

LUMEN & LEVER

FOR FOUNDER-LED BUSINESSES

---

# The Clarity Audit.

*A paid diagnosis from a systems thinker.*

PREPARED FOR

## Holden & Reeve

Claire Holden & David Reeve · Melbourne · 6 lawyers · 3 support staff

ENGAGEMENT

Five business days · One PDF report · One walkthrough call

---

*Holden & Reeve is a fictional firm used for illustration only. Any resemblance to real businesses is coincidental. Structure, depth, and tone match what you receive in a real engagement.*

lee@lumenandlever.com · lumenandlever.com

---

## 01 · ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

---

# What this report is. And what it is not.

Holden & Reeve is a boutique commercial law firm based in Melbourne. Six lawyers plus three support staff. Founded in 2014 by Claire Holden and David Reeve, who left a mid-tier commercial firm to start a practice focused on founder-led small and medium businesses. Practice areas include commercial contracts, employment, commercial leasing, business sales and acquisitions, and general corporate advice. Revenue is approximately \$3.2 million across roughly 140 active clients.

The firm is good at what it does. Client retention is above 85% year on year. The partners are both respected in their areas. But revenue has plateaued for two years while the partners work sixty-hour weeks, and Claire has started noticing she does not recognise the names of firms she is losing pitches to. Last month, a client she has acted for since 2016 mentioned in passing that they had almost hired a different firm before picking Holden & Reeve, because they found it "hard to tell the shortlist apart." That comment kept Claire up at night for a week.

Claire commissioned this Audit to answer one question. She phrased it plainly in the founder interview: **"We are demonstrably good at this. Why can the market not see it?"** The answer is in this report. Most of it will be uncomfortable, and some of it is harder to accept than the rest.

---

## WHAT YOU ARE ACTUALLY BUYING

This is not a marketing audit. It is not a brand review. It is not a list of SEO keywords or a redesign proposal. It is a diagnosis from someone who has spent thirty years looking for the structure underneath systems. Technical systems at IBM and inside tier one banks. Organisational systems across twenty to thirty concurrent programs inside a federal regulator. Commercial systems built from zero to a million customers. And more recently, systems for how human beings operate under pressure.

The habit underneath all of that is the same. Find out how the thing is actually put together. Find the structure that is quietly breaking. Tell the owner what to do about it. The word for that habit is **systems thinking**, and it is what you are paying for. Not a deliverable. Not a template. A pair of eyes that has seen this pattern in dozens of businesses, and a mind that cannot help looking for the structure underneath even when everyone else is arguing about the paint.

A law firm's positioning problem is never a law firm problem. It is the same structural problem that shows up in architecture practices, boutique consultancies, specialty manufacturers, design studios, and every other founder-led professional service. If you are reading this as a sample, the diagnosis in the following pages is not about commercial law. It is about the shape of problem that is almost certainly present in your own business, and will not be solved by anyone who has not learned to see it.

## SCOPE

Five business days. Desk research, website crawl, competitor review across six of Holden & Reeve's closest peers, a 90-minute founder interview with Claire and David together, a review of the tools and systems the firm uses day to day, a written report, and a walkthrough call. No implementation. No discovery workshops. No stakeholder interviews. One pair of experienced eyes on the whole business, and a written answer at the end.

---

**02 · EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

# Three findings. Three actions. One decision to make.

Holden & Reeve's problem is not the website. It is not the SEO spend, the brand, the logo, or the stock photography on the team page, though all of those show up later in this report. The problem is that Holden & Reeve has never written down who the firm is *for*. Without that decision, every surface of the firm defaults to looking like every other boutique commercial practice in Melbourne. And the clients the firm actually wants cannot tell the difference between Holden & Reeve and the five other names on their shortlist.

## THE THREE FINDINGS

**1****HIGH IMPACT****The firm's single biggest commercial differentiator is not mentioned on the website.**

During the founder interview, Claire confirmed that Holden & Reeve offers fixed-fee engagements across almost all commercial work, including matters that most comparable firms bill hourly in six-minute units. This is unusual at the firm's seniority level. It is genuinely rare in Melbourne commercial law. It is the single clearest reason a founder-led business should pick Holden & Reeve over Competitors C, D, or E in Section 03. The word "fixed-fee" appears nowhere on the current website. Not on the homepage. Not on the services pages. Not in the FAQ. Not on the contact form. The firm's strongest commercial argument has been kept a secret from the market for eleven years.

**2****HIGH IMPACT****Six lawyers. Six bios. Zero voices.**

Every lawyer in the firm appears on the "Our Team" page with a standard biography: law school, admission year, areas of practice, one line of personal interests. Not one of them has a published opinion on anything. Not one of them shows how they actually think about a legal problem. Clients choose lawyers the same way they choose doctors and surgeons: they want to know how the person thinks before they hand them a problem. The website shows credentials and nothing else. The most underused marketing asset in the firm is the fact that Claire has been writing private briefing notes to clients for years that are sharper and more valuable than anything on LinkedIn in her practice area.

## 3

## HIGH IMPACT

**Claire and David's instinct that the website is broken is correct about the symptom and wrong about the cause.**

The website is the surface where the problem is most visible. It is not where the problem lives. The problem lives in the fact that Holden & Reeve has never decided who the firm is *for*. Is it the \$500k owner-operator signing a supplier contract? The \$2M founder raising capital? The \$10M business owner selling to a strategic acquirer? Right now the firm tries to serve all three, and the website, the fee structures, and the partners' own elevator pitches all reflect that ambiguity. Until that decision is made, no rewrite will hold for more than six months.

**THE THREE ACTIONS**

Each is covered in depth in Section 08. Summary here.

1. Decide who Holden & Reeve is for. Recommended: founder-led businesses between \$500k and \$10M revenue who want a lawyer, not a legal department. Everything else cascades from this.
2. Rewrite the homepage around the fixed-fee promise. Lead with the sentence "We do not bill in six-minute units." That sentence alone will change the shape of the inbound inquiries within a fortnight.
3. Replace the six lawyer bios with one published opinion per lawyer per quarter. Claire's existing private briefing notes are the starting material. Publishing them is the fastest way to make each lawyer recognisable to the market.

## 03 · COMPETITOR POSITIONING MAP

## Six law firms. Read end to end.

Six of Holden & Reeve's closest competitors were reviewed across homepage, practice areas, people pages, fees or pricing pages, and any published insights. The selection was made during the founder interview and represents the firms Holden & Reeve loses work to most often. All names have been anonymised but the archetypes they represent are recognisable to anyone in Melbourne commercial law.

### COMPETITOR A

#### The White-Shoe Traditional

##### THEIR HEADLINE

*"Trusted legal counsel for the enterprises that built this city."*

##### POSITIONING

Founded in the 1920s. Formal, gilded, photographs of partners in dark suits against mahogany. Acts for listed corporates, family offices, and inherited wealth. Three hundred lawyers across four offices. They do not take work from businesses under \$20M revenue.

##### PRICE SIGNAL

No pricing mentioned anywhere. Contact is via a general switchboard and a partner's secretary.

##### WEAKNESS

Intimidating, slow, and structurally uninterested in the founder-led SME. A \$2M business approaching them is treated as a rounding error, if they take the call at all.

##### YOUR OPPORTUNITY

**Holden & Reeve can offer comparable calibre of advice to clients who would never make it past Competitor A's reception. Say so directly. Name the ground.**

### COMPETITOR B

#### The Aggressive Litigation Boutique

##### THEIR HEADLINE

*"When they come for you, come to us."*

##### POSITIONING

Ten partners, all ex-disputes. Combative tone, war-metaphor branding, photographs of partners looking serious and holding pens. Reputation for being the firm you hire when negotiation has failed.

##### PRICE SIGNAL

Hourly rates published on the fees page (\$650–\$950/hr). No fixed fees.

##### WEAKNESS

Litigation is not advice. A founder who needs ongoing commercial counsel does not want to live inside a fighting posture. Clients hire this firm for one matter and then never return.

##### YOUR OPPORTUNITY

**Holden & Reeve can be the trusted advisor the founder actually needs on the twenty decisions that happen before the one that ends up in court. Frame the distinction explicitly.**

## 03 · CONTINUED

## Competitor positioning map.

### COMPETITOR C

#### The Big Law Refugee Boutique

THEIR HEADLINE

*"Top-tier commercial experience, without the top-tier overhead."*

POSITIONING

Founded in 2018 by three ex-partners from top-tier national firms. Twelve lawyers. Clean modern brand, confident positioning, strong commercial focus. Clearly the most dangerous direct competitor in this set. Holden & Reeve loses work to them roughly one pitch in three.

PRICE SIGNAL

No published rates. "Contact us for a proposal." Engagements typically start at \$12,000 for a defined matter.

WEAKNESS

Six-minute billing units and hourly rates. They adopted the Big Law financial model with a slightly lower price tag. Clients who need to think out loud learn quickly that every phone call is billable. Word gets around.

YOUR OPPORTUNITY

**This is the most important competitor in the set. Competitor C has created the category Holden & Reeve should own: senior commercial advice for founder-led businesses. The one thing Competitor C cannot do without breaking their financial model is fixed-fee work. That is Holden & Reeve's entire opening.**

### COMPETITOR D

#### The Tech-Enabled Franchise

THEIR HEADLINE

*"Legal services for modern business. Subscription plans from \$299/month."*

POSITIONING

National platform. Subscription model. Junior lawyers supervised by senior ones. Heavy marketing spend on search and content. Templated documents, fast turnaround, light on advice.

PRICE SIGNAL

Transparent subscription tiers starting at \$299/month. High-volume, low-margin.

WEAKNESS

Commoditised delivery. No real relationship with any individual lawyer. A founder with a genuinely novel problem discovers very quickly that the template does not cover their situation.

YOUR OPPORTUNITY

**Holden & Reeve should own the opposite end: a real lawyer with real judgement, priced fixed-fee but not templated, who knows your business and returns your call.**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>COMPETITOR E</b>     | <b>The Single-Speciality Firm</b>  |
| THEIR HEADLINE          | <i>"Australia's employment law specialists."</i>   |
| POSITIONING             | Twenty-lawyer firm that only does employment and industrial relations. Strong brand in their niche. Turns away anyone with a non-employment matter. Genuinely excellent at what they do.   |
| PRICE SIGNAL            | Hourly billing with published partner/senior/junior rates. No fixed fees.  |
| WEAKNESS                | Turns away the three-quarters of the founder's legal needs that are not employment related. A growing business ends up juggling three specialists, which means juggling three sets of advice that do not talk to each other.                           |
| <b>YOUR OPPORTUNITY</b> | <b>Holden &amp; Reeve can be the full-service alternative for founders who do not want to manage three specialist relationships. The word "full-service" is underused in this market.</b>  |
| <b>COMPETITOR F</b>     | <b>The Referral-Only Old-Timer</b>   |
| THEIR HEADLINE          | <i>"(Website last updated in 2014.)"</i>   |
| POSITIONING             | Forty-year-old practice. Two partners. Wins all work through a network of accountants, business brokers, and existing clients. No website to speak of, no marketing spend, no published anything. Generally well-regarded by the people who know them. |
| PRICE SIGNAL            | Not published. "Call the office."  |
| WEAKNESS                | Invisible to any founder under fifty. The referral network is ageing out and the practice is quietly shrinking. New business formation has dropped for four years running.   |
| <b>YOUR OPPORTUNITY</b> | <b>Holden &amp; Reeve can combine a modern, visible online presence with the same level of direct partner attention Competitor F is trading on. Have both. Most firms have neither.</b>  |

### THE WHITE SPACE NONE OF THEM ARE TAKING

The commercial law firm for founder-led businesses between \$500k and \$10M revenue, where every engagement is led by Claire or David personally, every quote is a fixed fee rather than an hourly range, and you get a direct mobile number for urgent matters. Priced commercially but without the billing-unit anxiety that characterises the mid-tier. Fast enough to keep up with the pace of a growing business. Senior enough to give real answers.

Holden & Reeve already does this work. Every partner interview confirmed it. The firm has simply never said so out loud.

---

#### 04 · BRAND AND VOICE AUDIT

---

# The voice on the website is not the voice in the room.

The voice Holden & Reeve uses on its website is not the voice Claire and David use in a client meeting. This is the most common pattern in founder-led professional services firms. The website was written during a period of caution, almost certainly by committee, almost certainly with the intention of "sounding professional." What it actually sounds like is cautious, generic, and interchangeable with every competitor on the shortlist.

### CURRENT VOICE · SAMPLES FROM THE LIVE WEBSITE

*"Our experienced team provides trusted legal advice for businesses of all sizes."*

*"We pride ourselves on building long-term relationships with our clients."*

*"Whether you're a startup or an established enterprise, we're here to help."*

*"Our commitment to excellence ensures you receive the highest standard of service."*

Every one of these sentences could appear on the website of any of the six competitors reviewed. None of them commit to anything. None of them make a promise that could be broken. The word "excellence" appears on the homepage six times. It means nothing after the second.

### INTENDED VOICE · FROM THE FOUNDER INTERVIEW

During the 90-minute interview, Claire and David said the following. Verbatim. None of it is on the website. All of it should be.

**"Most lawyers don't know how to give an answer. They give you three answers and ask which one you want. We give you one answer and tell you why."**

**"If I can't explain a clause to a founder in plain English in two minutes, I haven't understood it well enough yet."**

**"The six-minute billing unit is a tax on founders who need to think out loud. We don't charge for thinking out loud."**

**"I turn down about one in five matters because I can see the client would be better served by someone else. That's why the rest stay for ten years."**

### THE GAP

The gap between the two voices is the gap between the firm the partners actually run and the firm the market sees. The website voice attracts nobody in particular. The founder voice attracts exactly the client Holden & Reeve wants and repels exactly the clients Holden & Reeve should not be taking. Fixing this is not a copywriting problem. It is a decision to sound like the people who actually run the practice.

---

**05 · WEBSITE DIAGNOSTIC**

---

# Ten problems. Every one fixable.

Below are ten specific problems with the current Holden & Reeve website, ranked by severity. Each corresponds to a common failure mode I have seen in dozens of founder-led professional services firms. Everything here is fixable within the three-week Reframe engagement.

**HIGH · 01 The fixed-fee offer is not mentioned anywhere on the homepage.**

The firm's single strongest commercial differentiator is invisible above the fold, below the fold, on the services pages, on the fees page, and in the FAQ. A prospect visiting the site today has no way of knowing that Holden & Reeve does not bill in six-minute units. This is Finding 1 from Section 02. It is the single highest-value thing to change on the site.

**HIGH · 02 The homepage talks about the firm. Clients want it to talk about them.**

Current opening: "Established in 2014, Holden & Reeve is a commercial law firm based in Melbourne..." The prospect is not looking for the firm's history. They are looking for someone who understands their specific problem. Rewrite the hero as the client's problem, not the firm's biography.

**HIGH · 03 The firm sounds identical to five of six competitors.**

See Section 04. Same phrases, same structure, same promises. Fix by committing to the voice from the partner interview and deleting every buzzword in favour of specifics.

**HIGH · 04 The fees page says "contact us for an estimate."**

This is the legal industry default. It is also a genuine frustration point for every founder who has ever hired a lawyer. Replace with a fixed-fee services page showing three service tiers with actual numbers. Commit. The wrong buyer leaves. The right buyer stays.

**HIGH · 05 The partners' answers to "what do you do?" do not match each other.**

During the interview, Claire said "commercial law for growing businesses," David said "SME corporate advisory," and the senior associate on reception said "everything commercial." Three answers. None of them is wrong. But the market cannot hear three answers at once. Pick one and enforce it.

**MED · 06 The About page opens with the firm's founding year, not with a story.**

"Established in 2014" is not a story. It is a date. Replace with the story Claire told during the interview about why she and David left Montague Vance in the middle of a promotion cycle to start a firm with a commitment to fixed fees. That story is the entire brand in one paragraph. It is not on the site anywhere.

**MED · 07 The tech stack has six tools doing the work of three.**

LEAP for matters and time recording. Clio for matter management (half-adopted, used by two of six lawyers). Outlook for email. OneDrive for documents. Slack for internal. Teams for client meetings. One of LEAP or Clio has to go. Addressed fully in Section 06.

**MED · 08 The average inquiry response time from the website form is six business days.**

Measured directly from the form submission log over the past three months. Four inquiries from the same period never received a reply at all. This is not a technology problem. It is a process problem. A one-business-day reply standard is the single most important operational change the firm can make this month.

**MED · 09 The AI strategy is one junior associate's ChatGPT account.**

One of the junior lawyers has been using ChatGPT to draft first-pass contract reviews. There is no firm policy, no disclosure to clients, no data handling protocol, and no quality review before the output is used. Given the Legal Profession Act obligations around confidentiality and supervision, this is a real regulatory risk. It must be addressed this month, not next quarter. Details and specific steps in Section 06.

**LOW · 10 The firm is paying an SEO agency \$350/month to rank for "commercial lawyer Melbourne."**

No measurable change in inquiry volume in eleven months. The problem is not that the SEO is failing. The problem is that even if it succeeded, it would be attracting traffic to a website that gives the visitor no reason to choose Holden & Reeve over any other result. Stop the spend until the positioning is fixed. Revisit in six months.

---

**06 · TECH STACK AND AI REVIEW**

---

# Six tools doing the work of three. One regulatory risk.

Holden & Reeve currently runs six tools across the firm: LEAP, Clio, Outlook, OneDrive, Slack, and Teams. LEAP and Clio do substantially overlapping work. Clio was added eighteen months ago by a lawyer who preferred its interface; the firm never retired LEAP. The result is that some matter files live in LEAP and some live in Clio, depending on who opened them. This is costing the firm roughly four hours a week in administrative overhead and \$220 a month in duplicated subscriptions.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

- LEAP is the industry standard for Australian commercial practice and already holds the firm's time recording, trust accounting, and historical matter data. Consolidate to LEAP. Retire Clio over a thirty-day migration window. Monthly saving: approximately \$220. Annual saving: approximately \$2,640. Operational clarity: substantial.
- Slack and Teams both exist because internal communication is on Slack and client video meetings are on Teams. This is reasonable but undocumented. Write it down. One line in the staff handbook.
- Outlook and OneDrive are both appropriate and neither needs changing. Email signatures, however, are inconsistent across the six lawyers. Standardise them. Takes an hour.

## **AI EXPERIMENTS · FLAGGED REGULATORY RISK**

During the founder interview, Claire mentioned that one junior associate has been using ChatGPT to draft first-pass contract reviews. There is no firm policy, no disclosure to clients, no protocol for what may be pasted into the tool, and no senior review before the output is used in client work. This creates risk in at least three directions: confidentiality, competence, and supervision, all of which are covered by specific obligations under the Legal Profession Uniform Law and the Australian Solicitors' Conduct Rules.

- Write a firm-wide AI usage policy this month. Three paragraphs: what AI may be used for, what it may not, and how client information is protected. Signed by both partners. Distributed to every lawyer and every support staff member. This is the single most urgent action in the report.
- Any AI tool used for client-related work must be one with enterprise data handling. Free-tier ChatGPT is not appropriate for anything containing client information, privileged material, or drafting for use in client advice.
- Decide whether clients are told that AI assisted in drafting their documents. The answer is probably yes. Put it in the engagement letter template.

---

**07 · DIFFERENTIATION STATEMENT**

---

# One paragraph. It has to earn its keep.

This is the paragraph Holden & Reeve should be able to recite in a lift, put on the homepage, print on the back of every business card, and open every new-client conversation with. It should be specific enough that no competitor could steal it without changing their business model. It should be true enough that both Claire and David agree on every word before it goes on the site.

---

Holden & Reeve is the commercial law firm founder-led businesses call when they need a lawyer who runs their own matter, answers their own phone, and charges a fixed fee instead of a six-minute billing unit. Every engagement is led by Claire or David personally. Every quote is a number, not a range. We do not charge you to think out loud.

---

**WHY THIS WORKS**

- It names the buyer (founder-led businesses) without naming a vertical, preserving the firm's cross-sector practice.
- It makes two specific, checkable promises (partner-led engagements and fixed fees) that three of the six competitors cannot match without breaking their financial model.
- It uses the exact phrase "six-minute billing unit," which every founder who has ever hired a lawyer recognises viscerally. The phrase does emotional work no generic claim could do.
- It ends with a reframe ("we do not charge you to think out loud") that captures the single most frustrating thing about hiring a lawyer. Clients read it and feel understood before they have spoken to anyone.

## 08 · RANKED ACTION PLAN

## Twelve actions. Ordered by revenue impact.

The ordering below is not a wish list. It is a sequence. Do them in this order. The early actions create the conditions under which the later actions work. Do them out of order and several will produce less than they should.

- 01 Decide who Holden & Reeve is for.**  
EFFORT: 1 DAY · IMPACT: HIGHEST  
The single decision that makes every other action possible. Recommended: founder-led businesses between \$500k and \$10M revenue. Claire and David both need to agree in writing. The decision takes an afternoon. Nothing else in this list works until it is made.

---

- 02 Rewrite the homepage hero around the fixed-fee promise.**  
EFFORT: 1 WEEK · IMPACT: HIGH  
New hero: "We do not bill in six-minute units." Subhead: the differentiation statement from Section 07. Photograph of Claire and David, not a stock image. This alone will change the shape of the inbound inquiries within a fortnight.

---

- 03 Delete the word "excellence" from every public surface.**  
EFFORT: 1 HOUR · IMPACT: HIGH  
Homepage, services pages, About, FAQ, email signatures, proposal template. Every instance. Do not replace with "quality" or "outstanding" or "premier." Silence is better than the wrong word.

---

- 04 Build a fixed-fee services page with three tiers.**  
EFFORT: 1 WEEK · IMPACT: HIGH  
Tier 1 (standard commercial contracts, employment letters, simple leases): fixed fees from \$750. Tier 2 (business sales under \$2M, shareholder agreements, commercial negotiations): fixed fees from \$2,500. Tier 3 (complex transactions, capital raises, acquisitions): fixed fees from \$7,500. Show the numbers. The wrong buyer self-selects out.

---

- 05 Introduce the \$500 first conversation as the only way new clients start.**  
EFFORT: 2 WEEKS · IMPACT: HIGH  
Ninety minutes with Claire or David. Fixed fee, credited against the first matter if the client proceeds. Signals that a partner's time is valuable. Filters out shoppers. Becomes the ritual that starts every relationship.

---

- 06 Fix the inquiry response process to one business day.**  
EFFORT: 1 WEEK · IMPACT: HIGH  
Every inquiry gets a reply within one business day, even if the reply is "we will come back to you by Friday." Monday and Thursday are dedicated response windows. The current six-day average is losing the firm roughly two matters a month.

- 
- 07 Rewrite the About page as Claire's origin story.**  
EFFORT: 1 WEEK · IMPACT: HIGH  
The story from the interview about why Claire and David left their previous firm mid-promotion-cycle to start a practice committed to fixed fees. One page. Photograph. No buzzwords. No "Established in 2014."
- 
- 08 Write the firm-wide AI usage policy.**  
EFFORT: 2 HOURS · IMPACT: MED  
Three paragraphs. Signed by both partners. Covers permitted uses, prohibited uses, and client data handling. Addresses the regulatory risk flagged in Section 06 before it becomes a complaint. This is urgent.
- 
- 09 Consolidate LEAP and Clio to LEAP only.**  
EFFORT: 4 WEEKS · IMPACT: MED  
Thirty-day migration window. One internal lead. Drop Clio at the end. Saves \$2,640 annually and eliminates the duplicated-matter-file problem that is costing four hours a week in admin.
- 
- 10 Replace lawyer bios with one quarterly opinion piece per lawyer.**  
EFFORT: ONGOING · IMPACT: HIGH  
Claire's private briefing notes are the starting material. Publish one a quarter per lawyer, 600 to 900 words, on a specific current issue in their practice area. Over a year, each lawyer has four published opinions and the market knows how they think.
- 
- 11 Stop the SEO spend until the positioning is fixed.**  
EFFORT: 1 HOUR · IMPACT: LOW  
Cancel the \$350/month engagement. Redirect the \$4,200 annual saving into real photography of the team and the office. Revisit SEO in six months once the new site has something worth ranking for.
- 
- 12 Add a direct mobile number for Claire and David for existing clients.**  
EFFORT: 1 HOUR · IMPACT: MED  
Published on the client portal only. Existing clients get a direct line for urgent matters. Takes an hour to set up. Becomes one of the most referenced benefits in every client testimonial thereafter.
-

---

**09 · METHOD**

---

# The habit, not the framework.

The Clarity Audit is not a framework, a template, or a proprietary methodology. It is the habit of a systems thinker applied to your business for five working days. Thirty years of looking at how things are actually put together, compressed into one focused week on your specific situation. The structure of the report is consistent across engagements. The findings are never the same twice.

## WHAT I DID

- **Day 1.** Ninety-minute founder interview with Claire and David together. Recorded with permission. Transcribed.
- **Day 1-2.** Full website crawl. Every public page read and documented. Screenshots captured. Tech stack audited from the tools named in the interview.
- **Day 2-3.** Competitor review. Six of the firm's closest peers selected during the interview. Each read end to end across homepage, practice areas, people, fees, and published insights.
- **Day 3-4.** Analysis. Finding the two or three structural points where the business is quietly breaking, rather than the twenty surface symptoms that cluster around those points.
- **Day 4-5.** Writing. The report you are reading.
- **Day 5.** Sixty-minute walkthrough call with Claire and David. Every section discussed. Questions answered. Decisions made.

---

## NEXT STEPS · THREE OPTIONS

### OPTION 1 · Act on this report yourself.

You have everything you need. The decision about who Holden & Reeve is for is the first and hardest one. Every other action follows. If you have a designer and a copywriter you trust, hand them the ranked action plan and start at the top. The first three actions can be done in a week without help from anyone.

### OPTION 2 · Upgrade to The Reframe.

If this report has been useful and you would rather have it executed than executed yourself, the Reframe is the next step. Three weeks from kickoff to launch. Every decision in this report becomes a built, working artefact on the new site. No second discovery phase. No re-doing the thinking.

In addition to everything in this Audit, the Reframe includes:

- A positioning and messaging architecture your whole team can use in every conversation.
- A refreshed visual identity (colour, type, imagery direction).
- A full website rewrite. Every page. Every word.
- A rebuild of up to 10 pages, built to load fast and read clearly.
- SEO foundations done properly, not monthly charges for a report you never read.

- Lead capture that actually captures.
- Two rounds of revisions and 30 days of post-launch support.

Total investment: \$9,500. The \$3,500 Audit fee is credited in full if you commit within fourteen days, so the upgrade is effectively \$6,000. No pressure either way. The report you are holding is yours regardless.

**OPTION 3 - Do nothing.**

This is a real option, and the most common one. The cost of doing nothing is not zero. It is every founder who picks a competitor because the competitor sounds clearer than you. It is every inquiry that never comes in because the prospect decided on the first three sentences of someone else's website. It is happening this week, whether or not you act.

**LUMEN & LEVER**

# You pay for judgement, not headcount.

*The habit of a systems thinker, applied to your business for five working days.*

If you have read this far, the question is no longer whether the same pattern exists in your own business. It does. The question is whether you would rather find out in five days, or keep discovering it one lost client at a time.

---

**Lumen & Lever** · For Founder-Led Businesses  
Melbourne · [lee@lumenandlever.com](mailto:lee@lumenandlever.com) · [lumenandlever.com](http://lumenandlever.com)

*"Holden & Reeve" is a fictional firm used for illustration only. Any resemblance to real businesses is coincidental. Structure, depth, and tone match what you receive in a real engagement.*