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Methodology and Data

*Survey Instrument:* The survey questionnaire was offered through an online survey platform as well as through an embedded electronic PDF, both of which allowed respondents to save their work and send to other members of their department to complete relevant sections if needed.

*Fielding Period:* The survey opened on January 30, 2019, and closed on April 12, 2019. Reminder emails were sent weekly.

*Target Population:* We targeted one relevant representative — the person we considered most capable of reporting on the information requested — in each legal department with at least one member of ACC. We reached out to around 10,000 organizations worldwide. In order of priority, we first sent invitations to heads of legal operations or, in many cases, a department’s sole legal operations staff member. If we did not have a member in that position, we then targeted the organization’s general counsel/chief legal officer — who would be able to appropriately delegate this task. If a member was not in either of these positions, we then targeted the highest-ranking individual in the legal department. Finally, if we received no response after repeated attempts, we reached out to a broader group of members in each department requesting that they forward the invitation to the most appropriate individual or group within the department.

*Participation:* A total of 508 legal departments participated. Apart from targeted email messages, opportunities to participate were also sent through LinkedIn campaigns.

*Comparability:* Respondents were asked to report all information for the period January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018 or the closest corresponding fiscal year. We asked legal departments within subsidiary companies to report their information at the level of the subsidiary rather than at the level of the parent company.

*Currency:* Respondents were asked to enter all financial values in US dollars. Non-US respondents were asked to use the exchange rate on December 31, 2018, for currency conversion.

*Industry:* All participating organizations were separately assigned up to three industry affiliations based on Standard Industry Classification (SIC) codes. See “Industry Detail” section for the industry breakdown.

*Anonymity:* Several organizations requested anonymity. We therefore include the designation “Anonymous” in our “Participating Organizations by Industry” list with the associated number of respondents who requested anonymity.

*Incomplete or Unusual Data:* Not all respondents answered all questions. In cases where data appeared unusual, respondents were emailed and asked to clarify their responses. In some cases, we received no reply and therefore had to omit certain data entries from our reporting. The benchmarking metrics reported tend to have a lower sample as complete data is required for all components of each benchmarking calculation.

*Statistical Terminology*

  *Mean:* The values of each observation are summed together and divided by the total number of observations.

  *Median:* This is the middle value of all observations ordered from low to high (also called the 50th percentile).

  *n:* This indicates the number of observations for a given metric or reported value.
## Terms and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centralized — Geographically</strong></td>
<td>Legal department personnel are based in one primary location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed — Geographically</strong></td>
<td>Majority of personnel are based within a primary geographic location, but some are located across operational business units, subsidiaries, or divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decentralized — Geographically</strong></td>
<td>Majority of personnel are located across multiple operational units, subsidiaries, or divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centralized — Reporting Structure</strong></td>
<td>Generally, personnel have a direct line reporting within the legal department up to the general counsel/chief legal officer, regardless of geographic location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed — Reporting Structure</strong></td>
<td>Reporting structures are equally mixed across personnel, with some having a direct line report within the legal department and others within their operational/business unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decentralized — Reporting Structure</strong></td>
<td>Vast majority of personnel have direct line reporting within their operational/business unit and dotted line reporting within the legal department up to the general counsel/chief legal officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paralegals/Case Managers</strong></td>
<td>Typically, non-exempt employees working on legal matters under the supervision of lawyers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Operations Professionals</strong></td>
<td>Staff who are solely dedicated to the management of a legal operations function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Legal Professionals</strong></td>
<td>May include corporate secretary office personnel, technology professionals, IP database management, contract and compliance analysts, and librarians. These are typically exempt employees performing more independent work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside Legal Spend</strong></td>
<td>Includes legal staff compensation (salary, cash bonuses, taxes, and benefits), overhead, and operating expenses (all administrative and office expenses and corporate costs allocated to the legal department). Does not include settlement costs, judgments, fines, recoveries, or filing fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Legal Spend</strong></td>
<td>Includes outside counsel, other service providers, and patent and trademark filing fees. Does not include settlement costs, judgments, fines, recoveries, or costs associated with claims or capitalized expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Litigation Matters</strong></td>
<td>Includes internal and external litigation matters (lawsuits only), including those that were still active at the time of survey participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts</strong></td>
<td>Contracts reviewed in 2018 from initial request until the contract has been completed or negotiations have been suspended or abandoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Cycle Time</strong></td>
<td>Average number of days from initial request until the contract has been completed or negotiations have been suspended or abandoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Significant” Law Firms</strong></td>
<td>Those firms that make up approximately 80 percent of the legal department’s spending on outside counsel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Summary

Table 1 presents a summary of all participating legal departments across six standard segments. Of note, we received strong non-US participation (36.2 percent) and a significant presence of organizations in the manufacturing and services industries. Nearly half of all organizations are privately owned and vary greatly in size, with one quarter under $100 million in revenue and 40 percent greater than $1 billion.

Table 1: Demographic Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/Pacific</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and Africa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization industrya</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, real estate</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization typeb</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly owned subsidiary</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (federal, state, local)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization’s total gross revenue 2018 (US $)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$100M</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100M to $499M</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500M to $999M</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1B to $2.9B</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3B to $9.9B</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10B or more</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization employees</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,000</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal staff</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 9</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 99</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 or more</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Industry list is based on Standard Industry Classification (SIC) Codes. See “Industry Detail” section for exhaustive list of sub-industries included. In some cases, companies were assigned more than one industry affiliation. Percentages therefore total to greater than 100 percent.

b Percentages total to greater than 100 percent due to ability to select more than one response option.
1. Key Benchmarks — Staffing

Legal staffing is a crucial component of any corporate legal department benchmarking effort. This is particularly true for legal given the uniquely difficult task of demonstrating the value of additional headcount when there is rarely a direct tie to the company’s revenue. Optimizing headcount is essential not only for effective legal coverage and product quality but also for internal client satisfaction and to operate in a proactive rather than reactive state. Table 2 presents 24 standardized staffing metrics representing the overall survey respondent population. We include five major staff categories. Contract (temporary) staff are listed as a separate category and are not included in the total inside legal staff calculations.

Table 2: Legal Department Staffing Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Legal Department Staff by Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of lawyers</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of paralegals/case managers</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of legal operations professionals</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-legal professionals</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of administrative/secretarial staff</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total inside legal staff</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contract (temporary) staff</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff by Position as a Percentage of Total Legal Department Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers as a percentage of total staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegals/case managers as a percentage of total staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal operations professionals as a percentage of total staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-legal professionals as a percentage of total staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/secretarial staff as a percentage of total staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Legal Department Staffing Metrics (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff by Position as a Percentage of Total Company Employees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegals/case managers as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal operations professionals as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-legal professionals as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/secretarial staff as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lawyer-to-staff Ratios</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per paralegal/case manager</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per legal operations professionals</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per non-legal professionals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per admin/secretary</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per total non-lawyer staff</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Department Staff Standardized by Company Revenue</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per $1 billion in company revenue</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>223.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal staff per $1 billion in company revenue</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>342.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See “Benchmarking Calculations” section for a complete list of metrics and their calculations.

**METRIC HIGHLIGHT**

Lawyers per $1 Billion in Company Revenue (Median)

- **Overall:** 8.7
- **Industry High:** 15.0
- **Industry Low:** 3.64
Legal spend takes many forms but it primarily centers around internal staffing costs, external legal fees, and the resulting cost of not having adequate legal resources (i.e., the cost of regulatory fines and penalties). We therefore break down internal and external legal spend into a series of relevant metrics that are standardized by staff size, overall legal spend, and company revenue. To allow for more direct and consistent comparison, these numbers do not reflect settlement costs, judgements, fines, recoveries, or costs associated with claims or capitalized expenses. Table 3 lists 37 standardized spending metrics representing the overall survey respondent population.

Table 3: Legal Department Spending Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Legal Spend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal spend (budgeted) 2018</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>$12,363,487</td>
<td>$1,600,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>$16,664,691</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to actual spend ratio 2018</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total legal spend (actual) as a percentage of company revenue 2018</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company revenue divided by total legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>$633</td>
<td>$249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total legal spend per lawyer</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>$718,580</td>
<td>$497,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total legal spend per legal staff</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>$432,856</td>
<td>$294,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company revenue per lawyer</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>$406,295,076</td>
<td>$115,321,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company revenue per legal staff</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>$248,095,521</td>
<td>$74,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside Legal Spend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>$7,666,164</td>
<td>$847,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside spend (actual) as a percentage of total legal spend (actual)</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside spend (actual) as a percentage of company revenue</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per inside spend (actual)</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>$1,621</td>
<td>$530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lawyer compensation and benefits spend</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$4,689,479</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer compensation and benefits as a percentage of total inside spend</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-lawyer compensation and benefits spend</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>$1,800,612</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-lawyer compensation and benefits as a percentage of total inside spend</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other inside spend</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>$1,173,411</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other inside spend as a percentage of total inside spend</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside spend per lawyer</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>$297,635</td>
<td>$227,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside spend per legal staff</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>$180,092</td>
<td>$142,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per lawyer hour</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>$114</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per non-lawyer hour</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3: Legal Department Spending Metrics (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>$9,710,316</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend (actual) as a percentage of total legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend (actual) as a percentage of company revenue</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per outside spend (actual)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>$1,910</td>
<td>$485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total outside spend on outside counsel</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>$5,794,148</td>
<td>$612,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend (on outside counsel) as a percentage of total outside spend</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total outside spend on other service providers</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$730,071</td>
<td>$10,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend (on other service providers) as a percentage of total outside spend</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total patent and trademark filing fees</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>$662,117</td>
<td>$1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent and trademark filing fees as a percentage of total outside spend</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other outside spend</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>$195,269</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other outside spend as a percentage of total outside spend</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend per lawyer</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>$423,977</td>
<td>$227,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend per legal staff</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>$251,655</td>
<td>$130,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See “Benchmarking Calculations” section for a complete list of metrics and their calculations.

### Metric Highlight

**Cost per Lawyer Hour (Median)**

- **Overall:** Median $90 per hour
- **Industry High:** Mining: $123 per hour
- **Industry Low:** Wholesale Trade: $74 per hour
Optimizing workload and how that work is allocated internally and externally is critical for maintaining proper coverage and efficiency in the legal department. Just as headcount and spend are intimately tied to one another, having a better understanding of current workload and work allocation directly affects proper optimization of headcount and spend. This section first presents metrics on litigation matters and contracts handled in the legal department. We then present the internal versus external work allocation among 12 different work area categories. Finally, we show how insourced work is distributed across several staff positions.

Table 4: Legal Department Workload Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Litigation Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of litigation matters handled</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>427.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of litigation matters handled per inside lawyer</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contracts reviewed</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>2,198.4</td>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contracts reviewed per inside lawyer</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract cycle time (in number of days)</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See “Benchmarking Calculations” section for a complete list of metrics and their calculations.

Figure 1 shows how legal departments allocate work across 12 broad work categories. The data in each bar chart represents the percentage of departments allocating work in five ways. The work is performed in-house, outsourced to a law firm, outsourced to an alternative legal service provider (ALSP), handled in another way, or not performed at all. In many cases, each type of work is allocated in more than one way, which is reflected in the resulting data.
Figure 1: Legal Department Work Allocation

- **Contract Management—Review and Drafting**: 97%
  - Insource (In-house): 16%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 3%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 2%
  - Other: 1%
- **Discovery—Data Collection**: 57%
  - Insource (In-house): 31%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 9%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 3%
  - Other: 3%
- **Discovery—Data Processing /Hosting**: 34% 36%
  - Insource (In-house): 18%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 4%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 4%
  - Other: 7%

- **Document Management—Review and Drafting**: 88%
  - Insource (In-house): 19%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 4%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 2%
  - Other: 5%
- **Due Diligence**: 69%
  - Insource (In-house): 50%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 4%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 3%
  - Other: 7%
- **Intellectual Property Services**: 44%
  - Insource (In-house): 44%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 7%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 3%
  - Other: 7%

- **Invoice Review**: 94%
  - Insource (In-house): 1%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 1%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 2%
  - Other: 4%
- **Legal Operations**: 93%
  - Insource (In-house): 2%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 1%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 1%
  - Other: 6%
- **Legal Research**: 79%
  - Insource (In-house): 3%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 2%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 2%
  - Other: 1%

- **Litigation—Legal Hold**: 71%
  - Insource (In-house): 31%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 2%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 11%
  - Other: 1%
- **Litigation—Case/Project Management**: 65%
  - Insource (In-house): 48%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 1%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 1%
  - Other: 10%
- **Records Management**: 90%
  - Insource (In-house): 6%
  - Outsource to Law Firm: 2%
  - Outsource to ALSP/LPO: 5%
  - Other: 5%
If respondents reported that any of the 12 work categories were performed in-house, we then asked how this work was distributed across staff positions. Table 5 presents the distribution of work in-house among seven types of positions. Percentages indicate the average amount of work in each category that is done for each legal department staff position. Cells with darker shades indicate that a larger percentage of work is carried out by that staff category.

Table 5: In-house Work Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Category</th>
<th>Lawyers</th>
<th>Paralegals/Case Managers</th>
<th>Legal Operations Professionals</th>
<th>Non-Legal Professionals</th>
<th>Administrative/Secretarial Staff</th>
<th>Contract (Temp.) Staff</th>
<th>Other Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract management — review and drafting</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery — data collection</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery — data processing/hosting</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document management — review and drafting</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due diligence</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property services</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoice review</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal operations</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal research</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation — legal hold</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation — case/project management</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records management</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Key Benchmarks — Law Firms and Fee Structures

Law firm convergence and alternative fee structures are topics of serious interest for corporate legal departments as the pressure to do more with less and to demonstrate value to the business only continues to grow. We present several metrics to help departments get a better sense of the law firm usage and fee structures commonly used among the overall survey population. Table 6 provides the average number of law firms employed by legal departments as well as the number employed across 30 separate practice areas. We also show the average number of law firms used that make up roughly 80 percent of a departments external spend. The numbers only reflect departments that employed at least one law firm in each practice area.

Table 6: Law Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Firms Employed by Legal Department</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of law firms employed</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of “significant” law firms employed</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Firms Employed by Practice Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antitrust</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital markets</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity/IT governance</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data privacy</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits/executive compensation</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/labor</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General/corporate commercial</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government relations</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry specific</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property — licensing</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property — patent</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property — trademark</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation — commercial</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation — environmental</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation — patent</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation — product liability</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation — securities</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation — trademark</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued ...
We then asked respondents to select which fee structures their department uses and what percentage of their external spend uses each of the fee structures listed. The upper bar indicates the percentage of legal departments that use each of the fee structures. The bottom bar indicates the percentage of outside counsel spend that is based on each fee structure. Fee structures are presented in descending order by adoption percentage.

**Figure 2: Fee Adoption and Outside Counsel Spend Percentage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Structure</th>
<th>Fee Adoption Percentage</th>
<th>Outside Counsel Spend Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discounts from standard hourly rates</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard hourly rates</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat fees for entire matters or for some stages of matters</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capped fees</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended hourly rates</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retainers (including periodic retainer fees)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives or success fees</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency fees (including reverse contingency fees)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based holdbacks</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Law Firms (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Structure</th>
<th>Litigation — other</th>
<th>Mergers and acquisitions</th>
<th>Property and casualty</th>
<th>Real estate</th>
<th>Regulatory</th>
<th>Securities/finance</th>
<th>Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Use of Technology

Employing the right technology in the appropriate functional areas can help to greatly improve matter and document management, contract processes, and financial record keeping, ultimately helping to streamline time consuming processes and reduce the amount of time spent on low-value work. It is essential for establishing and maintaining an efficient legal department. With a burgeoning legal technology industry, the process for acquiring the right technology for one’s department can be overwhelming. In order to better understand current technology usage among departments, we presented respondents with fourteen different legal technology solution areas and were asked to select those areas in which their legal department has implemented technology. Among each technology solution used, respondents were asked to list the specific vendor(s) and system(s) they employed and then rate each vendor and system on a five-point satisfaction scale. Figure 3 presents the percentage of departments that have implemented technology across each solution area among the overall survey population. See "Legal Technology Definitions" section on page 25 for a complete list of technology definitions.

Figure 3: Technology Adoption by Key Legal Technology Area

- eSignature: 43.9%
- Contract management: 41.3%
- Document management: 38.4%
- Matter management: 31.3%
- eBilling: 27.2%
- Records management: 19.7%
- Workflow tools: 18.9%
- IP management: 18.7%
- eDiscovery (legal holds): 16.7%
- Collaboration/knowledge management: 16.1%
- Analytics: 14.2%
- eDiscovery (collections and processing): 12.6%
- eDiscovery (analytics and review): 8.9%
- Integration tools: 3.7%
Table 7 presents the single most common (mode) vendor and system listed by respondents for each technology solution area. The “n” size indicates the number of respondents that use each of the listed vendors and systems. Many vendors produce systems in more than one solution area and are therefore eligible to be listed across more than one category. For example, 33 legal departments use Thomson Reuters as their eBilling technology vendor out of the total number of departments that listed a specific vendor in that solution area. This does not necessarily mean that a majority of participating legal departments use Thomson Reuters, simply that it is the most common vendor listed in that solution area.

Table 7: Most Common Vendors and Systems by Key Legal Technology Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Legal Areas</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Most Common VENDOR</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Most Common SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eSignature</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>DocuSign</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>DocuSign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract management</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>SharePoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document management</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>SharePoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Thomson Reuters</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Legal Tracker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBilling</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Thomson Reuters</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Legal Tracker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SharePoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow tools</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SharePoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP management</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>CPA Global</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FoundationIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (legal holds)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Zapproved</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Legal Hold Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/knowledge management</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>SharePoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Power BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (collections and processing)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Custom Build/OpenText/Relativity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Custom Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (analytics and review)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Relativity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RelativityOne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration tools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: It is not stated or implied that the vendors or products listed are recommended or endorsed by ACC in any way, and ACC expresses no opinion on them. ACC members and others should exercise independent judgement when selecting vendors and products.
Figures 4 and 5 present vendor and system satisfaction ratings, respectively, across technology solution areas. The ratings represent the overall satisfaction scores of the collective vendors and systems within a technology area and do not intend to reflect any single vendor or system. Both charts show the percentage of respondents that selected a specific satisfaction rating on a five-point scale and the data is ordered by the collective percentage totals of the “very satisfied” and “satisfied” categories. Exact percentages are presented only for those two categories for ease of interpretation.

**Figure 4: Vendor Satisfaction by Key Legal Technology Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Area</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration tools</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eSignature</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytics</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow tools</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (collections and processing)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (analytics and review)</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (legal holds)</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP management</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBilling</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter management</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document management</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract management</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/knowledge management</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records management</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5: System Satisfaction by Key Legal Technology Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Area</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration tools</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eSignature</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytics</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow tools</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (collections and processing)</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (analytics and review)</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBilling</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP management</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (legal holds)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter management</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records management</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/knowledge management</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document management</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract management</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to presenting ratings through categorical percentages, Figure 6 shows the average vendor and system rating across each technological solution. The top bar in each row lists the average satisfaction rating of all vendors collectively listed by respondents for each solution area. The bottom bar presents the same information for each system. The data is shown in descending order from highest to lowest average vendor rating. The bars on the right-hand side of the chart show the difference between average vendor and system ratings.

**Figure 6: Overall Vendor and System Ratings by Key Legal Technology Area**
6. Performance Scoring

In order to demonstrate effective legal performance and high value to the business, legal departments must define their strategic priorities and align them with those of the broader organization and measure their performance in achieving these priorities. We developed a set of 10 legal department performance attributes that emphasize outside counsel management in terms of spend and communication, optimizing operational efficiencies like work allocation and the employment of technology, talent development, and value alignment. Respondents were presented with each of the 10 performance attributes and asked to rate (on a five-point scale) both the importance of each attribute in their legal department and how satisfied they were with their department’s performance in each area. Table 8 lists each attribute and the overall average importance and satisfaction scores across all participating departments.

Table 8: Legal Department Performance Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We actively identify and implement ways to reduce outside counsel spend and other external spend.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We provide regular feedback on outside counsel performance to help ensure high quality, cost-effective legal work.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Our legal department initiatives/activities are aligned with our clients’ strategic priorities.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We regularly solicit feedback from our internal clients to improve our delivery of legal services.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Our clients consistently use a legal intake mechanism to allow us to track and assign requests for legal services.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work allocation among our legal department staff is measured or tracked to ensure the right work is being done by the right people.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We employ technology to streamline processes and reduce time spend on low-value work in the legal department.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We actively promote professional development opportunities for our legal staff.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Our legal department has a culture that promotes innovation and/or continuous improvement of legal services.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We clearly demonstrate the value of the legal department to our business leaders and other stakeholders.</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance Rating Scale: 1 = Not Important; 2 = Slightly Important; 3 = Moderately Important; 4 = Important; 5 = Very Important
Satisfaction Rating Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Satisfied; 5 = Very Satisfied
Figure 7 presents the average importance and satisfaction ratings for each attribute among all departments listed in descending order, from highest to lowest importance score. The outer bar represents the average importance score and the inner bar represents the average satisfaction score. The bar on the right-hand side of the chart shows the difference between average importance and satisfaction scores.

**Figure 7: Performance Ratings—Importance vs. Satisfaction**

In addition to charting the importance-satisfaction gaps across attributes, we created a performance matrix that assigns value labels based on a legal department’s combined importance and satisfaction scores for any given attribute. Figure 8 presents this matrix with each of four quadrants assigning a value label. For example, if a respondent rated a performance attribute as at least moderately important (on the y axis) and was neutral or dissatisfied (on the x axis) in the department’s performance, then that attribute is labeled as an “opportunity for improvement.”

**Figure 8: Legal Department Performance Matrix**
We then use the performance matrix to determine how legal departments are generally performing across each of the 10 attributes. Table 9 shows the percentage of departments that are assigned to each of the four quadrants for each performance attribute. Quadrants with the highest percentage of departments are highlighted. Attributes five, six, and seven are areas in which a plurality of departments have the greatest opportunity for improvement, while a plurality are performing well across the remaining attributes. However, there is strong variation across quadrants. Very few departments are exceeding expectations in any attribute and at least one third of departments have an opportunity to improve their performance in four of the remaining seven attributes.

Table 9: Quadrants Assigned by Performance Attribute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Department Performance Attributes</th>
<th>Opportunity for Improvement</th>
<th>Keep Up the Good Work</th>
<th>Exceeding Expectations</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We actively identify and implement ways to reduce outside counsel spend and other external spend.</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We provide regular feedback on outside counsel performance to help ensure high quality, cost-effective legal work.</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our legal department initiatives/activities are aligned with our clients’ strategic priorities.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We regularly solicit feedback from our internal clients to improve our delivery of legal services.</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Our clients consistently use a legal intake mechanism to allow us to track and assign requests for legal services.</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work allocation among our legal department staff is measured or tracked to ensure the right work is being done by the right people.</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We employ technology to streamline processes and reduce time spend on low-value work in the legal department.</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. We actively promote professional development opportunities for our legal staff.</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Our legal department has a culture that promotes innovation and/or continuous improvement of legal services.</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. We clearly demonstrate the value of the legal department to our business leaders and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmark Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmarking Metrics</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Legal Department Staff by Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of lawyers</td>
<td>Total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of paralegals/case managers</td>
<td>Total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of legal operations professionals</td>
<td>Total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-legal professionals</td>
<td>Total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of administrative/secretarial staff</td>
<td>Total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total inside legal staff</td>
<td>Total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contract (temporary) staff</td>
<td>Total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff by Position as a Percentage of Total Legal Department Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers as a percentage of total staff</td>
<td>Lawyers divided by total legal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegals/case managers as a percentage of total staff</td>
<td>Paralegals/case managers divided by total legal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal operations professionals as a percentage of total staff</td>
<td>Legal operations professionals divided by total legal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-legal professionals as a percentage of total staff</td>
<td>Non-legal professionals divided by total legal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/secretarial staff as a percentage of total staff</td>
<td>Administrative/secretarial staff divided by total legal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff by Position as a Percentage of Total Company Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>Lawyers divided by total company employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegals/case managers as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>Paralegals/case managers divided by total company employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal operations professionals as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>Legal operations professionals divided by total company employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-legal professionals as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>Non-legal professionals divided by total company employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/secretarial staff as a percentage of total company employees</td>
<td>Administrative/secretarial staff divided by total company employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawyer to Staff Ratios</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per paralegal/case manager</td>
<td>Lawyers divided by paralegals/case managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per legal operations professionals</td>
<td>Lawyers divided by legal operations professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per non-legal professionals</td>
<td>Lawyers divided by non-legal professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per admin/secretary</td>
<td>Lawyers divided by administrative/secretarial staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per total non-lawyer staff</td>
<td>Lawyers divided by non-lawyer staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Department Staff Standardized by Company Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers per $1 billion in company revenue</td>
<td>Lawyers divided by (revenue divided by $1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal staff per $1 billion in company revenue</td>
<td>Total legal staff divided by (revenue divided by $1B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benchmarking Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total Legal Spend</strong></th>
<th><strong>Calculation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal spend (budgeted) 2018</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to actual spend ratio 2018</td>
<td>Subtract budgeted amount from actual amount. Take the difference and divide by the budgeted amount. Multiply the resulting rate by 100 to find the % change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total legal spend (actual) as a percentage of company revenue 2018</td>
<td>Total legal spend divided by company revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company revenue divided by total legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>Company revenue divided by total legal spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total legal spend per lawyer</td>
<td>Total legal spend divided by lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total legal spend per legal staff</td>
<td>Total legal spend divided by total legal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company revenue per lawyer</td>
<td>Company revenue divided by lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company revenue per legal staff</td>
<td>Company revenue divided by total legal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside Legal Spend</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside spend (actual) as a percentage of total legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>Total inside spend divided by total legal spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside spend (actual) as a percentage of company revenue</td>
<td>Total inside spend divided by company revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per inside spend (actual)</td>
<td>Company revenue divided by total inside spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lawyer compensation and benefits spend</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer compensation and benefits as a percentage of total inside spend</td>
<td>Lawyer compensation &amp; benefits spend divided by total inside spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-lawyer compensation and benefits spend</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-lawyer compensation and benefits as a percentage of total inside spend</td>
<td>Non-lawyer compensation &amp; benefits spend divided by total inside spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other inside spend</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other inside spend as a percentage of total inside spend</td>
<td>Other inside spend divided by total inside spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside spend per lawyer</td>
<td>Total inside spend divided by lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside spend per legal staff</td>
<td>Total inside spend divided by total legal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per lawyer hour</td>
<td>Total lawyer compensation &amp; benefits spend divided by (lawyers x 1,800 billable hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per non-lawyer hour</td>
<td>Total non-lawyer compensation &amp; benefits spend divided by (non-lawyers x 1,800 billable hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued...
### Benchmarking Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Legal Spend</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend (actual) as a percentage of total legal spend (actual) 2018</td>
<td>Total outside spend divided by total legal spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend (actual) as a percentage of company revenue</td>
<td>Total outside spend divided by company revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per outside spend (actual)</td>
<td>Company revenue divided by total outside spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total outside spend on outside counsel</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend (on outside counsel) as a percentage of total outside spend</td>
<td>Outside spend (on outside counsel) divided by total outside spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total outside spend on other service providers</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend (on other service providers) as a percentage of total outside spend</td>
<td>Outside spend (on other service providers) divided by total outside spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total patent and trademark filing fees</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent and trademark filing fees as a percentage of total outside spend</td>
<td>Patent &amp; trademark filing fees divided by total outside spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other outside spend</td>
<td>Total number (in $US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend as a percentage of total outside spend</td>
<td>Other outside spend divided by total outside spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend per lawyer</td>
<td>Total outside spend divided by lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spend per legal staff</td>
<td>Total outside spend divided by total legal staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Litigation Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of litigation matters handled</td>
<td>Total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of litigation matters handled per inside lawyer</td>
<td>Number of litigation matters divided by inside lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contracts reviewed</td>
<td>Total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contracts reviewed per inside lawyer</td>
<td>Number of contracts divided by inside lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract cycle time</td>
<td>Number of days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Legal Technology Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Technology Area</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytics</td>
<td>Analytics tools support the collection, organization, and use of data to inform decision making and performance management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/knowledge management</td>
<td>Collaboration and knowledge management tools are used to support the process of capturing, distributing, and effectively using both structured and tacit knowledge assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract management</td>
<td>Contract management tools are used to support contract lifecycle management, including requesting, authoring, negotiating, approving, signing, analyzing, and storing contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document management</td>
<td>Document management tools are used to track, manage, and store digital documents and email, and reduce paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBilling</td>
<td>eBilling tools are used to submit invoices from outside counsel or external entities over the internet to organizations and support the processing of invoice payments electronically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (analytics and review)</td>
<td>Tools used to analyze and review data for eDiscovery and support the phases of the Electronic Discovery Reference Model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (collections and processing)</td>
<td>Tools used to identify, preserve, collect, and process data for eDiscovery and support the phases of the Electronic Discovery Reference Model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDiscovery (legal holds)</td>
<td>Legal hold tools are used to automate and manage the entire process of legal hold notifications, tracking responses, interviews, reminders, and escalations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eSignature</td>
<td>eSignature tools are used for electronic sending, signing, and managing of agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration tools</td>
<td>Integration tools are used to provide a way to connect and manage software applications and automate a variety of critical business processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP management</td>
<td>IP management tools are used to track and manage IP portfolios (patents and trademarks), provide docketing support, and process annuity payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter management</td>
<td>Matter management tools are used to manage and track legal matters, day-to-day matter work, and matter budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records management</td>
<td>Records management tools are used to manage the inventory of records. Typical items tracked include paper records, tapes, electronic media, and electronic data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow tools</td>
<td>Workflow tools are used to automate business processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industry Detail

01-09  Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing
  01 Agricultural Production—Crops
  02 Agricultural Production—Livestock
  07 Agricultural Services
  08 Forestry
  09 Fishing, Hunting, and Trapping

10-14  Mining
  10 Metal Mining
  12 Coal Mining
  13 Oil and Gas Extraction
  14 Nonmetallic Minerals, Except Fuel

15-17  Construction
  15 General Building Contractors
  16 Heavy Construction, Except Building
  17 Special Trade Contractors

20-39  Manufacturing
  20 Food and Kindred Products
  21 Tobacco Products
  22 Textile Mill Products
  23 Apparel & Other Textile Products
  24 Lumber and Wood Products
  25 Furniture and Fixtures
  26 Paper and Allied Products
  27 Printing and Publishing
  28 Chemicals and Allied Products
  29 Petroleum and Coal Products
  30 Rubber & Misc. Plastics Products
  31 Leather and Leather Products
  32 Stone, Clay, and Glass Products
  33 Primary Metal Industries
  34 Fabricated Metal Products
  35 Industrial Machinery & Equipment
  36 Electronic & Other Electronic Equipment
  37 Transportation Equipment
  38 Instruments & Related Products
  39 Misc. Manufacturing Industries

40-49  Transportation
  40 Railroad Transportation
  41 Local & Intercity Passenger Transit
  42 Trucking and Warehousing
  44 Water Transportation
  45 Transportation by Air
  46 Pipelines, Except Natural Gas
  47 Transportation Services
  48 Communications
  49 Electric, Gas & Sanitary Services

50-51  Wholesale Trade
  50 Wholesale Trade—Durable Goods
  51 Wholesale Trade—Nondurable Goods

52-59  Retail Trade
  52 Building Materials & Garden Supplies
  53 General Merchandise Stores
  54 Food Stores
  55 Automotive Dealers & Service Stations
  56 Apparel and Accessory Stores
  57 Furniture and Home Furnishings Stores
  58 Eating and Drinking Places
  59 Miscellaneous Retail

60-67  Finance, Insurance, Real Estate
  60 Depository Institutions
  61 Nondepository Institutions
  62 Security and Commodity Brokers
  63 Insurance Carriers
  64 Insurance Agents, Brokers, & Service
  65 Real Estate
  67 Holding & Other Investment Services

70-89  Services
  70 Hotels and Other Lodging Places
  72 Personal Services
  73 Business Services
  75 Auto Repair, Services, and Parking
  76 Miscellaneous Repair Services
  78 Motion Pictures
  79 Amusement & Recreation Services
  80 Heath Services
  81 Legal Services
  82 Educational Services
  83 Social Services
  84 Museums, Botanical, Zoological Gardens
  86 Membership Organizations
  87 Engineering & Management Services
  89 Services, NEC

91-99  Public Administration
  91 Executive, Legislative & General Government, Except Finance
  92 Justice, Public Order and Safety
  93 Public Finance, Taxation and Monetary Policy
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Participating Organizations by Industry

**Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing**
- Australian Vintage Limited
- Elders
- Golder Associates Pty Ltd
- Hancock Victorian Plantations Pty Limited

**Mining**
- Alacer Gold
- Apex Energy
- ConocoPhillips
- Continental Resources, Inc.
- Devon Energy Corporation LP
- Iluka Resources Limited
- MEG Energy Corp
- Northern Star Resources Limited
- Origin Energy
- Parker Drilling
- Royal Dutch Shell
- Anonymous (1)

**Construction**
- ATCO Australia
- Douglass Colony Group, Inc.
- Encore Electric, Inc.
- Graham Group
- JELD-WEN, Inc.
- McMahon Services
- Nabholz Construction
- Anonymous (1)

**Manufacturing**
- 3M Japan Limited
- A10 Networks
- Abbott
- Adelaide Brighton Ltd
- Advanced Sterilization Products
- Ag Growth International
- Ambev S.A.
- Apex Tool Group
- APIVITA S.A.
- Arauco Argentina S.A.
- ARM, Ltd.
- Auria Solutions
- Australian Vintage Limited
- BAE Systems Electronic Systems
- Bayer Italy
- Bio-Rad
- BlackBerry
- BlueScope Steel Limited
- Boehringer Ingelheim Italia S.p.A.
- Bombardier Commercial Aircraft
- Boston Scientific Corporation
- BRP Inc.
- BSH Home Appliances Corporation
- Buzzi Unicem USA
- CEA Technologies
- Celulosa Araucayo Constitucion S.A.
- Chemence
- Coca-Cola Amatil
- Collins Aerospace
- Concord Energy Holdings LLC
- ConocoPhillips
- Danaher
- Dell Technologies
- DENSIO
- DIADORAR
- Diageo plc
- Dialog Semiconductor plc
- DIC Corporation
- DMG MORI USA
- ECI Telecom
- Elkom Silicones USA Corp.
- Energizer Holdings Inc.
- Enphase Energy, Inc.
- Essilor Amera Pte Ltd
- Fitbit
- Flex Technology Group
- Florida Crystals Corporation
- Fluidigm Corporation
- Fresenius Medical Care Asia Pacific
- Fujitsu Australia Limited
- GE Transportation
- General Mills
- Gentell, Inc.
- GM Cruise LLC
- Hankook Tire America Corp.
- Hanwha Q CELLS America Inc.
- Harland Clarke Corp
- Hearst
- Heraeus, Inc.
- Hewlett Packard Enterprise
- HID Global Corporation
- Hills Limited
- Huntington Ingalls Industries
- Huntsman Corporation
- Hurco Companies, Inc.
- Husqvarna Group
- Imperial Tobacco
- Ingersoll-Rand
- Inmarsat Inc.
- Inteva Products, LLC
- Jaguar Land Rover LATAM
- JELD-WEN Australia Pty Limited
- JELD-WEN, Inc.
- JLL Technology Co. Ltd.
- John Deere
- Johns Manville
- Keter
- KidKraft, Inc.
- Kohler Co.
- Laidig Systems, Inc.
- Lassonde Pappas and Company, Inc.
- Levi Strauss & Co.
- LG Electronics USA, Inc.
- LifeStyles
- Lifeway Foods
- Lindt & Sprüngli
- LMI Aerospace
- Lockheed Martin Corporation
- Lonza Inc.
- Lululemon
- Lumenis
- Mahindra & Mahindra Limited
- Mediatek
- Menasha Corporation
- Micron Technology, Inc.
- MobileHelp, LLC
- Movado Group Inc.
- Nauto
- Nestlé Argentina S.A.
- Nestle Purina
- Nike Argentina
- Nokia Oyj
- Novartis
- Nsight
- NV Bekaert SA
- NXP
- OLEO CBD Drink Mixes
- ON Semiconductor
- Optics 1, Inc.
- OSRAM SYLVANIA Inc.
- Overhead Door Corporation
- OXEA Holding GmbH
- P. H. Glatfelter Company
- Panasonic
- Parker Hannifin Corporation
- PepsiCo Inc.
- Pilot Chemical Company
- Poly-America, L.P.
- PolyOne Corporation
- PPG Industries (Asia Pacific)
- Proeza
- Proteostasis Therapeutics, Inc.
- Rafael Advanced Defense Systems Ltd.
- Ricoh
- Riello S.p.A.
- Royal Dutch Shell
- Sara Lee Frozen Bakery
- Schréder
- Seagate Technology
Semiconductor Devices
Shape Technologies Group, Inc.
Siegfried
Siemens Healthcare Pty Ltd
Sihuan Pharmaceutical Holdings Group Ltd
Sony Middle East and Africa
Sophia Tolli Australia
SPIG S.p.A.
Stella-Jones Corporation
Subaru of Indiana Automotive, Inc.
Sumitomo Chemical
SunOpta Inc.
Superior Group of Companies, Inc.
SVP Worldwide/Singer Sewing
Syngenta
Targus
TE Connectivity Ltd.
Tenova
The Hershey Company
The New York Blower Company
The New York Times Company
Toyota Motor Corporation Australia Limited
Traditional Medicinals
TTM Technologies, Inc.
United Launch Alliance, LLC
United Technologies Corporation
Ventura Foods, LLC
Vi-Jon, Inc.
Vitamix
Vorwerk International Strecker & Co Werner Co.
Western Forest Products
Whirlpool Corporation
Xerox Argentina ICSA
Zebra Technologies Corporation
Anonymous (6)

Transportation
Akamai Technologies, Inc.
ATCO Australia
Australia Post
Cargolux
CGI
Data#3 Limited
ElectraNet Pty Limited
Encompass Digital Media
FedEx Ground Package System Inc.
Fraport Greece
Gogo Inc.
Hispasat
Innmarsat Inc.
ITV plc
Ixom Chemicals Group
Klook Travel Technology Ltd.
Lineage Logistics
Matson Navigation Company
Megaport
Middle East Broadcasting Networks
Muscatine Power & Water
Nine Entertainment Co. Holdings Ltd
Optus
Origin Energy
Ormat
Patriot Rail Company LLC
Pinnacle West Capital Corp
Queensland Rail
Sempra Energy
SGSP (Australia) Assets Pty Ltd
SunOpta Inc.
Telstra Corporation Limited
Verizon Media
Anonymous (4)

Wholesale Trade
3M Japan Limited
Acorn Stairlifts, Inc.
Ag Growth International
Agtegra Cooperative
Australian Vintage Limited
BAE Systems Electronic Systems
Becton Dickinson Spain
BlueScope Steel Limited
BRP Inc.
Calabrio, Inc.
Compass Group
Concord Energy Holdings LLC
Cox Automotive
Data#3 Limited
Diageo plc
Dialog Semiconductor plc
Dicalite Management Group, Inc.
Elders
Emerson Ecologics, LLC
Energizer Holdings Inc.
Fastenal Company
Fresenius Medical Care Asia Pacific
General Mills
Gordon Food Service
Hankook Tire America Corp.
Hills Limited
IMCD US LLC
Imperial Tobacco
Integrated Research Ltd.
International Dairy Queen
Ixom Chemicals Group
John Deere
Laidig Systems, Inc.
LG Electronics USA, Inc.
Lifeway Foods
Macy's, Inc.
Mansfield Oil Company of Gainesville, Inc.
McKesson Corporation
Mediatek
Medison
Murata Electronics Europe
Nabholz Construction
Nagase Holdings America Corp.
Nike Argentina
OLEO CBD Drink Mixes
ON Semiconductor
OSRAM SYLVANIA Inc.
P. H. Glatfelter Company
Panasonic
Parker Hannifin Corporation
Ricoh
Sara Lee Frozen Bakery
Schréder
Sihuan Pharmaceutical Holdings Group Ltd
SmartDrive Systems Inc.
Sumitomo Chemical
SunOpta Inc.
SVP Worldwide/Singer Sewing
Targus
Tech Data
The Marketing Store Worldwide (Asia) Ltd
The New York Blower Company
U.S. Venture, Inc.
Ultimate Positioning Group Pty Ltd
United Farmers of Alberta Co-operative Limited
Ventura Foods, LLC
Victory Wholesale Group
Western Forest Products
Xerox Argentina ICSA
Young Living Essential Oils
Anonymous (5)

Retail Trade
7-Eleven Stores Pty. Ltd.
Acorn Stairlifts, Inc.
Belk, Inc.
BSH Home Appliances Corporation
CarMax, Inc.
Coles Group Limited
Collins Foods Limited
Danaher
Discount Tire
Emerson Ecologics, LLC
Experian Australia Pty Ltd
Francesca’s
Gentell, Inc.
Guardian Pharmacy, LLC
International Dairy Queen
Jaguar Land Rover LATAM
Klook Travel Technology Ltd.
Levi Strauss & Co.
Lululemon
Macy's, Inc.
Mason Companies, Inc.
McDonald's Development Italy LLC
McDonald's Nederland B.V.
McDonald's Restaurants of Canada Ltd.
Meijer
Optus
PPG Industries (Asia Pacific)
Rimini Street
Sophia Tolli Australia
Stanton Optical
Stitch Fix
Subaru of Indiana Automotive, Inc.
Tastemade, Inc.
Toyota Motor Corporation Australia Limited
Ultimate Positioning Group Pty Ltd
Vitamix
Wawa, Inc.
Woolworths Group Ltd
Yesway
Anonymous (1)

Finance, Insurance, Real Estate
777 Partners
Agman Partners
Allan Gray Ltd.
Alterra Home Loans
Ambev S.A.
American Senior Communities
ATB Financial
Athene
Avant Mutual
Bank of Montreal
Blackhawk
British Columbia Investment Management Corp
Calibrium AG
Cardinal Capital Management
Central Payments
Century Plaza
Chubb Limited
Church Mutual Insurance Company
Coca-Cola Amatil
Compass Group
Compugen Inc.
Consilio
Coverys
CUNA Mutual Holding Company
Diageo plc
DPA Group N.V.
Elders
ElectraNet Pty Limited
EMC Insurance Companies
Enova International, Inc
EquityZen
Excellus BlueCross BlueShield
Fifth Third Bank
Goal Structured Solutions, Inc.
Grand Pacific Resorts
Great West Casualty Company
GuideStone Financial Resources
Guild Group
HCP, Inc.
HealthNow New York Inc.
Ingersoll-Rand
Insurance Australia Group Limited
ISS World
Jaguar Land Rover LATAM
JT Group Limited
Jump Trading
Keter
LendingUSA, LLC
Liberty Mutual Insurance
Lindt & Sprüngli
Lombard Odier
Magellan Financial Group Limited
Mahindra & Mahindra Limited
MassMutual
Massy Ltd.
Meridian Bank
Merrick Bank
Morningstar, Inc.
Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company
Nelnet, Inc.
Novartis
NXP
Penn National Insurance
Pepperstone Group Limited
Proeza
Quest Apartment Hotels
Quicken Loans
Raymond James Financial
Riello S.p.A.
Royal Bank of Canada
Schréder
Scottish Re
SDG Financial Holdings Group Hong Kong Co., Ltd.
SGSP (Australia) Assets Pty Ltd
Shape Technologies Group, Inc.
Siegfried
Sotheby's International Realty
Southeastern Real Estate Group, LLC
Syngenta
TE Connectivity Ltd.
Teacher Retirement System of Texas
USI Insurance Services
Van Metre Companies
Vancouver City Savings Credit Union
Vorwerk International Streckert & Co
Wolters Kluwer
Woolworths Group Ltd
Zenith Insurance Company
Anonymous (6)

Services
A10 Networks
Accenture Federal Services LLC
Active Release Techniques
Acuity Legal Consulting
Advanced Engineering & Environmental Services, Inc.
AdvancED/Measured Progress
Akamai Technologies, Inc.
Alberta Health Services
Alliance College-Ready Public Schools
Alliance Data
Allscripts
American Council on Exercise
American Senior Communities
ARM, Ltd.
Astris Health
Atkins Health
Atkins US Holdings, Inc.
Australia Post
Austalian Institute of Company Directors
Avanade, Inc.
Avant Mutual
Aviation Training Consulting, LLC
Bank Information Systems/Tiresias SA
Barton & Associates, Inc.
BenefitHub, Inc.
Big Switch Networks
Bio-Rad
Bitcoin IRA
Blackbaud, Inc.
BlackBerry
Blackhawk
Booz Allen Hamilton
British Columbia Investment Management Corp
CACI International
CEA Technologies
Center for Internet Security
Centurion, LLC
CGI
Chartered Accountants ANZ
Child Mind Institute
China Travel Service (Holdings) Hong Kong Limited
Collins Foods Limited
Command Alkon Incorporated
CompTIA
Compugen Inc.
Consilio
Corporate Governance Partners
Couchbase, Inc.
Counsel Press Inc.
CR Associates, Inc.
Data#3 Limited
DaVita Inc.
DEKRA North America
Dell Technologies
Devon Energy Corporation LP
Dialog Semiconductor plc
Diocese of Phoenix
Discount Tire
DNV GL
Dovetail Legal Solutions
DPA Group N.V.
DV construction
EF Education First
Enova International, Inc
Enphase Energy, Inc.
EPAM Systems Inc.
Essential Brands, Inc.
Estia Health
Experian Australia Pty Ltd
Express Services, Inc.
Extended Stay America, Inc.
Facebook, Inc.
Flash Entertainment
Flex Technology Group
Fluidigm Corporation
Foundation for California Community Colleges
Fujitsu Australia Limited
Garvan Institute of Medical Research
Get Heal, Inc.
Golder Associates Pty Ltd
Grand Pacific Resorts
Guild Group
Hewlett Packard Enterprise
Highgate Hotels, L.P.
i-CAR Education Foundation
iCIMS, Inc.
Inmarsat Inc.
Insightsoftware
InstaReM Pte. Ltd.
Integrated Research Ltd.
Intuitive Edge
IronClad Encryption Corporation
Ironside Risk Partners
IRT Group
ISS World
ITV plc
Jack Henry & Associates, Inc.
JLQ Technology Co. Ltd.
JobsOhio
John Muir Health
K12 Inc.
Keter
Khoros, LLC
Lakeland Regional Health
Leaf Group Ltd.
Legalwellbeing
Lonzas Inc.
Los Angeles County Museum of Art
Mapbox, Inc.
MasterCorp, Inc.
MBI Health Services
Mediatek
Megaport
Merrick & Company
Merrick Bank
Micro Focus Software Inc.
Mission Australia
MNP LLP
Morningstar, Inc.
MOX Services, LLC
National Community Pharmacists Association
National MS Society
Nativo, Inc.
NAVEX Global, Inc.
NEXT Financial Group, Inc.
Nokia Oyj
Nous Group
NYU Langone Health
Octave Music Group
Onit, Inc.
Optics 1, Inc.
Optus
Outreach Corporation
Panopto, Inc.
Percona LLC
Phase2 Technology, Inc.
Playbuzz Ltd.
Plexxis Software Inc.
PowerPlan, Inc.
Preaticat, Inc.
Pramata Corporation
Premier Parking
Progeny Health
PROS Holdings, Inc.
Prosci, Inc.
PSCU Inc.
Quorum Health
Rady Children’s Specialists of San Diego
Resources Connection, Inc.
Rimini Street
RMIT University
Royal Dutch Shell
Safe Software Inc.
SageNet LLC
SAI Global
Salary.com
SAP
Schireson
Sczudlo Advisors LLC
Seagate Technology
Segment.io, Inc.
ServiceMax, Inc.
Shape Technologies Group, Inc.
SherWeb
SirsiDynix
SmartDrive Systems Inc.
Society of Actuaries
Southern New Hampshire University
SPIG S.p.A.
Square Inc.
SRC, Inc.
Sustainability Victoria
Syngenta
Sys-tech Solutions, Inc.
Talbert House
TalentLaunch
Tastemade, Inc.
Team Velocity
The Common Application
The University of Alabama System
TIBCO Software Inc.
Tongal, Inc.
TTEC Holdings Inc
Ultimate Positioning Group Pty Ltd
United Negro College Fund, Inc.
Uniting Church in Australia (Synod of Victoria & Tasmania)
University of North Texas System
University of Wollongong
USI Insurance Services
UW Health
Van Metre Companies
Verinovum
Verizon Media
Vizual Limited
Victoria University
Viewpoint Construction Software Ltd
VMware Inc.
Vorwerk International Streckr & Co
WASH Multifamily Laundry Systems, LLC
WebPT, Inc.
WestEd
Wikimedia Foundation
Wolters Kluwer
WorkFusion
Wowza Media Systems
XING Technologies
YipitData
Zenlayer Inc.
Anonymous (14)

Public Administration
Alberta Health Services
Indian Air Force
Pilbara Ports Authority
Anonymous (1)
ACC Legal Services Management Program

Accelerate Innovation in Your Legal Department

Build a Stronger Team and Reduce Legal Costs
ACC Legal Services Management (LSM) programs have helped more than 1,000 in-house lawyers and law firm partners prepare for success in today’s constantly evolving legal environment, including Shell, Disney, Waste Management, BMO, and RBC.

Now, ACC offers a suite of training programs to help advance the skills of your legal team and lower your legal bills by improving the efficiency of your outside counsel — all delivered at your office and tailored for your legal department.

Leading-edge Focus
The LSM programs focus on cutting-edge business approaches, such as value-based fees, process improvement, project management, change management, and strategic use of data analytics — and how these innovations can benefit your legal department.

Benefits of private workshops for in-house departments and their outside counsel:
- Focused and interactive curriculum
- Ensemble faculty
- Peer learning environment
- Practical, hands-on tools and templates

Learn change initiatives that deliver:
- Tangible quality improvements
- Cost savings
- Innovative solutions and strategic cultural change
- Improved performance across internal-external teams

Find out how a private LSM program can be the catalyst for positive change and powerful results for your law department. Contact: Abby Adams, Director of Legal Management Services, at legalservices@acc.com or +1 202-349-1527.

For companies who are trying to advance to stage II in the realm of the value challenge, especially if you do not already have full-blown project teams and best practices, this is a thought-provoking and resource-intensive program.

Barbara Wagner
VP, Associate GC
Chiquita Brands International, Inc.

acc.com/LSM
About ACC: The Association of Corporate Counsel (ACC) is a global legal association that promotes the common professional and business interests of in-house counsel who work for corporations, associations and other organizations through information, education, networking opportunities and advocacy initiatives. With more than 45,000 members employed by over 10,000 organizations in 85 countries, ACC connects its members to the people and resources necessary for both personal and professional growth. By in-house counsel, for in-house counsel.® To learn more about ACC’s legal department benchmarking services please contact ACC Research at 202-293-4103 or visit www.acc.com/benchmarking.

About Major, Lindsey & Africa: is the world’s leading legal search firm. The firm, founded in 1982, offers a range of specialized legal recruiting and Transform Advisory Services to meet the ever-changing needs of law firms and legal departments and to support the career aspirations of talented lawyers and legal and compliance professionals. With more than 25 offices and 200-plus search consultants around the world, Major, Lindsey & Africa uses its market knowledge and experience to partner with organizations to fulfill their legal talent needs and provide solutions to increase team efficiency and effectiveness. Major, Lindsey & Africa is an Allegis Group company, the global leader in talent solutions. To learn more about Major, Lindsey & Africa, visit www.mlaglobal.com.