



The State Bar of California

OPEN SESSION AGENDA ITEM 60-1 NOVEMBER 2023

DATE: November 16, 2023

TO: Members, Board of Trustees
Sitting as the Regulation and Discipline Committee

FROM: The Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct
Brandon Krueger, Chair, Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct
Erika Doherty, Program Director, Office of Professional Competence

SUBJECT: Recommendations from Committee on Professional Responsibility and
Conduct on Regulation of Use of Generative AI by Licensees

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This memorandum sets forth the Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct's (COPRAC) initial recommendations regarding lawyer use of generative AI. In short, COPRAC believes that the existing Rules of Professional Conduct are robust, and the standards of conduct cover the landscape of issues presented by generative AI in its current forms. However, COPRAC recognizes that generative AI is a rapidly evolving technology that presents novel issues that might necessitate new regulation and rules in the future.

As an initial step, COPRAC has developed, and recommends that the Board adopt *Practical Guidance for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Practice of Law* to assist lawyers in navigating their ethical obligations when using generative AI. COPRAC envisions that the Practical Guidance will be a living document that is periodically updated as the technology evolves and matures, and new issues are presented.

COPRAC also recommends that the Board direct State Bar staff to develop attorney education programs that assist lawyers to understand and gain competence regarding the potential risks, benefits and ethical implications of using generative AI; examine the potential impacts of generative AI on law students and bar applicants; and work with the Legislature and California

Supreme Court to consider new or revised regulations regarding the use of generative AI in the practice of law.

BACKGROUND

On May 18, 2023, the chair of the Board of Trustees directed COPRAC, which is charged with studying and providing consultation and assistance to the Board on matters involving professional responsibility, to explore potential regulation of the ethical use of generative AI in the legal profession. The chair directed that, by the Board's November 2023 meeting, COPRAC issue recommendations, which could include practical guidance, an advisory opinion or other resources, changes to the Rules of Professional Conduct or other rules or statutes, or other recommendations to ensure that AI is used competently and in compliance with the professional responsibility obligations of lawyers.

COPRAC undertook an effort to familiarize committee members with the current state of generative AI and to understand its potential implications for the legal profession prior to developing recommendations regarding lawyer use of this evolving technology. COPRAC accomplished this work by forming a working team on generative AI (that included experts in the field on an ad hoc basis) and discussions and considerations at four COPRAC meetings on June 23, July 28, September 15, and October 20, 2023. This work also included:

- Surveying lawyers regarding current and planned uses of generative AI in their practices;
- Researching generative AI capabilities, limitations, and risks, by reviewing various materials, including the principles and guidelines prepared by [MIT's Task Force on Responsible Use of Generative AI for Law](#), and consulting with experts in artificial intelligence and founders of generative AI products;
- Reviewing the current Rules of Professional Conduct, statutory authority, case law, and ethics opinions to evaluate whether these existing authorities address the use of generative AI and to identify potential new ethical issues raised by generative AI; and
- Examining approaches taken by other jurisdictions to regulate the use of generative AI, specifically any regulations directed toward lawyers.

DISCUSSION

The current Rules of Professional Conduct do not expressly address the use of generative AI, creating uncertainty about lawyers' ethical duties regarding such use.¹ However, the rules are intended to apply to lawyers engaged in a variety of practice areas and situations.

¹ Comment [1] to Rule 1.1 (Competence) is the only explicit reference to technology. The comment, adopted March 22, 2021, states, "[t]he duties set forth in this rule include the duty to keep abreast of the changes in the law and its practice, including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology."

Historically, COPRAC has developed advisory ethics opinions that apply the rules and related authorities to certain situations. These opinions are issued for public input through a public comment process and ultimately approved by the Board of Trustees acting as the Regulation and Discipline Committee. After engaging in extensive study over the past several months, COPRAC believes that the existing rules can be applied to generative AI use at this time, and has prepared *Practical Guidance for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Practice of Law* (Practical Guidance), provided as Attachment A. This document is an interim step to provide guidance on this evolving technology while further rules and regulations are considered. The Practical Guidance sets forth the applicable Rules of Professional Conduct and statutory authority that would regulate the improper use of generative AI, and offers guidance for how a lawyer may comply with these ethics authorities.

The Practical Guidance is based, in part, on the principles and guidelines prepared by [MIT's Task Force on Responsible Use of Generative AI for Law](#), and addresses current concerns about lawyer use of generative AI, many of which apply in varying degrees to lawyer use of other technologies.

COPRAC recognizes that as the technology further develops, additional regulation, including amendments to the Rules of Professional Conduct, may be necessary. However, until there are issues presented by the use of generative AI that are not adequately addressed by existing rules and regulations, this Practical Guidance will remind lawyers of their existing professional responsibility obligations and assist lawyers with applying these obligations to new technology. In addition to recommending that the Board adopt the Practical Guidance, COPRAC intends to further study the following and, if necessary, return with further recommendations to the Board regarding:

- how to balance rules and guidance in the use of generative AI to protect clients and the public against its potential to facilitate efficiency and expanded access to justice;
- how to “supervise” non-human, nonlawyer assistance if the assistance allows for autonomous decision making by generative AI;
- whether the duty of competency should specifically require competency in generative AI (i.e., requirement more than what exists in Rule 1.1, Comment [1]); and
- whether a lawyer should be required to communicate to their client the use of generative AI and in what contexts.

The impact of generative AI on the profession extends well beyond a lawyer’s professional responsibility obligations. In addition to publishing and maintaining the Practical Guidance, COPRAC recommends that the Board take other action regarding generative AI:

Develop Attorney Education Addressing Generative AI

COPRAC recommends that the Board direct the Office of Professional Competence (OPC) to develop a one-hour minimum continuing legal education (MCLE) course that would satisfy the new, one-hour requirement for continuing legal education on technology in the practice of law and that addresses the competent use of generative AI (State Bar rule 2.72(C)(2)(a)(iv)).

COPRAC further recommends that the Board direct OPC to update the mandatory New Attorney Training, which new licensees must complete within their first year of practice, to include technological competence training for lawyers using generative AI. COPRAC believes that education in this area will allow lawyers to utilize generative AI for the benefit of their clients and to expand access to legal services while upholding professional ethics without harm to the public while the technology continues to develop.

Explore Regulatory Changes to Protect the Public

Generative AI products are being developed for a multitude of uses and for a variety of professions. They are also being developed to provide legal assistance to unrepresented persons. While generative AI may be of great benefit in minimizing the justice gap, it could also create harm if self-represented individuals are relying on generative AI outputs that provide false information. COPRAC recommends that the Board take action to:

- Work with the Legislature and the California Supreme Court to determine whether the unauthorized practice of law should be more clearly defined or articulated through statutory or rule changes; and
- Work with the Legislature to determine whether legal generative AI products should be licensed or regulated and, if so, how.

Consider the Impact of Generative AI on Law Students and Bar Applicants

Additionally, COPRAC recommends that the Board consider taking action to address generative AI use by law students by:

- Directing the Committee of Bar Examiners to explore requirements for California-accredited law schools to require courses regarding the competent use of generative AI; and
- Directing the Committee of Bar Examiners to explore regulations or rules related to the bar exam and generative AI.

COPRAC recognizes that the Practical Guidance document and other recommendations are a first step in the regulation of generative AI use by California lawyers, and that the State Bar is one of the first attorney regulatory agencies to address this technology. Through these initial recommendations, COPRAC believes that the State Bar will allow for attorneys and consumers

to gain the benefits of this transformative technology, while promoting responsible use of generative AI in a manner that will prevent public harm.

FISCAL/PERSONNEL IMPACT

None

AMENDMENTS TO RULES

None

AMENDMENTS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES POLICY MANUAL

None

STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS & IMPLEMENTATION STEPS

Goal 3. Protect the Public by Regulating the Legal Profession

RECOMMENDATIONS

Should the Board of Trustees, sitting as the Regulation and Discipline Committee, concur in COPRAC's proposed Practical Guidance and further recommendations, passage of the following resolutions is recommended:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees sitting as the Regulation and Discipline Committee, upon recommendation of the State Bar Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct, approves the publication of the *Practical Guidance for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Practice of Law*, provided as Attachment A; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees sitting as the Regulation and Discipline Committee, upon recommendation of the State Bar Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct, directs the State Bar Office of Professional Competence to (1) develop a one-hour minimum continuing legal education (MCLE) course that would satisfy the new, one-hour requirement for continuing legal education on technology in the practice of law and that addresses the competent use of generative AI; and (2) update the New Attorney Training to include technological competence training for lawyers using generative AI; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees sitting as the Regulation and Discipline Committee, upon recommendation of the State Bar Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct, directs State Bar staff to

work with the Legislature and the California Supreme Court to determine whether (1) the unauthorized practice of law should be more clearly defined or articulated through statutory or rule changes; and (2) legal generative AI products should be licensed or regulated and, if so, how; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees sitting as the Regulation and Discipline Committee, upon recommendation of the State Bar Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct, directs the State Bar Office of Admissions and the Committee of Bar Examiners to explore (1) requirements for California-accredited law schools to require courses regarding the competent use of generative AI; and (2) regulations or rules related to the bar exam and generative AI.

ATTACHMENT LIST

- A.** Practical Guidance for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Practice of Law

**THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND CONDUCT
PRACTICAL GUIDANCE FOR THE USE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE
PRACTICE OF LAW**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Generative AI is a tool that has wide-ranging application for the practice of law and administrative functions of the legal practice for all licensees, regardless of firm size, and all practice areas. Like any technology, generative AI must be used in a manner that conforms to a lawyer’s professional responsibility obligations, including those set forth in the Rules of Professional Conduct and the State Bar Act. A lawyer should understand the risks and benefits of the technology used in connection with providing legal services. How these obligations apply will depend on a host of factors, including the client, the matter, the practice area, the firm size, and the tools themselves, ranging from free and readily available to custom-built, proprietary formats.

Generative AI use presents unique challenges; it uses large volumes of data, there are many competing AI models and products, and, even for those who create generative AI products, there is a lack of clarity as to how it works. In addition, generative AI poses the risk of encouraging greater reliance and trust on its outputs because of its purpose to generate responses and its ability to do so in a manner that projects confidence and effectively emulates human responses. A lawyer should consider these and other risks before using generative AI in providing legal services.

The following Practical Guidance is based on current professional responsibility obligations for lawyers and demonstrates how to behave consistently with such obligations. While this guidance is intended to address issues and concerns with the use of generative AI and products that use generative AI as a component of a larger product, it may apply to other technologies, including more established applications of AI. This Practical Guidance should be read as guiding principles rather than as “best practices.”

PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Applicable Authorities	Practical Guidance
<p>Duty of Confidentiality</p> <p>Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6068, subd. (e)</p> <p>Rule 1.6</p> <p>Rule 1.8.2</p>	<p>Generative AI products are able to utilize the information that is input, including prompts and uploaded documents or resources, to train the AI, and might also share the query with third parties or use it for other purposes. Even if the product does not utilize or share inputted information, it may lack reasonable or adequate security.</p> <p>A lawyer must not input any confidential information of the client into any generative AI solution that lacks adequate confidentiality and security protections. A lawyer must anonymize client information and avoid entering details that can be used to identify the client.</p> <p>A lawyer or law firm should consult with IT professionals or cybersecurity experts to ensure that any AI system in which a lawyer would input confidential client information adheres to stringent security, confidentiality, and data retention protocols.</p> <p>A lawyer should review the Terms of Use or other information to determine how the product utilizes inputs. A lawyer who intends to use confidential information in a generative AI product should ensure that the provider does not share inputted information with third parties or utilize the information for its own use in any manner, including to train or improve its product.</p>
<p>Duties of Competence and Diligence</p> <p>Rule 1.1</p> <p>Rule 1.3</p>	<p>It is possible that generative AI outputs could include information that is false, inaccurate, or biased.</p> <p>A lawyer must ensure competent use of the technology, including the associated benefits and risks, and apply diligence and prudence with respect to facts and law.</p>

Applicable Authorities	Practical Guidance
	<p>Before using generative AI, a lawyer should understand to a reasonable degree how the technology works, its limitations, and the applicable terms of use and other policies governing the use and exploitation of client data by the product.</p> <p>Overreliance on AI tools is inconsistent with the active practice of law and application of trained judgment by the lawyer.</p> <p>AI-generated outputs can be used as a starting point but must be carefully scrutinized. They should be critically analyzed for accuracy and bias, supplemented, and improved, if necessary. A lawyer must critically review, validate, and correct both the input and the output of generative AI to ensure the content accurately reflects and supports the interests and priorities of the client in the matter at hand, including as part of advocacy for the client. The duty of competence requires more than the mere detection and elimination of false AI-generated results.</p> <p>A lawyer’s professional judgment cannot be delegated to generative AI and remains the lawyer’s responsibility at all times. A lawyer should take steps to avoid over-reliance on generative AI to such a degree that it hinders critical attorney analysis fostered by traditional research and writing. For example, a lawyer may supplement any AI-generated research with human-performed research and supplement any AI-generated argument with critical, human-performed analysis and review of authorities.</p>
<p>Duty to Comply with the Law</p> <p>Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6068(a)</p> <p>Rule 8.4</p> <p>Rule 1.2.1</p>	<p>A lawyer must comply with the law and cannot counsel a client to engage, or assist a client in conduct that the lawyer knows is a violation of any law, rule, or ruling of a tribunal when using generative AI tools.</p> <p>There are many relevant and applicable legal issues surrounding generative AI, including but not limited to compliance with AI-specific laws, privacy laws, cross-border data transfer laws, intellectual property laws, and cybersecurity concerns. A lawyer should analyze the relevant laws and regulations applicable to the attorney or the client.</p>

Applicable Authorities	Practical Guidance
<p>Duty to Supervise Lawyers and Nonlawyers, Responsibilities of Subordinate Lawyers</p> <p>Rule 5.1</p> <p>Rule 5.2</p> <p>Rule 5.3</p>	<p>Managerial and supervisory lawyers should establish clear policies regarding the permissible uses of generative AI and make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm adopts measures that give reasonable assurance that the firm’s lawyers and non lawyers’ conduct complies with their professional obligations when using generative AI. This includes providing training on the ethical and practical aspects, and pitfalls, of any generative AI use.</p> <p>A subordinate lawyer must not use generative AI at the direction of a supervisory lawyer in a manner that violates the subordinate lawyer’s professional responsibility and obligations.</p>
<p>Communication Regarding Generative AI Use</p> <p>Rule 1.4</p> <p>Rule 1.2</p>	<p>A lawyer should evaluate their communication obligations throughout the representation based on the facts and circumstances, including the novelty of the technology, risks associated with generative AI use, scope of the representation, and sophistication of the client.</p> <p>The lawyer should consider disclosure to their client that they intend to use generative AI in the representation, including how the technology will be used, and the benefits and risks of such use.</p> <p>A lawyer should review any applicable client instructions or guidelines that may restrict or limit the use of generative AI.</p>
<p>Charging for Work Produced by Generative AI and Generative AI Costs</p> <p>Rule 1.5</p> <p>Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 6147–6148</p>	<p>A lawyer may use generative AI to more efficiently create work product and may charge for actual time spent (e.g., crafting or refining generative AI inputs and prompts, or reviewing and editing generative AI outputs). A lawyer must not charge hourly fees for the time saved by using generative AI.</p> <p>Costs associated with generative AI may be charged to the clients in compliance with applicable law.</p> <p>A fee agreement should explain the basis for all fees and costs, including those associated with the use of generative AI.</p>

Applicable Authorities	Practical Guidance
<p>Candor to the Tribunal; and Meritorious Claims and Contentions</p> <p>Rule 3.1</p> <p>Rule 3.3</p>	<p>A lawyer must review all generative AI outputs, including, but not limited to, analysis and citations to authority for accuracy before submission to the court, and correct any errors or misleading statements made to the court.</p> <p>A lawyer should also check for any rules, orders, or other requirements in the relevant jurisdiction that may necessitate the disclosure of the use of generative AI.</p>
<p>Prohibition on Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation</p> <p>Rule 8.4.1</p>	<p>Some generative AI is trained on biased information, and a lawyer should be aware of possible biases and the risks they may create when using generative AI (e.g., to screen potential clients or employees).</p> <p>Lawyers should engage in continuous learning about AI biases and their implications in legal practice, and firms should establish policies and mechanisms to identify, report, and address potential AI biases.</p>
<p>Professional Responsibilities Owed to Other Jurisdictions</p> <p>Rule 8.5</p>	<p>A lawyer should analyze the relevant laws and regulations of each jurisdiction in which a lawyer is licensed to ensure compliance with such rules.</p>