

A BNK KAM SALES GUIDE

One Hundred Sales Prompts, from cold email to signed proposal

One hundred prompts that refuse to flatter what they do not know, each with the release check that lets you stand behind every message.

Evidence-based · with real sources · 2026 edition

BNK KAM

That was the opening of the book plus ten complete prompts. The other ninety are your safety net.

You saw the cover, the full table of contents, the colophon, the foreword and the first ten prompts, each complete. The complete library gives you everything:

- ✓ 100 fill-in prompts across 8 categories, each with its own release check
- ✓ The complete framework around the prompts, with five figures and six worksheets
- ✓ Four worked case studies, checklists, a glossary and the decision frameworks
- ✓ 73 sources, each retrieved, read and, in a second round, refuted rather than confirmed

The reason to buy is not the price, it is your signature. The burden of proof rests on you and it applies per message sent, and a single sales instruction that was correct last year and no longer is costs more than this library ever could. We promise you nothing about your return. We promise you that you will know what every sentence rests on.

Buy the complete library

€ 59.99

Instant download at:

www.bnkkam.com/products/honderd-sales-prompts

Contents

2. Colophon	5
Accountability for sources and method	5
Intellectual property statement	5
Disclaimer.....	6
Liability	6
Why this book contains no response rate at all.....	6
3. Foreword	7
4. Executive summary.....	8
The core	9
What changed for telephone calls on 1 July 2026.....	9
A download is not a customer	9
What the GDPR requires on top of this.....	10
No labelling obligation rests on a sales email.....	10
Honest promises, and in relation to whom.....	10
Arriving is a separate test.....	11
What the research does and does not say.....	11
Recommendations	12
5. Reader's guide.....	12
The six-part prompt model.....	12
Why there is a Signal, and why the prompt refuses without one	14
The fixed format of every prompt	14
The eight categories	15
What prompt methodology is and is not	16
6. The buying moment: why this book is needed now	17
6.1 The email that is correct and says nothing	17
6.2 Why this happens: the model has no access to the only thing that convinces	18
6.3 What the figures do say, and where they stop	19
6.4 Does the recipient notice?	20
6.5 The ground is shifting beneath practice	21
7. Context: law and science	23
7.1 Pillar 1: whether you may approach	23

7.2 Pillar 2: the GDPR alongside the Telecommunicatiewet.....	29
7.3 Pillar 3: promising honestly, and here two tracks run.....	32
7.4 Pillar 4: transparency where it does apply	36
7.5 The two tracks side by side.....	39
7.6 Reference: what is allowed, what is not, and where it is set out.....	39
8. BNK KAM own research and position.....	44
8.1 What we researched and what we found	44
8.2 The absence of evidence is itself the fact	46
8.3 The Signal, our position on why prompt lists fail.....	48
8.4 What a good Signal is.....	49
8.5 Our position on the framework	51
8.6 Where we do not know.....	53
9. The practical library	54
9.1 Cold email and openers	55
9.2 Follow-up sequences	92
9.3 LinkedIn and social selling	125
9.4 Discovery and conversation preparation	154
9.5 Proposals and quotations	185
9.6 Objection handling and closing	218
9.7 Compliance and opt-out.....	252
9.8 Deliverability and reputation	273
In closing on the library	291
10. Decision frameworks	291
10.1 When you deploy AI in outbound sales, and when you do not.....	292
10.2 Risks, and who bears them.....	293
10.3 Governance: who may do what, who releases, and where it is recorded	296
10.4 Purchasing: the questions you put to a supplier	298
10.5 Implementation in four steps.....	300
11. Practice and case studies.....	301
11.1 How to read these four case studies	301
11.2 Case 1, publicly sourced. Fifty addresses, and at none of them was it stated what it was intended for	302
11.3 Case 2, publicly sourced. The party that did not press send itself.....	303

11.4 Case 3, hypothetical. The lead magnet that did not become a customer relationship	305
11.5 Case 4, hypothetical. The calling round to former customers in September 2026	306
11.6 What the four case studies say together	309
12. Checklists and worksheets	310
12.1 Worksheet 1, the Signal	310
12.2 Worksheet 2, may I approach this prospect	312
12.3 Worksheet 3, the release check for every message	318
12.4 Worksheet 4, the claim check	322
12.5 Worksheet 5, the monthly deliverability check	323
12.6 Worksheet 6, the balancing assessment record	326
13. Frequently asked questions	329
14. Pitfalls and misconceptions	333
“B2B is always allowed”	333
“We have consent, because they downloaded something”	334
“We may call ex-customers”	334
“Check the Bel-me-niet Register first”	334
“AI text has to be labelled”	335
“The blacklist applies to everyone”	335
“The ACM does not enforce anyway”	335
“Roll out DMARC with pct=10”	336
“AI emails perform better”	336
“Nobody can tell it is AI”	336
“A longer email is more persuasive”	337
“The prompt does the work”	337
15. Glossary	337
16. Sources and accountability	342
16.1 Methodology	342
16.2 The list of sources	343
17. About BNK KAM and how we help	350
18. Image plan and list of figures	351

2. Colophon

Title. One Hundred Sales Prompts, from cold email to signed quotation.

Publisher. BNK KAM.

Authors. The BNK KAM knowledge editorial team.

Reference date. 16 August 2026. All statutory texts, guidelines, provider requirements and studies in this book were consulted on or before that date.

Accountability for sources and method

Beneath this book lies a source dossier of seventy-three sources, numbered S1 to S73. Every statement in the running text that is a fact carries the number of the source from which it comes. Where you see no number, you are reading craft, judgement or a BNK KAM position, and that is stated as such.

The dossier was built in two rounds. In the first round a group of researchers included, per source domain, only sources they had actually opened. In the second round verifiers, who had not written the first round, retrieved every source again with an ordinary browser setting, compared every quotation character by character with the source text and assessed every finding as sound, overstated or incorrect. The starting point of that second round was uncompromising: a finding is incorrect until it has been found back verbatim in the source. A third check then went through the numbering, the duplications, the scope statements and the internal contradictions. Two independent retrieval rounds per source, amounting to well over five hundred retrieval actions. This is an account of our own work and not a claim about the outside world.

For every legal source the dossier states the scope: does the norm apply in relation to consumers, does it also apply in business dealings, or does it apply to all recipients. That distinction runs on right into the prompts. A rule that applies solely in relation to consumers is nowhere presented by us as a general sales rule.

Intellectual property statement

The one hundred prompts in this book were written fresh for the buyer. This book contains no internal BNK KAM prompts, no description of our own working method and none of our automation recipes. What you are buying is a library you can use on its own, not a look behind our kitchen door. The prompts, the template structure and the release checks in this book are copyright-protected work of BNK KAM. You may use them without limit within your own organisation, including adapted to your market and your tone. You may not resell them as a product, incorporate them into your own training or software offering for third parties, or publish them unchanged.

Disclaimer

This book does not give legal advice. It describes the framework within which commercial communication takes place in the Netherlands, citing the source in each case, and it translates that framework into concrete writing instructions. It is no substitute for a lawyer, for in-house counsel or for a data protection officer.

Legislation changes, and sometimes faster than the trade literature keeps up. The customer relationship exception for approaching people by telephone lapsed on 1 July 2026 because the phrase “en tweede”, “and second”, was deleted from the opening words of Article 11.7(4) of the Telecommunicatiewet, the Dutch Telecommunications Act [S1][S4]. Above the text of that same act as currently in force it is moreover stated in so many words that amendments without a date of entry into force are present [S1]. The European guidelines on which this book relies at a few points likewise carry the statement that they are not binding and that only the Court of Justice of the European Union can give an authoritative interpretation [S41]. Where a real interest is at stake, always check the current text and, where it matters, with an adviser.

Liability

BNK KAM accepts no liability for loss arising from the use of this book, the prompts it contains or the texts generated with them. Responsibility for what you send, to whom you send it and on what legal basis remains with you and with your organisation. That is not only a legal division but also the heart of the book: the prompts are built so that you can verify what every sentence rests on, precisely because it is you who signs the message.

Why this book contains no response rate at all

This book contains no response rate, no open rate, no reply rate, no conversion figure and no percentage attached to a “proven framework”. Not by way of illustration either, and not with a caveat attached. That is a deliberate choice and the reason is simple.

The only pre-registered field experiment on commercial email written with a language model that we have been able to open, and that was reviewed by peers before it appeared, is the study by Dubé and Xu at an online wine retailer, with three randomised experiments in 2024 and 2025 [S58]. That study does not reject the null hypothesis of equal gross profit between the human-written cell, the model cell and the mixed cell, and it also sees no difference in open rate between those three cells [S58]. The economic argument the authors do identify lies in the cost of the writing, not in a higher return [S58]. The profit comparison from that research that has stuck in the trade press is moreover a comparison with sending no email at all and not with a human writer [S58]. And the scope is narrow: consumer market, United States, wine, existing newsletter subscribers, a small sample which the authors themselves point out [S58].

The only statement this evidence supports is therefore this one: measured against a human writer, no difference in gross profit and no difference in open rate was demonstrated in this

research, while the writing work itself is demonstrably cheaper [S58]. “No difference demonstrated” is not the same as “proven equal”, because the authors expressly confine themselves to small-sample decision theory [S58]. Anything beyond that would be a promise we cannot substantiate. The BNK KAM position is that a salesperson who promises a figure he cannot prove is doing precisely what this book advises him against, and that a publisher who does the same fails to apply his own lesson. We promise you no return. We promise you that you will be able to vouch for what you send.

3. Foreword

You probably know the moment. You paste the name of a company into a chat window, you ask for a cold email, and within five seconds there is a text that looks good. The sentences run smoothly, the structure holds, the closing is polite. And still you do not send it. Because when you read it aloud, you hear that it says nothing. “I saw that your organisation is growing strongly.” “In today’s market, efficiency matters more than ever.” “I think we could mean a great deal to each other.” The model writes fluently and it writes empty, and that is no accident. It knows nothing about this prospect. It has not a single fact about this company, this person, this quarter. What it does have is a collection of patterns of how such emails usually look. So it fills in the form and leaves the substance open, and it covers that emptiness with friendliness.

That is the irritation out of which this book arose. Not out of fear of a fine, not out of fascination with the technology, but out of the daily annoyance of a salesperson who takes his trade seriously and is handed a tool that flatters instead of knows.

The solution is less complicated than the market suggests, and it does not lie in a cleverer phrasing of your request. It lies in what you supply. Every prompt in this book demands one thing that you must provide yourself: a real, verifiable fact about this prospect. We call that the Signal. An event, a statement, a public fact, a sentence from their job advertisement, a remark by your contact in an earlier conversation. And if you leave that field empty, the prompt refuses to write and asks you for it. That is not strictness for its own sake, it is the only way in which you prevent the model from inventing what it does not know. The documentation of the model makers says the same thing in other words: a hard rule such as “always cite a concrete fact” can force a model to supply a fact it does not have [S69]. The reverse holds as well. Give the model a real fact, and it no longer has anything to pad out.

That reverses the relationship. It is not the model that supplies the substance and you the approval, but you who supply the observation and the model that supplies the form. That is less magical than the free prompt lists promise, and it is the only division under which you can, at the end, vouch for what goes out of the door in your name.

The second thing that makes this book different is how it deals with the rules. There is a good deal of law in it, complete with citations, but not as a legal lecture and not as a shield. We have written the framework down in such a way that it makes your text better, with the law as by-catch. The rule that in every commercial message you state your true identity and a valid address for unsubscribing comes from Article 11.7(7) of the Telecommunicatiewet [S1]. But it is also simply a better email: a recipient who sees at a glance who you are and how he can get rid of you reads the rest with less suspicion. The rule that you must be able to prove every promise in a quotation comes from the reversal of the burden of proof in Article 6:195 of the Dutch Civil Code, which applies in business dealings as a matter of course [S31]. But it is also simply a better proposal: a claim you can substantiate is, after all, more persuasive to a purchaser than a claim you cannot substantiate.

And then the ground that shifts. On 1 July 2026 the phrase “en tweede” lapsed from the opening words of Article 11.7(4) of the Dutch Telecommunicatiewet [S1][S4]. Two words. As a result the exception for the existing customer relationship still covers email, but no longer the telephone. Calling an existing or former customer unsolicited can no longer rest on that legal basis, and the Autoriteit Consument en Markt (ACM), the Dutch Authority for Consumers and Markets, reports that investigations into several companies are now under way [S18]. The amendment is not in a telecommunications act and not in an advertising act, but in Article 7.8 of the Energiewet, the Dutch Energy Act [S4]. We do not mention this to impress. We mention it because it shows how quickly a sales instruction that was correct last year can be out of date this year, and why a prompt that fixes such an instruction in place needs maintenance. The same applies, incidentally, to the most frequently repeated piece of advice in Dutch sales material: consult the Bel-me-niet Register, the former Dutch do-not-call register. That register no longer exists; since 1 July 2021 Article 11.8 of the Telecommunicatiewet has read solely “[Vervallen per 01-07-2021]”, repealed with effect from 1 July 2021 [S7].

What you read from here on is not a collection of tricks. It is a library of one hundred templates, built on six fixed building blocks, with a release check per prompt that is concrete and not general. We promise you no response. We promise you that at the end of every prompt you will know what every sentence rests on, and that you can send that sentence without flinching.

The BNK KAM knowledge editorial team

4. Executive summary

If you read nothing but this summary, you will know the following.

is what you write. That question only comes afterwards, and the prompts that follow answer only that second one. The first question has a category of its own: prompt 85 and prompt 86.

The mistake most often made in this category is that the salesperson begins with what he wants to say instead of with what he can point to. He opens with his company, his service or his reason for calling, and lets the model fill the gap with whatever sounds plausible about the recipient. That is how the sentence every buyer reads weekly comes about: that their organisation is growing and that efficiency is high on the agenda. That sentence is not untrue, it is empty, and because it flatters without knowing anything, it reads as a trick. The mirror mistake is just as persistent: assuming that a business address that stands on the internet is thereby also designated and made known for unsolicited commercial post [S1][S11].

The BNK KAM position is that the opener is not a trick but a piece of evidence. The first sentence shows that you know something about them that you can point to, and the rest of the message leans on that one fact. What you cannot point to, you do not write.

1. The first email on a real signal, the base prompt of this book

Purpose. You receive one complete first message to one recipient, built around one fact that you have pointed to yourself, with underneath it, per sentence, the origin of what it says. Everything that you have not supplied is missing from the text, and that is by design.

When to use it. For the first message to an organisation you have not yet spoken to, after you have established that you may approach this recipient and after you have a signal in hand. Do not use this prompt without first running prompt 2 if you doubt whether your signal is strong enough, and not as an assessment of the legal basis: that question is answered by prompt 85. Also do not use it for a second or third message, prompt 18 and prompt 19 are there for that, and not for an existing customer, because then prompt 11 is the right one. The subject line that comes out here is a working line; prompt 7 makes a good one of it.

This prompt is the base form of all one hundred. The six building blocks stand in it in their purest form: a Role that says who is writing, a Signal that can refuse, a Context that fixes the limits, a Task that asks for exactly one thing, a Format that makes the output checkable, and a Check with which the model rejects its own work. Two fields can refuse here, and that is so nowhere else in the book: the Signal, and the legal basis. The latter is a choice of ours, not a statutory requirement for a prompt, and the reason is simple. Anyone who cannot write down the legal basis should notice that before a fine text stands on his screen, because a fine text is hard to throw away.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are a Dutch business salesperson who writes one message to one person. You write soberly and briefly, without sales language, without exclamation marks and without superlatives. You add no fact whatsoever that does not stand below.

SIGNAL: [the concrete, verifiable fact about this particular organisation: the verbatim sentence or passage, the source reference and the date].

If SIGNAL is empty, or contains only a generality such as "they are growing", "they are digitalising" or "I have seen their website", then write nothing. Then first ask me for one concrete fact with the verbatim passage, the source reference and the date. Never devise an occasion yourself, and never present an occasion more firmly, more recently or more broadly than I have supplied it.

CONTEXT: My legal basis for emailing this recipient unsolicited is [the consent that I can demonstrate, with date and origin, or the earlier sale on which I rely, or the source reference showing that this end user has itself designated and made known this address for unsolicited commercial messages]. If that field is empty or contains only something like "it is a business address" or "it stood on their website", then write nothing and first ask me which legal basis I have; in doing so, never assume a general exemption for business recipients. The message goes to [the job title of the recipient exactly as it actually stands] at [the type of organisation and the size]. What we actually do is [what we deliver, in plain words, without any promise about the outcome]. The problem we work on is [the problem as I have actually seen it at others]. The next step I ask for is [the smallest possible step, for example answering one question or a conversation of twenty minutes]. Four fixed rules. One: use no figure, percentage, saving, return, payback period or lead time that I have not named myself above, not even as an example and not even with "up to". Two: name no customer name, reference, quality mark or partnership that I have not supplied. Three: the first sentence is about them, not about me and not about my company. Four: include my name [my name], my company name [the company name] and the sentence by which the recipient can unsubscribe [my unsubscribe sentence, with the address to which a request for termination can be directed] unchanged in the signature.

TASK: Write one message of at most [the maximum number of words] with four parts in this order. One: the occasion, in which the source reference from SIGNAL is named verbatim. Two: in one sentence what that fact means for their work, phrased as a question when I do not know it for certain. Three: what we actually do, in at most two sentences, without any statement about what it yields. Four: the next step from CONTEXT, as one question. Then write a subject line that covers what stands in the message. Ask nothing for which the recipient first has to look something up.

FORMAT: First line: "Subject:" followed by the subject line. Then the message, without subheadings. Then the heading "What each sentence rests on" with one line per sentence from the message: the sentence shortened to five words, followed by SIGNAL, CONTEXT or "general". No introduction, no explanation of your own working method, no alternatives.

CHECK: Test your own output on five points and write one line per point that ends in "passes" or "does not pass". One: the source reference from SIGNAL stands verbatim in the message. Two: there is no figure, percentage, saving, return or term that I have not supplied. Three: there is no customer name, reference or quality mark that I have not supplied. Four: the first sentence is about the recipient. Five: the message remains within the maximum number of words, with the counted number given. If any line reads "does not pass", rewrite the message once and report in one sentence what you have adjusted.

How to fill it in. - *The signal.* What belongs in it: the verbatim passage, where you found it and when it was published. Well filled in: "their job advertisement for a work planner of 3 August 2026 states: 'in connection with the start-up of our second production line in Venlo'". Too vague: "they are expanding". - *The legal basis.* What belongs in it: what you rely on, in one sentence that you would read aloud to a regulator. Well filled in: "on 14 May 2026 Mr De Boer ticked on our sign-up page that he wishes to receive commercial email; the confirmation stands in our system". Too vague: "it is an info address that stands on their contact page". - *The job title and the organisation.* What belongs in it: the job title exactly as it stands, plus the type of company and the size. Well filled in: "head of procurement at a family business in machine building, around eighty employees". Too vague: "the decision-maker". - *What we actually do.* What belongs in it: the action, not the promise. Well filled in: "we take over the drawing up and submission of the inspection files from work planning". Too vague: "we unburden companies in the field of compliance". - *The next step.* What belongs in it: the smallest step that you genuinely want. Well filled in: "the question whether they now draw up those files themselves or outsource them". Too vague: "a no-obligation introductory meeting".

Release check. - [] Can you point, for this one message, to what you rely on, because the burden of proof lies with you and it applies per message sent [S1][S11]. - [] Do your actual identity and a valid postal address or number to which a request for termination can be directed stand in the message, because for commercial messages that is a statutory requirement and not a layout choice [S1]. - [] Is the recipient informed in this message in a clear manner about the possibility of unsubscribing free of charge and easily, without an intermediate page, a login or a statement of reasons [S62]. - [] Have you genuinely read the little list "What each sentence rests on" and is there no sentence in it that is "general" and yet makes a promise. - [] Would you also send this message if the recipient placed it next to the message from your biggest competitor.

2. Assessing the signal before you write: is this strong enough to open on

Purpose. You receive an assessment of your own signal, point by point, with the conclusion as to whether you can open on it. This prompt produces no email text, and that is the intention.

When to use it. Before prompt 1, whenever you doubt whether the fact you have found is an occasion or merely a nicety. Use it in any event with a job move, an anniversary, an award or a milestone, because those are the cases in which people most often write on regardless. Do not use this prompt to test whether you are permitted to email: that is a different question and it stands in prompt 85. Also do not use it once you have already written, because then you are assessing your text and not your occasion, and then the text wins.

This prompt is the gatekeeper of the library. It tests against four requirements that we have written down ourselves, as craftsmanship and not as a measurable model: a signal is traceable, recent enough to say something about it now, specific to this organisation instead of to its sector, and it touches something you can genuinely do something about. The fourth requirement makes most signals drop out. The BNK KAM position is that a congratulation without a substantive connection is not an opening but a pretext, and that the recipient sees that faster than the sender thinks.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are a strict assessor of sales occasions. You write not a single sentence that could be pasted into an email. You judge, you do not compose.

SIGNAL: [the fact that I am considering as an occasion: the verbatim passage or event, the source reference, the date of publication and the date on which I found it].

If SIGNAL is empty, or contains only something general such as "they are growing", "they are active on LinkedIn" or "their sector is under pressure", then write nothing and first ask me for the verbatim passage with source reference and date. Never supplement the passage, and never look for a meaning in it that does not stand in it.

CONTEXT: I sell [what we actually deliver, in plain words] to [the type of organisation and the job title that usually deals with it]. The problem we work on is [the problem as I have actually seen it at others]. Assess my signal against four requirements. One, traceable: can I name the source reference, or is this an impression. Two, current: is this still live with them now, given the nature of the event and the date. Three, specific: is it about this particular organisation or about its sector. Four, actionable: is there a demonstrable connection between this fact and the problem above. A fact that meets the first three requirements and not the fourth you expressly call a pseudo-signal; a job move, an anniversary, an award or

a milestone falls under that as long as I cannot name what changes for them.

TASK: Do three things. First: assess each of the four requirements in one line, with a verbatim quotation from my SIGNAL as substantiation. Second: give one final verdict from precisely these three: "usable", "conditionally usable" or "not usable", with one sentence why. With "conditionally usable" you name the one missing fact that I still have to obtain. Third: with the verdict "not usable", name three kinds of sources where I can look for a stronger signal for this particular organisation, without inventing content that might stand there. Write no subject line, no opening sentence, no paragraph that is usable as an email and no example wording. Make no statement whatsoever about what this signal would yield.

FORMAT: A table with four rows, one per requirement, with the columns: requirement, quotation from my signal, verdict in at most twelve words. Underneath it the heading "Final verdict" with the one word or the one phrase and one sentence. Underneath that, where applicable, the heading "Still missing" or "Where you can look further". At most two hundred words in total.

CHECK: Test your own output on four points and write one line per point that ends in "passes" or "does not pass". One: with every requirement stands a verbatim quotation from my SIGNAL. Two: the final verdict is precisely one of the three permitted words. Three: nowhere stands a sentence that can be pasted straight into an email. Four: there stands no fact about this organisation that I have not supplied. If any line reads "does not pass", rewrite your output once and report in one sentence what you have deleted.

How to fill it in. - *The signal with two dates.* What belongs in it: the passage, the source reference, the publication date and the date on which you found it, because that difference determines whether it is still live. Well filled in: "tender document published on TenderNed on 2 July 2026, found on 12 August 2026, with the sentence 'submissions close on 15 September'". Too vague: "they have put something out to tender". - *What we actually deliver.* What belongs in it: the action, because the fourth requirement is tested against it. Well filled in: "we write and manage the maintenance files for installation companies". Too vague: "we help companies move forward". - *The problem.* What belongs in it: the problem as you have seen it at comparable customers, not as it stands in your brochure. Well filled in: "the work planner does this on the side and therefore delivers too late". Too vague: "a lack of efficiency". - *The job title that usually deals with it.* What belongs in it: who in practice decides or advises on this. Well filled in: "usually the general manager, sometimes the KAM coordinator". Too vague: "management".

Release check. - [] Does the output genuinely contain not a single sentence that you could copy, and have you resisted the urge to single one out after all. - [] If the verdict reads "not usable": have you actually dropped the signal instead of using it as an opening sentence

anyway. - [] If the verdict reads “conditionally usable”: have you obtained the missing fact yourself, and not had the model fill it in. - [] Do you know that an approved signal says nothing about the question whether you may approach this recipient, because publicly available is not yet agreement to use for marketing [S29] and the burden of proof lies with you [S1][S11]. - [] Have you kept the source reference, so that you can name it in the message and find it again later.

3. The opening sentence that is not about yourself

Purpose. You receive three possible first sentences that all three begin with the recipient, each with the test alongside it as to why that sentence is not about you. You choose one yourself.

When to use it. When your message is substantively right but the first sentence is still about your company, your occasion or your service. Also usable when you take over a template from a colleague and only want to replace the opening. Do not use this prompt to phrase a weak signal more attractively: a good first sentence on a pseudo-signal is better packaging for the same problem, and prompt 2 is there for that. Also do not use it for the visible preview line next to the subject line, that is prompt 8.

There is a limit in this prompt that is worth naming. An opening that is not about yourself is something other than an opening that hides that you want to sell something. Advertising must be clearly recognisable as such, through layout, presentation, content or otherwise [S61], and the Code reclame via e-mail, the Dutch code on advertising by email, requires the same for the email message [S62]. In business relationships there is, moreover, a misleading omission where the commercial intent is not apparent while that does not already follow clearly from the context [S31]. We consider that this is not a restriction but a relief: you do not have to use the first sentence to conceal something, only to show that you have looked.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are an editor who writes solely the first sentence of a business message. You deliver three possibilities and you do not choose for me.

SIGNAL: [the concrete fact about this organisation, with the verbatim passage, the source reference and the date] and [my current first sentence, copied verbatim, or the statement that I do not yet have one]. If SIGNAL contains no concrete fact about this organisation, then write nothing and first ask me for that passage with source reference and date. Never invent an event, a statement or a detail that I have not supplied, and never turn a sector-wide development into a statement about this organisation.

CONTEXT: The recipient is [the job title exactly as it stands] at [the

type of organisation]. Six fixed rules for every sentence you write. One: the subject of the sentence is the recipient or their organisation, never me, my company or my service. Two: the sentence contains the fact from SIGNAL or its source reference. Three: the sentence contains no compliment, no congratulation and no value judgement about their organisation. Four: the sentence contains no figure, percentage or superlative that I have not supplied. Five: the sentence does not conceal that this message is commercial; if a sentence only works because the recipient thinks that it is not a sales message, you reject it yourself. Six: name no customer name, reference, quality mark, partnership or example assignment that I have not supplied myself, nor described in a manner from which the reader can deduce the party. Every sentence counts at most twenty words and is one sentence, so without a semicolon construction with which you make it two.

TASK: Write three different first sentences. They differ not in wording but in angle: one that names the fact from SIGNAL and asks a question, one that names the fact and assumes a consequence for their work with a word that shows the uncertainty, and one that names the fact and says at once why I am writing because of it. Give one line per sentence with the reason why this sentence is about them and not about me. Finally assess my current first sentence, if I have supplied it, in at most two lines: what is the subject of that sentence, and what is lost if I leave it standing.

FORMAT: Three numbered sentences, each with one line "why about them" underneath. Then the heading "Your current sentence" with at most two lines. No introduction and no recommendation as to which sentence I should choose.

CHECK: Test your own three sentences on five points and write one line per point that ends in "passes" or "does not pass". One: in all three sentences the subject is the recipient or their organisation. Two: all three sentences name the fact or the source reference from SIGNAL. Three: none of the sentences contains a compliment, a congratulation or a figure that I have not supplied. Four: none of the sentences counts more than twenty words, with the number per sentence given. Five: there stands no customer name, reference or quality mark in them that I have not supplied. If any line reads "does not pass", rewrite that sentence once and report which sentence you have replaced.

How to fill it in. - *The fact with source reference.* What belongs in it: the passage from which the sentence can draw. Well filled in: "the minutes of the council meeting of 9 June 2026 state that they are taking the maintenance of the bridges into their own hands". Too vague: "the municipality is going to do something different with maintenance". - *Your current first sentence.* What belongs in it: your sentence verbatim, even if you consider it weak, because the comparison is the most instructive part. Well filled in: "We have been

specialists in management and maintenance for fifteen years”. Too vague: “I usually begin with a short introduction”. - *The job title exactly as it stands*. What belongs in it: the title that they use themselves. Well filled in: “team leader Public Space Management”. Too vague: “someone from the technical department”. - *The type of organisation*. What belongs in it: what kind of organisation it is, so that the tone is right. Well filled in: “a municipality with around forty thousand inhabitants”. Too vague: “the government”.

Release check. - [] Does the chosen sentence still read as a sentence from a salesperson, and not as a sentence that hides that you want to sell something [S61][S62]. - [] Is it apparent from the opening or from the immediate context that this is a commercial message, because concealing that is a misleading omission in business relationships [S31]. - [] Can you find the source reference that stands in the sentence again within a minute if the recipient asks for it. - [] Is there no word in the chosen sentence that you would not utter if you had the same person on the telephone. - [] Does the second sentence of your message genuinely connect to the chosen opening, or have you only replaced the first sentence.

4. From product description to problem description in the language of the recipient

Purpose. You receive your own product description translated into the problem as the recipient writes it down themselves, with, per sentence, the word from their own material on which that translation rests. What you cannot find back in their words stays out.

When to use it. When your text is right but stands in your own vocabulary, with words such as solution, platform, unburden or partner. Pre-eminently usable when you approach a new sector and notice that your usual words mean nothing there. Do not use this prompt without material in which the recipient writes themselves: without their words the model invents their words, and then you have replaced your own jargon with general jargon. Also do not use it to formulate a claim about results, that is prompt 63 and prompt 90.

Here the norm that does bind a business salesperson directly comes into play. Article 6:194 of the Dutch Civil Code declares a misleading statement unlawful in relation to another party acting in the course of its business, and Article 6:195 reverses the burden of proof: whoever determined the content and presentation of the statement must itself prove the accuracy and completeness of the facts contained or suggested in it [S31]. The blacklist of Article 6:193g of the Dutch Civil Code and the guidance documents of the Autoriteit Consument en Markt (ACM), the Dutch Authority for Consumers and Markets, apply in relation to consumers and are not the yardstick here [S30][S37]. We consider the reversal of the burden of proof the most useful editing rule that exists: it forces you to know, per sentence, where it comes from.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are a translator between two vocabularies. You convert my description of what we deliver into a description of the problem in the words that the recipient uses themselves. You add no problem that they have not written down themselves.

SIGNAL: [at least five verbatim sentences from material that this organisation has written itself: a job advertisement, an annual report, a tender document, an interview or a page from their website, with the source reference and the date for each sentence].

If SIGNAL is empty, or contains only my own summary of their situation instead of their own sentences, then write nothing and first ask me for those verbatim sentences with source reference and date. Never use technical words that stand in my material but not in theirs, and never invent a word that is "customary in their sector".

CONTEXT: My own description reads: [my current product description, verbatim, as it stands in my brochure or on my website]. The recipient is [the job title exactly as it stands]. Five fixed rules. One: every problem that you name rests on a verbatim sentence from SIGNAL, and you quote that sentence alongside it. Two: every word from my own description that does not occur in their material you replace with a word that does occur in it, or you delete it. Three: you name no figure, percentage, saving, return or payback period whatsoever; if my own description contains any, you take them out and report that. Four: you do not say what it yields them, you say what work or what risk lies on the table with them. Five: name no customer name, reference, quality mark, partnership or example assignment that I have not supplied myself, nor described in a manner from which the reader can deduce the party.

TASK: Do three things. First: make a table with per row one element from my description, the problem in their words, and the verbatim sentence from SIGNAL on which that rests. Second: give the elements from my description that you cannot link to their material anywhere, under the heading "No basis in their words", with one sentence per element saying why. Third: write out the problem description as one paragraph of at most eighty words, solely in their vocabulary, without naming my service.

FORMAT: The table with three columns. Then the list without basis. Then the heading "The paragraph" with the paragraph. No introduction, no advice about my positioning, no alternative wordings.

CHECK: Test your own output on six points and write one line per point that ends in "passes" or "does not pass". One: every named problem has a verbatim quotation from SIGNAL. Two: the paragraph contains no word from my own description that does not occur in their material. Three: nowhere stands a figure, percentage, saving or return. Four: the paragraph does not name my service. Five: the

paragraph counts at most eighty words, with the counted number given. Six: there stands no customer name, reference or quality mark in it that I have not supplied. If any line reads "does not pass", rewrite the paragraph once and report which words you have replaced.

How to fill it in. - *Their own sentences.* What belongs in it: five or more sentences that they have written themselves, with source reference and date. Well filled in: "from their job advertisement of 3 August 2026: 'the candidate draws up inspection reports and monitors recertification'". Too vague: "their site states that quality is important". - *Your own description.* What belongs in it: your text verbatim, including the words that you are not happy with yourself. Well filled in: the complete paragraph from your brochure. Too vague: "we offer a total solution, that is the core of it". - *The job title exactly as it stands.* What belongs in it: their title, because it determines which part of the problem lies with them. Well filled in: "work planner". Too vague: "the technical chap". - *The source reference per sentence.* What belongs in it: for each quotation where it comes from, because otherwise the table becomes unusable. Well filled in: "annual report 2025, page 14". Too vague: "somewhere on their website".

Release check. - [] Can you substantiate every assertion in the paragraph if the recipient asks for it, because in business relationships the burden of proof for the accuracy and completeness of your statement lies with you [S31]. - [] Have you genuinely left the elements without basis in their words out of your message, and not added them after all because you consider them important. - [] Does the paragraph contain no number whatsoever, not even in the form of "a large part" or "regularly", for which you have no source. - [] Would someone from that sector recognise the paragraph as their own language, and have you put it to one such person. - [] Do you still know which of their quotations lies beneath which sentence, so that you can cite it in a conversation.

5. The email of one hundred and fifty words, with a hard word budget

Purpose. You receive a message that remains within a word budget fixed in advance, with the counted number of words per part, so that you see what you have taken out of it and not only what stands in it.

When to use it. When your draft is right but too long, and when you notice that you are writing the third paragraph only because you wrote it in earlier emails as well. Also usable as a standing discipline with every first approach. Do not use this prompt on a message whose content is not yet right, because then you are shortening a wrong argument; use prompt 4 first in that case. Also do not use it for a proposal or a quotation, where scope and assumptions do need room, prompt 61 and prompt 65 are there for that.

The budget only works if it is distributed per part. A message of one hundred and fifty words with fifty words of run-up is just as long as a message of two hundred words and reads worse, because the ending is squeezed. We therefore consider that you should not agree a length but a distribution: it is the difference between cutting and budgeting. What this book

expressly does not add is a statement about what shorter messages yield. That is not out of modesty: there lies no source in this file that supports such a statement.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are an editor who writes within a fixed word budget. You count your own words and you report the number. You shorten by deleting, not by compressing sentences until they become unreadable.

SIGNAL: [the concrete fact about this organisation, with the verbatim passage, the source reference and the date] and [my complete draft text, if I already have one, including the signature].

If SIGNAL contains no concrete fact about this organisation, or only something general such as "they are in logistics", then write nothing and ask me first for that fact with source reference and date. Devise no occasion in order to be able to fill the text, and rather delete a part than pad it out.

CONTEXT: The message goes to [the job title of the recipient] at [the type of organisation] and is a first approach. The budget is as follows and it is hard: the occasion at most [the number of words for the occasion] words, what this means for their work at most [the number of words for the meaning for their work] words, what we actually do at most [the number of words for what we actually do] words, the follow-up question at most [the number of words for the follow-up question] words. The total of these four parts is at most [the total number of words] words. The salutation, the signature and the unsubscribe sentence do not count and remain unchanged: [my salutation], [my signature with name, company name and address], [my unsubscribe sentence]. Three fixed rules. One: use no figure, percentage, saving, return or term that I have not supplied myself. Two: name no customer name and no reference that I have not supplied. Three: rather delete a whole part than halve all four parts; if a part does not fit within its budget, you report that instead of compressing it.

TASK: Write the message in four parts according to the budget. Then give per part the counted number of words and the total. Then give a list of what you have deleted from my draft, with per line the deleted sentence shortened to five words and the reason in at most six words. If you exceed a budget, report that expressly instead of adjusting the count.

FORMAT: The message without subheadings, with the four parts as four paragraphs. Then the heading "Count" with five lines: four parts and the total. Then the heading "Deleted" with the list. No introduction.

CHECK: Test your own output on five points and write one line per point that ends in "passes" or "does not pass". One: each of the four

parts remains within its own budget. Two: the total remains within the total number. Three: the fact from SIGNAL still stands verbatim or recognisably in the first part. Four: there stands no figure, customer name or reference that I have not supplied. Five: the signature and the unsubscribe sentence stand in it unchanged. If any line reads "does not pass", rewrite the message once and report which part you have shortened.

How to fill it in. - *The four budgets.* What belongs in it: four numbers that add up to your total, with the most room for the occasion and the least for your own service. Well filled in: "occasion 40, meaning 35, what we do 50, question 25, total 150". Too vague: "keep it short". - *Your draft text.* What belongs in it: the complete draft, including the sentences that you already wanted to delete yourself. Well filled in: the text as it stands in your drafts. Too vague: "the core of it is that we can take over their maintenance". - *The signature.* What belongs in it: name, company name and an address to which a request for termination can be directed, because those words may not be budgeted away. Well filled in: the complete signature block as you use it. Too vague: "my standard signature". - *The unsubscribe sentence.* What belongs in it: your own sentence, verbatim. Well filled in: "If you no longer wish to receive messages from me, reply with 'no' or use the unsubscribe link at the bottom; I will process that within seven days". Too vague: "the standard unsubscribe text".

Release check. - [] Have the signature with your actual identity and the address for a request for termination remained intact during the shortening, because that statement is legally required and not a style choice [S1]. - [] Does the information about unsubscribing still stand in this communication itself, and not only in an earlier email [S62]. - [] Is the part "what we actually do" shorter than the part about them, and if not, is that a deliberate choice. - [] Have you read the list of deleted sentences and is there nothing in it that you actually had to keep. - [] Does the message, read aloud, still read as one person writing to one person, and not as a compressed telegram.

6. A second variant from a different angle, for a fair comparison

Purpose. You receive a second version of your message that genuinely chooses a different angle, together with an overview of exactly what differs and what remains the same in both versions.

When to use it. When you have one version and want to know whether your first angle is the only one, and when you are discussing a message with a colleague and the conversation would otherwise be only about wordings. Do not use this prompt to send both versions to the same recipient, and not to send them to two halves of one list in the expectation that you can draw a conclusion from that. We consider that with the numbers a salesperson in the SME sector works with you cannot make a reliable statement about which variant works better; that is a judgement of ours, and it is the reason that this prompt expressly predicts nothing.

A variant is only a variant when the angle differs, not the choice of words. Two messages that both open with the occasion, both name the same problem and both ask for a conversation of twenty minutes are one message in two coats. The comparison that this prompt produces is therefore not a bet on the yield, but a choice that you can defend yourself: which of the two angles fits what you genuinely know about this organisation.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are an editor who writes a second version of a message from a demonstrably different angle. You never predict which version works better and you give no recommendation on the basis of expected results.

SIGNAL: [the concrete fact about this organisation, with the verbatim passage, the source reference and the date] and [my existing version A, verbatim and complete, including the subject line].

If SIGNAL contains no concrete fact about this organisation, or if version A is missing, then write nothing and first ask me for both. Add no new fact about this organisation in order to make the second version more interesting; both versions rest on precisely the same fact.

CONTEXT: The recipient is [the job title of the recipient exactly as it actually stands] at [the type of organisation]. Choose the angle of version B from these four and use precisely one: the work that they now do themselves, the risk that they run if nothing changes, the decision that they have to take shortly, or the question of how they have solved it at present. Four fixed rules. One: version B is no rewording of version A; if the angle of A and B coincides, you report that and choose another. Two: no figure, percentage, saving, return or term that I have not supplied myself, in neither of the two versions. Three: no customer name and no reference that I have not supplied. Four: you make no statement whatsoever about response likelihood, attention, chance of success or any result at all.

TASK: Do four things. First: name in one sentence what the angle of my version A is. Second: choose one of the four angles from CONTEXT that demonstrably differs from it, and say in one sentence why it differs. Third: write version B, as long as version A or shorter, with the same signature and the same unsubscribe sentence. Fourth: make a comparison on four points: the occasion, the problem that is addressed, the next step requested and the tone, with per point what A does and what B does. Then name in one line what is identical in both versions and must remain identical.

FORMAT: Heading "Angle of A" with one sentence. Heading "Angle of B" with one sentence. Heading "Version B" with subject line and text. Heading "What differs" with a table of four rows and three columns. Heading "What remains the same" with one line. No advice as to which version I should choose.

CHECK: Test your own output on four points and write one line per point that ends in "passes" or "does not pass". One: the angle of B demonstrably differs from that of A, as appears from the comparison table. Two: both versions rest on the same fact from SIGNAL and contain no fact that I have not supplied. Three: nowhere stands a prediction, a likelihood, a percentage or a recommendation on the basis of expected results. Four: version B is no longer than version A, with the word count of both given. If any line reads "does not pass", rewrite version B once and report what you have changed.

How to fill it in. - *Version A.* What belongs in it: your existing message in full, including subject line and signature, because otherwise you are comparing half texts. Well filled in: the complete email as it stands ready. Too vague: "my usual opening email, I know it by heart". - *The fact.* What belongs in it: the same signal as in version A, verbatim. Well filled in: "in their quarterly statement of 30 June 2026 they announce that the site in Zwolle is closing". Too vague: "one thing and another is changing there". - *The job title and the organisation.* What belongs in it: who reads it, because the angle "the decision that they have to take" does not fit every job title. Well filled in: "operations director at a transport company with two hundred employees". Too vague: "the leadership". - *The signature and the unsubscribe sentence.* What belongs in it: your own text, so that version B is ready to send and not half finished. Well filled in: your complete signature block plus your unsubscribe sentence. Too vague: "I will put that underneath later".

Release check. - ☐ Are you not sending both versions to the same person, and also not to two people within the same organisation. - ☐ Are you choosing on the basis of what you know about this organisation, and not because one of the two versions reads more smoothly. - ☐ Are both versions separately defensible, so that you could also have sent the version you did not choose without amendment. - ☐ Do both versions state your actual identity, your address for a request for termination and the information about unsubscribing [S1][S62]. - ☐ Have you written down which angle you have chosen and why, so that you still know that in three months' time.

7. The subject line that covers what stands in the email

Purpose. You receive five subject lines that are all five covered by a sentence that genuinely stands in your message, with per line the covering sentence and the number of characters.

When to use it. As the final step after the text of your message is fixed, because a subject line that is devised earlier will steer the text instead of summarising it. Do not use this prompt to arouse curiosity that the email does not live up to, and not with a message whose content is still changing. For the visible first sentence next to the subject line prompt 8 is the right one, and for a follow-up message in a running sequence prompt 18 is.

Three limits work through into this prompt, and they are stricter than most subject lines that you receive. Advertising must be clearly recognisable as such through layout, presentation, content or otherwise [S61], and the Code reclame via e-mail repeats that requirement for the email message [S62]. In business relationships there is a misleading omission where essential information is provided in an unclear or ambiguous manner, or where the commercial intent is not apparent while that is not already clear from the context [S31]. And the identity of the sender may not be masked or concealed [S9][S1]. A subject line that feigns "Re:" while there was no earlier message touches all three at once. The BNK KAM position is simple: the subject line is a table of contents, not a lure.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are an editor who writes solely subject lines for an existing text. You write no subject line that the text does not live up to, and you do not change the text.

SIGNAL: [my complete message text, verbatim, including the signature] and [the concrete fact about this organisation that stands in the message, with the source reference and the date].

If SIGNAL contains no complete message text, or only a description of what the message is about, then write nothing and first ask me for the complete text. Devise no subject that does not stand in the text, not even if it would sound better.

CONTEXT: The recipient is [the job title of the recipient exactly as it actually stands] at [the type of organisation] and has not asked for this message. Seven fixed rules. One: every subject line is covered by one sentence that stands verbatim in my text, and you quote that sentence alongside it. Two: no "Re:", no "Fwd:", no "reply to your question" and no other reference to contact that has not taken place. Three: no urgency that does not occur in my text, so no "last chance", no deadline and no scarcity. Four: no figure, percentage, amount or superlative that I do not have in the text myself. Five: from the subject line or from the combination with my sender name the impression may not arise that this is not a commercial message. Six: the name of the recipient or of their organisation may stand in it, but only when the text genuinely is about that organisation. Seven: name no customer name, reference, quality mark, partnership or example assignment that I have not supplied myself, nor described in a manner from which the reader can deduce the party.

TASK: Write five subject lines that differ from one another in what they announce, not in wording. Give per line three things: the verbatim sentence from my text that covers it, the number of characters, and the designation "contains an assertion" or "contains no assertion". Then identify the subject lines that are not covered by the text and remove them yourself, stating which ones you have removed. Finally assess my own subject line, if I have one, on the same three

points.

FORMAT: A table with four columns: subject line, covering sentence, characters, assertion yes or no. Underneath it the heading "Removed" with the removed lines. Underneath that, where applicable, the heading "Your own line". No introduction and no recommendation as to which line I should choose.

CHECK: Test your own output on five points and write one line per point that ends in "passes" or "does not pass". One: every remaining subject line has a verbatim covering sentence from my text. Two: no line contains "Re:", "Fwd:", a reference to earlier contact or an urgency that does not stand in the text. Three: no line contains a figure or superlative that does not stand in my text. Four: with every line stands the number of characters. Five: there stands no customer name, reference or quality mark in them that I have not supplied. If any line reads "does not pass", write the line concerned once again and report which line you have replaced.

How to fill it in. - *The complete message text.* What belongs in it: the whole message, because the coverage is tested against it. Well filled in: the text as it stands ready to send, including the signature. Too vague: "it is about their new production line and our service". - *The fact with source reference.* What belongs in it: the signal that also stands in the email, with the date. Well filled in: "job advertisement of 3 August 2026 about the start-up of the second production line in Venlo". Too vague: "their expansion". - *The job title and the organisation.* What belongs in it: who reads it, because a technical and a commercial reader scan for different words. Well filled in: "quality manager at a food producer". Too vague: "someone from quality". - *Your own subject line.* What belongs in it: your current line verbatim, even if you consider it weak. Well filled in: "A quick chat about your quality file?". Too vague: "usually something with a quick chat".

Release check. - [] Is it clear from the subject line together with your sender name that this is a commercial message; recognisability is a requirement in the Nederlandse Reclame Code, the Dutch Advertising Code, and in the Code reclame via e-mail and not a layout choice, and that is self-regulation [S61][S62], while not making the commercial intent apparent is in business relationships also a misleading omission [S31]. - [] Does the line arouse no suggestion whatsoever of earlier contact, a running file or a reply to something that the recipient has asked, because with that you conceal the nature of your message: advertising must be clearly recognisable as such [S61][S62] and not making the commercial intent apparent is in business relationships a misleading omission [S31]. Quite apart from that, the identity of the sender may never be masked or concealed [S9][S1]. - [] Can you point to the covering sentence in your message, and does that sentence still stand in it after your final editing round. - [] Does the line withhold nothing that the recipient needs in order to decide whether he opens this message, because providing essential information unclearly or too late counts in business relationships as a misleading omission [S31]. - [] Would you also choose this subject line if the recipient were your best customer.

8. The first sentence that is visible in the preview pane of the recipient

Purpose. You receive three possible first sentences that add something to what the subject line already says, each short enough to fit in the preview pane and each without a courtesy preamble.

When to use it. After your text and your subject line are fixed, so after prompt 7. Pre-eminently usable when your message now opens with a salutation followed by a sentence that repeats the subject line. Do not use this prompt to put something in the preview line that does not come back in the email, and not separately from the subject line, because the gain lies precisely in the difference between those two. For the substantive opening of your message prompt 3 is the right one; this prompt is about the first sentence as a visible element next to the subject line.

That most email programmes show a piece of the beginning of the message next to the subject line is a practical observation of ours and not a source finding. The consequence is indeed familiar to everyone who looks at his own inbox: the salutation and the opening pleasantries are in view, and the content is not. We consider that you should not use that space to lure but to clarify, and in doing so we draw the same limit as with the subject line: the preview line may never give the impression that this is not a commercial message [S61][S62]. What counts here is not that it stands out, but that it is right.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are an editor who writes solely the first sentence of the message text, in the knowledge that this sentence may be visible next to the subject line. You do not change the rest of the text.

SIGNAL: [my chosen subject line, verbatim] and [my complete message text, verbatim, including the current salutation and first sentence] and [the concrete fact about this organisation, with source reference and date].

If SIGNAL contains no subject line or no complete message text, then write nothing and first ask me for both. Devise no fact in order to make the first sentence stronger, and do not repeat the subject line in other words.

CONTEXT: The recipient is [the job title of the recipient exactly as it actually stands] at [the type of organisation] and has not asked for this message. Seven fixed rules. One: the first sentence adds something to the subject line and does not repeat it. Two: the sentence contains no courtesy preamble, so not "I hope you are well", not "I will keep it short" and not "my name is". Three: the sentence counts at most twelve words. Four: the sentence contains the fact from SIGNAL or its source reference. Five: the sentence contains no figure, percentage or superlative that I have not supplied. Six: the sentence does not give the impression that this is not a commercial message and

feigns no earlier contact. Seven: name no customer name, reference, quality mark, partnership or example assignment that I have not supplied myself, nor described in a manner from which the reader can deduce the party.

The sentence must be readable without images and without formatting.

TASK: Write three possible first sentences. Give per sentence three things: what it adds to the subject line, the number of words, and the number of characters. Then assess my current first sentence on the same three points and say in one line what of it would be visible next to the subject line. Finally say which sentence from my existing text can be dropped because the new first sentence makes it superfluous.

Make no statement whatsoever about whether this message is opened, read or answered.

FORMAT: Three numbered sentences, each with three short lines underneath: "adds", "words", "characters". Then the heading "Your current first sentence" with the assessment. Then the heading "Can be dropped" with at most two lines. No recommendation as to which sentence I should choose.

CHECK: Test your own three sentences on five points and write one line per point that ends in "passes" or "does not pass". One: none of the three sentences repeats the subject line in other words. Two: none of the sentences begins with a courtesy preamble or with my name. Three: all three sentences count at most twelve words, with the number per sentence given. Four: all three sentences name the fact or the source reference from SIGNAL. Five: there stands no customer name, reference or quality mark in them that I have not supplied. If any line reads "does not pass", rewrite that sentence once and report which sentence you have replaced.

How to fill it in. - *The chosen subject line.* What belongs in it: the line that you are genuinely going to use, verbatim, because the first sentence is measured against it. Well filled in: "Second production line Venlo and the inspection files". Too vague: "something with their expansion". - *The complete message text.* What belongs in it: the whole message including the current salutation, because the salutation is usually the problem. Well filled in: the text as it stands ready to send. Too vague: "the rest is my standard text". - *The fact with source reference.* What belongs in it: the same signal that stands in the email, with the date. Well filled in: "job advertisement of 3 August 2026, with the sentence about the start-up of the second line". Too vague: "their growth". - *The job title and the organisation.* What belongs in it: who is looking on, on which device and in which role, in so far as you know that. Well filled in: "general manager who is often on the shop floor and looks at his post on his telephone". Too vague: "the boss".

Release check. - [] Have you sent the message to yourself and genuinely looked at what appears next to the subject line, instead of assuming it. - [] Does the visible combination of sender name, subject line and first sentence remain recognisable as a commercial

message [S61][S62]. - [] Is the first sentence readable without images, and is there no text above it that the reader sees first, such as an invisible preheader text from your sending platform. - [] Does the salutation still stand in the place where you want it, and have you not accidentally made a message without a salutation. - [] Has the sentence that according to the output can be dropped genuinely been deleted as well, so that you do not say the same thing twice.

9. The closing question that is small enough to say yes to

Purpose. You receive one closing question that the recipient can answer in a single line, that is smaller than the purchase you are ultimately working towards, and that you can deliver yourself without first arranging something internally.

When to use it. At the end of a first message that is otherwise finished, and with every draft that you notice reads pleasantly but asks for nothing. Do not use this prompt when an appointment is already in place and you only need a confirmation, and not in the final message of a sequence: there a closing belongs instead of a question, and that one is in prompt 20. Also do not use it if you cannot deliver the requested step within your own diary and your own authority, because then you are asking for something that you will have to watch over yourself.

The boundary here is not merely a matter of taste. Annex II to the General Section of the Nederlandse Reclame Code, the Dutch Advertising Code, counts “Persistent and unwanted pressure by telephone, fax, email or other distance media” among the advertising that is aggressive in all circumstances, and Article 18 provides that where that section speaks of consumers, the business recipient is also understood to be included [S61]. That is self-regulation and not law: the Reclame Code Commissie, the Dutch Advertising Code Committee, rules on it, and no fine follows from it [S61]. The BNK KAM position is that the closing question is the most honest place in the message, because that is where it becomes visible whether you want a conversation or a signature. We also consider that a choice between two times proposed by you is not a small question but a large question in disguise; that is a judgement, not a norm.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are a sales editor who writes only the closing sentence of a message. You do not touch the rest of the text, you summarise nothing, and you add no new arguments.

SIGNAL: [the concrete, verifiable fact about this recipient on which my message is built, with date and source] and [the final paragraph of my draft, pasted verbatim, so that you know what the closing sentence must connect to].

If SIGNAL is empty, or contains only a generality such as “they are growing fast” or “they are in our target group”, write nothing. Then first ask me for the concrete fact with date and source and for the

verbatim final paragraph. Do not invent a reason and do not infer a reason from the sector.

CONTEXT: The smallest step that I can deliver myself is [what I can deliver within my own diary and authority, with the time it costs the recipient]. The step that I ultimately want is [the decision I am working towards in the longer term], and it may not be asked for in the closing sentence.

Three fixed rules. One: the closing sentence contains exactly one question. Two: the question must be answerable with yes or no, without the recipient first having to look anything up. Three: saying no must cost the recipient one line and must not make him uncomfortable anywhere.

TASK: Write three candidate closing sentences, each of no more than twenty-five words, all three of which ask for the smallest step and not for the decision. Put one line under each sentence in which you say what the recipient must do precisely in order to say yes and what he must do in order to say no. Then give your preference with one sentence of reasoning.

Use no time pressure, no scarcity and no choice between two times proposed by me. Mention no figure, percentage, amount, saving, return or term that I have not supplied myself in CONTEXT. Mention no customer name and no reference.

FORMAT: Three numbered blocks of two lines, then one line with your preference and the reasoning. No introduction, no closing remark, no explanation of your working method.

CHECK: Test your own output on four points and report "passes" or "does not pass" for each point. One: every candidate contains exactly one question mark. Two: every candidate counts no more than twenty-five words. Three: no candidate asks for the decision that is stated in CONTEXT as the ultimate goal. Four: nowhere is there a figure or term that I have not supplied. If "does not pass" appears once, rewrite the candidates concerned once and report underneath in one line what you have changed.

How to fill it in. - *The signal*. What belongs in it: one fact that you have seen yourself, with date and source. Well filled in: "vacancy text for a second work planner, posted on their own site on 4 August 2026". Too vague: "they seem to be growing". - *The final paragraph of your draft*. What belongs in it: the text as it now stands, even if you consider it weak, because the closing sentence has to connect to it. Well filled in: the pasted paragraph. Too vague: "it ends with something about an introductory meeting". - *The smallest step*. What belongs in it: what you can deliver yourself, with the time it costs the recipient. Well filled in: "a conversation of twenty minutes, which I conduct myself, for which they need to prepare nothing". Too vague: "a no-obligation introduction". - *The ultimate decision*. What belongs

in it: where you want to go, precisely so that the model does not ask for it. Well filled in: “a framework agreement for maintenance”. Too vague: “cooperation”.

Release check. - [] Can you deliver the requested step yourself this week without the permission of a colleague or a diary that you do not control. - [] Is there no time pressure in it that you have invented yourself, such as an offer that brings pressing without a reason closer; persistent pressure by email counts in the General Section of the Nederlandse Reclame Code as aggressive, and that section includes the business recipient by way of Article 18 [S61]. - [] Can the recipient say no in one line, and does the message also state how he can unsubscribe free of charge and easily [S62]. - [] Does the closing sentence contain no figure whatsoever that you have not supplied yourself and no promise that you have not substantiated elsewhere in the message.

10. The message to someone who does not decide but does forward

Purpose. You receive a message that the recipient can forward without embarrassment: it contains one paragraph that stands on its own, it does not write the recipient off as an intermediary, and it does not ask him to do your selling for you.

When to use it. When you know for certain that your recipient touches the subject but does not take the decision, for example a work planner, a team leader or an office manager. Do not use this prompt if you can simply reach the decision-maker, because then you are writing to the wrong person. Also do not use it if you do not know who does decide: then you begin at prompt 52, the stakeholder map. And do not use it as a disguised request for contact details, because that is a different question with different consequences.

Those consequences are worth considering. If you get a name and an address back, a new assessment begins with that: the burden of proof under Article 11.7(1) of the Telecommunicatiewet, the Dutch Telecommunications Act, lies with the sender and applies per message sent [S1][S11]. If the data do not come from the data subject himself, the separate duty to inform of Article 14 GDPR also applies, at the latest at the moment of the first contact [S21], and there is no Dutch commercial exception that sets that duty aside: Article 41 of the Uitvoeringswet AVG, the Dutch GDPR Implementation Act, lists ten grounds and none of them is a sales ground [S26]. The BNK KAM position is therefore that you write a forwardable message and do not ask for an address: the first costs the recipient nothing, the second makes him responsible for something that he has not agreed to.

The prompt.

ROLE: You are a sales editor who writes to someone who knows the subject but does not take the decision. You treat that person as a fellow professional, not as a conduit.

SIGNAL: [the concrete, verifiable fact about this organisation with which I open, with date and source] and [what this recipient actually does,

according to his job title or according to a message of his own, with source].

If SIGNAL is empty, or contains only something general such as "he works in the technical department", write nothing and first ask me for the concrete fact with date and source and for what this person demonstrably does. Do not assume what someone with this job title usually does.

CONTEXT: I sell [what I deliver, in one sentence without adjectives]. The person who according to my own observation takes the decision is [the name or role of the decision-maker and how I know that], and I know that [with or without] certainty. Four fixed rules. One: the message nowhere says that the recipient is not the right person and does not use the words "the right person". Two: the message contains one paragraph of no more than sixty words which, read on its own, stands on its own and which the recipient can forward unchanged. Three: I do not ask for a name, not for an email address and not for a telephone number. Four: the message asks the recipient to explain or defend nothing on my behalf.

TASK: Write one message of no more than one hundred and fifty words, with the forwardable paragraph clearly recognisable as such among the rest. Put two lines under the message: the first says which sentence the recipient can forward most easily, the second says what the recipient does if he wants to do nothing.

Invent no customer names, no references and no examples from other organisations. Mention no figure, percentage, amount, saving, return or term that I have not supplied myself. Make no statement whatsoever about what this message will yield.

FORMAT: Subject line of no more than seven words, then the message, then the two lines. The forwardable paragraph stands as a separate paragraph and is referred to in the accompanying sentence as "the paragraph below". No bullet points in the message itself.

CHECK: Test your own output on four points and report "passes" or "does not pass" for each point. One: the whole message counts no more than one hundred and fifty words and the forwardable paragraph no more than sixty. Two: the words "the right person" do not occur and nowhere does it say that the recipient does not decide. Three: nowhere is a name or are contact details asked for. Four: every figure in the text comes verbatim from SIGNAL or CONTEXT. If "does not pass" appears, rewrite once and report in one line what you have changed.

How to fill it in. - *The signal.* What belongs in it: the fact about the organisation, not about the person, with date and source. Well filled in: "tender document on TenderNed of 22 July 2026 in which they invite tenders for maintenance at three locations". Too vague: "they do a lot of maintenance". - *What this recipient does.* What belongs in it: what you know about him, from his own message or from a public listing. Well filled in: "he posted a message on 30 July 2026 about the switch to a single fault-reporting number". Too vague: "he is a team leader". - *The decision-maker.* What belongs in it: who in your view decides it, plus how

certain you are of that, because that uncertainty may sound through in the text. Well filled in: “probably the head of facilities, according to the organisation chart on their site of May 2026; I do not know for certain”. Too vague: “someone from the board”. - *What you deliver*. What belongs in it: one sentence without adjectives, because that sentence travels on to someone you do not know. Well filled in: “we take over the breakdown maintenance of climate control installations at a fixed monthly price”. Too vague: “we take care of everything in the field of installations”.

Release check. - [] Can you read the forwardable paragraph aloud yourself to someone you have never spoken to, without explaining anything; if you cannot, it is not forwardable. - [] Do you nowhere ask for a name or an address, so that the recipient is not put in the position of providing a colleague’s data. - [] If you do get a name and address back, have you established your legal basis before the first message to that person; the burden of proof lies with you and applies per message sent [S1][S11]. - [] Does that first message to the referred person contain the information of Article 14 GDPR, including the source from which you obtained his data, at the latest at the moment of that first contact [S21]; a national commercial exception to that does not exist [S26]. - [] Is the text written in such a way that the recipient need do nothing with it without being blamed for that.

11. The message to an existing customer about an adjacent service

Purpose. You receive a message to someone who already buys from you, about a service that adjoins what was bought, written from what this customer has actually purchased and not from your service overview.

When to use it. When there is a current or completed purchase and you want to offer a second service that is connected to the first. Do not use this prompt with someone who only downloaded a document, subscribed or requested a quotation, because that is not a customer; for that the cold route from prompt 1 applies. Also do not use it for a service that has nothing to do with what was bought: then it is not an adjacent offer but a new offer, and then you must have a different legal basis.

This is the place to read the customer relationship exception precisely. Article 11.7(4) of the Telecommunicatiewet permits a sender who can demonstrate that he is using electronic contact details which he “has obtained from his customers in the context of the sale of a product or service” to use those details for unsolicited commercial communication “for the purposes of his own similar products or services”, provided that he has offered the opportunity to object free of charge and easily at the moment of collection, and with every message sent; those two requirements are cumulative, as appears from the structure “a. ..., and b. ...” [S1]. Every word does work. “From his customers” means that something has actually been sold: the OPTA fining decision Companeo establishes that it is not sufficient for someone to request information or a quotation [S11], and the Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens, the Dutch data protection authority, confirms that someone who only signed up for a newsletter, filled in a survey, took part in a prize draw or created an account

That was the opening of the book plus ten complete prompts. The other ninety are your safety net.

You saw the cover, the full table of contents, the colophon, the foreword and the first ten prompts, each complete. The complete library gives you everything:

- ✓ 100 fill-in prompts across 8 categories, each with its own release check
- ✓ The complete framework around the prompts, with five figures and six worksheets
- ✓ Four worked case studies, checklists, a glossary and the decision frameworks
- ✓ 73 sources, each retrieved, read and, in a second round, refuted rather than confirmed

The reason to buy is not the price, it is your signature. The burden of proof rests on you and it applies per message sent, and a single sales instruction that was correct last year and no longer is costs more than this library ever could. We promise you nothing about your return. We promise you that you will know what every sentence rests on.

Buy the complete library

€ 59.99

Instant download at:

www.bnkkam.com/products/honderd-sales-prompts