Sample Co.: Focal Point Review

Sample Outcomes Report | Messaging & Design Audit | October 2026

Brand Blur Score

40%

Blurred

Fragmentation a visitor would notice bouncing between touchpoints.

Visual: 20.1% | Verbal 59.9%

What's Good and Why

The website's visual system holds.

One indigo (#4338CA), one type pairing (Manrope and Inter) and one page template carry across every site page checked. Most companies this size don't get there without guidelines, and it's the foundation everything else can be built on.

The product is shown, not described.

The homepage hero is real product UI, with tasks moving between systems. In a category full of abstract shields and glowing nodes, that's the right instinct: show the work. The headline above it, "Automate the work between your work," makes a specific claim, and the sections below prove it.

The About page has a real voice.

The founding story, about operators who were tired of being the human glue between systems, is specific, human and believable. The founder's LinkedIn posts share that voice: they take positions instead of announcing features, and they get real engagement.

The proof that exists is credible.

Eight named customer logos, a current G2 badge and an uptime SLA linked to its terms. Plenty of competitors would trade their whole site for that customer list.

The solution brief is well built.

Problem, how it works, outcomes, proof, one CTA. It's the clearest explanation of the product anywhere in the body of work.

What's Bad and Why

The headline proof point won't hold still.

Hours saved per week is 12 on the homepage, 20 on the solution brief, up to 30 on LinkedIn and "a full day" on the webinar flyer. None has a source. For a buyer building an internal business case, a number that changes between assets makes every number suspect.

Big claims sit next to no proof.

"The only AI platform your IT team will love" (Platform H1), "the most secure automation platform" (brief) and "deploy in a day" (Pricing) have no customer, benchmark or third party behind them. The real proof sits further down the page.

The trust badges are dead links.

The SOC 2 and GDPR badges on the homepage link to "#". A security-minded buyer clicks those first, and the badges are only there to earn that buyer's trust.

There is no single first ask.

Seven touchpoints make six different primary asks: "Book a demo," "Talk to sales," "Start free trial," "Submit," "Download the guide" and a bare URL on the brief. CTA wording alone scores 64% blur.

A dormant channel is still linked.

X hasn't posted in 14 months, still pins a 2024 launch post and shows the old logo. Anyone who clicks the footer link sees a company that looks like it went quiet.

Inconsistencies

Six names for what Sample Co. is

Six touchpoints give six different answers to one question: what category is this company in?

- Homepage meta: "Workflow automation platform"
- LinkedIn tagline field: "AI operations platform"
- Pricing: "No-code automation for ops teams"
- September release: "The agentic operations layer"

(614) 352-4074 | eric.dunne@vergencydesign.com

- YouTube and the webinar flyer: "AI process automation" and "Intelligent work orchestration"

These aren't page headlines aimed at different readers. They're competing category names, and outside trade press has already settled on a seventh, clearer description on its own. Critical

The numbers drift.

Hours saved per week: 12 (Home), 20 (brief), up to 30 (LinkedIn), a full day (flyer). Customers: 350+ (March release), 500+ teams (September release), "hundreds" (About). Founding year: 2020 (March release) vs. 2019 (September release, LinkedIn). Integrations: 150+ (Home) vs. 200+ (Platform). None of these says what it measures, so they read as one set of numbers that won't hold still.

The tagline only lives off-site.

"Operations that run themselves" holds the homepage meta description and the X bio, which makes it the tagline by usage. It never appears on the visible site, and LinkedIn's dedicated tagline field says something else. Page headlines aren't counted here; different headlines for different pages is normal targeting.

Two stories about the AI agent add-on.

The September release and the LinkedIn banner lead with it as the company's future. The site treats it as one section halfway down Platform and one line on Pricing. A prospect arriving from LinkedIn lands on a different story.

Two collateral systems.

The solution brief matches the site. The webinar flyer and LinkedIn post graphics use a condensed display face, a magenta-and-orange palette and a stacked logo. Side by side, they don't look like the same company.

Two logos in public.

The current lockup runs on the site and the LinkedIn page. X and YouTube still show the pre-2025 logo, so two of the four channels reviewed introduce the brand with a mark it no longer uses.

Two voices

The About page and the founder's posts are specific and human. The product pages use category language ("streamline," "unlock," "seamless") any competitor could use. The brand's best voice never reaches the pages buyers use most.

What Could Be Good With Some Help

"Operations that run themselves"

is already in two genuine tagline slots, it's clear, and it has room for the AI agent story underneath it. It just needs to move onto the site, into LinkedIn's tagline field and onto the brief.

(614) 352-4074 | eric.dunne@vergencydesign.com

The About page voice

is already written. Carried into the Platform page and feature tiles, it would replace generic category language with something only Sample Co. can say.

The solution brief template and the real photography on LinkedIn are ready to reuse.
The brief needs a sourced proof number, the site's typeface and one CTA, and then it's the model for every future collateral piece. The team and customer photos on LinkedIn could replace the site's stock images without a reshoot.

Recommendations

Critical

Choose one category name and use it everywhere, lock every proof number into a claims glossary with a source, and fix or remove the dead SOC 2 and GDPR badges. For a buyer building a business case, these three undermine everything else on the page.

Important

- Decide where the AI agent add-on fits, and say it in one sentence on Home, Platform, Pricing, LinkedIn and both boilerplates.
- Remove or substantiate "the only," "the most secure" and "deploy in a day," and put "Operations that run themselves" in every genuine tagline slot.
- Pick one primary CTA and one secondary, use them on every page and channel, and keep one boilerplate under version control.

Recommended

- Bring the webinar flyer and social graphics onto the site's type, color and logo.
- Carry the About page voice into the product pages, and replace stock photography with the real team and customer photos already on LinkedIn.
- Write one-page guidelines: logo on light and dark, palette with hex values, type rules and a rule for callout colors.

Polish

- Update the X and YouTube avatars to the current logo, then revive X or remove it from the footer.
- Attribute the homepage testimonials to a company, and add alt text to the homepage images.
- Remove the duplicated brand name from page titles, give the Contact page a real H1 and settle on one icon style for the feature tiles.

Next Steps

Sample Co. doesn't have a design problem. It has a story that hasn't been decided, so each asset tells its own version. A positioning session settles the three missing answers (what category Sample Co. is in, where the AI agent add-on fits, which numbers are true), and the Content project rewrites the tagline placements, boilerplate and Platform page around them.

The homepage and the webinar flyer are the clearest candidates for a single-asset pass in the Design Review project. This sample is a composite of patterns found across more than 100 real Focal Point Reviews; Sample Co. is fictional, and no real client's details appear in it.