ANNEX 1. SUMMARY OF LAWTECH AND ETHICS LITERATURE

1. The Law Society’s position regulation of LawTech (2020)

To enable LawTech and legal services to maintain their industry-leading position in the face of growing competition, market liberalisation and disruption, it is essential that future regulation of LawTech, if any is needed, is carefully calibrated to protect consumers without stifling innovation.

Some factors that the Legal Services Board (LSB) and relevant regulators should take into account are:

- Most current LawTech products are aimed at assisting back-office processes, products and models, with e-Discovery and legal research being the most popular ones, followed by contract management tools¹. These aim to make services more affordable to clients or for the non-profit organisations to make their operations more efficient (indirectly by reducing costs or saving time).

- Although some initiatives are underway to develop technology which provides legal services without human involvement, our research suggests that these are in early stages and not widespread. Chatbots, pre-populated contracts and predictive analytics could be considered under this category. Further thought is required on the implications of these for the public interest. In particular such issues as explainability of automated decisions, potential bias and impact on privacy need to be taken into account, as highlighted in our report on the use of algorithms in the criminal justice system.

- LawTech applications used in connection with reserved legal activities. As well as unregulated Producers that use legal technology in their work, both should be further assessed through the prism of compliance with sector specific legal regulations and general consumer protection laws.

¹As shown in our LawTech adoption report (February 2019): https://www.lawsociety.org.uk/en/topics/research/lawtech- adoption-report
The LawTech sector has been made-up by key industry players providing services or products to Law Firms, and the use of consumer-facing solutions for legal services is still in its early stages. The emergence of technology and increasing regulatory complexity around the globe has meant that traditional demarcations between other forms of professional service and legal service provision have been blurred. The legal services sector is also starting to experience an emerging trend towards product and service commoditisation. The current landscape poses ethical questions and asks whether legal practitioners are at a regulatory disadvantage. National regulators, international bars and academics have started to consider whether legal technology should be regulated, the ethical implications of its use and its reach for law firms and consumers.

This is an opportune time for policy makers and regulators to shape and encourage an ethical approach to use of LawTech in legal services. However, in order to do so, policy makers and regulators must understand how industry is addressing perceived grey areas and consolidate best practice before altering the existing Standards and Regulations (STaRs). The STaRs are technology neutral, and there is no technology specific guidance. As a result, the legal services community interprets the rules differently and implements them differently. Ethical standards inspire consumer confidence, and accountable control over conduct.

The Law Society’s other publications on LawTech can be found here:

https://www.lawsociety.org.uk/campaigns/lawtech/

2. Regulators and experts in England and Wales: summary of papers

2.1 Legal Services Board

The Legal Services Board (LSB) 19/20 business plan includes a policy objective focused on regulation and technological innovation. As part of this objective, the LSB is leading an ongoing project entitled ‘Developing regulatory approaches for the use of technology in legal services’. The LSB invited a wide range of stakeholders to provide position papers on ‘how can legal services regulation support responsible technological innovation that improves access to justice?’ The Law Society contributed to this project.
The LSB commissioned Alison Hook, of Hook Tangaza, to produce a report entitled “The Use and Regulation of Technology in the Legal Sector beyond England and Wales”. The report finds there are benefits to industry-driven rules which can create clarity, interoperability, standards to guide choices by customers and a reduction of duplication. However, industry-led governance can also distort competition, create barriers to entry into markets which require policy interventions and not supply consumers with adequate protection.

Hook finds the legal community must not assume standing aside is the correct answer for a regulatory environment. She finds that a tipping point has been reached given the following global trends in LawTech and legal technology activity and adoption:

- New business models, and non-solicitors, threatening the SRA’s existing codes of conduct.
- Use of deep learning tech in consumer-facing legal advice which may pose ethical challenges.
- LawTech is crossing borders, undermining regulators ability to effectively regulate.
- Universities are offering legal and tech training implying there is a growing demand for the awareness of technological applications to legal service provision.
- Start-ups in this sector are faced with two significant barriers, hampering their innovation and adoption.
- Difficult environment for Legal tech start-ups, that continually operate in an environment where there is no guidance.

Hook investigated regulatory approaches taken up by the Financial Conduct Authority, Health Tech Sector and the automotive industry to extract best practice. Overall, the LSB states the legal community must:

- Review the consumer, ethical and practical risks associated with a regulator doing nothing. Without appropriate guidance investment capital is likely to favour other sectors, reducing the growth of the LawTech sector in the short and long-term.
- Share information, knowledge and learnings from all sectors and all jurisdictions to develop effective and targeted regulation which drives innovation and adoption.
- Engage the membership and other stakeholders to ensure they are not limited by their framing of LawTech and legal technology.
- Regulators should investigate the sandbox model adopted by the Financial Conduct Authority and only adopt it when it aligns with their strategic objectives.
- Ensuring that technology impacts all parts of the sector and not simply the B2B segment could require regulatory action.
The report concludes with recommendations.

For the LSB:
- There is a need to coordinate with the court reform program and public initiatives,
- Set up an advisory group to advise on the development of an advantageous regulatory environment for LawTech,
- Investigate data needs and data accessibility challenges,
- Analyse how current professional ethics and standards meet the demands of LawTech
- Develop a common language and conceptual understanding of key terms to increase the capabilities of regulators to effectively regulate the LawTech sector
- Finally address how technology may impact on the current regulatory settlement in England and Wales.

For frontline regulators:
- Develop an organisational technology strategy
- Build internal capacity and capabilities of understanding LawTech,
- Establish a dialogue with tech businesses active in their part of the sector,
- Harness opportunities of technology to meet regulations

### 2.1.2 Technology and Innovation in Legal Services (main report): published in 2018

The report found legal service providers want to make use of technological innovations, but may not because of real, or perceived regulatory, ethical and practical risks. Although the report investigated technology and innovation separately, the findings illustrate the inextricable link between the two. The study found:

I. The legal services sector innovation levels have reduced since 2015, although it should be noted this reduction should be viewed in the context of innovation for all UK businesses reducing.

II. There have been significant reductions in the perception regulation constrains innovation.

III. Increasing policy momentum behind the promotion of technology use across the UK economy.

IV. Any future regulatory environment must balance innovation whilst maintaining consumer protections.

V. Providers who provide legal services for larger clients and/or individual fee-paying clients are more likely to use technology. However, there is a long ‘tail’ of smaller firms (which are less likely to innovate) in the legal services market.

---

2 This report was conducted by BMG LLP and the analysis was undertaken by Robert Cross and Giorgio Castellano at the LSB
VI. The most frequently cited constraints to the use of technology are: risks with using unproven technology and a lack of IT expertise - point to the need to raise awareness and skills among legal service providers, and to address their ethical concern.

The Legal Services Board concluded their focus must be on; "stimulating stronger consumer-led competition; encouraging regulators to remove unnecessary regulations while maintaining essential consumer protections; and developing regulatory approaches in response to technological developments."

2.1.3 The Legal Services Board’s submission to the Competition and Markets Authority’s review of the legal services market study in England and Wales: September 2020.

The response by the Legal Services Board to the Competition and Market Authority’s review of the legal services market, draws on evidence from a forthcoming report on the state of the legal services sector. The LSB is due to make this research available late in 2020.

The LSB details in its response that innovation is by no means uniform across the legal services sector. It cites research that although there is a general perception technology is benefitting corporate clients, LawTech start-ups providing consumer facing services is the most populated market.

There are several factors which help explain this:

- Inherent risk aversion of the legal services sector is a barrier to innovation
- Partnership model hinders innovation
- Lack of expertise and capacity to innovate or adopt technologies
- Lack of necessary finance to innovate or adopt technologies
- Limited opportunities for new services to be developed
- The existing legislative and regulatory framework leading to a regulatory gap between unregulated and regulated providers.

The response highlights service innovation levels were highest in unregulated businesses. The response highlights preliminary reasons for this including minimal barriers to entry, comparatively low-tech development requirements and an underserved market have helped accelerate the growth of this market.

In responding to develop a more flexible and proportionate framework for the Legal Services Act, the LSB describes that four broad categories of regulatory reform that could be pursued:

- Longer-term legislative reform
- Shorter-term and more minor legislative reforms (such as those proposed by the Mayson Review)
- Structural changes that can be achieved within the existing legislation

---

Regulatory interventions that we and the regulatory bodies typically undertake.

The LSB cites its advocation for a review of reserved legal activities as for the purposes of:

- Better align the activities with areas of risk
- Provide a more modern framework to take account of technological and social developments,
- Address the ‘regulatory gap’ whereby unauthorised providers cannot easily compete with regulated entities who can provide reserved legal activities.

The LSB continues to consider if and how, developments in legal technology can be addressed by the regulatory framework, arguing it “may be appropriate to bring other elements of legal services provision within the scope of the regulatory framework”.

2.2 Legal Services Consumer Panel

The paper LawTech and consumers (2019) prioritises individual consumers and the services delivered to them. Its particular focus is to examine the regulatory framework needed to maximise the opportunities presented by LawTech, while ensuring it delivers the necessary protection for consumers, including those in vulnerable circumstances.

The Panel considered whether the SRA and the Council for Licensed Conveyancers (CLC) regulatory frameworks support LawTech while protecting consumers.

The following important points for regulators emerged from the study:

- Regulators should incentivise providers to use LawTech in widening access to legal services.
- Consumers should have access to plain English explanations of how LawTech arrives at particular conclusions
- The importance of ensuring that data inputted in AI systems is transparent, traceable and auditable.
- Need for ongoing quality assessment of LawTech solutions.
- Importance of adapting existing redress mechanisms to safeguard consumers.
- Importance of consumer interest being represented at all stages of developing, testing, evaluating and monitoring LawTech
- Regulators should identify regulatory barriers that might stifle innovation for the profession.
- CPD framework should support the profession in using LawTech safely and effectively

---


8 The LSCP was created in 2007 by the Legal Services Act. It is an independent arm of the LSB and is made up of a membership, whose appointments are approved by the Lord Chancellor
The paper uses the well-established consumer principles to explore the use of LawTech:

- **Access**: regulation should support the widest possible range of access to consumer, with an emphasis on vulnerable consumers and appropriate incentivisation schemes.
- **Choice**: consumers must have a choice whether to use LawTech-based services or not.
- **Information**: clear consumer transparency mechanisms to understand LawTech currently in use.
- **Quality**: LawTech should be of sufficient quality and safety.
- **Fairness**: Identify and address the risk factors that can exploit consumer vulnerability.
- **Redress**: an easily accessible method for redress should services go wrong.
- **Representation**: regulators should provide food practice guidance around consumers involvement in product development, testing and evaluation.

### 2.3 Solicitors Regulation Authority

#### 2.3.1 Corporate Strategy 2019/2023: published in 2019

The SRA has identified three themes for its corporate strategy 2020/2023, which will form the foundation of its regulatory approach to LawTech. The SRA plans to actively support the adoption of LawTech and innovation more broadly which help to meet the needs of the public, businesses and wider economy. The SRA will do this by:

- Building an understanding of the impact of technology on the profession.
- Monitoring developments of technology regulation across all sectors.
- Evaluating the needs of those with legal needs which are unmet.
- Working with innovators to support new approaches for providing and delivering legal services.

#### 2.3.2 Technology and Legal Services: published in December 2018.

The SRA says that the report gives an overview of how technology is helping to drive innovation in legal services and AI is already being used to improve and enhance – not replace – the work of human solicitors.

---

10 The three themes are (a) setting and maintaining high standards for the procession and SRA, (b) technology and innovation, and (c) anticipating and responding to change.
It is increasing use of technology can benefit the legal market by:

- improving access to legal services
- meeting demand
- driving competition in the market
- improving standards of service.

Remote working systems and services that are accessed through phones and the internet also help to deliver legal services to those who may be able to afford legal advice, but who cannot physically access it. Increasing access to legal services should increase demand in the market, rather than reducing the work available for solicitors.

Nearly a third of all legal services are now online or by email, at least in part. In conveyancing services, this increases to over half. The SRA concludes that technology can help firms complete work more quickly and accurately. This is particularly the case with AI applications that can automate routine process work. Clients value quick and predictable conclusions, and the most common cause for complaints to the Legal Ombudsman is delays. The combination of rapid processing of routine tasks with greater engagement is therefore likely to make clients more satisfied.

### 2.4 Professor Stephen Mayson: Reforming Legal Services Regulation beyond the Echo chambers (final report 2020)

Professor Stephen Mayson published a report ‘Reforming Legal Services: Regulation beyond the echo chambers’, following a two-year independent review into the regulation of legal services in England and Wales, which was supported by the University College London.¹¹

This report built on Professor Mayson’s interim report (2019) which considered whether LawTech providers should be regulated when they are able to deliver “legal services without human involvement”. The interim report did not present a draft blueprint for reform, but rather a series of findings, propositions and consequential questions.

The final report concludes that the legislative framework under the Legal Services Act 2007 is outdated and not sustainable in the long-term and proposes recommendations for wholesale reform in the future, as well as short-term solutions that could be considered under the current framework.

Professor Mayson argues that one of the reasons for changing the current framework is the regulatory gap which leaves many unregulated providers of legal services out of the regulatory remit. He points out to the following shortfalls:

---

¹¹ [https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ethics-law/sites/ethics-law/files/irlsr_final_report_final_0.pdf](https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ethics-law/sites/ethics-law/files/irlsr_final_report_final_0.pdf)
• The current six reserved legal activities do not necessarily cover all activities that ought to be regulated, leaving unregulated providers outside the scope of legal regulation.

• The rapid development of LawTech, that is also capable of offering legal advice and services independently of any human or legally qualified interface or interaction, at scale, that is beyond the reach of the current framework, and can expose consumers to risks and potential harm.

• A regulatory gap that exposes consumers to potential harm when some activities are not regulated when they ought to be and puts legally qualified practitioners at a competitive disadvantage.

• Increasing costs of legal advice and representation, reducing further the availability and affordability of legal services for many; this encourages either greater self-lawyering and litigants-in-person, or nudges increasing numbers of citizens into the world of unregulated providers or LawTech.

• Consumer confusion, caused by the existence of both regulated and unregulated providers for the same legal activities, and a profusion of differently regulated professional titles.

• Concerns about variability in the competence and quality of legal services, particularly in relation to will-writing, immigration advice and services, and criminal and youth court advocacy and representation.

• Inadequate or incomplete consumer protection, that is not consistent with a widespread consumer expectation that all legal services and those who provide them are subject to some form of regulation and protection.

The report favours a future regulatory environment where the focus of regulation should be on the ‘provider’ of legal services, whether an individual, entity, titleholder or technology. The timing in which regulation applies is determined based on the level of risk and severity if they occurred. Under the current framework, both law firms and solicitors need to be authorised to provide reserved legal services to the public. However, a large proportion of non-reserved activities remain outside the scope of regulation and can be delivered by unregulated providers, with a potential detriment to consumers. Regulation of providers may strengthen consumer protections by bringing within the regulatory framework providers and activities which are currently unregulated. Professor Mayson also proposes that the current reserved activities should be reviewed and opened to authorised individuals irrespective of whether they hold professional titles. While the proposals could potentially open the market of reserved activities to LawTech and other providers which are currently unregulated, they would lead to increased regulatory cost for the legal services market overall, and likely weakening of consumer protections for activities which are currently reserved.

Under Professor Mayson’s review, all ‘providers’ of legal services could be within the scope of regulation to varying degrees with a differential application of before, during and after-the-event regulation to reflect the importance or risk of any particular activity or circumstance. In relation to low-risk legal services, after-the-event redress would become available (principally through a reformed Legal Ombudsman). This level would set the minimum conditions of regulatory intervention to which all regulated providers of legal services would be subject. Beyond this entry-level, a risk-based approach could determine whether additional during- and before-the-event requirements should be applied.

3. International bodies

3.1 European Commission
The Commission published Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI in 2019. The paper argues that trustworthy AI has three components, which should be met throughout the system’s entire life cycle:

- it should be **lawful**, complying with all applicable laws and regulations
- it should be **ethical**, ensuring adherence to ethical principles and values and
- it should be **robust**, both from a technical and social perspective since, even with good intentions, AI systems can cause unintentional harm.

The key points on lawfulness are:

- Develop, deploy and use AI systems in a way that adheres to the ethical principles of: respect for human autonomy, prevention of harm, fairness and explicability.
- Pay particular attention to vulnerable groups such that have historically been disadvantaged or are at risk of exclusion.
- AI systems can pose certain risks and may have a negative impact, including impacts which may be difficult to anticipate, identify or measure. Adequate measures to mitigate these risks should be adopted.

The key points on ethical considerations:

- The development, deployment and use of AI systems should meet seven key requirements for Trustworthy AI: (1) human agency and oversight, (2) technical robustness and safety, (3) privacy and data governance, (4) transparency, (5) diversity, non-discrimination and fairness, (6) environmental and societal well-being and (7) accountability.
- Foster research and innovation to help assess AI systems and to further the achievement of the requirements. Disseminate results and open questions to the wider public, and systematically train a new generation of experts in AI ethics.
- Clearly communicate to stakeholders the AI system’s capabilities and limitations.
- Facilitate the traceability and auditability of AI systems.
- Involve stakeholders throughout the AI system’s life cycle. Foster training and education so that all stakeholders are aware of and trained in Trustworthy AI.

The key points on robustness are:

- Adopt a Trustworthy AI assessment list when developing, deploying or using AI systems, and adapt it to the specific use case in which the system is being applied.
- Keep in mind that such an assessment list will never be exhaustive.
3.2 American Bar Association

3.2.1 The American Bar Association (ABA), Resolution 112 on Artificial Intelligence (2019)

"The American Bar Association urges courts and lawyers to address the emerging ethical and legal issues related to the usage of artificial intelligence ("AI") in the practice of law including:
  • bias, explainability, and transparency of automated decisions made by AI
  • ethical and beneficial usage of AI;
  • controls and oversight of AI and the vendors that provide AI."

The purpose of this resolution and report is to urge courts and lawyers to address the emerging legal and ethical issues related to the usage of AI in the practice of law. The ABA noted currently the legal system and society have no basis to trust the operators of AI in either legal services or the delivery of legal services. From a professional development standpoint, lawyers need to stay ahead of the curve when it comes to AI to fulfil their existing ethical obligations when it comes to legal services. While AI offers cutting-edge advantages and benefits, it also raises complicated questions implicating professional ethics.

The ABA’s resolution is based on an investigatory report which sought to:

  • provides an overview of AI and the different AI tools used in the practice of law
  • analyses a lawyer’s ethical duties in connection with AI technology
  • explore the ethics of AI technology

The ABA in its resolution stated that the following principles and ethical factors should be taken into account in the use of LawTech:

  • **Duty of competence**: The duty of competence requires lawyers to be informed, and up to date, on current technology. Lawyers have a duty to identify the technology that is needed to effectively represent the client, as well as determine if the use of such technology will improve service to the client.

  • **Duty to communicate**: A lawyer’s duty of communication includes discussing with the client the decision to use AI in providing legal services. A lawyer should obtain approval from the client before using AI, and this consent must be informed. The discussion should include the risks and limitations of the AI tool. In certain circumstances, a lawyer’s decision not to use AI also may need to be communicated to the client if using AI would benefit the client. Failing to use AI technology that materially reduces the costs of providing legal services arguably could result in a lawyer charging an unreasonable fee to a client.
- **Duty of confidentiality:** use of some AI tools may require client confidences to be "shared" with third-party vendors. As a result, lawyers must take appropriate steps to ensure that their clients’ information appropriately is safeguarded and proof from third party vendors it is adequately safeguarded.

- **Duty to supervise:** lawyers are obligated to supervise the work of AI utilised in the provision of legal services and understand the technology well enough to ensure compliance with the lawyers existing ethical duties.

- **Bias and transparency:** Before using AI, the technology should be determined not to have built-in bias due to its programming or its data. The lawyer and court should ensure that AI vendors providing the tool to the lawyer and court are aware of and consider the potential for bias, including disparate impact.

- **Ethical and beneficial use:** AI, its production, and deployment should be beneficial (or at least not detrimental) to the lawyer, the court, clients, and society in general. Deployment of AI should take into account the needs and viewpoints of the lawyer’s and court’s various stakeholders (e.g., clients, plaintiffs, defendants and vulnerable person(s)). The use of AI should align with existing ethical codes and principles.

- **Monitoring and accountability:** The use of AI should be monitored for potential legal and ethical issues. AI should be designed to retain records and to allow for the re-creation of decision-making steps or processes, especially when accidents might occur. Legal counsel should be part of the process of accountability, controls, and oversight in order to protect the attorney-client privilege as well as to ensure legal compliance. AI and its usage should be audited and auditable.

- **Privacy control:** It is important that the courts and lawyers address the privacy impact in using the AI. To the extent that lawyers and law firms are subject to privacy laws, an AI impact analysis may need to assess such usage's compliance with such laws, such as the GDPR.

### 3.2.2 ABA Resolution 10A - Online Document Providers (2019)

In 2016, the New York County Lawyers Association (NYCLA) established a Task Force to understand the issues arising from the growth of Online Legal Providers (OLPs). The best practice guidelines were established, and adopted, to establish minimum standards for the reliability and efficacy of products, provide consumers with information and means of redress, provide consumers with information about the risks of continuing without the support of a lawyer, protect confidential consumer information and recommend where affordable lawyers can be accessed.

Key principles in the best practice guidelines:

- **Disclosure provisions:** The best practice guidelines take a disclosure -orientated approach, where the onus is on the “advertisers to ensure that disclosures are clear and conspicuous on all platforms consumers may use”.
• **Provisions regarding quality and enforceability:** Online forms should be valid in the intended jurisdiction (as represented by the Provider or requested by the customer). If not, Providers should inform their customers, in plain language, that the form is not substantially valid, or of any possible limitations on validity, in the intended jurisdiction and what steps can be taken to make it valid.

• **Clickwrap v. Browse wrap agreements:** Clickwrap agreements are more readily enforceable, since they “permit courts to infer that the user was at least on inquiry notice of the terms of the agreement and has outwardly manifested consent by clicking a box.” Clickwrap agreements therefore better protect both the OLPs and consumers.

• **Warranty provisions:** As flaws or issues arising from legal forms cannot be easily identified by a lay user, warranty protection is a fundamental aspect of best practice.

• **Arbitration provisions:** Most OLPs contracts require resolution through arbitration instead of the court and require it take place in distant locations inconvenient for users. Most forms prohibit class action and therefore limits the legal remedies of harmed users. The ABA found it is appropriate to permit the customer to have the option of preserving his or her day in a court in his or her home state and remove restrictions for class actions.

• **Consumer privacy:** Notify customers of whether and to what extent they intend to use Customer information, of how long they intend to keep that information, and of the fact that the information they receive is not covered by the attorney-client privilege or work product protection.

### 3.3 International Bar Association

The International Bar Association (IBA) carried out work on the provision of legal services by unregulated providers in the light of a rapid growth of technology and innovation in the legal sector. Last year the IBA’s Bar Issues Commission (BIC) launched a consultation which closed on 31 January 2020, on its work on unregulated providers, and whether the IBA should promote principles governing the provision of legal services for all legal services providers, regardless of their regulatory status.\(^\text{12}\)

**Proposed IBA Principles on the provision of legal services**

BIC developed the principles set out below and consulted whether they should be recommended to the IBA Council:\(^\text{13}\)

- **The aim of this document is to assist bars and other regulators of lawyers who are engaged in discussions with decision-makers in their jurisdictions regarding the standards which should apply to the delivery of legal services by whomever provided (i.e. whether by lawyers or others). Of course, the principles which apply to the practice of law by lawyers have become much more detailed and refined over centuries of legal practice. The document’s purpose is to propose**

---

\(^{12}\) The IBA consultation on unregulated providers November 2019.

\(^{13}\) Ibid.
a check-list of public purpose aims. For the avoidance of doubt, these are guidelines only, and their target is those bars and other regulators of lawyers involved in such discussions. These bars and other regulators may make such use of them as they wish.

- The principles are not intended to give encouragement to the provision of legal services by unregulated providers in jurisdictions where such provision is unlawful, nor to be used by unregulated providers for branding purposes. On the other hand, they are not intended to prevent or inhibit appropriate competition in the provision of legal services.

- The IBA continues to believe that the public interest and the interests of clients are best advanced when legal services are delivered by lawyers who are licensed or otherwise authorised, with the protections that usually attach to a lawyer’s licence: high standards of preliminary and continuing training; an ethical code which is enforced; discipline and removal from the right to practise where appropriate; professional indemnity insurance; and other guarantees.

- Given that there is an evident increase in the provision of unregulated legal services through the use of legal technology, separate principles have been developed where such technology is used.

- The areas both of provision of legal services by unregulated providers and of the impact of technology on the provision of legal services are developing rapidly, and so these principles are provisional in nature, being subject to review as their development becomes clearer.

- The IBA urges governments to ensure that the provision of legal services meets the following aims:

  A. Protection of the public
  
  B. Advancement of the administration of justice and the rule of law
  
  C. Meaningful access to justice for all, regardless of economic situation, and information about the law, legal issues, and the civil and criminal justice systems
  
  D. Transparency regarding the nature and scope of legal services to be provided, the credentials of those who provide them, and the availability of regulatory protections
  
  E. Delivery of affordable and accessible legal services, with the means suiting the needs
  
  F. Efficient, competent, and ethical delivery of legal services
G. Protection of confidential information and, where applicable to the provider-client relationship, privileged information

H. Independence of professional judgment

I. Accessible civil remedies for negligence and breach of other duties owed by providers of legal services, and sanctions for misconduct

J. Appropriate controls for money held on behalf of customers

K. Diversity and inclusion among legal services providers and freedom from discrimination for those receiving legal services and in the justice system

Where legal technology is used in the delivery of legal services, the following additional aims are included in the list:

L. Accountability and appropriate levels of supervision in the form of a named legal person to be responsible for the product, with contact details given

M. Human agency and oversight in the form of one or more suitably qualified people (not necessarily legally qualified, but qualified to understand and handle the technology and its consequences) to be identified to manage the technology

N. Respect for human rights, including non-discrimination, diversity, fairness, environmental rights, and the right to privacy and data protection

O. Transparency in the way the technology is built and operates so that it can be meaningfully explained, including both which data were used to create an algorithm, and also the legal basis for the use of the technology, to facilitate access to remedies where an outcome is challenged

P. Agreed minimum standards on the quality of data to be used in the delivery of legal services.