Enderby Finch LLP · AI maturity position

Phase 2 Diagnostic companion · five-stage firm-level assessment against the Reactive → Compounding anchor set

Sample output · fictitious firm, figures and findings · Alt-V Law

Derek Duffy, APAC Director, Alt-V

Enderby Finch sits in Experimenting, partly into Deploying, and measurement is the gating dimension. This position paper is what Phase 2 of an AI & Technology engagement produces at the end of week two, before the three tool diagnostics run on the firm's current estate. It names where the firm sits on the five-stage anchor model, surfaces the gating dimension, and names the three capability moves Phase 3 must set up. The firm, people and figures below are invented.

Five-stage firm-level position

STAGE	WHAT THE FIRM WOULD LOOK LIKE	ENDERBY POSITION
Reactive	No AI strategy; individual partners respond to client prompts; no committee; no budget line.	Past this stage. A governance committee was stood up in March 2026 and a Copilot pilot is live.
Experimenting	One or two pilots with no go-decision frame; pilots produce no usable data; strategy drafted at COO / CIO level without partnership endorsement.	**Current position (dominant).** The Copilot pilot has run for seven months without a go-decision. The committee has met twice. The AI strategy exists in draft but has not been to the partnership.
Deploying	Firm-wide tools procured; rollout across practice groups in progress; adoption uneven; the first measurement data is landing, usually inconclusive.	**Current position (partial).** Harvey, Lexis+AI, Luminance, Kira Systems and Legatics are deployed; six of eight have no measurement framework behind them.
Governed	Four control artefacts in place: partnership-endorsed strategy, published policy with teeth, vendor consolidation plan with retirement decisions landed, measurement discipline reading matter-type economics.	Not yet. The policy is drafted but not endorsed; no consolidation plan exists; measurement discipline is absent.
Compounding	Pricing moved to AFA on matter types where AI changes economics; leverage redesigned where AI replaces first-year work; partner pay reflecting AI-augmented delivery.	Not yet; Governed comes first. Compounding depends on the Pricing and Partner Pay pillars running against the AI efficiency reading, which does not yet exist.

© 2026 Derek Duffy. Licensed to Alt-V for authorised use.

The gating dimension

Measurement is the gating dimension. The firm sits in both Experimenting (strategy and governance stance) and Deploying (tool procurement) because the two tracks have run in parallel without composing. The specific move that converts them into Governed is the measurement discipline that would let the Copilot pilot owner answer the CEO's "scale, pivot or stop" question, and the overlap audit of the eight-tool AI stack that would let the vendor consolidation plan land. Without measurement, the firm cannot know which of the eight tools is actually producing productivity shift; without the overlap audit, it cannot retire anything safely. Everything else in the Governed stage waits.

This is the pattern the operating model is designed to test for in a mid-tier firm that said yes to multiple point tools before standing up the governance frame. Until the firm measures what its tools produce, the committee has no evidence to govern with.

The three capability moves Phase 3 must set up

Each is a specific capability build. All three can run in parallel across the eight-to-sixteen-week engagement without exceeding the firm's change capacity.

1. **Stand up the measurement discipline, starting with the Copilot pilot.** Baseline KPIs for the two practice groups in the pilot (corporate and employment), measurement protocol for the next 90 days, go / pivot / stop decision date at week sixteen. The CFO and the pilot owner co-own; the AI Programme Health Dashboard is the artefact. Without this, every other move stays blocked.
2. **Run the Legal Tech Architect audit and land the vendor consolidation plan.** The eight-tool stack has overlapping tools, and retiring two of them would cut licence spend. It is a partnership decision, because retiring a tool a practice group is attached to needs a partnership-level frame. The Legal Tech Architect audit is the input; the committee is the decision forum.
3. **Finish the AI policy and land it in the partnership.** The policy exists in draft; the gap is the four cluster disciplines it must support - tool control, training, verification, disclosure. The AI Governance Scorecard sample report names which cluster will fail an insurer's proposal form first (verification); the Policy Stack Configurator stands the policy up with those disciplines in it.

What this does not solve

The AI Operating Model Position is a firm-level stage assessment. It does not read the current legal-tech estate for overlap - the **Legal Tech Architect** does that. It does not read capability on the twelve dimensions - the **AI Readiness Diagnostic** does that. It does not read whether the governance would survive external questioning - the **AI Governance Scorecard** does that. It does not price a matter type under AI efficiency - the Pricing Engine does that, driven by the AI readiness results. It does not redesign practice-group leverage - that is a partner-pay conversation driven by the Talent Economics Model. The point of the position is to make the other four engagements credible, by naming what stage the firm is actually on.

The firm, people and figures in this position paper are invented. The AI Operating Model five-stage anchor is documented in the companion briefing, the AI Toolkit (July 2026) and the Legal AI Refresh (October 2026).

© 2026 Derek Duffy. Licensed to Alt-V for authorised use.