



AN INDUSTRY BRIEFING FROM GRAIL

# What's Changing in the Capital Behind Your Design

---

*Your next partner-capital decision. The project-margin forecast you sign. The partner-equity story that explains why this practice compounds faster than peers. A briefing for CFOs and Finance Directors at mid-market European architecture practices.*

---

**PREPARED BY**

Johan Grönstedt · GRAIL

**FOR**

European mid-market  
architecture practice finance  
leaders

**DATE**

April 2026

# Monday morning, partner council meeting at nine

---

Every architecture CFO at a mid-sized European practice has had the same Monday morning. Four things on the council agenda. Your Q2 project margin printed at 26% against a 32% plan, the second consecutive quarter below, and three concept-phase over-services from your best design directors account for most of the gap. Your strongest senior associate on the sustainability team handed notice two weeks ago, and two of her public-sector projects are now at delivery risk. Your practice manager has queued a €400k procurement for BIM-coordination and parametric-design software, described in the paper as a standard tooling upgrade. And the managing partner forwarded an email Friday from a PE-backed consolidator in London asking whether the partnership would explore a minority-stake conversation.

You have signed fifteen project-margin forecasts for this partner council. The pattern used to be simple. Hold the fee-to-cost ratio, hold utilisation, protect the partner draw. Keep the bank comfortable on WIP. The practice was understandable.

Something changed. Your concept-phase margin is slipping on projects where the AI-augmented production tools should have been lifting the senior-designer time cost. Your partner capital is running through practice management as software procurement. The sustainability commitment the partners made publicly exceeds what the current analytical capability can deliver at current fee rates. Your project accountants are closing faster than ever, and the auditor is asking about traceability on the agent-drafted work. The close is clean. The project-margin story underneath it is not.

The job has not changed since the first partnerships were formed. Allocate partner capital where design compounds. Sign the project-margin forecast the partners trust. Author the economic story that explains why this practice's equity compounds faster than peers. The bar has risen on every measure of doing it, simultaneously, and the contradictions the partnership has lived with for decades are suddenly re-openable.

*This briefing covers what is happening in your sector, what it means for the finance function you run, and the three questions your team should answer before the next partner meeting.*

# The production layer just stopped being where senior design time gets spent

---

Every AI-augmented tool your practice touches compresses the production layer. Specification writing, BIM coordination, regulatory compliance checking, standard detailing, whole-life carbon calculation, material benchmarking. Across the sector, 40% or more of senior-designer time has been spent on this work for the last decade, at fee-earning rates the partners accepted because there was no alternative. There is now. The firms moving first are redirecting that senior capacity back to concept work, client relationship depth, and the sustainability leadership their public commitments depend on. The firms moving second are banking the capacity as a quiet headcount reduction, and the next framework tender is where procurement teams will ask for a matching fee cut.

Your competitors are not standing still. Architecture-and-engineering consolidators have been testing the Nordic mid-market for two years, and the conversation is no longer theoretical. Ramboll acquired Henning Larsen in 2019, and that roll-up shape is moving down the fee-revenue band. The firms committing publicly to 2030 climate-neutral design targets (White Arkitekter being the clearest Nordic example) face an analytical demand that exceeds what any partnership can deliver manually at current billing rates. Whole-life carbon, circular material sourcing, and climate-resilience modelling all now sit on the fee-earning side of the P&L. The capability gap is being closed with AI-augmented infrastructure, or it is not being closed at all.

*Your production-layer cost is dropping. The question your partner council has not answered yet is whether the released capacity compounds into partner equity, or leaks back to the client as a fee reduction.*

The junior architect pipeline is thinning in parallel. Graduates are leaving the profession for technology careers because the production grind they were hired to do is the least creative hour of their day. AI that removes that grind changes what a junior architect's first five years actually are. Practices rebuilding the entry pathway around design apprenticeship and AI-augmented capability have talent the consolidators are already trying to hire. Practices that cut juniors this year will spend three years re-hiring them at higher cost in 2029.

# Your partner capital, your project margin, your story are feeling it every week

---

**Your partner capital.** Your practice manager's €400k procurement for BIM-coordination and parametric-design software is sitting in the practice-management budget, approved through the same mechanism used for printers and CAD licences. It is not a tooling request. It is the largest partner-capital decision the partnership will make this year, and it deserves the same discipline brought to a tuck-in acquisition. The practices that present this to the partner council as a capital line, with alternatives, keep the authorship for the next decade. The ones that approve it through practice management have already handed it to the vendor.

**Your project-margin forecast.** The partner council voted on a 32% project-margin plan. The Q2 print came in at 26%. Your Head of FP&A cannot reconstruct the phase-level story because the over-servicing signal lives in design-director time entries the partners never see in aggregate, the sustainability-analysis cost lives in a sub-consultant ledger that is not tied back to the fee line, and the WIP extension on the public-sector framework lives in treasury notes that do not make it into the partner pack. The forecast was not aggressive. The data architecture underneath it was built for monthly reconciliation, not continuous phase-level reconstruction, and that is where the plan is exposed.

**Your fee architecture.** The partner council voted on a fee structure that assumed AI-augmented deliverables would price like the deliverables they replaced. They don't. Competitors quoting into the same framework tenders are pricing multi-dimensional fees on the AI-augmented scope, outcome-based fees on sustainability certification, and value-based fees on planning-permission success. You are on one mechanic. Procurement teams see both quotes side by side. The fee structure that ran clean from 2018 to 2024 is now the reason your net multiplier is drifting on the accounts where the comparison is clearest.

**Your controller and FP&A bench.** The project accounting, WIP reconciliation, fee schedule generation, and first-draft partner-pack work that used to train a junior project accountant into a Controller into a Head of FP&A is now running on agents. The Q1 headcount win is real. The 2031 succession bench is empty. A partnership that cuts the junior layer without rebuilding the entry pathway has a cheaper quarter this year and no internal candidate for the Head of FP&A seat in five.

**Your partner-equity story.** Your partner council wants the annual-draw preview. The bank wants the covenant-review framing. The consolidator is sending discrete enquiries about a minority stake. Three audiences, three different documents, each drafted by a different team, each drawing on a different view of the same underlying practice. The CFOs pulling ahead write the story once and let the three audiences read excerpts of the same document. The ones behind them are editing three papers and hoping the numbers reconcile.

# You do not have three scorecard problems. You have one.

---

Your sector is repricing from below because production cost is dropping across every practice at the same time, and competitors are quoting multi-mechanic fees on the AI-augmented scope while most firms are still quoting stage-percentage. Your finance function is stretched because the project-margin forecast, the partner-capital authorship, and the partner-equity story are each being managed as separate work, each drawing on different data, each drafted by a different person. Same force, two altitudes. But there is a third thing happening that most mid-market architecture CFOs have not named yet, and it is the one that matters most.

Partner-capital allocation without project-margin credibility is guessing. Project-margin credibility without a partner-equity story is scorekeeping. A partner-equity story without a data architecture underneath it is marketing. The finance seat that holds all three holds one integrated asset, not three separate programmes. Every capital-allocation question, every project-margin gap, every narrative weakness is a symptom of the same missing layer: the design-and-capital intelligence infrastructure that feeds all three from the same data, the same discipline, the same partner-level trust.

This is the CAD decision of this decade for the architecture partnership. Every CFO in your peer group is making it right now, whether they see it that way or not. The practices that personally owned the 1990s CAD transition kept design authority and partner equity for the next twenty years. The ones that outsourced the transition to drafting bureaus lost fee-margin structurally within a decade. The shape is the same. The asset under decision is different. The cost of getting it wrong in 2026 is compressed into eighteen months instead of five years.

*You can tell which camp a practice is in from a single question. Can your team answer any material partner-council question by walking the same project-margin graph, in the same meeting, with the same data? Most mid-market practices cannot. The ones that can have already made the shift, and they are the ones compounding partner equity fastest.*

You have twelve to eighteen months. The consolidator conversation is no longer hypothetical. The CFOs who own this decision personally protect partner equity through the AI transition. The ones who do not become the CFO at the practice the consolidator acquires on terms the partner council would not have accepted two years earlier.

# What most practices are doing. What the winners are doing instead.

Most practices are making the same four decisions. A smaller group is making different ones. Default looks cleaner for three quarters. Winners compound from month fifteen.

| THE DEFAULT PATH                                                                                                                                              | THE WINNERS' PATH                                                                                                                                             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Approve software through practice management</b><br>Practice manager signs. Tooling line in the budget. Vendor owns the capability within eighteen months. | <b>Route AI capital through the partner council</b><br>Alternatives on one page against sustainability, junior pathway, tuck-in, partner draw. Partners vote. |
| <b>Hold fees flat, ship AI work quietly</b><br>Production cost drops. Fee stays. Net multiplier drifts. Competitors win the next framework.                   | <b>Migrate fees to three mechanics</b><br>Multi-dimensional on AI deliverables. Outcome-based on sustainability. Value-based on permission success.           |
| <b>Run the forecast on a monthly spreadsheet</b><br>Over-servicing visible only in the post-mortem. Framework scenarios take a week to model.                 | <b>Rebuild the forecast as a live driver graph</b><br>Over-servicing visible in the same meeting. Scenarios in an afternoon. Story in real time.              |
| <b>Cut the junior layer for the Q1 win</b><br>Headcount down twenty percent. Succession bench empty in 2031. External Head of FP&A at premium.                | <b>Redesign the junior pathway around design</b><br>New hires pair with agents on design reasoning and project analytics from day one.                        |

*The default path shows a cleaner Q1. The winners' path compounds from month fifteen. The difference is whether the CFO is authoring partner capital or administering it.*

# Capital Allocation. Forecast Credibility. Value-Creation Narrative.

*Three questions every architecture CFO is tracking. The first is the crux. The other two are how you earn the right to answer it.*

## 01 · CAPITAL ALLOCATION

### Where does the next €3-5M of partner capital actually compound?

AI-augmented design infrastructure the practice owns? The sustainability analytical capability the partners committed to publicly? The junior-training pathway rebuild? A tuck-in of a specialist studio? The partner draw itself? Today's default: the practice manager procures, the partner council never sees it as a capital question, and the authority to direct partner capital toward the practice's defensible position slides toward vendors.

## 02 · FORECAST CREDIBILITY

### Why did the project margin print below plan, and what is the phase-level story?

The partners voted on 32% project margin. The practice is printing 26%. Your Head of FP&A cannot walk the partner council through the phase-level story because the over-servicing signal sits in design-director time entries, the sustainability-analysis cost sits in a sub-consultant ledger, and the WIP extension on the framework sits in treasury notes the partners never see. Three scenarios used to take a week. They now run in an afternoon. The bar has risen on what credible means.

## 03 · VALUE-CREATION NARRATIVE

### What does this practice do that compounds partner equity faster than peers?

The partners want the annual-draw preview. The bank wants the covenant-review framing. The consolidator is sending discrete minority-stake enquiries. Three audiences, three documents, three teams, and the numbers underneath them do not match. The CFOs pulling ahead write the story once and refresh it continuously from the same data architecture. The three audiences read excerpts of the same document.

# What the practices winning this play are actually doing

---

Four concrete moves any architecture CFO can start this quarter. Each addresses one lever. Pulled together, they become one design-and-capital intelligence asset the practice runs on.

1

## **Capital: route the AI-infrastructure decision through the partner council, not practice management**

Your practice manager's €400k request is a partner-capital decision. Treat it like one. Present alternatives on one page: AI-augmented design and production capability owned by the practice, sustainability analytical build-out for the 2030 commitment, junior-pathway rebuild, tuck-in acquisition of a specialist studio, partner draw. Hurdle-rated against the partnership's own cost of capital. Name what you are choosing not to fund to protect what you are funding. That sentence keeps authorship at the finance seat.

2

## **Forecast: rebuild the project-margin forecast as a live driver graph**

Your forecast should draw from live design-director time entries, live WIP positions, live sub-consultant ledgers, and live framework-tender pipeline data, as one graph rather than five spreadsheets. Phase-level over-servicing becomes visible in the partner meeting rather than in the post-mortem. Framework-tender scenarios compress from a week to an afternoon. The forecast stops being a deliverable on a cadence and becomes a live artefact the partner council actually reads.

3

## **Fees: migrate from one fee mechanic to three**

Multi-dimensional fees on the AI-augmented deliverables. Outcome-based fees on sustainability certification targets. Value-based fees on planning-permission success and framework-tender scope. The stage-percentage base holds the core. The three new mechanics convert released production capacity into net multiplier expansion on the accounts where competitors are already quoting this way. Finance authors the migration plan. Design directors build against it. Procurement teams read two quotes side by side and notice the difference.

4

## **Narrative: write the partner-equity story once, refresh continuously**

Three sentences on one page. What does this practice do that compounds partner equity faster than peers? What capital gets starved to protect it? What gets fed? Refresh the story continuously off the same driver graph that runs the project-margin forecast. The annual-draw paper excerpts it. The covenant-review framing excerpts it. The consolidator enquiry gets the same document with a different cover note. Three audiences, one artefact, three registers. The partner council recites the story back.

# The only firm that joins partner-capital authorship to working design tools

The architecture CFO has four places to go. None can do what we do.

**The big finance transformation practices** will sell a twelve-month close-acceleration programme staffed by a partner and analysts billing hours. Their audit arm constrains what they can honestly advise on governance. Their billable-day model requires selling substrate being commoditised. They ship a tighter close, not partner-equity authorship.

**The architecture software vendors** will sell licences and a long implementation. Your partner-equity moat has to sit on practice-owned infrastructure or it becomes a vendor asset at renewal. The CFO who builds design-and-capital intelligence on a vendor stack builds it for the vendor.

**The practice-management specialists** will sell a point solution for one layer: project accounting, utilisation, reporting. None can run the partner-capital and partner-equity conversation the seat requires.

**The AI-native finance-agent and design-AI startups** will sell substrate tooling where depreciation is steepest. Buying them does not address who authors the partner-capital decision. A cleaner close, the same authorship gap.

*The market offers four things you have already said no to. GRAIL is the fifth option.*

## WHAT YOU GET

Senior advisory that speaks partner-meeting, not deck-room

Working infrastructure your team uses the same week

Custom agents built on your projects, your fees, your data

The start of a design-and-capital layer your FP&A owns

No vendor lock-in at any phase of the engagement

## WHY IT MATTERS

Founded by operators who have carried CFO-adjacent seats

Business first, technology second

Three weeks from first meeting to working infrastructure

Your team keeps the infrastructure, you own the IP

Every next step earned by what just shipped, never assumed

# Three sessions with your finance leadership. Working infrastructure from week one.

*We start with your finance leadership and a partner sponsor because the change cannot outrun the team's personal understanding of what is possible. Three workshops. Each delivers standalone value. Each earns the right to the next.*

## WORKSHOP 01

### How to think

Walk through what is happening in your sector and inside your finance function. Build the first piece of infrastructure in the room: a live driver agent on your real project-margin model, running against real time entries, WIP, and framework-tender pipeline. Your leadership team leaves with a shared view of what to do next and the first piece of working infrastructure already in their hands.

## WORKSHOP 02

### Your finance infrastructure

A half-day build. Your Controller, Head of FP&A, Project Accountants, and partner sponsor each leave with five to ten pieces of working infrastructure tuned to their work. Project-margin agents. Framework-tender scenario generation. Sustainability-budget monitoring. Partner-pack narrative drafting. Infrastructure your team uses the same week, not decks about infrastructure.

## WORKSHOP 03

### Ready to run

Refined infrastructure based on real use. The rollout plan to the wider finance team. The partner-capital-thesis document for the next council meeting. The fee-architecture migration roadmap for the design directors. And the managing-partner and bank conversations with numbers they can check: hurdle alternatives, scenario ranges, partner-equity measurement.

*Three weeks. No IT project. No partner-council approval needed to start. The infrastructure your finance function is already running on when we finish.*

## For your next partner meeting

The questions where your finance leadership cannot agree on an answer are the ones worth an hour on the partner-council agenda. Ask these honestly.

*Your practice manager has queued €400k for BIM-coordination and parametric-design software. Is it in the practice-management budget as a tooling line, or on the partner-capital page as one option among five? If the former, what would it take to move it before the next council cycle?*

*The partners voted on a 32% project-margin plan. Your print is 26%. Can your team walk the partner council through the phase-level over-servicing story in the same meeting, or does it take a post-mortem? If the latter, what data architecture is missing?*

*Competitors on your last three framework tenders are quoting multi-mechanic fees on AI-augmented deliverables. You are on one mechanic. What is the twelve-month plan to migrate to three, and who on your team is authoring it?*

*The partner council, the bank, and a consolidator have each asked for a different picture of this practice in the last ninety days. Are they reading excerpts of the same document, or are your teams drafting three papers that do not reconcile?*

*Of the junior project accountants and associates you are rotating out or cutting to agents this year, how many are the people who would have made your 2031 Head of FP&A succession bench? What are you doing instead to build that bench?*

*If any of these produces a disagreement in your finance leadership, that is the conversation worth having before the partner council asks.*

IN THIS SERIES

# There's a version of this briefing for every seat at the table.

GRAIL has produced industry briefings calibrated to the specific reality of each C-suite role.

## CEO

**Revenue. Margin. Valuation.**

Three numbers your board reads. AI is rewriting all three in your industry.

## CFO

▶ YOU ARE READING

**Capital. Forecast. Story.**

What you allocate this year is the story your board reads next year.

## COO

**Cheaper. Better. Faster.**

The triple threat that used to be a tradeoff is now table stakes.

## CHRO

**Capacity. Capability. Promise.**

The biggest talent transition of a career. Compete on capacity, not headcount.

## CPTO

**Moat. Speed. Allocation.**

The platform moat that survives 2028 is being chosen this year.

## CCO

**Margin. Pace. Position.**

The whole GTM playbook is being rewritten in real time, across every commercial team at once.

Visit [grail.works](https://grail.works) for the full series.

**GRAIL**

An AI-native management consultancy helping European mid-market leadership teams figure out what fundamentally changes about their business as AI enters their industry.

[www.grail.works](https://www.grail.works)