

One Legal Tech Architect run, one AI Readiness Diagnostic, one AI Governance Scorecard

Sample outputs from the Alt-V AI & Technology pillar - all three tool artefacts for one invented firm

Accompanies the AI & Technology briefing · Alt-V Law

Derek Duffy, APAC Director, Alt-V

Every firm, person and figure in these reports is invented. The three tool reports that follow are what the Legal Tech Architect, the AI Readiness Diagnostic and the AI Governance Scorecard produce when run on the Enderby Finch scenario. The AI Operating Model Position that opens the pack is a companion artefact - the five-stage firm-level read a Phase 2 Diagnostic deliverable would carry.

The scenario

Enderby Finch LLP is a UK regional full-service firm with 220 fee-earners, four offices (Leeds, Nottingham, Birmingham and Bristol), £48m in fees, and an independent partnership structure. A 2026 Microsoft 365 Copilot pilot is in progress across sixty lawyers in corporate and employment; adoption on the pilot sits at 23 per cent of invited seats and the pilot owner (CIO) cannot say whether to scale, pivot or stop. The firm has stood up an AI governance committee (March 2026) chaired by the Risk Partner; no policy has been signed off; the committee has met twice. The current legal-tech estate carries eight AI-adjacent tools acquired piecemeal across practice groups - Harvey (corporate, procured 2025), Lexis+AI (knowledge, procured 2024), Luminance (contracts, 2023), Litera (platform, 2023), Legatics (transaction management, 2024), Kira Systems (M&A due diligence, 2022), Microsoft 365 Copilot (firm-wide pilot, 2026) and iManage Work (DMS, legacy). Annual AI-tool spend of £680k; no overlap view; no measurement of productivity impact; no vendor consolidation plan. The CEO has started asking the committee which tools to double down on, which to retire, and how to run AI as a programme rather than a procurement list.

ARTEFACT	TOOL / TEMPLATE	READ IN THE SAMPLE
1. AI Operating Model Position	Companion artefact (T05 of the AI Toolkit)	Five-stage firm-level read. Enderby lands between Experimenting and Deploying - the Copilot pilot has not reached a go-decision; six of eight AI tools predate 2025 and have no measurement data. Three capability moves for the Phase 2 build.
2. Legal Tech Architect report	Vendor-overlap map, Audit sub-tool	Reads the firm's eight AI tools against the Legal Tech Atlas 11-category framework. Overlaps surface on contract review (Luminance / Kira Systems / Litera), on knowledge (Lexis+AI / Harvey) and on transaction management (Legatics / Harvey). Run-cost exposure: £680k AI spend, £420k of which is in overlap zones.
3. AI Readiness Diagnostic	Twelve-dimension capability read	Express path on a Mode-B scenario (AI deployed). Reads Developing on strategy and sponsorship (committee stood up, no policy); Nascent on governance, measurement and partner-economics alignment; Established on technology and integration. The floor rule fires on measurement, which is the headline gap.
4. AI Governance Scorecard	Five-cluster, 20-question governance read	UK edition. Reads Weak on policy and tool control (register not current, policy drafted but not endorsed), Weak on training and competence (ad-hoc sessions, no records), Red on output verification (no written procedure), Weak on supervision and accountability (nominal management ownership). Headline gap is output verification - the gating cluster for everything else.

How to read them

The **AI Operating Model Position** is a firm-level read against the five-stage anchor model. It opens the pack because the stage read frames what the firm can act on with the other three outputs. The **Legal Tech Architect** reads the firm's current estate for overlaps, run-cost exposure and consolidation targets. The **AI Readiness Diagnostic** reads capability across twelve dimensions; the floor rule names which dimension is capping the firm's overall band. The **AI Governance Scorecard** reads a slice of surface three - whether the firm's governance would survive external questioning from an insurer, a panel or a court. The four compose: the AI Operating Model Position stages the conversation, the Architect reads the estate, the Diagnostic reads the capability, the Scorecard reads the control. Each tool's output composes with the others - the Diagnostic's governance score and the Scorecard's cluster read must agree; where they disagree the engagement reconciles.

The tools and the methodology are management-consulting instruments. They focus the AI programme conversation; they do not substitute for a scoped engagement, and they do not stand up a governance committee or write an AI policy on their own.

NOTICE · FOCUS · CREATE

Enderby Finch LLP • AI maturity read

Phase 2 Diagnostic companion • five-stage firm-level read against the Reactive → Compounding anchor set

Sample output • fictitious firm, figures and findings • Alt-V Law

Derek Duffy, APAC Director, Alt-V

One page. This is the T05 AI Operating Model Position artefact Phase 2 of an AI & Technology engagement produces at the end of week two, before the three tool diagnostics run on the firm's current estate. It names where the firm sits on the five-stage anchor model, surfaces the gating dimension, and names the three capability moves Phase 3 must set up. The firm, people and figures below are invented.

Five-stage firm-level read

STAGE	WHAT THE FIRM WOULD LOOK LIKE	ENDERBY READ
Reactive	No AI strategy; individual partners respond to client prompts; no committee; no budget line.	Past this stage. A governance committee was stood up in March 2026 and a Copilot pilot is live.
Experimenting	One or two pilots with no go-decision frame; pilots produce opinions, not data; strategy drafted at COO / CIO level without partnership endorsement.	Current position (dominant). The Copilot pilot has run for seven months without a go-decision. The committee has met twice. The AI strategy exists in draft but has not been to the partnership.
Deploying	Firm-wide tools procured; rollout across practice groups in progress; adoption uneven; the first measurement data is landing, usually inconclusive.	Current position (partial). Harvey, Lexis+AI, Luminance, Kira Systems and Legatics are deployed; six of eight have no measurement framework behind them.
Governed	Four control artefacts in place: partnership-endorsed strategy, published policy with teeth, vendor consolidation plan with retirement decisions landed, measurement discipline reading matter-type economics.	Not yet. The policy is drafted but not endorsed; no consolidation plan exists; measurement discipline is absent.
Compounding	Pricing moved to AFA on matter types where AI changes economics; leverage redesigned where AI replaces first-year work; partner compensation reflecting AI-augmented delivery.	Not yet, and not next. Compounding depends on the Pricing and Partner Pay pillars running against the AI efficiency reading, which does not yet exist.

The gating dimension

Measurement is the gating dimension. The firm sits in both Experimenting (strategy and governance stance) and Deploying (tool procurement) because the two tracks have run in parallel without composing. The specific move that converts them into Governed is not more strategy, more tooling or more policy - it is the measurement discipline that would let the Copilot pilot owner answer the CEO's "scale, pivot or stop" question, and the overlap read on the eight-tool AI stack that would let the vendor consolidation plan land. Without measurement, the firm cannot know which of the eight tools is actually producing productivity shift; without the overlap read, it cannot retire anything safely. Everything else in the Governed stage waits.

This is the pattern Alt-V sees most often at mid-tier firms that said yes to multiple point tools before standing up the governance frame. The committee cannot govern what the measurement discipline does not read.

The three capability moves Phase 3 must set up

Each is a specific capability build, not an abstract improvement. All three can run in parallel across the eight-to-sixteen-week engagement without exceeding the firm's change capacity.

1. **Stand up the measurement discipline, starting with the Copilot pilot.** Baseline KPIs for the two practice groups in the pilot (corporate and employment), measurement protocol for the next 90 days, go / pivot / stop decision date at week sixteen. The CFO and the pilot owner co-own; the AI Program Health Dashboard (T08) is the artefact. Without this, every other move stays blocked.
2. **Run the Legal Tech Architect read and land the vendor consolidation plan.** The eight-tool stack has overlap exposure that is almost certainly worth £150k-£250k in run-cost release if two tools are retired. The decision is not technical - it is a partnership decision because retiring a tool a practice group is attached to needs a partnership-level frame. The Legal Tech Architect read is the input; the committee is the decision forum.
3. **Finish the AI policy and land it in the partnership.** The policy exists in draft; the gap is less about words than about the four cluster disciplines it must support - tool control, training, verification, disclosure. The AI Governance Scorecard sample read names which cluster will fail an insurer's proposal form first (verification); the Policy Stack Configurator (T07) stands the policy up with those disciplines in it.

What this does not solve

The AI Operating Model Position is a firm-level stage read. It does not read the current legal-tech estate for overlap - the **Legal Tech Architect** does that. It does not read capability on the twelve dimensions - the **AI Readiness Diagnostic** does that. It does not read whether the governance would survive external questioning - the **AI Governance Scorecard** does that. It does not price a matter type under AI efficiency - the Pricing Engine does that, driven by the AI readiness read. It does not redesign practice-group leverage - that is a partner-pay conversation driven by the Talent Economics Model. The point of the position is to make the other four engagements credible, by naming what stage the firm is actually on.

The firm, people and figures in this position read are invented. The AI Operating Model five-stage anchor is the T05 template, documented in the companion briefing and the AI Toolkit (July 2026) · 20261004 Legal AI Refresh.



LEGAL TECH ARCHITECT · TOOL STACK AUDIT

Generated **2026-10-07**

v1.2

Tool Stack Audit

Enderby Finch LLP

UK · £200–500m · 220 fee-earners

POTENTIAL ANNUAL EXPOSURE TO TOOL OVERLAP

£0 /year

£0 per fee-earner / yr

We don't see overlapping tools at this lens for your confirmed stack —
switch the lens or revisit Stage 2 if that looks wrong.

CAPABILITY	OVERLAPPING TOOLS	PER FE / YR	ANNUAL
No potential overlap at this lens — every capability is either uncovered or held by a single tool.			

Capability coverage map

Potential gaps are capabilities we have not identified coverage for in your confirmed stack. Some tools may cover capabilities we have not yet mapped — confirm before acting.

Document Review & Due Diligence POTENTIAL GAP	Contract Review & Risk Analysis POTENTIAL GAP	Document Drafting & Assembly POTENTIAL GAP
Legal Research POTENTIAL GAP	Litigation Analytics & Case Strategy POTENTIAL GAP	eDiscovery POTENTIAL GAP
Contract Lifecycle Management POTENTIAL GAP	eSignature & Execution POTENTIAL GAP	Knowledge Management & Firm Search POTENTIAL GAP
Document Management POTENTIAL GAP	Workflow & Process Automation POTENTIAL GAP	Client Intake & Conflicts POTENTIAL GAP
AML / KYC / Risk & Compliance POTENTIAL GAP	Time & Billing POTENTIAL GAP	Pricing & Matter Profitability POTENTIAL GAP
Practice & Financial Management (PMS) POTENTIAL GAP	CRM & Business Development POTENTIAL GAP	Business Intelligence & Reporting POTENTIAL GAP
HR, L&D & Talent POTENTIAL GAP	General-Purpose Gen AI Assistant POTENTIAL GAP	Cybersecurity & Email Security POTENTIAL GAP
Collaboration & Client Portals POTENTIAL GAP	Email Filing & Management POTENTIAL GAP	Records Management & Retention POTENTIAL GAP
Secure External Sharing & Deal Rooms POTENTIAL GAP	Trust Accounting POTENTIAL GAP	Partner Accounts & Profit Distribution POTENTIAL GAP
LEDES E-Billing & OCG Compliance POTENTIAL GAP	Mobile Time Capture POTENTIAL GAP	Enterprise GL / AP / Procurement POTENTIAL GAP

Multi-Currency / Multi-Office Consolidation POTENTIAL GAP	Litigation Case Management POTENTIAL GAP	Court E-Filing POTENTIAL GAP
Template-Driven Document Automation POTENTIAL GAP	Productised Legal Self-Service POTENTIAL GAP	Voice & Dictation POTENTIAL GAP
Ethical Walls & Access Controls POTENTIAL GAP	DLP & Information Governance POTENTIAL GAP	

Covered
Potential overlap
Potential gap

How these capabilities were identified. The taxonomy is drawn from the CLOC Core 12 Functional Areas (Corporate Legal Operations Consortium, 2024) overlaid with categories from the ILTA Technology Survey (International Legal Technology Association, 2025). Tool → capability mappings come from vendor product documentation, capability disclosures in ILTA / Legaltech News reporting, and Alt-V's own vendor assessments (2025–26). Firm tool inventories originate from the Legal IT Insider UK 200 survey (2025) plus firm-published AI announcements — see the methodology accordion at the end of this report for the full source list.

How the exposure figure is calculated

The number is the annualised **value of potential tool overlap** in your stack — capabilities where your confirmed tools hold two or more products at core or supported depth. For each overlapping capability we sum a mid-band per-FE list price across the tools involved, then multiply by your fee-earner count.

What it represents. A public-data estimate of **avoidable spend**, not your actual procurement figure. Realising it means consolidating your stack, negotiating exit terms with vendors at renewal, or shifting workload onto whichever tool best delivers the capability.

For peer comparison, open the **Peer Benchmark** card on the Launchpad — a survey-based view of your stack against firms in your bracket (density, coverage, redundancy, and four other metrics), sourced from consent-to-pool responses rather than the public-stack proxy this table previously carried.

Pricing is public list-price mid-band. Actual spend depends on your enterprise agreements, discounting and licence tier. Modelled variance **±40%**.

Where a vendor sells by consumption or bundles AI into an existing subscription, the per-fee-earner figure is a modelled band, not a quote; the pricing line beneath each tool shows what the vendor or third parties have published, with its date and confidence.

Capability coverage summary

Capability	Status	Tools	Covered by	Cost per FE / Yr
Document Review & Due Diligence Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Contract Review & Risk Analysis Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Document Drafting & Assembly Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—

CAPABILITY	STATUS	TOOLS	COVERED BY	COST PER FE / YR
Legal Research Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Litigation Analytics & Case Strategy Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
eDiscovery Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Contract Lifecycle Management Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
eSignature & Execution Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Knowledge Management & Firm Search Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Document Management Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Workflow & Process Automation Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Client Intake & Conflicts Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
AML / KYC / Risk & Compliance Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Time & Billing Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Pricing & Matter Profitability Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Practice & Financial Management (PMS) Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
CRM & Business Development Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Business Intelligence & Reporting Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
HR, L&D & Talent Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
General-Purpose Gen AI Assistant Firm-Wide	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Cybersecurity & Email Security Firm-Wide	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Collaboration & Client Portals Firm-Wide	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Email Filing & Management Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—

CAPABILITY	STATUS	TOOLS	COVERED BY	COST PER FE / YR
Records Management & Retention Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Secure External Sharing & Deal Rooms Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Trust Accounting Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Partner Accounts & Profit Distribution Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
LEDES E-Billing & OCG Compliance Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Mobile Time Capture Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Enterprise GL / AP / Procurement Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Multi-Currency / Multi-Office Consolidation Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Litigation Case Management Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Court E-Filing Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Template-Driven Document Automation Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Productised Legal Self-Service Legal Work	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Voice & Dictation Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
Ethical Walls & Access Controls Operations	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—
DLP & Information Governance Firm-Wide	POTENTIAL GAP	0	—	—

Confirmed tool inventory

TOOL	VENDOR	CAPABILITIES COVERED	PER FE / YR	ANNUAL (FIRM-WIDE)
No confirmed tools.				

Ready to convert this into actual savings?

For a consultant-delivered deep-dive that validates every assumption with your IT, finance and innovation leads — and quantifies avoidable spend to audit-grade confidence — contact Alt-V to discuss.

derek.duffy@altruisticventures.com →

Also from Alt-V: the *AI Readiness & Value Realisation Diagnostic* (free 11-dimension maturity read) and the *Business Services Operations Benchmark* (free cost-of-function comparison with saving estimate). Ask Derek for the links.

Generated 2026-10-07 · Currency: GBP · Modelled estimate, variance $\pm 40\%$ · Data handling — see privacy statement above.

© 2026 Derek Duffy. Licensed to Alt-V for authorised use.

INDICATIVE READINESS PROFILE

AI Readiness & Value Realisation Diagnostic

Enderby Finch LLP

Prepared for Derek Duffy · Managing Partner · Path: Express · Mode B — In-situ effectiveness · Date: 7 October 2026

HEADLINE

Your overall readiness band

OVERALL READINESS

Developing

Level 2 on the five-level scale (Foundational, Developing, Operational, Mature, Leading).

Biggest gap: Governance, Risk & Responsible AI.

No written AI policy. Ad-hoc guidance via email or partner conversations.

The single most important question to ask internally: Is your AI policy enforced (training-gated, breach-tracked, audit-able), or is it a posted document nobody references?

PER-DIMENSION READ

Where each dimension stands

One anchor question per dimension. The descriptor in the right-hand column is the level descriptor you selected.

DIMENSION	REPORTED LEVEL	RAG	WHERE YOU ARE
Strategy & Leadership	L2 · ACTIVE	RED	An AI strategy has been drafted (by COO, CIO, or an innovation team) but has not been formally endorsed by the partnership; budget exists for tools but not for programme.
Partnership Governance & Sponsor Coalition	L2 · ACTIVE	RED	A single partner sponsor exists (often Managing Partner or innovation partner). The programme would not survive their departure.
Data & Knowledge Management	L3 · OPERATIONAL	AMBER	60% to 80% complete; a metadata remediation programme is underway, with a target date.

DIMENSION	REPORTED LEVEL	RAG	WHERE YOU ARE
Technology & Integration	L3 · OPERATIONAL	AMBER	Cloud-resident DMS with at least one AI tool reading from it via API; outputs return to a designated matter folder; matter-level access controls are enforced.
Talent & AI Literacy	L2 · ACTIVE	RED	Training attendance is tracked; no competence assessment.
Culture & Change Readiness	L2 · ACTIVE	RED	At least one enterprise-wide change has been completed, but late, over budget, or with documented adoption issues. Awareness is high; desire across the partnership is uneven.
Operating Model & Process Maturity	L2 · ACTIVE	RED	Spend is heavily weighted to algorithm / licence (60%+); change and process spend is below 20%.
Governance, Risk & Responsible AI	L1 · AWARENESS	RED	No written AI policy. Ad-hoc guidance via email or partner conversations.
Regulatory & Professional-Conduct Readiness	L2 · ACTIVE	RED	Awareness exists; no defined approach; relies on individual partner judgment.
Partner Economics & Pricing Realignment	L1 · AWARENESS	RED	The tension between billable-hour realisation and AI efficiency has not been modelled.
Value Realisation & Measurement	L1 · AWARENESS	RED	No baseline was captured. Benefits are described in anecdote: 'partners say it saves time'. No numbers.

DEEPER READ

Take it deeper — the Comprehensive Diagnostic

This Indicative Profile is based on one anchor question per dimension. The Comprehensive Diagnostic uses approximately seven questions per dimension with evidence prompts, five internal consistency checks (including the partner-economics triple-claim and the shadow-AI exposure flag), and a prioritised twelve-month intervention roadmap. Your Express anchor selections will pre-fill the corresponding Full-path questions; you continue from the first unanswered dimension.

What the Comprehensive adds that this Indicative does not: per-dimension evidence summary, "what Level N+1 requires" intervention text, bias / perception cross-check log, twelve-month sequenced roadmap, peer-context paragraphs, visibility flags from "don't know" patterns.

NEXT MOVE

Your next move

You are in **Mode B — In-situ effectiveness**. The tool is live. The question is whether the partnership is realising the value the business case promised, and whether the next wave is set up to compound on the first.

Your single biggest gap is **Governance, Risk & Responsible AI**. Lifting this dimension is likely to do more for realised benefit than adding a second AI tool. The Comprehensive Diagnostic surfaces the adoption-lift, benefit-measurement and governance-maturation moves specific to your reported levels — and runs the partner-economics triple-claim check that most live-AI firms fail.

A typical in-situ next-wave sequence: partner-level adoption lift first; baseline-and-measure protocol second; governance maturation (NIST GMMM, ISO 42001 gap assessment) third; pricing and partner-comp realignment fourth.

ENGAGEMENT

How Alt-V can help

Book a scoping conversation

Book a 30-minute readout with Derek Duffy, APAC Director, Alt-V Law. We walk through your profile together, surface the one or two moves likely to shift the read in the next 90 days, and answer questions about the Comprehensive Diagnostic if you want a deeper read.

Book a readout: derek.duffy@altruisticventures.com

Also from Alt-V: the *Business Services Operations Benchmark* (free — cost-of-function comparison against size-banded UK/AU benchmarks) and the *Legal Tech Architect* (free — AI benefit estimate + tool-stack overlap audit against a 247-firm peer set). If Technology or Operating Model flagged amber or red above, they quantify the gap this diagnostic located.

APPENDIX

Your eleven anchor responses

For each dimension, this is the anchor question we asked and the level you selected.

STR-001 · STRATEGY & LEADERSHIP · REPORTED LEVEL 2

Which best describes your firm's AI strategy?

Level 2 — Active. An AI strategy has been drafted (by COO, CIO, or an innovation team) but has not been formally endorsed by the partnership; budget exists for tools but not for programme.

GOV-P-001 · PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE & SPONSOR COALITION · REPORTED LEVEL 2

Describe the sponsor coalition for AI at your firm.

Level 2 — Active. A single partner sponsor exists (often Managing Partner or innovation partner). The programme would not survive their departure.

DAT-001 · DATA & KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT · REPORTED LEVEL 3

What proportion of documents in your DMS have complete matter metadata (matter ID, client, document type, custodian)?

Level 3 — Operational. 60% to 80% complete; a metadata remediation programme is underway, with a target date.

TEC-001 · TECHNOLOGY & INTEGRATION · REPORTED LEVEL 3

How would you describe the current integration readiness of your DMS and PMS for AI tooling?

Level 3 — Operational. Cloud-resident DMS with at least one AI tool reading from it via API; outputs return to a designated matter folder; matter-level access controls are enforced.

TAL-003 · TALENT & AI LITERACY · REPORTED LEVEL 2

How is AI competence measured at the firm?

Level 2 — Active. Training attendance is tracked; no competence assessment.

CUL-001 · CULTURE & CHANGE READINESS · REPORTED LEVEL 2

What is the firm's track record on enterprise-wide change (PMS migration, merger integration, cloud rollout) over the last 36 months?

Level 2 — Active. At least one enterprise-wide change has been completed, but late, over budget, or with documented adoption issues. Awareness is high; desire across the partnership is uneven.

OPM-001 · OPERATING MODEL & PROCESS MATURITY · REPORTED LEVEL 2

How has the firm allocated its AI programme spend across (i) algorithm / licence, (ii) tech & data, (iii) people & process / change?

Level 2 — Active. Spend is heavily weighted to algorithm / licence (60%+); change and process spend is below 20%.

GOV-001 · GOVERNANCE, RISK & RESPONSIBLE AI · REPORTED LEVEL 1

Does the firm have a written, partnership-endorsed AI policy?

Level 1 — Awareness. No written AI policy. Ad-hoc guidance via email or partner conversations.

REG-005 · REGULATORY & PROFESSIONAL-CONDUCT READINESS · REPORTED LEVEL 2

Does the firm have a defined approach for cross-jurisdictional matters where rules diverge in the same matter (e.g. NSW SC Gen 23 vs Federal Court GPN-AI; UK SRA vs EU AI Act)?

Level 2 — Active. Awareness exists; no defined approach; relies on individual partner judgment.

PEC-001 · PARTNER ECONOMICS & PRICING REALIGNMENT · REPORTED LEVEL 1

Has the firm modelled what 20% / 40% time-compression on routine matters does to partner profit at current pricing?

Level 1 — Awareness. The tension between billable-hour realisation and AI efficiency has not been modelled.

Was a baseline (hours per matter type, cycle time, error rate) captured before AI rollout, and is the firm measuring against it?

Level 1 — Awareness. No baseline was captured. Benefits are described in anecdote: 'partners say it saves time'. No numbers.

ALT-V AI GOVERNANCE SCORECARD

AI governance — readiness scorecard

Your firm

FULL REPORT

Your readiness verdict

Exposed

L1 · Exposed

The firm cannot yet answer the questions being asked of it. At least one cluster has effectively nothing in place — and the outside question set (insurer, court, client) probes clusters independently, so the strongest areas do not offset the weakest. The good news: the distance from Exposed to Managed is mostly configuration and adoption, not invention — the artefacts involved are standard and fast to install.

SUMMARY

Your five clusters

Policy & tool control

L2 Ad hoc

L2 · Ad hoc

Training & competence

L1 Absent

L1 · Absent

GATING CLUSTER

Output verification

L1 Absent

L1 · Absent

GATING CLUSTER

Supervision & accountability

L2 Ad hoc

L2 · Ad hoc

Client disclosure & incident response

L1 Absent

L1 · Absent

GATING CLUSTER

Levels run Absent → Ad hoc → Managed → Evidenced. The questions now being asked — by insurers, courts and clients — are answered at Managed and proven at Evidenced.

UNITED KINGDOM

The questions you will face — United Kingdom

The question set converging on UK firms, from three directions at once:

Insurers (proposal and renewal forms). Which AI tools are used, and across which practice areas · what policies and procedures govern use · how human oversight and verification are maintained · whether staff are trained · how client information is protected.

The regulator (SRA guidance, supervision expectations and the August 2026 Warning Notice). Named accountability at COLP and board level · written policies and procedures · training and awareness · monitoring · verification proportionate to risk · telling clients where they are interfacing with AI. The Warning Notice on misuse of AI (17 August 2026) restates the duties on verifying authorities, supervision and client confidentiality, and flags open AI tools and privilege; the SRA's announcement of the Notice records 42 reports between July 2025 and July 2026.

Clients (panel questionnaires and outside-counsel guidelines). Arriving unevenly but arriving: disclosure of AI use on their matters · data-handling assurances · audit rights.

The courts. No England and Wales practice direction on AI disclosure exists as at October 2026 (the Civil Justice Council's final report is awaited), but judges are acting on fabricated authority: Munir [2026] UKUT 81 (IAC) amended the Upper Tribunal judicial review claim form to require a statement that each cited authority exists, can be located from the citation, and supports the proposition, and in Cork v Smith [2026] EWHC 1199 (Ch) the firm referred itself to the SRA after an AI tool produced a non-existent insolvency rule in letters to the court, and the judge ordered the judgment to be sent to the SRA.

A firm at Managed across all five clusters can answer these; a firm at Evidenced can prove its answers.

CLUSTER DETAIL

Per-cluster read and the gap that closes each

POLICY & TOOL CONTROL

L2 Ad hoc L2 · Ad hoc

The firm knows what it bought but not what is used. A policy may exist on the intranet; practice is individual discretion — the pattern the mid-market survey data calls AI as personal tooling rather than firm capability.

What closes this gap: the Alt-V AI Use Policy and Approved Tools Register — partnership-ready templates configured to your firm, generated with the rest of the four-document governance stack.

TRAINING & COMPETENCE

L1 Absent L1 · Absent

People are using tools they have never been trained on, in a profession where the known failure mode — confident fabrication — is invisible to the untrained eye. This is the gap that turns an AI error into a personal conduct issue for the fee-earner involved.

What closes this gap: the training-gates section of the Alt-V AI Use Policy plus the one-page verification desk aid — the artefacts that turn “we ran a session” into a records-backed training regime.

OUTPUT VERIFICATION

L1 Absent L1 · Absent

Nothing stands between an AI hallucination and a client or court except individual conscientiousness. Every publicised AI disaster in the profession — struck citations, wasted-costs orders, referred practitioners — passed through exactly this gap.

What closes this gap: the Alt-V AI Output Verification Protocol — a three-tier standard by output destination, citation checklist, sign-off matrix and matter-file recording, configured to the courts you appear in.

SUPERVISION & ACCOUNTABILITY

L2 Ad hoc L2 · Ad hoc

Ownership exists in name — IT, or an interested partner — without mandate, cadence or authority. Decisions about tools that touch client work are being made below the level that carries the risk.

What closes this gap: the Alt-V AI Governance Committee Terms of Reference — mandate, composition (scaled to firm size), decision rights, cadence and escalation, ready for partnership endorsement.

CLIENT DISCLOSURE & INCIDENT RESPONSE

L1 Absent L1 · Absent

The firm has no position on telling clients about AI use and no defined response if something goes wrong. Both questions are now being asked from outside — this cluster is where external scrutiny lands first.

What closes this gap: the client-communication and incident-reporting sections of the Alt-V AI Use Policy, plus engagement-terms language — a firm position on disclosure, and a route for the bad day.

ENGAGEMENT

How Alt-V can help

SHAPE A

Governance stack installation

A fixed-fee installation of the four-document Alt-V AI governance stack — use policy, governance committee terms of reference, pilot charters, verification protocol — configured to your firm's size, court footprint and tool set, ready for partnership endorsement. Weeks, not months.

SHAPE B

AI readiness and governance review

The wider read: where AI genuinely pays at your firm, in what order, and with what controls — the governance scorecard is one lens of a broader readiness diagnostic that sequences adoption and governance together.

Send Alt-V two things: this report, and the one question from your insurer's proposal form you are least confident answering.

[Email Alt-V](#)

METHOD

How this was scored

How this was scored: each cluster is the median of your answered questions in that cluster (rounded down on ties); your overall verdict is the lowest cluster, not the average. Skipped questions are excluded; clusters with fewer than two answers are not scored. This is a self-assessment: in Alt-V's experience firms score themselves generously on governance, most often on training and verification. If any answer described an intention rather than current practice, re-run it honestly — the gap between the two is exactly what the outside question set exposes.

This scorecard is a management diagnostic, not a compliance opinion and not legal advice. It measures your readiness to answer the questions insurers, courts and clients are now asking — it does not assess compliance with any regulation. Configured governance documents require your firm's own legal sign-off before adoption.

Generated by Alt-V AI Governance Scorecard (v1.1) · Regulatory position locked 7 Oct 2026 · Alt-V Law

NOTICE · FOCUS · CREATE

© 2026 Derek Duffy. Licensed to Alt-V for authorised use.