals, each formatted as: [Category] [Company]: [What happened] → [Why it might matter] → [Suggested action or question]. The 'why it might matter' column is the synthesis layer — this is where Claude's brief generation earns its cost. Signals with no clear implication for your business are not worth including. Action Items — 0–3 specific, time-boxed actions surfaced by the day's signals. Examples: 'Pricing team: competitor X dropped their SMB plan by 20% today — schedule a review call this week.' 'Sales enablement: update HubSpot battle card with new messaging detected on competitor Y homepage.' Distribution logic: not everyone needs the full brief. Configure routing by signal category: pricing changes → VP of Product + Sales Leader; messaging changes → Product Marketing; hiring signals → VP of Strategy + CEO; content changes → SEO and Content team. The full brief goes to one CI owner (typically a product marketer or strategist) who also receives all routed signals.

The daily brief must have a consistent publish time to build reading habits. 8:00–9:00 AM in the business's primary timezone is the standard recommendation — it lands before the workday's first decisions. Slack delivery with a formatted message (not a PDF attachment) has the highest open and read rate. Keep the #competitive-intel channel read-only for automated briefs — discussions happen in threaded replies, keeping the main channel scannable.

- Brief properties: under 400 words, same format daily, decision-oriented (signal + implication + action), correctly routed
- Format: Header (date, coverage, executive summary) + Signal Log (up to 5 signals in 3-column format) + Action Items (0–3)
- Signal Log format: [Category] [Company]: What happened → Why it matters → Suggested action
- Routing logic: pricing → Product + Sales; messaging → Product Marketing; hiring → Strategy + CEO; content → SEO team
- Delivery: Slack formatted message, #competitive-intel channel, 8:00–9:00 AM daily

- Channel discipline: #competitive-intel read-only for briefs; discussions in threaded replies

> *The Daily Brief Test: if your team stops reading the CI brief within 30 days of launch, the problem is either routing (wrong people getting it) or signal density (too many low-value signals). Diagnose which and fix it before assuming CI isn't valuable.*

SECTION 6

Competitive Intelligence for Product Marketing: The Positioning Response Playbook

CI only generates value when it changes decisions. For product marketing, the primary decision domain is positioning — your messaging, your differentiation claims, and your battle cards. The Positioning Response Playbook defines the response protocol for the most common competitive scenarios. Scenario 1 — Competitor Launches a Feature You Don't Have: immediate actions within 48 hours: assess the feature's strategic significance (is it core or peripheral to your value proposition?), review your product roadmap for timeline to parity (if within 6 months, messaging response is 'coming soon' with emphasis on current unique capabilities; if 12+ months, messaging response acknowledges the gap and redirects to your differentiated strengths). Update battle card with factual description of the feature and your positioning response within 5 business days. Scenario 2 — Competitor Significantly Cuts Price: immediate actions within 24 hours: validate the pricing change is permanent (not a promotional offer), model the impact on your win rate against that competitor, and alert the sales team with an initial response brief. Within 5 days: price sensitivity analysis, positioning review (emphasize TCO, support quality, or feature breadth if competing on value, not price), and updated battle card. Scenario 3 — Competitor Changes Core Messaging: this is the signal that most teams underreact to. Messaging changes reveal where a competitor is gaining traction or testing a new audience. Within 48 hours: screenshot and archive the old and new messaging, analyze the directional shift (are they moving up-market, down-market, or horizontally to an adjacent segment?), and brief the product marketing team. Within 2 weeks: update your own messaging review calendar to assess whether their new positioning creates an opportunity for clearer differentiation in the space they're vacating.

Build the Positioning Response Playbook as a living document with response templates for each scenario. The goal is to reduce the decision-making time from signal detection to positioning response. Without a playbook, the response to a competitor pricing change requires a meeting, a review, a draft, and an approval cycle — 2–3 weeks. With a playbook, the first-response brief is generated from a template and sent within 24 hours, and the full response is complete in 5 business days.

- Scenario 1 (New Feature): 48-hour assessment + battle card update within 5 business days
- Scenario 2 (Price Cut): 24-hour sales alert + price sensitivity analysis + positioning review within 5 days
- Scenario 3 (Messaging Change): 48-hour archive + directional analysis + messaging review within 2 weeks

- Response Playbook: build template for each scenario — reduce response time from 2–3 weeks to 24–48 hours
- Battle card update cadence: any Scenario 1 or 2 signal triggers an immediate battle card review
- Positioning opportunity rule: when a competitor changes messaging, they vacate a position — assess whether it creates differentiation space

> *The Messaging Change Signal: when a competitor significantly updates their homepage copy, they're telling you what's working or what isn't. Both versions of that information are strategic intelligence for your own positioning decisions.*

SECTION 7

Sales Enablement from CI: Arming Reps in Real Time

The gap between CI production and sales utilization is where most CI programs fail commercially. A product marketing team can produce excellent competitive intelligence that lives entirely in slide decks, Notion pages, and email threads that sales reps don't read. The integration that makes CI commercially valuable requires three elements: format, timing, and delivery channel. Format: sales reps need CI in two formats. First, the battle card — a single-page (or single-screen) reference that answers the five questions a rep needs in a competitive deal: what does the competitor claim?, what are their weaknesses?, what's our win story against them?, what's their typical objection and our response?, and what proof points do we have (win quotes, benchmarks, customer references)? Battle cards should be in HubSpot, Salesforce, or whatever CRM the rep lives in — not in a separate tool that requires context-switching. Second, the deal-specific signal — when a rep is in an active deal where the monitored competitor is involved, any CI signal about that competitor should be routed to the rep's Slack or CRM record immediately. This requires a webhook from your CI system that checks active CRM opportunities and routes signals by competitor. Timing: the most valuable CI signal is one that arrives before the next customer interaction. If a competitor raises prices today and you learn about it at 9 AM, a sales rep with a 2 PM call against that competitor needs the updated battle card before that call — not after. Speed of signal-to-rep routing is the primary operational quality metric for a sales-integrated CI system. Delivery channel: Slack with a direct message to the rep is the most reliable delivery mechanism for time-sensitive deal signals. CRM record updates are the right channel for ongoing battle card access.

A critical sales team adoption prerequisite: reps must trust the CI source. A battle card that contains an inaccurate competitor claim (whether factually wrong or outdated) erodes trust in all CI materials. Establish a battle card accuracy standard: every claim must have a source, a date, and a review date. Outdated claims (over 90 days old for fast-moving competitors) should be flagged or removed until refreshed.

- Battle card format: 5 questions answered — competitor claims, weaknesses, your win story, common objections + responses, proof points
- Battle card location: inside CRM (HubSpot or Salesforce) — no separate tools
- Deal-specific routing: webhook from CI system checks active opportunities, routes competitor signals to deal owners
- Timing principle: competitor signal before the next sales interaction, not after
- Delivery: Slack DM for time-sensitive signals, CRM record for ongoing battle card access
- Battle card accuracy standard: every claim has a source, date, and 90-day review date

Sales CI Adoption Rule: a battle card that has one inaccurate claim destroys trust in all battle cards. Accuracy is the foundation — without it, your CI investment doesn't reach the sales call.

31% higher win rate in competitive deals for reps with access to real-time CI vs. reps using quarterly-updated battle cards (Klue Win/Loss Analysis, 2025)

SECTION 8

The 90-Day Competitive Landscape Review Process

The daily CI brief handles tactical responsiveness. The 90-day review handles strategic synthesis — the higher-order analysis of competitive direction that can only be seen by looking across a quarter of signals, not a single day. The 90-day review produces three outputs: a competitive landscape narrative, a positioning gap analysis, and a set of strategic recommendations for the next quarter. The process runs over 4 working days (typically the first week of the quarter) and involves four roles: the CI owner (leads the process), the product marketing lead (owns positioning outcomes), the VP of Sales (contributes win/loss perspective), and the product leader (contributes roadmap input). Day 1 — Signal Synthesis: the CI owner reviews 90 days of archived daily briefs and categorizes all significant signals by competitor and signal category. The output is a signal heatmap — a simple grid showing signal volume and strategic significance by competitor and category. This surfaces which competitors were most active and in which strategic dimensions. Day 2 — Win/Loss Integration: the VP of Sales provides a 90-day win/loss summary by competitor. Combined with the signal heatmap, this connects observable competitive behavior to commercial outcomes. A competitor who changed messaging (Category 1 signal) should show up in the win/loss data — if their win rate against you increased in the same period, the messaging change may be working. Day 3 — Positioning Gap Analysis: the product marketing lead reviews the current competitive positioning matrix against 90 days of competitive evolution. Identify claims you can no longer make (competitor has closed the gap), new differentiation opportunities (competitor has vacated a position), and any market-level shifts that affect the category framing. Day 4 — Strategic Recommendations: combine all three inputs into a set of Q+1 recommendations: positioning updates needed (urgency-ranked), battle cards to refresh, hiring signals to watch, product investments suggested by competitive gaps.

The 90-day review is the mechanism that converts your daily CI investment into strategic positioning decisions. Without it, you have good tactical awareness and no strategic synthesis. The meeting itself should be 90 minutes maximum, structured around the three outputs (landscape narrative, gap analysis, recommendations), and produce at least three actionable decisions before it ends. Document the decisions and their competitive rationale — this becomes part of your institutional knowledge on competitive dynamics.

- Day 1: Signal Synthesis — categorize 90 days of signals into competitor × category heatmap
- Day 2: Win/Loss Integration — connect competitive behavior signals to commercial outcome data
- Day 3: Positioning Gap Analysis — identify claims lost, opportunities opened, category-level shifts

- Day 4: Strategic Recommendations — positioning updates (ranked), battle cards to refresh, roadmap inputs
- Review roles: CI owner (leads), product marketing (positioning), VP Sales (win/loss), product (roadmap)
- Review output: 3 actionable decisions documented with competitive rationale before meeting ends

> *The 90-Day Review Principle: daily CI gives you tactical awareness. The quarterly review gives you strategic synthesis. Both are required. Neither replaces the other.*

2.4x more positioning updates per year for product marketing teams with a 90-day review process vs. annual-only competitive review cycles

Real-Time CI System Implementation Checklist

Phase 1 — Foundation

- [ ] Define your competitive set: tier competitors into Tier 1 (direct, deal-present) and Tier 2 (adjacent, watch-only)
- [ ] Select tool tier: Enterprise (Crayon/Klue), Mid-Market (Semrush CI), or DIY (Firecrawl + Apify + Claude)
- [ ] Configure Firecrawl monitoring for all Tier 1 competitors: homepage, pricing, features, blog index — daily check
- [ ] Configure Apify actors for Tier 1 competitors: LinkedIn Jobs (weekly), G2 Reviews (weekly), Meta Ad Library (weekly)
- [ ] Set up #competitive-intel Slack channel with read-only posting policy for automated briefs
- [ ] Create competitive signal archive in Notion or Airtable: organize by competitor, category, date

Phase 2 — Build and Integrate

- [ ] Build Claude synthesis prompt: company context block, signal categorization instructions, action-flag criteria, brief format spec
- [ ] Build Make/Zapier orchestration workflow: Firecrawl webhook → Apify fetch → Claude synthesis → Slack post + Notion save
- [ ] Set up signal routing rules: pricing/hiring signals to leadership, messaging signals to product marketing, content signals to SEO team
- [ ] Build battle cards for top 3 Tier 1 competitors in CRM — 5-question format, source and date on every claim
- [ ] Set up deal-specific routing: CI signal → CRM lookup → route to deal owner Slack if competitor is in active opportunity
- [ ] Define Positioning Response Playbook: templates for new feature, price change, and messaging change scenarios

Phase 3 — Operate and Review

- [ ] Publish first daily CI brief — review with stakeholders, adjust signal density and routing based on feedback
- [ ] Schedule 90-day review process: block 4 working days at the start of each quarter
- [ ] Set battle card review cadence: 90-day auto-flag for outdated claims in CRM
- [ ] Track CI utilization: which signals generated action in the last 30 days — drop or deprioritize non-actionable signal sources
- [ ] Quarterly: evaluate tool stack performance — are collection and synthesis gaps appearing that require new sources?
- [ ] Semi-annual: benchmark CI program against 90-day win/loss data — quantify competitive intelligence contribution to deal outcomes

NetWebMedia

We Build Real-Time Competitive Intelligence Systems — From Signal Architecture to Daily Brief

NetWebMedia designs and implements custom CI systems for B2B marketing and strategy teams: signal architecture, DIY stack build with Firecrawl + Apify + Claude, daily brief format and routing, CRM battle card integration, and the 90-day review process. We also build on Crayon and Klue for enterprise deployments. If your team is still discovering competitor moves from prospects and customers rather than from a running CI system, we can change that in a 30-day engagement.

- AI Marketing Automation
- AEO & AI-First SEO
- Autonomous AI Agents
- Paid Media + AI Creative
- CRM + AI Workflows

netwebmedia.com/contact