FABER CAPITAL RESOURCES

Website & Conversion Analysis

What the current website communicates, what creates confusion, and which changes will strengthen the funnel.

The current website contains useful pieces of Faber Capital Resources. It does not yet organize those pieces into one clear identity, one credible lending story, or one measurable path to a qualified opportunity.

Prepared for	Bill Faber | Faber Capital Resources
Prepared by	Richard Pekala | Resonant Design
Report date	July 17, 2026
Purpose	Client review, internal planning, and comparable agency scoping

This report is based on public website review, technical inspection, competitive search research, and the preliminary business proposal. Search positions vary by engine, location, device, and date. It is not a legal, licensing, underwriting, cybersecurity, or regulatory opinion.

1 | WHAT THE SITE MUST BECOME

Executive Finding

The existing site functions, but it behaves like a lightly configured Realeflow investor template rather than an independent, marketing-ready financial brand. The redesign should preserve the recognizable company while replacing conflicting messages, weak proof, template residue, and unclear conversion paths.

Dimension	Current condition	Required outcome
Identity	Lender, broker, JV partner, wholesaler, buyer/seller, and listings language compete	One primary Faber story with secondary audiences routed deliberately
Trust	Thin team/proof; Gmail; limited visible licensing/disclosure structure	Named people, verified credentials, real deals, reviews, domain email, clear boundaries
Conversion	Generic contact form and broad calls to action	Submit-a-deal pathway with useful qualification and attribution
Content	Strong facts scattered across general pages; stale blog; duplicate portfolio	Dedicated programs, markets, case studies, FAQs, and resource structure
Platform	Shared builder fingerprints and technical debt	Independent, controlled, search-ready website and reporting environment

> The redesign is not primarily an aesthetic exercise. It is a decision about what Faber is, who each page serves, and what should happen next.

2 | WHAT A VISITOR SEES NOW

The Five-Second Test

The homepage leads with the generic language 'Leading The Way In The Real Estate Market'. That could describe a brokerage, realtor, developer, wholesaler, property manager, or lender. Faber's strongest offer - potential 100% purchase, rehab, and closing-cost funding within stated ARV/JV conditions - is present but not developed as the primary explanation.

Visitor question	Current answer	Recommended answer
What is this company?	Broad real estate and private-money language	Private real estate funding and JV resource for investors
Who is it for?	Several audiences appear	Primary investor/borrower; clearly routed partners and capital relationships
Where does it operate?	954 phone, South Florida language elsewhere, Cleveland portfolio residue	Confirmed service markets stated consistently
Why is it different?	No credit / flexibility / 100% claims without full framework	Property-first judgment plus transparent qualification and structure
What should I do?	General contact form	Submit a deal, understand qualification, or speak with the correct person

A high-value financial visitor should not have to infer the business model. Clarity is a trust signal.

Page & Platform Findings

Severity	Finding	Business effect
High	/services/ is nearly empty while real content lives at /services-2/	Splits authority and creates an unfinished experience
High	Empty property-listings page	Advertises an inactive function
High	Portfolio entries contain highly repeated wording and Cleveland signals	Weak proof; possible quality and geographic confusion
High	Meta descriptions absent; titles generic; dual homepage H1	Pages are not framed around search intent
High	Schema references rfsitebuilder tenant host	Weakens entity independence and canonical clarity
High	HTTP www behavior and sitemap delivery inconsistencies observed	Duplicate/insecure access and crawl fragility
Medium	Three blog posts from February 2020, on unrelated lifestyle topics	Signals inactivity and does not support lending authority
Medium	Seller-style testimonials conflict with lender positioning	Proof does not validate the primary offer
Medium	Public Gmail address	Reduces institutional confidence and domain trust
Medium	Shared builder/plugin dependencies and exposed WordPress surfaces	Requires hardening or migration for professional control

Security observations should be provided in a controlled technical appendix rather than advertised publicly. The redesign should coordinate with qualified security and compliance professionals.

The New Website Architecture

Page/section	Primary job	Conversion
Home	Explain Faber in seconds; show differentiator and proof	Submit a Deal / Speak With Faber
Funding Programs	Route visitors to the correct active solution	Open a program
100% Funding	Explain ARV/JV qualification honestly and concretely	Test/submit the transaction
How It Works	Make the process visible from inquiry to terms/funding	Begin qualification
Funded Deals	Prove experience with approved transaction facts	Discuss a similar deal
Referral Partners	Explain relationship, tracking, and next step	Become/submit as a partner
About Faber	Establish Bill, team, judgment, history, and boundaries	Contact the correct person
Resources	House FAQs, guides, reports, calculators, and blog	Continue learning / enter funnel
Submit a Deal	Collect the minimum useful facts and consent	Create a traceable opportunity

Secondary activities such as capital raising, property acquisition, or listings should be separated or clearly subordinated unless Bill confirms they are central to the current company.

Recommended homepage promise: A real person examines the transaction, explains what is realistic, and moves a viable opportunity toward the right capital structure.

Conversion & Trust Plan

The website should reduce uncertainty before asking for a large application. A short initial pathway can collect enough information to route the opportunity without requesting inappropriate sensitive records.

Layer	What to implement	Why it matters
Primary CTA	Submit a Deal	Matches the visitor's commercial intent
Initial fields	Name, phone, email, property address, purchase, rehab, ARV, property type, experience, timing	Creates a usable screen without excessive friction
Trust row	Named leadership; confirmed markets; programs; real deal facts; reviews; applicable credentials/disclosures	Reduces financial-services skepticism
Process visibility	Screen -> structure -> terms -> processing -> funding	Sets expectations and reduces repeated questions
Proof	Approved case studies with numbers, timeline, challenge, structure, outcome	Replaces generic promises with evidence
Routing	Source, owner, deadline, stage, next action in GoHighLevel	Prevents website leads from becoming anonymous emails
Measurement	Calls, forms, booked conversations, qualified opportunities, funded outcomes	Evaluates business value, not vanity traffic

Sensitive documents should remain in approved secure systems. The website and CRM should track status and provide secure links, not become an uncontrolled repository.

Rebuild Plan & Acceptance Checklist

Stage	Work	Bill approves
1. Position	Confirm primary business, products, audiences, markets, and compliance boundaries	Company message and exclusions
2. Structure	Approve navigation, page ownership, conversion paths, and content map	Sitemap and user journeys
3. Prototype	Apply the new structure inside the private mirror	Homepage and core visual direction
4. Build	Create responsive pages, forms, proof, resources, and analytics compatibility	Core copy and functionality
5. Connect	Route calls/forms to the operating system and attribution	Ownership, permissions, notifications
6. Validate	Mobile, links, redirects, indexing, accessibility, security handoff, analytics	Launch checklist
7. Launch	Deploy after approval; retain ownership/access documentation	Production release

Acceptance questions for any web provider: Does the price include messaging and information architecture, or only styling? Who writes and verifies lending copy? Are redirects and duplicate URLs handled? Are forms connected to an accountable pipeline? Are mobile and accessibility reviewed? Who owns the domain, files, analytics, accounts, and content? Are advanced integrations clearly excluded or priced?

> The website should become Faber's public explanation and private communication portal - not simply a new coat of paint.

Evidence base: live public page review, 54-file local mirror referenced in the technical audit, page/content inventory, passive header/configuration checks, competitive lender review, and the preliminary operations/CRM proposal. Findings are dated July 17, 2026.

Final products, terms, markets, licensing statements, security controls, and financial claims must be confirmed by Bill and appropriate professionals before publication.