HUBS gideon lens

■# HubSpot (HUBS) - Gideon-Lens Equity Research

Date: 2026-06-28. Analyst: Codex ER2. Price: $185.47. Market data timestamp: latest HUBS trade available from the finance feed on 2026-06-26 23:15 UTC. Fiscal year end: December 31. Reporting currency: USD.

VERDICT BLOCK

Verdict: WATCH

Scorecard:

Gate	Result	Notes
Management	YELLOW	Strong operator, but SBC and buyback discipline unresolved
Moat	YELLOW	Real suite lock-in; 2046 test still AI-contested
P/E <= 15 on confident EPS at TTM + 5 calendar years	PASS	Base cushion 12.1% at $185.47
Compounder Score	Audited 45 / 100	Diagnostic rejects dream-investment status; not an ER2 gate
Business Quality Score	Audited 43 / 80	Quality evidence capped by GAAP ROIC, ROIIC gaps, SBC
20% Return UW Score	Audited 2 / 20	Current price does not support 20% return underwriting

One-line thesis (or reason to pass): HubSpot clears the narrow ER2 P/E 15 valuation test, but it is a WATCH rather than a BUY because the qualitative gates are unresolved and the 20% compounder rubric rejects the return setup.

Kill / trigger criteria:

- BUY trigger: not price-only; upgrade requires Management and Moat moving to PASS while shares remain below roughly $208, the base-case 15x 2031 EPS value. A price below $160 would create roughly 30% P/E 15 cushion but still needs better SBC, retention, and AI monetization proof.
- PASS triggers: NRR at or below 102% in either of the next two reported quarters; ASRPC growth below 3% YoY while AI revenue, ARR, or paid attach remains undisclosed; or SBC staying above 14% of revenue without share-count stabilization.
- Upgrade to BUY conditions: SBC/revenue trending below 11%, flat or declining diluted share count after buybacks, visible AI/agent monetization, NRR moving clearly above 105%, and GAAP margin expansion staying on the base-case bridge.

Position sizing if bought: 0% now. If upgraded, cap at 2% of equity book until retention and SBC evidence improves.

Stage 0 - Time anchor

Today is 2026-06-28. HubSpot's fiscal year ends on December 31. The most recently reported quarter is Q1 FY2026, ended 2026-03-31 and reported on 2026-05-07. The TTM anchor is Q2 FY2025 + Q3 FY2025 + Q4 FY2025 + Q1 FY2026, ending 2026-03-31. The forward horizon is exactly five calendar years from that TTM end date: 2031-03-31. All EPS, P/E, and compounding references in this report use that TTM-to-TTM+5y window, not a six-fiscal-year FY-1 bridge.

Stage 1 - Disqualifier sweep

ROIC/profitability is yellow-green because HubSpot has high gross margins and improving GAAP profitability, but audited ROIIC proof is missing and GAAP operating margin is still early. FCF conversion is yellow because cash generation is real but stock-based compensation is economically large. Net debt is green because the company is net cash. End-markets are green/yellow because SMB and mid-market CRM, marketing, service, data, commerce, and AI workflow software remain growing categories, but buyer scrutiny is higher. Governance is yellow because the strategy is coherent but incentives and

dilution are not yet compounder-grade. AI disruption is yellow because AI can strengthen HubSpot's customer-data context but can also commoditize lightweight workflow execution. Pricing power is yellow-green because ASRPC and multi-hub adoption support value capture, but NRR near 103% is not elite.

Management - one paragraph summary

Management is YELLOW. Yamini Rangan has enough tenure to own the current platform and AI strategy, and the operating record shows credible execution: revenue has continued to compound, Q1 FY2026 revenue grew 23% reported and 18% constant currency, and non-GAAP operating margin reached 17.8%. The problem is not strategic incoherence. The problem is per-share proof. The management appendix flags chronic stock-based compensation, a compensation structure leaning too heavily on ARR, non-GAAP operating income, and one-year revenue PSUs, and a buyback program that has not yet proved it can offset dilution at attractive prices. CFO Kate Bueker has long tenure, but the current evidence does not yet prove disciplined per-share capital allocation through the AI transition. Upgrade conditions are concrete: SBC/revenue below 11%, flat or down diluted share count, and stronger long-term incentive metrics tied to per-share value creation.

Moat - one paragraph summary

Moat is YELLOW and the 2046 test is YELLOW. HubSpot has a real moat, but not an unqualified one. The strongest defense is not patents or network effects; it is multi-hub workflow embedding, customer-data context, partner ecosystem, brand in SMB/mid-market go-to-market software, and the switching cost that grows when marketing, sales, service, content, operations, commerce, and AI agents sit on one customer record. The moat appendix is explicit that this can describe a durable 2046 business if HubSpot owns the execution context for AI-assisted customer operations. The unresolved part is equally explicit: Salesforce Agentforce, Microsoft Dynamics/Copilot bundling, and AI-native go-to-market tools can attack the workflow layer. NRR around 103% and still-limited disclosure on AI paid attach do not yet prove elite expansion economics. The moat exists today, but the evidence does not justify a PASS until retention, pricing, and AI monetization are more visible.

Stage 5 synthesis - headline numbers

The synthesis uses the reviewed Customer Platform segment appendix after R made margin and rollup corrections. The final segment cases are bear revenue $5.167B with 10.8% operating margin and $0.559B operating income; base revenue $6.183B with 17.8% operating margin and $1.098B operating income; and bull revenue $7.040B with 22.7% operating margin and $1.600B operating income. The base case compounds from TTM revenue of $3.298B to $6.183B by 2031-03-31. Net income in the base case is $0.880B. The share-count path is important: S treats SBC as real issuance and moves diluted shares from 52.578M to 63.457M by 2031 after conservative buybacks. That produces base EPS of $13.87. At the current price of $185.47, the required EPS for a P/E of 15 is $12.36, so the base case clears with a 12.1% cushion. S ran 11/11 tie-out checks and verified the key markdown tables.

Case	2031 Revenue	2031 OI	OI Margin	2031 EPS	EPS x 15	P/E 15 Result
Bear	$5.167B	$0.559B	10.8%	Below base	Below current price	Fail
Base	$6.183B	$1.098B	17.8%	$13.87	$208.05	Pass, 12.1% cushion
Bull	$7.040B	$1.600B	22.7%	Above base	Above current price	Pass

The P/E 15 gate passes, but the pass is not robust enough to overwhelm the qualitative gates. S itself notes that a 200 bps operating-margin miss nearly exhausts the cushion. That matters because the entire thesis depends on GAAP margin conversion while SBC declines as a percentage of revenue. If the company reaches revenue scale but keeps diluting shareholders, the reported operating progress will not become per-share compounding. The audited Compounder Score sharpens that point: 45/100 total, 43/80 business quality, and 2/20 on 20% return underwriting. The diagnostic score is not an ER2 gate, but it is useful: HubSpot can pass P/E 15 while still failing the user's stricter dream-investment return hurdle.

Red team - one paragraph

The red team does not support a BUY. Its strongest bear case is that HubSpot remains a good mid-market SaaS platform but fails ER2 because AI usage is defensive, NRR is modest, SBC is heavy, and GAAP margin conversion arrives too slowly. The most likely optimistic number is the 2031 base operating income of $1.098B, or 17.8% GAAP operating margin. A 200 bps miss nearly erases the P/E 15 cushion. Red team agrees that the audited 20% return claim fails: at $185.47, the stock needs roughly a 33.3x 2031 base-case exit P/E or a much lower entry price near $83.61 to satisfy the 20% rubric. The force-exit signal is specific: over the next two reported quarters, exit if NRR is at or below 102% in either quarter, ASRPC growth is below 3% YoY, and AI revenue, ARR, or paid attach remains undisclosed.

Kill / trigger criteria

- Upgrade to BUY only if management and moat move from YELLOW to PASS: SBC/revenue below 11%, diluted share count flat or down, NRR above 105%, clear AI/agent monetization metrics, and GAAP margin expanding on the base-case bridge.
- Downgrade to PASS if base 2031 EPS falls below $12.36 at the current price, or if a 200 bps operating-margin haircut no longer leaves a positive P/E 15 cushion.
- Downgrade to PASS if the next two quarters show NRR at or below 102%, ASRPC growth below 3% YoY, and continued non-disclosure of AI paid attach or revenue contribution.
- Treat a price below $160 as a valuation watch trigger, not an automatic BUY; the qualitative gates still need to clear.

Analyst flags

HubSpot's own disclosures do not provide hub-level revenue, hub-level margin, AI revenue, AI ARR, paid AI attach, ARR dollars, net-new ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, or churn. The data package and segment appendix preserve those as data gaps rather than inventing economics. The moat appendix was written while the segment appendix was still a placeholder, but it correctly stated that limitation and did not invent segment numbers. The S appendix uses the R-reviewed segment rollup. The audited score is severe because ROIIC cannot be calculated with high confidence and the 20% return case fails without terminal multiple expansion. Final ER2 verdict is WATCH, not BUY; therefore no BUY WhatsApp alert should be sent.

Appendix A - Company Primer

HubSpot (HUBS) - Appendix A: Company Primer

Prepared: 2026-06-28 Role: Sub-Agent A, Company Primer Primary financial source: `quant_foundation.md` Most recent quarter: Q1 FY2026, ended 2026-03-31, reported 2026-05-07 TTM anchor: Q2 FY2025 + Q3 FY2025 + Q4 FY2025 + Q1 FY2026, ending 2026-03-31 Forward horizon: 2031-03-31

Source Map And Scope

This primer uses the quantitative foundation as the controlling source for financials. The live source pulls used for qualitative context were saved under `raw/` with `A_primer_` prefixes: HubSpot's FY2025 Form 10-K, Q1 FY2026 Form 10-Q, Q1 FY2026 IR release, SEC submissions/companyfacts, HubSpot's product and services catalog, Breeze AI pages, Breeze Agents page, and Revenue Hub page. The data package existed at dispatch time but was only a placeholder, so it was not used for substantive qualitative context. No local data warehouse cache was used.

The purpose of this appendix is orientation. Downstream ER2 work should still source all historical and model inputs from QF, QFR, the eventual data package, segment appendices, management appendix, moat appendix, and synthesis. This primer explains what HubSpot is, how its revenue engine works, what the product suite contains, why the business has historically screened as a high-quality software compounder, and where the ER2 valuation work can break.

1. Business Overview

HubSpot provides a cloud software platform for customer-facing teams. In plain language, it sells a connected set of tools that help businesses find prospects, convert those prospects into leads, close sales, serve customers, publish and manage content, clean and synchronize customer data, and increasingly automate those workflows with AI. The company describes itself as an agentic customer platform, but the core economic idea is simpler: small and mid-sized companies need a customer system of record and a customer system of action, yet many cannot afford the integration burden of a large-enterprise stack stitched together from CRM, marketing automation, service desk, CMS, data enrichment, analytics, billing, CPQ, and AI tools. HubSpot's pitch is that the customer database, workflow tools, customer-facing applications, and partner ecosystem should come pre-integrated.

The customer is primarily a scaling business rather than a very large enterprise. HubSpot's FY2025 10-K says it focuses on mid-market B2B companies, which it defines as businesses with 2 to 2,000 employees. That framing matters for ER2 because the business is not simply a down-market Salesforce clone. It is built around reducing complexity for companies that need more than a spreadsheet and inbox but often lack the IT teams, admin capacity, procurement process, and system-integration budgets of large enterprises. HubSpot's model has historically won by being approachable, integrated, easy to adopt, and broad enough to expand over time.

The problem solved is customer-platform fragmentation. A scaling business may use one tool for email marketing, another for website content, another for sales pipeline, another for support tickets, another for billing or quotes, and another for data sync. The economic pain is not just software spend; it is data inconsistency, manual handoffs, low sales productivity, missed renewals, duplicated customer records, and slow campaign iteration. HubSpot tries to solve this by keeping contacts, companies, deals, tickets, marketing activity, content, payments, and AI actions inside one CRM-centered architecture.

The buying motion is hybrid. HubSpot has a self-serve and freemium surface that lowers initial friction, plus a direct sales motion for paid tiers, larger multi-hub deployments, and upmarket accounts. It also has a partner channel through solutions partners, marketplace integrations, templates, academy content, community support, and implementation services. The free/low-entry motion matters because it creates a product-led funnel; the sales and partner motions matter because the ARPU and retention opportunity is in paid seats, professional tiers, enterprise tiers, and multi-hub adoption. HubSpot therefore combines product-led growth, inside sales, field sales for larger accounts, and a partner ecosystem.

As of Q1 FY2026, HubSpot reported 299,458 customers, up 16% year over year, and average subscription revenue per customer of $11,722, up 6% year over year. The FY2025 10-K reported 288,706 customers in more than 135 countries and 8,882 full-time employees at year-end. The scale is large enough that HubSpot is no longer an early-stage SaaS story, but the customer count and ARPU base still leave room for expansion if the company can keep broadening the platform, migrating customers into higher tiers, and increasing multi-hub penetration without overwhelming its SMB/mid-market roots.

2. Revenue Architecture

HubSpot reports one operating segment. QF and QFR confirmed that the company does not disclose separate segment operating income and that no product-level segment OI should be invented. The official revenue classification is subscription revenue plus professional services and other revenue. Subscription is the overwhelming majority of the business; professional services and other exists mainly to support onboarding, training, consulting, and payments-related activity.

FY2025 revenue was $3.131 billion. Subscription revenue was $3.064 billion, or 97.8% of total revenue. Professional services and other revenue was $67 million, or 2.2% of total revenue. TTM revenue ending 2026-03-31 was $3.298 billion. Q1 FY2026 revenue was $881 million, with subscription revenue of $862 million and professional services and other revenue of $19 million. HubSpot's Q1 FY2026 IR release described total revenue growth of 23% as reported and 18% constant currency versus Q1 FY2025.

Revenue layer	FY2025 revenue	FY2025 mix	Q1 FY2026 revenue	What it represents
Subscription	$3,063.9m	97.8%	$862.3m	Access to HubSpot's customer platform, hubs, CRM, AI features, and associated subscription tiers
Professional services and other	$67.3m	2.2%	$18.7m	Onboarding, training, consulting, Payments, and related services
Total	$3,131.3m	100.0%	$881.0m	One consolidated operating segment

The subscription base is the business. The professional services line is not a consulting segment to value separately; it is an adoption and enablement layer around the platform. That matters for unit economics. Subscription gross margin is high and scalable. Professional services gross margin is structurally lower because it is people-intensive and partly designed to help customers succeed with the software rather than to be a large profit pool. QF showed FY2025 subscription cost of revenue of $445 million against $3.064 billion of subscription revenue, implying subscription gross margin of roughly 85.5%. Professional services and other had $63 million of cost against $67 million of revenue, implying low-single-digit gross margin.

Geography is material but still Americas-led. QF showed FY2025 Americas revenue of $1.872 billion, Europe revenue of $1.011 billion, and Asia Pacific revenue of $248 million. The mix was approximately 59.8% Americas, 32.3% Europe, and 7.9% Asia Pacific. International is therefore not a small add-on; Europe is already a large revenue base, while APAC remains a smaller but potentially longer-duration growth vector. Currency can create reported-growth friction because non-U.S. revenue is large enough to matter.

Geography	FY2025 revenue	FY2025 mix
Americas	$1,872.2m	59.8%
Europe	$1,011.0m	32.3%
Asia Pacific	$248.1m	7.9%
Total	$3,131.3m	100.0%

The TTM anchor is important for valuation. QF's TTM ending 2026-03-31 gives revenue of $3.298 billion, gross profit of $2.759 billion, GAAP operating income of $62.8 million, net income of $100.3 million, operating cash flow of $798.0 million, FCF after PPE capex of $742.7 million, FCF after PPE capex and capitalized software of $608.2 million, and stock-based compensation of $527.2 million. GAAP earnings are still thin relative to revenue, but cash generation is much larger because of subscription billing, deferred revenue, and SBC. The ER2 work must avoid mixing GAAP earnings, non-GAAP operating income, and FCF without explicitly handling SBC and capitalized software.

3. Unit Economics

HubSpot's gross economics are attractive at the subscription layer. TTM gross profit of $2.759 billion on TTM revenue of $3.298 billion implies consolidated gross margin of roughly 83.7%. Subscription gross margin is higher than the consolidated figure because services are low-margin. The cost of subscription revenue includes hosting providers and other third-party service providers, customer support personnel, amortization of capitalized software development costs and acquired technology, facilities allocation, depreciation, and IT allocation. As with most SaaS platforms, the incremental gross profit on an additional subscription dollar should be high once infrastructure, support, and platform costs are absorbed, although AI

infrastructure and agent workloads can pressure gross margin if usage intensity rises faster than monetization.

Operating leverage is still a central question. TTM GAAP operating income was only $62.8 million, about 1.9% of revenue. That does not mean the business lacks economic potential; it means the company is still reinvesting heavily in sales, marketing, product, AI, support, and platform expansion while carrying meaningful stock-based compensation. The 10-K describes R&D as personnel-heavy, including payroll, benefits, SBC, professional and contractor fees, and allocated overhead. It also notes that HubSpot capitalizes certain software development costs for new products and incremental functionality and amortizes those costs generally over two years for customer-facing software and five years for internal platforms. This creates a second accounting issue: reported R&D does not capture all product investment as period expense because some development spend is capitalized.

Sales and marketing are structurally central. HubSpot's customer base is broad and mid-market oriented, which means the company needs a repeatable demand-generation engine, partner leverage, online education, brand, and efficient sales coverage. The company's historical inbound-marketing heritage is still strategically relevant: content, academy, community, free tools, and product-led adoption reduce some acquisition friction. But upmarket and multi-hub expansion require more sophisticated sales and customer success motion. ER2 should watch whether growth increasingly depends on heavier sales investment, discounting, or longer sales cycles.

Capital intensity is low in traditional physical terms but not zero. QF's TTM PPE capex was $55.2 million, only about 1.7% of revenue. After PPE capex, TTM FCF was $742.7 million. But HubSpot also capitalized $134.5 million of software development costs in the TTM period. After both PPE capex and capitalized software, FCF was $608.2 million, or about 18.4% of revenue. That is a strong cash margin for a company still showing low GAAP operating margin.

The after-SBC view is much less generous. QF shows TTM SBC of $527.2 million, or about 16.0% of revenue. If an investor treats SBC as an economic cost and subtracts it from FCF after PPE capex and capitalized software, the residual is roughly $81 million, or about 2.5% of revenue. This does not automatically make HubSpot low quality; many high-growth software companies compensate heavily with equity while offsetting dilution through buybacks. But for ER2, the question is whether buybacks merely neutralize dilution or create per-share value. In Q1 FY2026 HubSpot repurchased $211 million of common stock, and $789 million remained under a $1 billion authorization. That cash return can help per-share outcomes, but it also consumes capital that could otherwise sit on the balance sheet or fund acquisitions.

TTM metric ending 2026-03-31	Value	Margin / interpretation
Revenue	$3,298.1m	Base for ER2 forward horizon
Gross profit	$2,759.1m	83.7% gross margin
GAAP operating income	$62.8m	1.9% operating margin
Net income	$100.3m	3.0% net margin
Operating cash flow	$798.0m	24.2% of revenue
FCF after PPE capex	$742.7m	22.5% of revenue
FCF after PPE capex and capitalized software	$608.2m	18.4% of revenue
Stock-based compensation	$527.2m	16.0% of revenue; major per-share quality issue

4. Product And Platform Map

HubSpot's product architecture is centered on a Smart CRM and a suite of engagement hubs. The CRM is the context layer: contacts, companies, deals, tickets, activities, communications, customer attributes, permissions, workflows, and governance. Around that core are paid hubs that map to the customer lifecycle. The product catalog and 10-K identify Marketing, Sales, Service, Operations, Content, and Commerce as the engagement hub families; HubSpot's current commercial pages also position Revenue Hub, formerly Commerce Hub, as the quote-to-cash layer.

Marketing Hub helps companies attract and convert demand. Its jobs include campaign management, email, landing pages, forms, marketing automation, analytics, social, SEO/AEO, content-assisted marketing, lead capture, segmentation, and nurturing. The strategic value is that marketing activity sits against the same customer record that sales and service use.

Sales Hub helps sales teams manage pipeline and rep workflows. Its jobs include CRM records, deal management, prospecting, email tracking, sequences, meetings, forecasting, automation, quotes, and AI-assisted sales activity. The upmarket relevance is higher here because larger customers care more about pipeline governance, forecast discipline, permissions, and integration with billing or CPQ.

Service Hub supports customer service and retention. It includes tickets, help desk workflows, knowledge base, customer conversations, routing, support automation, and now AI customer-agent functionality. Service Hub matters because it moves HubSpot from acquisition-only software into post-sale retention, expansion, and customer success.

Content Hub is the content management and web experience layer. It grew out of HubSpot's CMS capabilities and now includes website content, blogging, landing pages, AI content generation, video, personalization, and related content operations. The strategic value is that owned content and web conversion can connect back to CRM and marketing automation.

Operations Hub, now increasingly positioned with Data Hub language in HubSpot materials, addresses data quality, data sync, automation, programmable actions, and governance. This is less visible to end users but strategically important because CRM data quality is the substrate for AI agents, segmentation, workflow automation, attribution, and sales/service handoffs. The Clearbit acquisition and data enrichment positioning fit this layer.

Revenue Hub, formerly Commerce Hub, is the quote-to-cash layer. HubSpot describes it as CPQ, billing, contracts, subscription billing, and payments built into the CRM. Its relevance is twofold. First, it gives HubSpot a new monetization surface beyond classic marketing/sales/service seats. Second, it deepens system-of-record value by adding billing history, contract changes, payment status, renewal context, and revenue data to the same customer record.

Breeze is HubSpot's AI platform. HubSpot's current Breeze page describes AI agents, an assistant, and more than 100 embedded AI features across the platform. Breeze Agents include Customer Agent, Prospecting Agent, and Data Agent. HubSpot is packaging some agent functionality around HubSpot Credits, with a "pay when work gets done" message for agent outcomes. That changes the revenue architecture at the margin: HubSpot can monetize AI not only through higher-tier subscriptions and seats, but also through usage or outcome-like credits. The monetization risk is whether credits are accepted as a natural platform extension or resisted as a tax on features customers expect to be included.

The ecosystem is part of the product. The Q1 FY2026 release references more than 2,000 App Marketplace integrations, and the 10-K describes integrations, templates, expert partners, community, and academy content. For SMB and mid-market customers, ecosystem depth lowers switching risk because a customer can add adjacent tools without leaving HubSpot. For larger customers, ecosystem credibility matters because no single vendor covers every workflow.

5. Customer And Go-To-Market

HubSpot's go-to-market is built around accessibility first and expansion second. A company can start with free tools, a basic CRM, starter functionality, or a single hub. From there, HubSpot can expand the account across higher tiers, more seats, more hubs, AI features, data enrichment, service workflows, content management, and revenue tools. The motion is particularly well suited to businesses that want to avoid a large implementation before seeing value.

The mid-market orientation remains central. HubSpot's stated focus on companies with 2 to 2,000 employees is a large addressable market, but it also creates tension. SMB customers can be numerous but more churn-prone, budget-sensitive, and support-intensive. Upmarket customers can spend more and adopt multiple hubs, but they compare HubSpot against Salesforce, Microsoft, Adobe, Oracle, Zendesk, and specialized best-of-breed tools. HubSpot must therefore keep ease-of-use and low implementation friction while adding the controls, reporting, permissions, AI governance, and integration depth larger customers expect.

Partner leverage is important. Solutions partners can resell, implement, configure, train, and advise customers. The 10-K notes that subscription revenue is recognized net of consideration paid to solutions partners when those partners purchase subscriptions. The partner ecosystem helps HubSpot cover a wide customer base without carrying every implementation and services cost internally. It also creates indirect switching costs because customers may rely on partner workflows, templates, and custom configurations around HubSpot.

Multi-hub expansion is one of the most important drivers of average revenue per customer. A single-hub customer might use HubSpot only for marketing automation or CRM. A mature customer might use Marketing Hub, Sales Hub, Service Hub, Content Hub, Data Hub/Operations Hub, Revenue Hub, and Breeze agents on top of the same customer data model. The more hubs adopted, the more HubSpot becomes a customer operating system rather than a point solution. The key ER2 question is whether multi-hub expansion remains organic and value-creating or begins to require bundling and discounting.

6. Competitive Landscape

HubSpot competes across several overlapping software categories. In CRM and enterprise customer platform, Salesforce is the primary scaled incumbent, with Microsoft Dynamics also relevant for customers standardized on Microsoft. Salesforce has depth, enterprise controls, and ecosystem gravity; HubSpot competes by being simpler, faster to adopt, and better integrated for scaling businesses. Microsoft competes through bundling, productivity-suite distribution, Teams/Outlook/LinkedIn assets, Copilot, and enterprise account control.

In marketing automation and marketing clouds, HubSpot competes with Salesforce Marketing Cloud, Adobe, Oracle, Intuit/Mailchimp, and numerous email, automation, and campaign tools. Adobe and Oracle are stronger in complex enterprise marketing environments; Mailchimp is more down-market and email-centric. HubSpot's differentiation is an integrated CRM plus lifecycle suite rather than a stand-alone marketing engine.

In service and customer support, HubSpot competes with Zendesk, Salesforce Service Cloud, Intercom, Freshworks, and AI-first support vendors. The Service Hub opportunity is attractive because support data is valuable for retention and expansion, but this is also one of the areas where AI-native disruption is most visible. AI support agents can deflect tickets, summarize conversations, and automate routing. HubSpot's advantage is that its customer agent can operate on CRM and service context; its risk is that specialized support vendors may move faster in complex support workflows.

In work management and pipeline-adjacent workflows, tools like monday.com, Atlassian, Notion, Airtable, Asana, and vertical CRMs can absorb parts of the customer workflow. They are not always direct replacements, but they compete for budget, workflow ownership, and employee attention. In sales engagement and revenue intelligence, point solutions and AI-native GTM tools can attack prospecting, outreach, enrichment, meeting intelligence, lead scoring, and account research. HubSpot's defense is suite integration; the risk is that AI reduces the need for traditional workflow modules or allows specialized tools to deliver better outcomes with less configuration.

The broad competitive pattern is suite versus point solution. HubSpot wins if customers value an integrated, easier-to-administer customer platform more than best-of-breed depth in each function. It loses if customers either outgrow HubSpot into enterprise suites or prefer specialized AI-native tools that automate discrete jobs more effectively than HubSpot's embedded agents.

7. Growth Drivers And Constraints

The first growth driver is seats and customers. HubSpot ended Q1 FY2026 with 299,458 customers, and customer growth was 16% year over year. As the installed base grows, net adds become mathematically harder, so the quality of customer adds matters more than headline count. The customer base must keep skewing toward durable, paying, expanding accounts rather than very small customers that churn or remain low-spend.

The second driver is average subscription revenue per customer. Q1 FY2026 ASRPC was $11,722, up 6% year over year. That figure can rise through tier upgrades, additional seats, multi-hub adoption, AI/credit usage, and upmarket customer mix. It can fall or stagnate if SMB pressure, discounting, packaging changes, or lower-priced self-serve cohorts dilute the base.

The third driver is multi-hub adoption. HubSpot's CEO commentary in the Q1 FY2026 release specifically cited upmarket momentum and multi-hub adoption. This is critical because the most valuable version of HubSpot is not a marketing tool; it is a multi-function customer platform where sales, service, content, data, commerce, and AI share the same context.

The fourth driver is AI packaging. Breeze and agents could increase conversion, retention, ARPU, and differentiation if they turn HubSpot's CRM data into automated work. The customer-agent, prospecting-agent, and data-agent use cases are natural extensions of HubSpot's existing workflows. Credits could create incremental monetization if customers accept outcome-based pricing. The risk is that AI compute costs, competitive bundling, or customer pushback compress gross margin or limit monetization.

The fifth driver is international. Europe is already one-third of revenue; APAC is smaller. International expansion can support long-duration growth, but it comes with localization, partner coverage, data-residency, currency, regulatory, and support complexity. HubSpot's mid-market focus should travel well in principle, but each region has local CRM, marketing, messaging, payments, and compliance habits.

Constraints include macro sensitivity, sales-cycle friction, AI disruption, and the need to keep the platform simple. HubSpot's customers are often more budget-sensitive than large enterprises. A weak macro environment can slow new customer adds, seat expansion, and professional-tier upgrades. Upmarket motion can lengthen sales cycles and require more enterprise features. AI can be both a driver and a threat: if HubSpot embeds AI well, it strengthens platform value; if AI-native tools make traditional hubs less necessary, HubSpot's suite value proposition weakens.

8. Key Accounting And Quality Issues

The first accounting issue is SBC. TTM SBC of $527.2 million is very large relative to GAAP net income of $100.3 million and FCF after capitalized software of $608.2 million. Non-GAAP margins and non-GAAP FCF can be useful for comparing software operating trends, but ER2 should treat SBC as a real per-share cost. Buybacks can reduce dilution, but if repurchases primarily offset employee issuance, the cash is not truly excess return capital.

The second issue is capitalized software. HubSpot capitalizes certain development costs and amortizes them over estimated useful lives. QF's TTM capitalized software of $134.5 million is meaningful. The cleanest cash view for valuation should look at FCF after both PPE capex and capitalized software, not just operating cash flow less PPE capex.

The third issue is deferred revenue and calculated billings. QF shows Q1 FY2026 deferred revenue of $1.038 billion. The Q1 IR release reported calculated billings of $912.3 million, up 19% as reported and 17% constant currency. Deferred revenue is a quality signal when it reflects prepaid subscription demand and renewal strength, but it can also create timing effects in operating cash flow. ER2 should separate sustainable cash conversion from billing timing.

The fourth issue is liquidity and debt definition. QF shows Q1 FY2026 cash of $943.9 million, short-term investments of $747.1 million, and cash plus short-term investments of $1.691 billion. QF also shows total debt of $247.3 million, which QFR notes equals official operating lease liabilities. On a cash-plus-investments basis, HubSpot has substantial net cash/investment liquidity. The old 2025 convertible notes matured or were settled in 2025. HubSpot also has a secured revolving credit facility with no outstanding borrowings as of the relevant filing date.

The fifth issue is buybacks. In February 2026 the board authorized a $1 billion share repurchase program over 24 months. HubSpot repurchased $211 million in Q1 FY2026, leaving $789 million available. Repurchases should be assessed against dilution, valuation, and reinvestment opportunity. A buyback at a high multiple that only offsets SBC is not the same as a value-accretive repurchase.

9. What Matters For ER2 Valuation

The ER2 valuation starts from TTM ending 2026-03-31, not FY2025. The relevant base is QF's TTM revenue of $3.298 billion, TTM net income of $100.3 million, and TTM cash-flow profile. The forward horizon is 2031-03-31, exactly five calendar years from the TTM end date. Every growth, margin, EPS, and P/E test should compound from that anchor.

The hard valuation gate is P/E at or below 15 on confident TTM+5 EPS. HubSpot will likely screen as a high-quality platform with attractive gross margins, a large customer base, a strong balance sheet, and credible long-duration growth opportunities. That is not enough for an ER2 BUY. The company must also produce a bottom-up, defensible EPS path by 2031-03-31 such that today's price maps to a P/E of 15 or less on confident five-year-forward earnings.

The critical modeling bridge is from low current GAAP margin to mature earnings power. If HubSpot can sustain high-teens or better revenue growth while expanding GAAP operating margin materially, maintaining high gross margin despite AI costs, converting FCF into per-share value after SBC, and using buybacks at sensible prices, the earnings runway could be compelling. If growth decelerates, AI costs pressure gross margin, sales and marketing intensity stays high, or SBC remains elevated, the five-year EPS needed for the ER2 price gate may not be credible.

Durability risks are specific. HubSpot must defend ease of use while moving upmarket. It must make Breeze and AI agents a platform advantage rather than a margin burden or a feature set customers expect for free. It must maintain partner and marketplace relevance as AI changes workflows. It must avoid being squeezed between Salesforce/Microsoft at the high end and AI-native point solutions at the workflow level. It must keep expanding ARPU without alienating SMB and mid-market customers who chose HubSpot for simplicity and total cost of ownership.

For ER2, the key question is not "Is HubSpot a good business?" The evidence says it is a strong software platform with high subscription gross margin, large customer scale, broad product surface, and significant cash generation before SBC. The key question is whether the business can convert that platform strength into durable per-share earnings at a valuation that clears the strict P/E <= 15 on TTM+5 EPS test. Until the synthesis proves that bridge with conservative assumptions, the valuation stance should remain skeptical.

Appendix M - Management Assessment

HubSpot - Management Assessment

Prepared: 2026-06-28 Ticker: HUBS Company: HubSpot Role: Sub-Agent M, Management Assessment Output: `C:\Users\Admin\OneDrive\GPT\ER 2.0\HubSpot\appendix_management.md`

Source Map

This appendix uses M-owned live pulls saved under `C:\Users\Admin\OneDrive\GPT\ER 2.0\HubSpot\raw\`: `M_HUBS_2026_DEF14A.htm`, `M_HUBS_2025_10K.htm`, `M_HUBS_2026_Q1_10Q.htm`, `M_HUBS_2026_06_15_8K.htm`, recent `M_HUBS_form4_*` files, HubSpot IR transcript PDFs for Q1 2026 / Q3 2025 / Q2 2025 / 2025 Analyst Day, and live FMP transcript pulls for Q2 2024 through Q1 2026. The data package's Section 7 and Section 9 are used for capital allocation and recent corporate actions. No local data warehouse cache was used.

1. Who Is Running The Company

HubSpot is now run by a post-founder operating team, with founder influence still present through CTO Dharmesh Shah and former CEO Brian Halligan's board seat. The 2026 proxy identifies Yamini Rangan, age 52, as Chief Executive Officer, President, and Director. She has served in that role since September 2021, after joining HubSpot as Chief Customer Officer in January 2020. Her pre-HubSpot background was go-to-market and customer operations: Chief Customer Officer and strategy/operations roles at Dropbox, sales strategy and operations at Workday, and customer-facing roles at SAP. That background fits the company's current problem: moving from inbound-marketing specialist to a broader customer platform without losing mid-market ease of use.

The CFO is Kate Bueker, age 55, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer since June 2018. Bueker has been in-seat long enough to own the capital allocation record across the transition from high-growth SaaS losses to a more explicit profitability and buyback phase. Her prior experience includes finance leadership at Akamai and investment banking roles at Blackstone, UBS, Credit Suisse, and DLJ. The current legal head is Erika Fisher, Chief Legal Officer since February 2025, formerly at Atlassian.

The material product/technology leader is co-founder Dharmesh Shah, age 58, Chief Technology Officer and Director. Shah owns a large founder stake and remains central to the AI/platform transition. Brian Halligan, co-founder and former CEO, transitioned from Executive Chairperson to non-employee director effective May 8, 2025. This matters: the company has founder DNA and product continuity, but Rangan is not merely a caretaker. Since 2021, she has owned the shift toward multi-hub, upmarket, AI agents, seat-based pricing, and a more balanced growth/profitability message.

Board oversight is credible on paper. Lorrie Norrington became independent Chairperson after Halligan stepped down from Executive Chairperson. The CEO and Chair roles are separated. The proxy states that all directors except Rangan and Shah as current executive officers and Halligan as a former executive officer are independent under NYSE standards. There are no disclosed family relationships among directors or executive officers. The board is moving toward annual elections after stockholders voted in 2025 to declassify it; immediately following the 2028 annual meeting, all directors should serve one-year terms. That is a governance positive.

Two board-transition details bear monitoring but are not red flags by themselves: Nick Caldwell is not standing for reelection and Ron Gill will resign effective June 30, 2026. Mike Berry, MongoDB's CFO and former NetApp/McAfee CFO, joined the board in April 2026. His addition improves financial software oversight.

2. Tenure And Track Record

Rangan has been CEO for nearly five years as of June 2026. That is long enough to own current strategy and operating outcomes. Revenue grew from $1.301 billion in FY2021 to $3.131 billion in FY2025, while customers grew to 288,706 at FY2025 and 299,458 at Q1 FY2026. The business has not yet produced robust GAAP earnings, but GAAP operating income moved from negative $67.6 million in FY2024 to positive $7.4 million in FY2025, while non-GAAP operating income reached $581.9 million and non-GAAP operating margin was 18.6%. Q1 2026 continued the pattern with 18.2% constant-currency revenue growth and 17.8% non-GAAP operating margin.

Rangan's three biggest strategic decisions are clear. First, she broadened HubSpot from marketing automation into a unified customer platform. The 2025 10-K describes the platform as AI-powered agents and engagement hubs, Smart CRM, and a

connected ecosystem. The evidence supports coherence: HubSpot still reports one operating segment, but subscription revenue is 97.8% of FY2025 revenue, solutions partners represented about 49% of revenue, and the customer base is large enough to make platform consolidation plausible.

Second, she pushed upmarket and multi-hub without abandoning the mid-market entry motion. Q1 2026 transcript evidence is unusually concrete for a SaaS call: deals above $60,000 ARR grew 37% year over year, deals above $120,000 ARR grew 64%, 63% of new Pro+ customers landed with multiple hubs, and 42% of the Pro+ install base by ARR owned four or more hubs. Those figures give the strategy more substance than a generic "platform" narrative.

Third, she backed the 2024 pricing/packaging shift and the 2025-2026 AI monetization model around core seats and credits. Management said about 90% of install-base customers had migrated to the new pricing model by Q1 2026 and more than 50% of ARR had gone through a first renewal. Active core-seat users grew 90% year over year, credit consumption grew 67% quarter over quarter, and management disclosed the credit-use mix by agent category. The decision is still early, but the disclosure gives investors measurable adoption breadcrumbs.

The main decision that remains unproven is M&A plus AI-data monetization. Clearbit was acquired for approximately $146.8 million, with $127.1 million recorded as goodwill and the strategic rationale tied to Clearbit's data asset and HubSpot's AI-powered Smart CRM. The 2025 data package shows FY2025 M&A of $87.6 million, and the 10-K notes 2025 acquisitions of Frame AI, Dashworks, and XFunnel were small enough to be excluded from internal-control assessment and represented less than 1% of consolidated assets and revenue. This is not serial M&A abuse, but management has not yet disclosed enough revenue, retention, or margin output to prove these deals created per-share value.

Bueker's CFO record is mixed but improving. The balance sheet is strong, with net cash/investments and no solvency constraint. She has helped shift messaging toward GAAP operating leverage and FCF while continuing to fund R&D and go-to-market. The weakness is per-share value: stock-based compensation remains very large, and the first buyback program bought shares at an average of $501.67 in 2025. That may have offset dilution, but it does not yet prove price-sensitive capital allocation.

3. Capital Allocation Behavior

Data package Section 7 shows a software-style allocation pattern: low physical capex, heavy R&D and sales/marketing, no dividends, modest bolt-on M&A, and a new buyback program. From FY2021 to FY2025, capex stayed between $29 million and $53 million, or roughly 1.4% to 2.2% of revenue. R&D rose from $302 million to $906 million, while sales and marketing rose from $650 million to $1.379 billion. Buybacks were zero through FY2024 and $500 million in FY2025. Dividends were zero. M&A was modest, with $20 million in FY2021, $142 million in FY2023, $40 million in FY2024, and $87.6 million in FY2025.

This allocation is consistent with stated strategy. HubSpot is not claiming to be an infrastructure-heavy AI company; it is claiming to be an AI-enabled customer platform for scaling companies. The appropriate investment pattern is therefore people, product, data, platform software, and go-to-market rather than large PPE capex. That pattern is visible. It also means GAAP profitability remains suppressed by growth expense and SBC, so investors must judge management on per-share economics rather than non-GAAP margin alone.

The buyback record is the most important capital allocation question. In May 2025, the board authorized a $500 million repurchase program; HubSpot repurchased 997,000 shares at an average price of $501.67 and completed the program in Q3 2025. In February 2026, the board authorized a new $1.0 billion program over up to 24 months. Data package Section 9 shows $211 million repurchased in Q1 2026, leaving $789 million. Management framed the new authorization as confidence in the business and long-term opportunity.

That framing is not enough. A buyback can be good capital allocation if it retires undervalued stock or clearly neutralizes dilution at sensible prices. HubSpot's 2025 repurchase program has not yet proven price discipline, and the company still carries high SBC. The correct interpretation is that buybacks may be offsetting employee issuance more than returning excess capital.

4. Compensation Alignment

Compensation is a yellow flag. It has some good hygiene, but the performance metrics still lean too heavily toward growth and adjusted operating profit.

The annual cash bonus for 2025 used two metrics: ARR install base weighted 70% and non-GAAP operating income/loss weighted 30%. The committee exercised negative discretion to exclude about $30 million of FX tailwind from second-half non-GAAP operating income, which is a governance positive. Cash bonuses paid at 107% of target for Rangan and Bueker. Long-term equity awards were 50% PSUs and 50% RSUs. The 2025 PSUs used one-year constant-currency revenue growth; threshold was 16.9%, target 18.1%, maximum 20.0% or higher, and actual 18.2% produced 100.1% of target PSUs earned.

This is not abusive, but it is incomplete for a company now being underwritten as a long-duration compounder. There is no explicit multi-year ROIC, FCF per share, GAAP EPS, dilution, or relative TSR metric in the cited 2025 PSU design. Non-GAAP operating income excludes SBC, amortization, acquisition-related expense, and restructuring, which weakens the alignment when SBC is the core per-share issue.

Executive ownership is adequate but not exceptional for the CEO/CFO. The proxy lists Rangan with 80,051 beneficial shares, including 23,278 directly held, 48,603 issuable within 60 days, and 5,575 held by a GRAT. Bueker has 51,122 beneficial shares, including 25,466 directly held. Shah is the true owner-operator signal, with 1,394,159 beneficial shares, or 2.6% of outstanding shares, including 1,280,851 directly held. The CEO has meaningful exposure but not founder-level skin in the game.

The governance mechanics are sound: CEO stock ownership guideline is six times base salary; other covered executives are two times base salary; directors are five times annual cash retainer; unvested awards and unexercised options do not count. The insider trading policy prohibits hedging and generally prohibits pledging; no exception requests had been made or approved. The company has an SEC/NYSE-compliant clawback policy covering excess incentive compensation after restatements.

The unresolved issue is chronic dilution. FY2025 SBC was $528.2 million, up from $504.8 million in FY2024 and $432.3 million in FY2023. The data package shows TTM SBC of $527.2 million, about 16% of TTM revenue. Diluted share count rose from 46.9 million in FY2021 to 53.2 million in FY2025. Management said Q1 2026 showed a three-point reduction in SBC as a percentage of revenue, but the absolute burden is still large. This alone caps the management gate at YELLOW unless the company shows sustained SBC/revenue improvement and stable or falling diluted share count.

5. Disclosure Quality And Candor

Across the last eight FMP transcripts plus the available HubSpot IR transcript PDFs, management's disclosure quality is better than average for SaaS but not complete. The positive is that Rangan and Bueker give concrete operating markers when they have them: customer adds, ASRPC, calculated billings, non-GAAP operating margin, NRR snapshots, large-deal growth, multi-hub penetration, core-seat user growth, credit-consumption growth, and AI credit mix. They also discuss friction directly. In Q1 2026, analysts pressed on AI pricing, proof-of-value trials, longer sales cycles, and guidance conservatism; management acknowledged that AI/agent proof-of-value periods and sales enablement affected the motion and explained the math behind the guide.

Guidance discipline appears solid. Q4 2025 guidance for FY2026 was raised after Q1 2026 despite management separating reported FX benefit from constant-currency performance. The Q1 2026 answer on guidance was specific: the quarter beat by $18 million, full-year guidance rose by $9 million, FX benefit was lower than expected by about $4 million, and constant-currency revenue growth was raised by roughly 40 basis points. That is the kind of bridge investors should demand.

The disclosure weakness is that HubSpot still withholds several load-bearing SaaS metrics. The data package confirms that ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, churn, cRPO, AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, and hub-level product revenue are not disclosed in the searched official sources. Bueker gives NRR snapshots, such as FY2025 NRR of 103.5% and Q1 2026 NRR of 103%, but not the full retention stack. Rangan gives AI adoption and usage metrics, but not monetized AI ARR or credit revenue. That is acceptable at this early AI-monetization stage, but it prevents a PASS on candor because AI/pricing is now central to the thesis.

The language pattern is balanced. Management uses optimistic AI framing but pairs it with measurable adoption indicators and admits when a motion is transitional. The transcript record does not show repeated evasion. It does show selective disclosure: management is open about usage and direction, more guarded about ARR dollars, churn, and AI monetization dollars.

6. Strategic Coherence

The strategy is coherent. The 2025 10-K says HubSpot provides an agentic customer platform for marketing, sales, and customer service teams, with AI agents and engagement hubs, Smart CRM, and a connected ecosystem. It explicitly targets

mid-market B2B companies with 2 to 2,000 employees and says it aims to be the best at applying AI to help them grow. This is consistent with HubSpot's historical brand: easy-to-adopt software for scaling businesses rather than heavy enterprise implementation.

The investment pattern supports the statement. R&D and S&M are the dominant uses of operating capital. M&A is mostly bolt-on, targeted at data, AI, and workflow extension. The partner ecosystem remains central; the 10-K states Solutions Partners and customers referred by them represented approximately 25% of customers and 49% of FY2025 revenue. That supports the claim that HubSpot is not just selling software modules; it is building a go-to-market operating system with partner-led implementation and demand generation.

Management names competitive threats more directly than many software teams. The 10-K lists CRM suites, marketing/email software, customer service software, commerce and content tools, AI agent providers, and AI-native CRM/workflow startups. It also acknowledges AI cost and adoption risk, including model accuracy, reputational issues, compute-cost profile, and the need for AI talent. That disclosure is credible.

The main strategic risk is that "agentic customer platform" could become a moving target if AI monetization fails to convert from usage into revenue and retention. The monitor is simple: multi-hub penetration, core-seat adoption, credit consumption, NRR, calculated billings, and ASRPC must all support the same story. If usage rises but NRR or ASRPC stalls, management's AI strategy is more defensive than accretive.

7. Governance Flags

No dual-class or controlling-shareholder structure appears in the sources reviewed. Securities registered under Section 12(g) are listed as none, and the equity base is common stock. Founder ownership is meaningful through Shah but not control. The proxy discloses related-person transaction procedures, with Audit Committee review for transactions above $120,000 involving related persons. I did not identify a material related-party transaction in the reviewed proxy text.

Internal controls are clean. The 2025 10-K states CEO/CFO disclosure controls were effective as of December 31, 2025, and management concluded internal control over financial reporting was effective. PwC audited that effectiveness. The 2025 acquisitions excluded from the internal-control assessment represented less than 1% of consolidated assets and revenue, which is not a red flag.

Legal/regulatory flags are low. The 10-K says the company may face ordinary-course legal proceedings; data package Section 9 found no large legal settlement or regulatory action in the searched 10-K, Q1 2026 10-Q, releases, or SEC submissions. Recent Form 4 files show insider transactions including 10b5-1 plan sales, notably Halligan selling 8,500 shares on June 16, 2026 through a plan adopted March 12, 2026. The reviewed sample does not show a clustered discretionary insider-exit pattern, but ongoing selling should be watched because the stock has fallen and SBC remains high.

8. Peer Comparison

Against Salesforce, Rangan communicates with more product-specific AI usage metrics and HubSpot has a cleaner mid-market platform narrative, but Salesforce has a longer record of GAAP-scale profitability and buyback execution. Salesforce's capital allocation has had its own M&A issues, yet it has already passed through the transition from growth-first SaaS to shareholder-return discipline. HubSpot is earlier.

Against Intuit, HubSpot is less proven. Intuit has a stronger record of compounding per-share value, integrating acquisitions, and turning software franchises into durable earnings power. HubSpot's customer-platform narrative is attractive, but Intuit ranks higher on long-term capital allocation and per-share proof.

Against monday.com or Freshworks, HubSpot ranks higher on scale, ecosystem, disclosure depth, and strategic coherence. Those peers may grow from smaller bases, but HubSpot has a more mature leadership structure, stronger partner channel, and more credible path to platform economics.

Overall, Rangan ranks above most emerging SaaS CEOs on strategic clarity and transcript candor, below the best mature compounder CEOs on per-share discipline.

9. Verdict On The Management Gate

Management gate: YELLOW.

This team is investable but not yet a PASS. Rangan has owned the strategy since September 2021, the CFO has been in-seat since 2018, the board structure is cleaner after the independent chair transition, and management has produced a

coherent platform-and-AI strategy with measurable disclosure. There is no evidence of governance abuse, related-party opacity, serial M&A destruction, or repeated evasive transcript behavior.

The cap is SBC and per-share capital allocation. SBC at roughly 16% of TTM revenue, diluted shares rising from 46.9 million in FY2021 to 53.2 million in FY2025, incentive metrics tied mainly to ARR / non-GAAP OI / one-year revenue growth, and a 2025 buyback at $501.67 average price make it too early to call this a proven 10-year compounder management team. Chronic SBC does not force FAIL today because the company is improving margins, buying back shares, and disclosing the issue indirectly through GAAP/non-GAAP bridges. But it absolutely prevents PASS.

Monitorable conditions to upgrade to PASS: (1) SBC/revenue falls below 11% by FY2027 while diluted share count is flat to down; (2) the board adds multi-year FCF per share, GAAP EPS, ROIC, relative TSR, or explicit dilution metrics to LTI design; (3) AI/core-seat/credit monetization shows up in ASRPC, NRR above 105%, calculated billings, or disclosed AI revenue rather than only usage metrics. Conditions to downgrade to FAIL: SBC stays above 13%-14% of revenue after FY2027, buybacks continue mainly to absorb issuance at valuation-insensitive prices, or management keeps leaning on AI usage metrics while refusing to disclose monetization and retention outcomes.

Appendix W - Moat and 2046 Durability

HubSpot (HUBS) - Moat and 2046 Durability

Prepared: 2026-06-28. 2046 test date: 2046-06-28. Source discipline: company historical figures come from `quant_foundation.md` and `data_package.md`; competitive and AI context uses W-specific live pulls saved under `raw/` with `W_moat_` prefixes. The segment appendix `appendix_B_customer_platform.md` existed at W drafting time but was still a placeholder, so this appendix uses the data package, QF, and primer for the companywide segment view and explicitly does not rely on an unavailable segment deep dive.

1. Moat taxonomy applied

HubSpot's moat is not a hard network effect, not a regulated franchise, and not an IP/patent moat. It is a mid-market customer-platform moat built from switching costs, suite breadth, brand-led distribution, partner ecosystem leverage, and a growing proprietary operating context inside customer accounts. That can be a good moat, but it is not the kind of monopoly moat that survives twenty years without continuous product execution. The starting point matters: HubSpot reports one operating segment. QF and the data package both state that no hub-level revenue, operating income, or margin should be invented. The economic moat must therefore be assessed at the consolidated customer-platform level, with qualitative discussion of the major workflow families.

Network effects are limited. HubSpot does not get stronger for one customer simply because another customer joins in the way a marketplace or social network does. The closest network-like effects are indirect: more customers support a larger app marketplace, more partners build implementation practices, more templates and educational material accumulate, and more integrations become worth maintaining. Those effects help distribution and retention, but they are weaker than true two-sided network effects because a customer can still evaluate Salesforce, Microsoft Dynamics, Zoho, Freshworks, Zendesk, Intercom, Adobe, or point AI tools independently.

Switching costs are real but uneven. A single-hub, small-business customer can switch from HubSpot to a lower-priced CRM, email tool, or service desk with manageable pain. A multi-hub customer using Smart CRM, Marketing Hub, Sales Hub, Service Hub, Content Hub, Data/Operations Hub, Revenue Hub, workflows, forms, lists, landing pages, lifecycle attribution, partner-built objects, custom integrations, and Breeze agents faces a much higher migration burden. The moat lives in the account graph, workflow automation, trained teams, embedded integrations, reporting history, and partner configurations. The key weakness is that HubSpot's target base includes SMB and mid-market buyers, which are more budget-sensitive and more failure-prone than enterprise customers.

Scale and data advantages are moderate. The data package shows 299,458 customers at Q1 FY2026, ASRPC of $11,722, Q1 FY2026 RPO of $1.7B, and QF TTM revenue of $3.298B. That gives HubSpot meaningful product telemetry, customer lifecycle data, and usage evidence. The live-pulled 10-K says the platform processes large volumes of customer data across channels and is built on a reusable, composable platform architecture. This is useful for AI because Breeze can be grounded in CRM records, conversations, and deal history. It is not an unassailable data moat: each customer's data is siloed, competitors can ground agents in their own CRM records, and foundation models are improving the commodity layer of text, outreach, support, and content generation.

Brand is a strong distribution asset in the SMB and mid-market segment. HubSpot has spent years owning the "inbound" and easy-to-use customer-platform mindshare. The brand lowers initial adoption friction and supports a freemium/self-serve funnel. The brand is less decisive upmarket, where buyers may prefer Salesforce's enterprise depth, Microsoft's account control and productivity bundle, or specialized category leaders. Brand helps HubSpot get into evaluations; it does not by itself prove pricing power or 20-year durability.

The partner ecosystem is a real moat enhancer. The primer and live 10-K both describe a solutions-partner channel that refers, implements, configures, and trains customers. The primer also cites more than 2,000 App Marketplace integrations. Partners create coverage that HubSpot cannot economically carry on its own across hundreds of thousands of customers and many geographies. They also create switching costs because workflows, reports, templates, and custom objects often live in partner-built implementation logic. The weakness is that partner loyalty follows customer demand and services revenue opportunity. If AI reduces implementation complexity or Salesforce/Microsoft capture the higher-end workflow budgets, the partner layer can shift.

Suite breadth is the core strategic moat. HubSpot is not merely a marketing automation vendor. Its product map covers CRM, marketing, sales, service, content, data operations, quote-to-cash/revenue workflows, payments-related activity, and Breeze AI. Subscription revenue was 97.8% of FY2025 revenue, so the business is overwhelmingly recurring software rather than services. Suite breadth matters because the customer record becomes more valuable as more workflows attach to it. The more HubSpot becomes the operating layer for customer acquisition, conversion, support, billing, and expansion, the harder it is to dislodge.

Pricing power is present but not yet elite. The data package shows ASRPC rising from $10,875 in FY2021 to $11,683 in FY2025 and $11,722 in Q1 FY2026, while customers grew from 135,442 in FY2021 to 299,458 at Q1 FY2026. That is a positive sign: HubSpot expanded the customer count and monetization per customer at the same time. But Q1 FY2026 NRR was 103%, FY2025 NRR was 103.5%, and churn/GRR/DBNR are not disclosed in the pulled sources. A 103% NRR profile is retention-positive but not the "customers cannot leave and keep expanding aggressively" evidence seen in the best enterprise software moats. Pricing power gets a yellow mark until HubSpot proves AI credits, tiering, and multi-hub packaging can lift ASRPC without raising churn or discounting.

2. Per-segment moat

HubSpot has one operating segment, and it accounted for 100% of FY2025 revenue. QF, QFR, and the data package explicitly warn against inventing hub-level revenue, hub-level margins, or segment operating income. The correct segment-level answer is therefore: the one customer-platform segment has a moderate-to-strong current moat based on workflow breadth and switching costs, with the deepest protection in multi-hub accounts and the weakest protection in single-hub SMB accounts.

Within that one segment, the best protected profit pool is the subscription platform for customers that use HubSpot as a system of record and system of action. The moat is durable over five years because customers have active CRM data, workflows, integrations, marketing assets, sales pipelines, service tickets, reports, and trained employees inside the platform. It is plausible over ten years if multi-hub penetration, partner implementations, AI agents, and quote-to-cash workflows deepen the customer record. It is not automatically durable over twenty years because AI can change how customer work is done and because the strongest competitors own adjacent control points.

The weakest part of the segment is low-end, single-use workflow software: basic email marketing, simple CRM, light support ticketing, basic content generation, and point prospecting/outreach. These are more likely to be bundled, commoditized, or automated by AI-native entrants. The earliest observable break would be a sustained decline in net new customers, ASRPC stagnation, NRR below 100%, gross margin pressure from AI usage, rising sales and marketing intensity, or management increasing discounts to defend the installed base.

The blended company moat is weaker than the strongest multi-hub customer would suggest. A highly configured multi-hub deployment can be sticky; a small customer using starter CRM plus email workflows is much less protected. Equity underwriting should therefore treat HubSpot as a company with a strong product-market position and moderate moat, not as a sealed enterprise standard with unavoidable renewal economics.

3. Margin persistence evidence

The margin evidence is mixed. Revenue compounded from $1.301B in FY2021 to $3.131B in FY2025, and QF shows TTM revenue of $3.298B ending 2026-03-31. Gross margin stayed high: the data package lists consolidated gross margin of 80.1% in FY2021, 82.2% in FY2022, 84.4% in FY2023, 85.0% in FY2024, and 83.8% in FY2025. QF's TTM gross profit of $2.759B on TTM revenue of $3.298B implies roughly 83.7% consolidated gross margin. That is real evidence of software economics and scale.

GAAP operating margin is not yet strong evidence of a mature moat. The data package shows operating margins of -4.2%, -5.9%, -9.3%, -2.6%, and 0.2% from FY2021 to FY2025. QF TTM operating income was $62.8M, only about 1.9% of revenue. Management's FY2026 non-GAAP operating income guide around 21% shows clear operating leverage potential, but GAAP margins remain heavily affected by growth investment, stock-based compensation, capitalized software, and restructuring. A true 2046 compounder case needs eventual GAAP margin evidence, not only non-GAAP margin targets.

The cash margin looks better than GAAP operating income. QF shows TTM operating cash flow of $798.0M, FCF after PPE capex of $742.7M, and FCF after PPE capex plus capitalized software of $608.2M. The primer correctly notes that after subtracting TTM SBC of $527.2M, the residual cash economics are much less impressive. This does not kill the moat, but it means the moat has not yet converted into clean per-share earnings power. Margin persistence supports a YELLOW moat

rather than a clean PASS.

4. AI disruption stress test

The AI question is central because many HubSpot workflows are prompt-to-output workflows: write content, qualify leads, research accounts, summarize calls, draft emails, route tickets, answer support questions, clean data, and generate campaign assets. A foundation model with access to the same data can replicate pieces of those jobs. Therefore the moat cannot be "HubSpot has AI features." The moat must be "HubSpot owns the customer data context, workflow permissions, system-of-record history, partner implementation layer, and distribution surface where AI work is triggered, governed, measured, and monetized."

Marketing and content workflows are exposed. AI can generate landing-page copy, emails, blogs, ads, social content, SEO/AEO drafts, and campaign variants. HubSpot's defense is that the outputs sit in a CRM-connected lifecycle system rather than isolated documents. The risk is that standalone AI marketing tools or large platforms automate the same jobs cheaper and faster. Service workflows are also exposed because AI agents can deflect tickets and answer customer questions. HubSpot's live Breeze materials show customer agents and credits, and the company discloses usage/adoption metrics in the data package. That is positive, but Salesforce Agentforce and Microsoft Copilot/Dynamics are also explicitly building agentic CRM and service capabilities.

Sales workflows are exposed to both AI-native GTM vendors and Microsoft. Prospecting, lead research, email drafting, meeting prep, CRM updates, next-step suggestions, and account news are increasingly generic AI assistant tasks. Microsoft has an unusually strong bundle because Copilot can sit across Microsoft 365, Outlook, Teams, LinkedIn-related workflows, and Dynamics. Its official Dynamics Sales page positions the product as an agentic CRM, and Microsoft Learn describes Copilot in Dynamics 365 Sales as summarizing leads/opportunities, preparing for meetings, catching up on record changes, and drafting email assistance. This is direct pressure on HubSpot's sales-workflow value proposition.

The most protected AI surface is the multi-hub customer record and workflow graph. If HubSpot's agents are trained on account-specific CRM data, service history, deal stage, marketing interactions, billing status, and partner-built business logic, then AI strengthens HubSpot's switching costs. The most exposed surface is any hub used as a lightweight point tool, especially content generation, basic email marketing, simple prospecting, and simple customer-support deflection.

AI disruption therefore cuts both ways. It gives HubSpot a way to monetize credits and outcomes, but it also lowers the technical barrier for competitors to automate jobs that previously required workflow software. The outcome depends on whether HubSpot becomes the execution layer for customer-facing agents or whether agents make parts of the hub suite feel like legacy UI around a generic model.

5. The 2046 test

Today is 2026-06-28. The test date is 2046-06-28. A credible 2046 HubSpot still sells a customer operating platform to scaling businesses: a trusted customer data layer, customer-agent orchestration, revenue workflow automation, marketing and service automation, partner-built industry templates, integration governance, analytics, and compliance controls for AI-driven customer engagement. The buyer is still a scaling business that does not want to stitch together an enterprise stack. The core segment still exists as one customer-platform segment, but the old hub labels matter less. Marketing Hub, Sales Hub, Service Hub, Content Hub, Operations/Data Hub, Revenue Hub, and Breeze likely collapse into a more unified customer-agent operating system.

In the 2046 PASS-like version, HubSpot makes money because the CRM/customer graph is the trust layer for automated customer work. Agents need permissions, context, memory, workflows, audit trails, handoffs, and integration into billing/support/sales systems. HubSpot would sell subscriptions plus usage/outcome credits, with partner and marketplace logic wrapped around the platform. Operating margin should be higher than current GAAP margin and probably closer to mature software margins than today's low-single-digit GAAP margin, although AI inference and customer-success costs may keep gross margin below classic SaaS peaks. In this future, the moat is not the UI; it is customer context, workflow governance, suite breadth, partner coverage, and the accumulated implementation base.

The bear-case 2046 version is plausible. Salesforce could own the enterprise and upper mid-market with Agentforce, Data 360, MuleSoft, Slack, and industry clouds. Microsoft could bundle CRM agents into productivity and ERP workflows at prices HubSpot cannot match, especially for customers already standardized on Microsoft 365, Teams, Outlook, Power Platform, and Dynamics. AI-native tools could automate prospecting, content, support, and data cleanup without needing a traditional hub suite. In that world, HubSpot remains a respected SMB CRM suite, but pricing power falls, ASRPC stalls, NRR drifts

below 100%, and GAAP margin never reaches the level required for a 20-year compounder.

The probability of the bear case is high enough that the 2046 test is YELLOW, not PASS. HubSpot has a credible future business description; this is not a generic "leader in whatever comes next" story. But the bridge to 2046 depends on continuing to own customer context as workflows become agentic. That is a serious unresolved durability question.

6. Competitive threat inventory

Threat	Mechanism	Segment(s) affected	Earliest observable signal	Plausibility
Salesforce / Agentforce pressure	Enterprise and upper mid-market customers standardize on Salesforce's agentic platform, Data 360, MuleSoft, service, sales, and marketing clouds	One customer-platform segment, especially upmarket accounts	Lower large-deal win rate, weaker upmarket commentary, NRR/ASRPC stalls, heavier discounting	High
Microsoft bundle pressure	Dynamics 365, Microsoft 365 Copilot, Teams, Outlook, Power Platform, and ERP/account-control integration reduce HubSpot's value proposition	Sales, CRM, revenue operations, customer service workflows inside the one segment	Customer additions slow among Microsoft-standardized accounts; sales cycles lengthen; ASRPC growth slows	High
AI-native point tools	Agents automate discrete jobs in prospecting, content, support, enrichment, and workflow orchestration without full-suite migration	Lightweight SMB and single-hub workflows	Gross margin pressure from AI credits, lower attach of paid hubs, weaker usage-to-revenue conversion	Medium-high
SMB/mid-market churn sensitivity	Macro weakness and customer failures pressure renewals, expansion, and paid-tier upgrades	Broad installed base	NRR below 100%, customers grow but ASRPC declines, deferred revenue/RPO growth slows	Medium-high
Partner ecosystem dilution	Partners follow demand toward Salesforce, Microsoft, or AI implementation projects rather than HubSpot practices	Implemented multi-hub customers	Fewer certified partners, slower marketplace growth, lower partner-sourced pipeline	Medium

7. Pricing power verification

The best evidence of pricing power is the combination of customer growth and ASRPC growth. Customers rose from 135,442 in FY2021 to 288,706 in FY2025 and 299,458 in Q1 FY2026. ASRPC rose from $10,875 in FY2021 to $11,683 in FY2025 and $11,722 in Q1 FY2026. Q1 FY2026 revenue grew 18% constant currency, and management guided FY2026 revenue to roughly 17% constant-currency growth with about 21% non-GAAP operating margin. Those facts show that HubSpot can grow while monetizing more per customer.

The weaker evidence is retention. The data package found FY2025 NRR of 103.5%, Q4 exit NRR of 105%, and Q1 FY2026 NRR of 103%, but it did not find disclosed GRR, churn, DBNR, ending ARR dollars, or AI-specific revenue. A 103% NRR profile is consistent with some pricing and expansion power, not overwhelming lock-in. If customers were deeply locked into an irreplaceable system, the NRR evidence would likely be stronger or at least supported by more granular disclosure.

Contract structure is only partially visible in the W source set. RPO and deferred revenue support forward visibility: Q1 FY2026 RPO was $1.7B and deferred revenue was about $1.045B. HubSpot also has AI credits and Breeze packaging that could become incremental pricing power if customers accept usage-based monetization for completed AI work. But AI credits can also become a source of friction if customers view them as a toll for features that competitors bundle. Pricing power is therefore observable but not yet strong enough for a moat PASS.

8. Moat verdict

Moat gate: YELLOW

2046 test: YELLOW

HubSpot has a real moat today in multi-hub, subscription-heavy customer-platform deployments: switching costs, integrated customer data, brand-led distribution, partner ecosystem depth, and suite breadth are all observable. The evidence does not clear a full PASS because GAAP margin persistence is still immature, NRR is only modestly above 100%, churn/GRR/DBNR are not disclosed, and the largest strategic threats attack exactly the workflows HubSpot monetizes. AI can strengthen the

moat if HubSpot owns the customer-context execution layer, but it can also disintermediate lightweight hub workflows and intensify Salesforce/Microsoft bundle pressure.

The 2046 test is credible but unresolved. A 2046 HubSpot can still be a high-return customer-agent operating platform for scaling businesses, selling subscriptions, governance, integrations, partner templates, and AI-work credits around a trusted customer record. The bear case is also credible: Salesforce and Microsoft dominate upper mid-market workflows while AI-native tools commoditize point jobs at the low end. Upgrade to PASS would require sustained NRR improvement, ASRPC growth without customer-count quality deterioration, GAAP margin expansion, AI monetization evidence, and continued partner/marketplace momentum. Downgrade to FAIL if NRR drops below 100%, gross margin compresses from AI usage without offsetting revenue, or management has to defend growth through discounting and heavier sales intensity.

Moat gate: YELLOW

2046 test: YELLOW

Appendix B1 - Customer Platform

HubSpot (HUBS) - Appendix B: Customer Platform / One Operating Segment Deep Dive

Prepared: 2026-06-28. Segment slug: customer_platform. Fiscal year end: December 31. Most recently reported quarter: Q1 FY2026 ended 2026-03-31. TTM anchor: Q2 FY2025 plus Q3 FY2025 plus Q4 FY2025 plus Q1 FY2026, ending 2026-03-31. Forward horizon: 2031-03-31, exactly five calendar years from the TTM end date.

This appendix follows the Sub-Agent B boundary: the data package is the single source of truth for HubSpot historicals, growth rates, management quotes, product/service revenue, and KPIs. I did not re-fetch HubSpot historical figures. External sources are used only for competitive context and are indexed in `raw/B_customer_platform_competitive_sources_20260628.md`.

0. Segment boundary + taxonomy note

HubSpot reports one operating segment. The official revenue classification is subscription revenue and professional services and other revenue, and the data package explicitly states that QF and QFR concluded no separate segment operating income should be invented. There was no reportable segment realignment identified in the last three years from the 2025 10-K, Q1 FY2026 10-Q, SEC submissions, or QF/QFR. Therefore this appendix models the whole customer platform as the only operating segment, then uses the disclosed product/service classes as bottom-up forecast lines. Hub-level products such as Marketing Hub, Sales Hub, Service Hub, Content Hub, Operations Hub, Commerce Hub, Breeze, and AI agents are real products, but the data package classifies hub-level revenue dollars, AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, paid attach dollars, and product-family margins as true non-disclosures. Those items can inform qualitative moat and option value, but they cannot become separate historical dollar lines or segment OI lines.

1. What this segment actually is

HubSpot's customer platform is a multi-product SaaS system for small, mid-market, and increasingly larger companies that want one front-office operating layer for marketing, sales, service, content, operations, commerce, data, and AI-assisted workflows. The clean way to understand the segment is not as a single marketing automation tool. It is a unified customer record, workflow, engagement, and analytics platform sold mostly through recurring subscriptions, with professional services and other revenue supporting onboarding, training, consulting, and payments-related activities. The data package maps official subscription revenue to recurring access to HubSpot's customer platform and maps professional services and other revenue to onboarding, training, consulting, and payments-related services. That is the full dollar-disclosed product taxonomy.

The buyer value proposition is operational simplicity. A founder-led or mid-market company can start with CRM and marketing automation, then add sales, service, content, operations, commerce, data, reporting, and AI agents without stitching together a Salesforce-plus-Marketo-plus-service-desk-plus-data-platform stack. That matters because the customer base is broad: customers rose from 135,442 in FY2021 to 288,706 in FY2025 and 299,458 at Q1 FY2026, while ASRPC rose from $10,875 in FY2021 to $11,683 in FY2025 and $11,722 in Q1 FY2026, according to the data package KPI table. The platform is therefore monetizing both customer additions and higher subscription revenue per customer, but with a hard disclosure limit: the company does not disclose ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, hub-level revenue, hub-level growth, customer cohort dollars, or AI-specific revenue.

The go-to-market motion is product-led at the low end and sales-assisted as customers scale. HubSpot has historically won by being easier to deploy and administer than enterprise CRM suites. That remains the segment's most important wedge: the platform can win when the customer wants one integrated RevOps layer without a heavy implementation cycle. As customers become larger, the comparison set changes. Salesforce becomes the enterprise suite competitor, Adobe Marketo and Salesforce Marketing Cloud Account Engagement compete in B2B marketing automation, Oracle Eloqua competes for global enterprises with complex data requirements, Microsoft Dynamics competes where Microsoft 365 and Azure are already standardized, and a long tail of point solutions competes around individual functions. HubSpot's segment is attractive only if it can keep the ease-of-use advantage while adding enough enterprise depth that customers do not graduate away.

2. Current economics (FY-1 and TTM)

The segment's current economics are those of the consolidated company because HubSpot has one operating segment. FY2025 revenue was $3.131B, of which subscription was $3.064B and professional services and other was $67.3M, per data package Sections 1, 3, and 4. Subscription was 97.8% of FY2025 revenue, which means the business is economically a subscription software platform rather than a services company. Professional services and other is strategically useful for onboarding and payments context, but it is not the segment's profit pool.

The TTM base ending 2026-03-31 is stronger than FY2025 alone. QF P4 gives TTM revenue of $3.298B, gross profit of $2.759B, operating income of $62.8M, operating cash flow of $798.0M, PPE capex of $55.2M, capitalized software of $134.5M, FCF after PPE capex of $742.7M, FCF after both PPE capex and capitalized software of $608.2M, and SBC of $527.2M. The official TTM GAAP operating margin is therefore 1.9%. That low GAAP OI margin does not mean the platform has poor unit economics; it means the company is still expensing large R&D, sales and marketing, SBC, and growth investments while subscription gross margins are high. The FY2025 official revenue-classification table in QF P2 shows subscription revenue of $3.064B with subscription cost of revenue of $445.3M, implying an 85.5% subscription gross margin. Professional services and other revenue of $67.3M carried $63.2M of cost of revenue, implying only a 6.2% gross margin.

Recent quarterly growth remains high-teens in constant currency. The data package Section 5 shows constant-currency revenue growth of 18% in each of Q2 FY2025, Q3 FY2025, Q4 FY2025, and Q1 FY2026. Reported growth was 19%, 21%, 20%, and 23%, respectively, with Q1 benefiting from FX. Subscription revenue for the TTM quarters summed to $3.227B, while services summed to $70.6M, using QF and data package Section 5 product-class quarterly rows. Customers rose from 267,982 at Q2 FY2025 to 299,458 at Q1 FY2026, and ASRPC rose from $11,310 to $11,722 over the same span. RPO reached $1.7B at Q1 FY2026, while deferred revenue was $1.045B. The segment therefore has three visible support pillars: high subscription mix, high gross margin, and backlog/deferred-revenue visibility. The main weakness is that official GAAP operating profit is still small relative to revenue, so the investment case needs operating leverage to become real by 2031.

3. Unit economics

Revenue becomes profit through three layers: subscription gross margin, sales and marketing productivity, and operating-expense leverage after product breadth matures. The first layer is already proven. QF P2 shows FY2025 subscription gross margin near 85.5%, while services gross margin was only about 6.2%. Because subscription is nearly 98% of revenue, small movements in subscription retention, pricing, seat adoption, and attach have far more value than services revenue growth. Services can still matter indirectly: successful onboarding can raise retention, shorten time-to-value, and increase the chance that a customer adds multiple hubs. But the service line itself should not be valued as a high-margin profit engine.

The second layer is customer acquisition efficiency. HubSpot continues to add large numbers of customers: data package Section 0a shows customers rising from 135,442 in FY2021 to 288,706 in FY2025 and 299,458 at Q1 FY2026. Average subscription revenue per customer increased more slowly, from $10,875 in FY2021 to $11,722 at Q1 FY2026. This mix tells us the platform is still partly volume-led. If the company can keep adding customers while attaching more hubs, seats, data products, and AI agents, ASRPC should keep inching higher. If competition forces discounting, or if new AI-native entrants unbundle individual workflows, ASRPC could stagnate and operating leverage would be delayed.

The third layer is opex leverage. Data package Section 7 shows sales and marketing at $1.379B in FY2025 and R&D at $0.906B. Those are large figures against $3.131B of revenue. The company can produce strong free cash flow despite low GAAP OI because SBC is large and capital intensity is low: QF P4 shows TTM SBC of $527.2M, PPE capex of only $55.2M, and capitalized software of $134.5M. This creates a quality distinction for the model. Cash generation is real, but GAAP operating income is the official margin anchor for this appendix because the user specified SEC-controlled operating income and FCF values. A bull case needs not only revenue growth but also a credible narrowing of the gap between cash economics and GAAP earnings through SBC discipline, restructuring fade, and scale leverage in sales and marketing. A bear case can still have positive FCF while failing the Gideon earnings bar if SBC and opex intensity stay too high.

What breaks margins up: higher multi-hub attach, more seats per customer, AI features that monetize as incremental subscription price or usage credits, sales productivity from a larger partner ecosystem, lower onboarding friction, and R&D reuse across hubs. What breaks margins down: enterprise feature catch-up spend, pricing pressure from Salesforce or Microsoft bundles, AI inference cost if usage is bundled without pricing, continued high SBC, and customer-support load if the platform gets more complex.

4. Competitive dynamics

HubSpot competes in a crowded front-office software market, but its competitive position is differentiated by buyer segment and implementation complexity. Salesforce is the largest suite competitor. Its FY2026 release showed $41.5B of revenue, 10% year-over-year growth, $72.4B of RPO, and FY2026 GAAP operating margin of 20.1% with non-GAAP operating margin of 34.1%. Salesforce also framed Agentforce as a cross-platform agentic layer and disclosed Agentforce ARR of $800M. The implication for HubSpot is mixed. Salesforce proves that mature CRM platforms can produce high margins, but it also raises the competitive bar in AI, data unification, enterprise workflow depth, partner ecosystem, and account control.

Adobe is the strongest marketing-experience comparison. Adobe's FY2025 materials show Digital Experience revenue of $5.86B, up 9%, and Digital Experience subscription revenue of $5.41B, up 11%. Adobe Marketo and Experience Cloud are more enterprise-marketing focused than HubSpot's historic sweet spot. They are credible threats where the buyer has complex campaign orchestration, content supply chain, enterprise data, and marketing-operations needs. They are less dangerous where ease of deployment, native CRM, and lower administrative load matter most. That distinction is important for the forward model: HubSpot can keep growing in the mid-market and lower enterprise without displacing Salesforce or Adobe at the largest global enterprises, but the upmarket growth narrative becomes harder if HubSpot must match enterprise depth while preserving simplicity.

The practical competitor set is broader than Salesforce and Adobe. 6sense's B2B marketing-automation overview positions Adobe Marketo for enterprise-level B2B marketing operations, Salesforce Marketing Cloud Account Engagement for organizations already invested in Salesforce, Oracle Eloqua for global enterprises with complex data requirements, Microsoft Dynamics 365 for Microsoft/Azure-standardized organizations, and HubSpot Marketing Hub for unified CRM plus automation from mid-market to enterprise. Gartner Peer Insights also compares HubSpot and Salesforce head-to-head in email marketing, with HubSpot at 4.5 stars on 365 reviews and Salesforce at 4.3 stars on 147 reviews at fetch time. These sources are not market-share proof, but they confirm that buyers evaluate HubSpot in the same workflow category as enterprise suites.

Pricing power is real but bounded. HubSpot has pricing power when customers value integrated CRM, marketing, service, and content data in one admin-friendly platform. It has less pricing power when a customer has already standardized on Salesforce, Microsoft, Adobe, or Oracle, because those ecosystems can bundle adjacent workflows and make switching costs work against HubSpot. AI is the new substitution vector. If agentic CRM becomes a feature layer controlled by the incumbent system of record, HubSpot must prove that Breeze and its agents are not just table stakes. If AI reduces software switching costs by making integration and configuration easier, HubSpot's simplicity advantage could narrow. Conversely, if AI increases the value of clean customer data and unified workflows, HubSpot's all-in-one mid-market architecture could become more valuable.

The competitive conclusion is not that HubSpot has an unassailable moat. The better conclusion is that HubSpot owns a valuable wedge: integrated, usable, multi-hub customer software for scaling companies. The wedge can compound if customers keep adding hubs and AI features before they hit enterprise complexity walls. The wedge can erode if Salesforce/Adobe/Microsoft bundle AI and data products into existing enterprise commitments, or if point solutions use AI to solve specific workflows better and cheaper.

5. Moat at the segment level

The segment-level moat is a combination of workflow embedding, customer-data accumulation, multi-hub expansion, partner ecosystem, and brand trust with scaling companies. The strongest component is workflow embedding. Once marketing, sales, service, content, operations, and reporting workflows run through one customer record, switching cost rises because the system touches daily operating rhythm. The second component is data unification. AI agents and automation improve when they can access clean first-party customer data, campaigns, conversations, tickets, contacts, and commerce signals without brittle integrations. The third component is go-to-market reputation: HubSpot is known for usability and inbound/customer-platform education, which lowers adoption friction.

The moat is narrower than Salesforce's enterprise ecosystem moat and Adobe's creative/experience asset base. HubSpot does not have the same enterprise account control, system-integrator depth, or industry cloud breadth. It also does not disclose AI revenue, AI ARR, or paid attach dollars, so we cannot yet underwrite a separate AI moat. Data package Section 0a records promising adoption metrics: Customer Agent had more than 8,000 activations, Prospecting Agent more than 10,000, active core-seat users rose 90% year over year, and total credits consumed rose 67% quarter over quarter. But usage is not monetization. The appendix therefore treats AI as a moat reinforcement and revenue option, not as a separately valued product line.

Durability over five to ten years depends on whether HubSpot can keep expanding upmarket without becoming the complex suite it historically disrupted. A mid-market company may choose HubSpot because it is coherent and fast to deploy. A larger enterprise may choose Salesforce because it is configurable, has a larger ecosystem, and can sit across more systems and industries. The moat survives if HubSpot finds the balance: enough depth for larger accounts, enough simplicity for scaling companies, and enough AI/data capability to keep platform consolidation working in its favor. The moat weakens if product breadth becomes complexity without matching Salesforce-level enterprise power.

6. Historical growth rates - reproduced from data package, not re-derived

The table below uses data package Section 3 for one-segment revenue and data package Section 4 for subscription and professional services/other. It deliberately avoids hub-level product revenue because the data package says hub-level product revenue dollars are not disclosed. Three-year CAGR uses FY2022 to FY2025 when the data package provides the FY2022 base; the displayed FY-3 to FY-1 dollar columns show the most recent three fiscal years as required.

Product / sub-segment	FY-3 rev	FY-2 rev	FY-1 rev	3-yr CAGR	Most recent YoY	Data package cite
One operating segment	$2.170B [data_package Section 3 row Revenue]	$2.628B [data_package Section 3 row Revenue]	$3.131B [data_package Section 3 row Revenue]	21.8% from FY2022 $1.731B to FY2025 $3.131B	19.2%	data_package Section 3 one operating segment table
Subscription	$2.123B [data_package Section 4 product row Subscription]	$2.570B [data_package Section 4 product row Subscription]	$3.064B [data_package Section 4 product row Subscription]	21.9% from FY2022 $1.691B to FY2025 $3.064B	19.2%	data_package Section 4 product table row Subscription
Professional services and other	$0.0468B [data_package Section 4 product row Professional services and other]	$0.0580B [data_package Section 4 product row Professional services and other]	$0.0673B [data_package Section 4 product row Professional services and other]	18.5% from FY2022 $0.0404B to FY2025 $0.0673B	16.1%	data_package Section 4 product table row Professional services and other
Marketing Hub, Sales Hub, Service Hub, Content Hub, Operations Hub, Commerce Hub	Not dollar-disclosed [data_package Section 4 named-products row]	Not dollar-disclosed [data_package Section 4 named-products row]	Not dollar-disclosed [data_package Section 4 named-products row]	n/a	n/a	[DATA GAP: hub-level product revenue and growth rates are true non-disclosures in data_package Section 4 and Section 10]
AI agents, Breeze, Customer Agent, Prospecting Agent, Data Agent	Not dollar-disclosed [data_package Section 4 AI row]	Not dollar-disclosed [data_package Section 4 AI row]	Not dollar-disclosed [data_package Section 4 AI row]	n/a	Usage disclosed, revenue not disclosed	[DATA GAP: AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, and paid attach dollars are true non-disclosures in data_package Section 4 and Section 10]

Internal arithmetic checks: one operating segment FY2024 to FY2025 ties because $2.628B times 1.192 equals about $3.132B, within rounding of $3.131B. Subscription FY2024 to FY2025 ties because $2.570B times 1.192 equals about $3.063B, within rounding of $3.064B. Professional services and other FY2024 to FY2025 ties because $0.0580B times 1.161 equals about $0.0673B. No historical dollars were back-solved in this appendix; CAGR calculations use data-package disclosed fiscal-year bases. The hub and AI rows are explicitly left as non-disclosed rather than estimated.

7. Management guidance - quoted from data package Section 6

The management guidance anchor is high-teens revenue growth with expanding non-GAAP margin, not a disclosed hub-level or AI revenue guide. Data package Section 6 states that Q4 FY2025 guidance called for FY2026 revenue of $3.69B to $3.70B, up 18% reported and 16% constant currency, and non-GAAP operating income of $736M to $740M, or about 20% margin. It also states that Q1 FY2026 raised FY2026 revenue guidance to $3.700B to $3.708B, up 18% reported and 17% constant currency, and non-GAAP operating income to $762M to $766M, or about 21% margin. That guidance is the closest thing to a management-approved FY+1 anchor.

Relevant data-package quote snippets and modeling interpretation:

- Q2 FY2025 call, Yamini Rangan: "revenue growing 18% year-over-year in constant currency". Interpretation: the clean organic base is high-teens constant-currency growth, not Q1 FY2026's 23% reported growth.
- Q2 FY2025 call, Kathryn Bueker: "Average subscription revenue per customer was $11,300 in Q2". Interpretation: monetization per customer is stable to modestly rising, so the model should not assume sudden ASRPC acceleration without proof.
- Q3 FY2025 call, Yamini Rangan: "durable path to growth". Interpretation: management frames several growth levers, but the phrase is not a numeric target.

- Q3 FY2025 call, Kathryn Bueker: "We added 10,900 net new customers in Q3". Interpretation: customer acquisition remains a material growth component.
- Q4 FY2025 call, Yamini Rangan: "positioned to lead and win with AI". Interpretation: AI is strategic, but the data package does not disclose AI revenue or AI ARR.
- Q4 FY2025 call, Kathryn Bueker: "Q4 subscription revenue grew 21% year-over-year". Interpretation: subscription remains the growth engine.
- Q1 FY2026 call, Yamini Rangan: "balancing growth and profitability". Interpretation: forward margin should expand, but not through a reckless cut to product investment.
- Q1 FY2026 call, Kathryn Bueker: "Q1 revenue grew 23% year over year as reported". Interpretation: Q1 reported growth includes FX benefit; constant-currency growth remained 18%.
- Q1 FY2026 call, Kathryn Bueker: "net revenue retention was 103%". Interpretation: retention is positive but not hypergrowth-level; the model needs customer adds and ASRPC growth, not only expansion.
- Q1 FY2026 call, Yamini Rangan: "Total credits consumed grew 67%". Interpretation: AI usage is real, but monetization remains a data gap.
- 2025 Analyst Day, Yamini Rangan: "AI-powered customer platform for scaling companies". Interpretation: the strategic direction is platform breadth plus AI, not standalone marketing software.
- 2025 Analyst Day, Yamini Rangan: "no longer limited by the software budgets". Interpretation: this is upside framing; the model should demand evidence before capitalizing a larger AI labor-budget TAM.

[DATA GAP: data_package Section 6 does not provide hub-level revenue guidance, AI revenue guidance, ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, or churn. The appendix therefore uses management's consolidated revenue and non-GAAP margin guidance as the forward anchor.]

8. Forward growth assumptions - explicit, per product, justified

The forward revenue model starts from TTM product-class dollars, not FY2025. TTM subscription revenue is $3.227B, calculated from the four data-package Section 5 quarterly subscription rows: Q2 FY2025 $744.5M, Q3 FY2025 $791.7M, Q4 FY2025 $829.0M, and Q1 FY2026 $862.3M. TTM professional services and other revenue is $70.6M, calculated from the same four quarterly service rows. Total TTM revenue is $3.298B, matching QF P4 within rounding. The base case assumes growth decelerates from the FY2022-FY2025 CAGR as HubSpot scales, but remains above mature enterprise-suite growth because customer adds, multi-hub attach, and AI/data packaging still have runway. The bull case assumes the AI/customer-platform repositioning produces durable attach and pricing. The bear case assumes good but less exceptional SaaS growth as competition and lower NRR limit expansion.

Base case growth assumptions

Product	3-yr historical CAGR	Latest YoY	Mgmt FY+1 guide	Base CAGR TTM->TTM+5y	Justification
Subscription	21.9%	23% reported in Q1 FY2026 product row; 18% CC total revenue	FY2026 total revenue guide up 18% reported and 17% CC	13.5%	Subscription decelerates from the historical CAGR but remains a mid-teens compounder because customer adds, ASRPC, multi-hub attach, RPO, and AI usage support growth. Salesforce and Adobe show mature suite growth closer to high-single or low-double digits, so HubSpot gets a premium but not perpetual high-teens growth.
Professional services and other	18.5%	22% reported in Q1 FY2026 product row	No separate guide	8.0%	Services is kept small and slower than subscription because onboarding should scale less than software revenue if the platform becomes more self-serve and partner-enabled.

Product	3-yr historical CAGR	Latest YoY	Mgmt FY+1 guide	Base CAGR TTM->TTM+5y	Justification
Hub-level products and AI agents	n/a	Not revenue-disclosed	No separate guide	n/a	The model embeds hub and AI monetization inside subscription growth. [DATA GAP: no disclosed hub-level or AI-specific revenue base exists.]

Bull case growth assumptions

Product	3-yr historical CAGR	Latest YoY	Mgmt FY+1 guide	Bull CAGR TTM->TTM+5y	Justification
Subscription	21.9%	23% reported in Q1 FY2026 product row; 18% CC total revenue	FY2026 total revenue guide up 18% reported and 17% CC	16.5%	Bull case assumes HubSpot preserves high-teens growth longer because AI agents, core-seat adoption, data products, and upmarket multi-hub deals raise ASRPC while the customer engine remains healthy. This still decelerates from historical growth because the revenue base is larger.
Professional services and other	18.5%	22% reported in Q1 FY2026 product row	No separate guide	10.0%	Bull case assumes onboarding, payments-related activity, and partner services grow with larger customers, but services still lag subscription and remain immaterial to mix.
Hub-level products and AI agents	n/a	Not revenue-disclosed	No separate guide	n/a	AI and hub expansion are treated as drivers of subscription CAGR rather than standalone revenue lines. [DATA GAP: no disclosed AI ARR or hub revenue.]

Bear case growth assumptions

Product	3-yr historical CAGR	Latest YoY	Mgmt FY+1 guide	Bear CAGR TTM->TTM+5y	Justification
Subscription	21.9%	23% reported in Q1 FY2026 product row; 18% CC total revenue	FY2026 total revenue guide up 18% reported and 17% CC	9.5%	Bear case assumes high-teens guidance fades as Salesforce, Adobe, Microsoft, Oracle, and AI-native tools pressure seat expansion and pricing. Growth remains positive because the platform is embedded and subscription gross margins are strong, but the company stops compounding at premium SaaS rates.
Professional services and other	18.5%	22% reported in Q1 FY2026 product row	No separate guide	4.0%	Bear case assumes services growth slows sharply as customers delay expansion projects and partners capture more implementation work.
Hub-level products and AI agents	n/a	Not revenue-disclosed	No separate guide	n/a	AI usage fails to become separately monetizable and mostly defends retention. [DATA GAP: no disclosed paid attach dollars.]

Year-by-year deceleration check: the base subscription path is consistent with the high-teens FY2026 guide followed by gradual deceleration. A plausible path is about 17.0% in year 1, 15.5% in year 2, 13.5% in year 3, 11.5% in year 4, and 10.5% in year 5, producing roughly the same five-year CAGR as the table. The bear path compresses faster after FY2026 as NRR and ASRPC plateau. The bull path holds closer to high-teens for longer but still fades by 2031 because a $3.2B TTM subscription base cannot be underwritten as a 20% compounder indefinitely without disclosed ARR or AI monetization proof.

9. Forward operating margin assumptions - explicit and justified

The official current margin base is GAAP operating income from QF P4: TTM operating income of $62.8M on TTM revenue of $3.298B, or 1.9%. That is the starting point for official operating income. Non-GAAP guidance is used as a directional cross-check only: data package Section 6 says FY2026 non-GAAP operating income guidance implies about a 21%

non-GAAP margin. The gap between 1.9% GAAP TTM margin and about 21% non-GAAP guided margin is mainly the burden of SBC, restructuring, amortization, and other non-GAAP exclusions. For ER2 purposes, the model must not simply import non-GAAP margin into GAAP OI; it must underwrite how much of the gap can close by 2031.

Product / line	Current margin evidence	Bear TTM+5y op margin	Base TTM+5y op margin	Bull TTM+5y op margin	Mechanism
Subscription	FY2025 subscription gross margin about 85.5%; segment GAAP OI margin 1.9% at TTM	11.0%	18.0%	23.0%	Subscription gross margin allows high operating leverage, but sales, R&D, support, AI infrastructure, and SBC absorb the spread. Bear assumes growth investments and competitive pricing keep GAAP margin low; base assumes meaningful opex and SBC leverage; bull assumes HubSpot approaches mature SaaS profitability while staying below Salesforce non-GAAP margin.
Professional services and other	FY2025 service gross margin about 6.2%; small revenue mix	0.0%	4.0%	6.0%	This line includes onboarding, consulting, training, payments, and other service revenue. Because FY2025 service gross margin was only about 6.2%, the line cannot be modeled above that margin without a disclosed gross-margin reset. Bear assumes services are break-even support for adoption; base assumes modest utilization and partner leverage; bull assumes the line approaches but does not exceed the disclosed gross-margin evidence.
Whole customer platform	TTM GAAP OI $62.8M on $3.298B revenue; FY2026 non-GAAP guide about 21% margin	10.8% blended	17.8% blended	22.7% blended	Segment margin is revenue-weighted from product-class margins. The main swing factor is whether high subscription gross margin converts into GAAP OI as scale rises and SBC intensity normalizes, while services remain a low-margin support line.

The base case requires a large improvement from current GAAP margin, but not an heroic margin relative to mature software comps. By 2031, HubSpot would be over $6B of revenue in the base case. A platform at that scale with subscription gross margin in the mid-80s should be capable of high-teens GAAP operating margin if growth remains healthy and SBC moderates. The bull blended margin of 22.7% assumes stronger subscription pricing, partner leverage, and lower sales-intensity from multi-hub expansion, partly offset by low-margin services. It does not assume Salesforce-level non-GAAP margin because HubSpot is still smaller, still investing in AI and upmarket depth, and still relying on product-led plus sales-assisted expansion. The bear blended margin of 10.8% assumes the business becomes profitable but never fully converts gross margin into GAAP OI because competition and AI investment consume leverage.

10. Segment rollup - built bottoms-up, arithmetic must tie

The rollup below starts with TTM subscription revenue of $3.227B and TTM professional services and other revenue of $70.6M. It compounds each line exactly five calendar years to 2031-03-31, then applies the product-class operating margin assumptions from Section 9. Because product-family revenue and AI revenue are not separately disclosed, all hub and AI effects are embedded in subscription growth and margin.

Case	Subscription revenue 2031-03-31	Services and other revenue 2031-03-31	Segment revenue 2031-03-31	Blended operating margin	Segment operating income 2031-03-31	Tie-out
Bear	$5.081B	$0.086B	$5.167B	10.8%	$0.559B	Subscription plus services equals segment revenue; revenue-weighted OI equals $0.559B

Case	Subscription revenue 2031-03-31	Services and other revenue 2031-03-31	Segment revenue 2031-03-31	Blended operating margin	Segment operating income 2031-03-31	Tie-out
Base	$6.079B	$0.104B	$6.183B	17.8%	$1.098B	Subscription plus services equals segment revenue; revenue-weighted OI equals $1.098B
Bull	$6.926B	$0.114B	$7.040B	22.7%	$1.600B	Subscription plus services equals segment revenue; revenue-weighted OI equals $1.600B

Arithmetic checks: bear revenue equals $5.081B plus $0.086B, or $5.167B; bear OI equals $5.081B times 11.0% plus $0.086B times 0.0%, or about $0.559B. Base revenue equals $6.079B plus $0.104B, or $6.183B; base OI equals $6.079B times 18.0% plus $0.104B times 4.0%, or about $1.098B. Bull revenue equals $6.926B plus $0.114B, or $7.040B; bull OI equals $6.926B times 23.0% plus $0.114B times 6.0%, or about $1.600B. All segment totals reconcile to product-level assumptions within rounding.

The revenue cases imply approximate total segment CAGRs from TTM to 2031-03-31 of 9.4% in bear, 13.4% in base, and 16.4% in bull. The base case is deliberately below the FY2022-FY2025 total revenue CAGR of 21.8% and below the latest reported Q1 FY2026 growth, because the company is scaling into a more competitive revenue base. It is still above Salesforce and Adobe Digital Experience's latest growth benchmarks because HubSpot is smaller and has more multi-hub runway. The bear case is not a collapse; it is a normalization case where the customer platform remains good but not exceptional. The bull case requires evidence that AI, data, and upmarket expansion are not just retention tools but monetization accelerants.

11. Key risks and wildcards

The first risk is AI monetization opacity, primarily affecting the bull case. Data package Section 0a shows strong AI usage indicators, including agent activations, credit consumption, and core-seat usage, but it also says AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, and paid attach dollars are not disclosed. If AI remains bundled table stakes, the bull subscription CAGR is too high. If AI becomes a priced usage layer that improves retention and ASRPC, the bull case becomes more credible.

The second risk is upmarket complexity, affecting base and bull. HubSpot's wedge is ease of use. Moving upmarket requires enterprise controls, data governance, integrations, partner depth, and workflow complexity. Those features can increase customer value, but they can also raise R&D and implementation burden. If HubSpot loses simplicity without matching Salesforce depth, the moat weakens.

The third risk is platform-account control, affecting bear. Salesforce, Microsoft, Adobe, and Oracle can bundle CRM, data, AI, productivity, and marketing tools into broader account relationships. Where a customer has already standardized on one of those ecosystems, HubSpot's incremental value must be very clear. Bundling pressure could cap pricing and slow enterprise conversion.

The fourth risk is retention quality, affecting all cases. Data package Section 0a and Section 10 flag ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, and churn as true non-disclosures. Q1 FY2026 NRR of 103% is helpful but not enough to underwrite a high-confidence expansion engine. If retention weakens while customer additions stay strong, headline growth may look fine for a while but lifetime value and margin quality would be lower.

The fifth risk is GAAP margin conversion, affecting the ER2 earnings bridge. HubSpot can generate cash while GAAP OI remains small because SBC is large. QF P4 shows TTM SBC of $527.2M against TTM operating income of $62.8M. If dilution and SBC stay elevated, the company may not produce the GAAP operating income needed for a confident 2031 earnings case even if revenue compounds.

The sixth wildcard is pricing architecture. Analyst Day commentary suggests management sees AI expanding the budget category beyond traditional software. That could be powerful if customers pay for agents, credits, outcomes, or premium data workflows. But the data package does not disclose paid AI attach, so the model treats this as optionality. Future disclosures to watch are AI ARR, paid agent seats, credit revenue, AI attach by customer cohort, and whether ASRPC accelerates without customer growth decelerating.

Ending summary table

Case	Segment TTM+5y Revenue	Segment TTM+5y Op Margin	Segment TTM+5y Op Income	Probability
Bear	$5.167B	10.8%	$0.559B	25%
Base	$6.183B	17.8%	$1.098B	50%
Bull	$7.040B	22.7%	$1.600B	25%

Bottom line: HubSpot's Customer Platform is a high-quality single-segment SaaS business with strong subscription gross margin, high-teens current constant-currency growth, customer growth, rising ASRPC, and visible RPO support. The credible base case is not a revenue problem; it is a GAAP operating leverage problem. A $6.2B 2031 revenue base with 17.8% operating margin is achievable if multi-hub attach, pricing, AI/data usage, and opex discipline work together. The major data gaps are also the core thesis questions: no hub revenue, no AI revenue, no ARR dollars, no DBNR/GRR/churn, and no segment-reported OI. The appendix therefore gives HubSpot credit for a strong platform trajectory but refuses to model undisclosed products as separate revenue pools.

Appendix S - Synthesis (Combined Earnings Model)

HubSpot (HUBS) - Synthesis (Combined Earnings Model)

Prepared: 2026-06-28. Role: Sub-Agent S, Synthesis. Output: `C:\Users\Admin\OneDrive\GPT\ER 2.0\HubSpot\appendix_synthesis.md`.

This appendix builds the combined TTM+5y earnings model for HubSpot from the reviewed one-segment appendix, the data package, QF, management, and moat appendices. It uses the orchestrator price of $185.47, the TTM anchor ending 2026-03-31, and the horizon date of 2031-03-31. I do not re-fetch market data or substitute a new price. The appendix also preserves the ER2 distinction between valuation arithmetic and investment gates: the base case clears the P/E 15 arithmetic gate after explicit dilution, but management and moat are both YELLOW, so this S appendix does not mechanically upgrade the company to a clean compounder PASS.

1. Anchors

- Today: 2026-06-28.
- Company fiscal year convention: December 31.
- TTM anchor end date: 2026-03-31.
- TTM quarters: Q2 FY2025 plus Q3 FY2025 plus Q4 FY2025 plus Q1 FY2026.
- Latest completed FY label for historical tie-out: FY2025.
- Horizon date: 2031-03-31.
- Compounding span: exactly 5.0 calendar years from 2026-03-31 to 2031-03-31.
- Current price for P/E 15 gate: $185.47.
- TTM diluted share count: 52.578 million from QF P6, official Q1 FY2026 diluted weighted-average shares.
- TTM SBC: $527.204 million from QF P4. This is treated as real dilution, not as a harmless add-back.

QF is the quantitative anchor. QF P4 gives TTM revenue of $3.298125B, TTM operating income of $62.805M, TTM net income of $100.258M, TTM operating cash flow of $797.972M, TTM PPE capex of $55.242M, TTM capitalized software of $134.542M, FCF after PPE capex of $742.730M, FCF after PPE capex and capitalized software of $608.188M, and TTM SBC of $527.204M. QF P6 gives Q1 FY2026 diluted shares of 52.578M. The data package confirms that HubSpot has one operating segment, so the reviewed customer-platform segment appendix is coextensive with the company. No hidden second segment or corporate revenue line is added.

The segment appendix was peer-reviewed and updated before this synthesis. The required B/R final cases are the controlling forecast cases: Bear revenue $5.167B, operating margin 10.8%, and operating income $0.559B; Base revenue $6.183B, operating margin 17.8%, and operating income $1.098B; Bull revenue $7.040B, operating margin 22.7%, and operating income $1.600B. Those figures are reproduced rather than re-derived from a pre-review B draft.

2. Segment-level forward assumptions

HubSpot has one operating segment. The segment appendix decomposes that single segment into disclosed product-class lines, subscription and professional services/other, but only the whole customer platform is a reportable operating segment. Hub-level products and AI agents are real product narratives but not dollar-disclosed revenue pools. The forward model therefore embeds AI, multi-hub attach, customer additions, ASRPC, and upmarket movement inside subscription growth and margin, rather than creating unsupported new product lines.

Segment	TTM revenue ($B)	Bear TTM+5y rev	Base TTM+5y rev	Bull TTM+5y rev	Bear OI margin	Base OI margin	Bull OI margin	Source
Customer Platform / one operating segment	$3.298B	$5.167B	$6.183B	$7.040B	10.8%	17.8%	22.7%	Reviewed appendix_B_customer_platform.md Sections 8, 9, and 10

The segment cases are plausible but not risk-free. The base case requires HubSpot to compound revenue at roughly 13.4% over five years from the TTM base while lifting GAAP operating margin from 1.9% TTM to 17.8% at the horizon. That is a substantial earnings conversion. It is supported by high subscription gross margin, current high-teens constant-currency revenue growth, and management's non-GAAP margin guide, but it remains a real execution ask because SBC is still large and GAAP operating income is not yet mature.

The bear case is not a disaster case. Revenue still reaches $5.167B because the customer platform remains useful, but margin conversion stalls at 10.8%. That case captures competitive pressure, modest NRR, AI monetization opacity, and the risk that HubSpot must keep investing heavily to defend the platform. The bull case reaches $7.040B and 22.7% OI margin. It requires more sustained AI, data, core-seat, multi-hub, and upmarket monetization than the current disclosures prove.

3. Combined revenue build

There is no corporate revenue elimination. The one operating segment is the consolidated company, and the reviewed segment appendix ties product-class revenue to total segment revenue. The combined revenue build therefore equals the segment build after checking that the segment base is the QF TTM base. The TTM revenue denominator for CAGR is $3.298125B from QF P4.

Line	Bear	Base	Bull
Sum of segment TTM+5y revenue	$5.167B	$6.183B	$7.040B
Corporate eliminations	$0.000B	$0.000B	$0.000B
Combined TTM+5y revenue	$5.167B	$6.183B	$7.040B
Implied TTM to TTM+5y CAGR over 5.0 years	9.4%	13.4%	16.4%

The base revenue path is consistent with management's near-term guidance but does not simply extrapolate the latest reported 23% Q1 FY2026 growth. Data package Section 5 says constant-currency revenue growth was 18% in Q2 FY2025, Q3 FY2025, Q4 FY2025, and Q1 FY2026. Data package Section 6 says FY2026 guidance was raised to $3.700B to $3.708B revenue, up 18% reported and 17% constant currency. The base path assumes the first forward year is still high-teens, then decelerates into the low teens by the end of the five-year horizon. That is consistent with a scaling SaaS company that is still smaller than mature enterprise-suite peers but no longer small enough to underwrite perpetual 20% plus growth.

The revenue model also respects the data gaps. The data package explicitly marks ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, churn, AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, and hub-level revenue as true non-disclosures. These gaps do not make the revenue case unusable, but they cap confidence. The base case is underwritten from total revenue, customer count, ASRPC, billings, RPO, NRR snapshots, and management guidance rather than from a clean ARR bridge.

4. Combined operating income build

The segment appendix already models GAAP operating income at the whole-company level. Because HubSpot reports one operating segment and the segment appendix's operating margin is the blended customer-platform margin after sales, marketing, R&D, support, AI infrastructure, SBC, and other company-level opex burden, I do not subtract a second corporate expense line. Doing so would double-count the operating burden.

Line	Bear	Base	Bull
Sum of segment TTM+5y OI	$0.559B	$1.098B	$1.600B
Unallocated corporate expense	$0.000B	$0.000B	$0.000B
Combined TTM+5y OI	$0.559B	$1.098B	$1.600B
Implied OI margin	10.8%	17.8%	22.7%

Corporate-expense assumption: included in the one-segment blended GAAP OI margin. HubSpot does not disclose separate segment operating income, and QF/QFR warned against inventing segment OI. The correct operating-income bridge is therefore: use the reviewed segment margin as the consolidated GAAP OI margin, then avoid adding a second undisclosed headquarters line.

The base case has the largest underwriting burden in the entire synthesis. TTM GAAP operating margin is only 1.9%, while FY2026 non-GAAP operating margin guidance is about 21%. The five-year base assumes that a meaningful portion of the

non-GAAP to GAAP gap closes as revenue scales, restructuring fades, and SBC intensity declines, but it does not import the non-GAAP guide directly into GAAP profit. A 17.8% GAAP OI margin in 2031 is demanding but not absurd for a $6B plus subscription-heavy software platform with FY2025 subscription gross margin around 85.5%. It is also not proven. The management appendix caps management at YELLOW partly because compensation and buyback behavior have not yet proven per-share discipline.

5. Net income and EPS build

The EPS bridge uses GAAP-style operating income, modest net interest income, no separate other-income engine, a normalized tax rate, and the explicit diluted share count path in Section 6. The net interest assumption is deliberately modest. HubSpot is net cash, with $0.944B cash, $0.747B short-term investments, and $0.247B debt at Q1 FY2026 per data package Section 8 and QF P6, but the share path assumes continuing buybacks and continuing SBC issuance. That means net cash can help pre-tax income, but it should not be allowed to rescue the model.

Line	Bear	Base	Bull
Combined TTM+5y OI	$0.559B	$1.098B	$1.600B
Net interest income	$0.020B	$0.030B	$0.040B
Other income	$0.000B	$0.000B	$0.000B
Pre-tax income	$0.579B	$1.128B	$1.640B
Tax rate assumed	22.0%	22.0%	22.0%
Net income	$0.452B	$0.880B	$1.279B
Diluted share count at TTM+5y	63.457M	63.457M	63.457M
EPS at TTM+5y	$7.12	$13.87	$20.16

The tax rate is normalized at 22% for all cases. HubSpot may have actual tax attributes, jurisdictional mix, and stock-compensation tax effects that move reported tax rates around, but by 2031 the model should not rely on a low or negative tax rate to clear the valuation gate. A 22% rate is conservative enough for a U.S.-listed software company with international revenue and still transparent enough to audit.

Base-case EPS is $13.87. At the current price of $185.47, the base case needs EPS of $12.36 to clear a 15x forward P/E gate. The base case therefore clears by $1.51 per share, or 12.1% on the value test. That cushion is real but not huge. A modest margin miss, a heavier share-count path, or tax normalization above 22% could consume it. The bull case is not needed for the P/E gate. The bear case fails decisively.

6. Share count path

The share-count path starts from official Q1 FY2026 diluted weighted-average shares of 52.578M. It treats TTM SBC of $527.204M as real issuance. The annual gross SBC issuance is approximated as TTM SBC divided by the current price, or 2.843M shares per year. This is intentionally punitive because current share price is far below the 2025 buyback average; using a higher grant-price assumption would produce fewer SBC shares, but the ER2 discipline should not hide dilution by assuming a favorable equity-compensation price.

Buybacks are modeled conservatively because the management gate is YELLOW for buyback discipline. Data package Section 7 shows zero buybacks from 2021 through 2024, $500M in FY2025, and $211M in Q1 FY2026, but the management appendix notes the 2025 buyback occurred at an average of $501.67 and has not yet proven price sensitivity. The model therefore uses only $150M per year of forward repurchases at an average price of $225, retiring 0.667M shares per year. This is not a no-buyback assumption, because HubSpot has an authorization and recent activity, but it refuses to assume buybacks fully offset SBC.

Year	Starting share count (M)	Buyback $ ($B)	Avg price assumed	Shares retired (M)	SBC issuance (M)	Ending share count (M)
Year 1	52.578	$0.150B	$225	0.667	2.843	54.754
Year 2	54.754	$0.150B	$225	0.667	2.843	56.929
Year 3	56.929	$0.150B	$225	0.667	2.843	59.105
Year 4	59.105	$0.150B	$225	0.667	2.843	61.281
Year 5	61.281	$0.150B	$225	0.667	2.843	63.457

The result is meaningful dilution: ending diluted shares rise from 52.578M to 63.457M. The path is harsh, but it reflects the ER2 requirement to treat SBC as real issuance. If HubSpot actually reduces SBC/revenue below the management appendix upgrade condition and deploys buybacks at attractive prices, realized share count could be lower. That upside belongs in a future re-underwriting, not in the base case today.

The difference between cash generation and per-share economics matters. QF shows TTM FCF after PPE capex of $742.730M and FCF after both PPE capex and capitalized software of $608.188M. Those are strong cash numbers. But TTM SBC is $527.204M. A model that adds SBC back to cash flow while assuming no dilution would overstate owner earnings. This synthesis uses GAAP OI and an explicit share path to keep that issue visible.

7. P/E 15 test

The P/E 15 gate is applied to base-case EPS, not bull-case EPS. The required EPS at the current price is $185.47 divided by 15, or $12.36. Base-case EPS is $13.87, so the valuation gate passes with a 12.1% cushion. Because the cushion is not wide, this is a PASS on math but not a high-margin-of-safety result.

Case	EPS at TTM+5y	EPS x 15	Current price	Cushion %	Pass?
Bear	$7.12	$106.75	$185.47	-42.4%	FAIL
Base	$13.87	$207.98	$185.47	12.1%	PASS
Bull	$20.16	$302.38	$185.47	63.0%	PASS

The conclusion is direct: the base case clears the P/E 15 gate, but the cushion is thin enough that the result should be monitored through margin conversion, SBC discipline, and revenue deceleration. The result would fail if base EPS fell below $12.36. That could happen through several routes: the base OI margin lands closer to 15.8% than 17.8%, share count rises beyond 66M, tax rate moves to 25% and margin misses simultaneously, or revenue CAGR decelerates more quickly than the reviewed B/R base.

8. Reflexivity check

The TTM reconstruction ties because the one operating segment is the company. QF P4 gives TTM revenue of $3.298125B and TTM OI of $62.805M. The reviewed segment appendix uses TTM revenue of $3.298B and TTM GAAP OI margin of 1.9%, citing QF P4. The difference between $3.298B and $3.298125B is rounding. Segment revenue therefore ties to consolidated TTM revenue within well under 2%.

The latest completed FY tie-out also passes. Data package Section 2 gives FY2025 revenue of $3.131B and operating income of $0.007B, with FY2025 controlled by QF/QFR SEC values because FMP had small differences. Data package Section 3 gives the one operating segment FY2025 revenue of $3.131B and company-level GAAP operating income of $0.007B. QF P2 gives FY2025 official total revenue of $3.131266B from subscription revenue of $3.063917B plus professional services and other revenue of $0.067349B. The historical reconstruction is therefore not being forced by the synthesis.

This check is important for HubSpot because the company does not disclose segment OI. If S had tried to add marketing, sales, service, AI, and operations as separate undisclosed economic segments, the TTM and FY2025 reflexivity checks would have become fragile. The reviewed one-segment approach avoids that failure mode.

9. Recency anchor and guidance sanity

The base model's first forward-year run-rate is checked against the most recent annualized quarter and management guidance. Q1 FY2026 revenue was $880.995M, so the latest-quarter annualized run-rate is about $3.524B. A reasonable first-forward-year base bridge from the segment appendix is subscription growth near 17.0% and services growth near 8.0%, implying about $3.852B of revenue for the first forward TTM year. That is 9.3% above the Q1 annualized run-rate and inside the 10% recency tolerance.

The first-forward-year number also makes sense against management's FY2026 calendar-year guidance of $3.700B to $3.708B. The synthesis first-forward-year TTM window runs beyond calendar FY2026 because the anchor is 2026-03-31 and the forward year runs to 2027-03-31. It should therefore sit modestly above the FY2026 guide if the company keeps compounding at high-teens growth in the next few quarters. The implied $3.852B first-forward-year revenue is about 4% above the FY2026 guide midpoint, which is not a hidden reacceleration.

The guidance check also protects against over-reading Q1's reported 23% growth. The data package states that constant-currency growth was 18% in each of the most recent four quarters. The base case uses high-teens near-term growth followed by deceleration. It does not assume Q1's reported FX-assisted 23% persists.

10. Sensitivity - what matters most

The main sensitivity is not net interest income. The main variables are operating margin, revenue CAGR, and share count. Tax rate matters, but a 300 bps tax move is smaller than a 200 bps OI-margin miss. Revenue CAGR matters because the base revenue case still has to compound from $3.298B to more than $6.1B in five years. Share count matters because the explicit SBC path moves diluted shares from 52.578M to 63.457M despite assumed buybacks.

Sensitivity	Low case EPS	Base EPS	High case EPS	EPS impact vs. base	P/E 15 result at low case
Revenue CAGR plus or minus 200 bps, margin held at 17.8%	$12.75	$13.87	$15.14	-$1.12 / +$1.27	PASS by 3.1%
Customer-platform OI margin plus or minus 200 bps, revenue held at $6.183B	$12.38	$13.87	$15.42	-$1.49 / +$1.55	PASS by 0.1%
Diluted share count plus or minus 5%, NI held constant	$14.59	$13.87	$13.20	+$0.72 / -$0.67	PASS by 6.8%
Tax rate plus or minus 300 bps, pre-tax income held constant	$14.40	$13.87	$13.33	+$0.53 / -$0.54	PASS by 7.8%

The most important single variable is operating margin. A 200 bps OI-margin miss nearly erases the P/E 15 cushion, leaving EPS around $12.38 versus a required $12.36. That means the base gate is analytically fragile even though it technically passes. Revenue is second. A 200 bps lower revenue CAGR still passes, but with a narrower cushion. Share count is third in the one-variable table, but it can become decisive if paired with a margin miss. A 5% higher share count alone still passes; a 5% higher share count plus a 200 bps OI-margin miss would fail.

The variable to monitor in practice is not one spreadsheet cell; it is the linkage between pricing, AI monetization, SBC, and GAAP margin. If AI usage grows but does not show up in ASRPC, NRR, calculated billings, or disclosed AI revenue, HubSpot may need to keep spending to defend the platform without earning the margin step-up. That is the scenario that turns today's math PASS into a false positive.

11. Combined earnings summary table

Probability weights are 25% bear, 50% base, and 25% bull. The weights match the reviewed segment appendix and are appropriate because the company has real growth and platform evidence but management and moat remain YELLOW. A heavier bull weight would over-credit undisclosed AI monetization and per-share discipline; a heavier bear weight would ignore the high-teens current revenue trend, strong subscription mix, RPO, and net-cash balance sheet.

Case	Revenue ($B)	OI ($B)	OI margin (%)	NI ($B)	EPS ($)	Probability	EPS x 15	vs. $185.47
Bear	$5.167B	$0.559B	10.8%	$0.452B	$7.12	25%	$106.75	-42.4%
Base	$6.183B	$1.098B	17.8%	$0.880B	$13.87	50%	$207.98	12.1%
Bull	$7.040B	$1.600B	22.7%	$1.279B	$20.16	25%	$302.38	63.0%
Probability-weighted EPS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	$13.75	100%	$206.30	11.2%

The probability-weighted EPS arithmetic is: 25% times $7.12 plus 50% times $13.87 plus 25% times $20.16 equals $13.75. That is close to the base result because the weights are symmetric. The probability-weighted EPS x 15 value of $206.30 is 11.2% above the current price. Probability weighting is not the gate, but it is a useful sanity check: the base is not a one-point cliff where all value comes from the bull case.

The base headline is therefore: TTM+5y revenue $6.183B, operating income $1.098B, net income $0.880B, EPS $13.87, required EPS $12.36, and valuation cushion 12.1%. The synthesis result is P/E 15 gate PASS, with YELLOW qualitative gates left intact.

Model-risk read-through

The synthesis is intentionally stricter on shares than a conventional SaaS sell-side model would be. Many models would use non-GAAP operating income, add back SBC, assume buybacks offset issuance, and then present a cleaner EPS bridge. That would be the wrong ER2 treatment for HubSpot today. The management appendix makes SBC and buyback discipline the central unresolved management issue. QF shows TTM SBC of $527.204M against TTM revenue of $3.298B and TTM GAAP operating income of only $62.805M. That means SBC is not a small rounding item. It is one of the main reasons free cash flow looks stronger than GAAP earnings. Treating it as real issuance is the only way to keep per-share economics honest.

The chosen share path is also deliberately asymmetric. It gives HubSpot credit for continuing repurchases, because the company bought back $500M in FY2025 and $211M in Q1 FY2026, but it does not let those repurchases neutralize the entire SBC burden. The annual $150M buyback assumption is below the recent authorization pace, while the $225 assumed repurchase price is above the current price but far below the 2025 average repurchase price. This middle ground prevents the model from saying "no buybacks ever" while still respecting the YELLOW management gate. If management proves price discipline at depressed valuations, the upside will show up through lower share count. If management merely uses buybacks to absorb issuance at poor prices, the base EPS bridge is already closer to reality than a flat-share model would be.

The OI bridge is the other risk concentration. The base case requires HubSpot to move from 1.9% TTM GAAP operating margin to 17.8% by 2031. That step is feasible only if three things happen together. First, subscription gross margin remains high and AI inference or support costs do not structurally compress the gross-profit pool. Second, sales and marketing productivity improves as customers attach more hubs, seats, data products, and AI features without requiring proportionally more go-to-market cost. Third, SBC and restructuring fade as a percentage of revenue rather than being replaced by new adjustment categories. Missing any one of those three does not automatically break the company, but it can break the P/E 15 gate because the margin cushion is thin.

Revenue risk is subtler. The base case is not aggressive relative to HubSpot's historical growth, but it is aggressive relative to what the company will need to prove at a larger scale. The current evidence is supportive: high-teens constant-currency growth, rising customers, rising ASRPC, $1.7B of RPO, and FY2026 guidance around 17% constant-currency growth. The evidence is incomplete where it matters most for long-duration durability: no ending ARR dollars, no net-new-ARR dollars, no DBNR, no GRR, no churn, no hub-level revenue, and no AI monetization dollars. That means the base revenue case is underwritten from aggregate trend evidence, not from a clean cohort or ARR build. It is acceptable for S, but it should not be mistaken for a high-confidence ARR waterfall.

The practical read-through is that HubSpot is a valuation-gate PASS only if the investor is willing to underwrite operating leverage before the GAAP proof is fully visible. At $185.47, the price gives some room for that underwriting, but not enough room to ignore the next two years of evidence. The most important confirming signals are not quarterly revenue beats alone. They are stable or rising NRR, ASRPC acceleration without customer-quality deterioration, calculated billings and RPO that support high-teens growth, SBC/revenue moving toward the management appendix upgrade condition, and diluted share count stabilizing. The most important negative signal would be continued AI usage growth with no monetization, no retention lift, and no margin improvement.

Tie-out checks

All 11 required checks are completed below. None failed. Several passed with explicit caveats because HubSpot has one operating segment and because product-family and AI revenue are not disclosed. Those caveats are not arithmetic failures; they are model-risk flags that should stay visible in the main narrative.

Check #	Check	Result	Evidence
1	Reported-financial tie-out for TTM and FY2025	PASS	TTM revenue $3.298125B and OI $62.805M from QF P4 tie to the one-segment base within rounding; FY2025 one-segment revenue $3.131B and OI $0.007B tie to data package Sections 2 and 3 and QF SEC-controlled values within 2%.
2	NI divided by shares equals EPS	PASS	Bear $0.452B divided by 63.457M equals $7.12; Base $0.880B divided by 63.457M equals $13.87; Bull $1.279B divided by 63.457M equals $20.16, all within rounding.
3	Segment sum tie-out at horizon	PASS	There is one operating segment; segment revenue equals combined revenue in all cases, with zero corporate eliminations.

Check #	Check	Result	Evidence
4	Product-to-segment rollup	PASS	Reviewed B Section 10 ties subscription plus services to segment revenue: Bear $5.081B plus $0.086B equals $5.167B; Base $6.079B plus $0.104B equals $6.183B; Bull $6.926B plus $0.114B equals $7.040B.
5	Weighted margin check	PASS	Reviewed B Section 10 ties product-class margins to blended OI: Bear about $0.559B, Base about $1.098B, and Bull about $1.600B. Hub and AI product margins are not separately invented.
6	Share count path	PASS	Starting 52.578M plus five years of 2.843M annual SBC issuance less 0.667M annual repurchase retirement equals 63.457M ending diluted shares.
7	Growth plausibility	PASS	Base revenue CAGR of 13.4% is below FY2022-FY2025 total revenue CAGR of 21.8% and below 1.2 times the historical rate; the segment appendix explicitly justifies deceleration from high-teens current growth.
8	Historical arithmetic	PASS	Reviewed B Section 10 compounds TTM product-class revenue for exactly five years and its rollup matches the case totals within rounding; this synthesis reproduces the reviewed final case totals.
9	Recency anchor and guidance sanity	PASS	Base first-forward-year revenue of about $3.852B is 9.3% above Q1 FY2026 annualized revenue of $3.524B and about 4% above FY2026 guidance midpoint, appropriate for a TTM year extending to 2027-03-31.
10	Sensitivity arithmetic table ties to base model	PASS	Section 10 sensitivities recompute EPS from the same base revenue, margin, tax, interest, and 63.457M share-count bridge; the operating-margin sensitivity nearly exhausts the P/E cushion.
11	P/E 15 gate integrity and probability-weighted EPS	PASS	Required EPS is $185.47 divided by 15, or $12.36; base EPS is $13.87 and clears by 12.1%; probability-weighted EPS is $13.75 from 25% Bear, 50% Base, and 25% Bull.

Tie-out result: 11/11 checks passed.

Synthesis conclusion

HubSpot's combined earnings model clears the valuation gate, but not by enough to ignore qualitative uncertainty. The base case reaches $6.183B of revenue and $1.098B of GAAP operating income by 2031-03-31. After modest net interest income, a normalized 22% tax rate, and an explicit diluted share count of 63.457M, base EPS is $13.87. At $185.47, 15 times base EPS is $207.98, giving a 12.1% cushion.

The key reason the gate passes is not financial engineering. The share count path is punitive, and buybacks are deliberately conservative. The gate passes because the reviewed segment model assumes HubSpot can combine durable low-to-mid teens revenue compounding with real GAAP operating leverage. If those two assumptions hold together, the current price is below 15 times TTM+5y base EPS. If operating leverage disappoints, the cushion disappears quickly.

Management and moat remain YELLOW. The management appendix flags SBC, compensation alignment, and unproven buyback discipline. The moat appendix flags AI disruption, modest NRR, undisclosed churn/GRR/DBNR, and the uncertainty of a 2046 customer-agent platform. S does not override those gates. The correct synthesis is: valuation math is supportive at the current price, but the investment case still depends on seeing GAAP margin conversion, falling SBC intensity, stable or falling diluted shares, and proof that AI/core-seat/credit usage becomes monetized retention and ASRPC rather than merely defensive product cost.

Appendix CS - Compounder Score

HubSpot - Compounder Score

Prepared: 2026-06-28. Ticker: HUBS. Exchange: NYSE. Currency: USD. Current price: $185.47. TTM anchor: 2026-03-31. Horizon date: 2031-03-31.

1. Executive Verdict

HubSpot is a good software business, but it is not a 20% return compounder at the supplied price under this diagnostic rubric. The evidence supports a real platform with high subscription mix, strong gross margins, high-teens current constant-currency growth, a large customer base, and a net-cash balance sheet. The evidence does not support an "investable now" classification because the shareholder-return math fails when SBC is treated as a real cost and the exit multiple is not allowed to expand.

The Compounder Score is 61/100. The Business Quality Score is 59/80 and the 20% Return Underwriting Score is 2/20. The score-implied classification is Reject under the CompounderScorer 20% hurdle. That diagnostic label does not override the ER2 synthesis P/E gate, which passed on base-case 2031 EPS. It says something narrower: if the investor demands a 20% annualized return without terminal multiple expansion, HUBS does not clear.

The base case in the synthesis reaches 2031 revenue of $6.183B, operating income of $1.098B, net income of $0.880B, and EPS of $13.87 after the share count rises from 52.578M to 63.457M. At 15x base EPS, the 2031 endpoint is about $208.05 per share. From $185.47, that is only about a 2.3% annualized five-year return before any dividends, and HubSpot pays no dividend. A 20% annualized return from today's price would require an endpoint of about $461.51. On the base case, that implies a 33.3x exit P/E. That is terminal multiple expansion versus the 15x ER2 valuation framework, not owner-return underwriting.

The business-quality score is also capped. HubSpot has excellent subscription economics and a credible runway, but current GAAP operating income is still immature. QF gives TTM revenue of $3.298B, TTM operating income of only $62.8M, TTM net income of $100.3M, FCF after PPE capex and capitalized software of $608.2M, and SBC of $527.2M. Cash generation is real, but a very large portion of the cash-flow bridge comes from equity compensation. Treating that SBC as harmless would overstate owner earnings. The management appendix correctly kept the management gate at YELLOW because SBC and buyback discipline remain unproven, and the moat appendix kept the moat and 2046 test at YELLOW because AI and bundle pressure can attack lightweight workflows.

2. Data Source Map

Evidence family	Source used	Confidence	Notes
Price	User-supplied live finance quote, latest trade 2026-06-26 23:15 UTC	High	$185.47 used throughout; no new quote substituted.
Shares	`quant_foundation.md` P6	High	Q1 FY2026 diluted weighted average shares of 52.578M.
Market cap / EV	CS calculation from price, shares, cash, short-term investments, and debt in QF P6	Medium	Market cap about $9.752B; EV about $8.308B.
Income statement / cash flow	`quant_foundation.md` and `data_package.md`	High	QF uses SEC-controlled values where FMP differed.
Segment model	`appendix_B_customer_platform.md`	High	HubSpot has one operating segment; hub and AI revenue are not invented.
Management	`appendix_management.md`	Medium-high	Management gate YELLOW due SBC, incentives, and buyback discipline.
Moat	`appendix_moat.md`	Medium	Moat and 2046 test YELLOW due AI, bundle pressure, and modest NRR.
Synthesis / valuation gate	`appendix_synthesis.md`	High	Base EPS $13.87, bear EPS $7.12, bull EPS $20.16, share count 63.457M.
Raw CS scratch	`raw/CS_compounder_calculations_20260628.md`	Medium	Contains CS-only calculation checks; no warehouse cache used.

No local data warehouse cache was used. I did not make additional FMP pulls because the required ER2 input files already contain live FMP, SEC, and HubSpot IR pulls and the CS task did not require a new source to fill a scoring gap. The live-source rule is satisfied through the verified source chain in QF, D, B, M, W, and S.

3. Key Financial and Quality Metrics

Metric	Value	Source / formula	CS interpretation
TTM revenue	$3.298B	QF P4	Scaled SaaS platform, not a small-cap option.
TTM operating income	$62.8M	QF P4	GAAP operating margin only about 1.9%; earnings power still prospective.
TTM NOPAT	$49.0M	$62.8M OI x 78% tax-adjusted	Current EV/NOPAT is not useful as a cheapness signal; NOPAT is immature.
TTM FCF after cap software	$608.2M	QF P4	Cash generation is real, but must be checked against SBC.
TTM SBC	$527.2M	QF P4	16.0% of revenue and 86.7% of FCF after capitalized software.
Market cap	$9.752B	$185.47 x 52.578M	Price is based on the supplied live quote and QF shares.
Enterprise value	$8.308B	Market cap + debt - cash - short-term investments	Net cash lowers EV, but does not fix the 20% return problem.
EV / TTM NOPAT	169.6x	$8.308B / $49.0M	Current GAAP NOPAT is too low for a value signal.
EV / FCF after cap software	13.7x	$8.308B / $608.2M	FCF multiple looks reasonable before dilution, but SBC consumes most FCF.
FCF yield after cap software	6.2%	$608.2M / $9.752B	Helpful, but not equal to owner yield because SBC is large.
FY2021-FY2025 revenue CAGR	24.6%	$1.301B to $3.131B	Strong historical scale proof.
Share count CAGR	3.2%	46.9M to 53.2M FY2021-FY2025	Dilution is not trivial.
Base 2031 EPS	$13.87	Synthesis	Clears P/E 15 gate, but not 20% IRR.
Base 2031 endpoint at 15x	$208.05	$13.87 x 15	Only about 2.3% annualized from $185.47.

The financial profile is a classic software quality puzzle. Revenue, gross margin, customer count, RPO, and balance sheet all look attractive. GAAP operating income, SBC, share count, and monetized AI evidence are the limiting factors. The CS rubric does not allow the attractive factors to offset the return-underwriting failure.

4. Rubric Scorecard

Category	Score	Max	Rationale
Incremental returns on capital	17	25	Unit economics and FCF scaling are strong, but GAAP NOPAT and measured ROIC remain immature and ROIIC cannot be calculated with high confidence from negative or tiny historical NOPAT.
Reinvestment runway	18	20	Large customer-platform runway, high-teens current constant-currency growth, customer growth, ASRPC growth, RPO, multi-hub attach, and AI usage support runway.
Durability of moat	11	15	Real switching costs and suite breadth, but moat gate and 2046 test are YELLOW due Salesforce/Microsoft/Adobe/AI-native pressure and modest NRR.
Accounting and financial quality	7	10	Revenue and balance sheet are clean, but SBC and capitalized software make FCF less comparable to owner earnings.

Category	Score	Max	Rationale
Capital allocation discipline	6	10	Reinvestment is rational and M&A is mostly bolt-on, but buyback price discipline, dilution control, and compensation alignment are not yet proven.
Price and 20% underwriting	2	20	The 20% case fails without a much higher terminal multiple; bear is unacceptable and base IRR is far below the hurdle.
Total	61	100	Reject under the CS 20% compounder rubric.

The biggest positive score is runway. The biggest negative score is valuation. This is the right shape for HUBS: the company can plausibly keep compounding revenue and improve margins, but today's price does not create a 20% annualized underwriting setup if the exit multiple is disciplined.

5. ROIIC and Reinvestment Analysis

Reported ROIC is not yet the correct headline for HubSpot. The data package shows FY2021-FY2025 reported ROIC of -3.6%, -5.5%, -9.2%, -2.4%, and 0.3%. Those figures reflect GAAP operating losses during a heavy reinvestment phase and a net-cash balance sheet that can distort invested-capital denominators. They also reflect real expenses: R&D, sales and marketing, SBC, restructuring, and customer-platform expansion. The CS score does not pretend this is already a high-reported-ROIC compounder.

The better business-quality evidence is unit economics plus forward operating leverage. Subscription is about 97.8% of FY2025 revenue, and FY2025 subscription gross margin was about 85.5%. Customers rose from 135,442 in FY2021 to 288,706 in FY2025 and 299,458 in Q1 FY2026. ASRPC rose from $10,875 in FY2021 to $11,683 in FY2025 and $11,722 in Q1 FY2026. TTM constant-currency revenue growth held at 18% across the last four reported quarters. That combination supports real reinvestment productivity.

However, ROIIC cannot be calculated cleanly enough to award a top score. The standard formula needs a stable NOPAT base and cumulative reinvestment. HubSpot's historical GAAP NOPAT moved from negative to barely positive, while reinvestment includes large expensed growth opex, capitalized software, modest M&A, and SBC-driven employee investment. If one uses FCF instead of NOPAT, the business looks much better. If one treats SBC as a real cost, the owner-return picture is much less generous. Because the CS rule requires treating SBC as a real cost and separating accounting artifacts from true returns, the ROIIC score is capped.

The acquisition-inclusive view is also not fully provable. The data package shows M&A of $20M in FY2021, $142M in FY2023, $40M in FY2024, and $87.6M in FY2025. The management appendix discusses Clearbit and smaller AI/data/workflow deals such as Frame AI, Dashworks, and XFunnel. The pattern is not serial roll-up behavior, and the spending is modest relative to revenue, but the company has not disclosed enough acquisition-specific revenue, retention, or margin output to prove high acquisition-inclusive ROIIC.

The conclusion is balanced: HubSpot has the kind of low-capex, high-gross-margin, software reinvestment model that can produce very high incremental returns as it matures. The evidence does not yet prove that those incremental returns are flowing through to GAAP NOPAT and diluted EPS after SBC. Therefore Category 1 earns 17/25, not a compounder-grade 22-25/25.

6. Runway Analysis

Runway is the strongest part of the score. HubSpot is not only a marketing automation vendor anymore. The B appendix frames it as a single customer-platform segment with marketing, sales, service, content, operations/data, commerce/revenue workflows, Smart CRM, and Breeze AI embedded in a broad subscription platform. That positioning is credible because product breadth, customer count, partner channel, and RPO are all visible in the verified source chain.

The recent growth base is strong. Q2 FY2025, Q3 FY2025, Q4 FY2025, and Q1 FY2026 each showed 18% constant-currency revenue growth. Customers rose sequentially to 299,458, ASRPC rose to $11,722, and RPO reached $1.7B. The FY2026 guide in the data package was raised to $3.700B-$3.708B of revenue, up 18% reported and 17% constant currency, with non-GAAP operating income around a 21% margin. That supports a multiyear growth runway, not a melting product line.

The B appendix's base case takes that evidence and still decelerates revenue growth. It moves from a TTM revenue base of $3.298B to 2031 revenue of $6.183B, a 13.4% CAGR. That is below FY2021-FY2025 historical growth and below recent reported growth. It is aggressive enough to reflect HubSpot's smaller scale versus Salesforce and Adobe, but not so aggressive that it assumes high-teens growth forever.

The runway score is not perfect because several of the most important SaaS expansion metrics are not disclosed. The data package says ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, churn, cRPO, AI revenue, AI ARR, and hub-level revenue are true non-disclosures in the pulled sources. Q1 FY2026 NRR of 103% is positive but not elite. AI usage signals are real, including core-seat usage, credits consumed, and agent activation, but the company has not disclosed paid AI attach or AI ARR. That means the runway is credible, not fully underwritten from cohort-level data.

Runway earns 18/20. The score gives HubSpot real credit for a large market opportunity, proven organic growth, multi-hub expansion, and AI/platform optionality. It withholds the final points because the best expansion metrics are partial, and because AI could become either a monetization layer or a defensive cost.

7. Moat Analysis

The moat is real but not yet elite. HubSpot's advantage comes from workflow embedding, suite breadth, customer data context, brand-led distribution, partner ecosystem, and the increasing pain of moving a multi-hub deployment. A customer using CRM records, marketing workflows, sales pipeline, service tickets, content assets, operations/data automation, reporting, and AI agents inside one platform faces a much higher migration burden than a customer using a lightweight point tool.

The evidence supports moderate pricing power. Customers and ASRPC both rose over time. Subscription revenue remained the overwhelming majority of revenue, and subscription gross margin stayed high. RPO and deferred revenue support near-term visibility. The partner ecosystem also matters: implementation partners, templates, integrations, and marketplace depth increase the practical cost of switching for more complex accounts.

The weak spots are important. The moat appendix gave both the moat gate and the 2046 test a YELLOW. NRR around 103% is retention-positive but not best-in-class evidence of unavoidable expansion. HubSpot does not disclose GRR, churn, DBNR, or ARR dollars. Salesforce, Microsoft, Adobe, Oracle, and AI-native point tools all attack parts of the same customer-workflow surface. AI can strengthen HubSpot if the customer record becomes the trusted execution layer for agents, but it can also commoditize lightweight content, prospecting, support, and CRM-update workflows.

The moat score is 11/15. HubSpot receives credit for a defensible platform position and real customer embedding, but it does not receive a PASS-like moat score because disruption risk is not low and because the best durability proof would be stronger NRR, cleaner AI monetization, and more granular retention disclosure.

8. Accounting and Capital Allocation Analysis

Accounting quality is acceptable but not simple. Revenue, product classification, one-segment reporting, balance sheet, and SEC tie-outs are well controlled in QF and the data package. The QF reconciliation passed 8/8 checks and used official SEC values where FMP had small differences. The company is net cash even before short-term investments. There are no obvious restatement, related-party, or solvency red flags in the reviewed appendices.

The hard accounting issue is SBC. TTM SBC of $527.2M is 16.0% of revenue and 86.7% of FCF after PPE capex and capitalized software. That is too large to ignore. It also means non-GAAP operating margin and FCF yield can make the business look more mature than the diluted-share economics justify. The synthesis handled this correctly by modeling annual gross SBC issuance of 2.843M shares and only partial buyback offset, causing diluted shares to rise to 63.457M by 2031.

Capital allocation is similarly mixed. The company has the correct reinvestment priorities for a software platform: product, R&D, sales and marketing, AI/data capabilities, partner ecosystem, and modest bolt-on M&A. The acquisitions do not look like reckless empire building from the evidence reviewed. The balance sheet gives management flexibility.

Buybacks are not yet a positive capital-allocation proof point. The management appendix notes that HubSpot completed a $500M buyback in 2025 at an average price of $501.67 and authorized a new $1B program in 2026, with $211M repurchased in Q1 FY2026. That may help offset dilution, but the evidence does not yet prove price-sensitive repurchases or per-share value creation. Compensation metrics also lean heavily on ARR, non-GAAP operating income, and one-year revenue growth rather than multiyear FCF per share, GAAP EPS, ROIC, or dilution.

Accounting and financial quality earns 7/10. Capital allocation earns 6/10. Those are not failure scores, but they cap the total because the compounder rubric cares about owner earnings and per-share outcomes, not only revenue growth.

9. 20% Return Underwriting

This is where the score fails. The synthesis base case already does meaningful work for HubSpot: revenue grows to $6.183B, GAAP operating margin reaches 17.8%, net income reaches $0.880B, and EPS reaches $13.87 despite dilution. The ER2 P/E 15 gate passes because $13.87 times 15 is $208.05, which is above the current price of $185.47.

That is not a 20% return setup. A 20% annualized five-year return requires today's $185.47 to become about $461.51. On base EPS of $13.87, that requires a 33.3x exit P/E. On the 15x endpoint, the base case earns only about 2.3% annualized. The bear case endpoint at 15x EPS is $106.80, a -10.5% annualized return. The bull case endpoint at 15x EPS is $302.40, about a 10.3% annualized return. Even the bull case does not reach 20% under a 15x exit multiple.

Case	2031 EPS	Exit P/E	Endpoint	Five-year IRR
Bear	$7.12	15.0x	$106.80	-10.5%
Base	$13.87	15.0x	$208.05	2.3%
Bull	$20.16	15.0x	$302.40	10.3%
Base 20% hurdle	$13.87	33.3x	$461.51	20.0%

The max buy price for a 20% annualized return on the base 15x endpoint is about $83.61. That is not a formal target price; it is the diagnostic price required to meet this specific 20% hurdle using the synthesis base EPS and a 15x exit multiple. At $185.47, the stock may still be attractive under the ER2 P/E 15 framework, but it is not attractive under the stricter CompounderScorer return target.

The valuation score is 2/20. The two points come from the net-cash balance sheet and the fact that the current FCF yield after capitalized software is not absurd before SBC dilution. The score does not award base-case IRR points, exit-multiple conservatism points, bear-case points, or reverse-DCF comfort points.

10. Hard Veto Checklist

Hard veto	Status	Evidence
ROIIC below cost of capital with no credible path	Watch	Current GAAP ROIC is weak, but subscription unit economics and forward margin leverage provide a credible path.
ROIC high only because invested capital is tiny	Watch	Current invested-capital metrics are distorted by net cash and immature NOPAT, so CS avoids over-crediting ROIC.
Growth requires persistent external financing	Pass	HubSpot is net cash and produces FCF before SBC; solvency is not the issue.
Share count rises materially without clear per-share value creation	Watch / Fail	Synthesis shares rise from 52.578M to 63.457M after SBC and partial buybacks.
Large acquisitions without return disclosure	Watch	M&A is modest, but acquisition-specific returns are not fully disclosed.
FCF consistently lags earnings structurally	Pass	FCF exceeds GAAP earnings, but this is not a free pass because SBC is material.
Concentration, regulation, platform dependency, cyclicality, leverage impairment	Watch	Main impairment risk is competitive and AI/platform disruption, not leverage.
20% return case requires terminal multiple expansion	Fail	Base case needs about 33.3x 2031 EPS to hit 20% annualized from $185.47.
Company needs flawless execution to justify today's price	Watch / Fail	Revenue durability, GAAP margin expansion, SBC reduction, and AI monetization all need to work together.
Cannot explain moat in one paragraph	Pass	Moat is workflow embedding plus suite breadth, data context, partner ecosystem, and brand distribution.
Accounting, governance, auditor, related-party, or restatement issues impair trust	Pass	No such red flag identified in reviewed appendices.
Balance sheet risk could wipe out equity	Pass	Net cash balance sheet.

The decisive veto is the 20% return case. It requires terminal multiple expansion, so the score cannot classify the stock as investable now under the compounder rubric.

11. Final Decision

Score-implied classification: Reject.

This is a rejection under the diagnostic 20% compounder rubric, not a statement that HubSpot is a bad business. The company has an attractive platform, a large runway, strong subscription gross margins, and credible operating leverage. The CS score rejects the current setup because the owner-return math is not remotely close to 20% annualized at a 15x exit multiple, and because the qualitative evidence is not clean enough to justify overriding that math with heroic assumptions.

The main upside evidence is clear: high-teens constant-currency growth, nearly all revenue from subscriptions, customers near 300,000, rising ASRPC, RPO of $1.7B, net cash, and a base synthesis case that clears the ER2 P/E 15 gate. The main negative evidence is equally clear: low current GAAP operating income, very high SBC, material modeled dilution, modest NRR, undisclosed churn/ARR/AI revenue, YELLOW management, YELLOW moat, and a 20% return case that requires about a 33.3x base-case exit P/E.

Stage 7 scorecard notes:

- Compounder Score note: 61/100. HubSpot is a real software platform compounder candidate, but the diagnostic score rejects it at the current price because the 20% case requires a much higher terminal multiple than the ER2 base case uses.
- Business Quality Score note: 59/80. Runway, subscription gross margin, balance sheet, and platform breadth are attractive, but the score is capped by low current GAAP ROIC, immature ROIIC proof, modest NRR, YELLOW moat durability, high SBC, and unproven buyback discipline.
- 20% Return UW Score note: 2/20. Base 2031 EPS of $13.87 at 15x implies only about 2.3% annualized from $185.47; a 20% return would require roughly a 33.3x base-case exit P/E, so the hurdle does not clear without multiple expansion.

12. Machine-Readable JSON


```
{
  "company": "HubSpot",
  "ticker": "HUBS",
  "exchange": "NYSE",
  "analysis_date": "2026-06-28",
  "currency": "USD",
  "current_price": 185.47,
  "market_cap": 9751641660,
  "enterprise_value": 8307880660,
  "business_quality_score": 59,
  "business_quality_score_max": 80,
  "valuation_underwriting_score": 2,
  "valuation_underwriting_score_max": 20,
  "total_score": 61,
  "total_score_max": 100,
  "classification": "Reject",
  "clears_20pct_hurdle": false,
  "base_case_irr": 0.023,
  "bear_case_irr": -0.105,
  "bull_case_irr": 0.103,
  "max_buy_price_for_20pct_irr": 83.61,
  "scorecard_notes": {
    "compounder_score": "61/100: HubSpot is a real software platform compounder candidate, but the diagnostic score rej
    "business_quality_score": "59/80: runway, subscription gross margin, balance sheet, and platform breadth are attrac
    "twenty_percent_return_underwriting_score": "2/20: base 2031 EPS of $13.87 at 15x implies only about 2.3% annualize
  },
  "category_scores": {
    "incremental_returns_on_capital": {"score": 17, "max": 25},
    "reinvestment_runway": {"score": 18, "max": 20},
    "durability_of_moat": {"score": 11, "max": 15},
    "accounting_and_financial_quality": {"score": 7, "max": 10},
    "capital_allocation": {"score": 6, "max": 10},
    "price_and_20pct_underwriting": {"score": 2, "max": 20}
  },
  "threshold_tests": {
```

```
    "total_score_gte_80": false,
    "business_quality_score_gte_65_of_80": false,
    "valuation_score_gte_15_of_20": false,
    "roiic_plus_runway_gte_35_of_45": true,
    "base_case_irr_gte_20": false,
    "bear_case_irr_gte_8_to_10": false,
    "no_hard_vetoes": false,
    "does_not_require_multiple_expansion": false
  },
  "key_metrics": {
    "adjusted_roic_5yr_median": null,
    "roiic_3yr": null,
    "roiic_5yr": null,
    "acquisition_inclusive_roiic_5yr": null,
    "reinvestment_rate_5yr_avg": null,
    "revenue_cagr_5yr": 0.246,
    "nopat_cagr_5yr": null,
    "fcf_cagr_5yr": 0.337,
    "fcf_conversion_5yr": null,
    "share_count_cagr_5yr": 0.032,
    "sbc_to_revenue_latest": 0.16,
    "sbc_to_fcf_latest": 0.867,
    "net_debt_to_ebitda": null,
    "ev_to_nopat": 169.6,
    "fcf_yield": 0.062
  },
  "hard_vetoes": [
    "The 20% return case requires terminal multiple expansion: base 2031 EPS of $13.87 needs about 33.3x exit P/E to co
    "Share count is modeled rising from 52.578M to 63.457M after SBC issuance and conservative repurchases, so per-shar
    "The company needs simultaneous revenue durability, GAAP margin conversion, SBC reduction, and AI monetization evid
  ],
  "top_positive_evidence": [
    "TTM revenue is $3.298B and constant-currency revenue growth held at 18% across the latest four reported quarters."
    "Subscription revenue is about 97.8% of FY2025 revenue, with FY2025 subscription gross margin near 85.5%.",
    "Customers rose to 299,458 at Q1 FY2026, ASRPC rose to $11,722, RPO reached $1.7B, and the balance sheet is net cas
    "The reviewed base case reaches 2031 revenue of $6.183B and GAAP operating income of $1.098B, enough to pass the ER
  ],
  "top_negative_evidence": [
    "TTM GAAP operating income is only $62.805M, so current NOPAT is immature and EV/TTM NOPAT is about 169.6x.",
    "TTM SBC is $527.204M, or 16.0% of revenue and 86.7% of FCF after capitalized software.",
    "Moat and 2046 durability are both YELLOW because AI and bundle pressure can attack lightweight workflows and NRR i
    "Management is YELLOW because buyback discipline, incentives, and dilution control are not yet proven."
  ],
  "data_gaps": [
    "No disclosed ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, churn, or cRPO.",
    "No disclosed hub-level revenue, hub-level margins, AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, or paid AI attach dollars.",
    "ROIIC cannot be calculated with high confidence from GAAP NOPAT because historical NOPAT was negative or very smal
    "Acquisition-specific return disclosure is limited for Clearbit, Frame AI, Dashworks, and XFunnel."
  ],
  "source_confidence": "Medium"
}
```

Appendix CSA - Scoring Audit

HubSpot - Scoring Audit

Prepared: 2026-06-28. Ticker: HUBS. Company: HubSpot. Currency: USD. Current price: $185.47. TTM anchor: 2026-03-31. Horizon date: 2031-03-31.

1. Original vs Audited Scores

This audit reviews the CompounderScorer output against the CSA scoring-auditor rules. I used the supplied ER2 files only: `appendix_compounder_score.md`, `compounder_score.json`, `quant_foundation.md`, `data_package.md`, `appendix_B_customer_platform.md`, `appendix_management.md`, `appendix_moat.md`, and `appendix_synthesis.md`. I did not use local data warehouse caches and did not make a new FMP pull because the existing ER2 files already contain the live-pulled, SEC-controlled source chain needed to audit the score.

The original markdown and JSON agree: Business Quality Score 59/80, Valuation / 20% Return Underwriting Score 2/20, total Compounder Score 61/100, classification Reject. The original return math is directionally and arithmetically sound. Base 2031 EPS is $13.87. At a 15x exit multiple, the base endpoint is $208.05 per share. From $185.47, that compounds at about 2.3% annually over five years. A 20% annual return requires a 2031 endpoint of about $461.51, or 33.3x base-case 2031 EPS. The maximum buy price for a 20% return at the 15x base endpoint is about $83.61.

The audited score preserves the 2/20 valuation score but reduces Business Quality from 59/80 to 43/80. This score is reduced because the original business-quality score gives too much credit to incremental returns on capital when the same source files state that ROIIC cannot be calculated with high confidence. The score also over-credits moat and capital allocation relative to the YELLOW management gate, YELLOW moat gate, 103% recent NRR, high SBC, and a share-count path that rises from 52.578 million to 63.457 million despite assumed buybacks.

Item	Original	Audited	Notes
Business Quality Score / 80	59	43	Reduced for missing ROIIC, immature GAAP ROIC, high SBC, YELLOW moat, and weak buyback proof.
Valuation / 20% Return UW Score / 20	2	2	Preserved. The 20% case fails, but net cash and FCF yield justify minimal residual credit.
Total Score / 100	61	45	Reduced by 16 points, mostly in incremental returns and capital allocation.
Classification	Reject	Reject	Score remains a diagnostic Reject.

2. Score Reductions and Reasons

Incremental returns on capital is the main reduction. The original score awarded 17/25 even though 5-year reported ROIC in the data package is -3.6%, -5.5%, -9.2%, -2.4%, and 0.3%, and the Compounder Score appendix says ROIIC cannot be calculated with high confidence from GAAP NOPAT because historical NOPAT was negative or tiny. Under the scorer rubric, 1A gets no high-ROIC credit if ROIC is negative or not meaningful, and 1B gets 0 when ROIIC is below the hurdle or supported by insufficient evidence. HubSpot deserves some points for subscription gross margin, low physical capital intensity, customer growth, RPO, and real FCF generation, but the evidence does not support a high incremental-return score today. I reduce this category from 17/25 to 8/25.

Reinvestment runway is reduced from 18/20 to 16/20. HubSpot has strong aggregate evidence: TTM revenue was $3.298 billion, constant-currency revenue growth held at 18% across the latest four reported quarters, customers rose to 299,458 in Q1 FY2026, ASRPC reached $11,722, and RPO reached $1.7 billion. That is real runway evidence. The deduction is for underwriting opacity. The data package marks ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, churn, cRPO, hub-level revenue, AI revenue, and AI ARR as true non-disclosures. A 16/20 still gives HubSpot meaningful runway credit, but 18/20 is too generous for a SaaS company whose most important retention and AI monetization metrics are not disclosed.

Durability of moat is reduced from 11/15 to 9/15. The moat appendix is balanced and assigns both the moat gate and 2046 test YELLOW. HubSpot has real switching costs in multi-hub deployments, suite breadth, a partner ecosystem, brand distribution, and customer data context. But recent NRR around 103% is not elite, churn and GRR are missing, and the moat

appendix identifies credible pressure from Salesforce, Microsoft, Adobe, AI-native point tools, and bundle economics. The evidence supports a good product-market position, not a clean long-duration moat PASS.

Accounting and financial quality is reduced from 7/10 to 6/10. QF reconciliation passed 8/8, revenue tie-outs are strong, the balance sheet is net cash, and no accounting abuse was identified. The deduction is economic rather than procedural. TTM SBC is $527.204 million, or 16.0% of revenue and 86.7% of FCF after capitalized software. Capitalized software is also material at $134.542 million TTM. Cash generation is real, but the owner-earnings bridge is not clean enough for 7/10.

Capital allocation is reduced from 6/10 to 4/10. Reinvestment priorities are rational and acquisitions are not obviously reckless, but buyback discipline is unproven. The management appendix states HubSpot completed a $500 million 2025 buyback at an average price of $501.67, then authorized another $1 billion program. That may offset dilution, but it does not yet prove value-creative repurchases. Incentives also rely heavily on ARR, non-GAAP operating income, and one-year constant-currency revenue growth, not multi-year ROIC, FCF per share, GAAP EPS, explicit dilution, or relative TSR.

3. Unsupported Claims

The most important unsupported claim is high ROIIC. The record supports strong software unit economics, not measured ROIIC. A high-ROIIC score requires a credible calculation of NOPAT change against reinvestment. That calculation is absent, and the source files explain why it is hard: GAAP NOPAT has been negative or tiny, invested capital is distorted by net cash, growth opex is expensed, and SBC is large. This is not a minor presentation gap. It directly hits the scoring rubric's largest business-quality category.

Acquisition-inclusive ROIIC is also unsupported. The data package shows M&A cash outflows of $20 million in FY2021, $142 million in FY2023, $40 million in FY2024, and $87.6 million in FY2025. The management appendix discusses Clearbit, Frame AI, Dashworks, and XFunnel. These deals appear bolt-on rather than empire-building, but HubSpot has not disclosed enough acquisition-specific revenue, retention, margin, or cohort output to prove strong acquisition-inclusive returns.

AI monetization remains an evidence gap. The B appendix and data package contain usage indicators such as agent activations, credit consumption, and core-seat adoption, but they also flag AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, and paid attach dollars as undisclosed. AI can become an important monetization layer, but it cannot support high moat or runway points until usage shows up in paid economics, ASRPC, retention, calculated billings, or disclosed AI revenue.

4. Calculation Errors

I found no material arithmetic error in the original return-underwriting calculations. The base 15x endpoint is $13.87 times 15, or $208.05. The five-year IRR from $185.47 to $208.05 is about 2.3%. The bear endpoint is $106.80 and produces about -10.5% annualized. The bull endpoint is $302.40 and produces about 10.3% annualized. The 20% hurdle endpoint is $185.47 times 1.2 to the fifth power, or $461.51. Dividing that by $13.87 gives a required 33.3x exit P/E. The $83.61 maximum buy price also checks: $208.05 divided by 1.2 to the fifth power.

The calculation break is in the score interpretation, not the IRR math. The original incremental-return category gives 17/25 while the ROIIC field is null and the appendix says ROIIC cannot be calculated with high confidence. The scorer rubric gives 8 points to ROIIC only when the calculation is credible and high; insufficient evidence scores 0. The original score appears to substitute qualitative unit economics for formal ROIIC. That is too generous under CSA rules.

Reverse DCF also supports the reduction. Using current EV of about $8.308 billion, current NOPAT of roughly $49.0 million from TTM operating income taxed at 22%, a 15x exit EV/NOPAT, and a 20% five-year return target implies an extreme required NOPAT CAGR near 95%. That figure is distorted by the tiny current NOPAT base, but that is exactly the point: the current GAAP profit base is too immature to underwrite a 20% return from today's price without a major earnings step-up and/or multiple expansion.

5. Missing Data

The most important missing evidence is a credible 3-year and 5-year ROIIC calculation. The second is acquisition-inclusive ROIIC for Clearbit and the smaller AI/data acquisitions. The third is retention quality: ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, churn, and cRPO are not disclosed. The fourth is product economics: hub-level revenue, hub-level margins, AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, and paid AI attach dollars are not disclosed. The fifth is proof that SBC/revenue will decline enough to stabilize diluted share count. The synthesis models shares rising to 63.457 million by 2031, which prevents a clean per-share compounder score today.

These gaps do not mean HubSpot is a bad business. They mean the CompounderScorer rubric cannot treat it as a dream compounder yet. Aggregate growth, subscription mix, and FCF are good. Cohort economics, ROIIC, and per-share capital discipline are not yet good enough or disclosed enough.

6. Hard-Veto and Threshold Test Audit

The 20% return case requires terminal multiple expansion, so the hard veto is active. Base IRR is below 10%, bear IRR is negative, and even bull IRR at a 15x exit multiple is only about 10.3%. The audited score therefore cannot classify HubSpot as investable now under this diagnostic rubric.

The score also fails the business-quality thresholds. Total score is below 70, Business Quality is below 65/80, Valuation / 20% Return Underwriting is below 15/20, base-case IRR is below 20%, bear-case IRR is not acceptable, and the ROIIC plus runway subtotal does not clear the 35/45 threshold after the ROIIC reduction. The company has a credible path to better evidence, but the path is not the same as evidence already earned.

7. Final 20% Hurdle Pass/Fail

Final 20% hurdle result: FAIL. HubSpot's ER2 base case may pass the separate P/E 15 arithmetic gate, but the CompounderScorer hurdle is different. At $185.47, the base-case 15x endpoint produces only about 2.3% annualized. The 20% case requires about a 33.3x exit P/E on base 2031 EPS. That is multiple expansion, not conservative owner-return underwriting.

8. Dream Business / Dream Investment Classification

Audited classification: neither. HubSpot is a strong SaaS platform candidate with attractive subscription economics and a real growth runway, but it is not yet a "dream business" under this rubric because high ROIIC, durable moat, and per-share capital allocation are not proven. It is also not a "dream investment" at the current price because the 20% return case fails without major terminal multiple expansion. The single biggest reason is simple: the business has not yet converted its attractive revenue platform into audited, high-confidence ROIIC and diluted per-share compounding.

9. Stage 7 Scorecard Notes

- Compounder Score note: 45/100. HubSpot has attractive SaaS platform traits, but the audited score rejects the setup because ROIIC proof is missing and the 20% return case requires a much higher exit multiple than the ER2 base framework.
- Business Quality Score note: 43/80. Revenue growth, subscription gross margin, RPO, and net cash are positives, but low GAAP ROIC, uncalculated ROIIC, high SBC, dilution, YELLOW moat, and YELLOW management keep the quality score well below compounder grade.
- 20% Return UW Score note: 2/20. Base 2031 EPS of $13.87 at 15x implies about 2.3% annualized from $185.47; a 20% return requires roughly 33.3x base-case exit P/E, so the hurdle fails without multiple expansion.

10. Auditor JSON


```
{
  "company": "HubSpot",
  "ticker": "HUBS",
  "analysis_date": "2026-06-28",
  "original_business_quality_score": 59,
  "audited_business_quality_score": 43,
  "business_quality_score_max": 80,
  "original_valuation_underwriting_score": 2,
  "audited_valuation_underwriting_score": 2,
  "valuation_underwriting_score_max": 20,
  "original_total_score": 61,
  "audited_total_score": 45,
  "total_score_max": 100,
  "original_classification": "Reject",
  "audited_classification": "Reject",
  "final_20pct_hurdle_pass": false,
  "dream_business_investment_classification": "neither",
  "single_biggest_reason": "The original business-quality score over-credits incremental returns even though normalized
  "confidence": "Medium"
```

```
}
```

Appendix RT - Red Team

HubSpot (HUBS) - Red Team Appendix

Prepared: 2026-06-28. Role: Sub-Agent RT, Red Team. Output: `C:\Users\Admin\OneDrive\GPT\ER 2.0\HubSpot\appendix_red_team.md`.

This appendix is a hostile read of the HubSpot ER2 production case. It is not a balanced risk section. It assumes the Stage 5 synthesis is wrong somewhere and tries to locate the failure point before the main narrative accidentally converts a thin valuation pass into a BUY-quality conclusion. The synthesis says the P/E 15 arithmetic gate passes at $185.47 because base 2031 EPS reaches $13.87 versus required EPS of $12.36, a 12.1% cushion. That is not much cushion. The audited compounder score is harsher: 45/100, Reject, with Business Quality 43/80 and only 2/20 for 20% return underwriting. Red team agrees with that diagnostic rejection. The business may be good, but the stock does not yet underwrite like a Gideon compounder at the current price.

Sources used inside the ER2 package are the synthesis, customer-platform segment appendix, management appendix, moat appendix, data package, scoring audit, and audited score JSON. External competitive-pressure checks were saved in `raw\RT_external_sources_20260628.md` and used only to anchor the Salesforce, Adobe, and Microsoft threat framing.

1. Most Fragile Assumption

The most fragile assumption is not the 13.4% five-year revenue CAGR by itself. It is the assumption that the one customer-platform segment converts that revenue into a 17.8% GAAP operating margin by 2031-03-31 while preserving enough growth and avoiding a new AI/SBC cost layer. In Stage 5, this line is the base-case whole customer-platform operating margin: $6.183B of 2031 revenue, 17.8% blended operating margin, and $1.098B of operating income. The business line is subscription-heavy and has high gross margin, so the assumption is possible. It is also the load-bearing place where the thesis can break.

The reason is mechanical. HubSpot's TTM GAAP operating margin is only 1.9%, built from $62.8M of operating income on $3.298B of revenue. The synthesis asks the company to add about 1,590 basis points of GAAP operating margin in five years. The segment appendix justifies that with subscription gross margin near 85.5%, scale leverage, SBC moderation, partner leverage, and AI/data attach. Those are coherent drivers, but none is fully proven at the level required by the valuation gate. Management still guides and discusses profitability mainly through non-GAAP operating income. The data package and management appendix both show the problem: TTM SBC is about $527M, roughly 16% of revenue, while TTM GAAP operating income is only about $63M. If the company reduces SBC only slowly, or replaces restructuring/SBC adjustments with new AI investment and enterprise-product cost, the non-GAAP to GAAP bridge may not close fast enough.

Sensitivity makes this a binary issue. Stage 5 says a 200 bp operating-margin miss drops EPS from $13.87 to about $12.38, leaving only a 0.1% P/E 15 cushion. Every 100 bp of operating margin on $6.183B of revenue is about $61.8M of operating income, or roughly $48M after a 22% tax rate. Spread over 63.457M shares, that is roughly $0.76 of EPS. A 220 bp miss would likely push EPS below the $12.36 requirement, and a 300 bp miss would put EPS closer to $11.6 before any revenue or share-count shortfall. This is not a soft risk. A very ordinary SaaS margin delay breaks the arithmetic gate.

The most fragile product/line inside that assumption is subscription operating leverage, not services. Services remains small and low margin. Subscription must carry nearly all the profit improvement, but subscription is also where Salesforce, Adobe, Microsoft, Oracle, and AI-native point tools apply pressure. If HubSpot has to defend customers with more sales coverage, more partner incentives, more AI credits bundled into existing subscriptions, or more R&D to match enterprise workflow depth, the 17.8% GAAP margin is too high even if revenue keeps growing.

2. Most-Likely-to-Be-Optimistic Stage 5 Number

The single Stage 5 number most likely to be optimistic is the base-case 2031 operating income of $1.098B. Revenue of $6.183B can be defended from current high-teens constant-currency growth, customers, ASRPC, RPO, and guidance. The share-count path is already punitive, rising from 52.578M to 63.457M despite buybacks. But the operating-income bridge assumes that HubSpot can become a clean high-teens GAAP-margin company by 2031 while still investing in AI, upmarket functionality, customer success, and go-to-market coverage.

That number leans on evidence that is directionally right but not robust enough. The segment appendix says the base subscription path decelerates from high-teens to low-teens growth and that the base blended margin reaches 17.8%. Yet the

data package does not disclose ending ARR dollars, net-new ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, churn, hub-level revenue, AI revenue, AI ARR, or paid attach dollars. Management discloses useful breadcrumbs: Q1 FY2026 NRR of 103%, total credits consumed up 67% quarter over quarter, active core-seat users up 90% year over year, and customer/ASRPC growth. Those are not the same as proof that AI and multi-hub usage carry incremental gross profit at scale.

The external comparison also argues for caution. Salesforce is already at $41.5B of FY2026 revenue with 20.1% GAAP operating margin and 34.1% non-GAAP operating margin, while reporting $800M of Agentforce ARR and more than $2.9B of Agentforce/Data 360 ARR. Adobe's Digital Experience business grew 9% to $5.86B in FY2025, with subscription revenue up 11%. Those are mature-suite benchmarks: they prove high margins are possible, but they also show that large front-office or experience clouds tend to settle into lower growth. HubSpot is smaller and can grow faster, but the model is trying to get both: a premium growth profile and a near-mature GAAP margin. That combination is exactly where the optimism sits.

3. Strongest Bear Case

The strongest bear case is that HubSpot's AI transition is defensive, not accretive. HubSpot is forced to ship Breeze agents, credits, data products, and upmarket workflow depth because Salesforce, Microsoft, Adobe, Oracle, and AI-native vendors are redefining CRM and marketing work around agents. Customers use the features, but they do not pay enough incremental dollars for them to expand ASRPC, NRR, or gross margin. The result is still a useful customer platform, but the business becomes a good mid-market SaaS suite rather than a compounding category winner.

In that scenario, the first visible damage appears over the next four to eight quarters. NRR sits near or below 103% instead of moving above 105%; ASRPC grows only low-single digits while customer additions carry the headline; calculated billings and RPO growth decelerate below revenue growth; and management keeps highlighting usage metrics without disclosing AI revenue, AI ARR, or paid attach. Segment revenue still grows, perhaps high-single to low-double digits, so the bear case does not require a collapse. It only requires the base case to miss operating leverage by 200-300 bps, or for revenue CAGR to slip while margin also stalls. That is enough to erase the 12.1% valuation cushion.

The short-seller version is blunt: HubSpot looks cheap on a 2031 P/E only because the model capitalizes future GAAP margin that the company has not yet earned. Current NRR is modest, the best retention metrics are undisclosed, AI monetization is undisclosed, SBC is heavy, and the biggest incumbents are putting agentic CRM into broader account-control bundles. The company can keep winning SMB and mid-market customers and still fail the Gideon bar because per-share GAAP earnings lag the revenue story.

4. Cross-Examination of Management Commentary

First, management says HubSpot is "positioned to lead and win with AI." The skeptical read is that this is a strategic necessity, not evidence of monetization. The data package says Customer Agent activations, Prospecting Agent activations, core-seat usage, and credit consumption are disclosed, but AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, and paid attach dollars are not. If the statement is overpromising, it should show up first as rising AI usage with no lift in ASRPC, NRR, calculated billings, or disclosed AI revenue. It may also show up as gross-margin pressure if credits are bundled into existing plans while compute and support costs rise.

Second, management says it is "balancing growth and profitability." The skeptical read is that the company is balancing two metrics that can look good on a non-GAAP basis while GAAP per-share economics remain mediocre. The management appendix notes that 2025 bonus and PSU design leaned on ARR, non-GAAP operating income, and one-year constant-currency revenue growth, not multi-year ROIC, FCF per share, GAAP EPS, explicit dilution, or relative TSR. If the commentary is wrong, the first evidence is not a revenue miss; it is SBC/revenue staying above 13%-14% after FY2027, diluted shares continuing to rise, and non-GAAP margin improving faster than GAAP operating margin.

Third, Analyst Day language that HubSpot is "no longer limited by the software budgets" is the most aggressive management claim. The red-team view is that this claim is option value until monetized. It implies AI agents expand HubSpot's budget pool from software seats into labor/work outcomes. But the data package says paid AI attach dollars are not disclosed, and Q1 NRR was only 103%. If HubSpot really expands beyond software budgets, ASRPC and NRR should move. If they do not, the claim is a TAM story rather than an earnings story.

5. Stage 5 Tie-Out Reverification

The recency anchor is arithmetically sane. The TTM anchor uses Q2 FY2025 through Q1 FY2026, ending 2026-03-31. Q1 FY2026 revenue of $881.0M annualizes to about $3.524B, and Stage 5's first-forward-year revenue of about $3.852B is 9.3% above that run rate and about 4% above FY2026 guidance midpoint. The issue is not a stale quarter. The issue is that

constant-currency growth has been stable at 18% for four quarters, while the base model assumes gradual deceleration and simultaneous margin expansion. That can work, but it leaves little room for a normal sales-cycle or AI-pricing digestion period.

The share-count path is conservative but still a source of sanity pressure. The model adds annual gross SBC issuance of 2.843M shares and subtracts only 0.667M shares of repurchases, ending at 63.457M diluted shares. That is appropriately harsh. Red team does not attack the share count as too low. The better critique is that the existence of this much modeled dilution proves the base EPS result is dependent on operating margin. If the share count is already rising 20.7% over five years, the company cannot also miss GAAP margin and still clear the gate.

Product CAGR does not obviously exceed competitor evidence without explanation. Base subscription CAGR is 13.5%, below the recent 21.9% three-year subscription CAGR and below Q1 reported growth. The concern is not that revenue growth is hallucinated. The concern is confidence quality. HubSpot earns a growth premium over Salesforce and Adobe because it is smaller and has more multi-hub runway, but the data needed to prove that premium is exactly what is missing: ARR dollars, churn, GRR, DBNR, hub revenue, and AI revenue.

6. Score-Derived 20% Return Claim

The audited score already says the 20% return case does not clear, and red team agrees. The key score-derived claim is not a bullish claim; it is the rejection itself: at $185.47, base 2031 EPS of $13.87 at 15x produces only about 2.3% annualized, and a 20% return requires about a 33.3x exit P/E on base EPS. The maximum buy price for a 20% return at the 15x base endpoint is $83.61.

The assumption that would break any attempted rescue of the 20% case is terminal multiple, not arithmetic. To get a 20% annual return from today's price, an investor must believe either that base EPS is far too low or that the market pays a premium multiple in 2031 despite maturing growth, modest NRR, unresolved AI disruption, and continued dilution. That is not conservative owner-return underwriting. If someone tries to call HubSpot a 20% return stock from here, they are making an implicit multiple-expansion argument dressed up as quality-compounding.

7. Signal That Forces an Exit

The concrete force-exit signal is: over the next two reported quarters, if NRR is at or below 102% in either quarter while ASRPC growth is below 3% year over year and management still does not disclose AI revenue, AI ARR, or paid AI attach dollars, exit the position or force a full rewrite to PASS/WATCH with no valuation-gate credit for AI. Use Q2 FY2026 and Q3 FY2026 as the initial window if those are the next reports available after this appendix.

This is the right signal because it directly tests the thesis rather than a generic macro variable. The base case requires AI, multi-hub attach, pricing, and upmarket movement to create subscription growth and operating leverage. NRR at or below 102% would say expansion power is weakening. ASRPC growth below 3% would say monetization per customer is not carrying the model. No AI monetization disclosure would mean management is still asking investors to capitalize usage rather than revenue. If all three occur together, HubSpot may still be a fine company, but the 2031 EPS bridge should no longer be trusted.

A secondary margin-trigger should also be monitored: if SBC/revenue remains above 14% after FY2027, or diluted shares are not flat-to-down by FY2027 while buybacks continue, the management gate should move from YELLOW toward FAIL. That would not require selling solely on one metric, but it would invalidate the management appendix upgrade path and force a lower EPS range.

8. Red-Team Conclusion

Thesis does not survive as a BUY-quality compounder case today. It survives only as a conditional valuation-gate pass with substantial evidence still owed. The specific break is that the synthesis relies on GAAP operating leverage before the company has proven that AI usage, multi-hub attach, NRR, ASRPC, and SBC discipline can all move in the right direction at once. The base-case P/E 15 gate passes on paper, but it is a thin pass: a 200 bp margin miss nearly exhausts the cushion, and the audited score already rejects the 20% return case.

The main narrative should not be written around "HubSpot clears the valuation gate." That is true but incomplete. It should be written around "HubSpot clears the 15x arithmetic only if margin conversion arrives; the audited compounder lens rejects the stock as a 20% return setup until retention, AI monetization, and per-share discipline improve." The strongest bear argument is not that HubSpot is broken. It is that the company is good enough to keep growing but not good enough, transparent enough, or cheap enough to underwrite as a Gideon compounder at $185.47.

Appendix D - Data Package (raw historicals)

HubSpot (HUBS) - Data Package

Prepared: 2026-06-28. Fiscal year end: December 31. Most recently reported quarter: Q1 FY2026 ended 2026-03-31 and reported 2026-05-07. TTM anchor: Q2 FY2025 plus Q3 FY2025 plus Q4 FY2025 plus Q1 FY2026, ending 2026-03-31. Forward horizon for downstream ER2 work: 2031-03-31.

Source discipline: this data package uses live pulls performed during this run. Quantitative statement values follow the cleared Quant Foundation and Quant Foundation Review: QF reconciled to 8 of 8 checks passed and QFR cleared Wave 1. No local data warehouse cache was read. Raw D-owned live pulls are saved under `C:\Users\Admin\OneDrive\GPT\ER 2.0\HubSpot\raw\` with `D_` prefixes where applicable.

0a. Industry classification and disclosure inventory

HubSpot is a U.S. domestic SaaS/software issuer. The controlling official source set is SEC EDGAR Form 10-K and Form 10-Q, HubSpot IR earnings releases, HubSpot IR transcript PDFs, FMP stable statement endpoints, FMP revenue-product-segmentation, and FMP earning-call-transcript for searchable call text. FMP segment data is thin because HubSpot reports one operating segment and FMP only captures the official revenue classification into subscription and service lines. Therefore this Section 0a applies the SaaS/software checklist before any product or KPI is called undisclosed.

Search inventory performed in live-pulled sources: ARR, ending ARR, net new ARR, NRR, DBNR, dollar-based retention, GRR, churn, RPO, remaining performance obligation, cRPO, billings, deferred revenue, customers, average subscription revenue per customer, ARPU, ACV, customer cohort, enterprise customer, large deals, multi-hub, seats, stock-based compensation, dilution, gross margin, sales and marketing, research and development, AI, Breeze, agentic, pricing, packaging, and usage. The SEC companyfacts pull exposes RevenueRemainingPerformanceObligation and contract liability concepts. The IR releases expose customers, ASRPC, calculated billings, revenue growth, margin, and guidance. The earnings-call transcripts expose selected ARR, NRR, net-new-ARR, seat, and AI usage commentary, including FY2025 NRR, Q1 FY2026 NRR, net-new-ARR growth commentary, agent activations, credit consumption mix, and core-seat adoption. The filings, releases, and transcripts searched in this run did not expose ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, churn, cRPO, ACV by cohort, AI-specific revenue, or AI-specific ARR.

Dataset / table family	Official source searched	Search terms or table names	Years available	Included in data package?	If excluded, why	Downstream relevance
Segment economics	2025 10-K, Q1 2026 10-Q, FMP revenue-product-segmentation	operating segment, subscription, professional services, geography	FY2021-FY2025 plus Q1 FY2026 trend	Yes	n/a	Defines single-segment model and prevents invented segment OI
SaaS growth KPIs	Q4 FY2021-FY2025 releases and Q1 FY2026 release	customers, ASRPC, calculated billings	Customers and ASRPC FY2021-FY2025 plus Q1; billings FY2024-FY2025 quarterly only	Yes	Calculated billings appears in recent releases, not as full five-year annual series	Recency, growth formula, moat
RPO and deferred revenue	SEC companyfacts and 10-K/10-Q filings	RevenueRemainingPerformanceObligation, ContractWithCustomerLiabilityCurrent, ContractWithCustomerLiabilityNoncurrent	FY2021-FY2025 plus Q1 FY2026	Yes	n/a	Backlog, billings quality, forward revenue visibility
ARR / NRR / DBNR / GRR / churn	2025 10-K, Q1 2026 10-Q, Q1-Q4 releases, FMP transcripts, Analyst Day transcript	ARR, ending ARR, net new ARR, NRR, DBNR, GRR, churn, retention	NRR and net-new-ARR growth commentary disclosed in FY2025/Q1 FY2026 calls; ending ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, and churn not found	Partial	Ending ARR dollars and net-new-ARR dollars remain undisclosed; recent NRR and net-new-ARR growth commentary are included below	Retention-quality and growth-leading-indicator modeling
Customer cohorts / ACV / seats	2025 10-K, latest releases, FMP transcripts, Analyst Day transcript	ACV, ARPU, seats, cohort, enterprise customers, large deals, upmarket	Qualitative commentary plus disclosed large-deal ARR thresholds and core-seat adoption commentary	Partial	True non-disclosure for cohort dollars and count series; selected seat and deal-size metrics are disclosed	Important but cannot be modeled as disclosed cohort dollars
AI and pricing metrics	Q1-Q4 calls, Analyst Day transcript, releases	AI, Breeze, agentic, pricing, packaging, work budgets, credits, activation, usage	Agent activation counts, resolution rates, credit-consumption mix, core-seat usage, and pricing commentary disclosed in calls	Partial	AI revenue, AI ARR, and paid attach-rate dollars remain undisclosed; usage/adoption metrics are disclosed	Moat, pricing optionality, and proof-of-adoption tracking

KPI family	Granularity	FY-5 2021	FY-4 2022	FY-3 2023	FY-2 2024	FY-1 2025	Latest interim / TTM	Source path
Customers	Company total	135,442	167,386	205,091	247,939	288,706	299,458 at Q1 FY2026	HubSpot Q4 FY2021-FY2025 IR releases; Q1 FY2026 release
ASRPC	Average subscription revenue per customer	$10,875	$11,231	$11,365	$11,312	$11,683	$11,722 in Q1 FY2026	HubSpot Q4 FY2021-FY2025 IR releases; Q1 FY2026 release
RPO	Remaining performance obligation	$376.6M	$554.9M	$807.0M	$1000.0M	$1600.0M	$1700.0M at Q1 FY2026	SEC companyfacts RevenueRemainingPerformanceObligation
Deferred revenue	Contract liability current plus noncurrent	$434.9M	$545.8M	$678.0M	$788.2M	$1013.4M	$1044.7M at Q1 FY2026	SEC companyfacts contract liability concepts
Calculated billings	Quarterly disclosed metric	n/d	n/d	n/d	$767.6M Q4 only	$971.4M Q4 only	$912.3M in Q1 FY2026	HubSpot IR releases; no full five-year annual table found
Ending ARR / net-new-ARR dollars	Recurring revenue quality	not disclosed	not disclosed	not disclosed	not disclosed	FY2025 net-new-ARR growth +24% YoY disclosed; dollars not disclosed	Q1 FY2026 net-new ARR growth below CC revenue growth, with FY2026 guide still above CC revenue growth	HubSpot Q4 FY2025 and Q1 FY2026 FMP transcripts
NRR / retention	Net revenue retention and dollar retention	not disclosed in pulled sources	not disclosed in pulled sources	not disclosed in pulled sources	101.8% FY2024 NRR, per Q4 FY2025 call comparison	103.5% FY2025 NRR; 105% Q4 exit	103% in Q1 FY2026	HubSpot Q4 FY2025 and Q1 FY2026 FMP transcripts
AI adoption / usage	Agent, core-seat, and credit metrics	n/d	n/d	n/d	early AI usage commentary only	Customer Agent >8,000 activations; Prospecting Agent >10,000; Customer Agent about 60% of Q4 credits	Active core-seat users +90% YoY; total credits consumed +67% QoQ; Customer Agent 53% / Prospecting Agent 17% / Data Agent 16% of Q1 credits	HubSpot Q4 FY2025 and Q1 FY2026 FMP transcripts
SBC / dilution	Company-level expense and share count	$166.8M SBC; diluted shares 46.9M	$275.8M SBC; diluted shares 48.1M	$432.3M SBC; diluted shares 49.9M	$504.8M SBC; diluted shares 51.8M	$528.2M SBC; diluted shares 53.2M	QF TTM SBC $527.2M	FMP stable cash flow and income statement plus QF

Inventory conclusion: HubSpot has enough official SaaS KPI disclosure to support customers, ASRPC, RPO, deferred revenue, recent billings, margin, SBC, opex, NRR snapshots, net-new-ARR growth commentary, and AI usage/adoption analysis. It does not disclose ending ARR dollars, net-new-ARR dollars, DBNR, GRR, churn, product-family revenue dollars, hub-level growth rates, AI-specific revenue, AI-specific ARR, or cohort economics in the live sources searched. Those remaining gaps are true non-disclosures for this D package, not FMP omissions.

1. Reporting structure and taxonomy

Current reportable structure: HubSpot operates as one operating segment. Official revenue classification is subscription revenue and professional services and other revenue. QF and QFR both concluded that no segment operating income should be invented. The product-to-segment mapping is therefore simple: FMP Subscription and Circulation maps to official Subscription, while FMP Service maps to official Professional services and other. The one operating segment accounted for 100% of FY2025 revenue, or $3.131B, under SEC-controlled QF values.

Taxonomy check: no reportable segment realignment was identified in the last three years from the 2025 10-K, Q1 2026 10-Q, SEC submissions, or QF/QFR. The official taxonomy has remained one operating segment with revenue split into subscription and professional services/other. There is a naming cleanup in FMP product rows: Subscription and Circulation appears with capitalization variants, but it ties arithmetically to official subscription revenue. Geographic disclosure is material because international revenue is nearly half of the business; the 2025 10-K gives Americas $1.872B, Europe $1.011B, and Asia Pacific $0.248B, summing to FY2025 revenue.

Current segment	FY2025 revenue	% of total	FY2025 OI disclosure	Description	Source
One operating segment	$3.131B	100.0%	Not separately disclosed as segment OI	Unified customer platform; revenue classified as subscription and professional services/other	QF P2; FY2025 10-K; FMP product segmentation

Geography	FY2025 revenue	% of total	Source
Americas	$1.872B	59.8%	QF P2; FY2025 10-K
Europe	$1.011B	32.3%	QF P2; FY2025 10-K
Asia Pacific	$0.248B	7.9%	QF P2; FY2025 10-K
Total	$3.131B	100.0%	Arithmetic tie-out

2. Consolidated historicals, 5 years, FMP-sourced

The table uses FMP stable annual income statement, balance sheet, cash flow, ratios, and key metrics pulled live in this run. FY2025 revenue and operating income use QF/QFR SEC-controlled values because QF documented small FMP-vs-SEC gaps: FMP revenue was $22 thousand below SEC, and FMP operating income excluded restructuring expense. ROIC is NOPAT divided by invested capital, where NOPAT equals operating income after observed tax rate capped at 25% and invested capital equals equity plus total debt less cash. For years where net cash exceeds operating invested capital, ROIC is marked not meaningful rather than forced into a misleading percentage.

Metric	FY-5 2021	FY-4 2022	FY-3 2023	FY-2 2024	FY-1 2025	Source
Revenue ($B)	$1.301B	$1.731B	$2.170B	$2.628B	$3.131B	FMP stable; FY2025 revenue/OI controlled by QF SEC tie-out
Gross margin (%)	80.1%	82.2%	84.4%	85.0%	83.8%	FMP stable income statement; FY2025 revenue controlled by QF SEC tie-out
Operating income ($B)	$-0.055B	$-0.103B	$-0.201B	$-0.068B	$0.007B	FMP stable; FY2025 revenue/OI controlled by QF SEC tie-out
Operating margin (%)	-4.2%	-5.9%	-9.3%	-2.6%	0.2%	FMP stable; FY2025 revenue/OI controlled by QF SEC tie-out
Net income ($B)	$-0.078B	$-0.107B	$-0.165B	$0.005B	$0.046B	FMP stable; FY2025 revenue/OI controlled by QF SEC tie-out
EPS diluted ($)	$-1.66	$-2.35	$-3.30	$0.09	$0.86	FMP stable; FY2025 revenue/OI controlled by QF SEC tie-out
Diluted share count (M)	46.9	48.1	49.9	51.8	53.2	FMP stable; FY2025 revenue/OI controlled by QF SEC tie-out
Stock-based compensation ($B)	$0.167B	$0.276B	$0.432B	$0.505B	$0.528B	FMP stable cash flow statement
Capex ($B)	$0.029B	$0.037B	$0.034B	$0.038B	$0.053B	FMP stable; FY2025 revenue/OI controlled by QF SEC tie-out
FCF ($B)	$0.177B	$0.181B	$0.251B	$0.561B	$0.708B	FMP stable; FY2025 revenue/OI controlled by QF SEC tie-out
ROIC (%)	-3.6%	-5.5%	-9.2%	-2.4%	0.3%	FMP stable; FY2025 revenue/OI controlled by QF SEC tie-out

Five-year pattern: revenue compounded from $1.301B in FY2021 to $3.131B in FY2025. GAAP operating income stayed low because HubSpot continues to expense growth investments, SBC, and restructuring, but free cash flow scaled materially. FY2025 FCF was $707.6M before capitalized software adjustment per FMP cash flow; QF TTM FCF after PPE capex was $742.7M and after both PPE capex and capitalized software was $608.2M. Downstream synthesis should use QF TTM as the forward base, not FY2025 alone.

3. Segment historicals

HubSpot has one operating segment. This section intentionally does not invent separate segment operating income. Because the one operating segment is coextensive with the company, consolidated revenue is the segment revenue base. Consolidated GAAP operating income is shown only as company-level economics, not as a management-reported segment OI measure.

One operating segment	FY-5 2021	FY-4 2022	FY-3 2023	FY-2 2024	FY-1 2025	Source
Revenue ($B)	$1.301B	$1.731B	$2.170B	$2.628B	$3.131B	FMP stable annual; FY2025 QF SEC-controlled
YoY %	n/a	33.1%	25.4%	21.1%	19.2%	FMP stable annual; FY2025 QF SEC-controlled
Company-level GAAP operating income ($B)	$-0.055B	$-0.103B	$-0.201B	$-0.068B	$0.007B	FMP stable annual; FY2025 QF SEC-controlled
Company-level GAAP operating margin (%)	-4.2%	-5.9%	-9.3%	-2.6%	0.2%	FMP stable annual; FY2025 QF SEC-controlled

Segment note: QF and QFR independently verified HubSpot reports one operating segment. Therefore, the only defensible segment appendix is a single companywide segment appendix unless the orchestrator chooses to split by products qualitatively. If a downstream B appendix models Marketing Hub, Sales Hub, Service Hub, Content Hub, Operations Hub, Commerce Hub, or AI agents as separate economic segments, it must label those as non-disclosed internal product views and cannot claim historical segment OI.

4. Product / sub-segment historicals

The finest dollar-disclosed product split is subscription versus professional services and other. HubSpot names product hubs and AI agents, but the live filings and IR materials pulled for this package do not disclose dollar revenue by hub, ARR by product, AI revenue, seat counts, or product-family margins. FMP annual and quarterly revenue-product-segmentation ties to the official revenue classification, so it can be used for subscription and service dollars only.

Segment	Product	What it is	Dollar disclosure?	If yes, last 3 years revenue + source
One operating segment	Subscription	Recurring access to customer platform subscriptions	Yes	FY2023 $2123.5M; FY2024 $2569.5M; FY2025 $3063.9M; FMP annual product endpoint and 10-K classification
One operating segment	Professional services and other	Customer onboarding, training, consulting, payments and other service revenue	Yes	FY2023 $46.8M; FY2024 $58.0M; FY2025 $67.3M; FMP annual product endpoint and 10-K classification

Segment	Product	Disclosure method	Last 4 quarters YoY growth	Source
One operating segment	Marketing Hub / Sales Hub / Service Hub / Content Hub / Operations Hub	Named products; no dollars or YoY growth table	Not disclosed	2025 10-K; Q1 2026 10-Q; Q1-Q4 FY2025/FY2026 releases searched
One operating segment	AI agents, Breeze, Customer Agent, Prospecting Agent, Data Agent	Product, strategy, activation, resolution, and credit-usage mix disclosed; no AI ARR or AI revenue dollars	Usage/adoption disclosed; true non-disclosure for AI-specific revenue, ARR, and paid attach dollars as of pulled sources	Q1 FY2026 release, Q1 FY2026 transcript, Q4 FY2025 transcript, and 2025 Analyst Day transcript
One operating segment	Upmarket and multi-hub deals	Management commentary; no dollar historicals	No revenue or growth rate by cohort disclosed	FMP transcripts and Analyst Day transcript

Product disclosure conclusion: subscription is 97.8% of FY2025 revenue and professional services/other is 2.2%. HubSpot is not economically a services company. The service line is important for onboarding and payments context, but downstream revenue and margin work should focus on subscription durability, customer adds, ASRPC, RPO, billings, and AI/pricing optionality.

5. Most recent quarterly trend, last 4 quarters

Company FY ends December 31. Most recently completed fiscal quarter at time of writing: FY2026 Q1, covering 2026-01-01 to 2026-03-31, reported on 2026-05-07 via

https://ir.hubspot.com/news-releases/news-release-details/hubspot-reports-strong-q1-2026-results. This section uses QF for statement values and HubSpot IR releases for headline growth rates, customers, ASRPC, billings, and non-GAAP operating margin.

Quarter	Revenue	YoY growth	GAAP operating margin	Non-GAAP operating margin	Customers	ASRPC	Calculated billings	Source date
Q2 FY2025	$760.9M	19% reported; 18% CC	-3.2%	17.0%	267,982	$11,310	$814.3M; 26% reported; 20% CC	2025-08-06
Q3 FY2025	$809.5M	21% reported; 18% CC	1.4%	19.9%	278,880	$11,578	$804.0M; 18% reported; 19% CC	2025-11-05
Q4 FY2025	$846.7M	20% reported; 18% CC	5.7%	22.6%	288,706	$11,683	$971.4M; 27% reported; 20% CC	2026-02-11
Q1 FY2026	$881.0M	23% reported; 18% CC	3.2%	17.8%	299,458	$11,722	$912.3M; 19% reported; 17% CC	2026-05-07

Quarter	Subscription revenue	Subscription YoY	Professional services and other	Services YoY	Source
Q2 FY2025	$744.5M	19% reported	$16.3M	21% reported	https://ir.hubspot.com/news-releases/news-release-details/hubspot-reports-q2-2025-results
Q3 FY2025	$791.7M	21% reported	$17.8M	19% reported	https://ir.hubspot.com/news-releases/news-release-details/hubspot-reports-q3-2025-results
Q4 FY2025	$829.0M	21% reported	$17.8M	12% reported	https://ir.hubspot.com/news-releases/news-release-details/hubspot-reports-strong-q4-and-full-year-2025-results
Q1 FY2026	$862.3M	23% reported	$18.7M	22% reported	https://ir.hubspot.com/news-releases/news-release-details/hubspot-reports-strong-q1-2026-results

Recent trend read-through: constant-currency revenue growth held at 18% in each of Q2 FY2025, Q3 FY2025, Q4 FY2025, and Q1 FY2026. Reported growth accelerated to 23% in Q1 FY2026 because FX turned favorable, so the clean underwriting base is high-teens constant-currency growth, not low-twenties reported growth. Customers rose from 267,982 at 2025-06-30 to 299,458 at 2026-03-31, while ASRPC rose from $11,310 to $11,722. Billings growth remained positive but is quarterly and can be seasonal; Q4 was $971.4M and Q1 was $912.3M.

6. Management commentary on forward growth

Live transcript sources: FMP earning-call-transcript for Q2 FY2025 dated 2025-08-06, Q3 FY2025 dated 2025-11-05, Q4 FY2025 dated 2026-02-11, and Q1 FY2026 dated 2026-05-07. Official HubSpot IR transcript PDFs for those periods were also fetched into raw. The 2025 Analyst Day event page and corrected transcript PDF were fetched; the direct static-file slide download returned 403 in PowerShell and is treated as not fetched / omitted, not as not disclosed. The quote snippets below are short verbatim anchors; interpretation is paraphrased for modeling use.

Source	Call date	Speaker	Verbatim quote snippet	Topic	Interpretation
Q2 FY2025 call	2025-08-06	Yamini Rangan, CEO	"revenue growing 18% year-over-year in constant currency"	Growth baseline	Use high-teens CC revenue growth as recent organic base, not reported FX uplift.
Q2 FY2025 call	2025-08-06	Kathryn Bueker, CFO	"Average subscription revenue per customer was $11,300 in Q2"	Monetization	ASRPC was flat in CC and modestly positive reported; growth is still customer adds plus mix.
Q3 FY2025 call	2025-11-05	Yamini Rangan, CEO	"durable path to growth"	Growth formula	Management framed multiple levers: core hubs, upmarket, downmarket, ecosystem, and AI.
Q3 FY2025 call	2025-11-05	Kathryn Bueker, CFO	"We added 10,900 net new customers in Q3"	Customer adds	Customer acquisition remains large enough to support mid-to-high teens growth.
Q4 FY2025 call	2026-02-11	Yamini Rangan, CEO	"positioned to lead and win with AI"	AI strategy	AI is central strategic messaging; model should demand evidence in attach, ASRPC, billings, or retention.

Source	Call date	Speaker	Verbatim quote snippet	Topic	Interpretation
Q4 FY2025 call	2026-02-11	Kathryn Bueker, CFO	"Q4 subscription revenue grew 21% year-over-year"	Subscription engine	Subscription is the economic core and drives nearly all revenue.
Q1 FY2026 call	2026-05-07	Yamini Rangan, CEO	"balancing growth and profitability"	Growth plus margin	Management is not guiding to a major AI investment reset; margin should keep expanding if growth holds.
Q1 FY2026 call	2026-05-07	Kathryn Bueker, CFO	"Q1 revenue grew 23% year over year as reported"	Latest quarter	Reported growth is above CC growth; use the release to separate FX from organic.
Q1 FY2026 call	2026-05-07	Kathryn Bueker, CFO	"net revenue retention was 103%"	Retention	Recent NRR is disclosed, even though ending ARR dollars and churn are not.
Q1 FY2026 call	2026-05-07	Yamini Rangan, CEO	"Total credits consumed grew 67%"	AI usage	AI adoption has disclosed usage indicators, but not AI revenue or AI ARR.
2025 Analyst Day	2025-09-03	Yamini Rangan, CEO	"AI-powered customer platform for scaling companies"	Platform positioning	Strategic direction is broader than marketing automation; moat work should test platform breadth.
2025 Analyst Day	2025-09-03	Yamini Rangan, CEO	"no longer limited by the software budgets"	TAM claim	Large claim needs evidence; treat as upside option until AI monetization is disclosed.

Forward guidance from live releases: Q4 FY2025 release guided FY2026 revenue of $3.69B to $3.70B, up 18% reported and 16% constant currency, and non-GAAP operating income of $736M to $740M, or about 20% margin. Q1 FY2026 release raised FY2026 revenue guidance to $3.700B to $3.708B, up 18% reported and 17% constant currency, and non-GAAP operating income to $762M to $766M, or about 21% margin. The guidance supports continued margin expansion while keeping revenue growth in the high teens; it does not support assuming a visible reacceleration above 20% constant currency without additional evidence.

7. Capital allocation history

Year	Capex	Capex / revenue	R&D	R&D / revenue	S&M	Buybacks	Dividends	M&A	Source
2021	$0.029B	2.2%	$0.302B	23.2%	$0.650B	$0.000B	$0.000B	$0.020B	FMP stable annual cash flow and income statement
2022	$0.037B	2.2%	$0.442B	25.5%	$0.886B	$0.000B	$0.000B	$0.000B	FMP stable annual cash flow and income statement
2023	$0.034B	1.6%	$0.618B	28.5%	$1.069B	$0.000B	$0.000B	$0.142B	FMP stable annual cash flow and income statement
2024	$0.038B	1.4%	$0.779B	29.6%	$1.219B	$0.000B	$0.000B	$0.040B	FMP stable annual cash flow and income statement
2025	$0.053B	1.7%	$0.906B	28.9%	$1.379B	$0.500B	$0.000B	$0.088B	FMP stable annual cash flow and income statement

Capital allocation notes: HubSpot does not pay a dividend. The largest recent capital allocation item is repurchase activity, including $500.0M in FY2025 cash flow and $211.0M during Q1 FY2026 per the IR release. M&A was modest in FY2025 at $87.6M of acquisition cash flow, consistent with bolt-on acquisitions rather than a roll-up model. Capital intensity is low on PPE capex, but capitalized software is material; QF TTM showed $134.5M of capitalized software, so downstream FCF should consider both PPE-only FCF and FCF after capitalized software.

8. Balance sheet snapshot, FY-1 and latest quarter

Item	$B	Source
Cash and equivalents	$0.944B	FMP quarterly balance sheet; QF P6

Item	$B	Source
Short-term investments	$0.747B	FMP quarterly balance sheet; QF P6
Total debt current plus LT	$0.247B	FMP quarterly balance sheet; primarily operating lease liabilities
Net debt using cash only	$-0.697B	Calc; negative means net cash
Net debt using cash plus ST investments	$-1.444B	Calc; negative means net cash
Net debt / EBITDA	n/m net cash	Calc using net cash balance sheet
Goodwill + intangibles	$0.554B	FMP quarterly balance sheet
Tangible book value	$1.442B	Calc stockholders equity less goodwill and intangibles
Deferred revenue current plus noncurrent	$1.045B	SEC companyfacts and QF P6
RPO	$1.700B	SEC companyfacts RevenueRemainingPerformanceObligation

Balance-sheet read-through: HubSpot is net cash even before short-term investments, so debt does not constrain the 2031 horizon. The debt line is economically lease-like rather than a conventional leverage burden. The main balance-sheet items to monitor are deferred revenue, RPO, and SBC dilution rather than solvency. RPO reached $1.7B at Q1 FY2026, while deferred revenue was $1.045B. That supports near-term revenue visibility, though HubSpot does not disclose cRPO separately in the pulled sources.

9. Recent corporate actions, last 12 months

- 2026-05-07: HubSpot reported Q1 FY2026 revenue of $881.0M and raised full-year 2026 guidance to $3.700B to $3.708B revenue and $762M to $766M non-GAAP operating income. Source: HubSpot Q1 FY2026 IR release.
- 2026-03-31 quarter: HubSpot repurchased $211.0M of common stock in Q1 FY2026, with $789.0M remaining under the $1B authorization. Source: HubSpot Q1 FY2026 IR release.
- 2026-02-11: HubSpot reported FY2025 revenue of $3.131B, customers of 288,706, ASRPC of $11,683, Q4 calculated billings of $971.4M, and FY2026 initial revenue guidance of $3.69B to $3.70B. Source: HubSpot Q4 FY2025 IR release.
- 2025-11-05: HubSpot reported Q3 FY2025 customers of 278,880 and calculated billings of $804.0M. Source: HubSpot Q3 FY2025 IR release and FMP transcript.
- 2025-09-03: HubSpot held 2025 Analyst Day and emphasized AI-powered customer platform positioning, Breeze agents, upmarket and downmarket growth, and pricing/platform transformation. Source: HubSpot Analyst Day event page and corrected transcript PDF fetched live.
- Legal/regulatory: no large legal settlement or regulatory action was identified in the Q1 2026 10-Q, FY2025 10-K, releases, or SEC submissions searched for this D package. This is a searched non-finding, not a legal opinion.

10. Open data gaps

Gap	Classification	Sources and terms checked	Implication
Ending ARR dollars and net-new-ARR dollars	True non-disclosure	2025 10-K, Q1 2026 10-Q, Q1-Q4 releases, FMP transcripts, Analyst Day; searched ARR and annual recurring revenue	Cannot model ARR stock or net-new-ARR dollars directly; use disclosed growth commentary only
DBNR, GRR, churn	True non-disclosure	SEC filings, IR releases, and FMP transcripts; searched DBNR, dollar-based, gross retention, churn, GRR	Retention quality must be inferred from disclosed NRR snapshots plus customers, ASRPC, RPO, deferred revenue, and billings
cRPO	True non-disclosure	SEC companyfacts exposes RPO, not current RPO; filings searched cRPO and current remaining performance obligation	Use total RPO only; do not invent current RPO
Hub-level product revenue dollars	True non-disclosure	10-K, Q1 10-Q, releases, Analyst Day; searched Marketing Hub, Sales Hub, Service Hub, Content Hub, Operations Hub	Segment appendix should not build hub-level historical revenue tables

Gap	Classification	Sources and terms checked	Implication
AI-specific revenue, AI ARR, or paid attach dollars	True non-disclosure	Q1 FY2026 release, Q1 call, Analyst Day transcript; searched AI, agentic, Breeze, usage, pricing	Usage/adoption KPIs exist, but AI monetization dollars remain qualitative upside/defense only
Analyst Day slide deck direct static-file	Not fetched / omitted	IR event page identified static-file; direct PowerShell download returned 403	Use Analyst Day event page and transcript PDF, not slide deck, for this D package
Segment operating income	Not applicable / true non-disclosure	QF/QFR and 10-K searched segment and operating segment	Do not invent segment OI; use consolidated operating income only

Source map and self-verification

Check	Result	Evidence
Most recent quarter headline growth	Passed	Q1 FY2026 IR release fetched live; body shows revenue grew 23% reported and 18% constant currency
Management quote source date	Passed	FMP transcript endpoint for Q1 FY2026 returned date 2026-05-07, matching expected call and IR release date
FY2025 revenue live FMP annual pull	Passed with QF control	FMP annual income statement pulled live; QF/QFR use SEC-controlled FY2025 revenue $3.131266B because FMP was $0.022M lower
Markdown table contract	Prepared for validation	All tables generated through a single helper with equal cell counts and pipe replacement
Warehouse cache avoidance	Passed	No local data warehouse path was read; raw pulls are D-owned live FMP, SEC, and HubSpot IR files

Key downstream handoff: HubSpot is one operating segment, with FY2025 revenue $3.131B and FY2025 subscription revenue $3.064B. TTM revenue ending 2026-03-31 is $3.298B per QF. The current operating story is high-teens constant-currency growth, customer base expansion from 288,706 at FY2025 to 299,458 at Q1 FY2026, ASRPC rising to $11,722, RPO of $1.7B, and non-GAAP operating margin guidance around 21% for FY2026. The hardest gaps are retention metrics and product-family economics; those should remain explicit model-risk flags.