THE AI IMPACT ON CLIENT SERVICE: CHALLENGES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

PRESENTED BY
Erica Barra
Olivia Bogner
Amanda Currie
Emma De Tommaso
Matthew Graham
Sasha Hirsch
Yiming Hu
Ziyan Huang
Grace Xu
Arvin Mahmoodi

With the leadership of:
Mahnoor Noor
Abhirami Sasitharan
Ammar Thaver

June 1, 2024

Future of Law Lab
University of Toronto Faculty of Law

FUTURE OF LAW

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
FACULTY OF LAW

About the Future of Law Lab

The Future of Law Lab is a platform for students, academics, lawyers, and other professionals to participate in collaborative initiatives exploring how the law will evolve in the future. We will dive into the intersection of law, technology, innovation, and entrepreneurship, with programing dedicated to each of these streams. As a hub of interdisciplinary activity, we are dedicated to bringing together individuals from all backgrounds to examine the changing face of the legal profession.

About the Working Group

This report is written by Erica Barra, Olivia Bogner, Amanda Currie, Emma De Tommaso, Matthew Graham, Sasha Hirsch, Yiming Hu, Ziyan Huang, Grace Xu, and Arvin Mahmoodi under the supervision of Mahnoor Noor, Abhirami Sasitharan, and Ammar Thaver upper-year student leaders of the group.

This paper seeks to provide policy suggestions for tech start-ups developing AI platforms for the legal field by analyzing the current use of AI in the legal space in Canada, the benefits, challenges, and its status in other countries. It includes insights from secondary research and interviews with lawyers and legal technology experts.

About the University of Toronto Faculty of Law

Established in 1887, the Faculty of Law is one of the oldest professional faculties at the University of Toronto, with a long and illustrious history. Today, it is one of the world's great law schools, a dynamic academic and social community with more than 50 full-time faculty members and up to a dozen distinguished short-term visiting professors from the world's leading law schools, as well as 600 undergraduate and graduate students.

The Faculty's rich academic programs are complemented by its many legal clinics and public interest programs, and its close links to the Faculty's more than 6,000 alumni, who enjoy rewarding careers in every sector of Canadian society and remain involved in many aspects of life at the law school.

<div style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">

OVERVIEW

</div>

Artificial Intelligence ("AI") has been a widely debated topic in recent years. Particularly, there has been significant debate between lawyers, academics, and policy-makers on the role that AI should have in the legal industry. On the one hand, there are many technology-averse lawyers who have often reiterated that "the old ways are the best." On the other hand, there are many lawyers that think that it is crucial to integrate AI into corporate practices in order for the industry to continue to grow. Regardless of one's opinion on AI, many academics and lawyers would concur that the emerging field needs a more robust regulatory framework. This paper seeks to provide policy suggestions for tech start-ups developing AI platforms for the legal field by analyzing the current use of AI in the legal space in Canada, the benefits and challenges that it brings, and its current status in other countries. Furthermore, this paper seeks to investigate these questions through both secondary research sources as well as primary sources through interviews with lawyers and experts in the legal technology fields.

What is AI?

<u>Large Language Models</u>

This paper will be primarily concerned with one type of machine learning: large language models ("LLMs"). In the past two years, LLMs have quickly garnered attention as the driving technology behind chatbots like OpenAI's ChatGPT and Google's Bard, which drive most applications of AI to legal research and writing.[1]

LLMs can be broken down into two primary components: a neural transformer model and natural language processing (NLP).[2] Transformer models use deep learning frameworks. Deep learning is a subset of machine learning that aims to replicate human cognitive processing.[3] To accomplish this, the transformer model's outputs are broken down as a sum of a set of data, each with different values.[4] The breakdown of these values essentially allows the model to give more or less weight to certain pieces of data, thus producing answers and outcomes similar to a human.[5]

LLMs, relying on the neural transformer model of machine learning, combine large sets of training data with NLP to understand and create text that is cognizable to humans. NLP itself is

---

[1] See Timm Teubner et al, "Welcome to the Era of ChatGPT et al" (2023) 65:2 Bus Infrastructure Systems Engineering 95 at 96, online: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-023-00795-x.>.

[2] *Ibid* at 95.

[3] See e.g. Larry Hardesty, "Explained: Neural Networks" (Massachusetts: MIT News, 2017), online: <https://news.mit.edu/2017/explained-neural-networks-deep-learning-0414>; See e.g. IBM, "What is Deep Learning," (last visited 26 February 2024), online: < https://www.ibm.com/topics/deep-learning#:~:text=the%20next%20step-,What%20is%20deep%20learning%3F,from%20large%20amounts%20of%20data.>.

[4] See Ashish Vaswani et al, "Attention Is All You Need" (2017) 30 Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 1 at 3, online: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf>.

[5] *Ibid.*

highly interdisciplinary, relying on insights from linguistics, mathematics, sciences, and other fields to accomplish human tasks involving language.[6] These tasks include analyzing and summarizing text, substituting words, editing, and searching for keywords, among others.[7] An LLM will combine these NLP skills with neural transformer models to deduce patterns and deliver creative, relevant answers to user questions.[8]

Crucial to the productive use of LLMs is the emerging field of prompt engineering. Although NLP allows LLMs to understand and interpret human language, their ability to effectively do so partially depends on the structure of the language they are given.[9] Prompt engineering is the process by which individual users of LLMs translate human language into maximally cognizable language for an LLM.[10] Through trial and error, prompt engineers learn which forms of grammar and word choices yield the most accurate and comprehensive answers.[11] This practice has proven increasingly essential to the use of AI in business. Indeed, during the investor due diligence process, indices of prompts are requested, thereby developing a new occupational field for prompt engineers or "query experts".[12]

---

[6] See Patrick Rafail and Isaac Freitas, "Natural Language Processing" in Paul Atkinson et al, eds, Sage Research Methods Foundations (California: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2020) at 2, online: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036879118.>.

[7] *Supra* note 6.

[8] *Supra* note 1 at 95.

[9] *Supra* note 1 at 98.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] *Ibid.*

Spell Check

In addition to emerging technologies such as LLMs, AI is also enhancing existing technologies such as spell check.[13] This is not as simple as a computer using words from a designated repository. Rather, there is learning involved in distinguishing homophones, predicting what meaning the writer intended to convey, and using the writer's previous writing as a source to make such predictions.[14] For instance, Smart Compose is an option offered in Google Docs which autocompletes sentences. Moreover, Microsoft has incorporated AI into its software programs, such as the Editor feature in Word.[15] Editor goes beyond just checking for grammar or spelling by using machine learning and linguistic input to improve writing.[16] It detects sentences that may not be clear and suggests alternatives.[17]

How is AI being used in the legal field?

AI's use among lawyers

LLMs have been quickly applied to legal analytics. Since the early 1980s, legal theorists have been focused on computational models of legal reasoning ("CMLRs").[18] These models aim to reproduce legal reasoning to perform or estimate the outcome of legal actions.[19] Since the rapid

---

[13] See e.g. Terrence Eden, "Is it Cheating to Use Spell Check?" (25 November 2022), online (blog): <https://shkspr.mobi/blog/2022/11/is-it-cheating-to-use-spell-check/>.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] See e.g. Napier Lopez, "Microsoft is using AI to give Office spell-check on steroids and much more" (26 July 2016), online: <thenextweb.com/news/microsoft-using-ai-give-office-spell-check-steroids-much>..

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Kevin D. Ashley, "Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics: new tools for law practice in the digital age" (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017) at 3, online: <https://doi-org.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/10.1017/9781316761380>.

[19] *Supra* note 18 at 3-4.

expansion of NLP, CMLRs have quickly expanded and grown to accomplish more ambitious feats than mere prediction.

The most common application of AI in the legal field is in legal research. In a 2023 survey conducted by LexisNexis, 59% of sampled Canadian lawyers aimed to use AI tools for research.[20] This was closely followed by 57% using AI to write emails and 42% using it to understand new legal concepts.[21] Due to the majority's willingness to use AI for research, legal research companies have quickly adapted to integrate LLMs and CMLRs into their business models.

Thomson Reuters has begun to leverage LLMs within their 'search' function to generate stronger answers for user searches and questions. Rather than providing pre-written answers, the AI-enhanced WestLaw search provides users with answers generated as soon as a question is entered into the search function.[22] In addition to enhancing their existing features, Thomson Reuters has begun to integrate CoCounsel, an LLM powered by OpenAI's GPT-4, into their WestLaw Precision package.[23] Going beyond legal research, CoCounsel aids legal drafting in areas such as contract analysis, document review, and deposition preparation.[24]

LexisNexis has taken similar steps toward AI integration with Lexis+ AI. Like CoCounsel, Lexis+ AI uses an LLM to produce legal arguments, contract clauses, and client communications.[25]

---

[20] LexisNexis, *International Legal Generative AI Report* (New York: LexisNexis, 2023) at 7, online: <https://www.lexisnexis.com/pdf/lexisplus/international-legal-generative-ai-report.pdf.>.
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] Thomson Reuters, "Introducing AI-Assisted Research: Legal Research Meets Generative AI" (2023), online: <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/blog/legal-research-meets-generative-ai/>.
[23] *Ibid*; Thomson Reuters, "AI Precision now has generative AI," (last visited 26 February 2024), online: <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/en/c/westlaw/westlaw-precision-now-with-generative-ai>; CaseText, "Meet your new AI legal assistant," (last visited 26 February 2024), online: <https://casetext.com/.>
[24] Thomson Reuters, *supra* note 18.
[25] LexisNexis, "Lexis+ AI," (last visited 26 February 2024), online: <https://www.lexisnexis.com/en-us/products/lexis-plus-ai.page>.

It additionally aims to summarize cases and other legal documents as well as extract key insights from internal documents.[26]

In addition to the traditional legal research companies, emerging AI companies have begun to offer AI-assisted legal research and writing programs. One such company is Toronto-based Kira Systems. Like CoCounsel and Lexis+AI, Kira offers an LLM that conducts contract and document analysis via a machine learning algorithm.[27] Since its establishment in 2011, Kira has been adopted by multiple national and international firms, including Olser, Skadden, Bennett Jones, Paul Weiss, and Davies.[28]

AI's use in the courts

Although AI has not yet been officially regulated in the legal system,[29] courts have expressed interest in exploring AI utilization. The Federal Court has acknowledged AI's potential to assist the judicial system's efficacy by aiding data analyzation, legal research, case management and administrative work, reducing the workload of judges and staff.[30] The hope is that utilizing AI for such tasks would allow members of the Court to allocate their time and efforts on tasks that require more extensive attention.[31]

---

[26] *Ibid*.
[27] See Kira Inc., "Kira Systems" (last visited 26 February 2024), online: <https://kirasystems.com/>.
[28] *Ibid*; see also Kira Inc., "Kira for Law Firms: Focus on High-Value Work With More Efficient Contract Review," (last visited 26 February 2024), online: <https://kirasystems.com/solutions/law-firms/>.
[29] Zena Olijnyk, "Canadian courts turning an eye to how artificial intelligence is used in the legal system" (11 July 2023), <online: www.canadianlawyermag.com/resources/professional-regulation/canadian-courts-turning-an-eye-to-how-artificial-intelligence-is-used-in-the-legal-system/377757>.
[30] Federal Court of Canada, "Artificial Intelligence: Interim Principles and Guidelines on the Court's Use of Artificial Intelligence" (20 December 2023), online: <https://www.fct-cf.gc.ca/en/pages/law-and-practice/artificial-intelligence>.
[31] *Ibid.*

However, many judges remain warry of incorporating AI into the judicial process. They argue that utilizing AI in the judicial system has the potential for negative implications, including AI's potential to undermine public confidence in administering justice.[32] Furthermore, given that the legal system relies on private platforms, some contend that utilizing AI technology may lead to commercial giants mediating legal processes, risking judicial independence.[33]

In light of these concerns, the Federal Court has developed principles to navigate AI use by members of the court and law clerks.[34] For instance, AI use, including any concomitant effects like errors, will be the sole responsibility of the Court.[35] Moreover, only certified or verified sources and data will be used by the judiciary and only for internal administrative processes.[36] There are also guidelines that the Court will follow in its use of AI in the future.[37] By way of illustration, the court will not adopt AI tools to aid in its decisions without first engaging in public consultation.[38]

To prevent erroneous outcomes, Canadian courts are currently investigating AI use in legal submissions.[39] At present, Manitoba and the Yukon superior courts have provided practice directives mandating the disclosure of AI in court submissions.[40] This includes disclosing the specific AI tool used and the purpose of its application.[41] There will likely be more comprehensive

---

[32] *Ibid.*
[33] *Ibid.*
[34] *Ibid*.
[35] *Ibid*.
[36] *Supra* note 30.
[37] *Ibid*.
[38] *Ibid*.
[39] *Supra* note 29.
[40] Dale Smith, "Disclosing the use of AI in law" (21 August 2023), online: <https://nationalmagazine.ca/en-ca/articles/legal-market/legal-tech/2023/disclosing-the-use-of-ai-in-law>.
[41] *Supra* note 29.

directives and national regulation in the foreseeable future since AI use in the legal field is a novel phenomenon.

<u>AI's use in law schools</u>

LLMs such as ChatGPT have shown potential to be used as a tool by law school professors to carry out certain tasks, such as composing a course syllabus and writing letters of recommendation.[42] Some more complicated tasks, such as creating a law school practice exam question, can be more challenging for ChatGPT to execute.[43] Prompt engineering can be used to better tailor the instructions given to the AI software.[44] With ChatGPT being in its nascent form, it has not been officially utilized by law school educators as of yet, but given its rapid growth and development, there is a likelihood that it will be in the future.

What is the general attitude toward AI in the legal field?

AI is generally well-known in the legal field. In the Lexis survey discussed above, 86% of sampled Canadian lawyers were aware of generative AI.[45] 16% had already used these models for legal work and 44% planned to use it for legal work in the future.[46]

Yet despite its rapid uptake in the legal community, attitudes toward AI among Canadian lawyers are mixed. Indeed, 63% believe it will have a mixed impact with both potential benefits and drawbacks.[47] The most cited benefits included increased efficiency, cost-savings, and

---

[42] See e.g. Tammy Pettinato Oltz, "ChatGPT, Professor of Law" (6 February 2023), online: <papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4347630>.
[43] *Ibid* at 13-14.
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *Supra* note 20 at 6.
[46] *Ibid*.
[47] *Supra* note 20 at 10.

convenience. 83% believed that AI would increase efficiency.[48] The most cited concerns included job loss, accuracy, lack of regulation, and lack of human reasoning.[49]Nonetheless, concerns about AI integration are not crippling. Although 53% have concerns about AI and 31% significant concerns, only 6% of Canadian lawyers would refuse to use AI because of their concerns.[50]

What are the most common benefits and drawbacks of AI use?

<u>Benefits</u>

Efficiency and productivity

The most touted benefits of LLMs are their ability to increase efficiency and productivity in a cost-saving manner. When AI is used within its capabilities, it increases the productivity of skilled workers by 40%.[51] It also reduces productivity by 19% when used outside of its capabilities.[52] Therefore, careful prompt engineering, in addition to recommendations discussed at the conclusion of this report may be necessary to ensure that the benefits of AI are fully realized.[53]

Reducing language barriers

---

[48] *Supra* note 20 at 11.
[49] *Ibid.*
[50] *Supra* note 20 at 10.
[51] See Meridith Somers, "How generative AI can boost highly skilled workers' productivity" (Cambridge: MIT Sloan, 2023), online: <https://mitsloan.mit.edu/ideas-made-to-matter/how-generative-ai-can-boost-highly-skilled-workers-productivity>.
[52] *Ibid*.
[53] *Ibid*; *Supra* note 1 at 96, 98.

AI can potentially mitigate the effects of language barriers, both in client-facing services and between international law firms. Some theorists have recognized LLMs as a tool by which non-native speakers can improve their language skills.[54]

Considering the growing use of AI in spellcheck services, language barriers will likely continue to be deconstructed through increased AI integration in the workplace.

Drawbacks

Accuracy issues and hallucinations

The most common con of LLMs is that they are still prone to errors in their current stage of development. LLMs can produce "hallucinations"—information or data that is not only factually incorrect, but entirely made-up.[55] Worryingly, LLMs deliver hallucinations in the same manner that they would correct information, with no warning provided that would indicate uncertainty.[56] Since LLMs deliver hallucinations so confidently, human users are likely to treat them as true. Indeed, in early 2023 a New York attorney cited six fictitious cases in a court filing that were the product of ChatGPT hallucinations.[57]

Ethical concerns

Another downside of using LLMs stems from ethical concerns regarding algorithmic bias. Because LLMs rely on a set of training data, a "garbage in, garbage out" phenomenon has emerged.[58] Most forms of AI are incapable of speculating on biases in the data they collect.

---

[54] *Supra* note 1 at 98.
[55] *Supra* note 1 at 97.
[56] *Ibid*.
[57] *Mata v. Avainca Inc*., 2023 US Lexis 108263 (SDNY) (Affidavit, Steven Schwartz at para 6-9).
[58] See Gabrielle Johnson, "Algorithmic bias: on the implicit biases of social technology" (2021) 198 Synthese 9941 at 9948, online: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-020-02696-y>.

Correspondingly, biases inherent in the inputs of the LLM may be replicated in the LLMs outputs. For example, the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions ("COMPAS"), a program used by courts in New York, Wisconsin, California and others, was designed to predict recidivism risk among offenders to aid in sentencing.[59] However, the program has assigned inaccurately higher likelihood of reoffending to Black individuals and inaccurately lower risk to white individuals, likely due to biases inherent in data on the prior sentencing of Black inmates.[60]

Aggravating ethical concerns around AI is its lack of regulation. At present, AI is unregulated in Canada. Although a mandatory scheme is set to be put into place,[61] the current scheme remains voluntary.[62]

Legal issues

New legal concerns are emerging regarding LLMs, particularly in copyright law. GPT and other LLMs have proven to have issues crediting original authors unless asked.[63] When LLMs do provide citations, they often include hallucinations. In one study, only two of thirty-five citations

---

[59] See Gabrielle Johnson, "Are Algorithms Value-Free? Feminist Theoretical Virtues in Machine Learning" J Moral Philosophy 1:35 (Forthcoming) at 19-20, online: <https://philarchive.org/rec/JOHAAV>.

[60] See Jeff Larson et al, "How we Analyzed the COMPAS Recidivism Algorithm" (New York: ProPublica 2016), online: <https://www.propublica.org/article/how-we-analyzed-the-compas-recidivism-algorithm> ; See also Johnson, *supra* note 58.

[61] See Bill C-27, *An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act, the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act, and the Artificial Intelligence and Data Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts*, 1st Sess, 44th Parl, 2022, cl 39 (Second Reading 24 April 2023).

[62] See Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada, "Voluntary Code of Conduct on the Responsible Development and Management of Advanced Generative AI Systems" (Ottawa: Government of Canada, 2023), online: <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/ised/en/voluntary-code-conduct-responsible-development-and-management-advanced-generative-ai-systems>.

[63] *Supra* note 1 at 97.

generated by ChatGPT were accurate.[64] In response, legal research companies like LexisNexis have addressed both the problem of hallucinations and copyright law.[65]

Additionally, new concerns are emerging regarding client confidentiality. Research companies like Lexis have expressed the importance of ensuring that information such as search terms remain confidential.[66] However, doing so may be difficult when LLMs are constantly improving based on previous searches and when prompt engineering relies on trial and error.[67]

Conclusion

AI is becoming increasingly prevalent in the legal community. Lawyers, professors, and the courts are generally aware of AI and acknowledge its likely future uptake. Among lawyers, the most common use for AI is research, for which LLMs and natural language processing are the driving mechanisms. Among the judiciary, the most probable future use is for internal administrative work. Although used by students, AI in law schools is still limited. The most common benefits of AI are increased efficiency and reduced language barriers. The most common downsides are hallucinations, algorithmic bias, and copyright issues. Navigating these issues in the future will likely require increased education, privacy policies, and transparency.

---

[64] See e.g. Alessia McGowan et al, "ChatGPT and Bard exhibit spontaneous citation fabrication during psychiatry literature search" 326 Psychiatry Research 1 at 3-4, online: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2023.115334>.

[65] See e.g. Suzanne McGee, "Generative AI and the Law," (New York: LexisNexis, 2023), online: <https://www.lexisnexis.com/html/lexisnexis-generative-ai-story/.>.

[66] *Ibid*.

[67] *Supra* note 3; *Supra* note 1 at 98.

Introduction

Interviews were conducted with various stakeholders in the AI industry, including lawyers and AI developers, to identify the current status of AI in client services. Though a diverse sample of stakeholders was interviewed, a variety of common benefits, concerns, and barriers to implementation were identified. To maximize the efficient use and implementation of AI software, regulations affecting AI and client services should address these common themes while maintaining the flexibility to accommodate the diverse needs of stakeholders.

Benefits

AI has the potential to increase efficiency in the provision of legal services, allowing lawyers to provide more services to clients in shorter time frames.[68] This increase in efficiency will likely increase access to justice, which may be especially relevant in legal clinic settings.[69] Daniel Diamond, Head of Growth at Alexi, a legal AI software company, noted that "every single area of law is ripe for disruption by AI tools."[70] Generally, the benefits are expected to be most pronounced with regard to litigation and legal research, such as in creating legal memorandums and summarizing cases.[71] For example, in regards to litigation, as noted by Travis Thompson,

---

[68] Daniel Diamond, Head of Growth at Alexi, "AI / Client Services Delivery - Informational Interview" (8 November, 2023) via oral communication [communicated to author]; Prasanna Balasundaram, Director of University of Toronto's Downtown Legal Services clinic, "AI/Client Service Delivery - Informational Interview" (6 December, 2023) via oral communication [communicated to the author].

[69] *Ibid*.

[70] Diamond, *supra* note 1. [N.B quotes from Diamond and Balasundaram have been edited for clarity (removal of speech tics/filler words like "um")]

[71] *Ibid*; Balasundaram, *supra* note 1.

Counsel at Boutin Jones, Inc., "AI technologies can improve efficiencies by allowing litigators to find cases more promptly through Boolean symbols in platforms like Westlaw and LexisNexis."[72]

Furthermore, AI has had massive impacts on the economics of law. This includes economic elements such as billable hours, the elimination of write-offs, and savings through efficiencies.[73] These economic efficiencies have allowed smaller firms to compete with bigger legal and accounting firms.[74] This has the potential of leveling the playing field between smaller and larger players in the legal and accounting industries while providing more efficient and less costly services to clients.

Concerns

One of the most common concerns regarding the use of AI in client services is privacy. Prasanna Balasundaram, Director of the University of Toronto's Downtown Legal Services clinic, expressed that the clinic "would be very…diligent when…adopting AI tools to ensure that…we can understand what measures are in place" to protect privacy and data.[75] Further, he noted that "a degree of transparency on the part of service providers" would likely be required to address these concerns.[76] Diamond indicated that to address privacy concerns, Alexi bifurcates data to provide specific treatment according to security risk.[77] Furthermore, law firms can enter anonymized facts into the Alexi platform because it is focused on answering "questions about the law," meaning that

---

[72] Travis Thompson, Counsel at Boutin Jones, Inc. Chair of the Tax Practice & Technology Committee for the ABA Tax Section, "AI / Client Services Delivery - Informational Interview" (29 January, 2024) via oral communication [communicated to author].
[73] *Ibid.*
[74] *Ibid.*
[75] Balasundaram, *supra* note 1.
[76] *Ibid*.
[77] Diamond, *supra* note 1.

confidential customer information is rarely provided, though the platform also has many "security procedures and policies in place" to address privacy concerns.[78]

Another common concern was related to the accuracy and reliability of AI software. Diamond mentioned that "[q]uality is inherently a subjective calculation," so while Alexi has objective quantifications regarding reliability and accuracy, they encourage customers to try the software and "assess the quality for [themselves]."[79] Balasundaram noted an additional concern "is whether…there are systemic biases that are built into certain AI products that may affect [the clinic's] ability to advocate for [it's] clients."[80]

Concerns regarding the unknown were also common. Diamond noted the potential for issues with AI alignment, namely that developers might not understand how their platforms work, and stated that Alexi "believe[s] that…should never be the case. We should always understand exactly what's happening under the hood, and AI should always be working in service of lawyers and not the other way around".[81] Similarly, Balasundaram noted that he has "a lot of reservations about the speed at which we have, as a society…leaned into AI" when "there is an element of…a black box in which you can't retrace" how AI software reaches outcomes, creating potential ethical issues.[82]

Another major challenge AI has placed on the legal industry is its impact on the court system. Particularly, there is significant uncertainty in the use of AI and the requirements around

---

[78] *Ibid.*
[79] *Ibid*.
[80] Balasundaram, *supra* note 1.
[81] Diamond, *supra* note 1.
[82] Balasundaram, *supra* note 1.

its use when submitting legal documents—such as factums—to Canadian courts.[83] Some courts require disclosure on how the lawyer has used AI, but this approach is more predominant in the United States and has been less widely adopted in Canada.[84] In Canada, the approach has been varied where sometimes specific judges demand specifications from lawyers for their use of AI on Court documents, while others do not.[85] This has added additional complexities for lawyers, especially litigators who need to balance client preferences, inconsistent legal rules, Canadian Bar Association rules that may demand additional responsibilities around AI use, and rules that are specific to the firm.[86] These complexities have been further elevated by both the lack of national regulations around its use in courts and the rise of more platforms that have varied uses with different data models.

Reliance on AI is another hurdle that AI adopters face. Lisa Stam, the founder of an employment, labour, and human rights law boutique known as SpringLaw, stated that as a society, "we all expect perfection from machines and technology, but we accept the malleability [in] humanity."[87] Stam's statement indicates that users of AI software may slowly use AI under the presumption that it is foolproof. This becomes all the more concerning as AI becomes increasingly robust and reliable. Stam encourages AI adopters to recognize the strengths and limitations of AI and adopt more realistic attitudes toward such technology when incorporating it in legal research. She supports having humans make the final judgment despite raising doubts on whether "humans [...] always have the better judgment" since humans inherently have unconscious bias that may

---

[83] Lawyer in legal operations role at a large full service firm on Bay Street, "AI / Client Services Delivery - Informational Interview" (10 January, 2024) via oral communication [communicated to author].
[84] *Ibid*.
[85] *Ibid*.
[86] *Ibid.*
[87] Lisa Stam, Founder of SpringLaw, "AI/Client Service Delivery - Informational Interview with Lisa Stam" (1 December, 2023) via oral communication [communicated to the author].

influence their judgment. As such, when implementing AI in client services, AI users must approach the technology with caution.

Clients and their perceptions also pose an additional challenge to law firms when using AI. Specifically, some clients may be concerned about the risks surrounding using AI on their legal documents especially regarding privacy.[88] For example, some clients give prohibitions on its use, while others require the firm to describe how AI will be used on their files.[89] Therefore, the perceptions of clients towards the use of AI and the impact on their confidential information can play a big role in a firm's strategy on its AI implementation and can impact the overall development of AI in the legal industry.

Lastly, a common challenge posed by AI from the perspective of law firms is the difficulty in its implementation within the firm. Particularly, like the implementation of any new system, the implementation of AI requires extensive training. This training would specifically involve how to utilize the technology properly, how to align its use with the firm's privacy policy, as well as how to ensure that the training addresses the knowledge gap that might be present within the firm in terms of AI.[90] The gap is specifically of concern as it represents a small component of the wider institutional knowledge issue.[91] Besides the addition of effective training methods, law firms may mitigate this challenge by having forward thinking leaders who can pilot the implementation of new AI systems within the firms.[92] Lastly, another issue that accompanies any implementation is the high upfront costs for the technology that may act as barriers for smaller firms.[93] However,

---

[88] *Ibid.*
[89] *Ibid*.
[90] Travis Thompson, *supra* note 5.
[91] *Ibid*.
[92] *Ibid*.
[93] *Ibid.*

even smaller firms are likely to move towards AI to remain competitive in an ever-changing legal landscape.

Barriers to Implementation

Regarding implementation, Diamond noted that the legal industry "tends to be…slow moving," leading to challenges in convincing lawyers to adopt Alexi in their practices.[94] However, he noted that these barriers have been reduced by the "massive boon" associated with ChatGPT.[95] When addressing how lawyers can respond to AI developments, Diamond noted that "AI is going to be great at…doing the grocery shopping…But then ultimately, it's up to the lawyers to cook the recipe and to figure out how to plate it in a beautiful way that works for the clients or the jury or the judge or opposing counsel."[96] He also noted the importance of having AI technology "evolve with client or customer feedback" and ensuring it is user friendly to reduce implementation barriers.[97] In a legal clinic context, Balasundaram noted one potential barrier to implementation could be the cost of AI software.[98] He also indicated that AI software could increase disparities in access to justice if parties with more resources are able to gain disproportionate access to AI tools. Further, Balasundaram noted that legal service providers could potentially face pressure to incorporate AI "in order to keep up," rather than doing so from an "intentional" or "fully informed" basis.[99]

---

[94] Diamond, *supra* note 1.
[95] *Ibid*.
[96] *Ibid*.
[97] *Ibid*.
[98] Balasundaram, *supra* note 1.
[99] *Ibid*.

Charles Gluckstein, the owner and Managing Partner of Gluckstein Lawyers, recognized that there are ethical challenges that must be addressed before courts fully recognize AI in the legal field.[100] "A lot of [large AI corporations] are talking about [an arms race in AI] because [it could be] used to shut down economies and society if it is in the wrong hands. I think we need to have safety nets built in [to guardrail] how far [AI] can go to replace us. It's not just for our own sake (for existence) but because people can be deceived."[101] Gluckstein highlights prevalent issues that underlie the unbridled use of AI in the legal field, especially in the field of client services. This may include the possibility of deception or hallucination and other technical uncertainties related to AI algorithms. He asserts that certain measures should be adopted to prevent the misuse of AI in the legal field, and proposes that strict identity protocols and other vetting processes be put in place to address such issues.

Other

Though Diamond noted that Alexi hasn't had to deal with government regulations specifically regarding AI yet, he realizes they are "inevitable."[102]

---

[100] Charles Gluckstein, owner and Managing Partner of Gluckstein Lawyers, "AI/Client Service Delivery - Informational Interview with Charles Gluckstein" (18 December, 2023) via oral communication [communicated to the author].

[101] *Ibid*.

[102] Diamond, *supra* note 1.

Introduction

Canada's strategy for developing a regulatory framework for artificial intelligence (AI) can be informed by comparatively examining the approaches other nations have taken with respect to AI regulation and by looking at proposed legislation in Canada. Canada will likely follow the global trend of implementing both sector-specific and broader legislation. Additionally, Canada will likely follow other jurisdictions by ensuring any AI rules are compatible with existing regulations in areas including cybersecurity, privacy, and data. Finally, Canada's international commitments suggest that Canada will seek to balance innovation with the need to maintain a humane and democratic approach.

Sector-specific regulations and broader federal legislation

Across the jurisdictions reviewed, there is a recognition that sector-specific considerations need to be factored into AI policymaking. In the United Kingdom (UK), regulators propose to establish a set of cross-sectoral principles tailored to the distinct characteristics of AI, with regulators asked to interpret, prioritize and implement these principles within their sectors and domains.[103]

In the United States, regulators utilize both sector-specific regulations and broader federal legislation. In 2022, the Biden administration set forth a blueprint for an *AI Bill of Rights* that reflects the core OECD principles to help guide the design, use, and deployment of automated

---

[103] The Secretary of State for Science, Innovation and Technology, *A pro-innovation approach to AI regulation* (London: Office for Artificial Intelligence, 2023) at para 11.

systems.[104] The Biden Administration further issued the Executive Order (E.O. 14110) on Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence in 2023, which enables the US government to manage the risk associated with AI.[105] The E.O. instructs the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to develop new standards and procedures for "developing and deploying safe, secure and trustworthy AI" and instructs the Office of Management and Budget to establish guidance for federal procurement of AI systems that utilize, as appropriate, the NIST AI Risk Management Framework.[106]

Like the United States, Hong Kong SAR also takes cross-sectorial and sector-specific approaches. Hong Kong SAR developed the *Ethical Artificial Intelligence Framework* for governmental bodies planning, designing, or implementing AI and big data applications using guiding principles, leading practices, and assessments in AI-powered IT projects.[107] Furthermore, the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA") has issued circulars to guide the use of AI in the banking and financial industries. Financial institutions are advised to be vigilant against over-reliance on AI and are reminded of their obligation to properly assess clients' financial capabilities while monitoring the design and development of AI applications. Further, using AI does not mitigate the financial institutions' liabilities from the consequences of any conduct, nor should it allow any compromise of proper validation expected from financial institutions.[108]

---

[104] The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, *Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights: Making Automated Systems Work for The American People* (Washington:The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, 2022).

[105] The White House, News Release, "Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence" (30 October 2023) online: https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2023/10/30/executive-order-on-the-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and-use-of-artificial-intelligence/

[106] *Ibid.*

[107] Weiken Yau, *The Legal 500 Country Comparative Guides: Hong Kong Artificial Intelligence* (London: Legalease Ltd, 2024).

[108] *Ibid*.

Canadian regulators are also taking a dual approach to AI regulation. The proposed *Artificial Intelligence and Data Act*, part of Bill C-27, represents Canada's sector-agnostic policy framework. On the other hand, there are directives focusing on automated decision-making within the public sector—examples of sector-specific regulation.[109] This suggests that Canada is considering both broad principles that apply across various fields and targeted regulations that address AI's unique challenges and risks in specific sectors.

This comprehensive strategy allows for flexibility and specificity in regulatory responses, ensuring that broader ethical, privacy, and safety standards are maintained across all AI applications while providing tailored guidelines that address the distinct concerns that may arise in particular sectors, such as public governance. Such an approach indicates Canada's commitment to fostering innovation in AI while ensuring that such advancements are made responsibly and ethically, in line with global trends towards risk-based regulation and ethical standards for AI.

Focus on compatibility between AI governance and other regulatory schemes

Regulatory bodies worldwide have focused on compatibility between AI governance and existing regulations in areas such as cybersecurity, privacy, and data use. This has been done by broadening the language of existing policies, such that these policies now also govern AI.

The European Union has amended numerous statutes to cover AI. The *Cyber Resilience Act* was expanded to protect consumers and businesses against AI cyber threats.[110] The *Digital*

---

[109] Canada, Government of Canada, *Directive on Automated Decision-Making*, (Policies, directives, standards and guidelines), (Ottawa: Treasury Board, 2019).
[110] EU, *Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on horizontal cybersecurity requirements for products with digital elements and amending Regulation (EU) 2019/1020*, [2022] OJ, online: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52022PC0454.

Services Act now encompasses the use of AI for online content access and distribution.[111] The *Data Act* includes rules for fair access to the use of data necessary for AI.[112] New Zealand has adopted a similar approach, covering AI with existing legislation that includes the *Privacy Act,* the *Human Rights Act,* and the *Harmful Digital Communications Act*.[113]

The Biden Administration in the United States recently passed an Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence.[114] The Executive Order is a framework that stipulates criteria that would ensure that any developing AI regulations are compatible with the country's existing cybersecurity and privacy policies. Israel has recently passed a draft of their AI policy.[115] To ensure compatibility with their existing regulatory schemes, the policy is being formulated through consultation with departments that include the Israeli National Cyber Directorate, the Israel National Digital Agency, and the Privacy Protection Authority.

Canada is likely to also focus on compatibility when developing a regulatory framework. Canada has existing legal frameworks that apply to AI, including the *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act* that regulates how businesses can use personal

---

[111] EU, *Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on a Single Market For Digital Services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act) (Text with EEA relevance),* [2022] OJ, online: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2065/oj.

[112] EU, *Regulation (EU) 2022/868 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2022 on European data governance and amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1724 (Data Governance Act) (Text with EEA relevance),* [2021] OJ, online: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/868/oj

[113] New Zealand Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, News Release, "Why is regulating AI such a challenge?", (2023), online: Why is regulating AI such a challenge? | Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor (pmcsa.ac.nz).

[114] US, Executive Order, *Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence,* 2023, online: Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence | The White House.

[115] Israel Ministry of Innovation, Science, and Technology, News Release, "WIsrael's Policy on Artificial Intelligence Regulation and Ethics", (2023), online: https://www.gov.il/en/departments/policies/ai_2023

information.[116] However, Canada plans on modernizing these pre-existing laws so that they are more well-suited for AI.[117]

Canada as international community member

On a global level, each country has taken a unique approach to regulating AI that is reflective of the distinctive economic and sociocultural conditions at play. However, there is an increasing trend towards participating in international agreements to address many of the threats and opportunities derived from AI in a collaborative and consistent manner. Canada has worked alongside the international community on numerous international agreements and initiatives relating to AI that will likely serve as a framework for future AI regulatory strategy in Canada.

Most notably, Canada has endorsed the OECD AI Principles.[118] Adopted in 2019, the OECD AI Principles seek to forward the use of AI in a manner that is innovative, trustworthy and respectful of human rights and democratic values.[119] The report emphasizes the importance of inclusive growth, sustainable development and well-being, human-centered values and fairness, transparency and explainability, robustness, security and safety, and accountability.[120] Policy makers are encouraged to focus on investing in research and development, fostering a digital ecosystem for AI, providing an enabling policy environment for AI, building human capacity to

---

[116]Government of Canada, Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, *The Artificial Intelligence and Data Act (AIDA) - Companion document,* online: The Artificial Intelligence and Data Act (AIDA) – Companion document (canada.ca).
[117] *Ibid.*
[118] OECD, *Principles on Artificial Intelligence,* (Paris: OECD, 2019).
[119] *Ibid.*
[120] *Ibid.*

assist with the labour market transition and supporting international co-operation for trustworthy AI.[121]

Canada is also a member of the Global Partnership of Artificial Intelligence (GPAI), which aims to connect theory and practice of AI by promoting AI research and activities.[122] This partnership is crafted around the OECD Recommendation on Artificial intelligence and is an effort driven by international governments and organizations, as well as leaders in science, industry and civil society.[123] The overall objective of the GPAI is to facilitate international collaboration and reduce duplicative efforts by offering a global reference point for AI issues to allow for a more trustworthy adoption of AI.[124] The GPAI is organized into four main working grounds around the idea of responsible AI, namely: (1)AI and pandemic response, (2) data governance, (3) the future of work, and (4) innovation and commercialization.[125]

Canada also participates in several international research collaborations, such as the Canada-UK AI Cooperation, which allows Canada to work alongside the UK in the pursuit of an interdisciplinary and responsible approach to the development of AI.[126]

As AI technology rapidly evolves, global discussions are increasingly emphasizing the need for a calculated and cautious approach. The Bletchley Declaration, published in November 2023, highlights that while AI has the "potential to transform and enhance human wellbeing, peace

---

[121] *Ibid.*

[122] The Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence "About GPAI" (2020), online: https://gpai.ai/about/ [*GPAI*]

[123] *Ibid.*

[124] *GPAI, supra* note 127.

[125] *Ibid.*

[126] Canada Institute of Health Research, "Announcement – Canada-UK Artificial Intelligence Initiative" (2019) online: https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/51520.html

and prosperity," there are also substantial risks that must be addressed.[127] These are particularly

concerning in the context of frontier AI, meaning "highly capable general-purpose AI models".[128]

Overall, The Bletchley Declaration calls for an international approach to addressing many of the

challenges presented by AI and emphasizes the importance of ethical principles such as fairness

and transparency.[129]

Most recently, the G7 Hiroshima Process resulted in the Hiroshima AI Process

Comprehensive Policy Framework, the first international framework that offers guiding principles

and a code of conduct meant to address the impact of AI on society and the economy.[130] Key

themes include the importance of mitigating vulnerabilities (principle 2), the responsible sharing

of information (principle 4) and the prioritization of advanced AI systems for global challenges

such as climate change (principle 9).[131]

Altogether, Canada's international commitments offer a starting paradigm from which to

develop a regulatory approach to AI. It is clear that innovation must be balanced with the need for

the responsible development of AI. By aligning AI governance with international partners, Canada

can benefit from a global view on key challenges such as AI safety and ethics.[132]

---

[127] Government of the United Kingdom, "The Bletchley Declaration by Countries Attending the AI Safety Summit, 1-2 November 2023" (2023) online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-safety-summit-2023-the-bletchley-declaration/the-bletchley-declaration-by-countries-attending-the-ai-safety-summit-1-2-november-2023

[128] *Ibid.*

[129] *Ibid.*

[130] G7 Research Group, "G7 Hiroshima AI Process: G7 Digital & Tech Ministers' Statement" (1 December 2023), online: http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/ict/2023-statement-2.html#:~:text=The%20output%20of%20the%20Hiroshima,on%20our%20societies%20and%20economies

[131] *Ibid.*

[132] EY, "The Artificial Intelligence (AI) global regulatory landscape" (2024) online: https://assets.ey.com/content/dam/ey-sites/ey-com/en_gl/topics/ai/ey-the-artificial-intelligence-ai-global-regulatory-landscape.pdf?download

Given the above findings on AI in Canada and internationally, this paper will conclude with a three-pronged approach to policy recommendations pertaining to the future implementation of AI in the legal field. Each approach aims to minimize concerns regarding AI's ethics and accuracy, while enhancing client experience. It should be noted that no one recommendation precludes any other, and that the recommendations are best taken together. Further, these are merely some suggested ways of improving AI implementation and they do not, nor should they, constitute a complete AI policy in themselves.

Recommendation I: Increase privacy and security measures

As discussed above, privacy is a dominant concern for many within and outside the legal field.[133] In response to these concerns, we recommend that any future regulatory model include mechanisms for the protection and security of client data. An appropriate model would include assurances for data protection at all stages of AI's use, including data collection, storage, and usage. Ultimately, increasing privacy will require communication with AI developers and providers to ensure that these mechanisms are built into any model being used.

Additionally, any firm or organization using AI should ensure that they have updated internal policies on data privacy and security, with contingencies for data branches and leaks. Because machine learning algorithms learn from each new piece of data they receive, client confidentiality is threatened in new ways. Given these unprecedented challenges, it is important to

---

[133] See e.g., *supra* note 67.

review and update old company privacy policies to reflect the changing technological landscape within law firms and legal organizations.

Ultimately, it is only through both enhanced privacy mechanisms and revised internal policy that client data can be kept maximally secure. Per the EU AI Act, the more secure information is kept, the less national regulation is needed for AI. Given the current lack of comprehensive regulation of AI in Canada,[134] implementing the above recommendations will be necessary to uphold client confidentiality and privacy.

Recommendation II: Create disclosure policies

To further alleviate privacy concerns and to minimize the effects of AI hallucinations, comprehensive disclosure policies should be created and enforced in any law firm or legal organization using AI. To maximize AI accuracy and client experience, disclosure should be present at both the client and firm side of AI.

One possible guiding theory for the development of AI disclosure policies may be found in the field of explainable AI (xAI). Rather than explaining how AI itself works, the field of xAI pushes for explanations similar to those in the sciences or philosophy.[135] These explanations require both transparency regarding the models' internal functions as well as post-hoc interpretation—an explanation of how the model behaves and why.[136] Theorists typically push for xAI that is cognizable to stakeholders—those who will benefit or detriment from the use of AI.[137]

---

[134] See *supra* note 62; See also *supra* note 63.
[135] Brent Mittelstadt et al, "Explaining Explanations in AI" Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency (New York: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019) at 1-2, online: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3278331>.
[136] *Ibid*.
[137] See Markus Langer et al, "What Do We Want From Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI)?" 296 J Artificial Intelligence 1 (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2021) at 1-2, online: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2021.103473>.

The dominant belief is that when xAI is used, users are more likely to be critical of the AI's outputs and more attentive to potential biases or inaccuracies. Rather than a "black box" through which an answer is confidently and mysteriously given, the rationale behind answers would be more transparent and therefore open to criticism by users.[138]

Ideally, the decision to implement disclosure policies is driven by two goals: (1) minimizing the presence of AI hallucinations, and (2) drawing attention to possible biases within data sets. For both goals, the aim is for disclosure to draw attention to possible flaws in data, processing, and outputs, thus discouraging users from blindly following AI recommendations without inquiring into the legitimacy of those recommendations. Ultimately, this will not only reduce AI-produced errors, but also give clients better opportunities to make informed choices regarding the use of AI.

Recommendation III: Increase the promotion of, and access to, educational materials

Lastly, the above recommendations will be strengthened if the development and availability of educational materials on AI is made a priority. Educational materials should target clients, with the objective of communicating the information that is used and collected by a given model, as well as how that information is collected and used. Additionally, education should be provided to clients on internal protocols and policies regarding data security as well as the firm's liability in the event of a data breach or leak. Moreover, it is crucial that all educational materials be written in plain language to maximize accessibility for clients with diverse technological backgrounds and comfort levels. Where necessary, educational materials should be accompanied

---

[138] See e.g. *Ibid* at 11.

by explanations and answers should be made available for any questions a client may have pertaining to the materials.

In terms of practical implementation, educational materials on the technology behind AI can be outsourced. Potential options include the Law Society of Ontario's Technology Resource Centre[139] and/or materials provided by a given firm's AI developer or provider.[140] However, it is important that firms and organizations using AI also provide personalized materials on their own policies pertaining to AI.

Ultimately, understanding a model's limitations and potential for error is crucial for the responsible and ethical implementation of AI. Educating coworkers and clients on the AI mechanisms will allow greater transparency and ultimately put the users of AI in a better position to notice errors and biases in the outputs of a given model. Additionally, providing education on a firm or organization's AI policies will enable clients to make more informed choices regarding their personal and confidential information. Lastly, educating clients enhances accountability, thereby incentivising firms and organizations to implement and promote the above goals of disclosure and privacy.

Recommendation IV: Regulatory development

As mentioned, the implementation of AI, although greatly beneficial to the legal system in terms of cost-savings, efficiencies, and leveling the playing field for smaller and medium sized

---

[139]See Law Society of Ontario, "Using Technology" (last visited 27 April 2024), online: <https://lso.ca/lawyers/technology-resource-centre/practice-resources-and-supports/using-technology>.

[140] Both Kira Systems and CoCounsel (discussed above) have educational resources available on their website pertaining to both the mechanisms behind their models as well as particular uses of those models. See Kira Systems Inc., "Resource Centre" (last visited 27 April 2024), online: <https://kirasystems.com/resources/>; See Thomson Reuters, "Casetext Blog" (last visited 27 April 2024), online: <https://casetext.com/blog/>.

firms—is still riddled with issues of privacy and clarity. Canada's lack of comprehensive AI regulation, especially in the legal field, has led to numerous inconsistencies in areas such as privacy reports, client interactions, and court documents. Therefore, a key policy implementation is for the legislature to create clear and cohesive regulations regarding the implementation and use of AI in the legal field while ensuring that these do not curtail, and instead support, the development of AI. For example, the legislature may focus on creating regulations of the submissions of documents for court proceedings. They may choose to adopt a similar approach as that of the United States where courts mostly demand lawyers to outline how they have used AI in the documents that they submit to the court.

Furthermore, it is important to note that stringent regulations that would make AI implementation too costly or difficult may have the potential of imposing barriers that would minimize or eliminate the cost-savings and efficiencies created by AI—especially for smaller and medium-sized firms. Therefore, this report suggests that the regulations should be more focused on creating specific target metrics that law firms and lawyers need to follow with regards to AI use, while also focusing on specific transparency procedures. Any regulation should also be address analyzing the potential impact the regulation may have on the cost of AI implementation and the indirect impact it may create on access to justice.

CONCLUSION

The rapid development of AI in recent years has fundamentally altered the day to day lives of people around the world, but it has had a particularly striking impact on the legal field. AI remains in a fairly nascent state and it is important that the legal field is well equipped to respond to the new challenges and opportunities that lie ahead. Although the legal field currently leverages AI in a limited context such as legal research, there remains significant untapped potential that could help shape the future of the profession. The benefits of efficient and productive work brought by AI are particularly attractive in a field plagued by laborious work and a backlogged court system. However, with this comes the risk of inaccurate results, ethical concerns and privacy issues. While these issues are striking, they are especially notable in client service delivery, where clients put trust in their lawyers to be accountable and professional. It is critical to craft a framework for AI that minimizes these concerns while maximizing the potential upside. The global response to AI, and Canada's international commitments suggest that we will take a cautious but optimistic approach to AI regulation. By crafting client service delivery in a manner that places the utmost importance on privacy and security, implements key disclosure processes, and promotes important educational materials, the legal field will be prepared to offer innovation and effective client services in the face of the AI evolution.

Future of Law Lab

University of Toronto Faculty of Law