

National Pro Bono Aspirational Target: The Target at Ten Years

FINAL REPORT
June 2018

T +61 2 9385 7381

F +61 2 9385 7375

info@probonocentre.org.au

www.probonocentre.org.au



Contents

Background	3
About this Report.....	3
Issues considered in the Target Review.....	4
1. Whether the word aspirational should be removed from the name of the Target	4
2. Whether the current Target of at least 35 hours per lawyer per annum should be changed or a higher target introduced.....	5
3. Whether work done for a substantially reduced fee should remain in the definition of pro bono legal services.....	5
4. Whether the definition of pro bono legal services should be amended and/or additional guidance notes created to include certain legal work done for social enterprises and/or other profit-making organisations.....	6
5. Whether there should be any change to “pro bono hours per lawyer per annum” as the metric for measuring pro bono legal work for the purpose of the Target	7
6. Whether, and if so how, a metric might be included in the Target that sought to provide a measure of the social impact of pro bono legal work	8
7. Whether signatories should be encouraged to adopt an internal timeframe for meeting the Target, and if so, how	8
8. Are there further measures by which governments could more strongly integrate the Target into their legal services tender arrangements and therefore encourage further pro bono growth?	9
9. How to increase the number of Target signatories	9
APPENDICES	10
Appendix 1 — Definition of “pro bono legal services” 1 July 2018	10
Appendix 2 — National Pro Bono Target Guidance Notes 1 July 2018	11
Appendix 3 — National Pro Bono Target Statement of Principles	15
Appendix 4 — List of current Target signatories	16



Background

The [National Pro Bono Aspirational Target \(Target\)](#) is a voluntary target that Australian law firms, incorporated legal practices (together **firms**), individual solicitors (including in-house corporate and government lawyers) and barristers are encouraged to adopt by becoming signatories and by signing a [Statement of Principles](#).

Signatories to the Target agree to use their best efforts to provide at least 35 hours of [pro bono legal services](#) per lawyer per year, adhere to the Statement of Principles and report annually to the Australian Pro Bono Centre (**Centre**) on whether they have met the Target in the previous year.

The National Pro Bono Resource Centre (as it then was) launched the Target on 26 April 2007. The target of at least 35 hours per lawyer per year was based on National Pro Bono Law Firm Survey data at the time indicating that the top performing firms in Australia were sitting just below that point.

Over the last ten years the Target has helped to foster the growth of pro bono in Australia, especially by large and mid-sized firms. Pro bono legal practice has gained a certain maturity, of which Target signatories can be proud.

The tenth anniversary of the Target is a time to celebrate these achievements and has provided an opportunity to reflect, consolidate, and consult, to ensure that the Target remains relevant as a benchmark of performance and a catalyst for further growth.

About this Report

This report sets out the issues that have arisen in the course of reviewing the Target, the Centre's response to those issues, and the proposed changes. In summary these changes are:

- a. retitling the "National Pro Bono Aspirational Target" as the "National Pro Bono Target";
- b. amending the definition of "pro bono legal services" in the Statement of Principles to include work undertaken for social enterprises under certain conditions; and
- c. the addition of guidance notes in relation to "substantially reduced fee" work, and work for charities, not-for-profit organisations and social enterprises.

This report should be read in conjunction with the [National Pro Bono Aspirational Target: The Target at Ten Years – Public Discussion Paper \(Public Discussion Paper\)](#), issued October 2017, and the [National Pro Bono Aspirational Target: The Target at Ten Years – Interim Report \(Interim Report\)](#), issued February 2018.

The Public Discussion Paper provides an overview of the Target's impact on pro bono in Australia and identifies six key issues for discussion. The Interim Report summarises the comments received in response to the Public Discussion Paper and sets out the issues arising.

These issues were further discussed at roundtable forums held in Sydney and Melbourne in March 2018 and the Centre thanks all those who made submissions and participated in the roundtable forums.

This is the final report of the Target tenth anniversary review. The changes outlined in in this report will apply from **1 July 2018**.

Issues considered in the Target Review

Issues considered in the Target review were either identified in the Public Discussion Paper, or raised in submissions made in response to the paper or in the roundtable discussion forums.

The main issues considered in this review were:

1. whether the word “aspirational” should be removed from the name of the Target;
2. whether the current Target of at least 35 hours per lawyer per annum should be changed or a higher target introduced;
3. whether work done for a substantially reduced fee should remain in the definition of pro bono legal services;
4. whether the definition of pro bono legal services should be amended, and/or additional guidance notes created to include certain legal work done for social enterprises and/or other profit-making organisations;
5. whether there should be any change to “pro bono hours per lawyer per annum” as the metric for measuring pro bono legal work for the purpose of the Target;
6. whether, and if so how, a metric might be included in the Target that seeks to measure the social impact of pro bono legal work;
7. whether signatories should be encouraged to adopt an internal timeframe for meeting the Target, and if so, how;
8. whether there are further measures by which governments could more strongly integrate the Target into their legal services tender arrangements and therefore encourage further pro bono growth; and
9. how to increase the number of Target signatories.

1. Whether the word aspirational should be removed from the name of the Target

As indicated in the Interim Report, the Centre intends dropping the word “Aspirational” from the title of the Target so that it is referred to as **The National Pro Bono Target**.

The reasons for doing this are:

- (a) A target is, by its very nature, “aspirational” and will remain so.
- (b) The word “aspirational” could be taken to imply there is no real obligation to make progress towards achieving the Target and therefore hamper meaningful engagement by signatories with the Target. This interpretation can undermine the Target’s effectiveness in driving the growth of a firm’s pro bono program and in strengthening its pro bono culture.
- (c) Dropping “aspirational” will assist in framing the Target as an industry standard for the practice of pro bono in Australia.



2. Whether the current Target of at least 35 hours per lawyer per annum should be changed or a higher target introduced

The Centre's position is that the target of at least 35 hours should not be changed nor should an optional higher target be introduced. There is little appetite for either of these proposals amongst target signatories and the Centre notes that in FY2017, 51 Target signatories (48.6% of those who reported) met or exceeded the Target and 54 did not (51.4%),¹ thus putting the figure of 35 hours in the middle of current performance. Thus, 35 hours per lawyer per year continues to provide an effective benchmark of pro bono performance in Australia.

As noted in the Public Discussion Paper, 28 Target signatories (26.7% of those who reported) did undertake 50 or more hours per lawyer in 2016/2017 — a cohort of high achievers that includes large firms, small firms and individuals. The Centre notes that some of these firms have internal targets of 50 hours but only one such signatory supported a change to the Target to introduce a 50-hour option.

While the performance of these firms is commendable, not all Target signatories can achieve results on this scale. Law firm capacity to undertake pro bono will always vary from time to time and raising the target at this stage may be contrary to the objective of growing the number of signatories.

3. Whether work done for a substantially reduced fee should remain in the definition of pro bono legal services

The Centre intends to retain work done for a “substantially reduced fee” in the definition of “pro bono legal services” with the following additional requirements:

- (a) commencing with the reporting period 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019 inclusive, the Centre will request Target signatories to report separately on (i) pro bono legal services provided for no fee; and (ii) pro bono legal services provided for a “substantially reduced fee”;
- (b) for pro bono legal services provided for a “substantially reduced fee”, hours reported to the Centre should only count on a pro rata basis based on the degree of fee reduction; and
- (c) the Centre will only count “substantially reduced fee” hours reported against the Target if those fees have been reduced by at least 50% of what the legal service provider would otherwise charge for the work.

Points (b) and (c) above are further explained in the revised Guidance Notes (see Appendix 2). These additional notes aim to provide guidance about the meaning of the term “substantially reduced fee” and clarify the approach to be taken to counting and reporting this work for the purposes of the Target.

Through the review process, the Centre has become aware of a number of contexts in Australia where substantially reduced fee work has been undertaken with the clear intention of furthering the public good and/or facilitating better access to justice for the client, and the provider considered it to be pro bono legal work. This has occurred in large, mid-size and small firms.

Whilst most international definitions of pro bono legal work exclude work done for a reduced or substantially reduced fee, it is a common feature of the Australian approach, as demonstrated by the

¹ Australian Pro Bono Centre, *Tenth Annual Performance Report of the National Pro Bono Aspirational Target*, October 2017, <http://www.probonocentre.org.au/provide-pro-bono/aspirational-target/>.

definition adopted by the Law Council of Australia, the Victorian Government Legal Services Panel pro bono conditions, and most of the State and Territory law society and bar pro bono schemes.

A key purpose of the Target is to build support across the entire Australian legal profession for the provision of pro bono legal services and to further access to justice for those who would not otherwise have access to legal help. Maintaining “substantially reduced fee” work within the definition furthers these objectives. By excluding it, these objectives may be compromised.

Three key points were put in the Target discussion forums as to why reduced fee work should be excluded. The first is that it is not clear what a “substantially reduced fee” means. The second is that counting this work equally with work done for free does not create a level playing field. The third is that “substantially reduced fee” work is a different type of service, recognised in the US in the dialog about sustainable “low bono” models of legal practice.

In response to these three points, the Centre has revised the Target Guidance Notes as referred to above. The revisions will enable the Centre to monitor and consider “substantially reduced fee” work separately to free work, without removing the incentive for lawyers and firms to undertake “substantially reduced fee” work as they see fit, as they can still count that work pro-rata towards the Target.

4. Whether the definition of pro bono legal services should be amended and/or additional guidance notes created to include certain legal work done for social enterprises and/or other profit-making organisations

Throughout the Target review process a large majority of Target signatories voiced their support for incorporating into the Centre’s definition of “pro bono legal services” legal work for certain for-profit organisations. This would be achieved either by expressly including this type of work in the definition or through the Guidance Notes.

From 1 July 2018 the Centre will both amend clause 1(c) of the definition of “pro bono legal services” (see Appendix 1) and publish supporting Guidance Notes on amended clause 1(c) (see Appendix 2, Part 2).

There are a number of compelling reasons for making these changes, including:

- (a) firms are acting on a pro bono basis for an increasing number of organisations that use their revenue and/or enterprise model to assist vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community. Social enterprises are an increasingly common structure being used for an organisation to pursue social, humanitarian, cultural or environmental goals;
- (b) clause 1(c) of the current definition of “pro bono legal services” only includes work for “charities and other non-profit organisations” of which social enterprises and other for-profit organisations are neither;
- (c) changing the definition to expressly include legal work for certain for-profit organisations aligns the Centre’s definition with that of leading overseas pro bono organisations. For example, the US Law Firm Pro Bono Challenge® allows firms to count certain work for



“charitable, religious, civic, community, governmental and educational organizations”.² The TrustLaw Index allows firms to count certain work for “social enterprises” (businesses with a social, humanitarian, cultural or community focus) as validated by the law firm or pro bono referral organisation unless the focus is incidental or a fortunate by-product of the organisation’s mission;³ and

- (d) a large proportion of pro bono legal work will “raise an issue of public interest”, as contemplated by clause 1(b) of the definition, but it may not always be clear whether work for ‘for-profit entities’ is captured by this part of the definition. Work for low-income or disadvantaged individuals may not, in every case, raise an issue of public interest by being likely to affect a significant number of people and/or raises an issue of broad public concern.

The revised clause 1(c) will recognise within the definition of “pro bono legal services” the giving of legal assistance for free or for a substantially reduced fee to charities, other not-for-profit organisations or social enterprises whose sole or primary purpose is to work in the interests of low income or disadvantaged members of the community or for the public good.

The words “charities, not-for-profit organisations or social enterprises,” in clause 1(c) will replace the words “charities or other non-profit organisations” and so will expand the definition to include social enterprises that meet the criteria set out in the Centre’s Guidance Notes (see Appendix 2). The words “in each case where their sole or primary purpose is to work in the interests of” replace “on behalf of”.

5. Whether there should be any change to “pro bono hours per lawyer per annum” as the metric for measuring pro bono legal work for the purpose of the Target

The Centre agrees with the sentiment expressed in the roundtable discussion forums that hours, rather than financial value, is a better metric for measuring pro bono legal work. The primary reasons for using hours include: (i) ‘hours’ is a constant across firms; and (ii) this metric takes into account a firm’s overall size, instead of the financial value of the work.

Measuring pro bono legal work by hours also makes pro bono work referable to the individual professional responsibility of every lawyer to engage in pro bono work.

The Centre recognises that hours alone does not measure the impact of pro bono legal work. Whilst this is a vital consideration, it is considered beyond the scope of this review and better dealt with through a separate process (see below).

Although the Law Firm Pro Bono Challenge[®] in the US includes both a measure in hours and a percentage of annual total paying client billable hours, little support was expressed for such an approach in the Australian context.

² See <http://www.probonoinst.org/wpps/wp-content/uploads/Law-Firm-Challenge-Commentary-2017-1.pdf>

³ <http://www.trust.org/trustlaw/members/>

6. Whether, and if so how, a metric might be included in the Target that sought to provide a measure of the social impact of pro bono legal work

In its preamble the **Statement of Principles** is mindful of the professional responsibility of a lawyer to provide pro bono legal services to address the unmet legal needs of poor and disadvantaged members of the community. It was suggested in the roundtables that relying solely on the measure of hours does not allow the Centre to report meaningfully on whether this core objective is being met.

The Centre accepts that hours as a measure of pro bono work does not indicate the effectiveness or impact of this work. The Centre is keen to work with pro bono providers to identify and agree on common metrics or approaches to measuring effectiveness and impact.

Some individual pro bono programs and practices have developed their own evaluation methodologies to monitor and manage the effectiveness and impact of their programs. The Centre has assisted this work by developing tools to help service providers develop their own evaluation structures and processes: see [Chapter 1.13 of the Centre's Australian Pro Bono Manual on Evaluation](#). Nonetheless, reporting on impact in a meaningful way is a challenge not just for the Target cohort, but for the whole legal assistance community.

7. Whether signatories should be encouraged to adopt an internal timeframe for meeting the Target, and if so, how

Setting an internal timeframe for meeting the Target can be a useful and powerful device for building a firm's pro bono culture and for making progress towards meeting the Target. Currently, the Centre supports the adoption of an internal timeframe in its Guidance Notes. The Centre can also develop tailored reporting and follow-up strategies for those signatory firms whose performance is consistently low relative to other firms.

The Centre would prefer to provide more active support to signatories that are not reaching the Target on a case-by-case basis. It will also continue to use positive messaging around setting internal timeframes and strategies for reaching the Target.

Specifically, the Centre will regularly engage with these signatories and enquire about support they may require to meet the Target, what barriers they face, and what they are doing to improve their Target performance. The Centre will assist those signatories to build a framework for reaching the Target within a set timeframe. As part of this strategy, the Centre may request additional information in the annual reporting process from those signatories that consistently fall well below, and fail to improve their performance against, the Target.



8. Are there further measures by which governments could more strongly integrate the Target into their legal services tender arrangements and therefore encourage further pro bono growth?

The Centre will continue to work with, and advocate to, the Commonwealth and State and Territory governments to develop ways of leveraging pro bono performance in firms that provide legal services to government through legal services tender arrangements.

Mandatory annual reporting on pro bono performance is seen by the Centre as a vital part of these government tender schemes. The Centre advocates that governments take a consistent approach to reporting requirements, in recognition of the national and/or global operation of law firm pro bono practices and so as to minimise the regulatory burden on firms.

The Centre will continue to advocate for both corporate and government legal panel tender arrangements to contain specific questions about a law firm's pro bono performance. Corporations are encouraged to use the sample questions for panel law firms set out in Appendix E to the Centre's publication [Pro Bono Legal Work: A guide for in-house corporate lawyers](#), prepared in association with the Law Society of NSW and the Association of Corporate Counsel (2017).

9. How to increase the number of Target signatories

One of the Target's objectives has always been to broaden participation across the profession and to emphasise that lawyers have both an individual and a shared responsibility to help improve access to justice by doing pro bono legal work.

Twenty-four of the 25 largest firms (as identified in the July 2017 Australian Financial Review Law Partnership Survey)⁴ have signed up. These are all firms with over 200 FTE lawyers.⁵ They make up the bulk of the Target cohort, with their lawyers representing 80.5% of all lawyers covered by the Target.⁶

In order to increase the number of Target signatories, the Centre intends to work more with mid-size firms, smaller firms and new entrants, and to continue to raise the visibility of pro bono across the profession. The Centre has been working with mid-size and smaller firms through facilitating emerging and developing pro bono practice forums in Sydney and Melbourne in 2018. It will continue to broaden its communication with these firms and publish accounts of inspiring and innovative pro bono legal work.

⁴ Australian Financial Review, Law Partnership Survey July 2017, <http://www.afr.com/business/legal/interactive--law-partnership-survey--july-2017-20170629-gx0wsb>.

⁵ For the purposes of the Target, each of these firms reported that across FY2017 their average FTE lawyer head-count was over 200.

⁶ Based on the number of signatories that reported in FY2017.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 — Definition of “pro bono legal services” 1 July 2018

Amended text highlighted in yellow below:

The Centre’s definition of “**pro bono legal services**” (for the purposes of its [National Pro Bono Target Statement of Principles](#) and its [National Law Firm Pro Bono Survey](#)) is as follows:

1. Giving **legal assistance for free or at a substantially reduced fee** to:
 - a. individuals who can demonstrate a need for legal assistance but cannot obtain Legal Aid or otherwise access the legal system without incurring significant financial hardship; or
 - b. individuals or organisations whose matter raises an issue of public interest which would not otherwise be pursued; or
 - c. **charities, other not-for-profit organisations or social enterprises, in each case where their sole or primary purpose is to work in the interests of low income or disadvantaged members of the community, or for the public good;**
2. Conducting **law reform and policy work** on issues affecting low income or disadvantaged members of the community, or on issues of public interest;
3. Participating in the provision of **free community legal education** on issues affecting low income or disadvantaged members of the community or on issues of public interest; or
4. Providing a **lawyer on secondment** at a community organisation (including a community legal organisation) or at a referral service provider such as a Public Interest Law Clearing House.

The following is **NOT** regarded as pro bono work for the purposes of this statement:

1. giving legal assistance to any person for free or at a reduced fee without reference to whether he/she can afford to pay for that legal assistance or whether his/her case raises an issue of public interest;
2. free first consultations with clients who are otherwise billed at a firm’s normal rates;
3. legal assistance provided under a grant of legal assistance from Legal Aid;
4. contingency fee arrangements or other speculative work which is undertaken with a commercial expectation of a fee;
5. the sponsorship of cultural and sporting events, work undertaken for business development and other marketing opportunities; or
6. time spent by lawyers sitting on the board of a community organisation (including a community legal organisation) or a charity.

For guidance on calculating pro bono hours for the purpose of the [Target](#) please refer to our [Guidance Notes](#).



Appendix 2 — National Pro Bono Target Guidance Notes

1 July 2018

New text highlighted in yellow below:

PART 1 - GENERAL

1. Only work that involves the delivery of **pro bono legal services** as defined for the purposes of the Target should be reported.
2. Many firms have Community Service and Corporate Social Responsibility programs under which their lawyers and non-lawyers provide a broad range of community service work. Examples of this include literacy and mentoring work, and volunteering to provide services at community organisations. These programs may also involve the firm donating to charities. These activities do not fall within the definition of “pro bono legal services” and should not be reported.
3. Signatories should calculate the number of FTE lawyers for the year by using the average of the number of FTE lawyers at the first day and the last day of the reporting financial year.

$$(FTE\ lawyers\ at\ 1\ July + FTE\ lawyers\ at\ 30\ June) \div 2$$

(Where a new Target firm is reporting for a period less than a full financial year, the number of FTE lawyers should be calculated by using the average number of FTE lawyers at the first day and the last day of the reporting period).

4. “Firm’s lawyers”⁷ includes law graduates not yet admitted to legal practice and thus their pro bono hours should be reported. It does not include paralegals, and their hours should not be reported as pro bono hours.
5. Signatories have the option of separately reporting paralegal hours where the work performed is of a legal nature and would otherwise be charged to the client if it were a commercial matter.
6. Time recorded for the purpose of delivering pro bono legal services should be treated in the same way that work performed for commercial clients is treated. In this respect, each signatory firm’s policies for the treatment of travel time should apply to their pro bono legal work.
7. Each signatory should have systems in place to ensure that accurate records are kept of the pro bono legal work performed.
8. Pro bono legal services may include international pro bono legal services, that is pro bono legal work undertaken:
 - outside Australia, by lawyers who are supervised by, or provided from, an office based in Australia
 - for clients based outside Australia, by lawyers based in Australia; or
 - for organisations based in Australia where the work concerns an initiative outside Australia.
 In this context references to “community” in the definition of “pro bono legal services” include communities outside of Australia.
9. In relation to pro bono legal services provided for a “substantially reduced fee”:

⁷ For the purposes of these Guidance Notes, “firm’s lawyers” refers to lawyers and law graduates at a law firm or at an incorporated legal practice, as appropriate.



- Signatories should report separately on pro bono legal services provided for a “substantially reduced fee” compared to pro bono legal services provided for no fee.
- “Substantially reduced fee” pro bono hours reported to the Centre should only count on a pro rata basis based on the proportion that the reduced fee bears to the fee that would otherwise be charged. For example, if the fee charged is reduced by 75% of what would otherwise be charged for the matter, then 75% of the hours worked on the matter can be counted towards the Target.
- The Centre will only count “substantially reduced fee” hours reported against the Target if those fees have been reduced by at least 50% of what would otherwise be charged for the matter.
- The term “otherwise be charged for the matter” as used in this Note 9 refers to what the fee would be if the matter were not considered a pro bono matter.

PART 2 – PRO BONO WORK FOR CHARITIES, OTHER NOT-FOR-PROFIT ORGANISATIONS AND SOCIAL ENTERPRISES

The following Guidance Notes relate specifically to clause 1(c) of the definition of “pro bono legal services”:

Mission

In assessing whether legal work for a charity, other not-for-profit organisation or social enterprise should be undertaken on a pro bono basis, the key factor is whether the mission and impact of the organisation is likely to benefit low income or disadvantaged members of the community, or be for the public good.

To be for the public good the mission of the organisation must be to advance a broad public interest, namely that it is likely to affect a significant number of people and/or that it raises a matter of broad public concern.

Mission alone may be a sufficient determinant subject to the unique criteria to be considered for social enterprises (see below).

Matter

If the mission that would justify the matter being a pro bono one is partial, or not sufficiently compelling, the nature of the proposed legal matter should be considered. If the matter is one that aims to benefit a low income, socially disadvantaged or a marginalised individual or group, or is clearly in the broader public interest, the matter may be considered a pro bono legal matter.

Means

Where neither the mission nor matter is itself conclusive, a matter may still be considered a pro bono legal matter if the organisation cannot afford to pay for legal services. However, a lack of means alone is not sufficient to meet the criteria for pro bono legal work. Other factors for consideration may include all or any of:

- the constituency ordinarily served by the organisation and their disadvantage (if any);
- the nature and extent of the legal services requested and the possible outcome if legal services are not obtained;
- whether the organisation has been referred by a pro bono legal referral agency;
- the overall financial position of the organisation; and
- the stage of development of the organisation.



Social Enterprises

Social enterprises are not defined in Australian law but for the purposes of this Guidance Note their key characteristics are that they operate as a business seeking to generate revenue and have a primary social, humanitarian, cultural or environmental mission. Social enterprises aim to benefit the public and the community rather than shareholders and owners.

Since the circumstances of each social enterprise will be different, professional judgment should be applied in each case.

Work for social enterprises will be considered pro bono legal work if:

- (a) **Profit Allocation:** At least 50 percent of the social enterprise's profit is used or to be used to support its mission, whether as a continual re-investment into the enterprise itself or donation to a third-party charity or other not-for-profit organisation.

To demonstrate that a social enterprise reinvests at least 50 percent of its profits to support its mission, the pro bono legal service provider could seek documented evidence, which may include:

- the social enterprise's governing documents;
- evidence of commercial joint ventures with charitable or not-for-profit organisations;
- evidence of the social enterprise's historic payout to investors or owners, if relevant; and/or
- other publicly available information; and

- (b) **Phase and Duration of Engagement:** The pro bono relationship is viewed, from its inception, as lasting only until the social enterprise becomes profitable from a market perspective and can pay for reasonably-priced legal services.

The size and phase of development of the social enterprise should therefore be considered. Early-stage start-up ventures will often have less capacity to pay for legal services than more established enterprises.

The duration of the pro bono legal representation should be determined on a case-by-case basis with reference to, for example, when:

- the social enterprise closes its first round of funding;
- the social enterprise begins to generate revenue or profit; or
- the annual profits of the social enterprise exceed a pre-determined amount.

Additional Criteria

Additional criteria to be considered in determining whether a social enterprise is eligible for pro bono legal assistance may include:

- **Cost ratio:** the ratio of expenditure on administrative costs (including remuneration of owners, directors and employees of the social enterprise) compared to expenditure on programs or services of the social enterprise in pursuit of its social, humanitarian, cultural or environmental mission;

- **Funding sources and expected investor rates of return:** the funding sources of the social enterprise and the rate of return expected by investors. Whether the social enterprise is funded through debt or equity or a hybrid of both, the social return expected by investors should be weighed against the expected financial return.

Social enterprises that are funded by low (below market) interest loans or other debt instruments and/or through share purchase where equity investors expect a below market rate of return are more likely to qualify for pro bono legal assistance by prioritising their Social Mission above financial return;

- **Suppliers:** whether any other service providers or suppliers to the social enterprise are providing services on a commercial basis;
- **State of market:** the state of development of the market(s) in which the social enterprise operates; and
- **Joint venture arrangements:** any joint venture arrangements with other organisations.

N.B. In July each year the Centre will send to each signatory an email attaching a standard form which is to be completed and returned to the Centre.

The Centre aims to publish, within 3 months of the end of each year, under the categories of law firm, solicitor and barrister, the number of signatories and the percentage that have met the Target in the previous year within each category. The Centre does NOT publish the names of those signatories that have met or not met the Target.

Law Firm Signatories which have not achieved the Target during the year, will be invited to discuss confidentially with the Centre their plans for how they will work to meet the Target in future.



Appendix 3 — National Pro Bono Target Statement of Principles

Name change only - highlighted in yellow above

For Law Firms

MINDFUL of the professional responsibility of all lawyers to provide pro bono legal services to address the unmet legal needs of the poor and disadvantaged in the communities in which we live, and

RECOGNISING that pro bono is not a substitute for the proper funding by government of Legal Aid agencies, Community Legal Centres and other government funded legal services,

OUR FIRM is pleased to join with other firms across the country in subscribing to the following statement of principles and in pledging our best efforts to achieve the voluntary target described below.

- Our firm recognises its professional obligation to provide pro bono legal services.
- In furtherance of that obligation, our firm agrees to encourage and support the provision of pro bono legal services by all its lawyers.
- We agree to use our best efforts to ensure that, by no later than 30 June in each year, our firm's lawyers will undertake an average of a minimum of 35 hours of [pro bono legal services](#) each year per lawyer.
- In furtherance of these principles, our firm also agrees:
 - to provide training and supervision as required to enable our lawyers to meet the need for pro bono legal services in the community in matters undertaken by our firm and;
 - to monitor the firm's progress towards the targets established in this statement and to report its progress annually to the partners and staff of the firm and to the Australian Pro Bono Centre.
- We acknowledge that when a lawyer provides pro bono legal services, he or she owes the pro bono client the same professional and ethical obligations that are owed to any paying client and accordingly the lawyer must give that work the same priority, attention and care as would apply to paid work.

Appendix 4 — List of current Target signatories

Law firms & ILPs

ACA Lawyers
Allen & Overy
Allens Linklaters*
Allygroup
Aneesa Parker Pty Ltd
Arnold Bloch Leibler*
Ashurst Australia*
Australian Business Lawyers
and Advisors
Australian Government
Solicitor
Bainbridge Legal
Baker McKenzie
Beckham Lawyers
Bilbehry
Bird & Bird
Bowden McCormack, Lawyers
+ Advisers
BT Lawyers
Chamberlains
Clayton Utz*
Colin Biggers & Paisley
Corrs Chambers Westgarth
Curwoods Lawyers
Devenish Law
DLA Piper Australia
Doyles Construction Lawyers
Eakin McCaffery Cox
Elemess Consulting Pty Ltd
Finlaysons
FOI Solutions
FoodLegal
Franklin Athanasellis Cullen
Gadens Lawyers, Melbourne
Gadens Lawyers, Sydney
Gilbert+Tobin*
Gillian Beaumont Legal
Hall & Wilcox Lawyers
Halliday Solicitors
Harmers Workplace Lawyers
Harris Carlson Lawyers
Hegarty Legal
Herbert Smith Freehills
HHG Legal Group
Hicksons Lawyers
Holding Redlich
Holman Webb Lawyers
HopgoodGanim
Hunt & Hunt (NSW)
Hunt & Hunt (Victoria)

HWL Ebsworth
Jackson McDonald
Jones Harley Toole
K & L Gates
Kemp & Co
Kemp Strang
Kennedys
King & Wood Mallesons
KPMG Law
Lander & Rogers
LegalVision
LLGOLD
Logical Legal Solicitors*
Macpherson Kelley Lawyers
Maddocks
Makinson & d'Apice
Marawah Law
Maurice Blackburn
McCullough Robertson
McDonnell Schroder Solicitors*
McInnes Wilson Lawyers
McPhee Lawyers*
Meyer Vandenberg Lawyers
Mills Oakley
Minter Ellison Group
Moray & Agnew
Moulis Legal
MSP Legal
Norton Rose Fulbright
Australia
Parke Lawyers
Phi Finney McDonald
Pragma Legal
Proximity Legal
Roberts Nehmer McKee
Rostron Carlyle
Russell Kennedy
Sabelberg Morcos Lawyers
Sachs Gerace Lawyers*
Salvos Legal
Salvos Legal Humanitarian
Sarah & Associates*
Shelston IP
Siracusa Legal
Slattery Thompson*
Sparke Helmore Lawyers
SRB Legal
Stuthridge Legal
Switch Legal
Triple BL Legal
Waratah Partners Lawyers +
Consultants

Warlows Legal
Webb Henderson
Wilson/Ryan/GroseWinn
Legal*
Withers Australia (formerly
Ryan Lawyers)*

Solicitors

Kerrin Anderson
Richard Clarke*
Megan Dyson
Gaby Jaksa
Nicola Johnson
Graham Jones*
Anthony Jucha*
Elizabeth Kollias
Nicholas Linke
Alexandra Longbottom
Virginia Marshall
Elena Mastjuk
Helen McGowan
Mary Nagle
David Peters
Bernadette Rayment
Stephen Rees*
Alexandra Rose
Michael Ryan
Sharon Sangha
Michael Simmons
Michael Tucak
David Vlahos
Nerida J Wallace
Gene Waters
Katherine Whittemore
Gai Winn
Sam Yiu Hing Tse
Sarah Wedgwood

Barristers

Jennifer Batrouney QC
Stephen Colditz
Simon Freitag*
Philip Greenwood*
Ashok Kumar
Craig McIntosh*
Fiona McLeod SC
Richard Thomas*
Justin Zeeman

* Foundation Signatory.



**AUSTRALIAN
PRO BONO CENTRE**

The Australian Pro Bono Centre is an independent, non-profit organisation that supports and promotes pro bono legal services. The Centre receives financial assistance from the Federal Attorney-General's Department and from the Departments of the Attorney-General in the States and Territories. Accommodation and other support is generously provided by the Faculty of Law at the University of New South Wales. For more information visit the Centre's website at probonocentre.org.au.

Australian Pro Bono Centre
Law Centres Precinct
Level 1
The Law Building
University of New South Wales

Email: info@probonocentre.org.au
Phone: +61 2 9385 7381
Fax: +61 2 9385 7375
Follow us on Twitter @AusPBC
Join us on LinkedIn