

Evolution of the Initiative

L.E.G.A.L. exists to solve fragmentation through collaboration. But collaboration requires coordination—coordination that has costs we’ve now collectively paid.

The final survey designs reduce burden (i.e., answer once, reuse), surface alignment gaps between clients and providers through mirrored questions, and center on commercial impact as the clearest measure of meaningful change. Third-party administration enables candor by keeping non-client-facing responses confined to de-identified and/or aggregated benchmarking outputs, while composite benchmarking returns value to all participants at no cost—through de-identification by default and consent-driven disclosure where attribution is permitted.

Where We Started

Law departments were already surveying their providers, often with overlapping or duplicative instruments. We began by aggregating more than 20 of these surveys—a cumulative exercise in every sense.

We removed redundancies and improved clarity, but the result remained too long, too narrative-heavy, and too demanding. Segmenting the instrument into *Quick*, *Full*, and *Case Study* variants helped only marginally; the burden was baked in.

To address it, we launched the *Survey on the Survey*, asking clients and providers alike to tell us what was necessary—and what could be cut. The exercise sparked invaluable conversations and surfaced insights from both sides of the client/provider divide.

What We Learned

- **Individually logical, collectively inefficient.** Each client’s survey made sense on its own, but in aggregate they dulled the collective conversation.
- **Narrative overload invites noise.** Blank boxes beg to be filled, even when the respondent has little to add.
- **Data for data’s sake.** Many clients were collecting information they didn’t use—often because the answers lacked clarity or comparability.
- **Wasted effort at scale.** Both sides spent hours crafting and reviewing long responses short on actionable insight.
- **Unspoken assumptions.** Many of the underlying issues that merit discussion are rooted in divergent assumptions that drive divergent expectations and actions.
- **Candor constraints.** Some essential questions can’t be asked directly by clients—or answered candidly by providers—without creating bilateral commercial risk; de-identified and/or aggregated benchmarking creates a safe lane for market-level candor.

How We Pivoted

We reframed the design around a single, clarifying question: “*How will this be used?*”

Rather than start with a long list of legacy questions, we worked backward from the answers that would truly inform dialogue between clients and providers.

The organizing principle remained money—commercial impact as the signal of real change. But our focus shifted from comprehensive consensus to streamlined, decision-ready benchmarking. We put an enormous amount of effort into each question in order to reduce burden, enhance comparability, and optimize information value.

- The **Client Survey** is now fully structured—checkboxes, dropdowns, and scales for comparability.
- The **Provider Survey** contains only one required narrative prompt—a concise reflection on commercially meaningful use cases, divided across three time horizons: Doing | Planning | Thinking.

Comprehensiveness still has its place. Optional narrative sections invite respondents to elaborate only where they have something substantive to contribute—isolating true signal instead of producing essay-length noise.

The surveys are also built for structured follow-up. High-signal responses, especially around GenAI use cases, can evolve into deeper exploration through the Case Study Canvas, a semi-structured tool for turning promising examples into tangible explorations of successful deployments.

The Updated Instruments

- **Provider Survey:** Structured, reusable, and built for comparability
- **Client Survey:** Mirrored counterpart highlighting alignment gaps and maturity differentials
- **Case Study Canvas:** Optional, semi-structured follow-up for high-signal use cases

Design Rules

- **Signal first:** Every question must earn its place.
- **Structure over sprawl:** Closed-ended items dominate.
- **Comparability by design:** Standardized scales and mirrored prompts.
- **Follow-on expected:** Surveys flag issues for targeted dialogue—not essays.

Clarifying De-Identification (Post-Launch)

Shortly after launch, we received excellent questions from participants about how de-identification works in practice—especially in the context of Provider Questions 6–16 and detailed benchmarking. Those questions led us to sharpen our language so it more clearly reflects the balance L.E.G.A.L. is designed to achieve: creating safe conditions for candor while still delivering the most useful, detailed benchmarking possible through de-identified and/or aggregated outputs.

Bottom Line

Better together. The collaborative redesign transforms an overloaded process into a disciplined, high-signal dialogue—minimizing both noise and the burden of extracting meaningful insight.