Haldane Pryce LLP · operating-model position

Current-state archetype blend, target archetype, and the three bridging moves

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

Derek Duffy, APAC Director, Alt-V

> **Haldane Pryce runs today as an undesigned blend of three archetypes**; its stated strategy implies Integrated Advisory led, with a Product House inside it, and three partner-vote decisions would get it there. The map is deliberately short: it is what a strategy conversation should produce before the vote. It names the operating-model shape the firm actually runs today, the shape the stated strategy implies, and the three moves between them. The firm, the people and the figures below are invented.

Current-state blend

Haldane Pryce today is an undesigned blend of three archetypes operating under one P&L. Corporate (120 FE, £28m) runs as a classic **Counsel House**: low leverage, senior-led, bespoke matters, high realisation. Insurance (90 FE, £16m) runs as a **Process Factory**: panel-driven, high leverage, standardised workflows, margin pressure increasing. The emerging healthcare practice (45 FE, £9m) is being built as an **Integrated Advisory** around NHS trusts and private providers, drawing on employment, commercial, property and regulatory in combination.

The three archetypes carry different cost structures, different partner pay defaults and different technology appetites. The current partner remuneration model, a modified lockstep with a merit element, favours the Counsel House and punishes the Process Factory; the technology budget favours the Process Factory and starves the Integrated Advisory. The friction the board describes as “we never seem to get technology decisions right” is a direct consequence.

Target archetype (what the stated strategy implies)

The 2024 strategy document names “sector-led regional leadership” with specific focus on healthcare and financial services. Read against the five archetypes, that is **Integrated Advisory led, with a Product House housed inside it for the panel-driven insurance work**. Insurance would run as a quasi-separate business unit with its own leverage and pricing targets, inside a firm whose shape is otherwise organised around sector-based cross-practice teams.

The firm keeps every practice; the decision is about how it is organised and resourced to run them.

Three bridging moves

Three decisions, in sequence, would make the target shape real. Each is a partner-vote-level decision.

1. **Separate the insurance P&L.** Carve the insurance practice into a Product House unit with its own leverage ratio, pricing authority, technology budget and partner pay defaults (fixed-and-bonus rather than modified lockstep). Governance: a committee reporting to the board quarterly rather than through the practice-group structure.
2. **Build the sector operating model for healthcare, as the exemplar for financial services next.** Stand up a sector lead with budget authority over cross-practice work, a client-facing P&L (not a practice-group one), and a resourcing model that pulls from employment, commercial, property and regulatory in combination. Partner pay adjusted for sector contribution, not practice-group origination alone.

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

3. **Reset the technology budget to the archetype shape, not evenly across practices.** Insurance (Product House) gets automation and matter-platform investment proportionate to its margin pressure. Healthcare (Integrated Advisory) gets collaboration and client-portal investment proportionate to the cross-practice shape. Corporate (Counsel House) gets lower-ticket, senior-productivity investment, not firm-wide tool rollouts.

What this does not solve

The TOM Map assesses shape only. It does not re-score the strategy - the Strategy Diagnostic in this pack does that. It does not change the remuneration model - the Partner Remuneration tools under the Pay pillar do that. It does not design the technology stack - the Legal Tech Architect under the AI & Technology pillar does that. Each follow-on is a separate engagement; the TOM Map tells a firm which engagements it needs, in which order.

The firm, people and figures in this map are invented. The archetype framework is Alt-V's Firm of the Future, documented in the companion briefing (July 2026).

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