

Explainer

Generative AI is advancing faster than the market can separate signal from noise. To get a handle on real change—amid unreal hype—many clients began surveying their provider networks on GenAI's evolving role in legal service delivery. Individually rational, these efforts cause unintended consequences: high-volume variants of similar questions, contradictory signals, and survey fatigue that slows the collective conversation.

This initiative replaces fragmentation with a coordinated process that produces composite benchmarks available to the entire ecosystem. Mirrored instruments—surveying both providers and clients—make misalignment visible by surfacing the expectations gap. It is an ongoing program designed for longitudinal learning, using disciplined, behavior-grounded questions analyzed at scale to produce decision-ready insight.

The Survey Instruments and the Benefits of Collaboration

Our goal is to improve the quality of information while substantially reducing burden for all participants.

Clients and providers are invited to use the [Provider Survey](#)—a co-designed instrument reflecting consensus questions from more than 20 major law departments, refined with input from dozens of Am Law firms. We also invite law departments to complete our [Client Survey](#), a mirrored counterpart that reveals alignment, or lack thereof, between clients and providers.

For clients:

- *Lower burden.* L.E.G.A.L. designs, administers, and manages the Provider Survey on the client's behalf—so clients receive provider client-facing responses as if they had run the survey themselves, but without the administrative overhead.
- *Stronger provider benchmarking.* Benchmark providers against your panel and against a broader market-wide dataset no single client can assemble independently.
- *Peer law department insight.* Through the Client Survey, gain visibility into how peer law departments are approaching GenAI—an otherwise inaccessible perspective.
- *Clearer diagnosis of misalignment.* As a neutral third party, L.E.G.A.L. can ask questions clients would not receive candid answers to directly; paired client/provider mirrors surface root causes, not just symptoms.
- *A shared point of reference.* Ground internal and external conversations in common benchmarks—shifting discussion from anecdote to evidence.

For providers:

- *Lower burden.* Answer core GenAI questions once, not separately for every client; responses persist and are prepopulated so updates are selective.
- *Client-by-client control.* Disclosure is never automatic; providers decide whether/when to release client-facing responses to each Requesting Client.

- *Peer and client benchmarking.* Participation entitles providers to composite insights into peer behavior and evolving client expectations—intelligence firms don’t get from one-off client surveys.
- *A safe space for candor.* A neutral third party can collect perspectives providers can’t share candidly in bilateral surveys, used only in de-identified/aggregate form.
- *A shared point of reference.* Common benchmarks improve the quality of client conversations and support internal strategy.

This is structured, behavior-grounded intelligence work. Across both sides of the market, we reduce burden through coordination while improving informational value through disciplined questions, analysis, and reporting.

What We Measure (and What We Don’t)

- *Organizing principle.* Our core concern is commercial impact. If GenAI isn’t changing who does what, how work is allocated or priced, and what clients spend, it isn’t changing the market—yet. We therefore prioritize commercial inflection points: new work, moved work, pricing shifts, realized savings, and changes to sourcing rubrics or fee structures.
- *Scope guardrails.* Commercial impact is a deliberate constraint that limits what we capture. We don’t seek to inventory every experiment or back-office efficiency, nor do we intend to become a policy repository. Rather, where depth is warranted, we facilitate selective follow-up, including our [Case Study Canvas](#).
- *Temporal framing.* Doing | Planning | Thinking: We anchor in observed outcomes (Doing), map funded near-term change (Planning), and elicit reasoned medium-term views (Thinking) to support longitudinal analysis and comparability.

What We Ask (and Why)

- *Prioritize structured questions.* Burden versus comprehensiveness is a largely unavoidable trade-off. Defaulting to structured questions (checkboxes, dropdowns) lowers burden and enables benchmarking. We also recognize that blank space implicitly asks for an answer even when a respondent has nothing useful to add. Limiting narrative questions reduces noise and invites clarity rather than creative writing.
- *Leaving room for clarifications.* All structured questions include an optional commentary box for respondents who want to challenge a question or caveat an answer. Structured questions are inherently constraining, and respondents retain the discretion to express themselves fully if they determine doing so will enrich the conversation.
- *With opportunity to request additional detail.* We prioritize minimal baseline burden, while enabling deeper follow-ons when warranted. Our objective is to limit labor-intensive exchanges to (i) the clients that want deeper detail and (ii) the providers prepared to engage on that topic. For example, instead of an open-ended narrative like “What is your GenAI strategy?,” our Provider Survey asks whether a provider has a formal, shareable GenAI strategy; the subset of interested clients can then request the document from subset of providers positioned to share it.

- *Case Study Canvas for depth, selectively.* A follow-up tool for use cases. Where clients want more detail on high-signal use cases, our semi-structured canvas captures design, workflow, and measurable impact while ensuring the core survey does not turn into an essay exam.
- *Intentional use, not ambient AI.* We distinguish deliberate use of generative systems from background “AI-enhanced” features so that activity measures and maturity signals are not diluted. Ambient AI is becoming ubiquitous; if we measure it the same way, it will drown out deliberate decisions and discrete efforts the instruments are designed to capture.
- *Mirrored instruments to surface the expectations gap.* Clients and providers answer parallel questions to make alignment—and misalignment—visible and actionable. Our goal is to map the expectations gap so that we can begin to close it.
- *Clear lines on disclosure.* We ask questions everyone cares about, and candor is essential for benchmarks to mean anything. Confidentiality enables candor in an industry otherwise premised on perfection. Client Survey responses are used solely for de-identified, composite benchmarking. Provider Survey responses are split: (i) Client-facing Questions 1–5 may be shared in provider-attributed form with a specific Requesting Client only if the provider explicitly authorizes release to that client; (ii) Questions 6–16 are never shared in a provider-attributable form and are used only for de-identified and/or aggregated benchmarking outputs (including de-identified visualizations where thresholds are met).

How Participation Works

- *Distribution.* Clients send a unique link to law firms and ALSPs to register for the [Provider Survey](#). Providers respond once; answers persist and can be updated. If already in the system, registration converts to a simple release request. Providers may also participate proactively to establish a baseline and access applicable benchmarking outputs—just as clients proactively respond to the [Client Survey](#) to gain access to those composite findings.
- *Permissioning.* Providers decide which clients receive their client-facing answers. All other responses are used only in de-identified and/or aggregated benchmarking.
- *What participants get back.* The composite report is modular, and access depends on participation.
 - Clients that complete only the Client Survey receive peer law department benchmarking (de-identified, program-wide).
 - Clients that request Provider Survey responses receive provider client-facing answers (where authorized) and provider benchmarking outputs, subject to minimum thresholds.
 - Clients that do both receive both sections.
 - Providers receive de-identified benchmarking outputs, but sections based on Provider Survey Questions 6–16 are available only if those questions are answered.

Follow-Ups, Events, and Ongoing Program

The market has solid tech maps and lists of use cases. We’re currently missing commercial-impact data and interrogable, in-depth case studies. Commercial impact is at the center of our survey design. And the base survey instruments are also calibrated to surface candidates for case studies. In addition to clients selectively

requesting that providers fill out our [Case Study Canvas](#), we will conduct our own follow-ups where answers indicate further inquiry may elucidate insights of interest to the larger market.

Selected case studies will be featured in the composite report and associated events—all opt-in, of course.

Consent-Driven Disclosure and Safe Benchmarking

Confidentiality is sacrosanct. Participation is opt-in. Disclosure is always consent-driven.

- No third party sees an identified/attributionable response unless the respondent explicitly agrees in writing. We do not assume consent; we require it.
- No client sees a provider's client-facing responses unless that provider authorizes disclosure to that specific client. Benchmark outputs are subject to minimum thresholds, and de-identified visualizations are provided only where participation supports safe de-identification.
- No one, including their providers, sees attributed client responses; client responses only feed into de-identified and composite benchmarking.
- Aggregation and de-identification are the defaults; insights are presented in de-identified and composite form unless expressly approved otherwise.
- Optional case studies follow a strict, multistep process, with off-the-record interviews and mutual written approval before any attributed publication.
- Our platform uses enterprise-grade infrastructure whose providers maintain independent assurance artifacts (including SOC 2 Type II and ISO 27001), with encryption in transit (TLS 1.2+) and encryption at rest (AES-256 where applicable).
- Raw data is accessible only to the core research team at LexFusion Intelligence.
- This is a nondisclosure-first environment—no resale, no repackaging.

For more, see the L.E.G.A.L. [Nondisclosure Policy](#) and our [Security Documentation](#).

Contact and Support

For questions about participation, permissions, or the policy, contact the LexFusion Intelligence team at LFIntel@baretzbrunelle.com.