

## Appendix 1: Survey Questions & Answers

Appendix 1 contains the questionnaire for the 2022 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 modified or excluded in order to maintain respondents' anonymity. Results have also been shuffled and presented in random order such that is not possible to draw connections between responses to separate questions. Typographical and other errors in the responses have also been corrected, where identified.

Where total responses for any question are fewer than 47 (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 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 2021/2022 financial year (**2022 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 2022 FY, i.e.:*

*(FTE lawyers at 1 July 2021 + FTE lawyers at 30 June 2022) ÷ 2 =*

Individual answers removed to protect respondent anonymity. There are:

- **Group A:** (firms with 450 or more FTE lawyers) – 10 firms with 8,396.41 FTE lawyers in total.
- **Group B:** (firms with 201 – 449 FTE lawyers) – 14 firms with 4,357.40 FTE lawyers in total.
- **Group C:** (firms with 50 – 200 FTE lawyers) – 23 firms with 2,758.24 FTE lawyers in total.

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

3. Does your firm have a dedicated pro bono coordinator or manager (i.e. someone whose primary responsibility is to coordinate the firm's pro bono legal work)?
  - **Yes** – Total: 38 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 16 firms.
  - **No** – Total: 9 firms – Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
4. Is the most senior dedicated coordinator/manager:
  - **A Partner? \*\*** – Total: 24 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 11 firms.

- **A Special Counsel?** – Total: 3 firms - Group C: 3 firms.
- **A Senior Associate?** – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 2 firms.
- **An Associate/Lawyer?** – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- **A non-legal staff member?** – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- **Other? (please specify)** – Total: 7 firms. *(see responses below)*

<b>Group A</b>	Chief Community Officer
	A director
	Director
<b>Group B</b>	Head of Pro Bono & Responsible Business
	Director
	National Pro Bono Manager
<b>Group C</b>	Chief Operating Officer

**\*\*Note:** One firm indicated under “other” that two Partners share the role jointly. For the purposes of data analysis, this response has been included under the standard response of “Partner”.

**5.** Do they:

- Perform the role **full time?** Total: 19 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Perform the role **part time?** Total: 19 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 10 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. In that case, please answer 0.8).

<b>Group A</b>	0.3
	0.8
	0.7
<b>Group B</b>	0.3
	0.4***
	0.6
	0.4***
	0.8
	0.7
<b>Group C</b>	0.5
	0.8
	0.1***
	0.6
	0.6
	0.3
	0.8
	0.6
	0.8

**Note 1:** One Group A indicated that their pro bono manager performed the role full time, but entered a FTE load that was <1.0. After consultation with the firm, the Centre changed their answer to Q5 from full time to part time for the purposes of data analysis.

**\*\*\*Note 2:** These responses were altered following email consultation with the firms.

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

- Yes – Total: 30 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- No – Total: 8 firms – Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 5 firms.

7. Do they undertake any pro bono legal work (i.e. legal work for specific clients/matters)?

- Yes – Total: 35 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 15 firms.
- No – Total: 3 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firms, Group C: 1 firms.

**Note:** One firm respond “Yes”, however, due to the non-legal job title of the pro bono manager, the Centre took the view that this person was not capable of performing legal work within the Centre’s definition of “pro bono legal work”. Accordingly, this response was changed to “No” for the purposes of data analysis.

8. What **percentage** of the time that this person spends in this coordinator role was spent undertaking pro bono legal work in the 2022 FY? (as opposed to the time spent managing or coordinating the pro bono program). Provide an estimate if you do not have an exact figure.

<b>Group A</b>	85%
	70%
	10%
	60%
	50%
	20%
	15%
	30%
	5%
<b>Group B</b>	100%
	13%
	50%
	20%
	50%
	40%
	40%
	33%
	75%
	15%
	10%
<b>Group C</b>	58%

80%
87%
65%
15%
60%
50%
40%
20%
20%
20%
75%
14%
10%
10%

**Note:** One firm's response to this question was removed for the purposes of data analysis. Due to the job title of the pro bono manager, the Centre took the view that this person was not capable of performing legal work within the Centre's definition of "pro bono legal work".

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

- Yes, all – Total: 13 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Yes, most – Total: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm.
- Yes, some – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- No – Total: 19 firms – Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 13 firms.

10. As at 30 June 2022, 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)?

- Yes – Total: 37 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 16 firms.
- No – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 7 firms.

**Note:** Four firms responded "No", despite reporting having dedicated pro bono managers. The Centre changed these responses to "Yes" in order to make these firms' data internally consistent.

11. How many of your dedicated pro bono staff are:

- Partners (FTE) – Total: 20.9 – Group A: 8.7, Group B: 4.4, Group C: 7.8.
- Special Counsel (FTE) – Total: 17.6 – Group A: 4.4, Group B: 5, Group C: 8.2.
- Senior Associates (FTE) – Total: 19.6 – Group A: 9.8, Group B: 8, Group C: 1.8.
- Associates/ Lawyers (FTE) – Total: 41.9 – Group A: 22.3, Group B: 15, Group C: 4.6.
- Graduates (FTE) – Total: 10 – Group A: 7.5, Group B: 0.5, Group C: 2.
- Paralegals/ Administrative staff (FTE) – Total: 24.4 – Group A: 11, Group B: 9, Group C: 4.4.
- Other (please specify below) (FTE) – Total: 6.3 – Group A: 4.4, Group B: 1.4, Group C: 0.5.

**Note 1:** Several firms' responses to this question have been amended by the Centre in order to ensure consistency with responses to Q4.

**Note 2:** One firm that indicated that they did have “dedicated pro bono staff” under Q10, but was not in a position to provide these staff members’ FTE loads. Accordingly, their response to this question was disregarded for the purposes of data analysis.

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

<b>Group A</b>	Director of Responsible Business
	Pro Bono Consultant
	Chief Community Officer; National Pro Bono & Community Investment Coordinator
	Director
<b>Group B</b>	Pro Bono Operations Manager
	National Pro Bono Manager
	Head of Pro Bono**
<b>Group C</b>	Consultant
	Chief Operating Officer***

**\*\*Note 1:** This firm did not nominate the FTE load of this staff member under Q11.

**\*\*\*Note 2:** This response was added by the centre in order to make this firm’s response consistent with their response to Q4.

**13.** Does your firm have a Pro Bono Committee?

- Yes – Total: 24 – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 12 firms.
- No – Total: 23 – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 11 firms.

**14.** If yes, how many people are on the Committee?

<b>Group A</b>	21
	12
	11
	9
	8
<b>Group B</b>	14
	13
	10
	7
	6
	4
	4
<b>Group C</b>	30
	12
	10

	3
	2
	10
	10
	8
	7
	6
	5
	4

**15. Who is on the Pro Bono Committee?**

- Partner(s) – Total: 24 – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 12 firms.
- Senior Associate(s) – Total: 14 – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Associate(s)/Lawyer(s) – Total: 13 – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Graduate(s) – Total: 5 – Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms.
- Paralegal(s)/Administrative Staff – Total: 3 – Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Marketing Staff – Total: 5 – Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Human Resources Staff – Total: 5 – Group B: 1 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Other (please specify) – Total: 12. *(see responses below)*

<b>Group A</b>	Director
	Global Head of Responsible Business
	Pro-Bono Coordinator
<b>Group B</b>	Media/public affairs
	Pro Bono Operations Manager, Chief Operating Officer, National Managing Partner, IT Director, Local Pro Bono & Community Partners from each office
	Special Counsel, Operations Manager
<b>Group C</b>	General Manager, Counsel(s)
	Chief Operating Officer
	Accounts
	Chief Operating Officer, Special Counsel
	Head of Finance, Quality Manager
	CEO

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

- Yes – Total: 41 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 20 firms.
- No – Total: 6 firms – Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.

**17. The following questions relate to the relationship between your firm’s pro bono legal program and its community program(s) (including social impact or CSR, philanthropy, or any other type of community service program). Please select the most accurate answer from the options provided.**

- a) Do the objectives of both programs align?

- Yes – Total: 29 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 15 firms.
  - No – Total: 0 firms.
  - Partially – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- b) Are your programs jointly managed or separately managed?
- Jointly managed – Total: 18 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
  - Separately managed: Total: 23 firms – Group A: 5 Firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 14 firms.
- c) Do your programs have a joint budget or separate budget?
- Joint budget – Total: 15 firms, Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
  - Separate budget – Total: 25 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 15 firms.

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

- Yes – Total: 34 firms, Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 14 firms.
- No – Total: 13 firms: Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 9 firms.

Yes. If so, what year was the RAP first introduced?

<b>Group A</b>	2008
	2011
	2014
	2013
	2010
	2018
	2014
	2016
	2018
<b>Group B</b>	2020
	2013
	2012
	2022
	2021
	2012
	2018
	2019
	2020
	2019
	2010
<b>Group C</b>	2012
	2021
	2021
	2009
	2010
	2021
	2022
	2010
	2019

	2006
	2019
	2021
	2021
	2019

### 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 2022 FY originated from the following:

Group A				
a) Pro bono referral schemes, professional organisations and community legal centres (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	b) Legal Aid (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	c) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	d) Direct requests for assistance (from individuals and / or not-for-profit organisations, charities or social enterprises)	e) Other sources (this could include internal projects)
25	15	10	50	0
50	1	10	35	4
20	1	0	76	3
38	0	1	61	0
70	0	0	30	0
49	8	1	38	4
21	1	2	75	1
50	0	10	35	5
9	1	1	69	20
44	2	4	35	15

Group B				
a) Pro bono referral schemes, professional organisations and community legal centres (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	b) Legal Aid (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	c) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)	d) Direct requests for assistance (from individuals and / or not-for-profit organisations, charities or social enterprises)	e) Other sources (this could include internal projects)
60	0	10	20	10
65	5	0	25	5
95	2	1	2	0
70	0	0	10	20



55	5	10	25	5
20	0	20	40	20
90	0	0	10	0
51	38	0	10	1
44	0	2	41	13
28	0	14	57	1
60	0	0	40	0
35	0	0	60	5
46	1	5	47	1

<b>Group C</b>				
<b>a) Pro bono referral schemes, professional organisations and community legal centres (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)</b>	<b>b) Legal Aid (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)</b>	<b>c) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services (this could include referrals, secondments, joint projects and/or clinics)</b>	<b>d) Direct requests for assistance (from individuals and / or not-for-profit organisations, charities or social enterprises)</b>	<b>e) Other sources (this could include internal projects)</b>
38	2	5	52	3
70	0	0	10	20
40	0	20	20	20
30	0	0	70	0
0	0	24	76	0
95	0	5	0	0
5	0	40	40	15
80	0	10	5	5
5	0	5	86	4
65	0	3	22	10
67	0	0	33	0
50	0	25	25	0
0	0	0	78	22
10	0	0	50	40
65	0	0	10	25
50	15	0	15	20
42	0	0	55	3
61	0	2	32	5
40	0	0	40	20
10	20	5	55	10
40	0	10	50	0
80	0	0	10	10
15	0	0	85	0

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 2022 FY, please indicate all schemes/organisations/centres from which you received this work:

- ACT Pro Bono Clearing House – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 1 firm.
- Cancer Council – Total: 13 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Justice Connect (including Law Institute of Victoria) – Total: 34 firms - Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 13 firms, Group C: 12 firms.
- JusticeNet SA – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Law Access (Western Australia) – Total: 22 firms - Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Law Society ACT – Total: 3 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm.
- Law Society NT – Total: 0 firms.
- Law Society of NSW Pro Bono Scheme – Total: 4 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Law Society of Tasmania Pro Bono Clearing House – Group B: 1 firm.
- LawRight – Total: 23 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Public Interest Advocacy Centre (incl Homeless Persons' Legal Service NSW) – Total: 21 firms - Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- TrustLaw – Total: 6 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- N/A – our firm has not undertaken any such pro bono work—Total: 2 firms—Group C: 2 firms.
- Other (please specify) – Total: 21 firms. (*see responses below*)

<b>Group A</b>	PILnet
	Footscray Community Legal Centre, Refugee & Immigration Legal Centre
	ORIC LawHelp
	Many Community Legal Centres around Australia
	Arts Law Centre, Human Rights Law Commission, Refugee Advice & Casework Service
	Circle Green Community Legal Centre, Street Law Centre (WA), Caxton Street Legal Centre, Women's Legal Service Queensland, Refugee and Immigration Legal Service, Marrickville Legal Centre, First Australians Capital (pro bono referrals), Many Rivers (pro bono referrals), Global Sisters (pro bono referrals), Victorian Aboriginal Legal Service, Eastern Community Legal Centre, ARC Justice, Inner Melbourne Community Legal, Canberra Community Law (including Street Law), Fair Work Advice Service
	Law Help, Cooperative Legal Service Delivery Program
	IMCL, KLC, Redfern Legal Centre, Legal Aid NSW, Sussex Street, Supply Nation, Fairwork Commission, Caxton, The Shopfront Youth Legal Centre, RACS, RAILS
<b>Group B</b>	Newcastle Law Society (Afganistani refugee visa work)
	Seniors Rights Victoria, Arts Law Centre of Australia, Hume Riverina Community Legal Service, Women's Legal Service Victoria, Refugee Legal, West Justice, FWC Pro bono Program, Shoalcoast Community Legal Centre, ALARM, Cairns Community Legal Centre, Youthlaw, Seniors Rights Service NSW
	Fair Work Commission Workplace Advice Service, Community Legal Centres NSW Inc, Aged & Disability Advocacy, Goldfields Community Legal Centre, Senior Rights Service, Western Sydney Community Legal Centre, Arts Law Centre of Australia, Redfern Legal Centre, Older People's Rights Service WA, Australian Centre for Disability Law, Hunter Community Legal Centre, Inner City Legal Centre, Marrickville Legal Centre, University

	of Newcastle Legal Centre, Women's Legal Centre - ACT, Central Tablelands and Blue Mountains Community Legal Centre, Mental Health Legal Centre Victoria, Mental Health Law Centre WA, Legal Aid
	Djirra; Human Rights Law Centre; Refugee Legal; Refugee Advice and Casework Service
<b>Group C</b>	Asylum Seeker Resource Centre (Human Rights Law Program)
	Community Legal Centres NSW, Refugee Legal, Seniors Rights Service, Western NSW Community Legal Centre, Economic Justice Australia, Kingsford Legal Centre, First Nations Foundation, Climate Justice Programme, Australian Centre for Disability Law, Australian Human Rights Commission, Arts Law Centre of Australia, Aboriginal Legal Service of Western Australia, Community Legal Centres Australia, Redfern Legal Centre, Subiaco Legal Centre, Change The Record, Darwin Community Legal Service, Australian Council of Social Service, Refugee Advice and Casework Service, Human Rights Law Centre, National Justice Project
	Womens Legal Service Divorce Clinic, Refugee and Immigration Legal Service; Fair Work Commission Workplace Advisory Service
	WLSWA, Many Rivers Microfinance Ltd, Bloom - The Centre for Youth Innovation
	South West Sydney Legal Centre, Redfern Legal Centre, National Justice Project, NSW Bar Legal Assistance Scheme, Refugee Legal
	Kingsford Legal Centre, Westmead Institute of Medical Research, Financial Counselling Australia
	Redfern Legal Centre Ltd
	Caxton Legal Centre
	Caxton Legal, QLS, legal clinics run by the firm

#### 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 2022 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>	40
	87
	51
	59
	47
	64
	68
	70
	90
	68
<b>Group B</b>	15
	35
	39

	49
	17
	81
	62
	67
	68
	76
	76
	79
	59
	71
<b>Group C</b>	46
	30
	40
	40
	22
	47
	95
	25
	35
	30
	63
	62
	59
	59
	83
	84
	41
	85
	67
	81
	73
	31
	41

22. What percentage of partners in your firm in Australia participated in (did at least one hour of) pro bono legal work in the 2022 FY?

<b>Group A</b>	57
	36
	50
	51
	90
	35
	52

	57
	49
	57
<b>Group B</b>	59
	58
	10
	26
	60
	45
	14
	72
	35
	79
	68
	55
	56
	42
<b>Group C</b>	51
	19
	12
	72
	51
	35
	16
	30
	83
	40
	100
	15
	55
	29
	32
	47
	4
	70
	77
	29
	46
	15
	35

**23.** How many hours of pro bono legal work (including any work undertaken for a substantially reduced fee) did your firm's lawyers – including partners – in Australia carry out in total in the 2022 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.

The definition includes work undertaken for a substantially reduced fee, and so if you have undertaken work on this basis you should include it in your reported hours here. The Centre will only count "substantially reduced fee" hours reported against the Target if those fees have been reduced by at least 50% of what would otherwise be charged for the matter.

If your firm has undertaken hours at a substantially reduced fee, the number of hours that you report here should only reflect the percentage of those hours that were not charged to the client. For example, if your firm undertook 100 hours at a substantially reduced fee in the 2022 FY, and that fee was reduced by 50% of what the firm would ordinarily charge, your firm should only report 50 hours.

<b>Group A</b>	30351
	44168.6
	41924.7
	26351.31
	51998
	28848.4
	24076
	58314
	32150.4
	31030
<b>Group B</b>	4688
	17927.8
	9340
	5444.7
	9373
	2536
	8666
	4932
	9908
	12487.9
	15241
	12189
	7402
12937.5	
<b>Group C</b>	6694.6
	1155.9
	1358.08
	429.7
	490.5

	3675
	9491
	2373
	1344
	1135.6
	2974
	1483
	2474
	2218
	2052
	2954.2
	741
	251.3
	5825
	2930.7
	5432.58
	4350
	412.25

24. What percentage of lawyers (including partners) in your firm in Australia undertook 35 hours or more of pro bono legal work in the 2022 FY?

<b>Group A</b>	28
	30
	19
	37
	40
	15
	19
	26
	42
	31
<b>Group B</b>	16
	19
	10
	0
	21
	6
	56
	3
	6
	27
	27
	20
	17

	26.6
<b>Group C</b>	29
	10
	10
	4
	10
	10
	40
	0
	10
	6
	16
	5
	7
	18
	33
	14
	10
	0
	10
	17
	19
	20
	20

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

<b>Group A</b>	4
	5
	1
	3
	5
	3
	3
	3
<b>Group B</b>	2
	3
	2
	1
	1
	1
	4
	2
	3
	2



	2
<b>Group C</b>	5
	5
	1
	1
	1
	3
	0
	5
	1
	2
	5
	1
	6
	1
	0
	13
	2
	1

**26.** 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?

- No – Total: 36 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 19 firms.
- Yes – Total: 11 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 4 firms.

Yes. If so, please specify how many hours of work were undertaken by your firm for a substantially reduced fee in the 2022 FY:

<b>Group A</b>	744.3
<b>Group B</b>	5
	4863
	33
	50
	1064.1
	2305
<b>Group C</b>	980
	615
	73
	824.5

**27.** Please provide details of the substantially reduced fee work your firm undertook in the 2022 FY. For example, did you do more of this work for individuals or for organisations? What was the range of percentage fee reduction you applied?

<b>Group A</b>	Organisations. Fee reduction 50% or greater
<b>Group B</b>	Organisations
	68% of our total pro bono hours were undertaken on work for individuals, with the remaining 32% being undertaken on work for charitable organisations. We only carried out work at a substantially reduced fee for larger charities. 18% of new matters taken on in the 2022 financial year were done at a substantially reduced fee (50% discount or more). Our firm has made a policy decision to charge substantially reduced fees for larger charitable organisations so that we can ensure that at least 50% of our pro bono time is directed to assisting individuals experiencing disadvantage.
	One organisation only. Approx 50% reduction.
	The work mainly related to large Native Title and cultural heritage matters for Traditional Owners in relation to which we were able to obtain limited funding. that is, the matters were take on as full pro bono matters, but we were able to obtain some state sourced funding during the course of running the matters. We acted for a couple of not-for-profits on the basis of a 50% reduction in our fees.
	Organisation with reasonable assets. 50/50 payment arrangement.
	All of our work is for individuals...
<b>Group C</b>	Work done for charities at 50% reduction.
	Organisations; predominantly 50%
	The total value of the matter was reduced by 58% (i.e 58% pro bono and 42% fee paying). Predominantly completed for organisations.
	We undertook 440 pro bono hours at substantially reduced fees for Not For Profit organisations – and another 215 pro bono hours for non-charitable organisations. The fee reduction was 50% or more.

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

28. What percentage of your firm’s pro bono legal work (by number of new files opened) in the 2022 FY was devoted to work for individuals, and what percentage was devoted to work for organisations?

<b>Group A</b>	
<b>Individuals:</b>	<b>Organisations:</b>
49	51
58	42
35	65
57	43
23	77
12	88
30	70
9	91
38	62
58	42
<b>Group B</b>	
<b>Individuals:</b>	<b>Organisations:</b>

20	80
40	60
95	5
10	90
44	56
43	57
93	7
40	60
28	72
50	50
46	54
68	32
60	40
45	55
<b>Group C</b>	
<b>Individuals:</b>	<b>Organisations:</b>
46	54
50	50
45	55
8	92
30	70
30	70
37	63
95	5
81	19
24	76
50	50
34	66
6	94
35	65
60	40
60	40
44	56
30	70
40	60
35	65
85	15
60	40
20	80

**29.** 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 2022 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: 13 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Agreements with / Tenders to Government for pro bono clients – Total: 0 firms.
- Animal Law – Total: 1 firm — Group B: 1 firm.
- Banking / Finance – Total: 0 firms.
- Bankruptcy – Total: 2 firms — Group A: 2 firms.
- Commercial Agreements (e.g. leases) – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Construction Law – Total: 0 firms.
- Consumer Law — Total: 6 firms — Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Coronial Inquiries — Total: 1 firm — Group C: 1 firm.
- Corporate Law (including corporations) — Total: 9 firms, Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Criminal Law: — Total: 3 firms, Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Charity and Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) Status Applications – Total: 9 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 7 firms.
- Debt – Total: 7 firms - Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Discrimination – Total: 7 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Employment law – Total: 25 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- Environmental Law and Climate Justice – Total: 4 firms, Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- Family Law (not including Family Violence) – Total: 5 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Family Violence/Domestic Violence – Total: 8 firms - Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Fines – Total: 3 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm.
- Governance – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Housing / Tenancy – Total: 12 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Human Rights – Total: 11 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Immigration – Total: 20 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Insurance – Total: 2 firms - Group C: 2 firms.
- Intellectual Property – Total: 6 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Personal Injury – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Privacy / Freedom of Information – Total: 3 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Powers of Attorney / Guardianship – Total: 5 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Professional Negligence – Total: 0 firms.
- Royal Commissions – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Social Security – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 2 firms.
- Superannuation – Total: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Tax (other than DGR) – Total: 4 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Town Planning / Local Government – Total: 1 firm, Group A: 1 firm.
- Trusts – Total: 0 firms.
- Victims Compensation – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Wills / Probate / Estate – Total: 12 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Other, please specify – Total: 3 firms. (*see responses below*)

<b>Group B</b>	Regulatory**
----------------	--------------

	Litigation & Dispute Resolution**
<b>Group C</b>	Self-representation service**

**\*\*Note1:** In the Centre's view, these responses do not constitute areas of law and practice. Therefore, they were not included in this Report.

**Note2:** Several responses entered under "other" were sorted into standard categories as follows:

- "Child protection and infringements" → Family Law (not including Family Violence)
- "Refugees and people seeking asylum" → Immigration
- "NDIS" → Social Security
- "Planning, Access and Environment" → Town Planning / Local Government

**30.** 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>	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People with a disability	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	People experiencing homelessness	Refugees and asylum seekers
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	Children and young people	People experiencing discrimination
	People experiencing homelessness	People who are financially vulnerable	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	People who are financially vulnerable	N/A	N/A
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People experiencing homelessness	Refugees and asylum seekers
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People experiencing homelessness	People who are financially vulnerable
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People who are financially vulnerable	N/A
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People experiencing homelessness	Refugees and asylum seekers
<b>Group B</b>	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	Older people (60 years +)	People from the LGBTIQ community

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

	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People experiencing discrimination	People from the LGBTIQ community
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People experiencing discrimination	People who are financially vulnerable
	People who are financially vulnerable	N/A	N/A
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People who are financially vulnerable	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	People who are financially vulnerable	People with a disability	N/A
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	N/A	N/A
	People with a disability	Refugees and asylum seekers	N/A
	People from the LGBTIQ community	Refugees and asylum seekers	N/A
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People who are financially vulnerable	People with a disability
	Older people (60 years +)	People with a disability	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	People experiencing discrimination	People who are financially vulnerable	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	Older people (60 years +)	People experiencing homelessness	People who are financially vulnerable
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	Older people (60 years +)	Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence
	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	People who are financially vulnerable	People with a disability
	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	Children and young people	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

**Note:** One Group B firm nominated five client groups rather than three. Their response was disregarded for the purposes of data analysis. The client groups nominated by this firm were:

*Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, Children and young people, People from the LGBTIQ community, Refugees and asylum seekers, and Women and/or survivors of domestic and family violence.*

- 31.** 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 2022 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: 2 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Agreements with / Tenders to Government for pro bono clients – Total: 2 firms — Group C: 2 firms.
- Animal Law – Total: 1 firm — Group B: 1 firm.
- Banking / Finance – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Bankruptcy – Total: 1 firm — Group C: 1 firm.
- Commercial Agreements (e.g. leases) – Total: 32 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 14 firms.
- Construction Law – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Consumer Law – Total: 1 firm – Group C: 1 firm.
- Coronial Inquiries – Total: 0 firms.
- Corporate Law (including incorporations) – Total: 25 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
- Criminal Law – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Charity and Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) Status Applications – Total: 23 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- Debt – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Discrimination – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Employment Law – Total: 28 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- Environmental Law and Climate Justice— Total: 5 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms.
- Family Law (not including Family Violence) – Total: 0 firms.
- Family Violence/Domestic Violence – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Fines – Total: 0 firms.
- Governance – Total: 25 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 10 firms.
- Housing / Tenancy – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Human Rights – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Immigration – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Insurance – Total: 4 firms - Group C: 4 firms.
- Intellectual Property – Total: 14 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Personal Injury – Total: 0 firms.
- Privacy / Freedom of Information – Total: 6 firms - Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Powers of Attorney / Guardianship – Total: 0 firms.
- Professional Negligence – Total: 1 firm — Group C: 1 firm.
- Royal Commissions – Total: 1 firm — Group B: 1 firm.
- Social Security – Total: 1 firm — Group C: 1 firm.
- Superannuation – Total: 0 firms.



- Tax (other than DGR) – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Town Planning / Local Government – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Trusts – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Victims Compensation – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Wills / Probate / Estate – Total: 4 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- Other, please specify – Total: 2 firms. (*see responses below*)

<b>Group A</b>	Law Reform, Policy and Regulatory**
<b>Group C</b>	Advocacy analysis and writing**

**\*\*Note1:** *In the Centre’s view, these responses do not constitute areas of law and practice. Therefore, they were not included in this Report.*

**Note2:** *One responses entered under “other” was sorted into a standard category as follows:*

- *“Real Estate” → Town Planning / Local Government*

**32.** 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 tick up to **three groups**.*

	<b>Client group 1</b>	<b>Client group 2</b>	<b>Client group 3</b>
<b>Group A</b>	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Social enterprises
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres

	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	N/A
<b>Group B</b>	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Community legal centres	
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	N/A
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	N/A
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	N/A
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres

<b>Group C</b>	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Community legal centres	Social enterprises
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	N/A	N/A
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	N/A	N/A
	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	N/A
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Community legal centres	N/A
	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	N/A	N/A
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	N/A
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Social enterprises
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	N/A	N/A
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Social enterprises

	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Community legal centres	N/A
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Community legal centres
	Not-for-profit organisations and charities	Other civil society / community organisations	Indigenous organisations, including Aboriginal Land Councils

**33.** To the best of your knowledge, in which areas of law or practice in the 2022 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: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Agreements with / Tenders to Government for pro bono clients – Total: 0 firms.
- Animal Law – Total: 3 firms — Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Banking / Finance – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Bankruptcy – Total: 0 firms.
- Commercial Agreements (e.g. leases) – Total: 3 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Construction Law – Total: 1 firm — Group A: 1 firm.
- Consumer Law — Total: 0 firms.
- Coronial Inquiries – Total: 2 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm.
- Corporate Law (including incorporations) – Total: 3 firms - Group C: 3 firms.
- Criminal Law – Total: 11 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Charity and Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) Status Applications – Total: 1 firm —Group C: 1 firm.
- Debt – Total: 2 firms - Group C: 2 firms.
- Discrimination – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Employment law – Total: 8 firms — Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 4 firms.
- Environmental Law and Climate Justice – Total: 1 firm— Group C: 1 firm.
- Family Law (not including Family Violence) – Total: 13 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Family Violence/Domestic Violence – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Fines – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Governance – Total: 0 firms.
- Housing / Tenancy – Total: 7 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Human Rights – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Immigration – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Insurance – Total: 4 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Intellectual Property – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Personal Injury – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Privacy / Freedom of Information – Total: 0 firms.

- Powers of Attorney / Guardianship – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Professional Negligence – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Royal Commissions – Total: 0 firms.
- Social Security – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 2 firms.
- Superannuation – Total: 0 firms.
- Tax (other than DGR) – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Town Planning / Local Government – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 2 firms.
- Trusts – Total: 1 firm — Group A: 1 firm.
- Victims Compensation – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Wills / Probate / Estate – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Other, please specify – Total: 7 firms. (*see responses below*)

<b>Group B</b>	Unknown—we do not record this data
	Litigation & Dispute Resolution**
<b>Group C</b>	No work rejected
	Very little is rejected
	Unable to provide this information
	Not possible to provide an accurate answer
	Litigation**

**\*\*Note:** *In the Centre’s view, these responses do not constitute areas of law and practice. Therefore, they were not included in this Report.*

- 34.** To the best of your knowledge, in which areas of law or practice in the 2022 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: 2 firms - Group B: 2 firms.
- Agreements with / Tenders to Government for pro bono clients – Total 6 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Animal Law – Total: 3 firms — Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Banking / Finance – Total: 4 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms.
- Bankruptcy – Total: 0 firms.
- Commercial Agreements (e.g. leases) – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Construction Law – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Consumer Law—Total: 0 firms.
- Coronial Inquiries – Total: 2 firms — Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Corporate Law (including incorporations) – Total: 6 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Criminal Law – Total: 4 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Charity and Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) Status Applications – Total: 10 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Debt – Total: 2 firms - Group C: 2 firms.
- Discrimination – Total: 1 firm - Group A: 1 firm.
- Employment law – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 4 firms Group C: 1 firm.
- Environmental Law and Climate Justice – Total: 2 firms — Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.

- Family Law (not including Family Violence) – Total: 6 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Family Violence/Domestic Violence – Total: 2 firms — Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Fines – Total: 0 firms.
- Governance – Total: 7 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms.
- Housing / Tenancy – Total: 2 firms — Group A: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Human Rights – Total: 0 firms.
- Immigration – Total: 0 firms.
- Insurance – Total: 6 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- Intellectual Property – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Personal Injury – Total: 0 firms.
- Privacy / Freedom of Information – Total: 1 firm — Group C: 1 firm.
- Powers of Attorney / Guardianship – Total: 1 firm — Group A: 1 firm.
- Professional Negligence – Total: 1 firm - Group B: 1 firm.
- Royal Commissions – Total: 0 firms.
- Social Security – Total: 2 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Superannuation – Total: 0 firms.
- Tax (other than DGR) – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Town Planning / Local Government – Total: 0 firms.
- Trusts – Total: 2 firms — Group C: 2 firms.
- Victims Compensation – Total: 1 firm - Group C: 1 firm.
- Wills / Probate / Estate – Total: 3 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Other, please specify – Total: 10 firms. (*see responses below*)

<b>Group A</b>	Defamation
<b>Group B</b>	We do not receive many requests from organisations
	Unknown - we do not record this data
	Rejections are based on requests not meeting requirements for a pro bono matter. Areas of law not recorded.
<b>Group C</b>	No work rejected
	We did not reject any
	Very little is rejected
	Unable to provide this information
	Not possible to provide an accurate answer
	Litigation**

**\*\*Note:** *In the Centre’s view, this response does not constitute areas of law and practice. Therefore, it was not included in this Report.*

**35.** Did your firm provide any pro bono legal services for social enterprises in the 2022 FY?

- No – Total: 33 firms – Group A: 3, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 18 firms.
- Yes – Total: 14 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 5 firms.

Yes. How many hours of pro bono legal services did your firm provide to social enterprises in the 2022 FY?

<b>Group A</b>	0.0**
	0.0**
	Unknown**
	14
	10,000
	6,365.8
	600
<b>Group B</b>	215
	3,844
<b>Group C</b>	35
	176
	1176
	100
	392.2

*\*\*These responses were disregarded for the purposes of data analysis.*

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

**36.** Did your firm set an overall target for its pro bono legal work in the 2022 FY?

- YES** - it represented a **maximum** or **capped** number of **hours** or **hours per lawyer** to be provided in the year
  - Total: 4 firms - Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- YES\*\*** - it represented a **minimum** number of **hours** or **hours per lawyer** to be provided in the year
  - Total: 24 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- YES** - it represented a **set number** of **hours** or **hours per lawyer** that the firm aimed to provide in the year
  - Total: 8 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- NO**
  - Total: 9 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 5 firms.
- OTHER** (please specify):
  - Total: 2 firms. (*see responses below*)

<b>Group B</b>	Target was to exceed the previous FY by as much as practical.
<b>Group C</b>	Yes, but unsure as to the target set.***

**\*\*Note 1:** One firm entered “National Pro Bono Target” under “other”. For the purposes of data analysis, this response was treated as a target that represented a “**minimum** number of **hours** or **hours per lawyer**”.

**\*\*\*Note 2:** This was not counted as a response for the purpose of data analysis.

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

- Larger – Total: 17 firms, Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- Same – Total: 20 firms: Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 1 firm — Group C: 1 firm.

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

<b>Group A</b>	40
	50
	35
	35
	52
	35
	35
<b>Group B</b>	50
	35
	35
	35
	35
	50
	35
	40
	50
	50
	38
	35
	<b>Group C</b>
25	
20	
20	
30/35 Hours pro bono legal work per lawyer	
35	
35	
35	
35	
35	
38	
30 – 34	



	35
	20
	50
	35

39. 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?

<b>Group C</b>	400
----------------	-----

40. Did your firm set an annual operational budget for its pro bono program in the 2022 FY?

- Yes - Total: 28 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
- No - Total: 19 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 14 firms

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

- Larger – Total: 18 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Smaller – Total: 1 firm – Group B: 1 firm.
- Same – Total: 6 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Don't know – Total: 3 firms: Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 1 firm.

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

42. 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: 3 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 15 firms
- Yes, billable hour targets only – Total: 20 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- No – Total: 1 firm – Group C: 1 firm.

43. 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: 22 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 10 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: 5 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- 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: 2 firms, Group C: 3 firms.

- Pro bono hours are treated as **non-billable hours** but are recorded as a **special non-billable** (e.g. pro bono) category (and have a lower or negligible value for the purposes of financial targets, if applicable) – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 2 firm, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Pro bono hours are treated as **non-billable hours** and are **not** recorded as a special non-billable category (and have a lower or negligible value for the purposes of financial targets, if applicable) – Total: 0 firms.
- Pro bono hours are not recorded at all – Total: 0 firms.
- Other (please specify): Total – 3 firms. (*see responses below*)

<b>Group B</b>	it varies from practice to practice, generally pro bono hours are billable but do not count for financial targets but where a lawyer or practice is undertaking a significant amount of pro bono hours this may differ. Re the answer to [44] below - it is consistent in that it is generally the same for each practice group.
	Pro bono hours are counted towards billable hours for utilisation purposes but do not form part of the financial budgets. Pro bono budget or target is separate to financial budget.
<b>Group C</b>	Pro bono hours are recorded with certain arrangements in place on a team by team basis.

**44.** 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: 41 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 14 firms, Group C: 17 firms.
- No – Total: 0 firms.
- Not applicable Total: 5 firms – Group C: 5 firms.

**45.** 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: 39 firms - Group, A: 10 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 17 firms.
- When considering promotion or advancement – Total: 26 firms - Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- When calculating bonuses – Total: 23 firms - Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 10 firms.
- In salary reviews – Total: 19 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Internal awards, events and communication – Total: 36 firms - Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 17 firms.
- None of the above – Total: 2 firms – Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 1 firm.
- Other, please specify: Total – 1 firm. (*see response below*)

<b>Group C</b>	Recognition in several areas to varying degrees
----------------	---

**Section 8 – Secondments**

**46.** Did your firm provide any pro bono secondments in 2022 FY?

- Yes – Total: 26 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- No – Total: 21 firms – Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 16 firms.

**47.** If yes, how many pro bono secondments did your firm provide in the 2022 FY?

Group A	18
	9
	19
	28
	6
	100
	26
	3
	7
	3
Group B	1
	9
	2
	7
	5
	12
	4
	32
	6
Group C	2
	1
	2
	3
	1
	8
	1

**48.** Are there any other noticeable trends in the form, duration and number of secondments provided by your firm since the last Survey, in July 2020?

Group A	An extra longer-term secondment
	No
	No - but we note that this number of secondments reflects the number of people who went on secondment and includes 12 rotating solicitors in our [City] office where each undertook a 2-week secondment to [community legal centre]. We seconded a lawyer to [legal service] which was not available in 2020. There was one secondment opportunity that we were not able to fill early in FY22, however, we were able to

	provide an additional secondee to a different organisation in response to an urgent request later in FY22.
	No
	There has been an increase in part-time secondment arrangements
	An increase
	More secondments overall, more commonly part-time and for a shorter duration. More remote secondments. Please note - in our response to the previous question, 26 is overall number of secondments. Given the duration and FTE, we have also calculated that this equated to 5.75 FTE over the 2022 FY.
	We have ceased all full-time, long-term pb secondments
	Reduced number of secondments
	No
Group B	Increase
	No
	Noticeable change in capacity within the firm to provide pro bono secondments as a result of COVID-19 – The teams that would often offer secondments have had less capacity - More juniors filling secondment roles.
	An overall increase in the number of secondments and the hours provided.
	Human rights focused secondments working on cases or building capacity for client assistance which were mostly performed virtually. Also policy based support within a community legal centre where funding did not cover the position.
	More project based secondments to avoid conflicts
	Secondment opportunities have grown since 2020 in terms of duration and they have also 'rolled over' to different practitioners more successfully
	No
Group C	We had a rolling secondment which has ended. We are looking to redeploy this resource to better align with our overall strategy.
	Yes - more organised and partner led/encouraged
	We are too young yet
	No
	One additional secondment since 2020

## Section 9 – Disbursements

**49.** Did your firm pay for any external disbursements in pro bono matters in the 2022 FY?

- Yes – Total: 33 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 14 firms.
- No— Total: 14 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 9 firms.

**50.** If yes, please nominate **up to three** categories where your firm incurred the most costs.

- Medical reports and appearance fees – Total: 7 firms - Group, A: 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
- Other expert witness reports and appearance fees – Total: 0 firms.
- Filing fees – Total: 23 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- Interpreters' fees – Total: 17 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.

- Travel and accommodation – Total: 9 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms.
- Search costs – Total: 21 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 10 firm.
- Barristers’ fees (advice or representation) – Total: 0 firms.
- Transcripts – Total: 4 firms - Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 2 firms - Group C: 2 firms.
- Other, please specify – Total: 1 firm.

<b>Group C</b>	Expert witness reports
----------------	------------------------

**Note:** Three responses entered by firms under “other” were allocated to standard categories by the Centre in the course of data analysis as follows: “FOI, Birth certificate application fees” → Search costs; “Subpoena fees” → Filing fees; “Interpreters’ fees” → Interpreters’ Fees.

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

- Yes – Total: 7 firms – Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- No – Total: 33 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 15 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 7 firms – Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 5 firms.

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

<b>Group B</b>	Prefer not to say
	NSW Law Society
	Justice Connect Domestic Building Legal Service Disbursement Fund, NSW Law Society Pro Bono Disbursement Trust Fund. We have also applied for court fee waivers for our pro bono clients but were not sure if this would be relevant here.
	Law Aid and Law Society of NSW Pro Bono Disbursement Scheme
<b>Group C</b>	NSW Law Society Pro Bono Disbursement Trust Fund
	Law Society of NSW Pro Bono Disbursement Trust Fund and Justice Connect Disbursement Fund
	LawRight/ Law Access WA

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

<b>Group A</b>	Schemes do not cover the nature of disbursements we covered
	No
	Too fiddly
	No need
	[Firm] maintains a disbursements budget for pro bono matters. Disbursements incurred to date are unlikely to meet the requirements of disbursement assistance schemes.
	We never think about it in time
<b>Group B</b>	We have not needed to either as clients have been paying or we have covered the amounts
	No need
	Haven't incurred disbursements on files we have worked on

	no
	We allocate some of our budget to covering such costs / disbursements.
<b>Group C</b>	The firm has agreed to pay disbursements
	Not aware a disbursement assistance scheme was in place.
	Not aware of assistance
	As a firm we believe in wearing disbursements as much as we can
	Our firm has chosen to incur the cost itself.
	The Firm does not pay a large amount of disbursements and where it foresees that it may (such as in Criminal Injury Compensation claims), it will seek to recover such disbursements upon (and subject to) payment of an award.
	Not consistent with the pro bono work undertaken.
	No reason
	Usually the matter is urgent when it comes to us and we dont feel applying to the scheme is a good use of limited time.

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

**54.** Does your firm evaluate its pro bono program?

- Yes – Total: 33 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- No – Total: 14 firms – Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 12 firms.

**55.** 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: 8 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Evaluation Framework (such as an Impact Measurement Framework or other Evaluation Tools) – Total: 15 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Other, please specify – Total: 15 firms. (*see responses below*)

<b>Group A</b>	A suite of documents setting out our new strategy and that guide the delivery and management of our new strategy.
	[Firm’s] pro bono program is aligned with the firm’s strategic pillars and RAP. Outcomes are measured against internal objectives and in consultation with community partners to assess impact.
	Own internal evaluation.
	[Firm] has a leading social impact practice known as [Program]. We work in trusted partnerships with community-led organisations, emerging leaders and respected advocates to further strengthen communities through strategic legal, justice & advisory projects, holistic pathways programs and targeted grants. [Program] is guided by a new 5 year strategy titled [Title]. We recognise that how we work is as significant as the work itself. The development and commitment to genuine and trusted partnerships with community is the foundation of our work and is key to real

	change. Critically, we are guided in our work by our [internal Indigenous groups]. In doing so, we centre the authority and leadership of community. With the privilege of receiving this legitimacy and direction comes our commitment to accountability and action.
	Metrics, client feedback, case studies.
	Informal evaluation including metrics and qualitative data.
<b>Group B</b>	Ongoing informal internal reporting.
	We review our program to ensure that we are maximising our pro bono work to meet our target.
	Hours and outcomes.
	Quantitative metrics.
	General review.
	Basic measures around internal targets and outcomes.
	Monitoring the work that is undertaken and exploring new options.
<b>Group C</b>	Align with clients and the work they do in the space.
	Fit to purpose with a focus on impact.

56. Which of the following are you evaluating or measuring in connection with the desired external impact of your pro bono program?

*Please tick all that apply.*

- Quantity of pro bono work provided by the firm's lawyers (i.e. hours of pro bono work) – Total: 28 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 9 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: 22 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 6 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: 21 firms - Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 7 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: 16 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Alignment with UN Sustainable Development Goals – Total: 13 firms - Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Don't know: Total: 1 – Group C: 1 firm.
- Other (please specify) – Total: 1 firm. (*see response below*)

<b>Group B</b>	Consider new clients and areas of work we can support and also increase in staff satisfaction
----------------	---

**57.** 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) – Total: 28 firms - Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 10 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: 8 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Client feedback / surveys – Total: 16 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Feedback provided by third parties (such as pro bono referral schemes or organisations) – Total: 20 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Qualitative data (i.e. case studies, experience of pro bono clients, etc) – Total: 21 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Don't know – Total: 1 firm – Group C: 1 firm.
- Other (*please specify*) – Total: 2 firms. (*see responses below*)

<b>Group B</b>	Staff feedback**
<b>Group C</b>	Internal only at this point**

**\*\*Note:** *In the Centre's view, these responses do not constitute externally focused measuring.*

**58.** Which of the following are you evaluating or measuring in connection with the impact of your pro bono program on your own firm?

*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: 7 firms, Group B: 7 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Participation in pro bono across the firm (i.e. number of lawyers involved, participation across levels of seniority/office): – Total: 28 firms - Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 7 firms.
- Employee experience – Total: 24 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 9 firms.
- Employee recruitment – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Employee retention – Total: 6 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- Employee professional development skills – Total: 13 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Marketing opportunities for the firm – Total: 10 firms - Group A: 3 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Effect of pro bono work on commercial relationships – Total: 14 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Don't know – Total: 1 firm – Group C: 1 firm.
- Other (*please specify*) – Total: 1 firm. (*see response below*)

<b>Group C</b>	Pro bono forms part of the firms DNA. Not one outcome is sought.
----------------	--



**59.** What are you using to do this internally focused measuring?

*Please tick all that apply.*

- Quantitative data related to participation in the program (i.e. participation levels per office/location, participation rates across levels of seniority, percentage of firm’s lawyers that participate in the pro bono program etc) – Total: 26 firms - Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Staff surveys – Total: 16 firms - Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 6 firms.
- Interviews/focus groups with staff – Total: 11 firms - Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Incorporating questions into staff appraisals – Total: 8 firms - Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
- Asking questions when on-boarding new staff – Total: 5 firms - Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 2 firms - Group C: 2 firms.
- Other (please specify) – Total: 3 firms. (*see response below*)

<b>Group B</b>	Seeking ongoing feedback and conducting pro-bono co-ordinator discussions
	Discussions with staff undertaking pro bono work
<b>Group C</b>	No formal process...

**60.** Have you found any of these evaluation methods (whether externally or internally focused) particularly useful? If yes, in what way? If no, please explain why.

<b>Group A</b>	Yes - add enhances culture and communication across the firm, raises awareness of issues of disadvantage
	Staff surveys have been most useful as allow benchmark comparison year on year
	We consider these surveys to be a useful standardised measure of the practice that is best used in conjunction with more regular client partnership conversations.
	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>	Yes. Allows us to see how much pro bono work we are doing.
	Our evaluation is reasonably uncomplicated. I don't think there is any particular usefulness that I could point to beyond that which would already be known in the pro bono community.
	Yes, able to track level of engagement from employees and interest in programmes
	Yes, data is helpful for analysing the work, spread, impact and survey or feedback is important to understand impact from the client perspective or value of work from a lawyer's perspective. This helps to shape the strategic work we do and also the evaluation of the practice.
	Telling stories are always the most compelling way to feel we are making a difference
	As an example, we regularly meet with our secondees to gather qualitative feedback on their secondments so that we can make any necessary adjustments to the

	secondment to make the best use of their time and are able to offer the most value to the organisation.
	It can provide a gauge of the value of our work to both the client and to the lawyer undertaking the work
<b>Group C</b>	Quantitative data and staff surveys assist us to reevaluate our pro bono program and fine tune it to meet the business needs and people.
	Useful for internal promotion of pro bono program
	It assist in deciding on new projects and the ones that we choose to continue with.
	Yes all of them are if different ways. Combined they allow us to very accurately measure the many benefits associated with our firm's pro bono/PIL program
	Unsure as lead pro bono partner overseas but we are looking to expand and better organise our program

**61.** 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: 44 firms - Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 13 firms, Group C: 21 firms.
- Increased opportunities for the firm’s lawyers to undertake direct client work – Total: 36 firms - Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 15 firms.
- Improved public reputation of the firm – Total: 34 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 17 firms.
- Increased pride in the firm – Total: 42 firms - Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 11 firms, Group C: 21 firms.
- Increased ability to attract new staff to the firm – Total: 36 firms - Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 17 firms.
- Improved retention of existing staff – Total: 32 firms - Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 14 firms.
- Increased levels of staff satisfaction – Total: 38 firms - Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 19 firms.
- Improved relationships with clients through pro bono partnerships: – Total: 26 firms - Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 13 firms.
- Don’t know – Total: 1 firm— Group B: 1 firm.
- Other – please specify – Total: 1 firm. (*see response below*)

<b>Group C</b>	Variety of projects
----------------	---------------------

### Section 11 – International law firms

**62.** 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: 12 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 4 firms.

- No – Total: 35 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 10 firms, Group C: 19 firms.
- 63.** Do your Australian offices undertake more or fewer pro bono hours per lawyer (on average) than your firm’s overseas offices?
- More – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 4 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 1 firm.
  - Fewer – Total: 2 firms – Group C: 2 firms.
  - About the same – Total: 1 firm – Group B: 1 firm.
  - Don’t know – Total: 1 firm – Group C: 1 firm.

**Section 12 – Corporate and government clients**

- 64.** Did your firm work with the in-house legal team of a corporate or government client on a pro bono matter or project in the 2022 FY?
- Yes – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 2 firms.
  - No – Total: 32 firms – Group A: 3 firm, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 20 firms.
- 65.** If yes, what was the nature of these pro bono matter/s or project/s?

<b>Group A</b>	Multi-jurisdictional research projects on areas warranting law reform
	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.
	<i>[The firm]</i> contributed to the <i>[Federal government agency]</i> on the <i>[report]</i> . <i>[The firm’s]</i> Chief Community Officer has had numerous discussions with inhouse legal teams regarding development of RAPs and pro bono programs, including <i>[corporation]</i> and <i>[corporation]</i> .
	Legal research
	Predominantly legal education programs and short advisory pieces
	Refugee legal clinics.
	Joint attendance at a clinic with one client/collaboration to present training to a school with another client
<b>Group B</b>	Direct representation of clients in a clinic; teaching / capacity building programs
	Legal advice roster
	Publications summarising laws on various issues in various jurisdictions
<b>Group C</b>	Legal matters in which it was agreed between ourselves and our client that the aim of the work associated with the legal matters overall was geared towards improving civil society
	Research
	Legal clinics

- 66.** Has your firm attempted to ‘clear’ positional/commercial conflicts for potential pro bono matters with your government or corporate clients in the 2022 FY?
- Yes – Total: 23 firms - Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 8 firm, Group C: 6 firms.
  - No – Total: 23 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 16 firms.

Yes—If so, has this process been successful?

<b>Group A</b>	In most cases
	DHA for Refugee Clinics
	Yes, successful
	Yes
	It has been a successful process, and our government and commercial clients have taken an open-minded approach to pro bono related conflicts
	Yes - on most occasions. Clearance was refused by one commercial client in the 2022 FY.
	Yes, this has been successful
	Largely, yes
<b>Group B</b>	Yes - usually we are able to resolve this.
	Yes
	Yes
	We have tried with government clients and have been successful.
	Yes
	Yes, we have had success with this process. However, sometimes the urgent timeframes with some pro bono matters means we have not had sufficient time to clear conflicts.
	Yes but this was for general training on [a scheme] so not a specific matter.
	Yes
<b>Group C</b>	Yes
	Yes
	Don't know
	Yes - in all but one case (which was understandable), client was happy to provide clearance.
	Yes
	Yes
	Yes

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

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

Please tick all that apply.

- Commonwealth Government Legal Services Panel – Total: 30 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 11 firms.
- New South Wales Government Legal Panel – Total: 26 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- South Australia Government Legal Panel – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Victorian Government Legal Services Panel – Total: 21 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 3 firms.

- Queensland Whole-of-Government Legal Services Panel – Total: 21 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Western Australia Government Legal Services Panel – Total: 17 firms – Group A: 9 firms, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- None of the above – Total: 7 firms – Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 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.

**68. 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.
	Should be stronger than just a tick-a-box "are you a Target signatory?"
<b>Group C</b>	Government requests for proposals included a requirement for successful tenderers to be a Signatory to the National Pro Bono Aspirational Target as a condition of panel membership and required annual reporting against this Target.

**69. 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.
<b>Group B</b>	Very detailed
<b>Group C</b>	Government requests for proposals included a requirement for successful tenderers to be a Signatory to the National Pro Bono Aspirational Target as a condition of panel membership and required annual reporting against this Target.
	I found it odd that this year NSW asked us to calculate the pro bono average based on the number of lawyers in the firm at the end of the financial year, which produces a different average hours per lawyer than asking for the average of lawyers from the start and end of the financial year. I think this makes more sense (it's better to use the more recent number for forecasting whether we are on track in the year to come) but it is annoying that it leaves everyone reporting two different figures for basically the same metric.

**70. South Australia: No comments made.**

**71. 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.
	Victoria's conflict-clearance mechanism has fallen away for pro bono work. It needs to be reinstated and understood.
	Reporting is time intensive and onerous compared to other jurisdictions. An hours based approach aligned with the Australian Pro Bono Target would be preferred.

**72. 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.
<b>Group C</b>	The Queensland Government has good processes in place for reporting by panel law firms, including reporting on pro bono hours and achievements.

**73. 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.
	Thank goodness they have finally created a central government reporting mechanism.
<b>Group C</b>	Government requests for proposals included a requirement for successful tenderers to be a Signatory to the National Pro Bono Aspirational Target as a condition of panel membership and required annual reporting against this Target.
	The WA government pro bono model has been effective at creating focus and motivation to do pro bono at the firm and more broadly by legal sector in WA. It is also pleasing that the model has an emphasis on assisting individuals, not just organisations.

**74. In the 2022 FY, when tendering to be on a panel to do legal work for a corporation, were you asked to answer any questions relating to your pro bono legal work?**

- Yes – Total: 41 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 19 firms.
- No – Total: 5 firms – Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 4 firms.
- N/A – our firm did not seek out work this way – Total: 1 firm – Group B: 1 firm.

Yes. If you have any comments on the nature of these questions, relating to your pro bono legal work, please enter them below.

<b>Group A</b>	Hours worked, who our main client groups are and in some cases we are specifically asked about pro bono (eg. State Government, Commonwealth Govt panels) and in other cases we are asked about our community impact and we mention pro bono work in this context.
	We have noticed an increase in the questions re our pro bono programme and about potential opportunities for law firm in house collaborations on pro bono projects.
	The quality of questions varies considerably.
	Several clients and potential clients expressed a desire to understand our approach to pro bono activities. On a number of occasions we were also asked whether we are a signatory to the National Pro Bono Target.
<b>Group B</b>	Demonstrating alignment with client's ESG goals.
	Questions asked include: Does your firm undertake pro bono work? Please describe the impact that your firm's pro bono work has had on your clients. Give examples of past pro bono work undertaken by the lawyers who have been nominated to be involved in this tender, within the last 2 years. Did your firm meet/exceed its Pro Bono target for the last FY?

	Questions direct firms to focus on government procurement strategy irrespective of expertise in that area and potential negative impacts of firms engaging outside their areas of expertise or understanding of a client base. We also see lots of questions form an ESG framework.
	General questions about social benefit programs, often specific to the area in which the corporation is based.
<b>Group C</b>	Projects, number of hours per lawyer, number of hours per partner
	Modern Slavery work
	In our experience almost all corporate client tenders include such questions
	During FY22, we responded to a small number of RFPs (less than 6) where we were asked to provide information on our pro bono work. These RFPs were issued by both private organisations as well as government departments and bodies. A typical example of this is to contain the following as a response criteria: "Outline opportunities to partner with [client] on pro bono / social impact initiatives".
	The questions mostly related to the nature of pro bono and broader community work.
	The types of questions are becoming more uniform which we are sure is partly due to the efforts of the Australian Pro Bono Centre. It becomes easier to prepare and respond to tenders when questions around pro bono and other initiatives are standardised to some degree.
	hours of work, signatory to national target
	I notice that the questions are getting more targeted in depth every year. I think this is a fantastic trend, and its good to see corporations exercising their buying power in this way.

#### Section 14 –The National Pro Bono Target

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

- Yes – Total: 46 firms – Group A: 10 firms, Group B: 14 firms, Group C: 22 firms.
- No – Total: 1 firm – Group C: 1 firm.

If no, please specify why not.

<b>Group C</b>	The National Pro Bono Target is on our agenda to consider, however has not yet been addressed.
----------------	--

#### 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 tick **three factors**.

<b>Group A</b>		
<b>First factor</b>	<b>Second factor</b>	<b>Third factor</b>

A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Strong and deep relationships with community partners	Strong Pro Bono leader ( <i>entered under "other"</i> )
A dedicated pro bono leader	A pro bono policy and strategic plan	Setting a firm-wide pro bono target and budget
A dedicated pro bono leader	Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A pro bono policy and strategic plan	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training	A pro bono policy and strategic plan
A dedicated pro bono leader	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm	Strong and deep relationships with community partners

<b>Group B</b>		
<b>First factor</b>	<b>Second factor</b>	<b>Third factor</b>
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm



A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A pro bono policy and strategic plan	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A pro bono policy and strategic plan	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training
Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	A pro bono policy and strategic plan

<b>Group C</b>		
<b>First factor</b>	<b>Second factor</b>	<b>Third factor</b>
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Setting a firm-wide pro bono target and budget
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Strong and deep relationships with community partners

A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	A pro bono policy and strategic plan	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A dedicated pro bono leader	Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training
Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm	Setting a firm-wide pro bono target and budget
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Setting a firm-wide pro bono target and budget
Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	Setting a firm-wide pro bono target and budget	Strong and deep relationships with community partners
Broad engagement of staff and appropriate training	Strong and deep relationships with community partners	Committee reporting back to practice areas ( <i>entered under "other"</i> )
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	A pro bono policy and strategic plan
Broad awareness of the pro bono program within the firm	Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work	Setting a firm-wide pro bono target and budget
A dedicated pro bono leader	Strong and deep relationships with community partners	A strategic risk management plan including accurate record keeping and a regular evaluation process
A dedicated pro bono leader	Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work	Strong and deep relationships with community partners

A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A dedicated pro bono leader	Adequate crediting and recognition of pro bono legal work within the firm
A strong social justice and pro bono culture supported by management	A pro bono policy and strategic plan	Performance of pro bono legal work to the same standard as commercial work

**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: 3 firms, Group C: 3 firms.
- Lack of management or partner support within the firm – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 3 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Concern about conflict of interest with fee paying clients – Total: 15 firms – Group A: 6 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Pro bono hours do not count as billable hours or for financial targets – Total: 10 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 4 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Firm capacity – Total: 40 firms – Group A: 7 firms, Group B: 12 firms, Group C: 21 firms.
- External economic climate – Total: 8 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 4 firms.
- Insufficient expertise in relevant areas of the law – Total: 14 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 8 firms.
- Ability to fund external disbursements – Total: 7 firms – Group B: 2 firms, Group C: 5 firms.
- Significant structural changes within the firm – Total: 3 firms – Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 2 firms.
- Already doing enough pro bono – Total: 1 firm – Group C: 1 firm.
- Too much work to build the pro bono program – Total: 5 firms – Group A: 1 firm, Group B: 1 firm, Group C: 3 firms.
- Other, please specify (you can nominate more than one challenge here): Total: 15 firms. (see responses below)

<b>Group A</b>	The Covid-19 pandemic e.g, because of impacts on Court lists and reduced opportunities for in-person engagement with pro bono clients.
	<i>... We have none of these challenges.</i>
	Challenges sourcing strategic pro bono projects
	<i>The main challenge is lack of capacity - no other challenges</i>
<b>Group B</b>	Lack of engagement opportunities due to low office attendance after covid and some practices disengaging with work after working from home for two years.
	Not enough dedicated pro bono resources
	Any pro bono work we undertake has to be done subject to <i>[legislative constraints specific to firm]</i>
<b>Group C</b>	Resourcing and firm size is a challenge to be able to achieve the desired pro bono target.
	Nil to specify...

	Continuing to give opportunities to the large cohort of junior lawyers who have joined the firm during and immediately following covid
	Size of firm and target expectations being so high
	Attitude
	Building appropriate recognition for lawyers undertaking pro bono and establishing more expansive KPIs; managing embedded processes and structures that affect pro bono
	Resourcing our pro bono team
	N/A

**78.** Is your firm delivering pro bono legal assistance in any new or innovative ways since the last Survey, in July 2020, 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>	Estate planning documentation using [document automation program] and continue consistent outreach attending remote communities that we now also do in [three Australian states]
	[Firm] has increased its use of technology as provided by our pro bono partners, including the Justice Connect Portal. We are also investing in the innovation work of [legal service], through a secondment of a senior legal operations professional.
	We have set up secondments quickly in response to our clients' needs eg, [community legal centre]. We have formed more cross-office teams to work together on pro bono projects virtually, e.g., [collaborative campaign project].
	Yes - We have been working with our legal practice management team to implement innovative case management solutions
	We are continuing work on an online legal help platform.
<b>Group B</b>	Aside from offering more remote, flexible secondment options, no.
	We use online service delivery, data analytics, provide technology advice and know how to clients to help build their capacity and can build tech solutions for clients. We are able to be in contact with a broad variety of clients working [online] who we had not been able to work with.
	[Firm] is taking part in the virtual secondment arrangement with [community legal centre] to assist with [area of law] services.
<b>Group C</b>	Yes - utilising data analytics to demonstrate patterns and trends across various legal issues.
	[R]estructure of the program and employee incentives for participation

**79.** Was your firm's pro bono program impacted, positively or negatively, by the COVID-19 pandemic in the 2022 FY?

- No – Total: 20 firms – Group A: 2 firms, Group B: 6 firms, Group C: 12 firms.
- Yes – Total: 27 firms – Group A: 8 firms, Group B: 8 firms, Group C: 11 firms.

Yes. If so, how?

<b>Group A</b>	Utilising the Zoom video conferencing platform during the pandemic assisted in reaching some clients more efficiently but it was not helpful for others and they were further isolated.
	COVID restrictions have limited our ability to run a number of clinics and in-person projects. There has been a greater impact on pro bono work for individuals than for organisations. As a positive, we have seen a significant increase in overall referrals.
	Due to increased capacity of fee earners, fee earners filled their time with undertaking more pro bono work.
	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 the needs of our clients (rather than proactive).
	A range of factors including access and engagement with key stakeholders.
	Challenges with face-to-face events and meetings.
	There was an initial increase in pro bono participation during the COVID-19 pandemic with an increase in firm capacity. This has changed over the last year as the firm is much busier and capacity is more of a challenge.
	If anything, it made us even more aware of the value of pro bono work to the community.
<b>Group B</b>	Lesser availability of staff meant overall pro bono hours were slightly reduced.
	Lower engagement from staff in opportunities (negative). Our ability to work with clients more closely and directly during COVID (positive). More organisational clients seeking help with workplace/covid advice (positive). Broader engagement across firm for clinics and cross office collaboration as it did not matter where we were working from online. This extend the variety of opportunities in smaller offices. (positive)
	We took on more Covid-19 related projects and some existing projects had to change to online advice.
	[Firm] continued to run secondments and matters virtually so the firm's pro bono work continued to grow with the added flexibility.
	Negatively impacted as lawyers could no longer attend in-person, legal centre rosters we not operating and volunteering was limited to Teams/On-line meetings.
	We have been unable to hold our First Nations Wills Clinics for the last couple of years. We are planning to relaunch the program in September of this year.
	[N]ot undertaking some of our traditional secondments which required face to face interaction.
<b>Group C</b>	Negatively, legal clinics shut.
	Positively as a pro bono opportunity arose out of the impact of Covid. Negatively as pro bono activity was not a focus during Covid, however did still reach our pro bono target.
	It reduced our team's ability to participate in community legal clinics.
	Our clinics had to swap to being remote, and many of them have remained that way. In some ways that is good because senior lawyers in particular find it more accessible to participate now. But I think our junior lawyers are missing out on the experience

	of being onsite at a CLC and learning from the environment. We're trying to get a balance between the two.
	Pro Bono hours affected by staff covid related illness.
	Firm capacity, external economic climate are a couple of factors that were negative impacts.
	Cancellation of in person legal clinics.
	Easier for staff to volunteer at clinics remotely.
	[T]he disconnections and relative isolation associated with covid led to general fatigue and strain across the firm in the first half of FY21 and so the typical high energy levels of our firm's lawyers waned slightly in that period.
	[T]he ability to deliver the services on site.
	We only started it 6 months ago, I can't answer this.

80. As at the end of the 2022 FY, roughly what percentage of your firm's pro bono legal work was being undertaken remotely (that is, **not** face-to-face)? Please provide an estimate if you do not have an exact figure.

<b>Group A</b>	40
	75
	Unknown
	90
	40
	70
	75
	98
	90
	95
<b>Group B</b>	45
	95
	70
	70
	80
	50
	100
	12
	50
	95
	20
	70
	30
80	
<b>Group C</b>	85
	20
	100

90
91
90
5
85
80
50
50
51
80
50
85
50
75
90
37
70
85
15

**81.** To what extent do you expect this will continue in the 2023 FY?

- I expect **more** of our firm's pro bono work will be undertaken remotely – Total: 0 firms.
- I expect it will be **about the same** as it was at the end of the 2022 FY – Total: 35 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 9 firms, Group C: 21 firms.
- I expect **less** of our firm's pro bono work will be undertaken remotely – Total: 12 firms – Group A: 5 firms, Group B: 5 firms, Group C: 2 firms.