

# AUGMENTED LEGAL SERVICES: ENHANCING THE PROVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES BY USE OF LEGALTECH

DANIEL BERESFORD

AND

JENS H KREBS

Portsmouth Law School, University of Portsmouth

---

## **Abstract**

This article considers the opportunities of LegalTech in law firms. It assesses the long-term benefits of a commoditization of legal services and the progress that the industry has made in achieving this. It will become clear that the sector is still operating traditionally, mostly ignoring technological advancements. Thus, there ought to be an analysis of what is holding back the sector and individual firms. The focal points of this analysis will be connected systems, LegalTech providers and the risks of stasis. Finally, heed will be paid to the potential incentives which might assist in the greater adoption of LegalTech.

**Keywords:** LegalTech; law in practice; access to justice; legal services; augmentation.

---

## [A] INTRODUCTION

Technology has impacted the evolution of businesses for over 30 years. In particular, the omnipresence of the internet and the resulting constant access to social media, shopping apps and online/mobile banking have allowed markets to grow rapidly (Embley & Ors 2020: 575). In contrast, the legal sector has been on fairly steady ground with little incentive or desire to evolve. In the last decade, however, law firms have experienced a great acceleration towards modernization. Thus, many academic writers debate the likelihood of machines replacing the traditional lawyer (Susskind 2008; Pasquale & Cashwell, 2015; Pasquale 2019), often concluding that, while complementation of lawyers, at least in the foreseeable future, is realistic, and has already begun (Pasquale & Cashwell, 2015: 47), a total replacement of human lawyers is currently unlikely (cf Susskind 2017: 188). It does not require yet another piece to reinforce what most writers have already established. Instead, this article

aims to evaluate how far the move towards technology complementation has come. However, the effect of technology in law should not be viewed solely as a means of making a lawyer's work easier, lighter or more profitable; 'augmented lawyering', in the words of Armour (Armour & Ors 2020), considers changes to the legal profession by use of technology and the positive, and possibly negative, effects this may have on those who seek legal advice.

Historically, lawyers would make use of basic information technology that was at their disposal. With the 1990s came the broader availability of personal computers, and law firms, like other businesses, upgraded from electronic typewriters to more integrated computing solutions, including large file storage, word processors for document drafting, and email to ease communications, on a single device. Computers made legal work far more efficient and, thus, cheaper, so that early adopters of computers could easily out-perform their competition. In 2020, reliance on computers, email, chatbots, and online chats, to name but a few, has become the baseline for the acquisition of a steady stream of clients. In areas where the acquisition of clientele is not an issue, the most limiting factor to greater success is often a lawyer's finite amount of time. A large proportion of a lawyer's day is typically taken up by law-adjacent tasks—ie those tasks without which the actual 'lawyering' cannot take place. As such, much of the time is spent on requesting information from clients, checking on progress within the legal team, drafting, wording and checking the accuracy of the information and personal details in documents and scheduling meetings. All of these have to be arranged in such a way that advice is given to clients within the agreed timeframe. 'Augmentation' aims at optimizing those tasks to free up competency. Already in 2003, Susskind predicted a shift from fully bespoke services to commoditization (Susskind 2003: 111). Within the last two decades, we have come a long way towards Susskind's vision; yet, what we see today is still generally considered 'legal services' rather than legal products. We, therefore, want to assess what the current obstacles to commoditization are and how they could be overcome.

## [B] CHANGING SYSTEMS

Many practitioners will be aware of machine-learning solutions, blockchain technology and smart contracting, but adoption of these technologies in the legal profession is still staggeringly low (Law Society 2019: fig 7). As it stands, there has not been a sufficient incentive for law firms that outweighs the concerns and risks of adopting technology that requires 'trust' without fully understanding its workings. But because a law firm

is a fee-earning business, its need for clientele might lower some firms' aversion to risk in the off-chance of gaining an early advantage over their competitors. Due to the availability of the internet and other technologies, today, clients are in a better position to 'shop' for a law firm and maybe even the lawyer of their choice (Solicitors Regulation Authority 2019). The resulting change has reshaped the legal service industry more into a marketplace, which has led to a conceptual change in the sector by which many firms would now consider their 'clients' to be 'customers' (*The Forte Edge* 2021). Acquisition of 'customers', as opposed to 'clients', necessitates a new, or at least different, business strategy (Law Society 2019: 16-19) with greater visibility through marketing and competing on price and quality being the most obvious changes to be implemented (Susskind 2017: 60). Consequently, a firm must find a way of lowering costs and enhancing quality without squeezing its profit margin unduly, in the same way that players in more traditional markets would.

To put themselves ahead, savvy firms have implemented case management systems early on, streamlining their overall workflow and organization. On an economic level, the use of case management systems has also furthered a shift from the traditional law firm to a more managed archetype (see Pinnington & Morris 2003: 86), with client satisfaction at its heart (Rogers & Ors 2021: 135). Lawyers can rely on legal software to organize their cases, build courtroom presentations, and manage the economic side of their law firm (LexisNexis 2021). These efforts of streamlining certainly improve how lawyers provide services internally, but much of this does not reach the client or yield an immediate benefit to them, which would affect their choice. Additionally, none of these changes will fundamentally alter the kinds of tasks that lawyers undertake. These economic savings may lead to increased earnings for the firm or maybe more affordable services for clients, but the greatest of benefits—ie 'freed expertise' for lawyers to pay greater heed to the core tasks of lawyers—remains unobtained. Greater improvements come from 'intelligent' software that completes monotonous tasks with great precision.

There are already various examples of intelligent services and augmented lawyering and their benefits. Tens of millions of online disputes are resolved every year without engaging lawyers (Civil Justice Council Advisory Group 2015; Perriam 2021). Large online marketplace platforms, like Amazon and eBay, typically provide a free service to resolve disputes over transactions made on their platforms. The initial steps of their dispute resolution process are typically automated, and common issues such as refunds or non-delivery are usually resolved without the need for any human intervention. More complex matters are considered

by employees of the platform company (Civil Justice Council Advisory Group 2015: para 4.2). While these services seem to contradict some of the above sentiments, in that technology might divert some legal traffic away from lawyers, two aspects must be borne in mind: firstly, the development of alternative dispute resolution, generally, and the European Union's Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) platform were introduced to 'contribute to the attainment of a high level of consumer protection' (ODR Regulation 2013, rec 1). Ease of access via an online portal is seen as a cheap, non-bureaucratic and necessary step to allow consumers to self-enforce their rights, particularly for purchases of minimal value (under £50). The reason for this leads to the second point, namely, the assumption that disputes of minimal value are diverted away from lawyers hinges on the fact that consumers would otherwise seek legal services, but for the availability of ODR. However, the amount of time and money a consumer would have to spend to enforce their rights in court exceeds the value of the item by far and, as such, these disputes would simply never be raised (ODR Regulation 2013, rec 7).

Even though online dispute resolution does not assist lawyers, *per se*, it is a prime example of how software can be used to provide or enhance knowledge about a legal subject and, from a lawyer's view, externalize it as a marketable product to customers.

Taking this one step further, the same technology (artificial intelligence (AI)) is revolutionizing legal analytics. LexisNexis' AI, *LexMachina* (*LexMachina* nd), is capable of analysing US cases to predict results in patent litigation more accurately than legal experts in this area (Susskind & Susskind 2017: 69). Practitioners, and those aspiring to be legal professionals, will certainly have to rely upon legal databases such as LexisNexis or Westlaw and their advanced search algorithms to conduct efficient research (Haggerty 2018). Yet, the ability to offer AI predictions of that nature to customers is a valuable product, saving customers time and money, while reducing the amount of 'manual' research required by lawyers.

Although these examples show an indicative shift in the use of LegalTech solutions, there does not seem to be an industry-wide (normed) move towards it (Tromans 2021). This is despite Susskind paving the way by explaining, in general terms, a route to a technology-integrated future (Susskind & Susskind 2017: 195-202). In the following, we will therefore go through these steps and outline where the industry at large is situated, and we will consider the steps to be taken to move ahead.

## [C] TOWARDS COMMODITIZATION

A higher level of technology integration in law firms would allow for greater optimization of processes through automation. Currently, the optimal way of exploiting LegalTech is by way of commoditizing legal services. Achieving this is a transformative journey whereby a law firm evolves its services from bespoke advice to standardized, automated and eventually commoditized advice products (Susskind & Susskind 2017: 196). ‘Externalization’ is only the final step in developing a law firm that has packaged its services into defined, yet flexible, products. However, before this level of integration can be reached, a law firm must successfully traverse ‘standardization’ and ‘systematization’.

While this sounds like a long and tedious process, the legal profession, as a whole, has come quite far in this process. Standardization of contracts and processes, for instance, has been in existence for a long time: for example for the disposition of land, sales contracts or wills. Most of these documents exist as template documents, condensed to their essentials and, while in each instance, these documents will need to be ‘completed’ by adding personal data, or amending optional or conditional clauses, much of the document does not require more than a final look to check its accuracy and applicability to the client. The standardization of contracts, for instance, usually pursues at least one of four possible goals: reduction in negotiations, definition of the parties’ relationship, allocation of risk and definition of the non-bespoke products (Baffi 2007: 2). Legal consequences aside, much of this is intended to save time and lower costs. However, because a law firm typically offers a greater variety of services, not all of the common benefits of standard-term contracting apply. For example, the standard contracts that a seller of goods uses are designed to define the transaction between them and the buyer. In contrast, documents drafted by a lawyer are intended for their client and not for the relationship between them and the client. Thus, these documents show more variation between clients than would be common for sellers of goods in transactions with different buyers. However, this does not mean that it is impossible to design templates. A sophisticated template document requires experience with the common variations that clients often need. Consequently, a template can be created that contains core provisions and optional blocks or provisions that can be added or removed depending on the client’s needs. Even though many templates used in law firms may not have reached the highest level of sophistication and, thus, do not utilize a lawyer’s time efficiently, their existence is sufficiently common to consider their systematization. One of the reasons why systematization might be desirable, even though not all

processes have been fully standardized, is that the implementation of a system may improve and complement standardization. A 'system' might provide additional data which, otherwise, may not have been available, or which would have been too cumbersome to procure without sufficient technological integration.

Automation is a major aspect of systematization. Due to the widened access to data, it can make working with templates much easier and quicker. Automation software will generate the desired document, including most of the content needed in the particular instance, based on definable conditions and triggers. As a result, there is no need for human intervention: for example, to add a start date or calculate the end date in contractual agreements, or automatically enter the client's personal data into a will, as it can be imported from the client database. Already, there are a variety of providers of 'automated document creation' solutions in the market. In essence, these programs allow lawyers to add 'coded' rules to their templates. Typically, these are formulated in a 'mark-up language' where instructions mimic spoken languages, like English (Thomson Reuters 2021: 28). This way, an instruction might take the following shape:

**If *Begin\_date* IsGreaterThan *End\_date* Then**

Alert ("Please check the dates.")

For people without a background in computing, this syntax is a much more accessible way of defining rules and, thus, significantly reduces the entry barrier. By defining these additional rules in a template, lawyers can work through it and, with only a few clicks, design a document that is ready for use. In a well-designed automated template, the system will already know what information is required and where to insert it in the document and prompt the user to input it as and when needed (Sumners 2021). The framework in which the document is created is narrowly controlled by the system, and it warns about information that does not match the required format (such as invalid email addresses or postcodes) and raises inconsistencies, like conflicting dates. This can reduce the margin of error to the point where the 'drafting' is fully completed by paralegals and trainees, and a solicitor or partner only carries out the final checks before releasing it. To reduce the duplication of data, the client's address and contact details might be automatically inserted from the firm's client database, or if not available, the template will feed the data into the database for future use.

However, the term 'automation' intuitively suggests efficiency and cost savings. As a result, some expertise, or at least some careful thought,



is required to capitalize on the benefits which these systems promise. The uninformed introduction of automation and the blind ‘automation’ of templates could easily result in the opposite. Before a law firm begins the actual work of automating, its processes and procedures require careful analysis, or an ‘automation audit’ (see *echo.legal* 2021). The full picture of how the law firm operates and when information, relevant to the template, becomes available will impact how the template is designed and what information is requested, at any given point in time. The effects of ‘over-automation’ typically appear where documents or templates are designed in a way that does not correspond with the firm’s workflow. As an example, the document might ask for completion dates for certain stages in a project or an inventory list that must be provided by the client. If the completion of the document requires some input, the frictionless flow is disrupted, and placeholders are put in place. These will need to be fixed at a later stage, but because the system is not aware of the temporary nature of the information, it will not prompt subsequent changes.

Furthermore, it is not uncommon that initial attempts rely on a totalitarian approach. In other words a little automation is good, more must be better. However, this is a fallacy. It can certainly be enjoyable to test new functions and add little gimmicks that bring a smile to the designer’s face every time they complete the document, but this does not mean that these would add any value in practice. For instance, it would be possible to set up a data table containing a list of all lawyers in the law firm. Upon completion, the template reads the list and presents it to the individual to indicate who has worked on the form. In many instances, this will not be necessary, and where it is required, it is probably best entered as plain text. Having to comply with this step for every mandate could result in slowing down the process or even driving lawyers away from using it altogether.

These optimizations will already enhance a law firm’s efficiency and make it more profitable. However, we recall one of the key drivers of LegalTech being a firm’s clients. Regardless of whether a firm’s clientele consists of commercial entities or individuals, externalized services are a core influencer (the same is also true for in-house lawyers) (Law Society 2019: 56).

## [D] COMMODITIZATION

At the time of writing, the implementation of automation systems is anything but commonplace. The legal profession is a traditional one, built upon history and precedents (Simon & Ors 2018: 257). With lawyers

reluctant to change, it is unsurprising that many firms are still using paper files. A smooth transition to a modern and connected law firm may not be possible until the stigma that latches on to technology is lifted. However, it would be naive to assume that this stigma is the sole reason for a slow and fragmented transition. Reaching Susskind's vision of commoditization is not only a matter of technology, but also one of structural and cultural shifts, which can only occur if the industry understands the purpose, and commercial opportunities, of 'commoditization' as a concept.

Susskind believes that technology is making a move from the back office to the front office in firms (Susskind & Susskind 2017). Today, however, technology must *become*, at least partially, the front office of the modern firm. The legal commodity, the product on offer, consists of information, knowledge and expertise in legal documents, many of which may not require any oversight. This implies that firms can offer greater access to their products to clients by using technology with only a marginal investment of time, money and effort. For example, existing legal products can use quantitative data, such as dates, prices and names, for software to generate tailored wills or contracts. Automation of this kind has already been explored above; 'commoditizing' would mean making this 'product' accessible to clients for a fixed price, using a website where clients can self-serve beyond conventional business hours. A carefully drafted form guides the client through the steps to completion and, in some cases, the complete document is immediately available for download. Of course, some legal documents will need to be finalized by a lawyer and their completion will remain pending until then. Refining a firm's processes to the point that legal services can be commoditized has two beneficial effects: firstly, it allows for the acquisition of work outside business hours, and a new work structure, whereby part of the day is dedicated to finalizing accrued document requests from clients; secondly, it creates a separate, passive source of income for the firm from purchases of fully automated documents, whose existence may only be revealed on the firm's bank statements.

Most large firms have recognized this opportunity and considered implementing technology as a high priority (Wolstenholme & Ors 2021), but reliance on sophisticated technology is often seen to be a risky expenditure. Thus, mostly well-funded city firms make the greatest use of advanced technologies (Embley & Ors 2020: 638). Small firms that harness these methods, too, can see a profound increase in efficiency, as staff utilization is maximized and room for error minimized.



## [E] CONNECTED SYSTEMS

We have already considered the use of case management software and the new business model (see Pinnington & Morris 2003; Rogers & Ors 2021) but have concluded that reliance on these systems alone will not significantly further ‘augmented lawyering’. One key inhibitor to the wider success of LegalTech might be the fragmented use of systems, not within the sector, but the law firm. Technologists have developed a plethora of tools available to firms, each with a particular role. For example, providers like *Clio* and *Needle* specialize in ‘practice management’. *Contract Express*, *Rocket Lawyer* and *Lawyaw* provide solutions for ‘document assembly and creation’. *OpenText* and *Everlaw* are specialists in ‘eDiscovery’, whilst *LexMachina*, *Colossus* and *Ravel* are revolutionizing ‘outcome prediction’ (Engstrom & Gelbach 2021: 1011, 1012). These tools are often referred to as ‘point solutions’ aimed at completing specific legal tasks (Dale 2018). Often, these technological tools are limited by their interfaces, like their connectivity to other internal or external tools/systems. Data isolation and the need to change between systems or software, depending on the task, are what hinder even the most tech-savvy firms from achieving higher efficiency. Furthermore, switching between tools can be frustrating, counterintuitive and, in any event, time-consuming. Likewise, a firm’s use of multiple platforms can make them more prone to security risks.

Issues arising from the use of multiple unconnected platforms are not new. Enterprises in other sectors have long recognized the opportunities and worked towards positive solutions. Over two decades, the successful integration of different systems has been achieved by the use of standardized data formats and communication protocols. Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) is a model of software deployment whereby a provider licenses an application to customers for use as a service on demand. SaaS software providers may host the application on their own servers or upload the application to the consumer device, disabling it after use or after the on-demand contract expires (Stanley & Briscoe 2010). Within the context of law, SaaS tools aim to harmonize platforms by implementing consistent protocols. Reliance on standard protocols is necessary as cloud-based software cannot access local tools or data. Communication protocols provide seamless integration into the office environment.<sup>1</sup> This way, users can transport data from one system to the next, set up automatic synchronization between systems, or utilize a Hub-and-

---

<sup>1</sup> Common protocols are OAuth2.0 (Hardt 2012) or Enterprise Service Bus integration (Binildas 2008: ch 1).

Spoke solution or an Enterprise Service Bus which act as intermediaries between systems (Binildas 2008: 37-39).

This level of integration is not present in, or insufficiently advertised to, law firms. Solution providers emphasize the qualities of their products over those of their immediate competitors, but little to no emphasis is placed on synergies with complementary systems.

## [F] EVOLVING THE LEGAL SECTOR

Thus far, we have considered the approach that the majority of firms in the legal sector take and presented some opportunities that technology offers to these firms. But it remains unclear what has led to the continued separation of the two. Law firms are commercial entities, and at least some players have successfully started relying on technology so it stands to reason that these success stories would incentivize others to follow suit. Potential reasons for this stagnation might be the regulation of the legal sector, missed opportunities by service providers or a silent offensive from another sector. It is time to look at these in some detail.

### Sector regulation

The UK's legal sector is strictly regulated, and lawyers require a practitioner's licence in order to provide legal advice. While this ensures clients receive advice from qualified professionals only, it can also create an entry barrier for more innovative business entities. Relaxing this might introduce to the sector the level of IT competence needed to successfully operate LegalTech. But, in turn, it could reduce the quantity or quality of legal advice offered to the public (cf Rigertas 2014). However, the introduction of 'alternative business structures' (ABSs) by the Legal Services Act 2007 (LSA) does allow for traditionally atypical firms to enter the market. An ABS is a company comprising lawyers and non-lawyers that can provide 'reserved legal services' (Rab 2021). The 'new legal ecosystem', whereby non-lawyers can be involved in 'aspects of lawyering', enables LegalTech start-ups to develop and offer technology-assisted, augmented services which are more appealing to clients than traditional legal advice, and more empowering to lawyers in the execution of their profession.

Lucy Bassli claims that the growth of legal services and its participants have transformed the profession into an industry (*The Forte Edge* 2021). As was intended by the LSA, a more diverse field of players in the market has increased competition and is a strong incentive for innovation. Given

the currently fast-moving nature of technology, a focus on technological innovation in law firms is the most promising way to improve a firm's legal services and increase its competitiveness. The success of a large player in the LegalTech service industry might change the legal services landscape in a similar way Amazon did with bookselling (cf Susskind 2008: 94). To date, however, Bassli's claims seem over-optimistic. In 2019, the Law Society reported little acceleration in the adoption rate of LegalTech systems among practitioners, despite the increased number of LegalTech start-ups (Law Society 2019: 8). While a clear reason for this is yet to be found, there are some possible causes which should be considered.

Law is often viewed as a traditional profession with longstanding rules and customs, and technology has only slowly found its way in. Many lawyers may still see themselves as insufficiently capable of using 'tech' to advocate for radical change, or they see it as an inadequate and disruptive solution, forced upon them. Trialling new methods is generally disregarded, or delayed, until hard evidence is available. Of course, anyone waiting for such evidence will lag behind and become a mere follower in the 'LegalTech Revolution'. This aversion to risk would certainly explain the industry's reluctance to endemic change, but it does not address the high level of rejection of those software solutions shown by ABS start-ups.

## Missed opportunities

Assuming that LegalTech solutions are as successful as claimed and confer great benefits on the law firms and their clients, a sufficient number of clients will have experienced LegalTech's workings and request or enquire about its use in cases where the technology is not used. There are a number of powerful IT solutions for the legal sector offering enhancements like those discussed above, and a few large providers run campaigns to advertise these solutions and their benefits. However, one cause for slow adoption could be that these marketing strategies are insufficient or ineffective.<sup>2</sup> A detailed analysis of current marketing strategies falls outside the scope of this article and exceeds our expertise. However, where the sector is largely unaware of the product solutions or, despite promotions, adoption remains slow, it stands to reason that sellers are not doing enough, or what is needed, to convince firms to adopt their products.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is important to note that this argument relates to the LegalTech sector as a whole. It does not address any particular service providers, products or campaigns.

Providers' websites offer extensive information about the features of their products and the resulting benefits for a firm's stakeholders. Service providers make conscious attempts to reduce complexity. As such, Thomson Reuters intentionally relies on the term 'authoring' as opposed to 'coding' to emphasize a more light-touch approach to dynamic document creation by lawyers, rather than software developers (Thomson Reuters nd). Furthermore, information is typically kept concise, aided by abstract icons. These sound-bites might seem appropriate and convincing to those who know the product. The same might not be true for partners in a law firm. As an example, features like the 'volume assembly engine', 'DocuSign', 'iManage' or 'document suite generator' remain opaque to non-enthusiasts and could overwhelm and make the product appear far more complex and difficult than it might be in reality.

Websites also contain little about the wider context of the product within the context of the law firm. We have already discussed the narrow focus on individual solutions for particular tasks in a law firm. However, exploiting the potential of LegalTech fully would inevitably require as many tasks as possible to be augmented. This would mean that a law firm would need to obtain multiple products. Furthermore, there is no clarity on whether, or how far, these products would work together to form a complex solution. Service providers may need to reconsider their marketing approach or their product's compatibility if they want to convince more firms to adopt their products. With missing integration capabilities, ABSs might draw on their experience in other sectors and design their solutions in line with those global standards which would allow for data to flow freely between systems.

## Silent invasion and innovation incentives

The LegalTech Revolution might take an unexpected shape. All too often, innovation is an evolved version of what is currently practised. However, the threat of disruptive technology is its very nature: in the legal context, this might mean that LegalTech start-ups might move away from developing IT solutions for law firms altogether. Instead, it could be more lucrative to develop tech solutions that allow them to offer legal advice independently and silently divert clients away from lawyers. This potential risk to the legal profession has not yet been recognized by the majority, and once law firms perceive signs of declining business, it will already be too late to reverse the transition. For traditional law firms to ringfence their clientele, they need to embrace the evolving nature of legal services and start adopting current technology solutions ahead of the market.

In early 2020, businesses around the world were given another incentive to consider new ideas on how to conduct business. Due to the pandemic, governments around the world instituted national lockdowns. From one day to the next, all face-to-face interactions ceased, and companies and individuals were forced to rely on technology for tasks that would be considered face-to-face and low-tech (grocery shopping, doctors' appointments, education). In sectors, such as health service and education, technological solutions emerged quickly as a matter of necessity and, for that reason, did not come with a stigma of adversity. The legal sector, too, was forced to rethink its approach to accommodate the public's access to justice. Worldwide, courthouses had to remain closed for a prolonged and uncertain period and cases started piling up (*Municipio De Mariana v BHP Group plc* 2020). With concerns about overwhelming backlogs in court cases, the use of technology was heralded as the main solution (Meadows 2020). Shortly after the introduction of lockdowns, justices in Columbia swiftly made use of Remote Courts Worldwide, adopting online virtual conferences for urgent matters (Remote Courts Worldwide 2020).

The pandemic as a catalyst is not the only reason for such expert systems to prevail. They serve as examples of innovative thinking and successful blends between the two disciplines. This is important as many recognize that technology will still have critical use in legal services beyond the pandemic (Meadows 2020). The extent to which the pandemic has 'forced' law firms to introduce online legal services or, at least, consider potential avenues to providing a continued presence in the market remains to be seen. In any event, it will have reinforced that holding on to traditional forms of legal services can quickly lead to an unviable business model, with technology as the obvious solution.

## [G] CONCLUSION

It is indisputable that the systems mentioned will become more prominent in the legal sphere as technology improves, but this will not be without its shortcomings. Some software products can already complete tasks once done by lawyers (Susskind 2018: 31), and, eventually, professionals will have no choice but to embrace this augmented way of working. Trying to assess which roles in the legal sector may, or may not, be consumed by technology is merely fear-mongering. A better way to view the future could be to consider how LegalTech will present new methods of supplying services. The focus should be on the transformation of roles to match the demands of the new digital era. The shift to a consumer market for the acquisition of clients in some areas of law is already discernible, albeit in the early stages. As such, the role of a traditional lawyer will continue to

evolve. Examples of this can be seen in the recent uptrend in the use of subscribed legal packages, where a client pays a fixed monthly price in exchange for legal advice, often delivered remotely (Solicitors Regulation Authority 2019: 27). Therefore, jobs that require creativity and experience will remain, but the need for new skill sets will gradually expand the definition of a legal expert to include the roles responsible for discovering and implementing such alternatives. As time progresses, the definition will no doubt extend to include legal-data analysts, design engineers and software developers. The usage of technology in law remains modest but is nonetheless growing (Armour & Ors 2020). It will be the responsibility of these new experts to ensure a smooth transition from two distinct sectors into a blended discipline.

### ***About the authors***

**Daniel Beresford** is an LLM Law and LegalTech graduate of the University of Portsmouth and was a student at the time of writing.

**Jens H Krebs** (PhD, LLB, AFHEA) is the Director for Postgraduate Law Programmes and a Principal Lecturer at the University of Portsmouth. His profile is available on the [website](#) of the University of Portsmouth.

Email: [jens.krebs@port.ac.uk](mailto:jens.krebs@port.ac.uk).

### **References**

- Armour, J & Ors (2020) *Augmented Lawyering* Working Paper No 558/2020 Oxford: European Corporate Governance Institute.
- Baffi, E (2007) *The Economics of Standard Form Contracts*.
- Binildas, C A (2008) *Service Oriented Java Business Integration: Enterprise Service Bus Integration Solutions for Java Developers: From Technologies to Solutions* Birmingham: Packt Publications.
- Civil Justice Council Advisory Group (2015) *Online Dispute Resolution for Low Value Civil Claims* London: Civil Justice Council.
- Dale, R (2018) 'Industry Watch, Law and Word Order: NLP in Legal Tech' 25(1) *Natural Language Engineering* 211-217.
- echo.legal (2021) '[Automation Audit](#)'.
- Embley, J & Ors (2020) *Legal Systems and Skills: Learn, Develop, Apply* 4th edn Oxford: Oxford University Press.



- Engstrom, D F & J B Gelbach (2021) 'Legal Tech, Civil Procedure, and the Future of Adversarialism' 169 *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 1001-1099.
- Forte Edge, The* (2021) 'Innovative Thinking—Featuring Lucy Bassli'.
- Haggerty, J (2018) 'LexisNexis versus Westlaw Revisited: Comparison of Top Legal Research Platforms' LAC Group.
- Hardt, D (2012) 'RFC 6749—The OAuth 2.0 Authorization Framework' RFC-editor.org October 2012.
- Law Society (2019) *Lawtech Adoption Research* London: Law Society.
- LexisNexis (2021) 'What Technology Do Lawyers Use?' Lexis Legal Advantage.
- LexMachina* (nd) Menlo Park CA: LexMachina.
- Meadows, C (2020) 'Remote Access to Court Hearings Should Continue Post-Pandemic, Says Courts Correspondent' Society of Editors.
- Pasquale, F (2019) 'A Rule of Persons, Not Machines: The Limits of Legal Automation' 87 *George Washington Law Review* 1-55.
- Pasquale, F & G Cashwell (2015) 'Four Futures of Legal Automation' 63 *UCLA Law Review Discourse* 26-48.
- Perriam, B (2021) 'Lawyer-Free “eBay Justice” Proposed for Smaller Claims' The Justice Gap.
- Pinnington, A & T Morris (2003) 'Archetype Change in Professional Organizations: Survey Evidence from Large Law Firms' 14 *British Journal of Management* 85-99.
- Rab, S (2021) 'Regulation of the Legal Profession in the UK (England and Wales)' Thompson Reuters Practical Law.
- Remote Courts Worldwide (2020) 'New Court Rules for Videoconferencing in Colombian Courts'.
- Rigertas, L A (2014) 'The Legal Profession's Monopoly: Failing to Protect Consumers' 82 *Fordham Law Review* 2683-2702.
- Rogers, J & Ors (2021) 'Legal Project Management: Projectifying the Legal Profession' 2 *Law, Technology and Humans* 133-157.
- Simon, M & Ors (2018) 'Lola v Skadden and the Automation of the Legal Profession' 20 *Yale Journal of Law and Technology* 234-310.

- Solicitors Regulation Authority (2019) *The Changing Legal Services Market* Birmingham: SRA.
- Stanley, J & G Briscoe (2010) 'The ABC of Digital Business Ecosystems' 15(1) *Communications Law* 1-24.
- Sumners, W (2021) '[Are Your Templates Automation Ready?](#)' echo.legal.
- Susskind, R E (2003) *Transforming The Law: Essays on Technology, Justice, and the Legal Marketplace* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Susskind R E (2008) *The End of Lawyers? Rethinking the Nature of Legal Services* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Susskind, R E (2017) *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to your Future* 2nd edn Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Susskind R E (2018) 'AI, Work and "Outcome-Thinking"' (Autumn) *British Academic Review* 30-31.
- Susskind, R E & D Susskind (2017) *The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts* 1st edn Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomson Reuters (nd) [Contract Express](#).
- Thomson Reuters (2021) *Contract Express—Author Getting Started Manual*.
- Tromans, R (2021) '[How Far Has Technology Really Disrupted the Legal World?](#)' Artificial Lawyer 25 January 2021.
- Wolstenholme, K & Ors (eds) (2021) *Facing the Future with Confidence—PwC Law Firms' Survey 2021* St Albans: PricewaterhouseCoopers.

## Legislation

Legal Services Act 2007

Regulation (EU) No 524/2013 on Online Dispute Resolution for Consumer Disputes, 2013, OJ L165/1 (ODR Regulation)

## Cases

*Municipio De Mariana v BHP Group plc* 2020 EQHC