



AUSTRALIAN PRO BONO CENTRE

Appendix 1

Sixth National Law Firm Pro Bono Survey 2018 Questions & Answers

This appendix contains the questionnaire for the 2018 National Law Firm Pro Bono Survey, complete with survey responses for each question.

*Where appropriate, the results have been divided into Groups according to the size of the respondent firms: **Group A**, **Group B**, and **Group C**. In some cases, text responses have been wholly or partially modified or excluded in order to maintain respondents' anonymity. Typing errors have also been corrected, where identified.*

Where total responses for any question are fewer than 37 (total number of Survey respondents), this signifies that certain respondents did not answer the question.

Section 1 – About your firm

1. Question 1 requested each firm's contact details for the purposes set out in Section 1 of the Survey questionnaire. Answers to this question are therefore omitted from this Appendix 1.

2. How many full-time equivalent lawyers (including partners and law graduates but excluding paralegals and law clerks) were there in your firm in Australia in the 2017/2018 financial year (2018 FY)?

E.g. A person working four days per week would be classed as 0.8 FTE. Three lawyers who each work two days per week would count for 1.2 FTE (0.4 x 3).

To calculate your answer, please average the number of FTE lawyers on the first day and last day of the 2018 FY, i.e.:

(FTE lawyers at 1 July 2017 + FTE lawyers at 30 June 2018) ÷ 2 =

Individual answers removed to protect respondent anonymity. There are:

- Group A (firms with between 450-1,000 FTE lawyers) – 9 firms.
- Group B (firms with between 201-449 FTE lawyers) – 12 firms.
- Group C (firms with between 50-200 FTE lawyers) – 16 firms.

Section 2 – About your firm's pro bono program

3. Does your firm have a primary pro bono coordinator or manager (i.e. someone whose primary responsibility is to coordinate the firm's pro bono legal work)?

- Yes – Total: 33 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- No – Total: 4 firms – Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.

4. Is that person:

- A Partner – Total: 14 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- A Special Counsel – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- A Senior Associate – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- An Associate/Lawyer – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- A non-legal staff member – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Other (please specify) – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms. See below for the specified responses.

GROUP A	Pro Bono Counsel / Head of Pro Bono
	Head of Pro Bono & Community
	Director
	We have a dedicated pro bono team made up of a Partner, Special Counsel and Senior Associate. This combination is equivalent to 1.6 FTE lawyers.
	Director of Community Engagement
GROUP B	Director
GROUP C	Pro Bono Manager (admitted lawyer)
	National Pro Bono Manager (also a practising lawyer)
	Chief Operating Officer
	Director of Pro Bono and Responsible Business (also a qualified lawyer)

5. Do they:

- Perform the role **full time** – Total: 17 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Perform the role **part time** – Total: 16 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 10 firms.

6. Do they receive some measure of payment, fee relief or billable credit specifically for acting in the role?

- Yes – Total: 26 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- No – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 5 firms.

7. Does this person undertake any pro bono legal work (i.e. legal work for specific clients/matters)?

- Yes – Total: 31 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- No – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

8. What percentage of the time that this person spends in this role was spent undertaking pro bono legal work in the 2018 FY?

GROUP A	25%
	70%
	30%
	100%
	65%
	10%
	5%
	Partner 20%, Special Counsel 100%, Senior Associate 100%
GROUP B	65%
	100%

	50%
	75%
	9%
	30%
	12%
	40%
	20%
	15%
	30%
GROUP C	13.3%
	20%
	30%
	60%
	48%
	25%
	50%
	50%
	20%
	10%
	Unsure

9. Is this answer an estimate?

- Yes – Total: 25 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
- No – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

10. Does your firm have pro bono coordinators in its other offices in Australia, if applicable?

- Yes, all – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Yes, most – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 1 firm
- Yes, some – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- No – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Not applicable – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

11. Did your firm have any “dedicated pro bono lawyers” (i.e. lawyers whose key responsibility is to undertake and/or manage pro bono legal work for the firm) and other staff allocated to your firm’s formal pro bono practice at 30 June 2018? If so, please count these below (full-time equivalent).

This does not include lawyers on secondment to other organisation/s, unless they continue as “dedicated pro bono lawyers” when they return to the firm.

- Partners – Total: 8.4 – Group A: 2.8, Group B: 3.8, Group C: 1.8.
- Special Counsel – Total: 6.3 – Group A: 1.8, Group B: 4.5, Group C: 0.
- Senior Associates – Total: 16 – Group A: 8, Group B: 4.6, Group C: 3.4.
- Associates / Lawyers – Total: 16.6 – Group A: 3.8, Group B: 8.2, Group C: 4.6.
- Graduates – Total: 2.5 – Group A: 1, Group B: 1.5, Group C: 0.
- Paralegals / Administrative Staff – Total: 11.55 – Group A: 3.55, Group B: 6.6, Group C: 1.4.
- Other – Total: 8 – Group A: 3, Group B: 3, Group C: 2. Please see the below for the specified responses.

12. If you entered a figure (greater than zero) against "Other" in the question above, please list these role/s:

GROUP A	Head of Pro Bono & Community.
	Pro Bono Counsel / Head of Pro Bono.
	Pro Bono Director.
GROUP B	Australia Pro Bono Associate.
	National Manager, Pro Bono Services.
	Based in community legal centres as long-term secondees for dedicated provision of pro bono
GROUP C	Pro Bono Manager.
	Pro Bono Solicitor and Head of Corporate Social Responsibility.

13. Does your firm have a Pro Bono Committee?

- Yes – Total: 25 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 10 firms.
- No – Total: 12 firms – Group A 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 6 firms.

14. Does your firm focus its pro bono program on specific area/s of law or practice, or types of clients? If so, please list these areas.

- Yes – Total: 31 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- No – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.

GROUP A	We act for low income and vulnerable people who cannot obtain Legal Aid, and for the NFPs which support low income and vulnerable people.
	Reducing inequality & poverty (particularly around children & young people).
	Our pro bono practice has four focus areas in Australia: Reconciliation, disability & health, homelessness and building the rule of law. Our pro bono practice is directed at relevant legal issues arising from those areas.
	Access to justice, homelessness, disadvantaged equity, alleviation of poverty.
	Homelessness, refugees' issues, Indigenous issues, education for the most disadvantaged, access to justice more broadly and social finance and impact investments.
	The key focus areas are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians and people in regional, rural and remote areas. We also respond to critical or emerging areas of community need.
	Alleviating disadvantage. Human Rights. Indigenous rights. Environment.
GROUP B	Disability, refugees, Indigenous, elder abuse, homelessness.
	We prioritise work for Indigenous people, people with disability, refugee and asylum seekers, human rights and discrimination matters and organisations assisting each group. However, we do not exclude work from other disadvantaged and marginalised people.
	Secondments to CLCs; commercial / employment advice / drafting resources for charitable organisations; training on a range of issues.
	Our broad areas of focus are: people seeking asylum and refugees, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, economic injustice. These areas are not exclusive, and we undertake a diverse range of work.
	Local community impact.
	In addition to strong support for community legal centres / Citizens Advice Bureaux, the firm provides extensive support to a range of community-based organisations across Australia, including: Mission Australia / Salvation Army / Salvos Legal / Homeless Persons Legal Services / Domestic violence support services / The National Centre Against Bullying, part of the Alannah & Madeline Foundation / Not-for-profit community groups focused on supporting children or the elderly / Asylum Seeker Resource Centre / Refugee and Immigration Legal Centre / Health-related not-for-profit community groups.
	Asylum seekers, seniors' law / elder abuse, not for profits / charities.
	Youth (including Education), Poverty, Health, Arts, Environment, Elderly, Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islanders, LGBTQI, Human Trafficking.

	Cyber civil rights, anti-human trafficking.
	Child rights, migrant rights and trafficking and Rule of Law.
	Women and older people experiencing family violence, ATSI Australians and organisations and human rights matters.
GROUP C	Access to justice; health and mental health; Indigenous education and capacity building; rural and remote communities and their activities; community arts; promoting philanthropy and corporate giving.
	Refugees & asylum seekers. Women, youth & prevention of family violence. Seniors' rights and elder abuse, Indigenous Australians, The Arts, Not for profit law, Employment law.
	Women, Children, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders & the Environment.
	Homelessness, Indigenous Australians, refugees and asylum seekers, women and children in need and mental health.
	Current focus on: refugee rights, seniors' rights, self-represented litigants, program and work performed is broader than that though.
	Refugee law. Climate justice.
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and NFPs, environmental NGOs, cultural and religious causes, particularly Jewish causes, in governance, general commercial, tax, admin law, land rights and native title and some test cases litigation.
	Asylum seekers, Indigenous communities, people with disabilities.
	Access to justice, access to education and employment, helping displaced people.
	Law Right, self-representation service for QCAT, State and Federal Courts, Cancer Council and local sporting organisations. Areas of practice include litigation, commercial, corporations, taxation, administrative law, family and estates.
	Not for profits, and secondments to Streetlaw, MHLC and Law Access.
	Our main areas of practice include clinics for the Asylum Seeker Centre and participation in the Cancer Council pro bono referral program. We target large charities for whom we can undertake commercial, property and employment legal services.
Access to justice. Access to education. Access to finance.	

15. Does your firm have a corporate social responsibility (CSR), community engagement (CE) or community service (CS) program?

- Yes – Total: 31 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- No – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.

16. Please describe the relationship between your firm's pro bono legal program and its CSR, CE or CS program. Are they separately managed? Does your pro bono program have its own objectives and budget?

GROUP A	Holistic.
	Heavily combined and integrated community and pro bono program with separate budgets but common objectives.
	Pro bono and community engagement are operationally distinct but thematically aligned to maximise impact.
	The two programs are completely separate. Our pro bono program does have its own objectives but does not have its own budget.
	They are separately managed programs. Our pro bono practice has a policy and budget which is separate from our CSR programs.
	Director manages both programs with a small team dedicated to the full program. The budgets are separate, but all are managed by the Director, with some flexibility between budgets.
	Pro bono is a standalone legal practice. CR is a broader engagement program, but pro bono and CR work very closely together. Pro bono partner is also the head of Corporate Responsibility. Pro bono and CR are managed separately, through separate people (except for the partner) budgets and objectives.

	The pro bono practice is separately run and managed with its own policy, procedures and budget. The pro bono practice is however a part of the larger CSR program and lawyers in the pro bono practice are also part of the CSR committee (among others).
GROUP B	Our Pro Bono Practice and Community Program each have their own policy, with clear objectives and separate budgets. However, both are managed by the same team.
	They are separately managed but reflect each other's aims. Own budget, own plans.
	We have a greening group made up of staff who are interested in working on environmental initiatives. This is managed separately to the pro bono program.
	These types of programs are not managed by the pro bono program. However, the pro bono team have a lot of input into this type of work at the firm.
	They are separately managed with separate objectives and budget.
	They are separate. The pro bono program has its own objectives and budget.
	We have a Pro Bono legal practice with its own budget and objectives which is managed on a day to day basis by Pro Bono Counsel. We have a separate Community Service program with its own objectives and budget. The Community Service program is managed on a day to day basis by our Community Service Lead and overseen by Pro Bono Counsel.
	Separately managed. PB program has no separate budget.
	Separately managed programmes - CSR comes under the HR banner, though close cooperation and consultation exists with the pro bono committee.
	Managed by same partner but with consultants allocated to work on community engagement.
GROUP C	Managed together to achieve co-ordination. Social outcomes.
	The pro bono program is one element of the broader CSR program.
	The Pro bono program is separately managed from our other programs. The Pro Bono Program is managed by our COO. The pro bono program has its own objectives, but no real budget attached to it.
	Pro Bono legal program and CSR are currently managed together. Focus is currently on Bro Bono legal work, with CSR initiatives growing. Pro Bono legal program has its own objectives / policy and budget.
	CSR is dealt with by a sub-committee of the Pro Bono Committee, and by Office Services Staff. The Pro Bono legal program has a separate budget and separate objectives.
	The pro bono and CSR program are managed by the same Partner. The programs operate separately, with the pro bono program having its own objectives and budget. However, we find that the two programs complement and support one another, creating a culture of contribution.
	The dedicated pro bono solicitor coordinated both the pro bono and CSR programs. The programs have the same focus areas. The pro bono and CSR programs did not have a budget in 2017 / 18.
	Separately managed with distinct budgets.
	The CSR program includes pro bono work done by professional staff within the firm and is managed by the pro bono coordinator and pro bono committee. The CSR does not have a formal separate budget.
	Pro bono program has its own objectives and budget, but Committee shares oversight of Pro Bono and Community Investment Work. We seek to do pro bono work for the charities that we partner with on volunteering.
	We operate a separate pro-bono program with objectives and budget.
	Separately managed. PB Program has objectives but no budget.
Our pro bono legal program is managed separately from our CSR program.	

Section 3 – Sources of pro bono legal work

17. What percentage of your firm's pro bono legal work (by number of new files opened or new matters commenced on existing files) in the 2018 FY originated from:

Please complete each option below and ensure your total answer adds up to 100. Please answer 0 against any option that does not apply.

GROUP A					
a) Pro bono referral schemes and organisations (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	b) Community legal centres (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	c) Legal Aid (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	d) Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islander Legal Services (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and / or clinics)	e) Direct requests for assistance (from individuals and/or not-for-profit organisations)	f) Other sources (this could include internal projects)
20	30	0	10	15	25
6.6	6	0	6.1	79	2.3
5	62	0.13	0.25	32.62	0
15	35		10	40	
1.6	51.9	4.7	0.1	32.3	9.4
19	19		5	50	7
10	20	20	30	20	0
36	2		5	57	
GROUP B					
a) Pro bono referral schemes and organisations (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	b) Community legal centres (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	c) Legal Aid (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	d) Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islander Legal Services (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and / or clinics)	e) Direct requests for assistance (from individuals and/or not-for-profit organisations)	f) Other sources (this could include internal projects)
60	20	0	5	10	5
5	25	15	10	25	2
25	35	1	10	20	9
15	50	0		35	0
5	40	5	10	40	
50	40	3	0	5	2
10	20	5	20	40	5
60	20	0	0	10	10
30	33	0	0	33	4
25	5	0	5	5	
1.9	90.4	0	0	3.6	4.1
28	43	1	6	19	3
Group C					
a) Pro bono referral schemes and organisations (this could include referrals,	b) Community legal centres (this could include referrals, secondments,	c) Legal Aid (this could include referrals, secondments,	d) Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islander Legal Services (this could include	e) Direct requests for assistance (from individuals and/or not-for-	f) Other sources (this could include internal projects)

secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	joint projects and/or clinics)	joint projects and/or clinics)	referrals, secondments, joint projects and / or clinics)	profit organisations)	
38	55	0	1	5	1
20	10	0	0	50	20
49	6	0	1	40	4
15	10	5	0	50	20
45	20	2	0	25	8
30	40	0	0	10	20
10	5	0	20	35	30
32	59	0	0	9	0
11	38	43	0	8	0
15	15	0	0	60	
10	40	0	0	50	0
50	20	0	0	10	20
26				70	4
50				25	25
0	30	0	0	70	0

18. Is this answer an estimate?

- Yes – Total: 32 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 14 firms.
- No – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

19. If your firm undertook pro bono legal work originating from at least one pro bono referral scheme or organisation in the 2018 FY, please indicate all schemes/organisations from which you received a referral:

- ACT Pro Bono Clearing House – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Justice Connect (incl Homeless Persons' Legal Clinic Victoria) – Total: 27 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 10 firms.
- JusticeNet SA – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Law Access (Western Australia) – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Law Society NT Pro Bono Clearing House – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Law Society of NSW Pro Bono Scheme – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Law Society of Tasmania Pro Bono Clearing House – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- Public Interest Advocacy Centre (incl Homeless Persons' Legal Service NSW) – Total: 20 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- LawRight, formerly Queensland Public Interest Law Clearing House (incl Homeless Persons' Legal Clinic) – Total: 19 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Other (please specify) – Total: 13 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 5 firms. Please see the below for the specified responses.

GROUP A	Salvos Legal Humanitarian Service, YouthLaw ACT, Law Society ACT, StreetLaw.
	Law Help (ORIC referrals).
	LawHelp / TrustLaw.
GROUP B	Cancer Council Legal Referral Service.
	LawHelp Scheme for Indigenous corporations.

	Human Rights Law Centre, PILPG.
	ACT Law Society Legal Advice Bureau, Belmont Neighbourhood Centre, Hunter Community Legal Centre, Salvo's Legal Brisbane.
	Cancer Council NSW.
GROUP C	WLS, Cancer Council, Arts Law, Youth Law.
	Cancer Council.
	Cancer Council Legal Referral Scheme.
	TrustLaw.
	RACS, Women Lawyers Association of NSW, Salvation Army Safe House, Cancer Council Opportunity International.

Section 4 – Recording pro bono legal work

20. What percentage of your Firm's lawyers participated in (i.e. did at least one hour of) pro bono legal work in the 2018 FY?

Please refer to paragraph 4 of Part 1 of the **Guidance Notes**.

GROUP A	68
	74.6
	84
	37
	65
	63.50
	80.5
	61
	75
GROUP B	25
	60
	55.5
	80
	67.5
	50
	72
	72
	67
	37.3
	77
GROUP C	48
	64
	73.29
	30
	90
	66.89

	58.5
	59
	40
	66
	47
	81
	27
	53
	30-40
	80

21. Is this answer an estimate?

- Yes – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- No – Total: 24 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 8 firms.

22. If the data is readily available to you, what percentage of partners in your firm in Australia participated in (did at least one hour of) pro bono legal work in the 2018 FY?

GROUP A	45
	36.8
	34
	40
	78
	56
	62.5
	50
	42
GROUP B	45.1
	9
	18 lawyers at partner level and above undertook PB work
	20
	44
	49.40
	35
	55
	23.15
36	
GROUP C	37
	52
	34.78
	75.58
	75
	19

	65
	40
	3 or 4 partners in total out of 22, approximately 18%
	30
	40
	31

23. Is this answer an estimate?

- Yes – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- No – Total: 21 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 5 firms.

24. How many hours of pro bono legal work did lawyers in your firm in Australia carry out in the 2018 FY?

Please refer to the *definition of “pro bono legal work”*, including **Guidance Notes**, when calculating this figure.

GROUP A	32,696.00
	16,858.00
	34,052.00
	8,953.80
	27,782.90
	39,148.00
	24,818.00
	24,938.00
	14,496.80
GROUP B	8,759.77
	21,315.00
	9,377.00
	14,026.00
	14,567.25
	8,007.00
	10,814.00
	4,723.80
	8,789.40
	6,110.00
	3,307.00
	12,157.00
	GROUP C
5,252.20	
2,856.81	
8,317.00	
342.00	
982.75	
2,906.72	

	8,847.43
	4,255.00
	1,796.00
	915.00
	1,112.00
	3,821.00
	760.70
	418.00
	662.00

25. How many hours of pro bono legal work per lawyer (averaged across the total number of full time equivalent lawyers in your firm) were carried out in the 2018 FY?

This figure is arrived at by taking the number of hours of pro bono legal work undertaken by your firm's lawyers and dividing it by the total number of full time equivalent (FTE) lawyers working at your firm. For example, if your firm had undertaken 1,000 hours of pro bono legal work and employed 100 FTE lawyers it would have achieved 10 pro bono hours per lawyer per year.

GROUP A	37.37
	34.58
	29.54
	43.36
	43.93
	50.34
	41.08
	11.47
	34.90
GROUP B	35.20
	41.32
	62.32
	27.82
	16.53
	53.56
	41.90
	29.55
	34.20
	25.13
	41.57
11.21	
GROUP C	6.00
	13.24
	30.32
	42.65

	2.20
	21.60
	70.33
	17.80
	36.00
	15.00
	11.32
	38.91
	17.70
	7.84
	22.61
	11.30

26. What percentage of lawyers in your firm in Australia undertook 35 hours or more of pro bono legal work in the 2018 FY?

GROUP A	8.18
	29.00
	19.00
	5.80
	38.30
	27.80
	23.70
	24.00
	28.00
GROUP B	19.00
	14.50
	24.00
	72.00
	50.00
	21.40
	13.60
	80.00
	31.00
	2.00
	27.00
GROUP C	32.00
	20.00
	27.00
	14.61
	2.00
	13.38

	16.00
	26.00
	15.00
	12.00
	6.00
	25.00
	7.00
	6.00
	27.00
	5.00

27. Is this answer an estimate?

- Yes – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
- No – Total: 24 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 7 firms.

28. What percentage of your firm's total billable hours does its pro bono legal work represent?

GROUP A	2.7
	3.7
	3.21
GROUP B	2.4
	3.5
	15
	10
	2
	2.3
	0.82
	4
GROUP C	1.59
	0.3
	5.68
	3
	1.1
	2
	3
	1.4
	1.5

29. Is this answer an estimate?

- Yes – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- No – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.

30. (Optional) Are you including any substantially reduced fee pro bono work in your total reported hours of pro bono legal work?

Please refer to the [Guidance Notes](#) when answering this and the following question.

- No – Total: 26 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- Yes – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.

If yes, please specify how many hours in the 2018 FY.

GROUP A	None.
GROUP B	50
GROUP C	188.7
	233

31. (Optional) The Centre is seeking to better understand the nature of substantially reduced fee pro bono work. Please provide details of the substantially reduced fee work your firm has undertaken in the 2018 FY (for example, was the work for individuals or organisations; what was the degree of fee reduction?).

GROUP A	Generally legal work for NFPs and charitable organisations on a 50 / 50 fee paying / pro bono basis. Most of the work we do for a substantially reduced fee is done by our tax team when they are working beyond capacity and we would have to turn the work away otherwise.
GROUP B	Approximately 11.4% of all pro bono work was at a substantially-reduced fee. 11.5% at a 50% discount and 3% at a discount of between 51-99%. All for NFP / charity organisations. We also set pro bono rates based on lawyers' average realised rates, not rack rates.
	We have not included hours of work undertaken in our practice areas that do not time record in our estimate of hours as we do not have a reliable method for estimating those hours. Therefore, it is our view that the hours reported in this survey under-estimates the pro bono work done at the firm.
	For organisations 60% reduced.
GROUP C	4 NFPs and 2 individuals. Generally, a 50% reduction in fees.
	We undertook one matter on a part pro bono basis (minimum 50% discount to our usual fees) given the sensitive and technical nature of the advice required, which otherwise would have conflicted with our commercial practice. As a compromise to charging full fee, we agreed to assist the NFP by offering a 'substantially reduce fee' arrangement. The client was very appreciative of the compromise reached.
	If and when we charge substantially reduced fees it will usually be for not for profit organisations (that we may or may not already act for pro bono in other matters), and whether we charge will depend on the matter and the relationship we have with the client. Usually the reduction is 30%-40% and sometimes much more of our standard hourly fees. In such circumstances we will often cap our fees too.
	This work was carried out for not for profit organisations at up to 40% less than standard hourly rates.

Section 5 – More about your firm’s pro bono program

32. What percentage of your firm’s pro bono legal work (by number of new files opened, or by other measure) in the 2018 FY was devoted to work for individuals or organisations?

NOTES:

1. Please ensure your answer adds up to 100%.
2. For the purposes of this survey, a secondee to a community legal organisation whose primary role is to provide advice to the centre’s clients should be considered to be working “for individuals”.

Alternately, providing advice to the community legal organisation itself (in relation to governance, for example) should be considered to be work “for organisations.”

3. If you have a more accurate measure of the split of work between “individuals” and “organisations”, please provide your answers on this basis (for example, by number of hours rather than by number of mew files opened).

- Pro bono legal work for individuals (%)
- Pro bono legal work for organisations (%)

GROUP A	
Individuals	Organisations
51.5	48.5
65	35
67	33
38.5	61.5
40	60
42	58
58	42
30	70
10	90
GROUP B	
Individuals	Organisations
54	46
55	45
65	35
32	68
95	0
67 (by hours)	33 (by hours)
25	75
60	40
95	5
56	43
GROUP C	
Individuals	Organisations
54	46
75	25
0	100
10	90
30	70
15	85
30	70
62	38
95	5
92	8
40	60
45	55

36	64
13	87
20	80
30	70

33. Is this answer an estimate?

- Yes – Total: 23 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 10 firms.
- No – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.

34. To the best of your knowledge, in which five areas of law and practice did your firm in Australia spend the most time providing pro bono legal services in the 2018 FY (not including work undertaken by lawyers seconded to other organisations)?

Please list up to 5 areas.

- **Administrative / Constitutional** – Total: 9 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- **Agreements with / Tenders to Government for pro bono clients** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Animal Law** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Banking / Finance** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Bankruptcy** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Commercial Agreements (e.g. leases)** – Total: 13 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 8 firms.
- **Construction Law** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Consumer Law** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Coronial Inquiries** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Corporate Law (including incorporations)** – Total: 13 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- **Criminal Law** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Debt** – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 6 firms.
- **Charity and Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) Status Applications** – Total: 13 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- **Discrimination** – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- **Employment Law** Total: 20 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- **Environment** – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Family Law (not including Family Violence)** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Family Violence / Domestic Violence** – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Fines** – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Governance** – Total: 14 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- **Housing / Tenancy** – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Human Rights** – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- **Immigration** – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- **Insurance** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Intellectual Property** – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- **Personal Injury** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Privacy / Freedom of Information** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Powers of Attorney / Guardianship** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Professional Negligence** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Royal Commissions** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Social Security** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.

- Superannuation – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Tax (other than DGR) – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Town Planning / Local Government – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Trusts – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Victims Compensation – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Wills / Probate / Estate – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Other (please specify) – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 0 firms. Please see below:

GROUP A	Disputes.
	Elder Abuse.
GROUP B	As the large proportion of our work is done via secondment, it would be a mix of things and dependent on the community legal centre. Non-secondment work covered mostly commercial agreements and IP related work.
	Due to broad spread of work it is hard to identify just five areas.
GROUP C	None.

35. Within the 5 areas of law and practice you have nominated above, which client groups (if any) has this work been done for or for the benefit of? Please list up to three groups.

E.g. asylum seekers, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, victims of crime, children, homeless persons, women, LGBTIQ community, seniors.

Please enter "n/a" where appropriate.

GROUP A		
Special interest group 1	Special interest group 2	Special interest group 3
Homeless Persons.	ATSI.	N/A
Asylum seekers.	Disadvantaged / Homeless.	Children and Young People.
Homeless Persons.	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	Women.
Homeless persons.	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	Women.
Asylum seekers.	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	Homeless persons.
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	Victims of crime.	Not for profits, charities and social enterprises.
Asylum Seekers.	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.	Homeless Persons.
GROUP B		
Special interest group 1	Special interest group 2	Special interest group 3
NFPs and charitable organisations.	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	Legal issues associated with having cancer.
Indigenous.	People with disability.	Refugees and Asylum seekers.
People seeking asylum and refugees.	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	People with financial vulnerabilities.
Asylum seekers.	LGBTIQ community.	People with a disability.
Domestic violence survivors.	Asylum seekers.	N/A
Homeless persons.	Domestic violence.	Aboriginals.
Children (students).	Community health services.	N/A
Asylum seekers.	Women.	Transgender teenagers.
GROUP C		
Special interest group 1	Special interest group 2	Special interest group 3

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	Women.	Children.
Asylum seekers.	Young people.	Women.
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	Women.	N/A
Homeless persons.	Children.	N/A
Asylum seekers.	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	Women and children in need.
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.	Environmental NGOs.	Victims of discrimination.
Asylum seekers / Refugees.	Cancer sufferers.	NFPs.
Asylum seekers.	Seniors.	Self represented litigants.
Asylum seekers.	ATSI.	People with disabilities.
Asylum seekers.	Disabled.	N/A
Asylum seekers.	Victims of crime.	N/A
Asylum seekers.	Terminally ill.	3rd world micro-financing women / education.

36. To the best of your knowledge, in which areas of law or practice in the 2018 FY did your firm reject the most requests for assistance (for reasons *other than* means or merit)?

Please tick up to five.

- **Administrative / Constitutional** – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Agreements with / Tenders to Government for pro bono clients** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Animal Law** – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Banking / Finance** – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Bankruptcy** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Commercial Agreements (e.g. leases)** – Total: 2 firms - Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Construction Law** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Consumer Law** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Coronial Inquiries** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Corporate Law (including incorporations)** – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Criminal Law** – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- **Debt** – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Charity and Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) Status Applications** – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Discrimination** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Employment Law** – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Environment** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Family Law (not including Family Violence)** – Total: 9 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- **Family Violence / Domestic Violence** – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Fines** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Governance** – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Housing / Tenancy** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Human Rights** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Immigration** – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- **Insurance** – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Intellectual Property** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Personal Injury** – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- **Privacy / Freedom of Information** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Powers of Attorney / Guardianship** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Professional Negligence** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

- **Royal Commissions** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Social Security** – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- **Superannuation** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Tax (other than DGR)** – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- **Town Planning / Local Government** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Trusts** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- **Victims Compensation** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Wills / Probate / Estate** – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- **Other, please specify** – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 3 firms. Please see below:

GROUP A	Native Title, Defamation.
GROUP B	None.
GROUP C	Property.
	Property.
	Generally due to the fact that we do not practice in particular areas therefore did not have the relevant expertise.

37. Has your firm provided any pro bono legal services for social enterprises in the 2018 FY?

- **Yes** – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- **No** – Total: 21 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 13 firms.

38. Does your firm have a Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP)?

- **Yes** – Total: 15 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- **No** – Total: 18 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 12 firms.

39. When was the RAP introduced?

GROUP A	2009
	2018
	2016
	2010
	2014
	2011
	2014
	2014
GROUP B	2014
	2010
	2014
	2009
GROUP C	2016
	2007
	2017

Section 6 – Targets and operational budgets for pro bono legal work

40. Did your firm set an overall target for its pro bono legal work in the 2018 FY?

Please tick all that apply.

- YES** - it represented a **maximum or capped** number of **hours or hours per lawyer** to be provided in the year – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- YES** - it represented a **minimum** number of **hours or hours per lawyer** to be provided in the year – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- YES** - it represented a **set number of hours or hours per lawyer** that the firm aimed to provide in the year – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- YES** - it represented a **maximum or capped financial value** (i.e. a capped dollar amount or capped percentage of gross billables/net revenue etc) – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- YES** - it represented a **minimum financial value** (i.e. a minimum dollar amount or minimum percentage of gross billables/net revenue etc) – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- YES** - it represented a **set financial value** (i.e. a set dollar amount or percentage of gross billables/net revenue etc aimed for by the firm) – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- NO** – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- DON'T KNOW** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- OTHER** (please specify) – None.

41. Was this target larger, smaller or the same as it was two years ago?

- Larger** – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Smaller** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- Same** – Total: 16 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Don't know** – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.

42. If your firm set a target that represented a number of hours or hours per lawyer, did this target represent:

This figure is arrived at by taking the number of hours of pro bono legal work undertaken by your firm's lawyers and dividing it by the total number of full time equivalent (FTE) lawyers working at your firm. For example, if your firm had undertaken 1,000 hours of pro bono legal work and employed 100 FTE lawyers it would have achieved 10 pro bono hours per lawyer per year.

- More than 35 hours of pro bono legal work per lawyer (e.g. higher than the figure set in the National Pro Bono Target) – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- 35 hours of pro bono legal work per lawyer (e.g. the figure set in the National Pro Bono Target) – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Less than 35 hours of pro bono legal work per lawyer (e.g. lower than the figure set in the National Pro Bono Target) – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- A number of hours for the firm to provide as a whole, with no reference to a pro bono hours per lawyer calculation – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Not applicable – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

43. Did your firm set an annual operational budget for its pro bono program in the 2018 FY?

- Yes** – Total: 19 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- No** – Total: 15 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 10 firms.
- Don't know** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

44. Is this annual operational budget larger, smaller or the same as it was two years ago?

- Larger** – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Smaller** – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Same** – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Don't know** – Total: 2 firms: Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

45. Are lawyers in your firm required to meet billable hour targets or financial targets?

- Yes, both billable hour targets and financial targets – Total: 27 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- Yes, billable hour targets only – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Yes, financial targets only – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- No – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

46. How is pro bono legal work treated in your office for the purposes of lawyers’ billable hour and/or financial targets?

- Pro bono hours are treated as **billable hours** for the purposes of billable hour targets (and financial targets, if applicable) – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Pro bono hours are treated as **billable hours** for the purposes of billable hour targets but **reduced in value for the purposes of financial targets** – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Pro bono hours are treated as **billable hours** for the purposes of billable hour targets (and financial targets, if applicable) but are **capped** at a certain number of pro bono hours per week/month/year – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Pro bono hours are treated as **non-billable hours** but are recorded as a **special non-billable** (e.g. pro bono) category (and have a lower or negligible value for the purposes of financial targets, if applicable) – Total: 9 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Pro bono hours are treated as **non-billable hours** and are **not recorded** as a special non-billable category (and have a lower or negligible value for the purposes of financial targets, if applicable) – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Pro bono hours are **not recorded at all** – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Other, please specify** – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm. Please see below:

GROUP A	Pro bono hours are treated as non-billable hours, but are recorded as pro bono hours, and they are taken into account when evaluating team members' performances.
	Pro bono hours are treated as non-billable hours but are recorded as special non-billable (pro bono) category. Approved pro bono hours will be recognised for the purpose of assessing whether an individual has met their financial performance targets and are eligible for incentive payments.
GROUP B	It varies from practice to practice as we have different billing practices across the firm.
GROUP C	Some pro bono hours are treated as billable hours, others are not e.g. work done at clinics is not treated as billable hours.

47. If your firm has more than one Australian office, is this a consistent practice across your entire firm in Australia (all offices and practice groups)?

- Yes – Total: 30 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 12 firms.
- No – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

48. Does your firm recognise and/or reward the pro bono legal work of your lawyers in any of the following ways?

Please tick all that apply.

- In lawyers’ performance appraisals – Total: 32 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- When considering promotion or advancement – Total: 19 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- When calculating bonuses – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- In salary reviews – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 5 firms.

- Internal awards, events and communication – Total: 29 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- Other, please specify – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms. Please see below:

GROUP A	Nominations for external awards (such as pro bono lawyer of the year).
GROUP B	None.
GROUP C	None.

Section 8 – Secondments

49. How many pro bono secondments did you provide in the 2018 FY?

GROUP A	7
	3
	6
	4
	4
	7
	0
	6
	6
	GROUP B
2	
0	
17	
2	
Not specified	
1	
0	
2	
0	
GROUP C	0
1	
0	
0	
0	
0	
1	
0	
0	
5	
0	
1	
0	

	0
	0
	0

50. Measured in hours, were the secondments provided by your firm:

- All provided on a full-time basis – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- Mostly provided on a full-time basis – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Provided equally on a full- and part-time basis – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- Mostly provided on a part-time basis – Total: 2 firm – Group A: 2 firm, Group B: 0 firm, Group C: 0 firms.
- All provided on a part-time basis – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms.

51. What was the most common length of full-time secondments provided by your firm, if any?

GROUP A	6 months.
	6 months.
	4 weeks.
	6 months.
	6 months.
GROUP B	1 - 2 months.
	6 weeks x 2.
	3 months.
	3 months.
GROUP C	5 days.
	3 months.

52. What was the most common part-time secondment arrangement provided by your firm, if any?

For example, "two days per week for three months" or "three hours per fortnight for six months."

GROUP A	1 / 2 day per week.
	Two days per week for three months.
	One day per week.
	1 day per week for 3 months.
GROUP B	Two days a week for X months
	2 - 3 days for 3 - 6 months.
	One morning per week ongoing.
GROUP C	2 days per week for 12 months.
	One day a week for a month.
	One day per week for 8 weeks.
	3 days per week for 3 months.

53. Are there any other noticeable trends in the form, duration and number of secondments provided by your firm since the last Survey, in July 2016?

GROUP A	Less capacity for secondments.
	The number of secondments is still similar, but it is becoming harder to find lawyers to place on secondment. It would be very difficult to add on more secondments.

GROUP B	We provided fewer pro bono secondments this financial year as compared with FY2017.
	Secondments are not a large part of our pro bono work and are undertaken on an ad hoc basis.
	Less junior capacity for secondments, hard to find capacity for long term secondments
GROUP C	This year was our first pro bono secondment.

Section 9 – Disbursements

54. Did your firm pay for any external disbursements in pro bono matters in the 2018 FY?

Please nominate up to three categories where your firm incurred the most costs:

- Medical reports and appearance fees – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Other expert witness reports and appearance fees – Total: 3 firms - Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Filing fees – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Interpreters' fees – Total: 16 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Travel and accommodation – Total: 13 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Search costs Total: 14 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Barristers' fees (advice or representation) – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Transcripts – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Other, please specify – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 5 firms. Please see below:

GROUP A	No responses.
GROUP B	Did not pay disbursements.
	None.
GROUP C	Miscellaneous.
	Taxi fares and photocopying.
	Did not pay disbursements.
	Did not pay disbursements.
	Did not pay disbursements.

55. If possible, please estimate the total costs of external disbursements incurred by your firm on behalf of its pro bono clients in the 2018 FY:

GROUP A	\$50,000
	\$84,000
	\$2,000
	\$8,500
	\$140,000
	Minimal
	\$31,340
GROUP B	\$15,000
	\$5,000
	Tens of thousands

	\$1,500
	\$8,310.56
GROUP C	\$5,000
	\$500
	\$49,962
	\$2,500 - \$5,000
	\$20,000
	\$2,000
	\$400

56. Has your firm applied to any disbursement assistance scheme in the last two years?

- Yes – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- No – Total: 24 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
- Don't know – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 4 firms.

Which disbursement assistance scheme/s has your firm applied to?

GROUP A	Law Society scheme.
GROUP B	NSW Law society.
	CLSD.
GROUP C	NSW Supreme Court.
	NSW Law Society.
	NSW Law Society Pro Bono Disbursement Trust Fund.

58. How was your experience in dealing with the scheme/s?

GROUP A	Law Society scheme - Very professional.
GROUP B	NSW Law society - It is an accessible scheme but limited in what it provides.
	CLSD - Good experience but can only claim where we meet certain parameters.
GROUP C	NSW Law Society – Excellent.
	NSW Law Society Pro Bono Disbursement Trust Fund - My applications for pre-approval of interpreter fees were promptly approved. I haven't sought reimbursement of those fees as we were either successful in recovering our costs and disbursements or the matters haven't yet gone to hearing.

59. Are there reason/s why your firm has not applied for assistance?

GROUP A	We cover disbursements as part of our pro bono contribution to the community. We hope that this allows sole practitioners and smaller law firms to access disbursement assistance
	Didn't appear that any disbursements qualified under the schemes.
GROUP B	No projects that require this.
	Not worth it.
	Matters urgent.
	We generally carry the disbursements on a file.
	Too time consuming.
	We are not aware of any scheme(s) for disbursement assistance for pro bono legal services.
GROUP C	No particular or consistent reason.

	Because our clients tend to be larger charities, they have the means of paying for disbursements.
	We didn't know about it plus we feel it is all part of the duty of carrying out pro bono work.
	Not aware of options and availability.
	None available.

Section 10 – Evaluating your firm's pro bono program

60. Does your firm evaluate its pro bono program?

- No – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms
- Yes – Total: 25 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 11 firms.

Please describe briefly the evaluation methodology.

GROUP A	Internal review process.
	The pro bono team is constantly reviewing its strategy, focus and partnerships to ensure that the work we do is having a positive impact on the disadvantaged and vulnerable people we seek to assist. This process is overseen by the firm's Global Pro Bono & Citizenship Council which is comprised by Senior Executives and Partners across the firm's global network.
	Ongoing monitoring of performance against targets.
	We evaluate the pro bono practice yearly and on an ongoing basis. We review hours across our offices, participation and spread of work across teams, number of matters and types of matters (including whether matters are within our focus areas). We also review our secondments and clinics regularly.
	We obtain feedback from pro bono participants.
GROUP B	Participation rates, client feedback, number of pro bono hours provided.
	Annual planning, assessment of board report, ongoing review of projects, rosters, case priorities etc.
	Review feedback received from both the pro bono client as well as lawyers to assess benefits.
	It is something we are working on at the moment, but at the moment the program reports progress on business plan goals to a steering committee.
	Regular reporting.
	We have an informal evaluation process. Pro Bono Counsel, together with the Pro Bono Group, regularly assesses the value of our programs and referral pathways. We also regularly review our focus areas to ensure we are addressing unmet legal needs that fit within the expertise (established or to be acquired through training) of our lawyers.
	Impact and input.
	Annual review with management.
GROUP C	Against KPI's regarding hours, client spread, participation rates and the national pro bono target.
	Reporting on: Hours (per office and department), New files, Participation rates, Referral sources, Areas of law, Cohorts assisted, Significant results. Surveying: Firm wide, Lawyers in relation to individual pro bono services (e.g. clinics).
	Review spread of participation across the firm, magnitude of support and make up of the various community partners.
	Through presentations to the partnership.
	Regular reviews of pro bono work and clinics. Quarterly reviews of all work and fee relief. Annual reporting and strategy review.
	Informal regular review of total hours, nature of work performed, legal staff participating and referral organisations (mostly through reviewing data and seeking feedback orally).
	By calculating the hours spent on pro bono work.

	Pro bono committee meets to evaluate performance and applications for assistance. Review of hours for purposes of reporting to Australian Pro Bono Centre and Law Right annually.
	Summary dashboards provided to partners overseeing programme, review by Central team in London.
	Annual report and Responsible Business Committee.

61. Please tick the three most significant factors on which you based that evaluation.

- Social impact – Total: 15 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Client feedback – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Feedback from third parties (for example, pro bono referral schemes or organisations) – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Number of pro bono hours provided – Total: 16 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
- Participating lawyer satisfaction – Total: 13 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Whether the program has assisted the firm in meeting its commercial goals – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Other please specify – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms. Please see below:

GROUP A	Participation and spread of legal work throughout teams and offices.
GROUP B	Participation rates.
GROUP C	None.

62. Did you find this evaluation (or evaluations) useful? In what way?

GROUP A	We find that evaluating our pro bono practice is a useful way to ensure that we are continually reviewing and seeking to improve our services to clients. It also enables us to identify any internal or external trends in the pro bono landscape.
	Yes, it is always important to ensure that we are contributing to the most appropriate causes in an effective manner.
	Yes. It keeps the pro bono practice focused and in line with our objectives.
GROUP B	Yes, especially when we compare data from year to year.
	Of course, it is part and parcel of any law practice.
	The evaluation is useful, but we are looking at ways to make it more meaningful and measurable.
	Yes.
	Yes. It told us how our lawyers felt.
	Always good to review and set strategies going forward.
	Yes, assisted in shaping the practice and developing new projects.
GROUP C	It is generally useful to assess the satisfaction with the pro bono program, the results we are getting and the spread of pro bono opportunities.
	Yes, useful to compare against previous years and overall targets.
	Yes.
	Yes, because it helps to reconfirm our commitment to pro-bono and its central importance to the culture of our firm.
	Yes.
	Yes, the review assists in identifying how participation can be increased.
	Yes, we use this decide which projects to continue with and guide decisions on new projects.

Section 11 – International law firms and law firm mergers

63. Do your Australian offices provide more or less pro bono legal services per lawyer (on average) than your firm’s overseas offices?

If your firm does not have an overseas office, please skip this question.

- More – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Less – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- About the same – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Don’t know – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

64. Is your firm an “international law firm”?

For the purposes of this Survey, “international law firm” refers to a firm with more lawyers overseas than in Australia.

- Yes – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- No – Total: 23 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 12 firms.

Section 12 – Corporate and government clients

65. Has your firm worked with the in-house counsel of a corporate or government client on a pro bono matter or project in the 2018 FY?

- Yes – Total: 9 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- No – Total: 23 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 14 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

66. What was the nature of these pro bono matter/s or project/s?

GROUP A	TalkLaw project (legal education in schools) National Children’s & Youth Law Centre - Cyberlaw project.
	Partnering on legal clinics and law reform projects.
	NFP client clinic.
GROUP B	Working on asylum matters - provided training and work with them on matters.
GROUP C	Delivery of legal information sessions; Drafting Legal Guides and Research Papers.

67. Has your firm attempted to ‘clear’ positional/commercial conflicts for potential pro bono matters with your government or corporate clients in the 2018 FY?

- No – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Yes – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 0 firms.

If so, has this been successful?

- No – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Yes – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 0 firms.

Section 13 – Government tender arrangements for legal services

68. Is your firm on the Commonwealth Government's Legal Services Multi-Use List, the Victorian Government Legal Services Panel, and/or the NSW Government Legal Panel?

GROUP A		
Commonwealth Government's Legal Services Multi-Use List	9 firms	
NSW Government Legal Panel	9 firms	
SA Government Legal Panel	1 firm	
Victorian Government Legal Services Panel	8 firms	
None of the above	0 firms	
GROUP B		
Commonwealth Government's Legal Services Multi-Use List	8 firms	
NSW Government Legal Panel	7 firms	
SA Government Legal Panel	0 firms	
Victorian Government Legal Services Panel	5 firms	
None of the above	1 firm	
GROUP C		
Commonwealth Government's Legal Services Multi-Use List	11 firms	
NSW Government Legal Panel	6 firms	
SA Government Legal Panel	0 firms	
Victorian Government Legal Services Panel	5 firms	
None of the above	2 firms	

Do you have any comments on the form and operation of the Commonwealth, NSW, SA and/or Victorian government tendering processes, in relation to the requirement to report on pro bono legal work?

69. Commonwealth comments

GROUP A	It would be helpful if a uniform system could be established and put into operation so that firms do not have to report the same information on multiple occasions and to multiple state and federal bodies.
	We would prefer all systems to be consistent nationally.
GROUP B	Whether or not pro bono targets are included in the new panel deed will have a significant impact on the amount of pro bono work undertaken by the firm.
	We are concerned that the govt panels are inadvertently resulting in some firms, especially those new to pro bono, taking on pro bono work to just meet targets for panels rather than developing an effective pro bono practice.
	Don't mind aspirational target as goal but would like to see more structured assessment of reporting and a person like in Vic that is able to assist with conflict management.
GROUP C	The tender process for the Commonwealth government requires member firms to be a signatory to the National Pro Bono Target.
	Very helpful to get buy-in for the pro bono programme. New guidelines should be made clearer.

70. NSW comments

GROUP A	It would be helpful if a uniform system could be established and put into operation so that firms do not have to report the same information on multiple occasions and to multiple state and federal bodies.
---------	--

	We would prefer all systems to be consistent nationally.
	This feels like an unknown quantity at the moment. What happens with the data provided? What role does it play?
GROUP B	Has improved.
	We are concerned that the govt panels are inadvertently resulting in some firms, especially those new to pro bono, taking on pro bono work to just meet targets for panels rather than developing an effective pro bono practice.
	Would be good if it was more like Vic system.
GROUP C	Guidance for reporting should be clearer.

71. SA comments

GROUP A	It would be helpful if a uniform system could be established and put into operation so that firms do not have to report the same information on multiple occasions and to multiple state and federal bodies.
	We would prefer all systems to be consistent nationally.

72. Victoria comments

GROUP A	It would be helpful if a uniform system could be established and put into operation so that firms do not have to report the same information on multiple occasions and to multiple state and federal bodies.
	We would prefer all systems to be consistent nationally.
	This is the most time-consuming response process, but the contractual obligation means it is the process most closely watched by the commercial partners in firm.
	Difficult and timely to produce required reports due to: - Definition being technical for categorisation, classification and recalculation using their panel agreed rates.
GROUP B	Would be good to make consistent with Commonwealth requirements.
	We are concerned that the govt panels are inadvertently resulting in some firms, especially those new to pro bono, taking on pro bono work to just meet targets for panels rather than developing an effective pro bono practice.
	Think this works well although onerous.

Section 14 –The National Pro Bono Target

73. Are you aware of the National Pro Bono Target of at least 35 pro bono hours per lawyer per year?

This figure is arrived at by taking the number of hours of pro bono legal work undertaken by your firm’s lawyers and dividing it by the total number of full time equivalent (FTE) lawyers working at your firm. For example, if your firm had undertaken 1,000 hours of pro bono legal work and employed 100 FTE lawyers it would have achieved 10 pro bono hours per lawyer per year.

- Yes – Total: 34 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 15 firms.
- No – Total: 1 firm – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

74. Is your firm a signatory to the National Pro Bono Target?

- Yes – Total: 30 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 12 firms.
- No – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms.

75. Why are you not a signatory to the National Pro Bono Target?

GROUP A	None.
GROUP B	None.

GROUP C	Don't think we have ever been asked.
	We have internal targets we are working to.

76. Do you wish to report on your performance on the National Pro Bono Target in the 2018 FY in conjunction with this survey?

PLEASE NOTE – reporting on the Target in conjunction with this survey will mean identifying your firm to the Centre and forgoing the anonymity of your survey responses. However, any identifiable information will be kept confidential by the Centre. For the purposes of publication, all responses will be de-identified.

IF YOU DO NOT WISH TO REPORT ON THE TARGET IN CONJUNCTION WITH THIS SURVEY, YOU WILL STILL NEED TO REPORT SEPARATELY.

- Yes – Total: 20 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- No – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 7 firms.

77. Did your firm meet the Target in the 2018 FY?

- Yes – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- No – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 6 firms.

Note: Only 22 firms answered this question, please refer to Q.25 above for the hours of pro bono legal work per lawyer provided by all 37 respondents.

78. What effect (if any) has being a signatory to the Target had on the pro bono legal work undertaken by your firm?

Please tick all that apply.

- The Target led to an increase in the pro bono legal work done by the firm – Total: 15 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- The Target increased the firm's focus on the legal needs of disadvantaged people and the organisations that assist those people – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- The Target had no effect – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- The Target decreased the amount of pro bono legal work done by the firm – Total: 0 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 0 firms.
- Other (please specify) – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms. Please see below:

GROUP A	The Target continues to provide a reference point for minimum pro bono contribution.
GROUP B	None.
GROUP C	We signed the target many years ago. Difficult to assess impact.
	The Target has led to better reporting in relation to the pro bono work we perform.

79. (Optional) Total paralegal hours (performed by paralegals on pro bono work of a legal nature):

GROUP A	1,720.6
	532.2
GROUP B	111.4
	156.4
	40
	232
	50
GROUP C	485.7

	520
	300 (approximately)
	140
	55.09

80. (Optional) The number of full-time equivalent paralegals that undertook the paralegal hours reported in the previous question.

GROUP A	Unknown.
	Unknown.
GROUP B	5.29
	2
	5
	26.6
	6
GROUP C	19
	32
	6
	3
	5.2

81. Do you anticipate that your firm will reach an annual average of at least 35 pro bono hours per lawyer per year during the 2019 FY?

This figure is arrived at by taking the number of hours of pro bono legal work undertaken by your firm’s lawyers and dividing it by the total number of full time equivalent (FTE) lawyers working at your firm. For example, if your firm had undertaken 1,000 hours of pro bono legal work and employed 100 FTE lawyers it would have achieved 10 pro bono hours per lawyer per year.

- Yes – Total: 19 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- No – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 9 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 0 firms.

Section 15 – What else can you tell us?

82. What is the single most crucial factor in the success of your firm’s pro bono program?

GROUP A	Leadership support.
	Leadership from the top of the Firm to build support and engagement.
	The quality of lawyers with specialist pro bono expertise who work in the firm’s pro bono & citizenship team. They are highly skilled and dedicated pro bono practice professionals and as such are able to guide, oversee and implement the firm’s pro bono practice successfully and with impact.
	Selecting appropriate causes to focus on.
	Pro Bono performance is a KPI for all of our lawyers.
	Ongoing and committed high level management support.
	A dedicated pro bono partner and senior pro bono team.
	Maintaining a broad number of opportunities to engage all staff.
	Introduction of a diverse pro bono program which makes a significant impact on the broader community and success of our people.

GROUP B	I would say leadership by the Board, Management and Partners to implement at office level and our Strategic Plan because these impact on all other factors.
	Prioritising client need, being proactive about forming and maintaining client relationships and dedicated pro bono roles which incorporate case work.
	Strong support and commitment from senior management. Full support from top management.
	The connection between the pro bono program and the firm's values.
	Strong support and encouragement from management.
	Building strong relationships with pro bono clients.
	Broad range of client groups, legal issues and matter types.
	Partner support.
	Appropriate pro bono referrals and internal capacity to do the work.
	Ensuring an active interest and participation of lawyers in the firm and a willingness to participate.
	Whole of firm support.
GROUP C	Culture.
	Providing engaging pro bono opportunities to lawyers as there is broad support for our pro bono program.
	Communication.
	Partner involvement and encouragement.
	We focus on social justice and the most significant areas of legal need.
	Management support and leadership.
	Management support.
	Encouraging solicitor participation.
	Support at senior level.
	Identifying pro bono programs in which our lawyers can participate.
	The (few) committed people driving it.
	Continued Partner and Senior Management support.

83. What are the top three challenges for your firm's pro bono program?

- Lack of information about pro bono opportunities – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- Lack of management or partner support within the firm – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Concern about conflict of interest with fee paying clients – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Pro bono hours do not count as billable hours or for financial targets – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Firm capacity – Total: 26 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- External economic climate – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Insufficient expertise in relevant areas of the law – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Ability to fund external disbursements – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Significant structural changes within the firm – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Already doing enough pro bono – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms.
- Too much work to build the pro bono program – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 0 firms.

- Other, please specify – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm. Please see below:

GROUP A	Finding the right pro bono work for some practice groups.
	Identifying sufficient appropriate pro bono opportunities.
GROUP B	Changes in level of management / partner support when staff changes. Resourcing.
	Need more dedicated people on the pro bono team.
GROUP C	Staff changes.

84. Is your firm delivering pro bono legal assistance in any new or innovative ways since the last Survey, in July 2016, which you wish to share?

GROUP A	We are now building an evaluation framework.
	We have increased our focus on the program significantly in the last 12 months.
	We have been focussing on the use of technology to assist disadvantaged and vulnerable clients (e.g., tax app with Justice Connect and sponsoring the Technology & Human Rights conference with the Australian Human Rights Commission).
	Creation of a law reform project that allows us to build upon the work done with organisations and community for many years.
GROUP B	Working with a CLC to resource a new clinic.
	We have a motor vehicle clinic with Marrickville Legal Centre. It is innovative in that we are providing advice within our area of expertise therefore not requiring supervision from MLC and therefore not imposing on their resources.
	More research-based projects to get systemic change, more projects looking an interactive online training, CLE'S and website-based service provision and information.
GROUP C	We are participating in a joint project between Victoria Legal Aid and 2 other law firms. We are training lawyers via online training modules, so that they are able to prepare merits advice for potential judicial review of IAA refugee decisions. Matters are referred from Victoria Legal Aid, and their lawyers supervise our lawyers in preparing and settling the merits advice and deciding on whether the matter should be the subject of an application for judicial review.
	The firm appointed a dedicated pro bono coordinator.

85. Is there anything else that would be useful for us to know about your firm's pro bono program?

GROUP A	We are sharpening our objective and focus
	We are at the early stages of our relaunch of the program, but we are excited out the program's future.
GROUP B	Despite the limitations to what we can do, we nonetheless are able to make significant contribution to the community.
GROUP C	<i>Answer omitted to maintain confidentiality.</i>

86. The abbreviated version of *The Australian Pro Bono Best Practice Guide* lists ten key elements of a best practice bono program. Please tick up to three areas in which you think your firm could most improve:

- A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- A dedicated pro bono leader – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training – Total: 13 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- A pro bono policy and strategic plan – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 3 firms.

- Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm – Total: 12 firms– Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Setting a firm-wide pro bono target and budget – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Strong and deep relationships with community partners – Total: 9 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- A strategic risk management plan including accurate record keeping and a regular evaluation process – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 0 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Not applicable, or do not wish to answer – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

87. Is there anything that the Australian Pro Bono Centre can do to help your firm with its pro bono legal work, or to assist the pro bono sector in general?

GROUP A	The sector benefits greatly from the Australian Pro Bono Centre's ability to provide a swift and coherent response to sector wide issues, for example, CLC funding, pro bono best practise. This assists both our firm and the pro bono sector in general.
	There is a growing need for support of asylum seekers, but interpretation costs limit the amount of work we can undertake. A fee reduced or paid interpretation program would hugely benefit NFPs working in this space nationally as more law firms and in-house counsel would be able to provide assistance.
GROUP B	Resources on where to go or who to approach for available pro bono opportunities that the firm could be involved in across the country.
	Keep doing the great job you do supporting the firms' programs.
GROUP C	The APBC website is a fantastic resource that I often utilise in my work and I commend APBC for maintaining it in such a user friendly and up to date way.
	Emphasise the importance of budget relief to management.
	The resources provided by the centre are very helpful.