Consultant Law Firms and Consultant Lawyers

One of the developments in the post-Legal Services Act 2007 legal landscape is the establishment and growth of consultant law firms. These are firms providing a central platform on which individual consultant lawyers work.

Unlike the traditional law firm model, consultants are self-employed and receive a share of the fees they generate rather than a salary, profit share or bonus. Like traditional law firms, they come in a variety of types and sizes and operate across areas of specialism.

This Loss Prevention Standard summarises the additional risks consultant law firms can face and the techniques that can be used to mitigate those risks.

Version: 1.0
Date: 24th June 2026

Consultant Law Firms and Consultant Lawyers

Introduction

A consultant law firm is an organisation which provides central infrastructure such as IT support, HR, secretarial and other support services as well as insurance and SRA authorisation to individual, self-employed consultant lawyers working within that organisation.

In traditional law firms, clients pay the firm which then pays its lawyers via mechanisms such as salary, bonuses or profit share. In consultant law firms, the organisation retains a percentage of the fees generated by the consultants in exchange for the provision of the central infrastructure / platform on which to practice. The consultants are remunerated by the balance of those fees.

Consultant law firms are therefore also known as platform firms or fee-share firms. In this LPS, for ease and consistency, the term *"consultant law firm"* is used to refer to the organisations and the term *"consultant"* is used to refer to the lawyers within them.

There are multiple benefits to this model for organisations, consultants and clients. Those benefits have resulted in both the number and size of consultant law firms increasing significantly post-Legal Services Act 2007 – making them an established feature of the legal services market in England and Wales. According to Codex Edge[1], in or by the end of 2024:

- There were 8 consultant law firms which each had more than 100 consultants working within them;
- The 10 biggest consultant law firms had 2,961 consultants collectively;
- 7 of the 10 biggest consultant law firms increased headcount by more than 10%;
- 4 of the top 10 law firms in England and Wales in terms of additional headcount (excluding M&A activity) were consultant law firms; and
- Growth was supported by retention. None of the 10 biggest consultant law firms had a retention rate lower than 88%. Retention rates were even higher in consultant law firms with fewer than 30 consultants.

However, there are also additional risks and challenges for and with consultant law firms. It is on these, together with potential strategies for mitigating them, that this Loss Prevention Standard focuses.

[1] See "Standards, Sources and Useful Links" below.

Risk Management Benefits of the Consultant Law Firm Model

The risk management benefits of consultant law firms include:

- **Consultant law firms tend to have a greater proportion of senior lawyers than traditional law firms**. One of the common features of the consultant law firm is that consultants generate work in much the same way as partners do in the traditional law firm model[2]. That generally means consultants need to have a client following before joining a consultant law firm. That following usually takes time to build. With that time comes experience, knowledge and reputation. Work in consultant law firms therefore tends to be more 'partner-led' / done at a higher post-qualification experience ("PQE") level than in traditional firms. Experience and knowledge can reduce the likelihood of mistakes leading to insurance claims;
- **Consultants have a direct financial interest in satisfying clients**. Lawyers generate a following by building relationships with clients, doing quality work for them and delivering good service levels. Clients are hard won but easily lost. Consultants having a direct financial interest in attracting and retaining them can be a powerful additional motivation to continue providing high standards of work and service;
- **Consultants tend to have fewer non-fee earning commitments than similarly qualified lawyers within a traditional law firm would have**. The platform provides the operational infrastructure and there are no (or reduced) additional requirements – such as recruiting and managing teams or overseeing business strategy – on consultants. This enables consultants to focus more on clients and carrying out their legal work;
- **Initial investment followed by sustainable growth and proportionate investment**. Growth is clearly positive for any business, but problems can occur when firms either grow without the requisite initial and ongoing investment in infrastructure or grow too fast for the infrastructure. Consultant law firms generally require a more significant initial investment in infrastructure at the outset than a traditional law firm start up to first attract consultants. Thereafter, there is both the motive for ongoing investment (consultants will demand it) and the opportunity (more consultants means a firm share of more income);
- **High retention levels**. Lawyer turnover can cause problems such as incomplete handovers, delays during handovers, lack of resource, reduction in expertise and managerial distraction (whilst recruitment occurs) – all of which can lead to insurance claims. As summarised above, there is evidence to suggest consultant law firms have better retention levels than traditional models.

There are also benefits for lawyers. Remuneration via a share of fees generated can be more lucrative than traditional remuneration via salary or partnership. Platform law firms can also offer greater autonomy and flexibility – both in terms of ways, times and places of working and in terms of how lawyers run their 'business'. As above, there is also the removal of the non-fee earning commitments usually required of experienced lawyers.

[2] Some consultant law firms do, however, also seek to attract work to the firm and then distribute that work amongst their consultants. This is sometimes referred to as a "hybrid" consultant law firm model.

The Additional Risks of the Consultant Law Firm Model

Introduction

When considering the risks discussed in this section, the following should be noted:

- Most consultants, as with most lawyers in traditional law firms, want to do things in the right way and act in the best interests of their clients and firms. Many of the risks discussed below will only eventuate when that principle is either not applied by an individual/s or is disapplied in a discrete scenario; and
- Consultant law firms face many of the same risks and challenges as traditional law firms and the platform must be set up accordingly and compliantly with all regulatory requirements. This Loss Prevention Standard only discusses the additional risks of the consultant model, or where risks that apply to traditional law firms are potentially greater in the consultant model.

The Additional Risks

Some of the additional risks applicable to consultant law firms are as follows:

- **Compliance being neglected as it is a diversion from fee earning**. Compliance being seen as a diversion is a potential risk in every law firm – the perception is often that it is less interesting and rewarding than dealing with legal work involved in matters and it does not count towards chargeable hours targets. That is the case even where, as in traditional law firms, lawyers are either paid for the time spent on compliance (via their salary) or have an interest in the compliance of their firm (whether by employment or a partnership stake), in addition to their own regulatory obligations. However, this risk can be magnified by the consultant model – consultants are not paid when they are not fee earning and their self-employed status can reduce the sense of a firm-wide ethos.

- **Reduced collaboration on cases**. Having more than one lawyer collaborating on cases reduces the risk of technical or practical errors being made. 'Silos' can develop when consultants wish to retain 'their' work and therefore fees, rather than involve others. Equally, consultants may be less willing to collaborate on other consultants' matters if that work is not remunerated or less well remunerated than other work. An extension of this is potential competitiveness or reduced levels of information or experience sharing amongst consultants. The temptation to compete is a human behavioural trait and the consultant law firm model is an approach which potentially leads to that trait manifesting. Information or experience sharing is relatively common in traditional law firms, but the consultant law firm model could also produce a lack of willingness on the part of consultants to do so in order to maintain a competitive edge.

- **Key person dependencies**. Any model emphasising individuals and risking a lack of collaboration also presents an increased risk of key person dependencies. This is a problem whenever that key person is absent (whether as a result of annual leave, illness or departure from the firm) – which can be particularly problematic in an often time-sensitive context such as legal practice.

- **Individualism – lack of a 'firm style' or 'firm approach' / reduced compliance with firm practices.** Clients usually instruct either a firm or a lawyer – and often do so due to the style or approach of that firm or lawyer. Whilst some consultant law firms seek to attract work to the firm as well as relying on the consultants to generate it[3], the majority of instructions received by consultant law firms will be instructions received by the consultant, not the firm, meaning that the style or approach of individual consultant will be a more significant factor in more instructions to a consultant law firm than a traditional law firm. Whilst all lawyers will have different styles and approaches and that is to be encouraged (particularly when it is a reason for the instruction), a minimum level of consistency and compliance is required in how matters are handled. For example, regardless of a lawyer's style, there are risk management benefits in ensuring a level of consistency of approach to matters such as onboarding, engagement letters, fees, document management and minimum service levels.
- **Potentially reduced levels of supervision and oversight.** Reduced levels of supervision and oversight may result from a potential lack of team structures, a perception that it is less required given the generally increased levels of lawyer experience in consultant law firms or inadequate processes and procedures. This issue relates both to supervision of work, but also to wider issues such as wellbeing / mental health. Mistakes can be made when individuals are suffering from mental health or wellbeing issues and may go unnoticed for longer when supervision and oversight levels are reduced. This issue may combine with the issue around capacity management discussed below.
- **Mission creep.** Consultants may be more tempted to do work either totally or partially outside their expertise (whether that work arises as a new / separate instruction or the initial scope of work expands). This might be because they have a more direct and personal financial interest in the work they carry out. It might also be borne out of a desire to retain a client / keep a client happy.
- **Consultants' role creep and potential other commitments.** Some consultants may have other roles, business interests or activities which can create potential risks such as liability to the firm for those other activities and risk to client money / assets / data / confidentiality.
- **Capacity management.** In a traditional law firm, exceeding targets is often only indirectly rewarded via bonuses or promotion possibilities, which often do not correlate particularly closely with the additional work carried out. With consultant law firms, the correlation between work and pay is much closer and therefore the temptation to 'make hay' greater. Service issues and mistakes can occur when lawyers work beyond their capacity – with the problem potentially exacerbated by some of the other issues discussed in this section.
- **Servicing the work.** Ensuring the right work is done at the right level. Whilst having a higher average PQE is usually a benefit, there are common legal tasks that are often more suited to junior or trainee lawyers or non-qualified staff (for example, preparing trial bundles or reviewing disclosure in a civil matter) – whether because they are actually better at it as they have recent experience of it or because they can carry it out at more proportionate or economic rates.

[3] See note 2.

Resourcing more administrative legal tasks also means consultants can spend more time on advice, strategy and client relations.

- **Financial challenges**. The fee-share model presents different (but not necessarily riskier) financial challenges than those that exist in traditional law firms. The consultant law firm's profit and funds potentially available for re-investment are essentially more 'baked-in' than that of a traditional law firm, because it is set by the fee-share percentage. This may mean that a consultant law firm is less able to make one-off investments or deal with sudden increases in costs. The financial benefit of the consultant law firm model is that it ought to be better insulated against falling work levels or other market challenges because, in the event of a fall in work levels or other market challenges, its main costs (the majority of salaries) fall commensurately whilst traditional law firms still have salary obligations even when lawyers are doing reduced fee earning (consultants are not salaried).
- **Potential handbrakes on growth**. Traditional law firms are often able to grow by 'cross-selling' other teams / services to existing clients. Similarly, they are often able to attract larger or repeat clients by offering cross-team expertise. The potential challenges in achieving collaboration and cross-selling in the consultant law firm model have been discussed above. Given the current market[4], this risk is not currently eventuating. However, the same research[5] also mentions a potential future challenge of recruitment if the pool of available lawyers seeking to work on a consultancy basis is exhausted.
- **Responsibility for strategy can be focussed on fewer people**. In the traditional law firm model, responsibility for strategy and the organisation generally can vest in a relatively large proportion or number of individuals - some or all the partners in that firm, for example. With the consultant law firm model, consultants generally do not have a like stake in, or responsibility for, strategy and the organisation generally – which may be focussed on a single founder / director or a small group of founders / directors.

Managing the additional risks

This sub-section focuses on suggested ways the additional risks can be managed. The checklist attached to this Loss Prevention Standard is designed to help in assessing vulnerabilities, any gaps in risk management and the adequacy of existing risk management.

We have identified three overarching principles which mitigate against many of the risks:

- **Get recruitment right**. Attracting and retaining good consultants is paramount. Good lawyers who want to work in the right way will naturally also want to do things in the right way and act in the best interests of their clients and firms – regardless of the nature of the firm. It is also important to recruit the right consultants for the platform. Each consultant law firm is different. Some will be better suited to some consultants than others (and vice-versa). The greater the alignment between the firm and the consultant, the less likely the risks discussed above are to eventuate;

[4] See page 1 and note 1 above.
[5] See note 1 above.

- **Get the platform right - via both initial and ongoing investment**. Firm policies, processes and manuals must be robust and compliance with them must be closely monitored. Given the nature of the model, it would also be highly beneficial for them to be centralised to ensure consistent application. This requires relatively high initial, and thereafter sufficient ongoing, levels of investment in the platform. In turn, that means the fee retention percentage must be adequate to maintain that investment whilst not making the firm unattractive to consultants or uncompetitive with other consultant law firms; and
- **Get the culture right**. A firm ethos centred around principles like collaboration, support and consistency can mitigate against problems associated with the remote, individualistic way of working which can affect the consultant law firm model. A good culture which consultants support can also improve retention.

More specific risk management techniques may include:

- **Consider making consultants contractually liable for some or all the insurance excess in the event they are responsible for a claim being made.** This can focus consultants on the importance of compliance and risk management. It can also discourage practices such as mission creep and the temptation to work beyond reasonable workloads. It is not, however, a panacea. It may encourage consultants to 'hide' otherwise notifiable circumstances. It may further discourage collaboration and embed siloed working (one possible response to potentially being liable for a mistake on a matter would be to ensure that the mistake they are liable for was at least theirs). There are also potential complications which need to be considered. For example, there may be an internal dispute over who was responsible for a mistake on a file being worked on by two or more consultants, or a consultant may argue the cause of the claim was following the firm's own procedures. Other issues include what happens in the event that the firm's excess in any particular policy year has been exhausted by the time a particular excess is due, what if there is disagreement on claims liability / resolution strategy and what would happen if the consultant leaves the firm before payment is required (professional indemnity claims have a notoriously 'long tail' between a mistake being made and a claim being made, let alone payment for that claim being made). Further, for the clause to have any effect, firms need to ensure that consultants could pay if the clause was enforced (being contractually liable to pay money is not the same as being able to pay);

- **Reflective remuneration.** Remuneration policies can encourage / embed numerous positive risk management behaviours. For example, remuneration policies (in addition to the fee share) could be used to encourage or require:
  - ✓ Collaborative working and work on matters 'belonging to' other consultants;
  - ✓ Cross-referrals (such as referral fees); and
  - ✓ Tasks which are not directly fee-earning but which are common in the traditional law firm model, such as carrying out peer reviews.
- **Ensure consultancy agreements include other desired obligations**. Examples might include requirements such as carrying out a certain number of peer reviews per month or provision of training. They could also include matters such as providing cover during other consultants' annual leave or absence.

- **Encourage or facilitate agreements between consultants.** Agreements do not need to be exclusively between the firm and consultant. Consultants could agree co-working practices (such as annual leave cover, illness cover or capacity support) with each other – whether this is via a reciprocal arrangement or via remuneration. The firm should ensure it is aware of all such arrangements and monitors their efficacy.
- **Encourage (or require) office working and other forms of informal collaboration.** These could be as straightforward as providing a case management system on which consultants can access other consultants' matters where there is no reason to restrict such access.

- **Identify areas which should be dealt with in accordance with firm-wide principles.** As set out above, whilst the styles and approaches of individual lawyers can vary (and this should be encouraged when it is a reason for the client instructing that lawyer), there are areas where consistency yields significant risk management benefits. Examples of this include client onboarding, engagement terms, document management and minimum client service levels.
- **Have a peer review process.**
- **Have an audit process.** Including those areas the firm has identified as justifying a consistent approach.
- **Consider other areas which could be monitored real time to improve the firm's supervision and oversight of its consultants.** These could include monitoring inactive files, incoming communications or consultants' time recording figures. It could also include obtaining client feedback both during and following the conclusion of matters.
- **Operate on a hybrid basis**[6]. This can assist with issues such as key person dependency, collaboration and capacity management. It can also make the consultant law firm more financially robust. It does, however, create a potential 'challenge on both fronts' scenario whereby the firm has all the risks of a traditional law firm as well as the additional risks of a consultant law firm.
- **Manage finances prudently.** Ensure adequate financial reserves / levels of retained profit are available to permit investment and to manage market forces.
- **Have strong corporate governance and accountability principles, with strategic and general responsibility split between a number of individuals and audited.** Also consider giving consultants a say in the management and strategic direction of the firm.
- **Provide comprehensive training at the outset (onboarding) and on an ongoing basis covering both issues specific to consultant law firms and general issues.** Strong onboarding training can inform, emphasise and embed everything above from the outset. Further ongoing training, even if the training is repeated and therefore serves as a refresher, should also be provided. Of course, the consultants have continuing competence requirements from the regulator and firms must monitor this as part of their obligation to ensure their consultants are competent to carry out their role in any event.

[6] Some consultant law firms, as they mature, have begun to employ lawyers / fee earners (or those training to become lawyers) on a more traditional basis, in addition to consultants.

Checklist

A Consultant Law Firm Checklist is presented in Appendix 1 which can be tailored to your own organisation.

Contact Information

United Kingdom

Please visit Aviva Risk Management Solutions or email us at riskadvice@aviva.com. To speak to one of our advisors, call 0345 366 6666.*

*The cost of calls to 03 prefixed numbers are charged at national call rates (charges may vary dependent on your network provider) and are usually included in inclusive minute plans from landlines and mobiles. For our joint protection telephone calls may be recorded and/or monitored.

Canada

Please visit Aviva Risk Management Solutions | Aviva Canada or email us at arms.canada@aviva.com

Ireland

Please visit Insurance Risk Management | Business Risk Management Insurance - Aviva Ireland or Email us at armsireland@aviva.com

Specialist Partner Services

Aviva have created a network of Specialist Partners to complement our in-house capabilities and to enable our policyholders to benefit from a wide range of risk management solutions at preferential rates and terms. Together, we provide solutions to help with the significant challenges of modern-day risk management.

Note: These partner relationships are wholly for the benefit of our policyholders with no income to Aviva.

United Kingdom

For more information please visit: Aviva Risk Management Solutions - Specialist Partners

Ireland

For more information please visit: Insurance Risk Management | Business Risk Management Insurance - Aviva Ireland

Canada

For more information please visit: Our Specialist Partner Network | Aviva Canada

Standards, Sources and Useful Links

United Kingdom

- Platform Firms Report 2025
- SRA | Solicitors Regulation Authority | Solicitors Regulation Authority

Additional Information

Loss Prevention Standards

These documents set out best practice recommendations to help reduce the likelihood and impact of losses.

Please visit Loss Prevention Standards to view the full library.

Aviva Risks Training Solutions (United Kingdom Only)

Aviva Risk Training Solutions, delivered through our Specialist Partner, SafetyCulture, provide free, bite-sized learning modules exclusively for Aviva policyholders.

Please visit Aviva Risk Training Solutions for further guidance.

Appendix 1 – Consultant Law Firms and Consultant Lawyers Checklist

Location	
Date	
Completed by (name and signature)	

	Recruitment and Selection of Consultants	Y/N	Comments
1.	In addition to the usual recruitment considerations, does our recruitment and selection policy: • Consider the purpose of the hire from a firm and strategic perspective (i.e. is the hire for growth, to supplement existing expertise, to expand into new practice areas)? • Assess the overall level of central support the consultant will require and the capacity of the platform to deliver that support (this could be as straightforward as assessing the consultant's likely work levels, or could consider aspects such as whether the consultant works in higher risk work areas)? • Assess whether the consultant will require any specialist support (for example, due to the nature of the work being carried out) and, if so, how that will be resourced? • Ask about their claims and regulatory records? • If the consultant is applying from a traditional law firm, query why they are doing so? • If the consultant is applying from another consultant law firm, query what it is about our platform they think suits them better and why they are doing so? • Determine the clients are they proposing to work for? Will any restrictive covenants affect that? Are there any actual or potential conflicts with existing clients of the firm? • Assess how the consultant would fit culturally?		

	Recruitment and Selection of Consultants Cont'd	Y/N	Comments
2.	What is the ratio of consultants accepted v rejected and does this support a conclusion that the recruitment and selection processes are being applied rigorously and effectively?		
3.	Is the recruitment decision reappraised and monitored once consultants are onboarded and at regular intervals thereafter?		
4.	What is the firm's retention rate over the following periods: • 0 – 12 months; • 1 - 2 years; • 3 – 5 years; and • 5 years+		
5.	If consultants leave the practice, are the reasons for them doing so evaluated and do we consider whether improvements could be made in future to reduce recurrence?		

	Contractual Arrangements with Consultants	Y/N	Comments
Note: A number of these issues may need to be consistent (a) from the date of recruitment of the first consultant (b) from the time of recruiting a consultant. The first may be important as having different terms with different consultants may lead to disenchantment. The second may be important as consultants are unlikely to agree any variation to their terms which are, or are perceived to be, disadvantageous to them.			
6.	What level of fee retention is appropriate / necessary? **Note:** The level of fees retained should strike a balance between facilitating the necessary level of ongoing investment in support functions and other necessary business expenditure whilst not being so high as to render the firm uncompetitive for / financially unattractive to, consultants.		
7.	• Will we specify a target / minimum level of overall fee income / fee contribution? • If so, what will that figure be?		

	Contractual Arrangements with Consultants Cont'd	Y/N	Comments
8.	• As a firm, do we consider it appropriate to make consultants contractually liable for the insurance excess in the event of a claim being made on that consultant's matter / do our contracts contain such a clause? If N, move to the next question. If Y, consider the following: • Does the wording of the clause deal with various potentially difficult scenarios? For example, what happens: ▪ In the event of a dispute over who is ▪ responsible for an error? ▪ If the aggregate excess has already been paid in ▪ any given policy year? ▪ If the consultant disagrees with a ▪ claim resolution that would require payment of the excess (such as settlement)? ▪ If the consultant leaves the firm before payment is required? ▪ If the firm's excess increases? Is the ▪ above rechecked? Does the clause have sufficient flexibility to take this into account? • Have we checked consultants could pay if called upon to do so? If so, how? Are those checks periodically updated? For example, consultants may arrange a separate insurance policy in respect of the potential liability to pay the excess.		
9.	• Do our agreements have a claims co-operation clause requiring consultants to assist in the defence of a claim if made? • Does that clause continue to have effect even if the consultant leaves the firm?		
10.	Are there any other remuneration-related clauses which need to be inserted? If so, what? For example: If a consultant brings a client or matter into the firm with which he or she may not best placed to deal (whether for reasons of specialism, knowledge, experience, capacity or some other reason), will we have a referral scheme or other form of reflective remuneration?		

	Contractual Arrangements with Consultants Cont'd	Y/N	Comments
11.	What other matters need to be covered in our agreements with our consultants? For example: Do consultants have to fulfil a certain number of 'non fee-earning' tasks such as carrying out peer reviews or providing training? Or should consultants have requirements to provide things like holiday or illness cover and, if so, on what basis is that provided?		
12.	• Where consultants have other roles, business interests or activities, are they contractually required to inform the firm of these? • Are there contractual provisions dealing with (a) responsibility for those other roles / interests (b) clear separation of firm and other business (including use of company systems, technology, name etc.) (c) security (including IT security, client data and information, client money etc.)? • Is compliance monitored? • Are consultants trained on the importance of separation and how to achieve the same?		
13.	• Do we permit or facilitate arrangements (such as holiday cover or illness cover) between consultants? • On what basis are these arrangements, remuneration or reciprocity? • If so, how do we ensure the firm is aware of all such arrangements?		

	Client Matters and Processes	Y/N	Comments
14.	• Do we have all necessary compliance processes (such as client onboarding, anti-money laundering, file opening, source of wealth, breach registers, fraud prevention and IT security) in place? • Are these processes tailored to the particular challenges of consultant law firms? • For example, do we assess, at onboarding, whether the instructed consultant has the necessary skills and experience to handle the matter? • Are these processes adequate to cope with scenarios where consultants have other interests?		
15.	Are those processes centralised?		
16.	Do we have specialist / dedicated teams for those processes?		
17.	• Is compliance with the processes monitored and reviewed? • If so, how?		
18.	How does the firm ensure that matters which require more than one lawyer (whether for reasons of specialism, capacity, general collaboration or any other reason) are identified at the outset and, thereafter, handled accordingly?		
19.	Do we monitor the proportion of files which have more than one lawyer working on them vs those that only have one lawyer working on them?		
20.	If a file only has one lawyer working on it, are any additional safeguards, such as additional peer review, put in place?		
21.	Do we have a peer review process and, if so, what are the details of that process?		
22.	• Whilst the individual approaches and styles of lawyers can be accommodated (and, in many cases, encouraged), in which areas is a firm-wide approach required? • In those areas, is compliance with the firm-wide approach monitored?		

	Client Matters and Processes Cont'd	Y/N	Comments
23.	Do we have a file audit process and, if so, what are the details of that process?		
24.	• In addition to the above, how are consultants supervised and overseen? • Against what parameters / metrics? • Who by? For example: In addition to audits and peer reviews, central monitoring of things like incoming correspondence, time recording or inactive files could identify issues such as overwork / lack of capacity or lack of progress on files before those issues escalate and produce complaints / insurance claims.		
25.	• Do we seek client feedback during a matter? • Do we do so at the conclusion of a matter? • If so, what questions are asked?		

	Firm Structure and Management	Y/N	Comments
26.	What is the firm's management and team structure? Does this allow for effective supervision, collaboration and oversight?		
27.	Is the firm purely a consultant law firm, or will it employ some lawyers on a more traditional basis (the hybrid model referred to above)?		
28.	• Does the firm seek to attract work to it as an entity, or rely on its consultants to do so? • If so, how are those matters resourced and how are fees apportioned? • Do we have a percentage target of 'firm-won' work v 'consultant-won' work and if so what is it?		
29.	• Is the firm financially stable and would it be able to deal with a financial event such as a sudden fall in turnover, increase in costs or a large required / desired investment? • If so, how? • What level of retained profit / reserves is appropriate and does the firm hit that level?		

	Firm Structure and Management Cont'd	Y/N	Comments
31.	Are the organisations' directors accountable to the consultants and, if so, how?		
31.	Do some or all of the consultants have a 'say' in the strategic direction of the firm?		

	Firm Culture and Values	Y/N	Comments
32.	How, if at all, is the firm's 'offering' to consultants different from other consultant law firms? *For example, do we seek to 'compete on price' (not recommended), have a unique specialism, focus or other USP, will we seek to compete by having best in class central functions?*		
33.	What is the platform's culture and what are the platform's values?		
34.	How are these nurtured and embedded? What steps do we take? What further steps could we take?		
35.	• Is this monitored and reviewed? • If so, how?		
36.	Are consultants given a say or involved in setting or reviewing the culture and / or values?		
37.	• What is the firm's office working policy? • What other collaborative working practices are in place? • Examples of facilitating collaborative working could include online meeting tools, the firm's case management system and intranet.		
38.	Does the firm's onboarding process include training on all the above with a focus on the risks specific to consultant law firms and the firm's approach to managing those risks?		

	Firm Culture and Values Cont'd	Y/N	Comments
39.	• Does the firm provide refresher training on topics covered during onboarding at regular intervals? • If so, how often?		
40.	Does the firm provide training when there are developments which affect consultants?		
41.	How does the firm ensure all consultants are and remain competent to carry out their roles?		
42.	Additional comments:		

Please Note

This document contains general information and guidance only and may be superseded and/or subject to amendment without further notice. Aviva has no liability to any third parties arising out of ARMS' communications whatsoever (including Loss Prevention Standards), and nor shall any third party rely on them. Other than liability which cannot be excluded by law, Aviva shall not be liable to any person for any indirect, special, consequential or other losses or damages of whatsoever kind arising out of access to, or use of, or reliance on anything contained in ARMS' communications. The document may not cover every risk, exposure or hazard that may arise, and Aviva recommend that you obtain specific advice relevant to the circumstances.

24th June 2026

Version 1.0

ARMSGI4272026

Aviva Insurance Limited, Registered in Scotland Number SC002116. Registered Office: Pitheavlis, Perth PH2 0NH.
Authorised by the Prudential Regulation Authority and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority and the Prudential Regulation Authority.