

Survey Access: bresslerriskblog.com/aisurvey



The Future of AI and Agentic Workflows in New Business Intake, Conflicts Management, and Client Evaluation

This survey seeks to understand current attitudes and future aspirations of law firm risk, IT, operational, and business leaders regarding the application of **Agentic AI** to executing client evaluation, conflicts management, and new business intake.

For the purposes of this exercise, "Agentic Artificial Intelligence" (Agentic AI) refers to systems capable of autonomously executing multi-step workflows to achieve a specific objective. Capabilities include:

- Integration of data from multiple internal and software systems and data repositories
- Planning and reasoning
- Complex analysis, risk scoring, and evaluation
- Business process execution (autonomously or in conjunction with active "Human-in-the-Loop" review)

Agentic AI may be delivered as a standalone experience (Copilot Studio), through custom tools developed by IT teams, or as native functionality embedded within a vendor-provided software application.

A Note on Survey Scope: This survey explores several risk management topics across the client evaluation lifecycle and is open to a variety of stakeholders. Please feel free to skip questions that do not relate to your area of personal responsibility, awareness, or opinion.

A Note on Survey Confidentiality: Responses to this exercise will be kept confidential and no identifying information will be shared publicly, in the survey report, or with any third party.

Demographic Information

Your Name: *

Your Job Title: *

Please classify your functional area of responsibility:

Your professional email address (to receive a copy of the published report): *

Firm Name *

Size of Firm (Total number of Lawyers):

Next

Section 1: Potential AI Use Cases — Business & Risk Evaluation

To what extent is your firm currently using AI technologies (either Generative or Agentic) to support New Business Intake, Client Evaluation, and Conflicts Clearance processes?

- In Production:** We are actively using AI tools to support these workflows in live, day-to-day operations
- Piloting:** We are currently piloting or testing AI tools/capabilities in a controlled environment
- Researching:** We are actively researching and evaluating AI, but no tools are deployed or in a pilot phase
- Not Exploring:** We are not actively exploring the use of AI for NBI/Conflicts at this time

Please note: For the purposes of this survey, *please assume* that any functional capabilities described **have been tested, proven to be effective, and demonstrated to comply with any standards your firm has or will establish.**

Put otherwise, these questions are not asking whether you "trust" AI at this point in time. They are asking whether, *assuming* your firm has developed appropriate confidence in AI to execute a specific task or workflow, and the capabilities were made available as part of your internal software systems, you/your firm would want to use AI to execute that task or workflow in practice.

Which of the following Agentic AI capabilities related to **client risk screening and evaluation** would you be interested in adopting?

	Extremely Interested in Adopting	Moderately Interested in Adopting	Somewhat Interested in Adopting	Not Interested in Adopting
Adverse Media & Reputational Risk Scoring: Reviewing global news sources and legal filings to generate reputational risk summaries and scores for prospective clients, based on issues including: public scandals, fraud allegations, or other PR sensitivities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ESG & Internal Policy-Driven Risk Screening: Autonomously scanning prospective clients' core business models, industry classifications, and public disclosures to flag clashes with the firm's internal client-acceptance policies (e.g., restricted industries like crypto/firearms/cannabis or environmental/social/human rights concerns)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Outside Counsel Guidelines (OCGs) Cross-Referencing (Competitors/Waivers): Autonomously checking proposed matters against any restrictive covenants, competitor definitions, or specific waivers mandated by OCGs of existing clients	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lateral Hire Data and Process Integration: Autonomously parsing complex lateral questionnaires, executing the requisite bulk conflict searches, and generating consolidated risk reports to accelerate onboarding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sanctions & AML/KYC Screening: Autonomously checking prospective clients against global sanctions lists, PEP (Politically Exposed Persons) databases, and cross-referencing beneficial ownership registries, generating audit-ready compliance logs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Positional / Issue Conflicts: Analyzing firm work product and practice data to flag if a new matter, as scoped during intake, likely requires advocating for a legal position that contradicts a position taken for an existing client	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Corporate Tree & UBO Mapping: Autonomously researching and building corporate family trees and identifying Ultimate Beneficial Owners (UBOs) using internal data, external data sources, and third-party data providers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Third Party Relationship Assessment: Autonomously identifying and cross-referencing involvement from litigation finance companies, insurers, or third-party payers involved in a matter to uncover hidden conflicts of interest or control issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other — Please list/describe additional use case(s):

Section 2: Strategic and Commercial Considerations

How would you like to see Agentic AI streamline or improve how your firm negotiates **Outside Counsel Guidelines (OCGs) and terms** with clients during intake?

(Select all that apply)

Unsure/Too Early to tell

Market-Standard Benchmarking: Quickly benchmarking a client's proposed terms against our firm's broader OCG portfolio to objectively show them their demands are "off-market"

Status Quo (Relationship-Driven): Minimal change; client negotiations will remain fundamentally driven by human relationships and partner leverage, regardless of what the data says

Client-Facing Innovation (The "Halo Effect"): Leveraging our use of advanced AI risk-modeling as a differentiator during pitches to demonstrate to clients that we are highly sophisticated operators

Financial Modeling of Toxicity: Quantifying the specific financial costs of restrictive OCGs (e.g., hidden administrative burdens or lost future revenue), empowering the firm to push back with hard math

Internal Partner Alignment: Using AI-generated data to convince our own rainmaking partners that an OCG is too risky, shifting the "bad guy" blame from the Risk team to objective data

When evaluating a new matter, how valuable would it be for an Agentic AI to execute **resource capacity and utilization checks** (e.g., cross-referencing matter profiles against timekeeping, Financial/PMS, HR, and experience databases)?

(Select one)

Highly Valuable (Strategic Staffing): It would help us model whether we have the right mix of available associates and partners before committing to large matters

Somewhat Valuable (Contextual Only): It would provide helpful context, but partners ultimately manage their own teams' bandwidth outside of centralized systems

Not Valuable (Incompatible Model): Our staffing and capacity models are highly distributed (e.g., decentralized by practice group) and would not benefit from AI modeling at intake

Not Valuable (Data Quality Barriers): The idea is good, but our internal HR and utilization data is currently too siloed or inaccurate for an AI to reliably leverage at intake

Comments (optional):

When navigating the internal politics of rejecting a "problematic" client or matter, how valuable would Agentic AI analysis be in justifying that rejection to the originating partner?

(Select one)

- Highly Valuable (The "Objective Shield"):** It would provide objective, data-backed risk scoring that shifts the "bad guy" blame away from the risk team or internal politics and onto the math
- Somewhat Valuable (Supporting Evidence):** It would help build the case, but the rejection conversation still requires heavy executive diplomacy and human management
- Not Valuable (Executive Responsibility):** This is purely a leadership issue. Partners will not accept technology-generated analysis as an excuse for rejecting their business opportunities

Comments (optional):

To transform your firm's risk and business acceptance function into a strategic growth enabler for the firm, which of the following changes, capabilities, or resources does your organization require?

(Select all that apply)

- Data Integration:** We need better flows of information across our CRM, business development pipeline, financial management, and third-party data intelligence
- Cultural Realignment:** We need firm management to actively redefine the risk team's mandate from "gatekeeper" to "growth enabler and strategic business partner"
- AI Adoption:** We need to take advantage of existing and emerging risk-focused AI tools that leverage Generative and/or Agentic AI to automate work.
- Technology Platform Improvement:** We need to replace or upgrade legacy software (e.g. intake, conflicts, terms), or we need to take better advantage of capabilities available today on our existing software
- Professional Upskilling:** We need to better train and upskill risk staff to enable greater contributions and productivity
- Staffing Capacity Expansion:** We need to invest in additional headcount or specialized risk roles to expand overall operational bandwidth
- Organizational Model Evolution:** We need to mature our model for intake and review (e.g. adopting centralized clearance, establishing a risk service center)
- No Change Required:** Our firm's current practices are already optimized to enable firm growth to a degree we are satisfied with
- Policy Standardization and Governance:** We need to better standardize review rules for ethical conflicts and business "friction" to eliminate ad-hoc partner negotiations and exception-management overhead
- Business Development Collaboration:** We need better standards for how we work with marketing and BD (e.g. proactive conflicts during pre-pitch and general client development phases)
- Other

Section 3: Perceived Value, Concerns, and Knowledge Gaps

Among the following potential benefits of using Agentic AI in **new business intake and conflicts management processes**, which do you consider most important for your firm?

(Please select your **top three** potential benefits)

Expanded Pursuit Capacity: The ability to take on matters and clients that the firm currently declines or delays due to conflicts management or process challenges

OCG Compliance Automation: Streamlined review and easier compliance with client OCGs

Risk Mitigation: Increased accuracy and analysis, reducing margin of human error (e.g., catching hidden corporate affiliations)

Overhead Reduction: Direct reduction of operational costs and overhead within the risk department

Accelerated Matter Opening: Faster turnaround times for clearing conflicts and opening matters

Operational Efficiency: Reduction in manual data entry and repetitive tasks for risk analysts

Talent Redeployment: Redeploying risk and compliance staff from process execution to higher-value strategic advisory roles

High-Fidelity Reporting: Improved report generation, narrative summarization, and risk ranking (e.g. more concise reports, more accurately rated/ranked issues, etc.)

Partner & Client Experience: Increased satisfaction from lawyers and clients regarding matter opening speed and reduced operational friction

Comments (optional):

What are your **primary concerns** regarding the adoption of Agentic AI to support **new business intake and conflicts management**?

(Please select your **top three** potential concerns)

Explainability (The "Black Box"): The inability to audit or clearly explain how the AI reached a specific score, conclusion, or recommendation

False Negatives & Accuracy: The risk of the AI missing a critical conflict or excluding vital risk data from a clearance report

Professional Responsibility & Malpractice: Breaching ethical duties (e.g., failure to supervise) or incurring malpractice liability if an AI error goes uncaught

External Data Privacy & Security: Exposing sensitive pre-intake client activity or firm data to third-party AI providers

System Integration: The technical difficulty and cost of securely connecting AI agents to legacy firm systems (e.g., DMS, financial, records, experience management).

Internal Information Barriers: The risk of the AI bypassing ethical walls and exposing restricted matter data to unauthorized internal staff

Cultural Change Management: Pushback from internal stakeholders who distrust AI or have any of the aforementioned or other concerns

AI "Hallucinations": The AI confidently inventing non-existent details (e.g., phantom corporate affiliations or fabricated entities)

Other

When evaluating an Agentic AI solution for Intake and Conflicts, which of the following features are absolute “must-haves” for your firm?

(Select all that apply)

- Human-in-the-Loop (HITL):** Built-in, systematic workflows that mandate a human analyst’s sign-off before designated actions are finalized
- Model Agnosticism (LLM Choice):** The architectural flexibility to swap or choose the underlying LLM (e.g., Claude, OpenAI, Gemini, local open-source models) based on the firm’s evolving preferences
- Private Hosting:** Strict private cloud environments
- Source Citation:** The AI must link directly to the specific internal document or data point it used to make its assessment
- Auditable Reasoning:** A clear, step-by-step log of exactly how the AI reached its conclusion
- No Model Training on Firm Data:** A contractual guarantee that firm data will never be used to train, fine-tune, or improve the vendor’s underlying models, regardless of how data is temporarily retained for processing
- Data Deletion / Zero Data Retention:** The vendor does not store firm data after processing — all inputs are purged at the conclusion of each session or query
- Other

In the context of utilizing Agentic or Generative AI to support client evaluation, conflicts, and new business intake, what are the biggest “unknowns” for you and your firm right now?

Please specify what you feel you don’t know but need to know before adopting these technologies (e.g., regulatory issues, insurer perspectives, data governance, technical infrastructure needs, peer success stories, ROI metrics, etc)

Over the past 12 months, how have your clients’ Outside Counsel Guidelines (OCGs) evolved regarding your firm’s use of AI for internal operational matters?

NOTE: Please focus specifically on AI in business operations (risk, intake, finance) rather than AI used in legal service delivery / practice of law (brief drafting, document review).

Which of the following Agentic AI capabilities for evaluating the **commercial and strategic viability** of new matters would you be interested in adopting?

	Extremely Interested in Adopting	Moderately Interested in Adopting	Somewhat Interested in Adopting	Not Interested in Adopting
Revenue Concentration & Portfolio Risk: Evaluating how adding a new corporate parent or subsidiary impacts the firm's overall revenue concentration and financial exposure to a specific industry downturn	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunity Cost & Conflict Avoidance: Predicting whether accepting a specific matter (or agreeing to its restrictive OCGs) will disqualify the firm from pursuing more lucrative future engagements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strategic Fit & Growth Alignment: Cross-referencing proposed matters against the firm's stated strategic goals (e.g., flagging low-margin work requested in non-strategic practice areas)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Historical Realization & Margin Modeling: Analyzing a returning client's past billing, write-offs, and realization rates to recommend whether to accept, reject, or renegotiate fees or terms for the new matter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
AFA & Pricing Structuring: Autonomously parsing historical matter data to propose optimal Alternative Fee Arrangements (e.g., flat fees, collars, success fees) tailored to the specific risk profile of the new engagement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments (optional):

In the context of **client intake operations (beyond conflicts)**, which of the following Agentic AI use cases would you be interested in adopting?

	Extremely Interested in Adopting	Moderately Interested in Adopting	Somewhat Interested in Adopting	Not Interested in Adopting
AI-restrictive Wall Enforcement: Extending access controls to AI tools and agentic workflows, preventing screened personnel from surfacing restricted firm or matter data through AI assistants or automated agents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intake Triage & Data Validation: Autonomously reviewing incoming matter requests for missing data (e.g., billing addresses, complete party lists) and quickly routing them back to the originating partner for correction, before requests enter the risk team's queue	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
OCG Extraction & Analysis: Autonomously extracting terms from Outside Counsel Guidelines (OCGs) to flag and escalate non-standard terms or overly restrictive mandates for human review	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ethical Wall & Information Barrier Management: Autonomously recommending the structure of required information barriers — including wall structure and affected lawyers/matters/systems that require screening — and, upon human approval, advancing those restrictions for deployment across firm systems; Monitoring personnel and matter activity for changes that may require updated restrictions and alerting risk staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waiver & Engagement Letter Drafting: Generating customized initial drafts of conflicts waivers and engagement letters, based on the specific parties and OCG terms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other — Please list/describe additional use case(s):

Which of the following Agentic AI use cases for conflicts clearance and reporting would you be interested in adopting?

	Extremely Interested in Adopting	Moderately Interested in Adopting	Somewhat Interested in Adopting	Not Interested in Adopting
<p>"Zero-Hit" Automation (Routine Compliance "Fast Lane"): Autonomously automating clearance of routine, low-risk matters that meet pre-defined thresholds — including zero-hit searches, but also extending to matters that clear all automated review criteria — bypassing the manual analyst queue entirely without requiring human analyst intervention</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>False Positive Filtering: AI agent reviewing hits and autonomously dismissing obvious non-matches or pure name-coincidences, prior to human review (e.g., dismissing "Apple Plumbing" when searching for "Apple Inc.")</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Contextual Summarization: AI agent synthesizing all remaining, valid database hits into a clear and concise narrative summary to accelerate the risk analyst's review</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Affiliate Risk Analysis: AI agent assessing whether a hit on a subsidiary or affiliate is likely to impute a conflict to the parent company</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Substantive Adversity Assessment: AI agent analyzing the matter description against existing client data to recommend whether a proposed representation is likely to be directly and legally adverse</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Advance Waiver / Terms Check: AI agent reviews any existing client OCGs, existing engagement letter, and/or existing advance waiver, making recommendations regarding the firm's ability to take on a matter based on advance waiver or decline a matter due to client rules</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Continuous Clearance: AI agent shifting from point-in-time intake to ongoing, active monitoring — regularly re-applying the aforementioned analytical capabilities to active clients and matters to flag emerging conflicts throughout the engagement lifecycle</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Conflict Mitigation Recommendations: Upon identifying a conflict, Agentic AI recommends specific tactics to resolve or mitigate said conflicts (e.g. proposing tailored waiver language, suggesting ethical screening approach, or identifying matter-scope modifications that would eliminate adversity)</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments (optional):

If your firm were to adopt a **"Continuous Clearance" model** — moving from point-in-time review during new business intake, to ongoing monitoring of active clients and matters — which of the following active-monitoring capabilities would you be interested in adopting?

	Extremely Interested in Adopting	Moderately Interested in Adopting	Somewhat Interested in Adopting	Not Interested in Adopting
Dynamic Corporate Tree Mapping: Autonomously alerting the risk team if an active client merges with, acquires, or is acquired by a known adverse entity or restricted OCG competitor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sanctions & Watchlist Alerts: Real-time flagging if an active client, their key executives, or Ultimate Beneficial Owners (UBOs) are suddenly added to global sanctions or restricted party lists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Positional Drift: Autonomously analyzing newly drafted or filed firm work product (e.g., briefs, memos) to flag where they may contradict legal positions taken in other active cases	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Third-Party Funder Emergence: Monitoring active litigation dockets and external announcements to flag when a third-party litigation funder quietly enters an existing matter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dynamic Activity Monitoring: Observation of lawyer/timekeeper time entry, document activity and/or internal collaboration, to identify new matter team participants, which may trigger ethical screens or other conflicts review	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adverse Media & Crisis Tracking: Continuous monitoring of global news and legal filings to alert relationship partners if a client faces a sudden regulatory investigation, fraud allegation, or a PR crisis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Business Model & Policy Drift: Monitoring active clients for significant shifts in their industry classifications or public disclosures that newly violate the firm's internal client-acceptance policies (e.g., pivoting into restricted industries)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 4: Human Capital, Reskilling, and Organizational Impact

Over the next 3-5 years, how do you anticipate the successful adoption of Agentic AI will impact the headcount and structure of your NBI/Conflicts team?

(Select one)

- Strategic Reallocation (No change in headcount):** Total headcount remains steady, but staff will pivot from manual data entry to higher-value, complex risk analysis.
- Specialized Growth (Increase in headcount):** We will require new, specialized roles (e.g., AI process managers, data engineers, or prompt tuners) to oversee and enhance the technology
- Operational Attrition (Slight reduction):** We anticipate a slight reduction in headcount over time as natural attrition is not backfilled, but significant reductions are unlikely
- Workforce Transformation (Significant reduction):** AI will automate a majority of current task-based roles, leading to a significantly smaller, more specialized department
- Unsure / Too early to tell**
- Other

Comments (optional):

How would you characterize the current sentiment among your NBI and Conflicts staff regarding the introduction (or potential introduction) of AI into their workflows?

(Select one)

- Enthusiastic:** They view it as a tool to remove tedious work and open new possibilities
- Cautiously optimistic:** They're waiting to see how such systems can work in practice
- Anxious:** They are concerned about job displacement
- Apathetic:** They are not paying close attention to AI for operational risk management or its potential impact
- Mixed:** Sentiment varies materially across team members; no clear prevailing view
- Other

Comments (optional):

If Agentic AI takes on "first-pass" conflicts review and more routine data entry activities, which new skills will become most critical for your human workforce to develop?

(Please select your **top three**)

Data Quality Management: Ensuring the firm's underlying data is clean enough for the AI to leverage effectively

Process Engineering: Designing new AI-enabled client evaluation, risk, and intake workflows to deliver new capabilities and value to the firm

Prompt Engineering / System Tuning: Helping to refine how the AI searches for and interprets conflicts

Strategic Risk Advisory: Shifting from data processors to internal consultants who advise partners on ethical or business conflicts

AI Output Validation / Auditing: Reviewing AI-generated reports for accuracy

Other

Section 5: Future Outlook & Readiness

To successfully adopt Agentic AI for new business intake and related risk management, with which existing systems must the technology effectively integrate?

(Select all that apply)

Experience Management Systems (e.g., Intapp, Foundation)

Horizontal AI Providers (e.g., OpenAI, Anthropic)

External Corporate Registries/Data Providers (e.g., Dun & Bradstreet, Capital IQ, Orbis, BvD)

NBI / Conflicts Workflow Platforms (e.g., Intapp Intake/Conflicts, Elite Conflicts, iManage Conflicts, Aderant Conflicts)

HR / Identity Management Systems (e.g., Workday HCM Okta)

Financial / Practice Management Systems (e.g., Aderant, Elite)

Document Management Systems (DMS) (e.g., iManage, NetDocuments, Microsoft SharePoint)

Data Lake / Data Warehouse (e.g., Snowflake, Microsoft Fabric/Azure Synapse, Databricks)

Vertical AI (e.g., Harvey, Legora)

Other

If a vendor offered a fully secure, highly accurate Agentic AI solution for NBI tomorrow, what would be your single biggest internal hurdle to adopting and deploying it?

(Select one)

Security & Compliance Barriers: Navigating the internal IT and Information Security audit and approval process

Budgetary Constraints: Lack of allocated capital or competing financial priorities

Executive Buy-in & Cultural Alignment: Securing approval and support from firm management or key practice leaders

Resource Constraints (Bandwidth): Lack of internal personnel and IT bandwidth to manage the implementation, integration, and training

Data Readiness: Our internal data quality is not suitable to support an AI deployment

Other

Looking ahead, when do you realistically expect Agentic AI to be a standard, trusted component of your firm's NBI and Conflicts workflow?

(Select one)

Within the next 12 months

1 to 2 years

2 to 3 years

3 to 5 years

5+ Years

Unsure

Other

Comments (optional):

Thank You!

Thank you for participating in the survey. We'll be in touch with results once the survey closes and analysis concludes.

Please invite colleagues at your firm, including those in other departments who may have relevant insight to share, to participate as well.

The more data this exercise gathers, the richer and more valuable the results will be.
