THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND CONDUCT

PRACTICAL GUIDANCE FOR THE USE OF
GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE PRACTICE OF LAW

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Applicable Authorities	Practical Guidance
Duty of Confidentiality Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6068, subd. (e) Rule 1.6 Rule 1.8.2	Generative AI products are able to utilize the information that is input, including prompts and uploaded documents or resources, to train the AI, and might also share the query with third parties or use it for other purposes. Even if the product does not utilize or share inputted information, it may lack reasonable or adequate security. A lawyer must not input any confidential information of the client into any generative AI solution that lacks adequate confidentiality and security protections. A lawyer must anonymize client information and avoid entering details that can be used to identify the client. A lawyer or law firm should consult with IT professionals or cybersecurity experts to ensure that any AI system in which a lawyer would input confidential client information adheres to stringent security, confidentiality, and data retention protocols. A lawyer should review the Terms of Use or other information to determine how the product utilizes inputs. A lawyer who intends to use confidential information in a generative AI product should ensure that the provider does not share inputted information with third parties or utilize the information for its own use in any manner, including to train or improve its product.
Duties of Competence and Diligence Rule 1.1 Rule 1.3	It is possible that generative AI outputs could include information that is false, inaccurate, or biased. A lawyer must ensure competent use of the technology, including the associated benefits and risks, and apply diligence and prudence with respect to facts and law. Before using generative AI, a lawyer should understand to a reasonable degree how the technology works, its limitations, and the applicable terms of use and other policies governing the use and exploitation of client data by the product. Overreliance on AI tools is inconsistent with the active practice of law and application of trained judgment by the lawyer. AI-generated outputs can be used as a starting point but must be carefully scrutinized. They should be critically analyzed for

Applicable Authorities	Practical Guidance
	accuracy and bias, supplemented, and improved, if necessary. A lawyer must critically review, validate, and correct both the input and the output of generative AI to ensure the content accurately reflects and supports the interests and priorities of the client in the matter at hand, including as part of advocacy for the client. The duty of competence requires more than the mere detection and elimination of false AI-generated results.
	A lawyer's professional judgment cannot be delegated to generative AI and remains the lawyer's responsibility at all times. A lawyer should take steps to avoid over-reliance on generative AI to such a degree that it hinders critical attorney analysis fostered by traditional research and writing. For example, a lawyer may supplement any AI-generated research with human-performed research and supplement any AI-generated argument with critical, human-performed analysis and review of authorities.
Duty to Comply with the Law Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6068(a) Rule 8.4 Rule 1.2.1	A lawyer must comply with the law and cannot counsel a client to engage, or assist a client in conduct that the lawyer knows is a violation of any law, rule, or ruling of a tribunal when using generative AI tools. There are many relevant and applicable legal issues surrounding generative AI, including but not limited to compliance with AI-specific laws, privacy laws, cross-border data transfer laws, intellectual property laws, and cybersecurity concerns. A lawyer should analyze the relevant laws and regulations applicable to the attorney or the client.
Duty to Supervise Lawyers and Nonlawyers, Responsibilities of Subordinate Lawyers Rule 5.1 Rule 5.2 Rule 5.3	Managerial and supervisory lawyers should establish clear policies regarding the permissible uses of generative AI and make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm adopts measures that give reasonable assurance that the firm's lawyers and non lawyers' conduct complies with their professional obligations when using generative AI. This includes providing training on the ethical and practical aspects, and pitfalls, of any generative AI use. A subordinate lawyer must not use generative AI at the direction of a supervisory lawyer in a manner that violates the subordinate lawyer's professional responsibility and obligations.

Applicable Authorities	Practical Guidance
Communication Regarding Generative AI Use Rule 1.4 Rule 1.2	A lawyer should evaluate their communication obligations throughout the representation based on the facts and circumstances, including the novelty of the technology, risks associated with generative AI use, scope of the representation, and sophistication of the client. The lawyer should consider disclosure to their client that they intend to use generative AI in the representation, including how the technology will be used, and the benefits and risks of such use. A lawyer should review any applicable client instructions or guidelines that may restrict or limit the use of generative AI.
Charging for Work Produced by Generative AI and Generative AI Costs Rule 1.5 Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 6147–6148	A lawyer may use generative AI to more efficiently create work product and may charge for actual time spent (e.g., crafting or refining generative AI inputs and prompts, or reviewing and editing generative AI outputs). A lawyer must not charge hourly fees for the time saved by using generative AI. Costs associated with generative AI may be charged to the clients in compliance with applicable law. A fee agreement should explain the basis for all fees and costs, including those associated with the use of generative AI.
Candor to the Tribunal; and Meritorious Claims and Contentions Rule 3.1 Rule 3.3	A lawyer must review all generative AI outputs, including, but not limited to, analysis and citations to authority for accuracy before submission to the court, and correct any errors or misleading statements made to the court. A lawyer should also check for any rules, orders, or other requirements in the relevant jurisdiction that may necessitate the disclosure of the use of generative AI.
Prohibition on Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation Rule 8.4.1	Some generative AI is trained on biased information, and a lawyer should be aware of possible biases and the risks they may create when using generative AI (e.g., to screen potential clients or employees). Lawyers should engage in continuous learning about AI biases and their implications in legal practice, and firms should establish policies and mechanisms to identify, report, and address potential AI biases.

Applicable Authorities	Practical Guidance
Professional Responsibilities Owed to Other Jurisdictions Rule 8.5	A lawyer should analyze the relevant laws and regulations of each jurisdiction in which a lawyer is licensed to ensure compliance with such rules.