

Sales enablement charter template

A sales enablement charter template is a one-page working agreement for the enablement function: its mission, what is in and out of scope, who it reports to, the team structure for your company size, a responsibility split with the teams it borders, and the metrics it is accountable for.

Last updated 2026-10-25. Online version: <https://www.revspire.io/resources/templates/sales-enablement-charter-template>

How to use this template

1. **Write the mission as a behaviour, not a service:** "Support the sales team" charts a helpdesk. Name the change: what sellers will do differently when the function works. Everything else in the charter is derived from that sentence.
2. **Get the sponsor before the scope:** A charter without a named executive sponsor is a memo. Agree the sponsor and the meeting rhythm first, because the scope lines only hold when someone senior repeats them.
3. **Write the out-of-scope lines with the owners named:** Declining work is only sustainable when the charter says who does own it. Every "out" line needs a name next to it, agreed with that person.
4. **Choose the structure model for the size you are, not the size you plan to be:** Pick from the models table deliberately and record why. If you expect to grow, write the trigger for the next shape into the charter, the way a hiring plan would.
5. **Fill the RACI with the neighbours in the room:** A responsibility split written alone is a list of opinions. One hour with sales management, product marketing and RevOps turns it into an agreement, and the disagreements it surfaces are the point.
6. **Pick metrics the function can actually move:** Three or four, each with a baseline, a target and a date. Revenue alone is too far downstream to steer by; activity counts are too near. Ramp, findability, coaching coverage and win rate where enablement intervened sit in between.

The template

Five blocks. The charter itself is the first and should stay on one page; the structure models, the RACI, the metrics and the cadence exist to make the charter's one page defensible.

The charter (one page)

Field	What to write	Your entry
Mission	One sentence: the change in seller behaviour or buyer experience this function exists to produce.	

Executive sponsor	The named leader who defends the remit and the budget, and how often you meet them.	
Scope: owned	The work enablement owns end to end: onboarding programme, coaching infrastructure, content governance, playbooks, tooling.	
Scope: explicitly out	The adjacent work enablement supports but does not own, with the owner named: quota setting, comp, product collateral accuracy, CRM administration.	
Reporting line	Who the function reports to and why that line was chosen over the alternatives.	
First-90-days priorities	The two or three things that will be visibly different in a quarter.	
Review date	When the charter itself is next reviewed. A charter without one quietly expires.	

Team structure models by company size: pick one deliberately

Sales org size	Team shape	Usual reporting line	What it does well	Where it breaks
Under 50 sellers	One enablement lead, part operator, part builder, with borrowed help from marketing and sales management	Head of sales or CRO	Fast, close to deals, no coordination cost	Everything depends on one calendar; coverage dies with holidays and hiring freezes
50 to 300 sellers	A small team split by discipline: one owner for content and tools, one for onboarding and coaching	CRO or VP of revenue operations	Specialisation without silos; adoption data lands in one place	The two halves drift apart unless the charter and cadence hold them together
300+ sellers	Pods aligned to segments or regions, plus a central standards and tooling spine	VP of enablement reporting to CRO	Local relevance with global consistency	Pods reinvent each other's work when the central spine is understaffed
Any size, no dedicated headcount yet	A named owner with protected hours and this charter, not a job title	Wherever that person already reports	Makes the work visible enough to justify the first hire	Protected hours get eaten by the day job unless the sponsor enforces them

The responsibility split with neighbouring teams (RACI)

Activity	Enablement	Sales management	Product marketing	RevOps
Content governance: approve, retire, version	A/R	C	R (accuracy)	I

Onboarding programme design and ramp gates	A/R	C	C	I
Coaching cadence and practice infrastructure	A/R	R (delivers coaching)	I	I
Playbooks and battlecards	A/R	C	R (competitive input)	I
Enablement tooling selection and administration	A/R	C	I	C (integration)
Measurement: ramp, adoption, win-rate reporting	R	C	I	A/R (data model)

Charter metrics: what the function answers for

Metric	Baseline today	Target and date	Measured how	Your entry
Time to first deal (ramp), by role	[Current median]	[Target, date]	CRM close dates against start dates	
Content findability and use	[Share of assets used in 90 days]	[Target, date]	Library analytics: searches, opens, shares	
Coaching coverage	[Share of reps with an active coaching row]	[Target, date]	Coaching records, not calendar invites	
Win rate where enablement intervened	[Baseline]	[Target, date]	Playbook-followed or practice-completed deals against the rest	

Operating cadence

Rhythm	Meeting	Standing output
Weekly	Intake triage against the charter scope	Accepted, declined and deferred requests, in writing
Monthly	Metrics review with sales management	One page: the charter metrics against their targets
Quarterly	Sponsor review	What moved, what did not, and any scope change proposed

A worked example

Example: fictional company. Halvern Data sells a data-quality platform with 120 sellers across two regions. Maya Lindqvist joined as its first head of sales enablement after two years of ad hoc enablement run from sales management. This is the charter she agreed with her sponsor in her first month.

Halvern Data: the charter Maya agreed in month one

Field	What was written
Mission	Every Halvern seller can find the approved answer, practise the hard conversation, and show the buyer evidence, without asking a colleague.
Executive sponsor	CRO; thirty minutes every second week, quarterly review in writing.
Scope: owned	Onboarding programme and ramp gates; content governance and the library; coaching infrastructure and practice; playbooks.
Scope: explicitly out	Comp plans and quota (sales ops), product collateral accuracy (product marketing, enablement governs versions), CRM hygiene (RevOps).
Reporting line	CRO. Considered RevOps; chose the CRO so the function answers to revenue, with RevOps owning the data model it reports through.
First-90-days priorities	A governed library reps actually search; ramp gates for the Q1 class; one coaching row per rep by the review.
Review date	First working day of Q3.

The structure decision, recorded with its reasons

Option considered	Why it was rejected or chosen
Stay as borrowed hours from sales management	Rejected: two years of it produced three onboarding decks and no owner; the work was invisible and the first thing dropped.
One lead plus an agency for content	Rejected: the agency could produce assets but not governance, and governance was the actual gap.
One lead now, a content-and-tools hire at 150 sellers, a coaching hire at 200	Chosen: the 50-to-300 split model, staged against headcount triggers written into the charter, so the next two hires are pre-agreed rather than re-argued.

Example: fictional company. Ferncastle Analytics, Harborview Metrics, Marlow & Finch Logistics and every person named in this example are invented for illustration. Any resemblance to real companies or people is coincidental.

Common mistakes

- **The charter is written but never socialised:** If sales management has not seen the scope lines, the requests keep coming and the declines read as unhelpfulness. The charter works in other people's heads or not at all.

- **Scope defined only by what is in:** The out-of-scope list is the half that protects the team. Without it, enablement accretes every orphaned task in the revenue org, and the mission sentence stops being true within a quarter.
- **Reporting line chosen by habit:** Where the function reports decides whose problems it inherits. Choosing without writing down the why makes the line impossible to defend at the next reorg.
- **A metrics section full of activity:** Sessions delivered and assets published measure effort. The charter metrics should let the sponsor see whether behaviour changed: ramp, usage, coverage, outcomes where the function intervened.
- **One person charters as a team of five:** A solo enablement lead who adopts a big-company scope fails at all of it. The one-owner model in the structure table is a legitimate shape; the charter should match it, then name the triggers for growing out of it.
- **No review date on the charter itself:** Remits drift. A charter without its own review date is accurate for about two quarters and then quietly wrong, which is worse than absent because people still quote it.