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Reuters/ Cristobal Saavedra
Welcome to the 2020 TrustLaw Index of Pro Bono, produced by the Thomson Reuters Foundation to map the global scale and trends of the pro bono legal sector.

This is the fourth such benchmarking exercise undertaken by the Foundation – and our largest ever. Our first, launched in 2014, compiled data from 105 law firms in 69 countries. Today’s index uses data sourced from 215 law firms representing 150,000 lawyers from 91 countries – a testament to the growing practice of pro bono legal assistance across the world, and during a period of unprecedent global crisis.

It is clear from our survey that the practice of pro bono is growing, fuelled by a desire to support the local community, and in sectors directly linked to the needs arising from these ongoing global emergencies. Lawyers have given a staggering 4 million hours of pro bono work over the last year to charities, social enterprises and individuals, providing crucial support to advance a wide range of issues from access to justice, economic development and microfinance, to human rights, women and LGBT+ rights, freedom of speech, sustainability and climate change.

The Thomson Reuters Foundation has long championed the practice of pro bono; scaling and developing the sector has been core to the work of TrustLaw, our pro bono legal network - now the largest in the world and launched over a decade ago.

Today, the power of the law remains a key driver of the Foundation’s work in advancing media freedom, fostering more inclusive economies and promoting human rights – work that is undertaken in the belief that societies around the world should be free, fair and informed.

To this end, TrustLaw works with leading law firms and corporate legal counsels to facilitate free legal support, ground-breaking research and resources for NGOs and social enterprises in 175 countries. By spreading the practice of pro bono worldwide, the service contributes to strengthening civil society and driving social change. Its network has grown to more than 6,000 members, including more than 950 law firms and in-house legal teams. It has facilitated more than 7,500 pro bono legal projects across 180 countries to date.

Using pro bono legal support to accelerate social impact is extraordinarily powerful; TrustLaw’s work over the years has resulted in real and lasting change – from protecting domestic worker rights in the Philippines, to banning conversation therapy for LGBT+ youth; from outlawing child marriage across the US to using technology to bring war criminals to justice. These outcomes were only made possible thanks to the generosity of our legal partners.

Through Trustlaw, the Thomson Reuters Foundation has also trained more than 300 lawyers in the emerging fields of social entrepreneurship and social finance to better equip them to support the social innovators and impact investors that are tackling some of the most significant challenges of our time. And it has worked with key stakeholders from across sectors to produce dozens of pioneering tools and resources to better support vulnerable communities around the world.

In an era where three global crises converge - health, economic and environmental - maintaining and growing the pro bono support of leading law firms and corporate legal departments around the world has never been more critical for NGOs and social enterprises on the frontlines of social change.
The objective of this index is two-fold; by identifying trends in the pro bono legal sector, it acts as a vital resource for law firms developing pro bono practices within their firms; and that by providing benchmarking data and transparency in different jurisdictions, it allows lawyers to better understand the industry, to set their own targets and encourage support for the sector.

Ultimately, our hope is that the index provides law firms with the information they need to create the right infrastructure for robust and sustainable pro bono practices and to achieve the greatest impact from their pro bono work. There has never been a greater need for it.

Antonio Zappulla
Chief Executive Officer, Thomson Reuters Foundation
INTRODUCTION

The 2020 Index of Pro Bono illustrates a story of global growth and commitment to pro bono legal assistance during one of the most challenging times in recent history.

Across the globe, law firms donated nearly 4 million hours of free legal support to charities, non-profits, social enterprises and individuals in need, helping them survive and drive much-needed social and environmental change.

Our findings illustrate that for pro bono to thrive, pro bono must be embedded within the culture of law firms, no matter their size. This commitment can be realized through the establishment of infrastructure to support pro bono, which, alongside incentivation through compensation or targets, can generally increase the amount of pro bono performed by lawyers.

As in prior years, an overwhelming majority of lawyers (96%) state that they perform pro bono in order to give back to their community. This has certainly been TrustLaw’s experience working with thousands of lawyers across the globe and over the last decade, who have been continuously generous with their skills, expertise and resources. In 2020, this motivation was especially palpable in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and protests for racial equality, as lawyers volunteered in droves to support the local communities that were hardest hit to build back stronger, more inclusive and healthier.

One of the greatest areas of growth we have seen in the 2020 Index of Pro Bono is by lawyers doing more work on environmental and climate change issues. Environment and Climate Change was selected as a focus area by 32 percent of firms, a significant increase from the 2016 Index (20 percent). It is likely that this growth reflects law firms’ efforts to address the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change across the globe and to support efforts towards cleaner energy and more sustainable development.

In terms of geographic expansion, in 2020 we saw high levels of pro bono hours beyond the traditionally leading pro bono markets – US, UK and Australia. The Americas, for example, saw firms nearly double the average amount of pro bono performed –in 2016 firms in the Americas performed an average of 11.7 hours of pro bono, while in 2020 the average increased to 20.2, suggesting a growing interest and participation in pro bono. Submissions from firms in Africa and the Middle East nearly tripled, and Nigeria stood out with one of the highest global averages of pro bono hours per fee earner (75.44), indicating a strong culture of pro bono in Africa’s largest nation. Europe’s pro bono culture continues to thrive, boosted by the region’s inaugural launch of the European Pro Bono Week in 2019, organised in by both law firms and non-profits. In the Asia-Pacific region, some countries continued to further embed pro bono infrastructure into their national legal practice systems while others saw lawyers respond in large numbers to human rights crises.

The 2020 Index of Pro Bono builds on prior versions and serves as a foundation for future understanding of the evolution of the pro bono sector. By mapping engagement and the growth of pro bono across the world, the Index is a unique tool to build robust and sustainable pro bono practices and to help firms understand how to achieve the greatest impact from their pro bono work. I look forward to our 2022 Index, to assess new trends and to ponder on the lessons learned. Our hope is that as the years progress we will have a strong body of evidence to showcase this growing field and further promote excellence in the practice of pro bono globally.
Our many thanks to all the firms big and small, from Argentina to Zimbabwe that kindly took the time to submit the data without which the Index would not exist. A special thanks to our partner firms, Allen & Overy, Ashurst, DLA Piper, Freshfields and Hogan Lovells, for generously sponsoring the 2020 Index of Pro Bono and enabling us to continue making it bigger and better in future years to grow awareness of pro bono trends, set benchmarks and build support for the sector. We look forward to all your continuing support and input as we strive to create a society where pro bono legal assistance can blossom and help drive the social and environmental change that is so critically needed across the globe.

Carolina Henriquez-Schmitz
Director, TrustLaw
THE TRUSTLAW INDEX OF PRO BONO BY THE NUMBERS

**215**
TOTAL RESPONDENT FIRMS

**45,019**
TOTAL NUMBER OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED TEN OR MORE HOURS OF PRO BONO

**3,957,865**
TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS OF PRO BONO PERFORMED

**26.3**
AVERAGE PRO BONO HOURS PER LAWYER

**91**
TOTAL NUMBER OF JURISDICTIONS

**150,519**
TOTAL NUMBER OF LAWYERS WORKING AT FIRMS WHO PROVIDED DATA

**A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The 2020 Index of Pro Bono, the first following a four-year hiatus, was worth the wait as it is the largest we have ever carried out. Once again, the trends indicate that legal pro bono – the provision of services by a legal professional for free – is growing across a majority of countries and regions. Lawyers continue to devote time, effort, skills and expertise to support people and organisations in need by ensuring that the law is accessible and justice can be attained.

In 2020 the respondent firms represent over **150,000 lawyers working in 91 jurisdictions**. These lawyers performed over **3.9 million hours** of pro bono work in their self-selected 12-month reporting period, with lawyers engaging in **26.3 hours** of pro bono on average.

**PRO BONO AND FIRM SIZE**

Law firms that engage in pro bono vary widely in size, and this was reflected in the responses to the Index, with some of the world’s largest firms providing information as well as local firms with just a handful of lawyers. Some respondents have a long and proud tradition of offering pro bono services to local communities, while others are new to this space.
Almost every respondent firm indicated that the main justification for offering pro bono support was a desire to support the community (96 percent), while 54 percent indicated that training and skills development of their staff was another key factor driving their engagement in pro bono.

Access to justice continued to be the most popular thematic area with 65 percent of firms supporting organisations, causes and initiatives related to this focus area. A large number of firms also equally supported economic development, microfinance and social finance along with human rights initiatives (both 43 percent) and 40 percent supported both education, training and employment and immigration, refugee and asylum initiatives.

In line with previous findings of the Index, the vast majority of firms (89 percent) offered pro bono support to registered charities and non-profits, while 71 percent provided pro bono assistance to social enterprises, and 67 percent provided pro bono assistance to individuals in need.
## PRO BONO FOCUS AREAS

Percentage of respondent firms who indicated they offer pro bono services in support of the following sectors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Justice</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Microfinance</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training and Employment</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration, Refugees and Asylum</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Rights</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Climate Change</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Rights</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT+ Rights</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Corruption and Good Governance</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid and Development</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Based Violence</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and Housing</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of the Media and Expression</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Trafficking, Slavery and Exploitation</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Water Rights</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Disease and Sanitation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and Reproductive Rights</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly and Senior Citizen Rights</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Hunger and Nutrition</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Rights</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War and Conflict</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings show that doing something to facilitate pro bono was more important than trying to do everything. A majority of respondent law firms (87 percent) reported that as part of their infrastructure to support pro bono they have at least one of the following: a pro bono policy, pro bono committee, or pro bono coordinator. At firms with a pro bono policy, lawyers performed 48.7 hours of pro bono, compared to 21.6 hours for lawyers at firms without a pro bono policy.

Though a majority of firms indicated that they have a pro bono coordinator (77 percent) to manage and coordinate pro bono matters, lawyers at firms with a coordinator averaged 29.6 hours of pro bono over the self-selected 12-month reporting period compared to 79.6 hours at firms without a pro bono coordinator. We do not conclude that pro bono coordinators have a negative impact on the overall amount of pro bono in firms as this trend is mostly credited to small firms that do not have a dedicated a pro bono coordinator but perform a high number of pro bono hours.

A majority of firms also reported having a pro bono committee (53 percent), which may play a key role in driving an increase in the levels of pro bono undertaken. Lawyers at firms with committees undertook an average of 50.3 hours of pro bono compared to firms without a committee, which performed an average of 26.5 hours. Firms with pro bono committees also reported more lawyers performing 10 or more hours pro bono.
Incentivising and Rewarding Pro Bono

Taking pro bono into account in fee earner performance appraisals can be a tool to encourage engagement in pro bono. Over two-thirds of firms factored pro bono into appraisal processes (69 percent). When pro bono was factored into appraisals, lawyers performed 46.7 hours of pro bono compared to 20.6 hours where it was not. However, the effect was not reproduced by lawyers with partner status at respondent firms. Partners for whom pro bono was considered during the appraisal process performed 38.4 hours of pro bono compared to 41.2 hours where it was not.

Linking pro bono to compensation for lawyers does not appear to be associated with higher engagement levels. We found 46 percent of firms factored pro bono into compensation processes, yet firms that did not factor pro bono into compensation performed more hours of pro bono (49.7 hours) as compared to law firms that did (29.2 hours).

A majority of firms (60 percent) had a pro bono target in place for their lawyers. A difference in the amount of pro bono performed was apparent between the two types of targets: mandatory and aspirational. Firms with mandatory targets recorded an average of 60.4 hours compared to 32.9 hours where the target was aspirational.
The TrustLaw Index of Pro Bono is designed to be a hub for information on trends in the pro bono sector. It was created in 2014 to meet two needs:

✓ to help law firms understand how to shape and develop pro bono practices within their firms to achieve successful and high-impact programmes; and

✓ to provide key benchmarking data and transparency on pro bono engagement in different jurisdictions globally to help lawyers and firms better understand the context in which they work.

In the four years since the last version of the Index was published, strong trends continue to emerge in the shape and structure of pro bono practices in different firms and attitudes to pro bono in different markets. Both the legal and social sectors are in transition at the present time, with both sectors looking for ways to strengthen their offerings in the face of financial pressure and competition. This could not be more apparent with the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, which has changed ways of doing business. A strong understanding of the state of pro bono globally is crucial to continuing to foster its growth. Access to data and trends allows lawyers to better understand where the industry is going, to set benchmarks and to build support for the sector.

Our findings illustrate that for pro bono to thrive, pro bono must be embedded within the culture of law firms, no matter their size. This commitment can be realised through the establishment of infrastructure to support pro bono. By mapping engagement and the growth of pro bono across the world, the Index is a unique tool to build robust and sustainable pro bono practices and to help firms understand how to achieve the greatest impact from their pro bono work.

The Index highlights factors that are key to developing a successful pro bono practice. We measure 'success' based on one simple metric in this report: levels of pro bono engagement. Given the vast cultural and contextual differences globally, the Index uses two primary indicators to represent pro bono engagement:

✓ The average number of hours of pro bono per lawyer (fee earner) over a self-selected 12-month reporting period

✓ The percentage of fee earners at a firm performing 10 plus hours of pro bono over the 12-month reporting period

These indicators have been chosen to provide a broad representation of engagement levels by lawyers and within firms, and, combined with other metrics, can give an insight into what contributes to a successful pro bono practice. In addition to these indicators, firms were invited to share qualitative information about their:

✓ Pro bono focus areas: whether firms prefer to work with certain types of pro bono clients and on certain types of pro bono matters;

✓ Pro bono infrastructure and practice: whether firms utilise pro bono coordinators, committees or policies such as pro bono eligibility criteria or oversight of pro bono by partners; and,

✓ Incentivising and rewarding pro bono: the implementation of pro bono targets and consideration of pro bono in performance appraisals and in awarding compensation.

---

1 Pro bono clients are categorised as follows: (1) registered charities/NGOs – these are registered organisations that are not driven by profit and have a social purpose; (2) social enterprises – these are businesses whose main objective is not profits, but instead incorporate elements of impact in their operations; (3) individuals in need that receive direct assistance from the law firm; (4) social justice – law firms provide legal expertise to a certain cause; (5) public interest litigation – law firms provide pro bono work not solely to support clients but to address a larger societal or judicial deficit in the community; and, (6) governments – providing partially or wholly-owned public entities, those that carry out a public function in their respective societies, or public departments, programmes or initiatives with legal advice and assistance.

2 The Index asks respondent firms about the structures they have put in place to embed a pro bono culture within their organisation and to ensure that pro bono matters can be managed and performed efficiently. The Index has tracked the presence of these elements and the impact on pro bono engagement levels within firms with the objective of developing a list of elements that constitute a pro bono practice, along with an indication of how successful these elements are.
WHO PROVIDED DATA

Law firms of different shapes and sizes and based all over the world were asked to provide information on how they organise their pro bono practice and how much pro bono work they perform in the countries or jurisdictions in which they operate. In total, 215 firms in 91 jurisdictions provided information about how they structure their practice, and of those 203 submitted detailed data on how much pro bono their lawyers undertake. For purposes of the Index, firms were placed in one of three categories of geographical reach:

✓ **International**: firms with global practices situated in offices across multiple continents;

✓ **Regional**: firms with a regional or continental reach with offices in multiple cities within either a geographic region or continent; and

✓ **Local or national**: firms with a country-based focus with offices within a single country.

This was the widest range of respondents we have ever received for the Index, meaning the data offers a detailed and unique snapshot of pro bono practice in the legal profession. To ensure the broad data set can be analysed to produce relevant findings, the Index uses a definition of pro bono that can be applied globally.


HOW THE DATA WAS ANALYSED

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

The quantitative analysis considers the average number of hours of Qualifying Pro Bono done per Qualifying Fee Earner; and the percentage of Qualifying Fee Earners doing 10 hours or more of Qualifying Pro Bono in a 12-month period selected by the respondent firm. Firms had to select any 12-month period falling between 1 January 2019 and 31 August 2020 (the self-selected 12 month reporting period). The data is presented in country or regional indexes, detailing individual firm data on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis. For purposes of the Index, Qualifying Pro Bono must meet the three criteria below:

✓ **Qualifying Work**: legal advice, assistance, representation, and research, as well as drafting agreements, policy documents or legislative instruments – as long as it is done without financial return. In this report, we refer to it simply as “pro bono”. It is distinct from legal aid, which usually refers to state-funded legal advice or representation for individuals who are unable to afford legal services.

✓ **Qualifying Fee Earner**: any legal professional who performs fee earning work for clients. In this report we may substitute the terms “fee earner” and “lawyer”. Fee earner is a category that includes students and trainees, law clerks, paralegals and other valued pro bono contributors within law firms. We use the plain language term “lawyer” for readability and as a stand-in for this wider range of professionals who support pro bono.

✓ **Qualifying Clients**: people of limited means or organisations with a societal, environmental, humanitarian, cultural or community focus, as validated by the law firm, referral organisations or pro bono organisations.
GLOBAL ANALYSIS

The global trends analysis in the first section of the Index below (of i.e., firm size, clients, focus areas, infrastructure and incentives) looks purely at law firm size and does not take into account the jurisdiction in which the law firm was based. Local context has an impact on the amount of pro bono done (as can be seen elsewhere in the Index), and the local regulatory, economic and market conditions have a significant effect on the size of the law firms that can be supported.

COUNTRY-LEVEL ANALYSIS

No matter where firms are located and irrespective of their size and resources, lawyers face similar challenges in trying to grow and strengthen pro bono initiatives. That said, the work itself can be very different in different jurisdictions. While the amount of pro bono performed has been tracked, comparisons are not intended to be drawn between countries. Country samples were reviewed for any significant differences in the composition of respondents. Comparisons were carried out between the 2016 and 2020 data sets only where the key characteristics of the samples were similar. In instances where either year’s sample was significantly distinct from the other, no comparative analysis is presented. Where country-level comparisons are included, they reflect the responses received in 2016 and 2020 and are not meant to be applied across the entire population of providers or to assert trends for the country.

Data relating to pro bono engagement is grouped into regions where the lawyers are located, excluding jurisdictions known for a high degree of infrastructure of pro bono (namely England and Wales, the United States and Australia). Where there is sufficient data (four or more submissions), country indexes received stand-alone analyses. In providing the data in this way, benchmarks of pro bono engagement have been generated, helping firms understand more about the local contexts in which they operate.

Throughout the analysis, the Index splits respondent firms into three groups based on headcount:

✓ **Small Firms**: Firms who have a total headcount of 0 – 49 fee earners
✓ **Medium-sized Firms**: Firms who have 50 – 199 fee earners
✓ **Large Firms**: Firms who have 200+ fee earners

Using the number of fee earners is a simplified proxy for the resources and capacity of a firm. By grouping firms in this way, the Index explores whether, and to what extent, a firm’s resources impact pro bono engagement levels, and how firms of different sizes allocate resources to pro bono practices.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

The qualitative information provided was used to develop a detailed industry analysis that is anonymised and aggregated concerning firms’ pro bono practice, focus areas and methods of rewarding and incentivising pro bono.

DATA QUALITY AND ASSURANCE

Firms were invited to contribute their own data for any given 12-month period during 2019 and 2020 to the Index. This data was checked upon submission, reviewed by a data analyst and audited by an independent data scientist. When inaccuracies were found, firms were asked to resubmit their data.
C. PRO BONO AND FIRM SIZE

SIZE OF FIRMS AND THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS

AVERAGE PRO BONO HOURS RECORDED PER LAWYER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LARGE FIRMS (200 + FEE EARNERS)</th>
<th>MEDIUM - SIZED FIRMS (50 - 199 FEE EARNERS)</th>
<th>SMALL FIRMS (FEWER THAN 50 FEE EARNERS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.6 HOURS</td>
<td>19.6 HOURS</td>
<td>32.8 HOURS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2020 Index of Pro Bono tracks the relationship between the fee earner headcount at firms and the amount of pro bono engagement. This component of the Index intends to establish if and to what extent, firm size affects the strength and success of its pro bono practices, for which we are using engagement levels as an indicator.

The 215 firms that submitted data for the Index were classified according to firm size and comprised:

✓ 100 Small Firms (less than 50 fee earners)
✓ 39 Medium-sized Firms (50 – 199 fee earners)
✓ 76 Large Firms (200 or more fee earners)

Our findings reveal that Large Firms performed the most pro bono, with an average of 35.6 hours per fee earner over the 12-month period. Compared to the 2016 Index, where Large Firms averaged 35.1 hours, this figure is consistent for this classification of law firms. Small Firms averaged 32.8 hours per fee earner, and Medium-sized Firms averaged 19.6 hours per fee earner.

Lawyers performing 10 or more hours of pro bono reflected a different trend. The average proportion of lawyers doing 10 or more hours of pro bono was 48 percent at Small Firms compared to 86 percent at Medium-sized Firms and 83 percent at Large Firms.

These findings reveal that Large Firms and their fee earners continue to benefit from pro bono infrastructure, financial resources and personnel to support the development of strong pro bono practices. In certain instances, they also benefit from being able to replicate and enforce global pro bono policies across their offices around the world, and in doing so, bring the practice to new markets and lawyers in those countries. The high
numbers of lawyers as well as available professional staff in Large Firms, including some whose responsibilities are solely to oversee and support pro bono, suggests there is more support, incentive and capacity for the lawyers to get involved in pro bono initiatives. Large Firms may also have greater financial flexibility to set pro bono targets and to count pro bono time towards billable targets. This can be a major incentive for fee earners to engage with pro bono that may not always be available at Small or Medium-sized Firms.

In the 2016 Index, the 45 Small Firms that submitted data averaged 41.7 hours per fee earner, a higher average than Medium-Sized or Large Firms. For the 2020 Index, 100 small firms averaged 32.8 hours. This finding may indicate that the increase in the number of firms and new jurisdictions with developing pro bono markets is occurring in countries where pro bono is still a nascent and growing practice. It could also be that this larger sample provides us with the data to make a more accurate assessment of the pro bono practices of Small Firms.
D. PRO BONO CLIENTS AND FOCUS AREA

WHY DO PRO BONO?

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENT FIRMS WHO INDICATED THEY OFFER PRO BONO SERVICES FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- Desire to support the community: 96%
- Training and skill development: 54%
- Staff retention: 29%
- Alignment with interests of client: 32%
- Marketing: 23%
- Externally mandated requirement: 15%
- Other: 13%

As seen in the previous Index analyses and through the in-depth insights afforded by the blogs from lawyers across the world which accompany the publication of this report, the practice of pro bono varies greatly around the world. A law firm in Australia may have a different motive for providing pro bono support than one in Zimbabwe. Similarly, there are numerous types of potential pro bono clients available to firms that provide the service. These beneficiaries come from different sectors, and the Index continues to map the various approaches taken by law firms in order to identify trends and analyse the link between the size of the respondent firm and the type and focus of work for the pro bono client.

To understand why certain firms work with certain clients, the Index analysed what motivates respondent firms to do pro bono and draws out related trends.

WHY PERFORM PRO BONO?

In order for law firms to have successful pro bono practices, not only do lawyers need to be willing to work on pro bono matters, but the firms themselves need to be willing to devote resources to build and maintain a pro bono practice and embed a culture of pro bono in their own organisation.
We view pro bono as a powerful force for good within society in ensuring greater media freedom, defending human rights, and building more inclusive economies. We believe that by lawyers lending valuable expertise to strengthening organisations, they contribute to building stronger and healthier communities.

Across all firms, by far the most common reason to perform pro bono was a desire to support the community, selected by 96 percent of respondents. Training and skill development for lawyers was the next most popular reason at 54 percent. An alignment with the interests of the client, staff retention and marketing were also commonly selected by respondents.

Although the trends for Large, Medium-sized and Small Firms largely conform to the overall findings for the data set, we did observe certain differences between these groups.

Among Small Firms, training and skill development was identified by 37 percent as a motivating factor, second to a desire to support the community. A new trend we have observed in the 2020 Index is that Small Firms are now more inclined to take into account some of the more commercial drivers for pro bono, such as alignment with the interests of clients (16 percent) and marketing (13 percent), as well as focusing on the benefits to the community. Compared to Large and Medium-sized Firms, which value pro bono to ensure staff retention (67 percent and 21 percent respectively), only 3 percent of Small Firms selected this as a factor, implying that for Small Firms, the retention of staff is not a meaningful motivator for doing pro bono.

For Medium-sized Firms, training and skill development (47 percent) was considered an important factor, and even more so in Large Firms (79 percent), where this factor was second only to a desire to support the community. Being aligned with the interests of clients was also far more frequently selected by Large Firms (59 percent) than by Medium-sized Firms (21 percent) and Small Firms (16 percent). It was evident that Large Firms were more willing to embrace the more commercial benefits of pro bono. This trend appears to be on the rise – in 2016, only 40 percent of firms were driven by the motivation to align with the interests of the client, as compared to almost 60 percent in the reporting period for this Index.

For Large Firms, every single respondent indicated a desire to support the community as a factor in driving the firm towards pro bono. We also observed that, as expected, marketing was an influential factor for pro bono practices in Large Firms (41 percent) as compared to Medium-sized and Small Firms (11 percent and 14 percent respectively). This trend may result from the fact Large Firms often possess the financial and workforce resources to market their brands and pro bono better, as compared to Small and Medium-sized Firms.

**PRO BONO FOCUS**

In line with findings from the Index in 2014, 2015 and 2016, the most selected pro bono focus area for firms overall continues to be access to justice, with 65 percent of respondent firms indicating they supported organisations and initiatives in this sector. Economic development, microfinance and social finance (43 percent), human rights (43 percent), education, training and employment (40 percent) and immigration, refugees and asylum (40 percent) were the next most supported focus areas.

Firms were invited to select one or more focus areas in which they work as part of the Index. An interesting trend we noted was that only one focus area increased in frequency since our last Index in 2016: Environment and Climate Change was selected as a focus area by 32 percent of firms, a significant increase from the 2016 Index (20 percent) and probably due to an increased interest across the globe in addressing environmental issues and climate change, and in supporting efforts towards cleaner energy and more sustainable development.

Analysing links between the size of firms and the pro bono focus areas they support adds colour to these findings. Access to justice continued to be the most popular focus area among Small, Medium-sized and
### PRO BONO FOCUS AREAS

Percentage of respondent firms who indicated they offer pro bono services in support of the following sectors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Justice</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Microfinance</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training and Employment</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration, Refugees and Asylum</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Rights</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Climate Change</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Rights</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT+ Rights</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Corruption and Good Governance</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid and Development</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Based Violence</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and Housing</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of the Media and Expression</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Trafficking, Slavery and Exploitation</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Water Rights</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Disease and Sanitation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and Reproductive Rights</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly and Senior Citizen Rights</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Hunger and Nutrition</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Rights</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War and Conflict</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOP THREE PRO BONO FOCUS AREAS FOR SMALL FIRMS

- Access to Justice: 53%
- Economic Development and Microfinance: 46%
- Education, Training and Employment: 39%

TOP THREE PRO BONO FOCUS AREAS FOR MEDIUM-SIZED FIRMS

- Access to Justice: 55%
- Education, Training and Employment: 53%
- Women’s Rights: 45%

TOP THREE PRO BONO FOCUS AREAS FOR LARGE FIRMS

- Access to Justice: 86%
- Immigration, Refugees and Asylum: 75%
- Human Rights: 66%
PRO BONO CLIENTS

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENT FIRMS WHO INDICATED THEY PRIMARILY OFFER PRO BONO SERVICES TO THE FOLLOWING CLIENTS:

- Registered charities/non-profits: 89%
- Social enterprise: 71%
- Individuals in need: 67%
- Social justice: 56%
- Public interest litigation: 48%
- Governments: 43%
- Other: 9%

PERCENTAGE OF FIRMS WITH FORMAL PRO BONO ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

- Large firms: 92%
- Medium-sized firms: 79%
- Small firms: 40%
Large Firms (selected by 53 percent, 55 percent and 86 percent respectively).

Small Firms additionally focused on economic development, microfinance and social finance (46 percent), followed by education, training and employment (39 percent), environment and climate change (33 percent) and employment (30 percent). Approximately one third of Small and Large Firms (33 percent and 34 percent respectively) indicated environment and climate change as areas of intervention, suggesting that these issues are of interest for Small and Large firms.

Among Medium-sized Firms, there was a greater focus on education, training and employment (53 percent), which was selected almost as frequently as access to justice. Women’s rights was a similarly popular focus area (45 percent), followed by disability rights and human rights (tied at 42 percent) and aid and development (39 percent). An interesting finding was that Medium-sized Firms also conducted more pro bono work focusing on women’s rights as compared to Small and Large Firms (24 percent and 38 percent respectively).

Large Firms increased their focus on immigration, refugees and asylum projects, with 75 percent of Large Firm respondents indicating they were working on this topic as compared to the 2016 Index which was at 58.6 percent. This made it the second most popular focus area for Large Firms behind access to justice (selected by 86 percent), and ahead of human rights (66 percent). It is possible that a growing refugee crisis in Europe as well as increased migration complexities in the United States drove Large Firms to channel resources to take on the high demand for pro bono support in this sector. Large Firms also dedicated pro bono resources at a significantly greater level to LGBT+ rights (52 percent) compared to Medium-sized and Small Firms (11 percent and 7 percent respectively).

**PRO BONO CLIENTS**

The most common types of pro bono clients supported by respondent firms were registered charities or NGOs, with 89 percent of respondent firms indicating they work with them. A total of 71 percent indicated they work with social enterprise clients, and 67 percent worked with individuals in need.

A total of 63 percent of respondent firms indicated that they have formal eligibility criteria in place for pro bono clients, a decrease from previous years (at 70 percent in both 2015 and 2016). A majority of Small Firms reported not having a formal eligibility process (60 percent), as compared to only 21 percent and 8 percent of Medium-sized and Large Firms respectively.
TrustLaw has been a champion of pro bono for over a decade, working with law firms across the globe to identify how to improve their practices in the sector. In 2019, we released the Championing Pro Bono: A Guide to Assessing and Strengthening Your Pro Bono Work, which brings together our findings on this topic and can help legal teams globally with their pro bono work.

DEFINING PRO BONO INFRASTRUCTURE

The Index defines pro bono infrastructure as including:

✓ A pro bono coordinator means a point person or team within a firm that has oversight of administration, coordination and/or assignment of pro bono matters.

✓ A pro bono committee is a body whose role is to evaluate potential pro bono matters and/or take a lead on pro bono policy and strategy issues.

✓ Pro bono policies are internal policies designed to guide or set minimum standards for pro bono practices.

No two firms treat the role of pro bono coordinator or committee, or the function of the pro bono policy, in exactly the same way. However, these elements are used as the basis of the way that firms facilitate pro bono.

FINDINGS

The findings support our 2016 Index findings that doing something to facilitate pro bono was more important than trying to do everything, and that judicious use of limited resources was paramount in trying to encourage a flourishing pro bono practice.

A significant portion of the respondent firms had at least one element of pro bono infrastructure in place, with 87 percent of respondents stating that they had one or more of a pro bono coordinator, committee or policy in place. Among Large Firms, nearly every single respondent in this category (99 percent) stated that it had an element of infrastructure, suggesting that pro bono infrastructure is essential for Large Firms involved in pro bono. For Medium-sized and Small Firms this figure was 95 percent and 74 percent respectively.

Only 11 percent of the respondent firms had all three elements of pro bono infrastructure in place. For Small Firms, this figure dropped to 5 percent, compared to 15 percent for Medium-sized Firms and 16 percent for Large Firms. These figures indicate that a majority of firms do not rely on all three elements of pro bono infrastructure to support their practices in this sector. For example, law firms may have either a pro bono coordinator or pro bono committee, as they can play a similar role in coordinating and approving pro bono projects.

Across all firms, the reported average pro bono hours and the average proportion of lawyers performing 10 or more hours of pro bono were higher when the respondent firm had at least one of a pro bono coordinator, a pro bono committee or a pro bono policy in place.

For respondent firms with an element of pro bono infrastructure in place, fee earners performed an average of 42 hours of pro bono, compared with an average of 22 hours for respondent firms without any elements of pro bono infrastructure. The average percentage of lawyers performing 10 or more hours of pro bono was 71 percent when there was an element of infrastructure in place, compared to 42 percent for respondent firms without any elements of pro bono infrastructure.

At Small Firms, respondents with an element of pro bono infrastructure performed an average of 64 hours of pro bono and 52 percent of their lawyers performed 10 or more hours of pro bono, compared with an average of 23 hours of pro bono and 37 percent of lawyers for respondent firms without any elements of pro bono infrastructure. At Large Firms, respondents reported an average of 16 hours where
PRO BONO INFRASTRUCTURE

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENT FIRMS WHO INDICATED THEY HAVE THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS OF PRO BONO INFRASTRUCTURE IN PLACE:

- 63% | Pro bono policy
- 77% | Pro bono coordinator
- 53% | Pro bono committee

PRO BONO INFRASTRUCTURE

PERCENTAGE OF FIRMS WITH ALL THREE OR ANY OF PRO BONO INFRASTRUCTURE

- 87% | Firms with any element of pro bono infrastructure
- 11% | Firms with all elements of pro bono infrastructure
there were no elements of pro bono infrastructure and 36 hours when an element of infrastructure was in place. At Medium-sized Firms, respondents performed an average of 16 hours of pro bono when pro bono infrastructure was absent as compared to 20 average hours being performed by firms with some pro bono infrastructure.

Similar to our findings in 2016, it seems to be more common to have at least one element of pro bono infrastructure present than it is to have all three elements. Across the entire data set, 11 percent of firms had all elements of pro bono infrastructure in place compared to 87 percent with at least one element in place. Interestingly, the average number of pro bono hours performed by lawyers at firms with all elements of pro bono infrastructure was 32 hours compared to 42 hours at firms with just one element in place. However, respondent firms with all elements of pro bono infrastructure in place reported that the average proportion of lawyers performing 10 or more hours was 76 percent, compared to 71 percent at those with only one element.

**PRO BONO POLICY**

Respondent firms with a pro bono policy reported a higher number of average pro bono hours performed by lawyers. Lawyers at firms with a pro bono policy performed an average of 48.7 hours of pro bono over the self-selected 12-month reporting period compared to 21.6 hours at firms that did not.

The Index found 63 percent of respondent firms had a formal pro bono policy in place. Among Small Firms, only 36 percent had a policy, an indication that for this category of firms, almost two-thirds do not utilise such policies. For Large Firms, 92 percent had a pro bono policy, perhaps as a means of articulating a unified approach to pro bono where the firm is larger, may operate across a number of countries and requires a uniform approach to regulating pro bono activity.

A key finding in this Index of Pro Bono is that Medium-sized Firms are adopting formal pro bono policies, with

---

**PRO BONO POLICY**

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENT FIRMS WHO INDICATED THAT THEIR PRO BONO POLICY COVERS THE FOLLOWING TOPICS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm’s attitude and intent</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility criteria for clients</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of a pro bono committee</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of pro bono coordinator</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
82 percent indicating having these in place compared to the 2016 Index where 55.6 percent of firms in this category had such a policy. Medium-sized Firms with policies performed 21.9 hours of pro bono on average compared to 9.2 hours by firms without policies.

Of the 63 percent of respondent firms that indicated the presence of a pro bono policy, 92 percent stated that it articulated the attitude and intent of the firm.

The Index also found that 77 percent of these firms indicated that the policy set out the eligibility requirements for pro bono clients, though this seemed to be more prevalent in Large and Medium-sized Firms (86 percent and 75 percent respectively) than in Small Firms (61 percent). Similarly, the pro bono policies of Large and Medium-sized Firms were more likely to define the roles of the pro bono committees and coordinators (at 65 percent and 63 percent respectively) than Small Firms, where only 36 percent included these elements. This may be because Small Firms could be less likely to have pro bono committees or coordinators to begin with.

### Pro Bono Coordinator

The Index found 77 percent of respondent firms said they had a pro bono coordinator. Medium-sized and Large Firms reported a designated pro bono coordinator at 92 percent, compared to Small Firms at 62 percent. Lawyers at firms with a coordinator performed 29.6 hours of pro bono on average compared to 79.6 hours at those without. This trend is mostly credited to Small Firms that do not have a dedicated a pro bono coordinator but perform a high number of pro bono hours.

Across all respondent firms, only 10 percent with a pro bono coordinator said this person had a non-fee earning role within the firm as well as working on pro bono and corporate social responsibility (CSR) matters. The majority, therefore, focus on a combination of pro bono, broader CSR initiatives and fee earning matters.

The Index found that pro bono coordinators at Small and Medium-sized Firms retained more fee earning

### Role and Responsibility of Pro Bono Coordinator

#### Percentage of Respondent Firms Who Indicated That Their Pro Bono Coordinator Has the Following Responsibilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Pro bono, CSR and fee-earning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Pro bono and broader CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Pro bono matters or administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Pro bono and fee-earning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Pro bono, CSR and non fee-earning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
responsibilities (21 percent and 55.5 percent respectively) than at Large Firms (8.5 percent). This is likely a result of greater resources in Large Firms permitting coordinators to focus predominantly on pro bono operations, as compared to Small and Medium-sized Firms where resources may be more limited. Pro bono matters and administration saw a large variance between the respondent firms, with coordinators at Large Firms dedicating 47 percent of their time to this, while those at Medium-sized Firms spent 10 percent and Small Firms only 4 percent of their time on such matters.

The majority of firms, 79 percent, also had a partner responsible for pro bono, although in some cases, particularly with Small and Medium-sized Firms, this is the same person as the pro bono coordinator. The presence of a pro bono partner may have a link to pro bono engagement levels within firms. Lawyers at firms with a pro bono partner performed 38.3 hours of pro bono on average compared to 18.5 hours at firms without. The Index found 36 percent of lawyers at firms with a pro bono partner perform 10 or more hours of pro bono compared to 28 percent at firms without.

PRO BONO COMMITTEE

At 82 percent, more Large Firms have pro bono committees in place than at Medium-sized and Small Firms (69 percent and 26 percent respectively), likely because greater human resources permit the formal involvement of more individuals in a firm’s pro bono infrastructure. Over half of respondent firms, 53 percent, had a pro bono committee in place and lawyers at these firms performed an average of 50.3 hours of pro bono, compared with 26.5 at firms without pro bono committees. This represents a departure from the findings of our 2016
Index, in which there was little distinction between the hours reported by respondent firms with and without pro bono committees.

Lawyers at Small Firms performed more hours of pro bono on average when they had a pro bono committee, carrying out 155.6 hours, compared to 26.5 hours when they did not. Lawyers at Large Firms performed 38.1 hours on average when they had a pro bono committee compared to 25.3 hours when they did not. However, lawyers at Medium-sized Firms with pro bono committees performed fewer average hours (16.1) than those that did not (27.7).

The same trend did not hold true among Medium-sized Firms when looking at the average proportion of lawyers performing 10 or more hours of pro bono, where 88 percent of lawyers at respondent firms with pro bono committees performed 10 or more hours of pro bono, compared to 85 percent at respondent firms without committees. Across all respondent firms, on average 74 percent of lawyers at firms with pro bono committees performed 10 or more hours of pro bono compared to 60 percent of lawyers at firms that did not have committees.

Strategy and policy were the predominant responsibility of the pro bono committees at 87 percent of the respondent firms. The most common responsibility for pro bono committees in Small Firms was identified as approving pro bono matters (77 percent), with strategy and policy as the leading responsibility at Medium-sized and Large Firms (96 percent and 92 percent respectively). Pro bono committees in Medium-sized firms also took greater responsibility for the administration of the pro bono programme (85 percent) as compared to Small and Large Firms (62 percent and 56 percent respectively). This could be because some Medium-sized Firms may be less likely to have the administrative resources to dedicate to pro bono available to Large Firms. At Small Firms, it may be a result of lawyers within the firms conducting the administrative work on pro bono themselves due to the lower prevalence of pro bono coordinators.

Pro bono committees may be credited with ensuring that a culture of pro bono is embedded within the firm, as more people are involved with pro bono initiatives. Large Firms may benefit from them because a culture of pro bono at an institutional level can then ‘trickledown’ to the firm at large. At Small Firms, involvement in a pro bono committee may result in lawyers being part of an entity overseeing pro bono for the firm, and thus increasing the impact of pro bono on the firm as a whole.

Overall, our data indicates an association between pro bono infrastructure and increased pro bono in law firms. It is not clear from our data whether having a pro bono policy, coordinator or committee drives the growth of pro bono or vice versa, though we expect it may be a combined effect—that infrastructure helps law firms and lawyers to undertake more pro bono, while a growing pro bono practice can lead firms to adopt more formal policies and structures.
F. INCENTIVISING AND REWARDING PRO BONO

Alongside building structures into law firms to facilitate pro bono work, many firms also seek to incentivise and reward lawyers for undertaking pro bono work. The performance of lawyers is typically evaluated not only on the quality of their work product but also the hours they have worked and the revenue they have generated (which we refer to as their utilisation). Many firms, therefore, have tried to ensure that their lawyers will not feel penalised based on either of these measures as a result of taking on pro bono matters.

There are several ways that firms do this:

✓ By taking pro bono work into account for appraisal and compensation processes, law firms can help ensure not only that lawyers devote the same level of diligence and enthusiasm to pro bono that they do to fee earning work, but also that lawyers do not feel that they are penalised or disadvantaged (financially or otherwise) by taking on pro bono rather than fee earning work.

✓ By implementing pro bono targets or by including pro bono work into fee earning (utilisation) targets, lawyers are encouraged to do more pro bono work and, again, will not feel penalised for doing so – particularly if pro bono work does not jeopardise financial incentives instituted by the firm.

APPRAISALS

Factoring pro bono into performance appraisals may have a positive impact on pro bono engagement among lawyers.

The findings show that 69 percent of all respondent firms factor pro bono into the appraisal process for lawyers. Among Small Firms, this figure was 45 percent, a lower figure than that reported to the 2016 Index, when 62.8 percent of firms in this category factored pro bono into appraisals. For Medium-sized Firms, this figure rose to...
92 percent, an increase from the 68.2 percent reported in the previous Index. Large Firm respondents factored pro bono into the appraisal process for lawyers at a 91 percent.

Lawyers at firms that took pro bono into account when conducting performance appraisals completed 46.7 hours of pro bono on average compared to 20.6 hours at firms that did not. This figure was most pronounced in Small Firms, where the average hours completed by lawyers at firms that factored pro bono into appraisals was highest among the size categories of firms at 92.6 hours, compared to 20.4 for Medium-sized Firms and 37.9 hours for Large Firms.

Factoring pro bono into partners’ appraisals may not impact the amount of pro bono they undertake. The data indicates that 46 percent of respondent firms factored pro bono into partner appraisals, with 35 percent of Small Firms taking it into account compared to 59 percent of Medium-sized Firms and 61 percent of Large Firm respondents.

On average, partners for whom pro bono was considered during the appraisal process performed 38.4 hours of pro bono compared to 41.2 where it was not. This could indicate that for partners across all firms, appraisal may not link directly with pro bono levels of engagement. Partners at Small Firms performed 59.4 hours on average when it was not considered in the appraisal process as compared with 42.3 hours when it was.

The submissions indicate that 71 percent of partners performed 10 or more hours of pro bono when it was factored into their appraisals, compared to 64 percent when it was not.

**COMPENSATION**

Law firms employ several different mechanisms to calculate compensation – typically a combination of seniority, performance and utilisation (billable hours). Many firms around the world expressly include pro bono matters in this calculation – in some cases all pro bono work is included, in other cases it is only a certain number of pro bono hours.

Respondent firms did not report a close association between compensation incentives and the amount of pro bono performed. The Index found 46 percent of respondent firms overall took pro bono into account when assessing compensation levels for lawyers – a figure which was 25 percent for Small Firms and 70 percent for Large Firms. On average, firms that did not factor pro bono into compensation performed 49.7 hours of pro bono compared to 29.2 hours at law firms that did. At Small Firms, the average pro bono hours were 11.7 hours at firms that did take pro bono into account and 66.3 hours at firms that did not. These findings might indicate that compensation may not be a main incentive in the amount of pro bono hours that some firms perform.

Interestingly, 70 percent of respondent firms indicated that they do not factor pro bono into compensation for partners – with Large Firms (61 percent), Medium-sized Firms (69 percent), and Small Firms (84 percent) not factoring it in at all. This figure was lower than the proportion of firms that factored pro bono work into partner appraisals, echoing the finding of the 2016 Index that compensation processes may be tied to the commercial performance of partners rather than the amount of pro bono performed.
**PRO BONO TARGETS**

**AVERAGE PRO BONO HOURS RecordED PER LAWYER:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRMS WITH PRO BONO TARGETS</th>
<th>FIRMS WITHOUT PRO BONO TARGETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>34.5 HOURS</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.3 HOURS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRO BONO TARGETS AND THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS**

**AVERAGE PRO BONO HOURSRecordED PER LAWYER:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Firms</th>
<th>Medium-sized Firms</th>
<th>Large Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspirational Target</td>
<td>Aspirational Target</td>
<td>Aspirational Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Target</td>
<td>Mandatory Target</td>
<td>Mandatory Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Index found that 60 percent of firms had a fee earning (utilisation) target in place, with a similar number reporting that they have a pro bono target in place. Overall, respondent firms with a pro bono target reported higher hours across the globe.

Some firms have instituted pro bono targets, both mandatory or aspirational, which respectively require or encourage lawyers in their employ to perform a minimum number of pro bono hours. For 60 percent of all respondent firms pro bono hours were also built into fee earning (utilisation) targets, ensuring that lawyers were rewarded, or at the very least not penalised, for taking on pro bono work. The Index found that 50 percent of firms treated pro bono hours the same as fee earning hours for the purposes of targets, while 22 percent credited pro bono hours up to a maximum threshold. Across the entire data set, 14 percent of firms did not take pro bono hours into account at all for fee earning (utilisation) targets.

At firms with a target, 74 percent of lawyers performed 10 or more hours of pro bono, compared to 57 percent at firms without. Small Firms with a pro bono target performed 93.4 hours, compared to 25.5 hours for those without. However, for Medium-sized Firms and Large Firms, respondent firms with a target reported similar hours to those without. The data indicates that targets may be useful, particularly in some Small Firms, to drive pro bono engagement.

For those with a pro bono target, 79 percent of respondent firms stated that their target was aspirational rather than mandatory and that therefore there was no penalty or recourse if the target was not met. Interestingly, 23 percent of Medium-sized Firms state that their targets were mandatory, far more than their counterpart Small Firms (5 percent) and Large Firms (0 percent).

At firms with a mandatory target, lawyers performed an average of 60.4 hours of pro bono, compared to 32.9 hours at firms where the target was aspirational. This figure was 150.5 hours for Small Firms when the target was mandatory, compared to 44.8 hours at Large Firms and 22.8 hours at Medium-sized Firms.

---

1 This high figure is as a result of a single Small Firm with a target of 500 hours per year for each of its lawyers. If this firm were excluded from the data, the figure would drop significantly.
The 2020 TrustLaw Pro Bono Index received submissions from 89 law firms in 25 countries across Africa and the Middle East. This represents an increase from the 2016 findings, where 33 law firms in 17 countries participated in the Index.

Respondent firms in these regions reported that lawyers provided an average of 19.6 hours of pro bono legal assistance each over the self-selected 12-month reporting period, a decrease from 2016’s finding of 25.9 hours. However, the percentage of fee earners undertaking 10 or more hours of pro bono increased from 35 percent in 2016 to 36 percent in this reporting period. Partners performed an average of 15.26 hours of pro bono, compared with 17.1 hours reported in the 2016 Index. The percentage of partners who contributed any time to pro bono increased from 40 percent in 2016 to 59 percent in 2020.

The higher 2020 response rate from these regions in the reporting period means this sample provides a broader picture of the amount of pro bono performed in Africa and the Middle East. The findings illustrate that, despite a decrease in average pro bono hours worked per lawyer, there is still a strong appetite among firms in Africa and Middle East to participate in pro bono initiatives.

There is a diverse legal and pro bono environment in these regions, and our findings suggest a continued positive trend towards expanding pro bono as well as a growing interest in it among legal communities in countries without historical traditions of pro bono. Local, regional and international law firms continue to build their pro bono practices by increasing and improving their pro bono infrastructure – the result of various factors ranging from an embedded culture of ‘giving back’, law society requirements for a minimum number of pro bono hours to be fulfilled annually, vibrant non-profit legal sectors that are actively involved in the provision of free legal services and pro bono initiatives being considered as part of performance appraisals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</th>
<th>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Attorneys</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Tamimi &amp; Company</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Tamimi &amp; Company</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Tamimi &amp; Company</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALN Ethiopia</td>
<td>Mesfin Tafesse &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>42.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALN Kenya</td>
<td>Anjarwalla &amp; Khanna LLP ALN Tanzania</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALN Kenya</td>
<td>Anjarwalla &amp; Khanna LLP ALN Tanzania</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALN Nigeria</td>
<td>G. Elias &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALN UGANDA</td>
<td>MMAKS ADVOCATES</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluko &amp; Oyebode</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asyla Attorneys</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;A ADVOCATES LAWFIRM</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNM Advocates</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNM Advocates</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bytelex Advocates</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bytelex Advocates</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFL Advocates</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chebet &amp; Munyaka Advocates LLP</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilume and Company</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Dekker Hofmeyr</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>77.06</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Aref International Law Office</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>428.57</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Silwamba, Jalasi and Linyama Legal Practitioners</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasken (Bell Dewar)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>72.48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanokanga &amp; Partners</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katende Ssempebwa and Company Advocates (KATS)</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieti Advocates LLP</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawtons Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Solicitors</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbula Mulu</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morsad Law Firm</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muri Mwaniki Thige &amp; Kageni LLP Advocates</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mweshi Banda and Associates</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Rose Fulbright South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novita Law</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogutu &amp; Associates Advocates</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Associates &amp; Co. Advocates</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharkawy &amp; Sarhan Law Firm</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>36.62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Adaji Chambers</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKK Advocates</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKK Advocates</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASLAF Advocates</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Juris Chambers</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udo Udoma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webber Wentzel</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zangue &amp; Partners</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where no data was provided by the law firm, the table will indicate this by using a dash (–) symbol to indicate this.
As explained in the Methodology section, comprehensive stand-alone country analyses are only published for Index findings in jurisdictions where four or more law firms submitted data on their pro bono activities in the 12-month reporting period. In the 2016 Index of Pro Bono, we received submissions from four firms in Kenya. For the 2020 Index, eight firms submitted data on their pro bono practices, improving our sample of pro bono work in Kenya. Due to a difference in sample composition, we only share data provided in 2020.

The pro bono market in Kenya remains one of the continent’s most vibrant, with a strong culture embedded in the practice of law firms to give back to those in society who are unable to afford it and need it the most. The biggest development in the sector over the last half decade was the passing of Kenya’s Legal Aid Act in 2016 that established the National Legal Aid Service, though pro bono remains largely unregulated, leaving practitioners and law firms free to decide their own approach to it.

Submissions by law firms for the 2020 Index show that fee earners based in Kenya carried out an average of 13.11 hours of pro bono legal work over the reporting period. An interesting trend revealed in the data was how fee earners at Small Firms averaged 10 or more hours, with 44 percent meeting this threshold. Respondent law firms in Kenya had 38 percent of their partners dedicate some time to pro bono work, with partners performing an average of seven hours of pro bono work.

Regional firms and legal networks that have been building hubs or partnerships with local firms in Kenya are replicating their pro bono infrastructure locally, resulting in a stronger culture within larger law firms in the country. While the Law Society of Kenya, the local bar association, listed the engagement of at least 600 lawyers in pro bono in its 2011-2016 strategic plan, its 2017-2021 strategic plan makes no reference to this. On the other hand, the Law Society’s implementation plan channels funding to a pro bono legal scheme, which indicates that this regulatory authority may be doing more to support pro bono services.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALN Kenya</td>
<td>Anjarwalla &amp; Khanna LLP ALN Tanzania</td>
<td>Anjarwalla &amp; Khanna LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNM Advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFL Advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chebet &amp; Munyaka Advocates LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieti Advocates LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbula Mulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muri Mwaniki Thige &amp; Kageni LLP Advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogutu &amp; Associates Advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the first year Morocco is included in the Index of Pro Bono. Morocco has many international firms that run their North Africa practices from this jurisdiction. Three out of the four Index submissions from Morocco were from international law firms.

Lawyers performed an average number of 16.82 hours per fee earner, with 42 percent of lawyers contributing 10 or more hours towards pro bono in the self-selected 12-month reporting period. Partners at respondent firms in Morocco performed an average of 22.14 hours each, with 43 percent of them performing more than 10 hours in this jurisdiction. Respondent firms also reported that 57 percent of their partners performed pro bono during the 12-month period.

We see other efforts to encourage pro bono. For example, in 2018 the Moroccan Industrial and Commercial Property Office (OMPIC) adopted new eligibility criteria for intellectual property (IP) professionals to provide their services on a pro bono basis, opening up opportunities within the IP practice. Grassroots-based pro bono schemes are also present, such as Droits & Justice’s Caravans of Justice Roadshow, an initiative that presents citizens with access to free legal services through the Caravan’s mobile pro bono clinics in tents, public venues and Souks (marketplaces).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morsad Law Firm</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Average</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>41.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2020 marks the first year that in-depth analysis has been carried out on the legal sector in Nigeria for the Index of Pro Bono. We received submissions from six law firms, five local and one international, with a mix of firms varying in size from the country’s largest practice to Medium-sized and single-person firms. We believe that this data from diverse practices paints a representative image of the pro bono trends in Africa’s largest nation.

The practice of pro bono is predominantly driven by NGOs and private practitioners, with the scope and availability of these services growing over the past few years. More recently, it has been argued that due to the large economy and burgeoning population of Nigeria, there is a need for more non-state actors to step up and ensure access to pro bono services is available to all who need them.¹

While the legal aid sector is regulated through the Legal Aid Act 2011, it is limited to providing this support to indigent persons and leaves the pro bono legal sector largely unregulated, though it is supplemented by the aspirational ideals within the Nigeria Bar Association’s Pro Bono Declaration of 2009. One of the biggest drivers motivating lawyers in Nigeria to undertake pro bono is that it is impossible to attain the apex rank of Senior Advocate of Nigeria without having provided pro bono legal services. It then comes as no surprise that, on average, partners from respondent firms in Nigeria performed the third highest number of hours of pro bono globally, at 75.44.

Over half of the partners in Nigeria (51 percent) reported having performed at least 10 hours of pro bono.

Submissions by law firms for this 2020 Index show that fee earners in Nigeria performed an average of 8.98 hours of pro bono, indicating a strong culture of pro bono. The data indicates that 34 percent of lawyers performed 10 or more hours of pro bono. Nigeria is a country to watch on matters of pro bono and we shall continue to monitor developments in this key African market to identify trends in the sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALN Nigeria G. Elias &amp; Co.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluko &amp; Oyebode</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Solicitors</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Adaji Chambers</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Average</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>34.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ https://lawaxis360degree.com/2019/06/05/the-necessity-for-proactive-pro-bono-services-in-nigeria/.
South Africa continues to cement itself as Africa’s most advanced pro bono market, with a legal sector where pro bono infrastructure is commonplace in its larger firms. For the 2020 Index we received submissions from nine firms, four local and five international, an increase of 33 percent from the submissions to the 2016 Index of Pro Bono. Results indicate that pro bono in South Africa continues to thrive, possibly as a combined result of its well-established legal practice sector and the pressing social challenges in the country that require lawyers to intervene on a pro bono basis.

Sections 34 and 35 of its South Africa’s Constitution guarantee access to justice for all in the country, yet direct free legal service for indigent persons occurs only under limited circumstances. The country’s bar associations, however, make it mandatory for their members to carry out a certain number of pro bono hours. South Africa also possesses a vibrant non-profit legal sector that is actively involved in the provision of free legal services. Organisations such as ProBono.org, for example, which facilitates access to pro bono and legal aid, have been recognised for their efforts in the access-to-justice space.

In South Africa, 63 percent of partners at respondent firms carried out pro bono in one form or another, recording 34.48 hours on average per partner. Participating law firms reported an average of 35.99 hours of pro bono per fee earner, compared with 39.3 hours reported in the 2016 Index. The percentage of lawyers performing 10 or more hours of pro bono also decreased, from 45 percent in 2016 to 40 percent for this 2020 Index. The data shows that pro bono trends in the South African market remain consistent, a likely testament to its strong culture of pro bono over a number of years.

A major development in recent years has been the impact of the Legal Practice Act No. 28 of 2015. One of its provisions, which came into effect in November 2018, introduces mandatory ‘community service’ for legal practitioners and trainees. Yet, practitioners in the pro bono sector continue to seek clarity on whether ‘community service’ and ‘pro bono legal service’ are synonymous, and thus whether pro bono work counts towards the requirements of the Act. The issue remains ambiguous and practitioners would value direction as to their duties to undertake pro bono under the Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Dekker Hofmeyr</td>
<td>77.06</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasken (incorporated as Bell Dewar Inc. in South Africa)</td>
<td>72.48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawtons Africa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Rose Fulbright South Africa</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webber Wentzel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Average</td>
<td>35.99</td>
<td>40.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Read more about this here: https://www.ibanet.org/Article/NewDetail.aspx?ArticleUid=75DB8F36-252C-4323-A80F-7BDB19B7098A.
2 Also see this article: http://www.derebus.org.za/clarity-pro-bono-legal-practice-act/.
In 1969, students in the Faculty of Law at the University of Dar es Salaam established a legal aid committee in a move to ‘give back’ to the community, some say the first such gesture by lawyers in the country. This is the first in-depth analysis of pro bono in Tanzania as part of the Index of Pro Bono.

For the 2020 Index we received submissions from four firms, consisting of one international, one regional and two local practices. Respondent firms in Tanzania saw their fee earners averaging 11.01 hours of pro bono in the reporting period. Firms with lawyers performing 10 or more hours of pro bono formed 38 percent of the submissions received. Respondents firms also reported that partners performed an average of 4.44 hours, with 56 percent performing 10 or more hours in this jurisdiction.

In 2017, the country enacted its Legal Aid Act, which regulates legal aid in the country, allowing for greater access to justice. This Act limits legal aid to legal education, information, advice, assistance or representation to indigent persons, hence pro bono services offered to NGOs and social enterprises remain unregulated. Tanzania has a large number of international and regional law firms with an embedded pro bono culture promoting pro bono work at a local level, prompting local firms to show an increased interest in engaging in pro bono as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Attorneys</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALN Kenya</td>
<td>Anjarwalla &amp; Khanna LLP ALN Tanzania</td>
<td>Anjarwalla &amp; Khanna LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asyla Attorneys</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novita Law</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Average</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>38.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lawyers in Uganda’s legal community are required to provide 40 hours of legal aid in line with the ethical and social responsibility obligations under the Advocates Act, which regulates the sector. The country’s legal aid and pro bono sectors are vibrant, with the Uganda Law Society’s renowned Pro Bono Day being a great example of institutional efforts to inculcate a culture of ‘giving back’.

This is the first time we have carried out an in-depth analysis in the Index of Pro Bono trends in Uganda. Submissions came from one regional, one international and four local law firms. Fee earners averaged 7.27 hours of pro bono in the self-selected 12-month reporting period. Lawyers donating 10 or more hours of pro bono in the Ugandan legal fraternity stood at 43 percent of the responses we received. Impressively, 88 percent of partners in the surveyed firms indicated that they performed pro bono, each averaging 8.27 hours.

Pro bono and legal aid services in Uganda are rendered through a variety of organisations, from law firms to community legal aid clinics and NGOs, diversifying access to justice in the country. Uganda also has law firms specialising in providing pro bono services for social enterprises in this nation, which has been dubbed the ‘world’s most entrepreneurial country’, helping to distinguish its pro bono practice from other African nations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALN Uganda</td>
<td>MMAKS Advocates</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNM Advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bytelex Advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katende Ssempebwa and Company Advocates (KATS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKK Advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASLAF Advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.good.is/articles/why-uganda-is-the-worlds-most-entrepreneurial-nation.
While pro bono activities are not widespread in the UAE, the presence of numerous international law firms seeded the practice in the country and it has grown, prompting local firms and legal advice services to take notice. As a result, it is predominantly private law firms that provide pro bono services, with limited involvement by NGOs or other actors in the sector.

In 2018, the Government of Dubai’s Legal Affairs Department launched a Smart Platform for Pro Bono Legal Services, which seeks to encourage the involvement of legal professionals in Dubai in pro bono work for financially disadvantaged citizens. Registered legal firms and individuals register on the Smart Platform to provide and benefit from pro bono legal services in turn. Twenty law firms with offices in the United Arab Emirates submitted data on their pro bono activities for the 2020 Index, an increase from the 13 firms that submitted data for the 2016 Index. With the high presence of international law firms domiciled in this commercial and financial hub of the Middle East, it is no surprise that all but one of the firms that submitted data were international.

The results show that fee earners in law firms in the UAE performed an average of 12.64 hours of pro bono, a slight increase from the 11.6 hours recorded in the 2016 Index. The percentage of fee earners spending 10 or more hours on pro bono work slightly increased in this reporting period, rising to 30 percent from 27 percent in the previous Index. In this jurisdiction, 35 percent of partners in respondent law firms performed some pro bono hours, averaging 5.86 hours, a decrease from the 7.1-hour average of the 2016 Index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Tamimi &amp; Company</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Average</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-four law firms across 18 countries in the Americas, excluding the United States, submitted pro bono data for the 2020 Index, representing an increase from the 35 law firms with 47 offices across 17 countries that submitted data for the 2016 Index.

The Index findings show that fee earners in the Americas performed an average of 20.2 hours of pro bono work each, an increase from the 11.7 hours of pro bono recorded in the 2016 Index. In addition, 34 percent of fee earners donated 10 or more hours of their time to pro bono work, a similar increase from 21 percent in the previous Index. These findings suggest a continued growing interest and participation in pro bono among lawyers in the Americas. Pro bono engagement among partners also increased – 51 percent of them did some type of pro bono work, almost double the figure reported in 2016. Respondent firms in the region also reported an increase in the average number of hours performed by partners, from 7.9 hours in 2016 to 9.04 hours.

This data suggests that law firms in the Americas continue to make efforts to evolve their pro bono practices and to institutionalise the practice, creating a pro bono movement that continues to gain significant momentum.

The pro bono infrastructure continues to grow and mature in the Americas. Through their annual pro bono survey, Latin Lawyer and The Cyrus R. Vance Center for International Justice outline the strides that law firms in collaboration with local clearinghouses 1.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</th>
<th>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albagli Zaliasnik</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>40.03</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelio Garcia Sayan Abogados SCRL</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOA Abogados S.A.</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basham, Ringe &amp; Correa, S.C.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beccar Varela</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake, Cassels &amp; Graydon LLP</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigard &amp; Urrutia Abogados SAS</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>57.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruchou Abogados</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cammarota e Abreu Advogados</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariola Diez Pérez-Cotapos and Sargent &amp; Krahn (Cariola’s associated firm)</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerolini &amp; Ferrari Abogados</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Legal</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Legal</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Legal</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Legal</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Legal</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empatthy</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estudio Osterling S. Civil de R.L.</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrere Abogados</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundación Enyx, A.C. - Enyx: Abogados + Emprendedores</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galindo, Arias &amp; Lopez</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gómez-Pinzón Abogados</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>47.87</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg Traurig, S.C.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Brown</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guevara &amp; Gutiérrez S.C.</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells BSTL SC</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>60.64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes &amp; Hughes</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral North</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLA Advogados</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legalsa</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>346.67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machado Meyer Advogados</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marval O’Farrell Mairal</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattos Filho, Veiga Filho, Marrey Jr. e Quiroga Advogados</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthey Tétrault LLP</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan LLP</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales &amp; Besa</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan &amp; Morgan</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosse IP, Fashion &amp; Social Media Law</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muñoz Tamayo &amp; Asociados</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMG</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangefi</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGBAM</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paz Horowitz</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez, Bustamante y Ponce</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippi Prietocarrizosa Ferrero DU &amp; Uría</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippi Prietocarrizosa Ferrero DU &amp; Uría</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinheiro Neto Advogados</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritch, Mueller, Heather y Nicolau, S.C.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>37.41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TozziniFreire Advogados</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanrell IP</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBSO Advogados</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Wobeser y Sierra</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>41.04</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pro bono movement in Argentina started a few decades ago and was strengthened by the Pro Bono Declaration for the Americas in 2008. In recent years, firms undertaking pro bono have started to institutionalise certain aspects of their practices, while others newer to the movement are just beginning to take on pro bono cases. In recent years, there have been local initiatives such as the launch of a campaign to promote pro bono in provinces beyond Buenos Aires.

Seven law firms with offices in Argentina participated in the 2020 Index, a slight increase from the six submissions of the previous Index. All but one of the responses were from local firms, with a single international firm submitting pro bono data from its Buenos Aires office. There has been a decrease in the average pro bono hours reported by fee earners, from 17.5 hours in 2016 to 14.6 hours in 2020. Similarly, 30 percent of lawyers performed 10 or more hours of pro bono, a decrease from 40 percent in 2016.

Respondent submissions revealed an increase in the average hours of pro bono done by partners in Argentina, from an average of 13.5 hours in 2016 to 17.4 hours in 2020. However, the number of partners who did any pro bono work decreased, with 35 percent of partners reporting that they gave their time to pro bono work during the reporting period, down from 40 percent in the 2016 Index of Pro Bono.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVOA Abogados S.A.</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beccar Varela</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruchou Abogados</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerolini &amp; Ferrari Abogados</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marval O’Farrell Mairal</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGBAM</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>29.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to long-standing regulatory restrictions, the pro bono movement in Brazil lagged behind other Latin American countries. These limitations were lifted in 2015, prompting a majority of the larger firms to scale up their pro bono work as part of their corporate social responsibility (CSR) programmes. A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this Index due to the significantly distinct samples in each reporting year.

The percentage of fee earners who provided at least 10 hours of pro bono was 26 percent. The average hours performed by fee earners was 7.8 hours. The Instituto Pro Bono in São Paulo is Brazil’s best-known clearinghouse, having played a significant role in pushing for regulatory reform to encourage pro bono, and an essential role in lifting the regulatory restrictions.

Data from the 14 respondent firms indicates that partners did an average of 1.24 hours of pro bono. The percentage of partners who spent any time on pro bono was 24 percent during the reporting period. In the recent years local initiatives have continued to thrive, such as the organisation of a regional Pro Bono Conference in São Paulo that took place in 2016 and the declaration of a local Pro Bono Week held annually every December.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cammarota e Abreu Advogados</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLA Advogados</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machado Meyer Advogados</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattos Filho, Veiga Filho, Marrey Jr. e Quiroga Advogados</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosse IP, Fashion &amp; Social Media Law</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinheiro Neto Advogados</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TozziniFreire Advogados</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBSO Advogados</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>26.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pro bono landscape in Canada continues to evolve at a fast pace. A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct.

Eight firms from Canada submitted data to the 2020 Index. On average, individual fee earners performed 20.77 hours of pro bono. The number of fee earners who recorded 10 or more hours of pro bono during the reporting period in 2020 was 44 percent. Partners reported an average of 4.7 hours, with firms reporting that 10 percent of their partners participated in any pro bono work.

Professional bodies such as the Canadian Bar Association’s Pro Bono Committee raise awareness of pro bono practices within the profession by providing access to pro bono resources for lawyers in different provinces. Pro Bono Canada (PBC) also supports the development of province-wide pro bono programmes by supporting vulnerable children, survivors of domestic abuse and victims of fraud. Provincial bar associations and pro bono organisations (e.g. Pro Bono Law Ontario, Access Pro Bono in British Columbia and Justice Pro Bono in Québec) also play a key role in supporting the pro bono sphere in Canada.

An example of the importance of the legal pro bono community in Canada is the recent partnership between the Canadian government and Pro Bono Ontario. On Jan. 8, 2020, Ukraine International Airlines Flight PS752 was shot down minutes after taking off from Tehran by an Iranian surface-to-air missile and 55 Canadian citizens and 30 permanent residents were among the 176 people killed. As part of its response, the Canadian Government announced that the Department of Justice would be providing more than CAD$200,000 in funding to Pro Bono Ontario to provide legal assistance to family members of Canadian citizens or permanent residents who lost their lives. This partnership, which was the first of its kind in Canada, demonstrated an acknowledgement of the central role played by pro bono services providers in access to justice.

This funding announcement gained attention as the two main providers of pro bono legal services in Ontario, namely Legal Aid Ontario and Pro Bono Ontario, had previously made several urgent pleas for additional and ongoing funding. Pro Bono Ontario released a report in May 2019 entitled “Pro Bono Ontario Funding Background and History”, which described the organisation’s dire financial situation and the need for stable funding from the Law Society.

Indigenous peoples’ rights are a focus of legal pro bono work in Canada. Justice Pro Bono, a Québec-based NGO that helps citizens who do not qualify for legal aid but cannot afford to pay a lawyer, launched a legal clinic in the remote area of Kuujjuaj, the largest northern village in the Nunavik region of Québec. This initiative aimed to provide pro bono legal assistance to Inuit communities who cannot access tribunals due to their location. The first clinic was held in March 2017 and focused on criminal and family law, as well as youth protection and inheritance law.

The current landscape in Canada – facing COVID-19-related urgent legal need in underserved communities, insufficient legal aid funding and law firms with dedicated pro bono efforts despite the strains caused by the pandemic – could prove to be an inflection point for pro bono.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blake, Cassels &amp; Graydon LLP</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral North</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy Tétrault LLP</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan LLP</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>37.41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>43.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chile is considered a leader in the pro bono movement, as its organisations and lawyers played a prominent role in the spread of the practice in the wider region. The country has a strong clearinghouse providing a variety of pro bono services.

In recent years, local initiatives have included the creation of a free legal guidance programme for the community created by Fundación Pro Bono after the earthquake of Feb. 27, 2010. This programme is activated whenever there is a state of emergency in the country, such as the 2017 wildfires that affected the southern part of the country.

For this 2020 Index of Pro Bono, we received four submissions from local law firms in Chile, resulting in our first country analysis for this jurisdiction. Fee earners from the country’s respondent law firms performed an average of 35 hours of pro bono during the reporting period. More than half of the fee earners in the region completed more than 10 hours of pro bono, with firms reporting 57 percent of their fee earners meeting this threshold. Firms also reported that 38 percent of partners recorded time spent on pro bono, with firm partners recording an average of 8.61 hours each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albaglì Zaliasnik</td>
<td>40.03</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariola Díez Pèrez-Cotapos and Sargent &amp; Krahn (Cariola’s associated firm)</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empatthy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales &amp; Besa</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>56.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 https://www.probono.cl/
The pro bono culture in Colombia has shown some growth in recent years, mainly due to law firms committing to the practice along with the work of local pro bono organisations. Some firms have established internal policies and structures to improve their pro bono infrastructure. In 2009, several firms founded the Fundación Pro Bono Colombia. This non-profit group provides pro bono to the less fortunate with the objective of making justice accessible to all Colombians. There have also been local initiatives such as the publication of a pro bono guide, the establishment of a local pro bono programme and initiatives addressing post-conflict issues for victims and former participants of the Colombian armed conflict.

For this Index, we received data from four local firms whose fee earners performed an average of 29 hours during the reporting period. Of the submissions we received, 46 percent of fee earners at these firms completed 10 or more hours of pro bono. Firm partners performed an average of 7.63 hours of pro bono each, with 31 percent of partners reporting that they engaged in some pro bono work during the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brigard &amp; Urrutia Abogados SAS</td>
<td>57.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gómez-Pinzón Abogados</td>
<td>47.87</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muñoz Tamayo &amp; Asociados</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippi Prietocarrizosa Ferrero DU &amp; Uría</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>29.14</td>
<td>46.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 https://probono.org.co/en/
We received nine submissions from Mexico for the self-selected 12-month reporting period. Six came from local firms and three from international firms. The pro bono culture in Mexico has achieved significant growth and continues to blossom with the establishment of several well-known clearinghouses such as Appleseed Mexico and firms in the country strengthening their pro bono programmes.

One notable pro bono initiative involved the creation of pro bono standards for the country in 2018 defining what can be considered pro bono and establishing a working group to advance its practice. Pro bono lawyers in the country organised themselves to respond to emergencies such as the 2017 Puebla earthquake that killed 370 people.

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. Fee earners in Mexico performed an average of 23.5 hours of pro bono in 2020. The percentage of fee earners who performed 10 or more hours of pro bono was 36 percent. In the responses we received, the average number of hours performed by firm partners was 14.11 hours. The percentage of partners who engaged in any pro bono stood at 49 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basham, Ringe &amp; Correa, S.C.</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundación Enyx, A.C. - Enyx: Abogados + Emprendedores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg Traurig, S.C.</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells BSTL SC</td>
<td>60.64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritch, Mueller, Heather y Nicolau, S.C.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Wobeser y Sierra</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>41.04</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>36.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across Asia and the Pacific (excluding Australia), 151 law firms with offices in 20 jurisdictions participated in the 2020 Index of Pro Bono. This is an increase in comparison with the 50 law firms with offices in 15 jurisdictions recorded in the 2016 Index. This Index however saw a drop in the average number of pro bono hours per fee earner over the self-selected 12-month reporting period, from 24.2 hours in 2016 to 20.02 in 2020. The percentage of fee earners doing 10 or more hours of pro bono was 31 percent in 2016 and 32 percent in 2020, an indication of sustained interest in the sector. The region saw consistency in partner engagement with the percentage of partners doing any pro bono work increasing marginally from 39 percent in 2016 to 40 percent. Individual partners undertook an average of 17.42 hours, up from 13.4 hours in 2016.

The practice of pro bono in Asia and the Pacific continues to gain momentum within both local and international law firms. Pro bono clearinghouses such as The Global Network for Public Interest Law (PILNet) have an established presence in the region, while the presence of several international firms with entrenched pro bono infrastructure supports pro bono engagement. Due to the diverse legal landscape and legal requirements in the region, the range of pro bono activity is varied, with pro bono being nascent or at its inception in some countries, while mature and thriving in others. There have also been important pro bono initiatives in the region, with the annual Asia Pro Bono Conference (APBC) and Asia Pacific Pro Bono Summit bringing together key stakeholders to strengthen access to justice in Asia and the Pacific.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</th>
<th>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.S &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALN Mauritius - BLC Robert &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacit Global</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica Law LLC</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Thai Legal</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Porter Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Porter Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assegaf Hamzah &amp; Partners</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bae, Kim &amp; Lee LLC</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTG Legal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher &amp; Lee Ong</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.L. &amp; F. De Saram</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>69.11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Kamal Hossain and Associates</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>87.95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DXC Technology, UnitedLex Enterprise Legal Services</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Thuraisingam LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainwell</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>62.71</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Procter LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Chambers</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Know,Right (IKR)</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sagar Associates</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Wood Mallesons</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Wood Mallesons (Hong Kong office)</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Information Access Associates(KIAA,LLP)</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanna Lawyers</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>222.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>57.02</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LawQuest</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MahWengKwai &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min Yung Hui &amp; Partners Law Office</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakoorsha Law Corporation</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>133.93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>112.69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>81.12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Weiss</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Law Associates</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLR Chambers</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pradhan &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Law Associates</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA Technology &amp; IP Attorneys</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes &amp; Gray</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes &amp; Gray</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes &amp; Gray</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes &amp; Gray</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saikrishna &amp; Associates</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth Shaw</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas and Co.</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Grierson</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinha Verma Law Concern</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steptoe and Johnson</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudath Perera Associates</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SyCip Salazar Hernandez &amp; Catmaitan</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanathip &amp; Partners Legal Counsellors Limited</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKCA and Partners</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivien Teu &amp; Co LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>54.29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>111.43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>121.18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We received data from four law firms with offices in Bangladesh for the self-selected 12-month reporting period for this Index. Efforts to increase provision of pro bono have occurred in this jurisdiction, including the setting up of organisations such as BLAST (Bangladesh Legal Aid & Services Trust) as an attempt to systematise pro bono provision, which has until now been informally dispensed by members of the Bangladesh Bar.\(^1\) BLAST emerged from a resolution of the Bangladesh Bar Council, and brings together a network of 2,500 panel lawyers across the country.

As 2020 was the first year in which multiple Bangladeshi offices submitted Index data, the data sets cannot be compared to identify chronological trends. However, 2020 findings showed that fee earners performed an average of 39.4 hours of pro bono work over the self-selected 12-month reporting period, and, impressively, 87 percent of fee earners contributed 10 or more hours. Partner involvement is very strong in Bangladesh, with 67 percent of firm partners engaging in some pro bono work over the self-selected 12-month reporting period. On average partners in Bangladesh spent more time doing pro bono than partners in any other country that provided data for the 2020 Index, with an average 92.92 hours per partner dedicated to pro bono in the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.S &amp; Associates</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Kamal Hossain and Associates</td>
<td>87.95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Chambers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Know, Right (IKR)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>39.35</td>
<td>87.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) [https://www.thedailystar.net/strengthening-pro-bono-legal-services-56731](https://www.thedailystar.net/strengthening-pro-bono-legal-services-56731)
Pro bono is still in its infancy in China, where there are no requirements to carry out pro bono legal work. The notion of pro bono is broadly gaining recognition in the country but appears directly connected to corporate social responsibility initiatives and is driven by the non-legal business community looking to provide in-kind, skill-based support. Apart from lawyers providing pro bono support for personal and social causes that are dear to them, there are also a small number of independent and legal aid organisations that offer free legal services to socially disadvantaged groups and individuals in need.

Although some district and municipal-level initiatives have encouraged lawyers to provide legal aid support (but not pro bono yet), the Chinese government has yet to implement any guidance or regulation that would both protect the practice and recognise the firms and lawyers who are doing pro bono legal work in the country. A regulatory change would be beneficial to help move the needle and build a culture of pro bono legal work in traditional Chinese law firms.

Twenty-seven law firms submitted data on their pro bono practices in China, our highest number of responses from this jurisdiction since 2014. All respondents were international firms with offices in China, with no submissions received from domestic Chinese firms. Findings indicated a dip in the activity of law firms over the past four years, with average pro bono hours per fee earner decreasing from 37.3 hours in the 2016 Index to 15.99 hours. The percentage of fee earners doing 10 or more hours of pro bono in China stood at 27 percent.

Our findings showed that partner engagement increased, with the percentage of partners devoting any time to pro bono projects rising from 17.8 percent in 2016 to 45 percent in 2020. Similarly, the average hours of pro bono work performed by partners based in China increased from 4.4 hours reported in 2016 to 17.76 hours in 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Porter Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes &amp; Gray</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth Shaw</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steptoe and Johnson</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP</td>
<td>121.18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td>27.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Though a culture of pro bono has existed in Hong Kong for years, developments such as the establishment of PILnet’s office in 2013 have helped support further growth. Hong Kong lawyers are prevented from providing free advice in certain situations, including for profit-making organisations (such as social enterprises)\(^1\) that have not been approved by the Bar Association. With an increasing awareness of legal needs that are neglected by the traditional legal aid system, various organisations have also started pro bono models, such as Justice Centre Hong Kong for refugees and Pro Bono HK, which runs legal clinics and legal literacy programmes for marginalised communities. When pro-democracy protests broke out in Hong Kong in 2019, 200 Hong Kong lawyers provided pro bono legal assistance to arrested protesters.\(^2\)

For the 2020 Index, 26 Hong Kong firms contributed data on their fee earners pro bono contributions, up from 21 firms in the 2016 Index. As in previous Indexes, submissions from Hong Kong continue to come predominantly from local branches of international law firms, with a single Index submission from a domestic Hong Kong firm received in 2020.

Respondent law firms indicated that pro bono in Hong Kong increased between 2016 and 2020, with fee earners carrying out 18.40 hours on average compared to 8.50 hours in 2016. Lawyers undertaking 10 or more hours of pro bono also increased in 2020; in 2016 only 15 percent met this minimum, while in this reporting period 35 percent of lawyers contributed 10 or more hours.

The 2020 Index findings show that individual partners increased the hours spent on pro bono matters to 10.72 from the 3.8 hours recorded in 2016. The percentage of partners who spent any time working for pro bono clients rose in Hong Kong rose from 18 percent to 50 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>69.11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Procter LLP</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Wood Mallesons (Hong Kong office)</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) See definition of Qualifying Clients earlier in this Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Weiss</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes &amp; Gray</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivien Teu &amp; Co LLP</td>
<td>54.29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>34.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although providing legal aid and pro bono are not mandatory in India, there has been a long-standing custom of providing free legal assistance. The practice of pro bono in law firms is becoming more organised, with firms developing pro bono cells and centres. Some firms also have pro bono policies and coordinators. Regular transactional services for non-profit organisations and social enterprises continue to be the preferred mode of providing pro bono support, particularly by corporate legal teams. Our observation of pro bono in India also reveals that there is enthusiasm from in-house counsel teams and companies to involve their legal teams in legal pro bono advisory services.

The National Legal Services Authority of India (NALSA) has had a robust scheme of legal aid in place for many years. To compliment NALSA, in 2019 the Department of Justice launched a new pro bono legal service, a tele-law mobile application, ‘Nyaya Bandhu’. The initiative aims to accelerate and facilitate connections between practising advocates and eligible beneficiaries. The services include criminal as well as civil litigation.

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. In 2020, we received submissions from eight local law firms. The average number of pro bono hours performed by fee earners was 12.18 hours in the 12-month reporting period. The percentage of fee earners doing 10 or more hours of pro bono work stood at 24 percent. On average, partners in India contributed 4.39 average hours of pro bono work. The percentage of partners devoting any time to pro bono work was 21 percent, with 7 percent of the partners conducting 10 or more hours of pro bono.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altacit Global</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTG Legal</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainwell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sagar Associates</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Information Access Associates (KIAA, LLP)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LawQuest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLR Chambers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA Technology &amp; IP Attorneys</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saikrishna &amp; Associates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas and Co.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKCA and Partners</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>24.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A tradition of pro bono is engrained in the legal culture of Indonesia because Indonesian law students typically start engaging in pro bono activity during their two-year internship when training to become a licensed lawyer. The Indonesian Advocate Association (PERADI) recommends that all domestic lawyers contribute at least 50 hours of pro bono work annually. Through Rule No.1/2020 enacted by PERADI, this recommendation has become a requirement for Indonesian lawyers in order to renew or obtain their advocate identity card. Foreign lawyers who work in Indonesia must show a consistent track record of providing 10 hours of pro bono support per month in legal research, government legal services or legal education.

This is the first in-depth analysis that is being carried out on pro bono trends in Indonesia for the Index. We received submissions from four firms in Indonesia, with three coming from international law firms and one from a local firm. On average, fee earners performed 12.45 hours of pro bono in the 12-month reporting period, with 34 percent performing 10 or more hours of pro bono. At respondent firms, 13 percent of partners took part in pro bono activities in the 12-month reporting period, performing an average of 2.37 hours each. In future years, it will be interesting to track the impact of PERADI’s 2020 mandate for lawyers to perform at least 50 hours of pro bono.

Pro bono legal practice in Indonesia can be observed across a wide spectrum of sectors, from assisting in criminal and human rights matters to teaching law. Indonesia hosts an estimated 4.5 million migrant workers sending back annual remittances worth nearly $9 billion USD, and many of these workers face challenges that call for enhanced pro bono support. A study by the Pro Bono Institute and Latham & Watkins in 2019 noted that major unmet needs include discrimination, industrial relations, labour issues and employment law.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assegaf Hamzah &amp; Partners</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Japan, lawyers providing free services are mostly engaged in criminal representation or government-subsidised work for low-income families. There are other governmental and non-governmental organisations that provide access to justice at a free or low cost, including the Japan Legal Support Center, the Duty Attorney Systems, and other legal counselling centres established by the bar associations.¹ Large commercial firms have established the Business Lawyers Pro Bono Network to work on pro bono matters to support NGOs in Japan.

Index participation from law firms with offices in Japan has decreased, with 13 data submissions received for the 2020 Index compared to 16 submissions for the 2016 Index. All submissions were provided by the local branches of international firms, with none received from domestic Japanese law firms.

Findings for 2020 indicate growth in Japan’s pro bono sector. On average, fee earners from respondent firms performed 29.72 hours of pro bono work compared to 11.9 hours reported the previous Index. The percentage of fee earners contributing 10 or more hours of pro bono work also saw an increase, up to 37 percent from 14 percent reported in the 2016 Index. This may be as a result of a greater culture of non-legal pro bono, particularly among young people who use their professional skills and experience to contribute to society.²

Partner engagement in pro bono in Japan also grew, the data suggests. In 2016 partners in law firms performed an average of 8.2 hours, but this grew to an average 26.15 hours in the reporting period for the 2020 Index. Similarly, the percentage of partners that performed pro bono hours rose to 58 percent in 2020, compared to 20.8 percent in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>133.93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>112.69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes &amp; Gray</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>36.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singapore’s pro bono practice is one of the most advanced and progressive in the region, benefiting from a commitment from the Law Society of Singapore and mandatory reporting on the number of pro bono hours completed each year. Since the 2016 Index, the biggest development has been the incorporation of the Law Society Pro Bono Services (LSPBS), a registered charity that is also an Institution of a Public Character. Though the LSPBS has been in existence since 2007, its formal registration as a separate corporate entity ‘marked a grand coming of age’ of the pro bono department in the Law Society, with a 30-strong team responsible for pro bono matters.

Since 2007, the LSPBS reports that it has assisted 10,000 underserved individuals and benefited from 2,000 volunteer lawyers. LSPBS provides assistance to NGOs and social enterprises through legal clinics and transactional assistance. Pro bono in Singapore is also provided by numerous specialist non-profit and legal entities. The culture of pro bono is also prevalent within the law student community, with organisations such as the National University of Singapore Pro Bono group promoting pro bono within their Faculty of Law.

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. The 2020 Index of Pro Bono received 24 submissions from law firms. Though a majority of the law firms submitting data in Singapore are the offices of international firms, three submissions were received from local firms – a first for the Index when it comes to data from this jurisdiction. In 2020 the data suggests that mandatory reporting requirements and formalised pro bono infrastructure at the Law Society level have been influential on practitioners in the jurisdiction. Fee earners from respondent firms based in Singapore carried out an average of 22.69 hours of pro bono each. The percentage of lawyers doing 10 or more hours of pro bono work was 34 percent in 2020.

Partners at respondent law firms in Singapore were also involved in pro bono activities, averaging 12 hours each. Thirty-two percent of partners gave back legal skills and knowledge by performing some pro bono.

In 2020, Singapore’s Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon emphasised the importance of pro bono and access to justice, stating that, “There is an important relationship between unequal access to justice and socio-economic inequality, which is one of the great challenges of our times and indeed one that the pandemic has brutally exposed in many societies.” He went on, “Now more than ever, pro bono services will be critical in supporting access to justice for those who cannot afford it... In the giving of your time, efforts, and skills to the most vulnerable members of society, you will not only find your lawyering skills sharpened, but also enjoy some of the most memorable and meaningful engagements in your professional lives.”

---

2. [https://nusprobono.com/about-us/](https://nusprobono.com/about-us/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica Law LLC</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Thuraisingam LLP</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>62.71</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Wood Mallesons</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>57.02</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakoorsha Law Corporation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>34.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With a strong tradition of human rights advocacy during its democracy movement in the 1970s and 1980s, the South Korean pro bono landscape has evolved to be more structured. The pro bono culture has been reinforced by the existence of legislation that explicitly formalises a duty to perform designated services, such as public interest activities (which can include pro bono), for a minimum of 30 hours per year – although local bar associations have the authority to decrease the requirement to 20 hours.

Since 2016, there have been several developments that indicate an increase in the uptake of pro bono in the country. Apart from the formation of the Law Firm Public Interest Network that includes 12 major law firms, the Dongcheon Legal Center for Non-profit Organisations and the Seoul Bar Association Pro Bono Support Center were also established, the latter by the Seoul Bar Association as South Korea’s first full-fledged pro bono clearinghouse. In addition, the Korean Bar Association set up a Pro Bono Support Center in 2020.

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. Submissions were received from eight law firms, one of which was local, for the 2020 Index. The average hours performed per fee earner in South Korea stood at 13.95 hours. The percentage of fee earners who performed 10 or more hours of pro bono work over the self-selected 12-month reporting period was 24 percent. Levels of partner engagement indicate that this category of fee earners performed 37.65 hours of pro bono. The percentage of partners who engaged in any pro bono work stood at 71 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Porter Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bae, Kim &amp; Lee LLC</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>81.12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes &amp; Gray</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. Submissions were received from eight law firms, one of which was local, for the 2020 Index. The average hours performed per fee earner in South Korea stood at 13.95 hours. The percentage of fee earners who performed 10 or more hours of pro bono work over the self-selected 12-month reporting period was 24 percent. Levels of partner engagement indicate that this category of fee earners performed 37.65 hours of pro bono. The percentage of partners who engaged in any pro bono work stood at 71 percent.
Traditionally, lawyers in Thailand support communities through legal aid for individuals, but a justice gap remains. Examples of organisations providing legal assistance and litigation support for individuals on human rights cases include the Human Rights Lawyers Association in strategic lawsuits against public participation (SLAPP) cases, Asylum Access and Refugee Rights Litigation Project in refugee cases, and Thai Lawyers for Human Rights in martial law cases.

In June 2016, the National Reform Steering Assembly Commission on Law and Justice System submitted a report specifying the limitations of pro bono schemes in Thailand to the National Reform Steering Assembly. Furthermore, pro bono has been pushed forward at the university level. In 2016, Thammasat University’s Pro Bono Society was established to promote pro bono at the law school, coupled with ongoing efforts by Bridges Across Borders Southeast Asia Clinical Legal Education (BABSEACLE) based in Chiang Mai, Thailand that runs CLE programmes across ASEAN (the Association of Southeast Asian Nations).

In 2018, PILnet also launched an anti-trafficking project establishing a network of pro bono lawyers to support anti-trafficking cases in Southeast Asia, pioneering the project in Thailand. Private law firms active in pro bono are also increasing, albeit slowly, nurturing the pro bono culture in Thailand.

Findings from law firms with offices in Thailand indicate growth in the legal community’s pro bono contributions over the four years since the 2016 Index. Submissions were received from six firms, half domestic, half international, an increase on the five received in 2016. The average number of hours that individual fee earners contributed to pro bono work increased from 17.2 hours reported in the 2016 Index to 53.08 hours reported for the 2020 Index. The percentage of fee earners carrying out at least 10 hours of pro bono also saw an increase, from 35 percent in the 2016 findings to 38 percent in this reporting period. Partner engagement grew, with 63 percent performing pro bono and, on average, each partner performing 46.72 hours of pro bono.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Thai Legal</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanna Lawyers</td>
<td>222.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanathip &amp; Partners Legal Counsellors Limited</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>53.08</td>
<td>37.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vietnam introduced a mandatory obligation for lawyers to do pro bono work in 2017 and has dedicated Oct. 10 each year to the provision of pro bono services. Whether private law firms engage in pro bono matters largely depends on their firm culture. Recent efforts to institutionalise a culture of legal aid and pro bono in the legal sector include the passing of the Law on Legal Aid (11/2017/QH14) in 2017 and Decision 112/QD-BTV. Under Decision 112, every lawyer is mandated to dedicate a minimum of four hours to pro bono and legal aid each year.

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. For the 2020 Index, four international law firms submitted responses on pro bono practices in Vietnam. They indicate that fee earners averaged 9.22 hours. The percentage of fee earners performing 10 or more hours of pro bono work over the self-selected 12-month reporting period stood at 27 percent.

Exactly 50 percent of partners in Vietnam’s respondent firms engaged in some pro bono, contributing an average of 3.9 hours each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>26.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2020 Index submissions were received from 48 law firms with offices in 31 countries across Europe, an increase from the 39 law firms with offices in 27 countries submitted in 2016.

The average annual pro bono hours carried out by fee earners from respondent firms increased from 15.2 hours in the 2016 Index, to 20.77 hours in the 2020 Index. In addition, the percentage of fee earners who reported doing 10 or more hours of pro bono work has increased from 26 percent in 2016 to 37 percent in 2020. These findings may suggest strengthened engagement with pro bono initiatives and a thriving pro bono ecosystem in Europe. However, partner engagement in Europe dropped with firms reporting that 38 percent of their partners contributed time to pro bono work, down from 42 percent in 2016. The average hours undertaken by partners was 10.8 hours in 2016 and 9.69 for this reporting period.

The region is characterised by a thriving and mature pro bono culture as law firms have deeply ingrained infrastructure and practices as a result of the institutionalisation of pro bono. The COVID-19 pandemic posed unprecedented challenges in 2020, with NGOs and social enterprises forced to face a multitude of unexpected legal questions on their day-to-day practices amid fears of their very survival. Law firms in Europe quickly responded to these uncertainties by garnering support for these organisations, helping them navigate complex legal challenges on a pro bono basis.

Various mechanisms also exist in Europe to support the development of pro bono practice, from pro bono clearinghouses and other organisations joining forces to address legal challenges faced by organisations. European Pro Bono Week celebrates the role played by volunteer lawyers across Europe in supporting NGOs and human rights organisations, and promoting access to justice for those in need. The European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) has also launched a new support service, the EUIPO COVID-19 pro bono hub, which aims to offer a tailor-made service to match small and medium enterprises to providers of pro bono intellectual property legal representation and advice throughout the EU.

The region continues to go from strength to strength in the development of pro bono practice.

---

1 PILnet European Pro Bono Week [https://www.europeanprobonoalliance.org/european-pro-bono-week-2020/](https://www.europeanprobonoalliance.org/european-pro-bono-week-2020/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</th>
<th>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;A Studio Legale</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;L Goodbody</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;L Goodbody</td>
<td>UK – N. Ireland</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Porter Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Porter Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Cox</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>31.54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>UK – Scotland</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>57.97</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avv. Ferdinando Lajolo</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-COME S.r.l.</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Chance</td>
<td>UK – Other</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>UK – Scotland</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek N.V.</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>66.18</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>78.44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>44.66</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>69.83</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>33.72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froriep</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Procter LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Procter LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavlak Law Firm</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>600.03</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>42.66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>52.59</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>68.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law office Josip Konjevod</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legance - Avvocati Associati</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozalp Law Firm</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAJIC Law firm</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>42.59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>41.95</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steptoe and Johnson</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stibbe B.V.</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vieira de Almeida</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>33.98</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>25.54</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</td>
<td>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Belgium’s Constitution protects the right to legal aid in Article 23, with state-subsidised legal aid widely available in the country. This has meant that historically, the provision of pro bono services remained voluntary, with no legal requirement for lawyers to provide pro bono assistance. This has been changing in the past few years, with clear signals of a growing awareness of pro bono in the legal profession.

First, state-subsidised legal aid has suffered funding cuts, which has increased the need for pro bono support for low-income individuals and NGOs. Second, increasing numbers of international law firms and companies – many of which require their lawyers to engage in pro bono work – have opened offices in the country, making Brussels one of the leading centres of pro bono in Europe. While pro bono in Belgium is led by international law firms operating from their Brussels offices, a large NGO presence in the Belgian capital is helping raise awareness among local law firms. Finally, the creation of The Good Lobby, an NGO working to create a more inclusive society and citizen engagement in the EU, has contributed to increasing the amount of pro bono work undertaken by Brussels-based lawyers, who were among the organisers of the first European Pro Bono Week in 2019.

For the 2020 Index data submissions were received from 22 law firms with offices in Belgium, an increase from 18 in 2016. Only one of these firms was local, with the rest of the data coming from international law firms. There was an increase in the average number of pro bono hours worked per fee earner, from 19 hours in the 2016 Index to 33.33 in the latest 12-month reporting period. The percentage of fee earners reporting 10 or more hours of pro bono increased from 30 percent in 2016 to 44 percent for the 2020 Index.

As in previous years, partner pro bono engagement remained strong in Belgium. The 2016 data indicated that 37 percent of partners participated in some pro bono work, while the latest data indicates an increase to 40 percent. Partners based in Belgium reported performing an average of 12.08 hours of pro bono each, compared to 10.4 hours in the 2016 Index findings.

---

2. [https://www.europeanprobonoalliance.org/agenda/](https://www.europeanprobonoalliance.org/agenda/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Porter Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>31.54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>44.66</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>69.83</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>42.59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steptoe and Johnson</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>33.98</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>43.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Czechia has enacted a range of laws for the provision of legal aid but it is not yet governed by a comprehensive statute. Since its accession to the EU in 2004, the pro bono market in Czechia has been evolving, perhaps as a result of influence from European neighbours and the growing presence of international law firms in this market.

Key stakeholders in pro bono include the European Pro Bono Alliance, and an associated pro bono clearinghouse, Pro Bono Centrum. Its aim is to promote the concept of pro bono among the Czech legal profession as well as the general public. According to the Pro Bono Centrum website, more than 100 NGOs and over 70 law firms are involved in the programme.

We received five submissions from the same firms in 2016 and 2020, all international law firms with offices in Czechia. These respondent firms averaged seven hours per fee earner, a drop from 13.4 hours in 2016. Additionally, 22 percent of fee earners performed 10 or more hours of pro bono, an increase from 19.1 percent. However, there was a decrease in partner engagement, with individual partners reporting an average of 4.10 hours dedicated to pro bono work, down from 15.3 hours in 2016. The percentage of partners who reported spending any time on pro bono work also followed this trend with firms reporting 34 percent, down from 54 percent in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>21.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A significant number of local law firms carry out pro bono activities in France, with international law firms also supporting efforts to professionalise pro bono work in the country. Today, many local firms promote pro bono and the practice continues to be a significant part of the social responsibility of law firms. Numerous French organisations have also launched programmes to mobilise lawyers, such as the Alliance des Avocats pour les Droits de l’Homme or Droits d’Urgence. As a further indication of the growth of the pro bono culture, in 2019 France celebrated its second Pro Bono Day, bringing together experts from different sectors to share their vision for pro bono.

We received data from 24 law firms with offices in France, an increase from the 22 we received in 2016. All respondent law firms were international. Analysis of the data received indicates the pro bono hours performed by fee earners remained constant at 20 hours both in 2016 and in 2020. The percentage of lawyers spending at least 10 hours on pro bono initiatives increased from 25 percent in 2016 to 32 percent, matching a growing trend in the wider continent.

Partner engagement among law firms in France also continues to grow at a steady pace. Partners contributed an average of 11.8 hours each over the reporting period, compared to 8.4 hours reported in the 2016 Index. In addition, 41 percent of partners worked on pro bono projects over the last reporting period, compared to the 35 percent reported in the 2016 Index findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>66.18</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Procter LLP</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>52.59</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM NAME</td>
<td>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>41.95</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a growing pro bono culture in Germany, with both local and international law firms increasing their pro bono activities. Historically, the institutionalisation of pro bono has been slow in Germany, for two main reasons. First, the Federal Republic and its States fund legal aid, which covers both civil and criminal court proceedings as well as out-of-court legal advice, leading to the perception that pro bono work is not needed. Second, German law prohibits lawyers from charging clients lower than the minimum statutory fees, which has been traditionally interpreted as a ban on (free) pro bono legal work.

In recent years, German and international law firms have increasingly challenged this as a misconception and started advocating for and providing pro bono support to both local and foreign clients, although the regulatory framework remains unclear. A number of leading firms organised themselves as Pro Bono Deutschland eV in 2011, with the aim of informing German lawyers and NGOs about pro bono; the group also set up the local clearinghouse UPJ Pro Bono Rechtsberatung in 2018. German law firms were among the organisers of the European Pro Bono Week in 2019, with lawyers celebrating pro bono work in Munich and Frankfurt. These steps toward the embedding of pro bono in Germany have the potential to contribute towards mainstreaming the concept of pro bono among legal teams and social impact organisations, many of whom are still unaware that free legal advice is available.

We received and analysed data from 28 submissions to the 2020 Index, an increase from the 24 received in 2016. Fee earners in the country performed an average of 15.78 hours of pro bono, up from 12.8 hours in 2016, and the percentage of fee earners doing 10 or more hours of pro bono work increased from 20 percent to 33 percent.

Partner engagement at respondent law firms in Germany grew with an average of 12.67 hours of pro bono in the reporting period for the 2020 Index, compared to 11.5 hours in 2016. Findings showed that 45 percent of partners worked on pro bono projects during the reporting period, higher than the 38 percent of partners who did so in 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>42.66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hungary has an active pro bono culture, greatly helped by the presence of PILNet and its Hungarian clearinghouse driving collaborations in the region among law firms, NGOs and charities, and connecting the legal needs of vulnerable communities with pro bono lawyers. In 2017, PILNet worked with law firms and individual lawyers to set up a dedicated child rights pro bono clearinghouse, operated by a former PILnet fellow, which brokers legal advice between minors and/or their guardians with pro bono lawyers.¹

In 2006, several law firms drafted and signed the Public Interest Law Initiative’s Pro Bono Declaration, in which they affirmed their commitment to advancing the public good by working for more clients on a pro bono basis.²

In 2018, a series of laws were passed which impacted the practice of pro bono in Hungary, including making it a criminal offence to help an illegal immigrant claim asylum.³ The regulations also require NGOs that receive foreign donations above a certain amount to register with the Hungarian authorities and disclose their donors. Organisations that fail to comply may be subject to fines or forced to dissolve. In June 2020, the European Court of Justice ruled that Hungary failed to fulfil its obligations under EU law by imposing these requirements on NGOs.⁴

We will monitor the impact that this decision has on pro bono in the future and assess whether it influences trends in the sector in the coming years.

For the 2020 Index, Hungary met the minimum threshold for stand-alone analysis with four firms, all international, submitting data. Fee earners from the country performed an average of 7.17 hours of pro bono work and 21 percent recorded more than 10 hours of pro bono. Of the respondent firms, 20 percent had partners that engaged in pro bono hours, recording an average of 3.70 hours each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ [https://www.pilnet.org/access-legal-help/pilnet-hungarian-clearinghouse/](https://www.pilnet.org/access-legal-help/pilnet-hungarian-clearinghouse/)
³ [https://www.reuters.com/article/us-hungary-soros-idUSKBN1JG1VN](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-hungary-soros-idUSKBN1JG1VN)
Pro bono culture in Ireland is developing, with significant growth in recent years. The Bar of Ireland has been running the Voluntary Assistance Scheme since 2004, which is a pro bono initiative providing legal assistance to charities, NGOs and civil society organisations. It is also now over a decade since the national pro bono clearinghouse, PILA (the Public Interest Law Alliance, a project of the Free Legal Advice Centres or FLAC), was launched, which has been central to driving the pro bono movement through its Pro Bono Referral Scheme.

Between 2018 and 2019, two of the country’s leading commercial law firms recruited their first dedicated pro bono associates and joined the UK Collaborative Plan for Pro Bono. In 2019, the first Pro Bono Week Ireland took place with numerous collaborative events across law firms, in-house legal teams, NGOs, social enterprises, and pro bono clearinghouses. The second Pro Bono Week Ireland took place in November 2020 and again saw collaborative events including all actors in the pro bono space. The PILnet Global Forum also chose Dublin to host its 2020 Forum, although the in-person event was postponed until 2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Significantly in 2020, the Pro Bono Pledge was launched – the first collaborative effort in Ireland to articulate the shared professional responsibility of lawyers to promote access to justice and provide pro bono legal assistance to those in need.¹ The Pledge was developed by an independent group of law firms, barristers and in-house legal teams with a presence in Ireland who have come together to affirm their commitment to delivering pro bono services. The initiative is coordinated by PILA and provides a common definition of pro bono, a commitment to a minimum aspirational target of 20 pro bono hours per lawyer per year and a mechanism to benchmark progress through annual reporting of anonymous pro bono data.

The social enterprise movement in Ireland has also continued to flourish in recent years and TrustLaw has organised numerous events to facilitate lawyers dedicating pro bono hours to support innovative Irish social businesses. Importantly, the Irish Government launched a National Social Enterprise Policy 2019-2022, focussed on building awareness of social enterprise, growing and strengthening the sector and achieving better policy alignment.

This is the first stand-alone analysis for Ireland as in previous editions of the Index the submissions received from respondent law firms in this jurisdiction did not meet the minimum threshold. For the 2020 Index we received responses from five law firms, whose fee earners performed an average number of 18.05 pro bono hours over the course of the 12-month reporting period. Of the responses received, 33 percent of lawyers performed more than 10 hours of pro bono during the period. Our findings indicate that 36 percent of partners at respondent firms engaged in some form of pro bono work, performing an average of 6.64 hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;L Goodbody</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Cox</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ [http://probonopledge.ie/](http://probonopledge.ie/)
In Italy, several legal clinics and a domestic clearinghouse have been running for nearly 10 years. Compared to some other European countries, Italy has a rich, well-developed and diverse ecosystem of NGOs and social enterprises. It is estimated that it is home to more than 300,000 NGOs and 25,000 social enterprises. Social cooperatives are the eminent form of social enterprise in Italy, representing approximately a third of such enterprises, and they also play a role in the pro bono ecosystem.

Eighteen law firms in Italy submitted data for the 2020 Index, an increase in participation compared to the 14 law firms that submitted data in 2016. Ten of these firms were international and four local. Lawyers from respondent firms provided an average of 20.92 hours of their time to pro bono initiatives in the self-selected 12-month reporting period, an increase from the average nine hours reported in the 2016 Index. The percentage of lawyers that provided 10 or more pro bono hours also increased, from 16.9 percent reported in 2016, to 34 percent in the data submissions for the 2020 Index.

We observed a steady growth in partner engagement between 2016 and this reporting period, with 36 percent of partners dedicating time to pro bono work, compared to 28 percent recorded in 2016. Similarly, the average number of hours partners devoted to pro bono work increased from an average 5.1 hours in the previous index to 11.4 hours during this reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;A Studio Legale</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>57.97</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avv. Ferdinando Lajolo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-COME S.r.l.</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legance - Avvocati Associati</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Luxembourg has well-established and extensive legal aid protection, which has meant that historically there has been low demand for pro bono work in the country. Legal aid in Luxembourg is managed by the Luxembourg Bar Association and is particularly efficient: trainee lawyers in Luxembourg are obligated to accept legal aid cases to qualify for the Luxembourg Bar, and lawyers cannot refuse to work on legal aid matters once they are appointed by the Bar.¹

There is no similar requirement to engage in pro bono work and the country has very strict rules on advertising for lawyers, meaning that in many cases they would not be able to promote pro bono work. These limit the incentives for lawyers to engage in pro bono work, although it is undertaken – mostly led by international law firms with offices in the country.²

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this 2020 Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. We received six submissions, all from international law firms. Fee earners performed an average of 17.2 hours of pro bono, with 41 percent carrying out 10 or more hours. Approximately half – 51 percent – of partners at respondent firms reported that they engaged in some type of pro bono work in the 12-month reporting period, performing an average of 11.7 hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>33.72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


² Ibid.
There is a thriving pro bono culture in the Netherlands. The country has a well-funded and comprehensive legal aid system, which has historically limited the demand for pro bono work. However, so-called ‘social impact organisations’ do not benefit from the publicly funded legal aid system, and there has been a growing awareness of their need for pro bono legal support.

In 2014 and 2015, a group of leading local and international law firms got together to create the first Dutch clearinghouse to meet the needs of the social impact sector. Pro Bono Connect was launched in 2016 and has contributed significantly to the development of pro bono culture in the Netherlands. An increasing number of local law firms report their pro bono and corporate social responsibility activities on their websites, and Dutch law firms were among the organisers of the first European Pro Bono Week, held in 2019.

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. Data was received from nine law firms with offices in the Netherlands – two were local firms and the remaining seven were international firms. Fee earners performed an average of 12.77 hours of pro bono work over the 12-month reporting period for the 2020 Index. The percentage of fee earners doing 10 or more hours of pro bono over the period stood at 26 percent. Partner engagement continues to be strong in the country, with 41 percent of partners performing an average number of 10.40 hours of some type of pro bono work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek N.V.</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stibbe B.V.</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both national and international law firms are active in pro bono work in Poland. Centrum Pro Bono is the national clearinghouse platform, run by the University Legal Clinics Foundation. It works to match law firms with NGOs to provide legal aid in a variety of areas including civil law, financial law, and employment law. They also run a pro bono roundtable, which offers an opportunity for lawyers to meet and discuss pro bono developments. The foundation coordinates, represents and supports a network of 24 legal clinics, and works with the bar associations to make legal aid and pro bono accessible.

Other NGOs providing lawyers with pro bono opportunities include the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights and the Polish Society of Anti-Discrimination Law, both of which work on strategic litigation and creative advocacy.

In 2007, law firms committed to the provision of legal services to the poor when they signed a “Pro Bono Declaration” at a roundtable on Pro Bono in Poland, and Polish bar associations actively promote various pro bono programmes. An amended law broadening the scope of eligibility for free legal assistance was enacted in 2019, setting out that legal aid would be available to every person declaring they were unable to bear the costs of legal representation. In 2020, it was reported that the Polish Government was considering introducing legislation similar to that introduced in Hungary which imposed requirements on NGOs in receipt of foreign funding to meet certain reporting requirements. Like Hungary, we will be monitoring the impact that this has on pro bono provision in the country.

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. All eight responses for the 2020 Index came from international law firms with offices in Poland. Fee earners completed an average of 8.16 hours of pro bono over the 12-month reporting period. The percentage of fee earners in Poland doing 10 or more pro bono hours stood at 18 percent. Firm partners reported an average of 5.60 hours, and overall 16 percent reporting that they engaged in some pro bono in 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro bono was not practised historically in Romania, though in recent years, particularly with accession to the EU in 2007 and the arrival of several international law firms, the legal community has increasingly become involved in pro bono. It has also become a customary practice in recent years for large Romanian law firms to dedicate resources to pro bono activities.† NGOs are engaged in the sector, with the Foundation for the Development of Civil Society launching in 2012 the Pro Bono Legal Services for NGOs project, a free service enabling lawyers to provide pro bono legal services to a variety of NGOs. In 2018 the National Association of Bars in Romania adopted a professional policy declaration encouraging the development of pro bono programmes, policies and events, and calling on lawyers to provide pro bono legal services of the same quality as those provided to fee paying clients. ²

This is the first stand-alone analysis that is being carried out for Romania, as in the 2016 Index only one respondent law firm provided pro bono data in this jurisdiction. Four law firms, all branch offices of international law firms, submitted data for the 2020 Index. Lawyers performed an average of 4.74 hours of pro bono in the 12-month reporting period. Findings show that 14 percent of fee earners performed 10 or more hours of pro bono work in the same period. Firm partners performed an average of 25.71 hours of pro bono work, with 44 percent of partners engaging in pro bono work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† https://www.avocatura.com/stire/8563/se-implica-marie-case-de-avocatura-in-programe-de-responsabilitate-sociala-nu-p.html
The Russian federal law on free legal aid provides the legal framework and key principles to both state and private legal aid systems. As a result of this strong state-run legal aid presence, there may be limited demand for pro bono support for individuals. One interesting development in pro bono within Russia has seen lawyers providing free legal advice and assistance to small and medium enterprises.¹

The development and growth of pro bono in Russia has been moderately slow for a few possible reasons. First, there is a culture of lawyers working in small teams or practices, meaning they may lack capacity to take on pro bono work. Second, the ‘Foreign Agent Law’ introduced in 2012, which requires that any foreign funding be registered, has proved to be burdensome for many NGOs and has caused a significant drop in the number of NGOs operating in the country. Third, pro bono is still a relatively new concept.

The pro bono environment is gradually maturing, with the community of the Russian Federal Chamber of Lawyers, along with regional bar associations and clearinghouses, continuing to support the development of pro bono in Russia and raising awareness among the legal and NGO communities.

Data was received from 13 law firms with offices in Russia, all international, a small increase on the 11 firms that submitted data for the 2016 Index. The average number of pro bono hours by fee earners increased from 18.1 hours in 2016 to 19.15 hours for 2020. The percentage of fee earners who performed more than 10 hours of pro bono saw an increase from 29 percent reported in 2016 to 32 percent reported for this Index.

There was an increase in the average number of hours performed by firm partners, with a 13 percent rise from an average of 15 hours per partner reported in 2016 to 17.09 hours during the reporting period. However, partner engagement dropped, with 28 percent of partners reporting doing any pro bono work, down from 45 percent in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>68.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the adoption of a legal framework for the provision of legal aid in 2005, a culture of lawyers ‘giving back’ to Slovakia has been growing steadily. In 2011, the Pontis Foundation launched the Attorneys Pro Bono programme enabling law firms to provide pro bono legal assistance to NGOs. In addition, the Pontis Foundation organises an annual Pro Bono Marathon bringing together volunteers from a range of sectors, including law firms. For one day, the volunteers assist NGOs with pre-defined assignments.

For the 2020 Index we received submissions from four international firms, the same number of respondent firms that participated in the 2016 Index. Lawyers donated less of their time to pro bono matters as compared to previous reporting periods, with fee earners performing an average of 18.52 hours of pro bono in the reporting period compared to 26.7 hours in 2016. The proportion of fee earners performing 10 or more hours also decreased, from 46 percent in 2016 to 43 percent.

Following the same trend, there was a drop of 13 percentage points in the proportion of firm partners undertaking pro bono work, from 42 percent in 2016 down to 29 percent during this reporting period. The average number of hours done by partners decreased by 82 percent, from 22.5 hours in 2016 per individual partner to 3.86 hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinstellar</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>25.54</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spain has a well-established legal aid system, and pro bono seems to be expanding rapidly. Many international and domestic law firms, and some corporate counsel, have ongoing pro bono programs, and a domestic clearinghouse was established in 2019.

Spain’s NGO market is quite mature and stable. There are more than 30,000 associations in the third sector (including cooperatives, mutual societies, associations, foundations and other labour-oriented enterprises), which comprise approximately 1.3 million volunteers and almost 650,000 employees. On the other hand, the latest study launched by Confederación Empresarial Española de la Economía Social (CEPES), of the socio-economic impact of the so-called ‘social economy’ in Spain, revealed that six out of 100 private companies belong to the social economy.¹

Index data was collected from 10 law firms with offices in Spain, a rise compared to the eight law firms that submitted data to the 2016 Index. All the firms were international, with fee earners performing an average of 13.71 hours of pro bono, up from the 11.4 hours recorded in 2016. Similarly, the percentage of fee earners providing 10 or more hours of pro bono increased to 36 percent from the 26 percent of the 2016 Index.

Partner engagement also continues to grow, with 53 percent of respondents reporting that firm partners gave time to pro bono work, up from 45 percent in 2016. Those partners also recorded higher mean hours during the reporting period, with partners spending an average of 14.52 hours, up from 12.1 hours reported in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹[https://www.cepes.es/publicaciones](https://www.cepes.es/publicaciones)
Pro bono is slowly growing in Switzerland, thanks to the efforts of a few leading law firms. The country has a well-established legal aid system which appears to have replaced other notions of pro bono work, and only a few law firms mention pro bono work in their promotional materials. However, a growing number of lawyers are interested in pro bono, particularly in Geneva, where they support the local offices of international NGOs orbiting around the many international institutions based in the city. The Human Rights Commission of the Geneva Bar Association has also set up a pro bono platform to provide legal assistance to NGOs working to advance human rights, a welcome development with the potential to help institutionalise and advance the culture of pro bono in Switzerland.

As in 2016, four submissions were received from law firms with offices in Switzerland, one of which was a domestic firm. The data collected indicates that pro bono engagement continues to rise in terms of the average hours being performed as well as the proportion of lawyers performing 10 or more hours. The average pro bono hours performed by fee earners rose significantly from 6.5 hours in 2016 to 32.27 hours in the 2020 Index reporting period. Similarly, data from law firms in Switzerland indicates a jump when it comes to the percentage of firms with fee earners performing 10 or more hours, with 79 percent of lawyers falling into this category, compared to only 12 percent in 2016.

Between 2015 and 2016, there was growth in the percentage of partners who participated in pro bono. However, the latest reporting period saw a spike in this number, with 79 percent of partners reporting any pro bono work, up from 10 percent in 2016. The average number of hours spent by firm partners on pro bono work grew from 0.2 hours to 22.19 hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froriep</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country average</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LARGE PRO BONO MARKETS
This section sets out country-level analyses for three markets with a particularly high degree of pro bono infrastructure (Australia, England and Wales, and the United States).
Pro bono legal practice is widely recognised and is an essential focus for Australian legal practitioners. Although there is no formal regulation of pro bono work, the National Pro Bono Aspirational Target (‘the Target’) launched by the Australian Pro Bono Centre in 2007 has been a vital contributor to the development of pro bono in Australia. The Target aims to celebrate both individual lawyers and the shared nature of the professional responsibility of all lawyers in the country by encouraging them to use their time and skillset towards public good, and ultimately to help bridge the access-to-justice gap. As of June 2019, the Target counted more than 14,000 lawyers who had pledged to provide a minimum of 35 hours of pro bono during each year.

A broad range of legal service providers offer pro bono support to individuals and organisations in need. The Australian Pro Bono Centre is a platform driving pro bono programmes which helps lawyers access resources to run pro bono initiatives. University legal clinics encourage pro bono early by teaming up qualified volunteer solicitors with law students to provide support in specific focus areas of need. Australian bar associations also engage in pro bono through schemes that encourage duty barristers to assist litigants with financial and legal needs.

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 was not carried out for this Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. Nine firms, all international, submitted data on their Australian offices’ pro bono practices. Fee earners in Australia performed an average of 25.16 hours of pro bono work each over the self-selected 12-month reporting period. The percentage of fee earners reporting 10 or more hours of pro bono stood at an average of 41 percent. The average number of hours done by firm partners was 11.2, with 52 percent of partners contributing time to pro bono legal provision.

---

**Australia**

Pro bono legal practice is widely recognised and is an essential focus for Australian legal practitioners. Although there is no formal regulation of pro bono work, the National Pro Bono Aspirational Target (‘the Target’) launched by the Australian Pro Bono Centre in 2007 has been a vital contributor to the development of pro bono in Australia. The Target aims to celebrate both individual lawyers and the shared nature of the professional responsibility of all lawyers in the country by encouraging them to use their time and skillset towards public good, and ultimately to help bridge the access-to-justice gap. As of June 2019, the Target counted more than 14,000 lawyers who had pledged to provide a minimum of 35 hours of pro bono during each year.

A broad range of legal service providers offer pro bono support to individuals and organisations in need. The Australian Pro Bono Centre is a platform driving pro bono programmes which helps lawyers access resources to run pro bono initiatives. University legal clinics encourage pro bono early by teaming up qualified volunteer solicitors with law students to provide support in specific focus areas of need. Australian bar associations also engage in pro bono through schemes that encourage duty barristers to assist litigants with financial and legal needs.

---

**A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 was not carried out for this Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. Nine firms, all international, submitted data on their Australian offices’ pro bono practices. Fee earners in Australia performed an average of 25.16 hours of pro bono work each over the self-selected 12-month reporting period. The percentage of fee earners reporting 10 or more hours of pro bono stood at an average of 41 percent. The average number of hours done by firm partners was 11.2, with 52 percent of partners contributing time to pro bono legal provision.**

---

**FIRM NAME** | **COUNTRY** | **AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER** | **FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)**
---|---|---|---
Allen & Overy LLP | Australia | 16.61 | 47
Ashurst LLP | Australia | 46 | 50
Dentons | Australia | 14.86 | 31
DLA Piper | Australia | 77.01 | 65
Hogan Lovells | Australia | 24.28 | 50
K&L Gates LLP | Australia | 24.95 | 46
King & Wood Mallesons | Australia | 62.7 | -
Seyfarth Shaw | Australia | 11 | 26
White & Case | Australia | 26.22 | 63
Country Average | | 25.16 | 41.12

There is a well-established, thriving culture of pro bono in England and Wales, which extends to all representatives of the legal profession – from solicitors to barristers and law school students to retired lawyers – and in both England and Wales, with a steady increase of firms based outside of London that engage in pro bono work.

The success of pro bono in England and Wales is due in part to the support of robust infrastructure. Within the last 20 years, several NGOs have been established to provide specialised pro bono opportunities to lawyers in England and Wales, ranging from international organisations to human rights focused services, from those sourcing pro bono opportunities for barristers in England and Wales to citizen advice centres offering legal clinics, and services specialised in sourcing corporate and commercial pro bono support for NGOs and social enterprises.

Law firms in the country have also been proactive. In 2014, the UK Collaborative Plan for Pro Bono was set up to develop the UK’s pro bono infrastructure and encourage more law firms to commit to a minimum of 25 pro bono hours per fee earner per year. The Collaborative Plan has been increasing both in terms of membership – at the time of writing, over 60 leading national and international law firms were members – and in the amount of pro bono work completed by its members, with over 50 percent of lawyers engaged in pro bono (according to 2019 figures).1

The success of the UK Collaborative Plan in increasing pro bono provision also inspired in 2019 the creation of the In-House Pro Bono Group, an association of in-house counsel that aims to foster a pro bono culture among in-house lawyers.

The strong presence of pro bono within the legal profession in England and Wales is evident in the annual Pro Bono Week. In 2020, the 19th edition of the celebration featured more than 50 events and, for the first time, representatives from across the UK organised sessions.

Following a year when social impact organisations and society have suffered the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic, we expect need for pro bono in England and Wales will grow. Lawyers are preparing themselves to expand the amount of pro bono they deliver, and this is shown in at least three trends. First, local pro bono groups are being established across England and Wales to coordinate pro bono support outside of London and to be in closer contact with the beneficiaries, be they individuals or local NGOs. Second, there is a growing interest in pro bono among in-house legal teams, a development that has the potential to hugely increase the number of lawyers working pro bono to support and offer business expertise to UK-based NGOs and social enterprises. Finally, pro bono culture is becoming more institutionalised and ingrained in law firm operations. In 2019, 88 percent of members of the UK Collaborative Plan counted pro bono work toward determining bonuses, and 30 out of 45 UK law firms that took part in the UK Collaborative Plan Report employed a (full- or part-time) pro bono professional. Moreover, an increasing number of leading law firms are hiring dedicated pro bono associates.

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. Index participation among law firms with offices in England and Wales stood at 54 participating firms for 2020. In this jurisdiction, fee earners performed an average of 19.55 hours of pro bono each. Furthermore, over a third of fee earners performed 10 or more hours of pro bono work, with 35 percent of lawyers meeting this threshold. Partners performed an average of 10.17 hours in 2020, with 38 percent of them dedicating time to pro bono work in the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>AVERAGE HOURS PER FEE EARNER</th>
<th>FEE EARNERS WITH 10+ HOURS OF PRO BONO (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;L Goodbody</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>31.47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Thai Legal</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Porter Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>95.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Cox</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>30.64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXA XL</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates Wells</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadwalader, Wickersham &amp; Taft LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olsowang LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooley LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>56.26</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravath, Swaine &amp; Moore LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>39.27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>67.93</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentsu Aegis Network</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Procter LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gowling WLG</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Chambers</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Smith Freehills LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>32.32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Name</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Average Hours Per Fee Earnings</td>
<td>Fee Earners with 10+ Hours of Pro Bono (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley Napley LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legance - Avvocati Associati</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>21.18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishcon de Reya</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milbank LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>50.51</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>68.42</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Weiss</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes &amp; Gray</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>35.24</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth Shaw</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>37.76</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons &amp; Simmons LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>97.94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steptoe and Johnson</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan &amp; Cromwell LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Wessing LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Sykes &amp; Higham LLP t/a VSH Law</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>70.41</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>34.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The United States is an international leader in the provision of pro bono legal services. It is home to a robust and diverse pro bono community, with law firms, bar associations, and intermediary organisations driving growth around the country. The four years between the 2016 Index and the 2020 Index presented many challenges to the most vulnerable communities in the United States. However, these challenges have also created opportunities for pro bono lawyers to step up and support in relevant social justice issues. According to the American Bar Association (and other relevant bodies), more lawyers are participating in pro bono legal services than ever before due to these challenges.\(^1\) According to the “Report on the Nature and Prevalence of Pro Bono Partner Roles Globally”, published in February 2020 by the Australian Pro Bono Centre, the Pro Bono Institute in Washington DC, the Thomson Reuters Foundation and DLA Piper, the US currently has the largest number of pro bono partners in the world.\(^2\)

Legislation and requirements around legal pro bono have not changed materially since 2016. New York continues to be the only state that requires qualifying hours of pro bono service for state bar admission. Only nine states (Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico and New York) currently require attorneys to report their pro bono hours.\(^3\) The lack of changes in legislation has not prevented the legal pro bono community from tackling the challenges presented in the years since the Index was last published.

On Jan. 27, 2017, then President Donald Trump signed an executive order imposing a ban on travel from seven majority-Muslim countries. As the Executive Order 13769 went into effect, thousands of protesters gathered at airports across the country. Thousands of lawyers set up clinics at airports and organised systems to handle volunteers and track travellers in one of the biggest urgent mobilisation efforts of pro bono legal assistance in the country. Immigration organisations continue to see pro bono lawyers showing up at immigration clinics, detention centres and other locales to assist separated minors, “Dreamers” (those minors protected under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals programme) and other immigrant communities affected by the different executive orders that have placed immigrants in the United States in a legal crisis.\(^4\)

In the same year, the #MeToo movement started an international debate on the sexual harassment, abuse and assault of women globally and has taken many directions since its inception in the United States. While much of the conversation has taken place on social media, pro bono lawyers have also taken action representing survivors of sexual molestation. In January 2018, TIME’S UP launched the Legal Defense Fund, housed and administered by the National Women’s Law Center Fund. The Legal Defense Fund was created to help survivors of sexual harassment and retaliation, especially low-income women and people of colour, achieve justice. There are more than 700 attorneys in the network taking on cases and helping people understand their rights at work. Many are taking sexual harassment cases on a pro bono basis.\(^5\)

A comparative analysis between 2016 and 2020 has not been carried out for this 2020 Index due to the samples in each year being significantly distinct. Forty-five firms with offices in the United States submitted information on their pro bono practices. On average, fee earners in the United States provided 70.12 hours of pro bono assistance each, a clear indication that the United States continues to be a world leader in the pro bono sector. The percentage of fee earners doing 10 or more hours of pro bono – 66 percent in the 2020 Index submissions – also

---

2. DLA Piper, the Australian Pro Bono Centre, the Pro Bono Institute in Washington DC and the Thomson Reuters Foundation. “Report on the Nature and Prevalence of Pro Bono Partner Roles Globally”. Available at: https://www.trust.org/publications/i/?id=4960b6d8-17c2-48cd-8c98-64f85213672
5. TIME’S UP. “TIME’S UP Legal Defense Fund”. Available at: https://timesupfoundation.org/about/our-story/
reflects that distinction. Furthermore, respondent firms indicated that 75 percent of partners engaged in some type of pro bono work. Firm partners also performed an average of 37.60 hours each, continuing to actively give back through pro bono.

The year 2020 was uniquely challenging for the world. In the United States, not only did the COVID-19 pandemic disproportionally impact low-income and minority communities, but there was also a historic movement around racial justice. In response to the growing legal needs of Americans arising from COVID-19, the American Bar Association created a nationwide task force of volunteer lawyers to identify the legal needs arising from the pandemic, make recommendations to address those needs, and mobilise volunteer lawyers and legal professionals to provide help. Law firms across the country also partnered with pro bono programmes to create legal clinics to help small businesses apply for federal funding.

As the summer of 2020 brought about a national movement to demand racial justice, pro bono lawyers and teams around the country stepped up to defend protesters and journalists unlawfully detained and started a conversation about how the law could be used to end systemic racism. The Association of Pro Bono Counsel (APBCo) brought together pro bono counsel to collaborate on addressing root causes of racial injustice. That collaboration led to the creation of the Law Firm Antiracism Alliance in June 2020. The Alliance connects pro bono lawyers around the United States with legal service organisations and initiatives focusing on racial justice and the law to create structural change. More than 240 law firms are now working together as members of the Alliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>88.74</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Overy LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>55.58</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Porter Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>104.09</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Cox</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXA XL</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell &amp; Berkowitz PC</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadwalader, Wickersham &amp; Taft LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb Steen &amp; Hamilton LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooley LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>52.57</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravath, Swaine &amp; Moore LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>68.83</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>114.54</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


7 The American Lawyer. “We Have to Succeed: Law Firm Antiracism Alliance Holds First Summit”. Available at: https://www.law.com/americanlawyer/2020/07/31/we-have-to-succeed-law-firm-antiracism-alliance-holds-first-summit/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRO BONO HOURS EACH FIRM HAS DONE (FEE-EARNER HOURS)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF LAWYERS THAT HAVE PERFORMED 10 OR MORE HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dechert LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>97.13</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentons</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>51.39</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>57.19</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Morris LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>49.91</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>87.75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>90.64</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide Loyrette Nouel</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Procter LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>64.52</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Lovells US LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>87.96</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland Hart</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&amp;L Gates LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>63.34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>64.47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>86.87</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer Levin Naftalis &amp; Frankel LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>123.07</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>88.57</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legance - Avvocati Associati</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linklaters</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>100.15</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loeb &amp; Loeb LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>37.76</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowenstein Sandler LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>58.03</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Brown LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>74.12</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrick Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>129.53</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hastings LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>102.46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Weiss</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>155.56</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>46.06</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth Shaw</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearman &amp; Sterling LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>79.36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &amp; Flom (UK) LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>144.16</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steptoe and Johnson</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>79.62</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan &amp; Cromwell LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>54.36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Gotshal &amp; Manges (London) LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>65.78</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>89.08</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>137.99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>70.126</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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