Access to Justice & Technology Network

Submission to the Independent Review of the National Legal Assistance Partnership (2020-2025) regarding the role of technology in addressing unmet legal need

October 2023

Access to Justice & Technology Network

http://a2jtech.org.au

Contents

1.   About the Access to Justice & Technology Network

The [Access to Justice & Technology Network](#) ("the Network") is a non-profit organisation dedicated to the promotion of technology to increase access to justice in Australia.

We support people facing disadvantage to obtain legal assistance by:
- **Building a network** - Connecting stakeholders who are interested in access to justice and legal technology, including community legal centres (CLC), not-for-profit (NFP) legal services, private law firms, tech firms and education providers.
- **Knowledge sharing** - Fostering collaboration and capacity building by disseminating information about initiatives, challenges and opportunities.
- **Supporting initiatives** - Providing support for organisations and initiatives through pro bono legal, IT, project management, research and marketing expertise.
- **Research and advocacy** - Conducting research and advocacy in relation to the potential uses and impact of legal technology in the access to justice space.

The Network's Steering Committee is made up of a diverse range of experts from across the legal sector, including CLCs, NFP legal services, private law firms, universities, legal technology companies.

Contributors to this submission include: Noel Lim (CEO & Co-founder at Anika Legal), Daniel Ghezelbash (Associate Professor and Deputy Director of the Kaldor Centre for International Refugee Law at UNSW), Vasili Maroulis (Managing Principal Solicitor at Marrickville Legal Centre), Matthew Keeley (Director at Youth Law Australia), Emily Macloud (Senior Design Strategist at Portable) and James Scheibner (Lecturer at the College of Business, Government and Law at Flinders University).

2.   Executive Summary

Technology provides significant opportunities to address the access to justice gap and to assist in achieving NLAP's intended outcomes. By examining how technology has been used to innovate service delivery, this submission evaluates the effectiveness and challenges of service delivery that could be enhanced by technology. By identifying the barriers to harnessing the potential of technology, this submission assesses the prioritisation, allocation, and distribution mechanism of Commonwealth funding.

2.1   The Problem

The vital role that free legal assistance plays in ensuring equal access to justice across communities is an integral part of Australia's justice system. Services delivered by Legal Aid Commissions (LACs), Community Legal Centres (CLCs), and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services (ATSILS) are key to ensuring that vulnerable people are empowered by our legal system, rather than be disempowered from being able to assert their rights through it or by experiencing it.

However, despite many decades' of excellent and resilient work within the legal assistance sector, unmet legal need within the Australian community remains high and is continuing to rise. Previous reports in 2012 suggested that less than half of Australians with a legal problem are able to access legal help - translating roughly to four million people who miss out.[1] More recent reports investigating legal needs in our community suggest that number could be growing.

In 2023, the Victoria Law Foundation published its Public Understanding of Law Survey Report (PULS Report), which found that where respondents reported problems that gave rise to a legal need, 78% had not been able to have that need be met by legal assistance.[2]

Even where legal assistance is provided, the need may not be met:

> "Even when legal advice is obtained, the majority of legal need is unmet, either because problems last two years or more (one of the elements of the definition of unmet legal need), because advice was insufficient, or both. Unmet legal need was routine, and where legal need is unmet there is no access to justice.
>
> Often, people are not getting what they need from legal services. Beyond analysis of legal need, of those PULS respondents who obtained help from one or more legal

---

[1] Justice Connect, *Seeking Legal Help Online: Understanding the 'missing majority'*, November 2020, p.9, <https://justiceconnect.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Justice-Connect-Seeking-Legal-Help-Online-Missing-Majority-Report-FINAL.pdf>.

[2] Balmer, N.J., Pleasence, P., McDonald, H.M. & Sandefur, R.L, *The Public Understanding of Law Survey (PULS) Volume 1: Everyday Problems and Legal Need*, (Melbourne: Victoria Law Foundation, 2023), p.10, <https://uploads-ssl.webflow.com/64aca8cd4793bdb0821ec3ab/64f542eb58fe75c66682d24a_The%20Public%20Understanding%20of%20Law%20Survey%20Report%202023%20Volume%201.pdf > .

services, 35% indicated they had not obtained all the expert help needed."[3]

Technology and innovation can play a key role in scaling the availability of fit for purpose interventions within the access to justice landscape. Opportunities to do more better with less using innovation are already prevalent in Big Law, but there is a real risk that the justice gap will continue to exacerbate if there is insufficient investment in technology and innovation within the access to justice setting.

Supporting the use of technology in access to justice can deliver huge social returns which are central to the intended outcomes of the NLAP. However, these returns will only be maximised if digital capability is appropriately resourced, and accompanied by a culture conducive to innovation. This submission focuses on how technology could help achieve the objectives of the NLAP, and the approach needed to do so. To illustrate this we draw on several case studies, some of which are real, and others which are hypothetical examples as noted in the footnotes.

Part 3 of this submission examines opportunities for technology to improve service delivery and maximise the use of resources. These opportunities offer benefits across the key issues of: effectiveness, wrap around services, early intervention, advocacy, efficiency and data collection.

Part 4 of this submission outlines current barriers preventing the adoption of technology and innovation.

Part 5 of this submission examines the changes to the NLAP required to overcome the barriers described in Part 3 and achieve the benefits described in Part 4. The changes pertain predominantly to the NLAP's funding model.

---

[3] Balmer et.al 2023, *The Public Understanding of Law Survey (PULS) Volume 1: Everyday Problems and Legal Need,* p.10.

2.2 Key Points

1. Investing in the use of technology in access to justice can deliver huge social returns, which are central to the intended outcomes of the NLAP.

2. Building the sector's digital capability is essential to maximise the long-term effectiveness of the use of technology.

3. Investing in technology will yield greater returns when it is appropriately resourced and accompanied by a culture conducive to innovation.

2.3 Recommendations

1. Acknowledge the importance of digital technology in delivering the NLAP's intended outcomes.

2. Quarantine NLAP funding specifically for innovation and building the sector's digital capability.

3. Account for the cost of the sustained use of technology within the Operational Component of the funding allocation model.

3.   Part 3: Opportunities

Investing in the use of technology in access to justice can deliver immense social returns which are central to the intended outcomes of the NLAP. There are three ways in which such opportunities align with the scope of the NLAP review:

3.1   Opportunity 1: Innovation enables new models to leverage untapped resources

Technology enables new capabilities including automated training and flexible collaboration. In a legal assistance context, technology creates opportunities for innovative service and business models which bring new resources into the sector. By using technology to efficiently leverage previously untapped resources, there is opportunity to grow the sector's capacity without relying on additional government funding.

Technology that is designed to optimise service delivery has the potential to enable new models which can leverage new resources in service of access to justice. This type of innovation is vital when considering the extent of resource constraints on the legal assistance sector.

> *Case Study*
> *Anika Legal is a community legal service that provides online casework for discrete, high-frequency legal problems. Anika Legal also identified large numbers of law students and lawyers in the private sector who wanted to contribute to access to justice but did not have the opportunity to do so.*
>
> *By building education technology that guided volunteer law students to independently make good legal decisions, and by developing a case management system designed specifically for the supervision of law students, they created a service model that reduced the supervision and administrative workload of their lawyers, resulting in a twofold increase of their lawyers' capacity.*
>
> *The education and legal technology that underpins this service model also enabled private sector lawyers to undertake sustained pro bono work in a flexible, remote manner, and without prior experience in the area of law. This enabled a cohort of lawyers who wanted to do pro bono work but were previously unable to - because of the demands of their work schedule or lack of experience - to be seconded to Anika Legal and increase the capacity of the sector.*
>
> *Finally, this tech-enabled service model created efficiencies in the supervision of law students, resulting in cost-savings for their supervising lawyers and creating a law student clinic which is financially sustained by university law schools seeking to offer the*

students meaningful practical legal experience. The technology reduces the resources required by the traditional student clinic model without compromising the educational value to law students, thereby enabling a viable social enterprise business model that channels university capital to the sector, and has the potential to do so sustainably at scale.

3.2   Opportunity 2: Digital tools enable scalable and efficient legal assistance

Digital tools can lead to economies of scale with potential to benefit help-seekers and increase the efficiency of community legal services. This is of particular value to the legal assistance sector due to the demand for legal assistance far outstripping its supply.

Help-seeker facing digital tools or 'self-help tools' are most often applications designed to instantaneously provide help-seekers with legal information relevant to their legal problem, e.g. FineFixer, Dear Landlord.

> *Case Study*
> *Moonee Valley Legal Service developed a digital tool, FineFixer, to assist help-seekers who had received fines to decide on a course of action. The total project cost was $57,000. Its one-year evaluation projected the tool would, in its first three years of operation, provide legal information in 72,456 sessions and save 8,043 hours of legal assistance with a total project cost of $0.79 per session. This equates to an estimated saving of $215,962 by providing legal assistance to otherwise legally capable people.[4]*

Digital tools to increase service efficiency can take numerous forms, perhaps most commonly an intake form which automates parts of the client interviewing process and a case management system which automates administrative duties. Another example is the use of education technology and predictive analytics to automate parts of staff training and guidance, as in the previous case study.

> *Comparative Case Study[5]*
> *This case study illustrates that mere adoption of digital processes is insufficient in optimising the opportunities presented by technological innovation*
>
> *CLC-A and CLC-B are both legal services that boast a strong digital presence. CLC-A is a small legal service with only one lawyer and one paralegal. CLC-B is larger, with a staff of two lawyers, an administrator and a paralegal. However, despite the difference in resourcing, both service the same number of clients at full capacity.*

---

[4] Moonee Valley Legal Service, FineFixer Evaluation, June 2018, p. 1-16, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wpW3Kh-muuFo7qlAB4EPqVFcCPH3HYjW/view?usp=sharing>
[5] Hypothetical example

The reason for the difference in efficiency gains is because of each CLC's ability to utilise technological opportunities to streamline data collection & service delivery.

CLC-B intakes clients via an online form that does not contain any conditional logic to assist with eligibility assessments. As a result, 60% of submissions are ineligible and CLC-B's paralegal spends the majority of their work day turning away ineligible help-seekers. This creates additional frustrations for the helpseeker experience, and rejection phone calls are often escalated to lawyers to manage. Further, for clients that are eligible, the online submission is manually forwarded to the lawyers by the administrator upon receipt each time, and the lawyers then manually create a case file by duplicating the intake form information into fields on their case management system. It often takes at least a week for clients to receive the first contact after they submit their online form.

In contrast, CLC-A's online intake form uses conditional logic to perform preliminary eligibility assessments. As a result, only 5% of submissions are ineligible and it takes the paralegal only half an hour each day to refer ineligible help-seekers onwards. For clients that are eligible, the online submission automatically turns into a matter on the case management system and an automatic email is sent within 1 hour confirming eligibility and indicating approximate wait time (depending on service capacity) until the file can be formally opened. The lawyer and paralegal's time is then devoted fully on progressing open case files, thus ensuring practice efficiency.

This case study demonstrates that digital tools require significant outlay to develop, but can provide legal support at marginal extra cost per user. The potential is far greater since the democratisation of generative AI. The legal industry is the second most susceptible to automation because of generative AI due largely to most tasks being text-based.[6] In the legal assistance sector there is an even greater impetus for digital solutions with large-scale potential given the large unmet need - the alternative to receiving automatically generated legal information is receiving no help at all.

---

[6] Briggs, J & Kodnani, D, *The Potentially Large Effects of Artificial Intelligence on Economic Growth*, (Global Economics Analyst, 2023), p.6, <https://www.key4biz.it/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Global-Economics-Analyst_-The-Potentially-Large-Effects-of-Artificial-Intelligence-on-Economic-Growth-Briggs_Kodnani.pdf>.

3.3   Opportunity 3: Tech-enabled data capability improves decision making and removes administrative burdens

3.3.1   Improve decision making

As the sector's digital and data capability grows, there are exciting opportunities to gain new insights, and develop better, more impactful services. Intuitive data collection processes, combined with fit-for-purpose technology can transform the effectiveness of the community legal assistance sector. By better utilising data, community legal centres can improve their service planning, surface meaningful insights to support advocacy efforts, and better design and evaluater services for their clients.

> *Case Study[7]*
> *CLC-A is a specialist community legal centre focusing on a particular demographic of clients. Front line staff who operate a telephone advice service had noted significant variations in demand on different times, and on different days. They reviewed their call centre data which told them how many calls they were receiving at different times of the day and days of the week, as well as how many calls were not answered. They combined this data with the case data for each phone call to identify how many calls from their target demographic were coming in at different times.*
> *By combining this data they were able to identify the following insights:*
> - *More eligible clients were calling between 10:30am and 2:30pm, and between 4pm-7pm.*
> - *A significant number of calls were coming through after 5pm, when the centre had shut.*
> - *Whilst call demands were particularly high between 12pm-2pm, there was also an increase in callers who were ineligible due their financial situation.*
>
> *Utilising these insights, the CLC-A made a number of changes to the way they staffed their telephone advice service. They changed their operating hours to be from 10:30am-7pm, so that their staff were available when their clients were calling. They also made changes to the messaging on their phone lines and website to make their eligibility requirements clear, reducing the number of ineligible callers speaking to their staff.*
> *These changes:*
> - *Increased the number of eligible callers receiving advice without changing staffing levels, and*
> - *Reduced the number of ineligible callers utilising staff time.*

---

[7] Hypothetical example

The legal assistance sector collects a range of data through its service delivery. The data includes information about the characteristics of clients, the incidences of particular legal problems, and the way their clients experience legal problems. If centres have sufficient funding for their operational costs, they can build their data capabilities. Centres that have built their data capability can derive insights from this data, which will lead to better service delivery and improved access to justice. Centres are frequently working in areas aligned with other key government priorities, and the data these centres collect can be used to inform these priorities.

Data capability in the not-for-profit context involves centres possessing the staff skills and roles, technologies, and data management practices and processes to meaningfully collect, analyse and act on data.[8] The key to effective data capabilities is investing the time and resources to build seamless collection systems such as intake forms that feed data directly into case management systems, and case management systems that are designed to seamlessly collect key data points so that they can be analysed at a later date. Well designed systems for data collection make life easier for centre workers and clients - not harder. They should be designed with current operational processes in mind.

> *Case Study[9]*
> *CLC-B is a specialist legal service that provides ongoing legal advice to clients. Staff had noticed that some clients tended to drop out of contact when their matters progressed to filing in the relevant court.*
>
> *The CLC-B had integrated their case management system with a data analysis tool, allowing them to generate reports from their casework data to identify the characteristics of clients who tended to drop off. They compared this data with the ABS profiles of renters to verify that these types of clients are more likely to be single parents. They then reviewed the files of this profile of the client to understand the themes of why clients were dropping off.*
>
> *They utilised this information to hypothesise that single parent clients were more likely to face barriers in attending a hearing and provided additional support to particular clients to reduce these barriers.*

By utilising data analysis tools such as Tableau, PowerBI, Retool or LookerStudio, centres can analyse data, and build custom reports that are available on demand. This saves time in preparing reports, and enables the comparison of internal and external data sources for greater insights. The tool that is most appropriate for each centre will depend on their needs, systems and degree of digital capability.

Unfortunately, much of the mandated data reporting in the sector focuses on outputs and is mandated by funders. This data does not speak to the comprehensive impact of legal

---

[8] Farmer J, McCosker A, Albury K, & Aryani A, *Data for Social Good,* (Melbourne: Palgrave MacMillan, 2023) p.60-62.
[9] Hypothetical example

assistance sectors, nor does it provide the insights needed for service planning. There have also been moves within the legal assistance sector, and not-for-profits more broadly, to develop impact measurement frameworks such as Theory of Change. These changes are helpful, but there is more work to do, above the outcome measurement changes anticipated in the current NLAP. By investing in data capability, the sector can move away from the easy to collect outputs and widgets and use the data we have to enable better decision making and improve access to justice.

3.3.2   Remove administrative burdens and enable more robust evaluation

The National Data Standards in the NLAP was an ambitious attempt at the time to standardise reporting across the sector to enable the efficiency comparisons between centres, and demonstrate all of the different work across the sector. Its output focus no longer represents best practice in outcome and impact measurement, and is due for a refresh, as anticipated in the current NLAP. Efforts should be made in the development of the outcome framework to align data sets with other funding sources such as other government departments where possible to prevent duplication in data collection and reporting. Key to any changes however, is investment in the infrastructure required for centres to meet reporting requirements. As changes to reporting requirements are made, centres need the resources to adapt to these changes. Sector-wide efforts to build this infrastructure have not been successful, and a new approach is required to build modern data infrastructure. Diversity and innovation in the tools centres use to adhere to any reporting requirements is essential.

For many years now, attempts have been made to develop data collection and case management systems for the sector. The current administrative burden for centres utilising the Community Legal Services System is significant. As things stand, some centres have implemented their own systems for case management and data collection that meet their particular needs. This diversity and innovation should be encouraged and reflected in the NLAP. Each centre has different requirements, and different operating models. It is near impossible to build a system that covers every centre's needs from both a reporting and case management perspective.

Data collection for the purposes of monitoring performance and continuous improvement needs to be embedded into operational processes to be efficient and effective. For legal assistance providers, this means that this function should be part of a case management system. Separating these functions at an operational level is inefficient.

Data collection and reporting can be seamless with well designed case management systems. Such case management systems support the efficient operation of the services they support. They are backed up by well designed processes that work for clients and workers. Centres without digital capability inhouse will need to be supported and resourced to do this work. Doing so will reduce administrative burdens, and free up resources for other priorities.

Improved data capability and practices offer tremendous value via better decision making and reducing administrative burdens. However, cybersecurity and other associated costs must be factored in to safeguard against potential risks which arise from these changes. While these costs may be significant, they are likely outweighed by the potential value they enable, and are likely already necessary.

3.4   Benefits of realising these opportunities

These three categories of opportunities represent innumerable potential benefits across several of the key issues. Examples of these include:

- **Effectiveness** - all opportunities can better achieve a range of NLAP's outcomes, illustrated by case studies.
- **Regional, rural and remote** - using technology to reduce the cost of service delivery and challenges associated with conflict-of-interest issues.
- **Wrap around services** - creating cost-efficient holistic services by supplementing traditional service delivery with digital tools.
- **Early intervention** - more affordably assist legally capable help-seekers with a digital tool to free up resources for help-seekers who require more comprehensive services.
- **Advocacy** - data collection and reporting capabilities build the evidence base for informed systemic change.
- **Efficiency** - data collection and reporting capabilities embedded into operational processes reduces the administrative burden associated with the NLAP's reporting requirements.
- **Data and evaluation** - data collection and reporting capabilities enable richer data to be collected and support the continuous improvement of service delivery.

There is so much unrealised potential for technology to drastically improve the sector's ability to meet legal needs in Australia. Given the scale of unmet need, harnessing the opportunities that technology provides should be a top priority. However, to harness these benefits we must overcome significant barriers which have stifled the sector's ability to innovate.

4.   Part 4: Current barriers to innovation

Despite some early adopters of technology and innovation, the legal assistance sector as a whole faces barriers to technological innovation due to a combination of inadequate resourcing and risk-averse environment of operation. As such, the legal assistance sector remains lagging in its exploration of technological innovation, and much of the potential of such opportunities remains unrealised.

The legal assistance sector could better realise the value of technology if it is financially supported to bring in skill sets that are non-traditional to the sector and upskill traditional staff to operate in environments of innovation. This will allow the sector to work towards an environment more conducive to maximising the opportunities afforded by technological advances to ensure equal access to justice, and curb the rising level of unmet legal need.

In our experience, the following cultural shifts need to occur to enable the sector to meaningfully maximise innovation opportunities:

- **Trust CLCs to set their own innovation agenda -** CLCs are uniquely placed to innovate to more effectively deliver legal assistance to the communities they serve. This is because they have a strong understanding of their clients' needs, can better calculate risk when developing their interventions, are more agile and quick to learn from their mistakes. Over the past decade, as more centres grapple with innovation, funding guidelines have incentivised seeking ad hoc project funding to build discrete tools. This focus does not account for the diversity of user needs, for whom digital tools may not be most impactful, and prevents individual centres from being properly resourced to innovate according to what would work best in their individual setting.

- **Invest in non-traditional talent in addition to existing operational & legal staff -** Lawyers and support staff must be supplemented with skill sets such as user experience (UX) designers, business analysts, and software developers. Further this investment must extend to resourcing the legal assistance sector to upskill and democratise the principles of innovation in "traditional" sector staff, so that they are more comfortable operating in a tech-enabled environment. The principles of innovation are often at odds with the risk aversion that the legal profession models. However, the success of innovative solutions is necessarily predicated on a healthy appetite for risk, embracing and learning from failure, and ability to deliver impact while simultaneously engaging in continuous change management.

- **Ensuring that early adopters of innovation are not penalised for taking risks and creating a culture of collaborative learning** - Early adopters of innovative solutions in their "lo fi" or minimum viable product (MVP) forms should not be penalised for failure. Rather, the sector should be resourced to collaborate and learn from these "failures" together, as this ultimately democratises the use of technology for social good overall.

Investing in technology will yield greater returns when accompanied by a culture of agility, risk appetite, and the ability to admit and learn from failure. The inverse can be observed through several failed large-scale technology projects undertaken by government agencies, institutional bodies and peak organisations in the legal assistance sector. By nature of their size and role in the sector it is particularly difficult for these entities to develop this culture, and therefore more difficult for them to lead innovation.

If the legal assistance sector is to effectively use technology to achieve the NLAP's outcomes, we must take a long-term view of building the sector's digital capability which will involve a shift in our innovation paradigm and adequate resourcing.

5.   Part 5: Changes to the NLAP

5.1   Recommendation 1: Acknowledge the importance of digital technology in delivering the NLAP's intended outcomes.

Part 3 puts forth the case for investing in technology. Part 4 explains the barriers to achieving the benefits possible from innovation, and what we must do to overcome them. Some of these barriers stem from the NLAP's omission of technology and innovation as a priority. Its review is an opportunity to make essential changes to allow technology to improve service delivery outcomes and maximise use of resources, and ultimately, better meet the legal assistance needs of people in Australia.

5.2   Recommendation 2: Quarantine NLAP funding specifically for innovation and building the sector's digital capability.

Action must go beyond acknowledgement. Limitations on funding for indirect costs leads to lower capability and effectiveness and not-for-profits universally underinvest into their core capabilities because their indirect costs are not adequately funded. By comparison, the corporate sector spends twice as much per employee on key capabilities including IT. [10]

Underinvestment in IT capability is particularly acute in the legal assistance sector. This is partly because the current NLAP does not accurately contemplate the returns on investing in technology to achieve the NLAP's desired outcomes, the state of digital capability in the sector necessary to achieve these returns, and how much investment would be required to bridge the current and desired future state. Given the advancement of technology since 2020 this would have been difficult to do, let alone account for within the NLAP's funding allocation model.

Case Study[11]
CLC-A submits its Annual Plan and seeks to have NLAP funding for a project to develop a digital tool that would enable a large number of help-seekers to access legal assistance that they otherwise couldn't, and a project to adopt a case management system that would drive service delivery efficiency. Both projects would free up CLC-A's resources that could be diverted to providing more frontline services. Their LAC, in considering whether to approve the use of NLAP funding for these projects, must consider the projects' relevance to the NLAP's national priority client groups and the CLC-A's ability to reach service deliverables. Because these projects' immediate outcomes are the assistance of a group including but not limited to a priority client group, and general service efficiency that will indirectly benefit priority client groups, the LAC chooses not to approve them. Instead, the LAC directs CLC-A to provide more frontline

---

[10] Social Ventures Australia, Paying what it takes, March 2022, p.3,
<https://www.socialventures.com.au/assets/Paying-what-it-takes.pdf>
[11] Hypothetical example

services exclusively for those priority client groups, even though CLC-A's proposed projects would have enabled them to assist these priority client groups more effectively and efficiently, albeit less directly.

LAC's are constrained by the NLAP in investing in innovation in the community legal sector. These constraints result in the barriers described in Part 4, and the significant investment currently needed to build the sector's digital capability. In understanding the potential benefits of technology and what is required to realise them, the true cost of investment can be accounted for and quarantined specifically for this purpose. Further, if the benefits of the funding are to be maximised it must be quarantined specifically for CLCs or other community organisations, which have strong understandings of their clients' needs and the culture and agility conducive to innovation. It is also crucial that the funding model gives these organisations the freedom to decide how best to use the funding.

5.3 Recommendation 3: Account for the cost of the sustained use of technology within the Operational Component of the funding allocation model.

Organisations that are able to fund innovative projects often cannot fund their maintenance beyond the duration of the project. Developing technology has a relatively high set up cost which is justifiable due the ongoing value it creates. However, they also come with ongoing maintenance costs. Investing in developing technology but not its ongoing costs represents a failure to capture the vast majority of the potential value of the project and is an inefficient use of resources.

Case Study[12]
CLC-A receives NLAP funding for a project to build its data infrastructure to enable data-driven decision making around assisting a priority client group. The project enables CLC-A to generate data-driven insights which assist the sector in designing more effective frontline services for this priority group, as well as a range of other client groups, on an ongoing basis. The funding for this project terminates and CLC-A cannot fund the maintenance of the data infrastructure despite the maintenance costs being a fraction of its set up costs. CLC-A's data infrastructure quickly falls out of step with its evolving theory of change and data framework, rendering it useless. The project ceases to create value for CLC-A or the sector.

On almost any measurement of disadvantage, current legal assistance provision falls far short of the legal needs of Australia. The vast benefits currently available through the use of technology, and the encouraging rate of social returns on investing in technology inspires hope that it is within our means to make up significant ground. By taking sensible and courageous steps to overcome the barriers to innovation we can help to overcome the access to justice gap in Australia.

---

[12] Hypothetical example