

## Appendix 1: Survey Questions & Answers

Appendix 1 contains the questionnaire for the 2020 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. Typographical and other errors in the responses have also been corrected, where identified.

Where total responses for any question are fewer than 38 (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. 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 2019/2020 financial year (2020 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 2020 FY, i.e.:*

$$(FTE\ lawyers\ at\ 1\ July\ 2019 + FTE\ lawyers\ at\ 30\ June\ 2020) \div 2 = \boxed{\phantom{000}}$$

Individual answers removed to protect respondent anonymity. There are:

- **Group A:** (firms with 450 or more FTE lawyers) – 9 firms with 7,111.4 FTE lawyers in total.
- **Group B:** (firms with 201 – 449 FTE lawyers) – 15 firms with 4,242.66 FTE lawyers in total.
- **Group C:** (firms with 50 – 200 FTE lawyers) – 14 firms with 1,518.37 FTE lawyers in total.

### Section 2 – About your firm's pro bono program

3. Does your firm have at least one dedicated pro bono coordinator or manager (i.e. someone whose primary responsibility is to coordinate the firm's pro bono legal work)?
  - **Yes** – Total: 29 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
  - **No** – Total: 9 firms – Group B: 4 firm, Group C: 5 firms.
4. Is the most senior dedicated coordinator/manager:
  - **A Partner?** – Total: 18 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
  - **A Special Counsel?** – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
  - **A Senior Associate?** – Total: 2 firms - Group C: 2 firms.
  - **An Associate/Lawyer?** – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
  - **A non-legal staff member?** – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
  - **Other? (please specify)** – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 1 firm.

For completeness, we have listed the roles nominated in the “Other” section below:

<b>Group A</b>	Director
	Head of Pro Bono
<b>Group B</b>	National Pro Bono Manager (legal staff)
	Head of Pro Bono (also a senior lawyer but not classified as such)
<b>Group C</b>	Chief Operating Officer

**5. Do they:**

- Perform the role **full time**? Total: 14 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Perform the role **part time**? Total: 12 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.

If so, what is their FTE? (e.g. a person working 4 days per week would be classed as 0.8 full time equivalent).

<b>Group A</b>	0.4
<b>Group B</b>	0.6
	0.5-0.6
	0.6
	0.2
	0.3
<b>Group C</b>	0.7
	0.6
	0.1
	0.1
	0.4
	0.2

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

- Yes – Total: 21 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- No – Total: 7 firms – Group B: 2, Group C: 5 firms.

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

- Yes – Total: 25 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- No – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firms.

**8. What percentage of the time that this person spends in this role was spent undertaking pro bono legal work in the 2020 FY? Provide an estimate if you do not have an exact figure. Please enter “N/A” if appropriate.**

<b>Group A</b>	100%
	10%
	10%
	10%
	N/A

	5%
	30%
	20%
	2%
<b>Group B</b>	4%
	25%
	35%
	10%
	100%
	30%
	15%
	15%
	30%
	40%
<b>Group C</b>	30%
	70%
	5%
	20-30%
	70%

**9. Does your firm have pro bono coordinators in its other offices in Australia?**

- Yes, all – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Yes, most – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Yes, some – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 2 firms.
- No – Total: 11 firms – Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Not applicable – Total: 10 firms – Group B: 4, Group C: 6 firms.

**10. As at 30 June 2020, did your firm have any “dedicated pro bono staff” (i.e. staff whose key responsibility is to undertake and/or manage pro bono legal work for the firm)?**

*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.*

- Yes – Total: 18 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- No – Total: 20 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 9 firms.

**11. How many staff in your pro bono practice are:**

- Partners (FTE) – Total: 10.4 – Group A: 4.3, Group B: 4.4, Group C: 1.7.
- Special Counsel (FTE) – Total: 3.6 – Group A: 1.8, Group B: 1, Group C: 0.8.
- Senior Associates (FTE) – Total: 12.5 – Group A: 8, Group B: 2.1, Group C: 2.4.
- Associates/ Lawyers (FTE) – Total: 17.2 – Group A: 6.53, Group B: 8.5, Group C: 2.2.
- Graduates (FTE) – Total: 5 – Group A: 5.
- Paralegals/ Administrative staff (FTE) – Total: 14.99 – Group A: 4.69, Group B: 9.1, Group C: 1.2.
- Other (please specify below) (FTE) – Total: 2.9 – Group A: 1.7, Group B: 1.2.

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

<b>Group A</b>	Operations
	Head of Pro Bono (equivalent to Partner role)
	Director, Organisational Development
<b>Group B</b>	2 x 0.4 FTEs on secondment to the pro bono team for 6 months.
	These other two staff work on our [omitted to preserve anonymity] Business Response and social mobility, work experience and community engagement programs

13. Does your firm have a Pro Bono Committee?

- Yes – Total: 22 – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- No – Total: 16 – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 7 firms.

14. How many people are on the Pro Bono Committee?

<b>Group A</b>	10
	4
	11
	10
	11
<b>Group B</b>	12
	9
	4
	7
	16
	5
	4
	4
	5
	9
<b>Group C</b>	5
	6
	2
	5
	6
	7

15. Who is on the Pro Bono Committee? Please tick all that apply.

- Partner(s) – Total: 21 – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Senior Associate(s) – Total: 9 – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Associate(s)/Lawyer(s) – Total: 10 – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Graduate(s) – Total: 1 – Group C: 1 firm.
- Paralegal(s)/Administrative Staff – Total: 3 – Group B: 3 firms.
- Marketing Staff – Total: 7 – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Human Resources Staff – Total: 3 – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms.
- Other (please specify) – Total: 10 (*see below*)

<b>Group A</b>	Management
	Pro Bono Head (Director)
	Global Head of Citizenship, Chief Legal Operations Officer

	Pro-Bono Coordinator
<b>Group B</b>	Special Counsel
	Finance staff, Diversity & Inclusion staff, Local Pro Bono & Community Partners in each office, IT staff.
	Central/management staff
<b>Group C</b>	Chief Operating Officer
	Special Counsel
	COO, Finance Staff

**16. Does your firm have a corporate social responsibility (CSR), community engagement (CE) or other community program(s)?**

- Yes – Total: 35 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 14 firms, Group C: 12 firms.
- No – Total: 3 firms – Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.

**17. Please describe the relationship between your firm’s pro bono legal program and its community programs (including responsible business or corporate social responsibility programs, philanthropy, or any other type of community services programs). Are they separately managed? Are their objectives aligned (i.e. do they focus on the same social impacts)? Does your pro bono program have its own budget?**

<b>Group A</b>	They are separate programs, separately managed. Both have a focus on access to justice and responding to disadvantage.
	Our pro bono practice is part of and run out of the CSR program. As such CSR and pro bono objectives are aligned, as is the pro bono and CSR budgets
	The Community Investment program includes the pro bono program and charitable donations, gift matching, professional volunteering and mentoring. All Community Investment and pro bono activities are mainly managed and administered by the same people and have aligned objectives. There is a separate pro bono budget that forms part of the overall Community Investment budget.
	Complete alignment. Now managed under one umbrella.
	Separately managed
	Jointly managed programs, objectives loosely aligned, each element of the program has its own budget (RAP, sustainability, philanthropy, pro bono)
	Pro bono and community engagement are operationally distinct but thematically aligned along the focus areas in Australia: Reconciliation, Disability & Health, Homelessness and Building the Rule of Law to maximise impact.
	The Corporate Responsibility program ('Social Impact') is closely linked but run separately to the pro bono legal practice. <i>[The firm's pro bono partner]</i> manages both and some goals align. The Pro Bono program and Social Impact Program have separate budgets.
	Managed together, there are synergies between the community projects and support we provide and the organisations we support with legal advice
<b>Group B</b>	They are managed together with goal of them being aligned but there is flexibility as CSR is approached from a local office level.
	They are distinct areas although aligned in their aims. The same partner manages them. They are open to all staff.
	Provision of pro bono services to Indigenous organisations is one of our RAP initiatives
	Separately managed, though with some participation overlap. Broadly aligned objectives - for example we have a strong diversity program with strong focus on LGBTI visibility. This group initiated and provides rostered solicitors for the first and only <i>[omitted to preserve anonymity]</i> Legal Advice clinic in Australia, with the <i>[omitted to preserve anonymity]</i> in Sydney. Another example is coordination between our Reconciliation Action Plan and Pro bono work.

	CSR and the pro bono program are separately managed. The pro bono program is run through a dedicated pro bono legal practice. The pro bono program has its own budget. Both programs have objectives aligned to the firm's social justice objectives.
	Both managed by myself as Head of Pro Bono & Responsible Business and under the umbrella of <i>[the firm's]</i> Foundation which includes our Volunteering and Fundraising initiatives and our pro bono work
	The pro bono operates separately to other community programs. There most overlap between the RAP, workplace giving program and pro bono program. The pro bono program has its own budget.
	The firm's Community Program is separately managed, however its objectives are similar - impact on the local communities in which we operate. The Pro Bono Program has its own budget.
	Separately managed, but with aligned goals and values. Pro bono work is budgeted separately from philanthropic/community activity, however in some cases disbursement funding has been sought from budgets for other programs.
	An initiative our firm is committed to is the provision of pro bono legal advice to marginalised and disadvantaged groups across the States in which we operate. <i>[The firm]</i> is a signatory to the Australian Pro Bono Centre's aspirational target of 35 hours of pro bono legal work per practitioner per year (in fact, our lawyers can spend up to 50 hours per year on approved pro bono matters and receive financial credit for this time). We have partnered with Justice Connect to close the justice gap by connecting people and community groups with legal assistance. Other pro bono clients include Homeless Person's Legal Services, Choice Passion Life, Gayaa Dhuri (Proud Spirit) Australia, Together for Humanity Foundation, Sydney Institute of Marine Science, Get Real Conscious Impact, Diabetes NSW + ACT, HIV/AIDS Legal Centre, Arthritis Australia, St Vincent's Hospital.
	They are separately managed.
	The Pro Bono partner oversees the community service programs with assistance from a Community Service Lead (2 days per week).
	Our pro bono legal program and our corporate social responsibility program are separately managed and their objectives are not purposely aligned. They are treated as two separate priorities.
<b>Group C</b>	Our pro bono and responsible business programs are closely aligned, managed by the same team. The programs support each other and focus on some SDG's. The Pro Bono program has its own budgets.
	Separately managed and not linked
	The CSR and Pro Bono programs are managed by the same committee, however they are budgeted for separately and their objectives are independent.
	Objectives are aligned but specific partnerships and strategies differ.
	Our newly established corporate social responsibility program is also managed by our pro bono manager and pro bono coordinator. We try to align the objectives of our pro bono and CSR programs. The two programs are contained within the same budget.
	Our programs are somewhat aligned and they are ultimately managed by the same two lead people. Our Pro Bono program however is developing at the moment and these programs will become more aligned in time. Our philanthropic program has a much narrower focus (but is still significant in terms of the value of our donations which is a very conscious decision by the Partnership).
	They are separately managed but they also work together including referring work.
	They are separately managed but aligned by the firm's vision and values.

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

- Yes – Total: 22 firms, Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- No – Total: 16 firms: Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 8 firms.

If so, what year was the RAP first introduced?

<b>Group A</b>	2010
	2014
	2018
	2016
	2011
	2011
	2014
	2008
<b>Group B</b>	2020
	2012
	2013
	2013
	2019
	2018
	2019
	2019
<b>Group C<sup>91</sup></b>	2018
	2020
	2019
	2019
	2007

### Section 3 – Sources of pro bono legal work

19. 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 2020 FY originated from the following:

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

<b>Group A</b>				
a) <b>Pro bono referral schemes, professional organisations and community legal centres</b> (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	b) <b>Legal Aid</b> (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	c) <b>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services</b> (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	d) <b>Direct requests</b> for assistance (from individuals and / or not-for-profit organisations, charities or social enterprises)	e) <b>Other sources</b> (this could include internal projects)
44	7	0	43	6
22	62	0	68	10
70	0	2	28	0
10	0	23	59	8
30	5	5	60	0
46	1	11	37	5
63	1	1	35	0

<sup>91</sup> One firm answered yes, but did not specify when they introduced their RAP.

25	10	25	15	25
35	0	7	59	0

<b>Group B</b>				
a) <b>Pro bono referral schemes, professional organisations and community legal centres</b> (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	b) <b>Legal Aid</b> (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	c) <b>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services</b> (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	d) <b>Direct requests</b> for assistance (from individuals and / or not-for-profit organisations, charities or social enterprises)	e) <b>Other sources</b> (this could include internal projects)
66	1	1	32	0
42	1	7	44	6
70	0	0	25	5
50	20	5	20	5
30	0	0	40	30
60	10	10	0	20
40	5	5	50	0
75	0	0	23	2
64	1	3	2	30
65	2	7	25	1
20	0	0	40	40
16	0	2	51	31
80	0	0	12	8
43	0	1	50	6
1.8	91.3	0	2	4.9

<b>Group C</b>				
a) <b>Pro bono referral schemes, professional organisations and community legal centres</b> (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	b) <b>Legal Aid</b> (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	c) <b>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services</b> (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	d) <b>Direct requests</b> for assistance (from individuals and / or not-for-profit organisations, charities or social enterprises)	e) <b>Other sources</b> (this could include internal projects)
70	0	0	10	20
46	0	0	54	0
47	5	0	48	0
30	0	0	50	20
90	0	0	10	0
0	0	75	20	5
30	0	0	50	20
66	0	0	7	27
44	0	0	54	2
70	5	0	15	10
34	0	3	63	0



0	0	0	20	80
10	0	0	90	0
10	0	20	20	50

20. If your firm undertook pro bono legal work originating from at least one pro bono referral scheme, professional organisation or community legal centre (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics) in the 2020 FY, please indicate all schemes/organisations/centres from which you received this work:

- ACT Pro Bono Clearing House – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 1 firm.
- Cancer Council – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Justice Connect (including Law Institute of Victoria) – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 13 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- JusticeNet SA – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms.
- Law Access (Western Australia) – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Law Society ACT – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms.
- Law Society NT Pro Bono Clearing House – Group A: 1 firm.
- Law Society of NSW Pro Bono Scheme – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 1 firm.
- Law Society of Tasmania Pro Bono Clearing House – Group B: 1 firm.
- Public Interest Advocacy Centre (incl Homeless Persons’ Legal Service NSW) – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 9 firms.
- Queensland Public Interest Law Clearing House (incl Homeless Persons’ Legal Clinic) – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- TrustLaw - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Other (please specify) – *Please see below for the nominated “other” responses.*

<b>Group A</b>	RACS, RAILS, CASE, HRLC, Employment Law Centre WA, Anti-slavery Australia, Consumer Action Law Centre, Federation of Community Legal Centres (Victoria), Cairns Community Legal Centre
	Many Rivers, Global Sisters, Caxton Legal Centre, Refugee & Immigration Legal Service, Women's Legal Service Queensland
	LawHelp, PILnet
	LawHelp (ORIC), Supply Nation
	Employment Law Centre; Northern Community Legal Centre
<b>Group B</b>	Various charities such as UN Women; Fred Hollows Foundation as well as from LawHelp Scheme (ORIC)
	Fitzroy Legal Service, StreetLaw WA, Inner City Legal Centre Sydney, Seniors Rights Service, Arts Law Centre for Australia
	Many different CLCs in each state
	Refugee Legal, Reconciliation NSW, Women's Legal Service Victoria, EDO NSW, Community Legal Centres Queensland, Arts Law Centre of Australia, Youthlaw
	Arts Law, Mental Health Legal Centre, Vic, Mental Health Law Centre WA, Australian Centre for Disability Law, Elizabeth Evatt Community Legal Centre, Marrickville Legal Centre, University of Newcastle Legal Centre, Darwin Community Legal Service, Top End Women's Legal Centre, St Kilda Legal Service, Western Sydney Community Legal Centre, Hunter Community Legal Centre, Central Coast Community Legal Centre, Wheatbelt Community Legal Centre, Womens Legal Centre - ACT & Region, Inner City Legal Centre, Redfern Legal Centre, PIAC, Employment Law Centre of WA,
	St Kilda Legal Services
	Consumer Action Law Centre
	ACT Law Society Legal Advice Bureau, Australian Orthotic Prosthetic Association Ethics Committee, Australian Science Teachers Association (ASTA), Inner Melbourne Community Legal, Mental Health Legal Centre Inc, MusicACT Incorporated, Salvos Legal

	Brisbane, University of Newcastle, WISH Legal Centre Sydney, Young Endeavour Youth Scheme
<b>Group C</b>	RACS, Refugee Legal, HRLC, AHRC, FWC Workplace Advice Service, Seniors Rights Service, NSSRN
	Redfern Legal Centre, Marrickville Legal Centre, Intellectual Disability Rights Service, Australian Centre for Disability Law, Seniors Rights Service, Salvos Legal Humanitarian
	EDO
	Women's Legal Service of Victoria, Moonee Valley Legal Service, Fitzroy Legal Centre, Peninsula Community and Legal Centre, Mental Health Legal Centre, Asylum Seeker Resource Centre
	RACS

#### Section 4 – Recording pro bono legal work

21. What percentage of your firm's lawyers, including partners, participated in (i.e. did at least one hour of) pro bono legal work in the 2020 FY?

*NB: "firm's lawyers" includes law graduates not yet admitted to legal practice, but does not include paralegals or law clerks.*

<b>Group A</b>	88
	56
	71
	90
	70.65
	57
	69
	69
<b>Group B</b>	79
	71
	25
	26
	52
	69
	30
	68
	65
	53.9
	9.2
	95
	58
	68
27	
<b>Group C</b>	39
	55
	91
	80
	40
	43
	55.21
	35.03
	61
	75
	63.8

	51
	30
	90

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 2020 FY?

<b>Group A</b>	85
	46
	45
	12
	56
	34
	57
	56
<b>Group B</b>	65
	54
	20
	26
	41
	65.7
	59
	53.4
	53
	47
	17.89
<b>Group C</b>	12
	77
	70
	30
	44
	34
	55
	57.5
	48.7
	60
	35
	95

23. How many hours of pro bono legal work did lawyers in your firm in Australia carry out in the 2020 FY?

*NB: "lawyers" includes law graduates not yet admitted to legal practice, but does not include paralegals or law clerks. Please refer to the definition of "pro bono legal work", including our Guidance Notes, when calculating this figure.*

<b>Group A</b>	47071
	23422.7
	51600
	51292
	16034
	26930
	40054
	29966

	17426
<b>Group B</b>	11699
	9550.5
	9452
	4305.68
	2686.5
	6490
	11617.6
	8733
	7544
	15046
	1012
	4114
	10776.6
	13115.6
	3639.7
<b>Group C</b>	1148.93
	1800
	2795.5
	2277
	1328.72
	1361.5
	2729
	1126.3
	603.4
	4100.87
	2311.5
	1044.9
	1210.9
	9800

**24. How many hours of pro bono legal work per lawyer did your firm carry out in the 2020 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.*

*The responses to this question are displayed here rounded to two decimal places, with any rounding errors in the original responses corrected.*

<b>Group A</b>	55.08
	45.1
	42.4
	62.7
	18.02
	37.45
	48.22
	42.77
	31
<b>Group B</b>	31.94
	37.02
	26.22
	21.21

	11.76
	26.12
	39.02
	40.06
	32.61
	37.37
	4.42
	12.56
	33.15
	50.55
	12.68
<b>Group C</b>	10.9
	14.06
	42.45
	30.77
	11.55
	16.02
	15.07
	9.39
	8.63
	26.79
	16.39
	13.4
	16.94
	75.04

25. What percentage of lawyers in your firm in Australia undertook 35 hours or more of pro bono legal work in the 2020 FY?

<b>Group A</b>	41
	19
	25
	32
	10
	29
	21
	34
	23
<b>Group B</b>	21
	28
	36
	5
	12
	19
	20.9
	3.9
	0
	28
	31
	1.7
	19
<b>Group C</b>	12
	10
	22

	0
	8
	12
	17.43
	9.17
	4
	18.9
	10.6
	20
	7
	70

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

<b>Group A</b>	3.7
	3.07
	3.1
	4
	2.4
<b>Group B</b>	2.4
	2.5
	1
	1.78
	0.9
	2.51
	2.7
	0.4
	2.7
	0.82
<b>Group C</b>	2.68
	2
	1.32
	0.81
	0.7
	1.3
	1
	1.3
	6.5

27. Did you include any pro bono legal services undertaken for a substantially reduced fee in your total reported hours of pro bono legal work in your response to Q23 above? Please refer to section 11 of the Guidance Notes when answering this and the following question.

- No – Total: 29 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- Yes – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

If yes, please specify how many hours in the 2020 FY:

<b>Group A</b>	20
	451
<b>Group B</b>	12.9
	1487.8
	2876

<b>Group C</b>	581
	1254.4

28. Please provide details of the substantially reduced fee pro bono work your firm undertook in the 2020 FY. For example, was the work for individuals or organisations? What was the degree of fee reduction?

<b>Group A</b>	50% fee reduction for organisation
	Only for some organisations. Discount of between 20 and 30%. Very small amount of work in this category.
	Individuals and organisations. Discount was at least 50%
	We give 50% fee reductions for an occasional matter for an NGO
	Organisational restructure - 40% pro bono reduction
<b>Group B</b>	One matter. Fee reduction 50%
	25%
	Work for a charity. Reduction of greater than 50%.
	We only carried out work at a substantially reduced fee for larger charities. 15% of this was for 50% reduced fee work and 1% was for 75% reduced fee work.
	Substantially reduced fee work was undertaken for charitable organisations and individuals. Average fee reduction was 14%.
<b>Group C</b>	This was substantially work for organisations who approached us directly to work with them. The fees ultimately charged for our work for these clients represented 10 - 20% of the value of time recorded on matters.
	50% reduction for organisations
	Organisations

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

29. What percentage of your firm’s pro bono legal work (by number of new files opened) in the 2020 FY was devoted to work for individuals, and what percentage was devoted to work for organisations? Please ensure your answer adds up to 100%.

<b>Group A</b>	
<i>Individuals:</i>	<i>Organisations:</i>
52	48
18	82
40	60
35	65
60	40
50	50
64	36
54	48
37	63
<b>Group B</b>	
<i>Individuals:</i>	<i>Organisations:</i>
49	51
57	43
70	30
50	50
50	50
50	50
90	10
18	82
70	30

65	35
72	28
4	96
58	42
30	70
95	5
<b>Group C</b>	
<i>Individuals:</i>	<i>Organisations:</i>
35	65
31	69
70	30
50	50
5	95
80	20
1	99
44	56
45	55
70	30
40	60
20	80
10	90
30	70

**30.** 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 2020 FY for **individuals**?

*For the purposes of this longitudinal study, this should not include work undertaken by lawyers seconded to other organisations.*

*Please tick up to **five areas**.*

- Administrative / Constitutional – Total: 6 firms - Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Agreements with / Tenders to Government for pro bono clients – Total 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Animal Law – Total: 0 firms.
- Banking / Finance – Total: 0 firms.
- Bankruptcy – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Commercial Agreements (e.g. leases) – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Construction Law – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Charity and Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) Status Applications – Total: 5 firms - Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Debt – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Discrimination – Total: 7 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Employment law – Total: 26 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Environment – Total: 0 firms.
- Family Law (not including Family Violence) – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Family Violence/Domestic Violence – Total: 6 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Fines – Total: 3 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm.
- Governance – Total: 4 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Housing / Tenancy – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Human Rights – Total: 11 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Immigration – Total: 14 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 4 firms.



- Insurance – Total: 4 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Intellectual Property – Total: 7 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Personal Injury – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Privacy / Freedom of Information – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Powers of Attorney / Guardianship – Total: 4 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Professional Negligence – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Royal Commissions – Total: 0 firms.
- Social Security – Total: 2 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm.
- Superannuation – Total: 0 firms.
- Tax (other than DGR) – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Town Planning / Local Government – Total: 0 firms.
- Trusts – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Victims Compensation – Total: 7 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Wills / Probate / Estate – Total: 10 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Other, please specify:

<b>Group A</b>	Disaster response (COVID19 and bushfires), access to justice
	Criminal Law
	Litigation/Disputes
<b>Group B</b>	Land rights
	Criminal Law
	Coronial Inquiries
<b>Group C</b>	Corporate law (including incorporations)
	Self-representation service

**31. Within the five areas of law and practice you have nominated above for individuals, which main client groups has this work been done for (or for the benefit of)?**

*Please tick up to three groups.*

	<b>Client group 1</b>	<b>Client group 2</b>	<b>Client group 3</b>
<b>Group A</b>	People experiencing discrimination	People experiencing homelessness	Victims of crime
	People who are financially vulnerable	Refugees and asylum seekers	Those affected by COVID-19 and/or bushfires
	People experiencing homelessness	People who are financially vulnerable	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	Children and young people	N/A
	People experiencing discrimination	People experiencing homelessness	People who are financially vulnerable
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People experiencing homelessness	Refugees and asylum seekers
	Children and young people	People experiencing homelessness	Refugees and asylum seekers
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People who are financially vulnerable	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People experiencing homelessness	People who are financially vulnerable
<b>Group B</b>	Older people (60 years +)	People experiencing homelessness	Refugees and asylum seekers
	People who are financially vulnerable	Refugees and asylum seekers	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence

	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	Children and young people	People who are financially vulnerable
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People who are financially vulnerable	N/A
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	Older people (60 years +)	People from the LGBTIQ community
	People from the LGBTIQ community	People who are financially vulnerable	Refugees and asylum seekers
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People who are financially vulnerable	Refugees and asylum seekers
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	Children and young people	Victims of crime
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	Children and young people	Refugees and asylum seekers
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People who are financially vulnerable	People affected by cancer
	People who are financially vulnerable	Refugees and asylum seekers	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	People who are financially vulnerable	N/A	N/A
	Older people (60 years +)	Refugees and asylum seekers	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	People experiencing discrimination	Refugees and asylum seekers	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	People from the LGBTIQ community	People with a disability	Refugees and asylum seekers
<b>Group C</b>	Older people (60 years +)	People who are financially vulnerable	Refugees and asylum seekers
	Older people (60 years +)	People experiencing discrimination	People with a disability
	People who are financially vulnerable	N/A	N/A
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	Refugees and asylum seekers	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	N/A	N/A
	Children and young people	N/A	N/A
	People experiencing discrimination	Refugees and asylum seekers	People suffering illness
	People experiencing discrimination	People who are financially vulnerable	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	People experiencing homelessness	Refugees and asylum seekers	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People who are financially vulnerable	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People experiencing discrimination	People with a disability
	People experiencing discrimination	Refugees and asylum seekers	Cancer patients
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People experiencing discrimination	N/A

**32. 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 2020 FY for organisations?**

*For the purposes of this longitudinal study, this should not include work undertaken by lawyers seconded to other organisations.*

*Please tick up to **five areas**.*

- Administrative / Constitutional – Total: 6 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Agreements with / Tenders to Government for pro bono clients – Total: 3 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Animal Law – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Banking / Finance – Total: 0 firms.
- Bankruptcy – Total: 0 firms.
- Commercial Agreements (e.g. leases) – Total: 24 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Construction Law – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Consumer Law – Total: 1 firm – Group B: 1 firm.
- Coronial Inquiries – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Corporate Law (including incorporations) – Total: 19 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Criminal Law – Total: 2 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Charity and Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) Status Applications – Total: 17 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Debt – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Discrimination – Total: 2 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Employment Law – Total: 21 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Family Law (not including Family Violence) – Total: 0 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 B: 1 firm.
- Governance – Total: 16 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Housing / Tenancy – Total: 3 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Human Rights – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Immigration – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Insurance – Total: 3 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Intellectual Property – Total: 15 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Personal Injury – Total: 0 firms.
- Privacy / Freedom of Information – Total: 6 firms - Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Powers of Attorney / Guardianship – Total: 0 firms.
- Professional Negligence – Total: 0 firms.
- Royal Commissions – Total: 0 firms.
- Social Security – Total: 0 firms.
- Superannuation – Total: 0 firms.
- Tax (other than DGR) – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Town Planning / Local Government – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Trusts – Total: 0 firms.
- Victims Compensation – Total: 0 firms.

- Wills / Probate / Estate – Total: 4 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- Other, please specify:

<b>Group B</b>	Tax
<b>Group C</b>	Environment
	Charity fundraising

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

*E.g. charities, not-for-profit organisations, social enterprises, other civil society / community organisations.*

*Please enter "N/A" where appropriate.*

	<b>Client group 1</b>	<b>Client group 2</b>	<b>Client group 3</b>
<b>Group A</b>	Charities	Local Aboriginal Land Councils	Indigenous organisations
	CLCs	NFPs and charities	Social enterprises, including indigenous business
	NFPs	Social enterprises	CLCs
	First Nations organisations	NFPs	CLCs
	Charities	NFPs	Community organisations
	Charities	Aboriginal Corporations	NFPs
	Homeless Persons	Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander peoples	Women & children
	NPFs/charities	CLCs	Social enterprises
	Community organisations	NFPs	Charities
<b>Group B</b>	Charities	NFPs	Social enterprises
	Community organisations including legal centres	NFPs	Aboriginal Land Councils
	Community Legal Centres	Charities/NFPs	N/A
	Charities	CLCs	Social enterprises
	NFPs	Charities	N/A
	Financially vulnerable	LGBTI	Refugees
	Traditional landowners	N/A	N/A
	Charities	NFPs	Community centres
	Charities	NFPs	Community groups
	Charities	NFPs	CLCs
	Refugee/asylum seekers	Financially vulnerable employees	Victims of crime
	NFPs	Community organisations	charities
	NFPs	Charities	Community organisations
	Charities	NFPs	N/A
Charities	NFPs	Community organisations	
<b>Group C</b>	NFPs	Other civil society/community organisations	N/A
	NFPs	Other civil society/community organisations	N/A
	Charities	N/A	N/A
	Charities	NFPs	N/A
	NFPs	N/A	N/A
	Charities	NFPs	N/A
	NFPs	Charities	N/A
	Charities	NFPs	N/A

	NFPs	N/A	N/A
	Charities	NFPs	Indigenous organisations
	NFPs	Community organisations	Charities
	Charities	N/A	N/A
	Charities	NFPs	Other civil organisations

**34. To the best of your knowledge, in which areas of law or practice in the 2020 FY did your firm reject the most requests for assistance for individuals (for reasons other than means or merit)?**

*Please tick up to five areas.*

- Administrative / Constitutional – Total: 2 firms - Group C: 2 firms.
- Agreements with / Tenders to Government for pro bono clients – Total 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Animal Law – Total: 0 firms.
- Banking / Finance – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Bankruptcy – Total: 3 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Commercial Agreements (e.g. leases) – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Construction Law – Total: 0 firms.
- Coronial Inquiries – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Corporate Law (including incorporations) – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Criminal Law – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Charity and Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) Status Applications – Total: 0 firms.
- Debt – Total: 3 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Discrimination – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Employment law – Total: 6 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms.
- Environment – Total: 0 firms.
- Family Law (not including Family Violence) – Total: 12 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Family Violence/Domestic Violence – Total: 3 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Fines – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Governance – Total: 0 firms.
- Housing / Tenancy – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Human Rights – Total: 2 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm.
- Immigration – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 5 firms.
- Insurance – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Intellectual Property – Total: 2 firms - Group C: 2 firms.
- Personal Injury – Total: 6 firms - Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Privacy / Freedom of Information – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Powers of Attorney / Guardianship – Total: 2 firms - Group A: 2 firms.
- Professional Negligence – Total: 3 firms - Group C: 3 firms.
- Royal Commissions – Total: 1 firm- Group B: 1 firm.
- Social Security – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Superannuation – Total: 0 firms.
- Tax (other than DGR) – Total: 3 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Town Planning / Local Government – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Trusts – Total: 0 firms.
- Victims Compensation – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Wills / Probate / Estate – Total: 10 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

- Other, please specify: *Please see below.*

<b>Group A</b>	Too hard to tell
	Native title, defamation
<b>Group B</b>	NDIS
<b>Group C</b>	Property law (disputes involving elder abuse)
	Litigation
	We have not kept records of the work we've not taken on. To the best of our knowledge, if pro bono instructions weren't accepted, it was because of a lack of available resources in the firm at the time, or because the area of law required was not within our expertise.

**35. To the best of your knowledge, in which areas of law or practice in the 2020 FY did your firm reject the most requests for assistance for organisations (for reasons other than means or merit)?**

*Please tick up to five areas.*

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

- Town Planning / Local Government – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Trusts – Total: 0 firms.
- Victims Compensation – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Wills / Probate / Estate – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Other, please specify: *Please see below.*

<b>Group A</b>	Too hard to tell
	Native title, defamation
<b>Group B</b>	NDIS
<b>Group C</b>	Property law (disputes involving elder abuse)
	Litigation
	We have not kept records of the work we've not taken on. To the best of our knowledge, if pro bono instructions weren't accepted, it was because of a lack of available resources in the firm at the time, or because the area of law required was not within our expertise.

**36. Has your firm provided any pro bono legal services for social enterprises in the 2020 FY?**

*Please refer to Part 2 of the Centre's Guidance Notes relating to pro bono legal work for social enterprises.*

- No – Total: 23 firms – Group A: 2, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- Yes – Total: 15 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 5 firm, Group C: 3 firms.

**If yes, how many hours of pro bono legal services did your firm provide to social enterprises in the 2020 FY?**

<b>Group A</b>	71.1
	642
	100
<b>Group B</b>	18
	50
	20
<b>Group C</b>	40
	208.98

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

**37. Did your firm set an overall target for its pro bono legal work in the 2020 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: 2 - Group B: 2.
- YES** - it represented a **minimum** number of **hours** or **hours per lawyer** to be provided in the year
  - Total: 13 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- YES** - it represented a **set number** of **hours** or **hours per lawyer** that the firm aimed to provide in the year

- Total: 13 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 4 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: 1 firm - Group B: 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.
- 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: 1 firm – Group B: 1 firm.
- NO**
  - Total: 10 - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- DON'T KNOW**
  - Total: 0 firms.
- OTHER** (please specify):

**Group C** Yes - we budget for salaries of pro bono staff (i.e. by way of fee relief)

**38. Is this target larger, smaller or the same as it was two years ago?**

- Larger – Total: 7 firms, Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Smaller – Total: 0 firms.
- Same – Total: 19 firms: Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Don't know – Total: 0 firms.

**39. If your firm set a target that represented a number of hours per lawyer, how many hours per lawyer was the target?**

*Enter "N/A" where appropriate.*

<b>Group A</b>	40
	40
	35
	35
	35
	50
	52
	35
<b>Group B</b>	25
	40
	32
	35
	25.6
	50
	35
	35



	50
	35
<b>Group C</b>	15
	35
	35
	21
	35
	10
	35

40. If your firm set a target that represented a total number of hours for the firm as a whole, how many hours was that target?

*Enter "N/A" where appropriate.*

**Group A**            40,000  
**Group B**            47,947

41. Did your firm set an annual operational budget for its pro bono program in the 2020 FY?

- Yes - Total: 20 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- No - Total: 17 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 10 firms
- Don't know – Total: 1 firm – Group B: 1 firm.

42. If yes, is this annual operational budget larger, smaller or the same as it was two years ago?

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

## Section 7 – Crediting and recognising individual lawyers' pro bono legal work

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

- Yes, both billable hour targets and financial targets – Total: 25 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 9 firms
- Yes, billable hour targets only – Total: 9 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Yes, financial targets only – Total: 0 firms.
- No – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.

44. 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: 19 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 6 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: 3 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, 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: 6 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- 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: 5 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 4 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: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Pro bono hours are not recorded at all – Total: 0 firms.
- Other (please specify):

<b>Group A</b>	Pro bono hours are treated as non-billable hours because of how the firm measures and tracks revenue. Recorded as 'special non-billable' approved pro bono hours will be recognised for the purpose of assessing whether an individual has met their financial performance targets and eligibility for incentive payments.
<b>Group B</b>	In 2019/2020 pro bono hours were treated as billable hours for billable hour targets, but were attributed no value for financial targets.
<b>Group C</b>	Pro bono hours are treated as non-billable hours but are recorded as a special non-billable category - they are discussed at performance appraisals as part of each lawyer's overall contribution to the firm.

**45. 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: 35 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 15 firms, 11 firms.
- No – Total: 0 firms.
- Don't know – Total: 0 firms.
- Not applicable Total: 3 firms – Group C: 3 firms.

**46. 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: 35 firms - Group, A: 9 firms, Group B: 15 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- When considering promotion or advancement – Total: 18 firms - Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- When calculating bonuses – Total: 12 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- In salary reviews – Total: 13 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Internal awards, events and communication – Total: 30 firms - Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- None of the above – Total: 1 firm – Group C: 1 firm.
- Other, please specify:

<b>Group B</b>	Each month we celebrate the top pro bono performer in internal communications, reward those who have done 35 hours of pro bono or more each year and share other communications throughout the year about successful pro bono matters.
<b>Group C</b>	We anticipate lawyer contributions to our pro bono program will become more widely integrated into areas such as performance appraisals, promotion and bonus discussions and salary reviews.

## Section 8 – Secondments

### 47. Did your firm provide any pro bono secondments in the 2020 FY?

- Yes – Total: 26 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- No – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 0 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Don't know – Total 1 firm – Group B: 1 firm.

### 48. How many pro bono secondments did your firm provide in 2020 FY?

<b>Group A</b>	We seconded lawyers to 10 organisations
	10
	10
	14
	12
	7
	8
	10
<b>Group B</b>	8
	4
	14
	3
	1
	1
	11
	1
	2
	1
	2
<b>Group C</b>	One lawyer secondment and 2 paralegal secondments
	2
	1
	2
	1
	1

### 49. Please list each secondment location, along with its duration and number of hours per week.

*For example – (1) Secondment to Justice Connect: 15 hours per week for 3 months; (2) Secondment to Caxton Legal Centre: 35 hours per week for 6 weeks.*

<b>Group A</b>	(1) [legal centre] - 1 graduate, full-time for 2.5 months (2) [legal centre]- 1 partner, full-time for 3 days (3) [legal centre]- 1 lawyer, 1 day per week for the year (4) [legal centre] - 1 graduate, full-time for 1.5 months
----------------	--

<p>(5) [legal centre]- 2 graduates, full-time for 2.5 months  (6) [legal centre]- 4 lawyers, full-time for 1 week each  (7) [legal centre] - 1 lawyer, 0.5 days per week for 4 weeks  (8) [legal centre] - 7 x 2 hour attendances  (9) [legal centre] - 1 lawyer, 1 day per week for full year  (10) [legal centre] - 1 lawyer, full-time for 8 weeks</p>
<p>(1) Secondment to [not-for-profit], 7.5hrs a week for 4 months  (2) [not-for-profit] 3 months, 19 hours a week  (3) [not-for-profit] 3 months, 19 hours a week  (4) [legal centre], 38 hours a week, 9 months  (5) [legal centre], 7.5 hours a week, 3 months  (6) [legal centre] – 6 months, 15hr/week  (7) [not-for-profit] - 3 months, 15 hours a week  (8) [not-for-profit] - 6 weeks - 38hrs/week  (9) [industry association] - 6 months, 19hours/week  (10) [industry association] - 6 months, 19hrs/week</p>
<p>(1) Secondment to [legal centre] (Community Health Justice Partnerships): 37.5 x hours per week for 9 months and then 30 hours for remaining 3 months  (2) Secondment to [legal centre] (Community Health Justice Partnership): 30 hours per week for 6 months total (4 months in FY20)  (3) Secondment to [legal centre]: 36.5 hours per week for 10 months (2 consecutive secondments = 10 months total)  (4) Secondment to [legal centre]: 36.5 hours per week for 6 months (2 separate secondments = 12 months total)  (5) Secondment to [not-for-profit]: 36.5 hours per week for 12 months (2 separate secondments)  (6) Secondment to [legal centre]: 36.5 hours per week for 12 months (2 separate secondments)  (7) Secondment to [not-for-profit]: 36.5 hours per week for 6 months  (8) Secondment to [legal centre]: 7.5 hours per week for 12 months  (9) Secondment to [legal centre]: 7.5 hours per week for 6 months  (10) Secondment to [legal centre]: 7.5 hours per week for 12 months</p>
<p>[legal centre] - 2.5 days p/w for 3 months  [legal centre] - 5 days p/w for 3 months  [legal centre] - 2 days p/w for 4 months  [legal centre] - 5 days p/w for 4 months x 2  [legal centre] - 5 days p/w for 6 months x 2  [legal centre] - 5 days p/w for 6 months x 2  [legal centre] - 5 days p/w for 6 months  [not-for-profit] - 3 days p/w for 3 months  [not-for-profit] - 3 days p/w for 3 months x 2  [legal centre] - 2 days p/w for 6 months</p>
<p>The main secondment is six months to [legal centre] full time. We also regularly send a graduate lawyer to [legal centre] for three weeks and host their grad for three weeks. Last FY, especially, because of the flexibility provided by WFH, we arranged 11 virtual secondments of approx. 2 days per week each - four to [legal centre], two to [legal centre], two to the [legal centre], two to [legal centre], one to [not-for-profit]. Most of these were for three months duration - approx. May-July.</p>
<p>Secondment to [legal centre]: 37.5 hours per week for 6 months x 2;  Secondment to [legal centre]: 37.5 hours per week for 6 months x 2;  Secondment to [not-for-profit]: 37.5 hours per week for 4 months;  Secondment to [legal centre]: 37.5 hours per week for 6 months;  Secondment to [legal centre]: 37.5 hours per week for 6 months;  Secondment to [legal centre]: 37.5 hours per week for 2 weeks and  Secondment to [legal centre]: 7.5 hours per week for 6 months.</p>
<p>1. Secondment to [legal centre] - full-time for six months on a rolling basis</p>

	<p>2. Secondment to [legal centre] full-time for six months on a rolling basis  3. Secondment to [legal centre] full-time for six months on a rolling basis  4. Secondment to [legal centre] - 2 lawyers sent on a part-time basis (15 hours per week) for six months  5. Secondment to [legal centre] - part-time basis (15 hours per week) for six months  6. Secondment to [legal centre] - part-time basis (15 hours per week) for six months  7. Secondment to [legal centre] - part-time basis (15 hours per week) for six months  8. Secondment to [legal centre] - part-time basis (15 hours per week) for six months</p> <p>(1) [legal centre]: 328 total hours.  Secondment to [legal centre] 207 hours, 6 months, 1 day per week.  Secondment to [legal centre] 121 hours, ongoing, 1 day per week from February 2020.  (2) [legal centre]: 286 total hours.  Secondment to [legal centre], 97 hours, 4 months, ad hoc basis.  Secondment to [legal centre], 73 hours, 3 months, ad hoc basis.  Secondment to [legal centre], 116 hours, ad hoc basis from February 2020.  (3) [legal centre]: 993 total hours.  Secondment to [legal centre] 195 hours, over 12 months.  Secondment to [legal centre] 405 hours, 2 days per week from August 2019.  Secondment to [legal centre] 393 hours, 2 days per week from August 2019.  (4) [not-for-profit]: 157 total hours.  Secondment to [not-for-profit], 157 hours, 6 months, 3 days per week.  (5) [legal centre]: 75 total hours  Secondment to [legal centre] 75 hours, 5 months, ad hoc basis.  (6) [legal centre]: 368 total hours  Secondment to [legal centre] 215 hours, 7 months, approx. 1 day per week.  Secondment to [legal centre] 153 hours, 6 months, ad hoc basis.</p>
<b>Group B</b>	<p>[legal centre]; 2dpw; 3 months  [legal centre]; 2dpw; 4 months  [legal centre]; 2dpw; 4 months  [legal centre]; F/T; 4 months  [legal centre]; 1dpw; 12 months  [legal centre]; 2dpw; 6 months  [legal centre]; 4dpw; 4 months  [legal centre]; 1dpw; 12 months</p> <p>[legal centre] - 2 days a week for 6 months  [legal centre] - 1 day a week ongoing  [legal centre] - 2 days a week for 4 months  [legal centre] - 1/2 day a week ongoing</p> <p>Full-time secondments in the FY to [not-for profit]; [legal centre]; [legal centre]; [legal centre]; 2 day a week secondment to [legal centre] (from September 2019); full-time secondment to [legal centre] (from March 2020); 1- day a week/fortnight secondment for FY19-20 to [legal centre]; [legal centre]; [legal centre]; 1 day a week for 12 weeks to [legal centre]; [legal centre]; [legal centre]; [legal centre]</p> <p>[legal centre], [legal centre]</p> <p>1 secondment to [legal centre] one day per week 12 weeks  1 secondment to [legal centre] 7.5 hours a week for 3 months</p> <p>(1) Secondment to [legal centre]: 7.5 hours per week for 6 months;  (2) Secondment to [not-for-profit]: 15 hours per week for 4 months;  (3) Secondment to [legal centre]: 15 hours per week for 6 months;  (4) Secondment to [legal centre]: 22.5 hours per week for 4 months;  (5) Secondment to [legal centre]: 37.5 hours per week for 6 months;  (6) Secondment to [legal centre]; 10 hours per week for 3 months (ongoing);  (7) Secondment to [legal centre]: 10 hours per week for 3 months (ongoing);  (8) Secondment to [legal centre]: 10 hours per week for 3 months (ongoing);  (9) Secondment to [legal centre]: 7.5 hours every 3 weeks for approx. 3 months;  (10) Secondment to [legal centre]: 15 hours per week for approx. 3 months;</p>

	(11) Secondment to [legal centre]: 15 hours per week for approx. 1.5 months
	[legal centre]– 1 day per week
	One paralegal seconded to [legal centre] for 4 months for 2 days per week
	(1) Seconded to [not-for-profit] 7.5 hours per day five days a week
	(2) Seconded to [legal centre] 7.25 hours per day five days a week
<b>Group C</b>	Secondment to [not-for-profit]: 1 day a week for 6 months
	Secondment to [legal centre]- 20 hours per week for 5 months
	Secondment to [legal centre] - no set hours (40 hours total)
	[legal centre]
	Secondments to [legal centre] (1) part time secondee - 18.75 hours per week for 12 months; and (2) part time secondee - 3 days per week for a 4-week period
	1 secondment to [not-for-profit]. We also have volunteers attend Community Legal Centres (such as [legal centre]) but we don't record those as secondments.
	Aboriginal Housing Association in [Sydney] and it was 2 months

50. Are there any other noticeable trends in the form, duration and number of secondments provided by your firm since the last Survey, in July 2018?

<b>Group A</b>	More secondments, some associated with additional capacity due to Covid-19
	Increased greatly over the last 12 months due to our change of approach.
	Usually no but as above just for the duration of wfh [working from home]
	Increased need for secondments but also an increased demand and interest from lawyers to assist - particularly since the onset of COVID-19
	No
	No
<b>Group B</b>	More and for longer
	much more flexibility as we are offering virtual secondments. we are able to work on projects, cases, or more traditional tasks
	Increased level of pro bono support through secondment
	No
	Less – in number and duration
	Nil
	Significant increase in secondments since 2018, when we reported 3.
	Our pro bono program has been being rebuilt over FY20, so secondments and overall hours reduced over the past year compared to prior periods
	Increased
No	
<b>Group C</b>	Increase in no. of secondments. Greater engagement with part-time secondments.
	Increase in secondments (note that we didn't fill out the previous survey)
	Less
	Our number of secondments has grown
	No

## Section 9 – Disbursements

51. Did your firm pay for any external disbursements in pro bono matters in the 2020 FY? Please nominate up to three categories where your firm incurred the most costs.

- Medical reports and appearance fees – Total: 6 firms - Group, A: 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms.
- Other expert witness reports and appearance fees – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Filing fees – Total: 13 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Interpreters' fees – Total: 13 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

- Travel and accommodation – Total: 7 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Search costs – Total: 17 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Barristers’ fees (advice or representation) – Total: 0 firms.
- Transcripts – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- None – Total: 11 firms - Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Other, please specify:

<b>Group A</b>	Visa application fees
<b>Group B</b>	FOI application fees and medical record fees
<b>Group C</b>	Cab charges for attendance at community legal centre clinics outside of ordinary hours

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

- Yes – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- No – Total: 26 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 2 firms – Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.

**53. If yes, which disbursement assistance scheme/s has your firm applied to?**

*Enter “N/A” if appropriate.*

<b>Group A</b>	VIC SC fee waiver scheme, NSW Pro Bono Disbursement Trust Fund
	We have sought waiver of Court and filing fees on behalf of Pro Bono clients
<b>Group B</b>	Law Society NSW
	Law Aid
	We had teams apply to the courts for waiver of court fees.
	Law Aid
<b>Group C</b>	NSW Law Society Disbursement Trust Fund
	NSW Law Society Pro Bono Disbursement Trust Fund
	Legal Financial Assistance
	Justice Connect; Court waiver from filing fees

**54. If not, are there reason/s why your firm has not applied for assistance?**

*Enter “N/A” if appropriate.*

<b>Group A</b>	Haven’t deemed it appropriate
	We usually find the schemes fairly slow and unworkable. To be honest, we also often forget what’s available when we are actually arranging services.
	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 schemes more readily
<b>Group B</b>	Most people don’t want to wait as they need to expend the costs immediately
	We have previously investigated the schemes and found that we do not qualify and/or the application process is too onerous for the level of assistance available
	[Firm] is not aware of any scheme(s) for disbursement assistance for pro bono legal services that might apply to our circumstances.
<b>Group C</b>	Not required

## Section 10 – Evaluating your firm’s pro bono program

### 55. Does your firm evaluate its pro bono program?

- Yes – Total: 30 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 13 firms, Group C: 10 firms.
- No – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 4 firms.

### 56. Which of the following have you created for your pro bono program? Please tick all that apply.

- Theory of Change (a process and product that articulates an organisation’s theory of how its activities are causing the change it is seeking to address) – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Evaluation Framework (such as an Impact Measurement Framework or other Evaluation Tools) – Total: 26 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 8 firms.

### 57. Which of the following are you evaluating or measuring in connection with the desired social impact of your pro bono program (externally focused)? Please tick all that apply.

- Quantity of pro bono work provided by the firm’s lawyers (i.e. hours of pro bono work) – Total: 26 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Participation in pro bono across the firm (e.g. number of lawyers involved, participation across levels of seniority/offices) – Total: 27 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Activities or outputs of the firm’s pro bono program (i.e. number of pro bono matters taken on, number of clients assisted, etc) – Total: 19 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Outcomes of the firm’s pro bono program for individual clients and organisations (i.e. leads to short and long term social change in individual or group knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviours) – Total: 19 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Social impact of the firm’s pro bono program (i.e. the impact of the firm’s pro bono program on access to justice for target groups and/or broader community) – Total: 11 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Alignment with UN Sustainable Development Goals – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Other (*please specify*):

<b>Group A</b>	Intend to incorporate the UN Sustainable Development Goals
----------------	--

### 58. What are you using to do this externally focused measuring? Please tick all that apply.

- Quantitative data related to participation in the program (i.e. number of pro bono hours, participation levels per office/location, participation rates across levels of seniority, percentage of firm’s lawyers that participated in the pro bono program etc) – Total: 28 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
- Quantitative data related to pro bono matter considerations (i.e. number of matters, type of matters and client groups, sources of referrals, types of referrals, etc) – Total: 23 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Client feedback / surveys – Total: 15 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Feedback provided by third parties (such as pro bono referral schemes or organisations) – Total: 18 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 4 firms.



- Qualitative data (i.e. case studies, experience of pro bono clients, etc) – Total: 15 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Other (*please specify*): Total: 0.

**59. Which of the following are you evaluating or measuring in connection with your own pro bono program (internally focused)? Please tick all that apply.**

- Operational aspects of your program (i.e. budget, compliance with your policy or program objectives, processes etc) – Total: 21 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Employee experience – Total: 22 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Employee recruitment – Total: 13 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Employee retention – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 5 firms.
- Employee professional development skills – Total: 12 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Marketing opportunities for the firm – Total: 12 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Effect of pro bono work on commercial relationships – Total: 13 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Other (*please specify*):

<b>Group A</b>	See question 58.
----------------	------------------

**60. What are you using to do this internally focused measuring? Please tick all that apply.**

- Staff surveys – Total: 11 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Interviews/focus groups with staff – Total: 10 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Incorporating questions into staff appraisals – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Asking questions when on-boarding new staff – Total: 10 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Other (*please specify*):

<b>Group A</b>	Operational reporting and fortnightly meetings of pro bono team
	Exit interview data
	See question 58
	Speaking and collaborating with Human Resources
<b>Group B</b>	Feedback on file closure forms and staff exit interviews
	Getting feedback from lawyers doing pro bono work
	Financial reporting
	We constantly liaise with the lawyers in involved in our program and ask for feedback on what is working well and what is not working well. We organise program lunches from time to time to seek this type of feedback. We take into account comments from commercial clients about the pro bono work in which they have been involved with us, as well as the commercial client's requests to be involved again.
<b>Group C</b>	Data check
	Tracking data recorded in internal systems

61. Have you found any of these evaluation methods particularly useful? If yes, in what way? If no, please explain why.

<b>Group A</b>	Useful to understand importance of community engagement to staff and benchmarks for recruitment, engagement and retention
	Incredibly useful and are explained in our FY20... Report. The data is rich and enables us to make changes to the practice where required.
	These processes have provided valuable feedback in terms of what aspects have appealed to employees, and which ones have generated the most benefit
	To the extent we have energy to focus on evaluation (with very limited capacity), we would prefer to focus on external (rather than) internal impacts. This approach aligns with our pro bono philosophy.
	Interviews and focus groups have been helpful in informing future strategies
<b>Group B</b>	Surveys are good because they are anonymous and you get some very honest responses; however, they are not undertaken by most people.
	Yes - we can gain an insight into the value of the practice to our people from exit interviews and feedback at close of matters
	The Staff survey is very useful and conducted annually so it provides an opportunity to benchmark
	We often use the results of these evaluations to communicate the impact of our program with staff internally. We have been looking into social impact models and theories of change but have not progressed any further at this stage.
	Limited data available for the past year, however broad staff surveys have proved useful in the past
	Yes. These evaluation methods have been good for staff motivation.
	Feedback from our employees is particularly useful. They have direct dealings with the client. they are undertaking the work.
	Yes, as they rely on both objective and subjective feedback, we can gauge the effectiveness of our pro bono effort particularly given our aspirational targets.
<b>Group C</b>	Ineffective as inconsistently used across the firm
	Yes - but seeking to expand our evaluation framework in FY21
	Yes, as it provides ongoing feedback for improvement of our program
	Yes, as they help us refine the practice and better utilise our resources

62. Based on your current understanding, whether anecdotal or evidence-based, which of the following are the impacts of your pro bono program on your firm?

*Please tick all that apply.*

- Additional skills development by the firm's lawyers – Total: 26 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Increased opportunities for the firm's lawyers to undertake direct client work – Total: 23 firms - Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Improved public reputation of the firm – Total: 22 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Increased pride in the firm – Total: 25 firms - Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Increased ability to attract new staff to the firm – Total: 18 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Improved retention of existing staff – Total: 19 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Increased levels of staff satisfaction – Total: 22 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Don't know – Total: 0 firms.

- Other – please specify:

<b>Group A</b>	Alignment with purpose
----------------	------------------------

### 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?**

- More – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Less – Total: 1 firm – Group B: 1 firm.
- About the same – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm.
- Don’t know – Total: 3 firms – Group C: 3 firms.
- Not applicable – firm does not have an overseas office – Total: 24 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 10 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: 11 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- No – Total: 27 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 10 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 2020 FY?**

- Yes – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 2 firms.
- No – Total: 23 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 12 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 4 firms – Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

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

<b>Group A</b>	A range of referrals of matters to assist charities also supported by the commercial client. Mainly fundraising and tax advice.
	Refugee legal clinics, Financial Abuse working group
	Shared value initiatives to see how we can align our respective community engagement cause areas, ambitions and initiatives and build networking opportunities whilst providing legal services to our communities
	Community legal education, Legal clinics, Legal research
	Homeless clinic work
	We are happy to collaborate with <i>[the firm’s]</i> clients on pro bono legal work. In these situations, we take on an advisory role: for example, involving our clients to join one of our existing clinics or facilitating joint training.
	Pro bono law reform work or research
	Working with banking clients on transgender banking issues
<b>Group B</b>	Being instructed by in-house counsel on pro bono matters, training in-house counsel teams for in-house project led by our firm. Assisting the clients of an in-house counsel's grant program with referral triage and legal work i.e. governance.
	Research, Legal guides, Legal information sessions

<b>Group C</b>	Admin law review; establishment of new not-for profit; applications for tax concessions for the entity
----------------	--

**67. Has your firm attempted to ‘clear’ positional/commercial conflicts for potential pro bono matters with your government or corporate clients in the 2020 FY?**

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

*If so, has this process been successful?*

<b>Group A</b>	Sometimes, yes
	Yes
	Yes
	Yes
	Usually
	Yes
	Joint law firm letters
	Yes
<b>Group B</b>	Mixed results
	Yes

### Section 13 – Government tender arrangements for legal services

**68. Is your firm on one or more of the following panels?**

*Please tick all that apply.*

- Commonwealth Government Legal Services Panel – Total: 27 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- New South Wales Government Legal Panel – Total: 21 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- South Australia Government Legal Panel – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm.
- Victorian Government Legal Services Panel – Total: 17 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 8 firms.
- Queensland Whole-of-Government Legal Services Panel – Total: 15 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Western Australia Government Legal Services Panel – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- None of the above – Total: 7 firms – Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.

*If you have any comments on the form and operation of any of these government tendering processes, in relation to the requirement to report on pro bono legal work, please enter them below.*

**69. Commonwealth:**

<b>Group A</b>	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
----------------	---

#### 70. New South Wales:

<b>Group A</b>	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
----------------	---

#### 71. South Australia:

<b>Group A</b>	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
----------------	---

#### 72. Victoria:

<b>Group A</b>	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
	Victorian target is onerous and qualifying criteria too narrow
	I appreciate the level of specificity they require of us in reporting. The benchmark scheme in Australia.
<b>Group B</b>	They seem to completely ignore conflict waiver requests. Many issues people have that need pro bono support are against governments. Better conflict waiver processes are needed.

#### 73. Queensland:

<b>Group A</b>	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
----------------	---

#### 74. Western Australia:

<b>Group A</b>	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
	The scope of allowable causes is very narrow - no credit is given for prob bono work for organisations other than CLCs or individuals. It would be good to see the scope expanded to include not for profit and/or charitable organisations.
	Huge supporter of the new arrangements, to encourage a culture of pro bono work for low-income clients in WA.

### Section 14 –The National Pro Bono Target

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

- Yes – Total: 35 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 14 firms, Group C: 12 firms.
- No – Total: 3 firms – Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

If not, please specify why not.

<b>Group B</b>	We are working to rebuild our pro bono program after a very disrupted past few years at the firm. Our hope is to sign on to the target in the course of this financial year.
	We have a 5 year plan to reach the target and expect we will become a signatory in the future.
<b>Group C</b>	Under review

## Section 15 – What else can you tell us?

### 76. What are the **top three** most crucial factors in the **success** of your firm’s pro bono program?

*Please list three factors.*

Group A		
First factor	Second factor	Third factor
Longevity	Able to use our skills and experience to enhance access to justice	Leadership
Fee earner engagement	Dedicated pro bono partner	Pro bono team capacity to facilitate opportunities
Alignment to purpose	Management – senior support	Alignment with business culture and history of firm (including long-standing embedded relationships with community organisations)
Engagement of our people	Strong partner support across all offices and most practice groups	Breadth and depth of the practice
Employee engagement	Widespread contribution to society	Employee skills development
Robustness regarding what matters we are willing to do	Leadership from our Chief Executive and Managing Partners	Lawyer enthusiasm and commitment to rule of law and social justice
Dedicated pro bono lawyers	Alignment with broader community investment, RAP and other CSR initiatives	Consistent time recording processes
Support from senior management	Maintaining ongoing relationship with our pro bono clients	Large pro bono team
Commitment from partners and staff	integrity	Contributing to strengthening civil society through application of the law

Group B		
First factor	Second factor	Third factor
Support from firm management part of the firm strategy to 2025	Client expectations Supported by leadership	Alignment with firm values Expected by people at firm
Engagement from senior management	Provision of diverse opportunities to do pro bono work	Wide dissemination and awareness of program within organisation
resources	Recognition	Budget
supporting solicitors to lead projects	Support from the partnership	Support from global heads of firm
Participation	Outcomes	Reward for effort
matter selection	Having a dedicated practice	High quality legal work
Support across the firm at all levels for pro bono work	Engaging matters/clients	Supporting lawyers to undertake and train them up to work on a myriad of pro bono matters that may be out of their skill set at the outset
Partner support	Interesting and impactful work engaging matters/clients	Work within expertise of lawyers

Support from the firm's leadership/partners leading by example	Recognising pro bono work in the same way (treating it a billable time)	Having a formal program in place and a dedicated pro bono team
Management support and engagement	Access to opportunities for lawyers to take on pro bono work	Effective and usable recording systems
Access to pro bono matters	Motivation for staff to want to make a difference	Financial reward towards billing targets
Appropriate referrals	Partner involvement	Involvement of young lawyers
support from management and senior partners	Quality service to our pro bobo clients and other partner organisations	Lawyer engagement
Partnering with an established and reputable legal service	Identifying areas where there is a true need for pro bono legal services	Support pro bono legal services which provide true value to vulnerable members of the community

<b>Group C</b>		
<b>First factor</b>	<b>Second factor</b>	<b>Third factor</b>
Firm Capacity	Personal development	N/A
Management and Support	Fee relief	Providing good training, support and supervision
Partner support	Financial and billable hour credit for pro bono work	Dedicated pro bono coordinator
N/A	N/A	N/A
Awareness or matters	Availability of the team	Aligned practice areas
lawyer engagement	Firm's capacity to undertake this work	N/A
Available to all lawyers who want to get involved	Pro bono hours recognised as billable hours	Leadership support/alignment with firm values
Individuals driving participation	Support of pro bobo partners	Support from management
Engagement of lawyers across the firm	Ability to find organisations that align with our pro bono objectives	Ongoing internal communication to promote and extend the pro bono program
Pro bono resourcing	Partner engagement	Relationships with CLCs
Access to appropriate pro bono work.	Leadership of the program	Internal processes and systems to enable the efficient administration of the program in a firm where we don't have a dedicated pro bono team and all pro bono work and the management of the program is performed by employees with already busy roles.
Continuing and expanding relationship with the majority of our pro bono clients – compared to once off support.	Quality of partners providing advice and working directly with clients	Ability to leverage firm-wide resources to client benefit
Relationships with pro bono clients	Understanding our pro bono client's needs	Referral network
improving the administration of justice through the matters we take on	Building on constructive partners and staff feedback	Building on constructive partners and staff feedback

**77. What are the top three challenges for your firm’s pro bono program?**

Please tick **three**.

- Lack of information about pro bono opportunities – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Lack of management or partner support within the firm – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Concern about conflict of interest with fee paying clients – Total: 14 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Pro bono hours do not count as billable hours or for financial targets – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 1 firm.
- Firm capacity – Total: 29 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 14 firms, Group C: 10 firms.
- External economic climate – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Insufficient expertise in relevant areas of the law – Total: 13 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Ability to fund external disbursements – Total: 2 firms – Group B: 2 firms.
- Significant structural changes within the firm – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm.
- Already doing enough pro bono – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Too much work to build the pro bono program – Total: 2 firms – Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Other, please specify (you can nominate more than one challenge here):

<b>Group A</b>	New firm leadership - not so much a challenge as an uncertainty for us at the moment.
	Finding opportunities to engage international offices
	Firm's rapid growth means that the target number of hours is continually increasing
	Difficulty sourcing major Pro Bono projects
<b>Group B</b>	Need to build up team with additional lawyers - understaffed
	Legislative constraints
	Juggling pro bono lead partner and pro bono coordinator roles with our full-time practices
	Measurement and evaluation
	Many partners are very supportive but need to do more to get their lawyers feeling comfortable that they can take on pro bono work. Also a large drop of in PB work by SC and SA's once promoted.
	Providing a sufficient mix of pro bono assistance which includes 'hands on' pro bono legal assistance and 'financial assistance / funding'.
<b>Group C</b>	Determining the scope of work required
	Difficulties in finding organisations that align with our objectives and do not already have existing pro bono support in place
	Sourcing pro bono engagements that align with our skill set

**78. Is your firm delivering pro bono legal assistance in any new or innovative ways since the last Survey, in July 2018, which you wish to share? In particular, please tell us about any new technology you’re using to deliver pro bono services.**

<b>Group A</b>	Love the Justice Connect portal
	[Firm] introduced [a collaborative software program] to [a clearinghouse], which resulted in the implementation of a portal in 2019 which allows the shared clinic to operate smoothly and efficiently.



	We are enthusiastic users of Justice Connect's hub. Also, like the rest of the profession, we've learned to use technology to continue servicing clients while WFH.
	We have set up secondments quickly in response to our clients' needs (e.g., bushfires related work with the [legal centre] and through the human rights and technology project with the Australian Human Rights Commission).
	[Firm] has moved to a sustained focus on supporting community legal centres and not-for-profits with law reform and advocacy support.
	Exploring online legal help platform
<b>Group B</b>	Using much more team based approaches and using technology as part of the offering
	We've started a telephone advice service to support [legal service] (replacing our usual volunteering at night clinics, closed because of COVID). We worked with [legal service] to devise this telephone service... We similarly run a telephone advice service from our office with the [legal service] in Sydney. We initiated the first [omitted to preserve anonymity] legal rights service with [legal centre] in Sydney. We provide a PPS registration service for Indigenous art centres... developed with [legal centre].
	Online revenge porn reporting tool
	Our dedicated pro bono practice has grown and this allows us to take on matters that require resourcing over the long term. At the same time lawyers across the firm in other practices have been encouraged to take on pro bono matters
	Increase in telephone advice rosters due to COVID. Increase in use of portals and sites to collaborate with CLC's to extend their reach to the community
	We are part of the Justice Connect Answers pilot. Recently, our clinics have moved to remote service delivery.
	In the time since the last survey, we have implemented our first "in-house" clinic - our Telephone Advice Clinic run with [legal centre]. We have also had to be flexible in the way we deliver assistance due to COVID.
	We are negotiating ways to providing free access to internal infrastructure and technology services (e.g. document management/e-discovery and matter management platforms) to community and legal groups, which will hopefully be able to augment our more traditional legal pro bono offerings
	No
	No
<b>Group C</b>	Same as our fee earning work and the technology we use
	No
	No
	We are working with more [clearing house's] service which we are enjoying

**79. Has your firm's pro bono program been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic?**

- No – Total: 12 firms – Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Yes – Total: 24 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 6 firms.

If so, how?

<b>Group A</b>	We're busier with demand but have also found more legal resources to respond.
	We have seen an uptick in requests for assistance from vulnerable individuals, particularly in employment and tenancy matters, and from the charities and not-for-profits that support them. Particularly, how to adapt technologically and in line with jurisdictional public health orders
	More pro bono requests related to impacts of COVID, both from individuals (including in relation to tenancy) and organisations. Impact on some face-to-face clinics (some paused, some moved to virtual solutions).
	Increased number of secondments we can offer
	Pro bono secondments have been more difficult to organise

	We've had some extra pockets of capacity and been able to solicit more work and also, even where work is very busy, some new pockets of commitment to servicing community during this crisis
	Yes – the community legal sector in Australia worked around the clock to transition their service delivery to telephone and other online means to assist the most vulnerable members of our society. We have been supporting our pro bono clients and organisations to transition and adapt the firm's pro bono legal assistance for these clients. We have been in more of a reactive phase responding to the needs of our clients (rather than proactive).
	We have moved many clinics and secondments to remote service delivery. There was an increase in legal need but also an increase in lawyer's ability and interest to assist on pro bono matters.
	Working from home has increased our ability to offer pro bono secondments
<b>Group B</b>	we have had much more work related to needs arising from COVID especially family law and employment law advice
	Reduced ability to undertake new secondments/projects
	Some legal services not open for clinics
	Increased capacity has meant we have done more pro bono work over the past few months.
	Yes and no. The most noticeable impact has been the changes or cancellation of advice clinics our staff have volunteered at in some states and territories. Not all centres have had the technology to be able to run these clinics remotely.
	Significantly reduced availability of pro bono opportunities for staff – reduced enquiries, and staff focus has been elsewhere.
	Lawyers are preoccupied with other issues
	Reduced budget including for staff
	The pandemic has negated the opportunity for us to provide hands on legal services in court and in the community legal service environment.
<b>Group C</b>	Delivery of services remotely
	Increase in pro bono referrals and matters taken on by the firm.
	Dramatically reduced hours
	Attendance at CLC clinics has been stalled.
	Reduction in pro bono hours / work due to closure of face-to-face clinics which generate large amounts of pro bono hours
	Clinics cancelled because of restrictions on meetings

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

<b>Group B</b>	The last 2-3 years of our program has been something of an aberration, as we have been rebuilding it following disruptions within the firm in FY18. Our hope is to return it to 'normal' over the course of the next year.
	We are really stretched, and do the best with the limited time/\$ resources we have. In addition to telephone advice/clinic work, and work with NFPs we aim for high impact projects with long standing significant clients.

**81. 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: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- A dedicated pro bono leader – Total: 6 firms – Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.

- Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm – Total: 14 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training – Total: 9 firms – Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- A pro bono policy and strategic plan – Total: 5 firms – Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Setting a firm-wide pro bono target and budget – Total: 6 firms – Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Strong and deep relationships with community partners – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- A strategic risk management plan including accurate record keeping and a regular evaluation process – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Not applicable, or do not wish to answer – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.

**82. 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?<sup>92</sup>**

<b>Group A</b>	Greater consultation with us, before programs are launched.
	Ensure that expectations around the delivery of pro bono legal services continues to evolve with the changing legal landscape faced by national and global commercial law firms and broader assistance with commercial conflicts of interest
	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 practice. This assists both our firm and the pro bono sector in general.
	It may be helpful for the Centre to think about beginning to offer referrals to members. in particular large pro bono matters. The resources provided by the Centre are excellent, and very helpful, thank you.
<b>Group B</b>	Particularly now that the pro bono sector is becoming crowded, the Centre could be useful in helping to identify organisations and areas of unmet need and linking firms and those organisations and areas like you are doing with the Law Council Justice Project.
	Referrals
	Would be great to touch base occasionally
	Some of the metrics e.g. billable hours are not easily measured in a personal injuries practice where time recording is not used. Assistance with measurement and evaluation of outcomes is always useful.
	I think our pro bono program is under resourced. It would be good to have a summary of the number of dedicated pro bono people that firms of a similar size have.
	We appreciate that the Centre is open to providing assistance to us and answering our questions when needed.
	If you have any other ideas on how we can access pro bono work, we would like to hear from you.
	In recent years we have had almost no contact
<b>Group C</b>	Open to any suggestions
	Further support to find organisations needing pro bono support

<sup>92</sup> Not included here are responses such as “No”, “No thank you”, “not really”.