

AI Readiness Checklist for Law Firms

A working file for your malpractice carrier, your ethics counsel and your own vendor records

Version 1.1 · October 2026 · support@ramtekintelligence.com

Bar guidance and insurers now expect a firm that uses AI to show three things: that it chose its tools with care, that a lawyer checks what the tools produce, and that it can explain both. This file helps you do that. It is written for any firm using AI tools, and it also records, honestly, what Ramtek does and does not offer today.

What is in this file

Part	What it is for
Part 1: Your firm	A checklist of what your firm should have in place, by duty. Tick it, note the evidence you keep.
Part 2: Vendor file	Twelve areas to ask any AI vendor about, with Ramtek's answers today, including the gaps.
Part 3: Carrier worksheet	The topics insurers and brokers report asking about, with space for your answers.
Part 4: Policy starter	A one-page AI use policy you can edit and adopt.
Part 5: Records to keep	What to put in your vendor file, and how to pull Ramtek's records.

This is not legal advice or an ethics opinion. Rules differ by state and by court; check your own jurisdiction's rules and any standing orders, and consult your ethics counsel or carrier where it matters. Rule numbers refer to the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct.

Status words used in Part 2: Yes = Ramtek does this today. Partly = true with limits stated in the answer. No = Ramtek does not offer it. On request = Ramtek will provide it when asked.

Part 1: What your firm should have in place

Grouped by the duty each item serves. These are practical actions drawn from ABA Formal Opinion 512 (2024) and the Model Rules it applies, not a statement of what any one state requires.

Competence (Rule 1.1)

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	Someone at the firm has read ABA Formal Opinion 512 and your state bar's guidance on generative AI, and the firm knows where to find both.	Copy of each opinion in the vendor file
☐	Each lawyer who uses an AI tool understands, at a reasonable level, what it can and cannot do, including that it can produce confident answers that are wrong.	Training date and attendee list
☐	The firm knows which AI model or service sits behind each tool it uses and what that provider does with data.	Vendor file, Part 2
☐	Time spent learning a new tool is not billed to a client as time on the client's matter.	Billing guidance to staff

Confidentiality (Rule 1.6) and security

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	Before client information goes into any AI tool, a lawyer has read the tool's terms, privacy notice and data handling description, and decided the risk is acceptable for that kind of information.	Signed-off vendor review (Part 2)
☐	The firm has asked whether the tool learns from, or is trained on, what you put in. If it does, the firm has either avoided client information or obtained informed consent, because general wording in an engagement letter is not enough.	Vendor answer in writing
☐	The firm has decided which kinds of information may NOT go into AI tools (for example sealed filings, grand jury material, or information a client has asked you to keep out), and staff know the list.	Policy, Part 4
☐	Access to the tool follows the firm's own access rules: named users, individual logins, two-factor sign-in turned on, people removed when they leave.	User list, date of last review
☐	The firm knows what it would do if the vendor reported a data incident, including which breach-notice laws apply and who contacts clients.	Incident steps in the policy

Verification and candor to the tribunal (Rules 1.1, 3.1, 3.3, 8.4(c))

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	A lawyer reads every AI-assisted document before it leaves the firm and takes responsibility for it.	Review mark or sign-off on the file

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	Every case, statute, rule and quotation that came from an AI tool is checked against a primary source before it is relied on or filed.	Verification step in the policy
☐	The firm has checked whether the courts it appears in, and individual judges' standing orders, require disclosure or certification of AI use, and has a way to comply.	List of courts and rules checked, with dates
☐	Facts in AI-drafted documents are checked against the file, not against the draft itself.	Checklist item on the matter

Communication with clients (Rule 1.4)

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	The firm has decided when it will tell clients about its use of AI, for example when a client asks, when a client's confidential information will go into a tool, when it affects the cost or the way the matter is handled, or when a court or the client requires it.	Written decision in the policy
☐	Where consent is needed, it is specific and informed: what tool, what information, what risks. It is not buried in boilerplate.	Consent wording and signed copies
☐	A client who asks how AI was used on their matter gets a straight answer, and the firm can find that answer.	AI Activity Log (Part 5)

Fees (Rule 1.5)

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	Hourly bills reflect the time a lawyer actually spent, including reviewing AI output. They do not bill the hours the AI saved as if a person had worked them.	Billing guidance to staff
☐	Any charge for an AI tool is disclosed, reasonable, and agreed with the client. General software overhead is not passed to clients unless agreed.	Engagement letter wording
☐	The firm has considered whether flat or value-based fees fit work where AI shortens the time.	Note to file

Supervision and firm policy (Rules 5.1 and 5.3)

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	The firm has a written AI use policy that managing lawyers have approved.	Policy, Part 4
☐	One named person owns AI tools: approves new ones, keeps the vendor file, and is the contact for questions.	Name and date in the policy

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	Lawyers and staff have been trained on the policy, and new joiners are trained as they arrive.	Training log
☐	The firm can see who used AI, on what kind of work, and which lawyer reviewed the result.	AI Activity Log export (Part 5)
☐	The firm treats an AI vendor like any other outside provider of services: due diligence before use, a check on its confidentiality and security practices, and a review when things change.	Vendor file, reviewed at least yearly
☐	Staff know how to report an AI error, near miss or suspected leak, and that doing so is expected.	Incident steps in the policy

Client-facing chat and advertising (Rules 5.3 and 7.1)

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	If an AI chat assistant is on the firm's website, it says plainly that it is an AI, that the conversation is recorded and shared with the firm, and that it is not legal advice.	Screenshot of the notice
☐	The firm has checked its own state rules on chat tools and on recording or monitoring conversations, and on advertising and solicitation, for the way the tool is used.	Note to file
☐	Marketing about the firm's use of AI is accurate and does not overstate what the technology does.	Review of website text

Conflicts and separation between matters (Rules 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	The firm has asked each vendor how one client's information is kept apart from other clients' and from other firms', and has considered whether AI use across matters could create a conflict.	Vendor answer, Part 2

Insurance and review

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	The firm has read its professional liability policy for any AI-related exclusion, sublimit or endorsement, and has asked its broker or carrier how AI use is treated. Coverage for AI errors is not settled across the market.	Broker's written answer
☐	The renewal application's AI questions have been answered from a written policy and records, not from memory (Part 3).	Completed worksheet

Done	What your firm should have	Evidence to keep
☐	The firm re-reads this checklist, the policy and the vendor file at least once a year and whenever a tool, its terms or a relevant rule changes.	Review date in the policy

Part 2: Vendor file for Ramtek Intelligence

Twelve areas to ask any AI vendor about, with Ramtek's answers as of October 2026. "On request" means we will give it to you when you ask, not that it is already published. Where Ramtek does not offer something, the answer says so.

Area 1: Data inputs and lineage

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
What data goes into the product?	Text and files you paste or upload (documents, emails, contracts, transcripts, matter descriptions), contact and matter details you enter, and, for the website assistant, what a visitor types.	Yes	Terms of Service; Privacy Notice
Where does it go next?	To Ramtek's application, to a commercial AI model provider through its API while a request runs, and to Ramtek's database provider for storage. The categories of provider are listed on the Security page, and the path of one request is drawn step by step at ramtekintelligence.com/trust/data-flow .	Yes	Security page, Subprocessors; Where your data goes
Can access be limited to the minimum data needed?	Partly. You choose what to paste or upload. Inside a firm, users can see the firm's clients, matters, deadlines, library documents and saved results; there are no per-matter permissions or ethical walls.	Partly	Product pages; AI Activity Log
What about sealed, privileged or other highly sensitive material?	Ramtek recommends against submitting highly sensitive information such as sealed filings. What may be uploaded is the firm's decision, and Part 4 includes a place to record it.	Partly	Security page, Attorney-Client Privilege

Area 2: Storage, jurisdiction and retention

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Where is data stored and processed?	Application hosting processes data in the United States. The database provider and its region are available on request.	Partly	Security page; request
How long is data kept?	For the life of the subscription. After cancellation, 30 days, with a reminder email about a week before deletion, then permanent deletion from production. A free trial's data is deleted 30 days after the trial ends. Deletion earlier is available on request.	Yes	Terms, Section 13; Privacy Notice
Are prompts, outputs and logs kept?	Saved results are kept in the account. For the Document Drafter and Email Assistant, the description or context you typed is saved with the result. For an analysis of a pasted or uploaded document (a contract, an opinion, a transcript), the document text is not saved; the analysis is, with a short title taken from the start of the document. Usage records are kept with the account.	Yes	Privacy Notice
What does the AI model provider keep?	The provider may keep requests for up to 30 days for trust-and-safety monitoring, then deletes them. Ramtek does NOT have a zero-data-retention arrangement with the provider.	Partly	Security page, AI Processing

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Is your data used to train, fine-tune or benchmark models?	No. Ramtek does not train models on firm data, and the provider's API terms bar training on API inputs. The attorney-facing tools are stateless: a request carries no memory of another firm's data.	Yes	Security page; Privacy Notice
Can retention be adjusted?	Partly. Firm admins can delete library documents. There is no per-firm retention setting for saved results; deletion is on request.	Partly	Request

Area 3: Subprocessors and model providers

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Which third parties may receive firm data?	Nine categories, named by role on the Security page: AI inference, database, application hosting, payments, content delivery and email routing, error monitoring, legal research sources, internal team messaging, and email delivery. Names and details are in the DPA on request.	On request	Security page; DPA
Will you notify us before adding or changing a material subprocessor?	The Security page is kept current. A commitment to notify firms before a change is not in the public terms; ask for it in the DPA.	No	Request
Are downstream providers bound to equivalent confidentiality and data-use limits?	They are bound by their own commercial terms. The flow-down terms you can rely on are the ones in a signed DPA.	On request	DPA

Area 4: Security controls

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Encryption?	TLS 1.2 or higher in transit. Database connections are encrypted. The database provider reports encryption at rest and a SOC 2 Type II report; ask us to confirm current status for your file.	Yes	Security page
Sign-in and access control?	Individual logins, passwords stored hashed, optional two-factor sign-in (authenticator app) on every account, sessions up to 30 days, firm admins add and remove users, removed users lose access at once. Firm data is separated by firm.	Yes	Security page, Access Controls
Single sign-on, role-based access by matter or office?	No single sign-on. Roles are firm admin and member. No per-matter or per-office access.	No	Product pages

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Other protections?	Rate limiting, protection against cross-site request forgery, signature-checked billing webhooks, and automated daily checks of billing, database connectivity and access controls. Live system status, with 90 days of uptime and any incidents, is published at ramtekintelligence.com/status. It is measured by Ramtek itself, not by an independent monitor.	Yes	Security page, Ongoing Monitoring; Status page
Incident response?	Affected firms are told without unreasonable delay and within the time the law requires (for example, Florida allows up to 30 days to notify affected individuals); Ramtek aims for 72 hours. There is no contractual timeline unless your DPA adds one.	Partly	Security page, Incident Response
Independent assurance of Ramtek itself?	Not available today: no SOC 2, ISO 27001 or third-party penetration test report for Ramtek. Ramtek's database provider reports its own SOC 2 Type II.	No	Part 2B

Area 5: Testing, validation and known limits

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
How is the product tested?	Automated tests run before each release. For the main drafting and analysis tools, the AI model was chosen by comparing candidate models on legal tasks, graded blind by another model. No independent third-party accuracy or red-team report is available.	Partly	Request
Does the vendor disclose where output can be unreliable?	Yes. Every tool shows an attorney-review notice. AI output can be wrong, can miss a fact, and can state a wrong rule with confidence. The Document Drafter is instructed never to cite a case from memory. Limits are stated on each product page: for example, a contract review reads up to 50,000 characters, and state-law reference data covers only some states.	Yes	Tool pages; product pages, "What it does not do"
Can I tell what an output is based on?	Partly. The AI Law Assistant researches with named sources. Statutes cited in several tools come with links to the public text. The Transcript Analyzer checks that every quotation appears in the transcript. A separate automatic check of case citations against a database of real decisions is built but is not active as of this version.	Partly	Product pages

Area 6: Human review and escalation

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Is a lawyer required to review before anything leaves the firm?	Ramtek is built so that nothing is sent, filed or signed for you. Drafts, analyses and proposed deadlines wait for an attorney. Changes to your records proposed by the AI Law Assistant happen only after you confirm them. A mark on saved work records that an attorney reviewed it.	Yes	Product pages; AI Activity Log

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
What if an output looks wrong?	Edit it, discard it, or ask again. There is no automatic action to undo. Report a problem to support@ramtekintelligence.com.	Yes	Support

Area 7: Confidentiality, privilege and secondary use

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
May the vendor access or reuse firm data?	Ramtek processes firm data to provide the service you request. It does not sell, share or monetize it. Ramtek is a software provider, not a party to the attorney-client relationship.	Yes	Privacy Notice; Terms
Is one client's data kept apart from another's?	Each firm's data is separated by firm. Each request to the AI provider is stateless and does not carry another firm's data.	Yes	Security page

Area 8: Output handling and traceability

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Are outputs labeled and traceable?	PDF and Word exports carry the attorney-review notice. Saved results are listed with who made them and when, and the Activity Log records the tool used. Statute links and the quotation check help trace what an output rests on.	Yes	Tool pages; AI Activity Log
Can flawed outputs be corrected or deleted?	Outputs are text you edit. Saved results can be deleted on request.	Partly	Request

Area 9: Audit, records and oversight

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Can we see who used the system, on what, and when?	Yes. The AI Activity Log (in the sidebar as "AI activity") lists each AI action and each saved result with the person, tool and time, and shows which attorney marked a result reviewed. Firm admins see everyone; other members see their own. Firm admins can export it to CSV.	Yes	AI Activity Log
What is NOT recorded?	The text of a question or an answer is never shown in the log. Logins, log-outs and exports are not recorded in it. Administrator-level system logs are Ramtek's and are not exposed to firms.	Partly	AI Activity Log note
How long are logs kept?	With the account, until the account's data is deleted. There is no fixed multi-year retention commitment.	Partly	Privacy Notice

Area 10: Exit rights and data retrieval

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Can we get our data out?	Every result can be copied or downloaded as text, PDF or Word. Contacts and the AI Activity Log export to CSV. A fuller export of an account's data is available on request.	Partly	Tool pages; request
What happens at the end?	Data is kept 30 days after cancellation, then permanently deleted from production. You can ask for immediate deletion.	Yes	Terms, Section 13; Security page

Area 11: Contract terms, liability and procurement

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Are the claims above in an enforceable contract?	The Terms of Service and Privacy Notice are the public contract. Commitments beyond them, such as subprocessor notice or incident timelines, belong in a Data Processing Agreement. Ramtek will discuss one on request.	On request	Terms; DPA request
Liability, indemnity, arbitration?	The Terms limit liability and provide for arbitration. Have your counsel read those sections for the sensitivity of your use.	Yes	Terms of Service
Notice of changes?	Active subscribers get email notice of material changes to the Terms, and the Security page carries its own update date.	Yes	Terms
Contractual audit rights over Ramtek's systems?	None offered.	No	Part 2B

Area 12: Fit for a law firm

Question	Ramtek today	Status	Where to verify
Is the product built for legal work?	Yes. Tools are built for law firms: drafting, contract review, intake, deadlines, research. Firm and state context (practice areas, courts, signature, state) is applied to every draft.	Yes	Product pages
Which uses should be restricted?	Your firm decides. Ramtek suggests restricting: sealed or grand jury material, material a client has asked you to keep out, protected health information unless you have agreed terms with us first, and any filing made without lawyer review.	Partly	Part 4

Part 2B: What Ramtek does not offer today

Many vendor questionnaires ask for the items below. Ramtek does not offer them as of October 2026. A firm whose policy requires one of them should not use Ramtek for that purpose, or should ask us first.

Asked for in many questionnaires	Ramtek today
SOC 2 Type II or ISO 27001 for Ramtek itself	Ramtek's database provider reports a SOC 2 Type II; Ramtek has no report of its own.
A zero-data-retention agreement with the AI provider	The provider may keep requests for up to 30 days for safety monitoring.
Single sign-on (SAML)	Sign-in is by individual login with optional authenticator-app two-factor.
Per-matter permissions or ethical walls	Users at a firm share its clients, matters, library and saved results.
Customer-managed encryption keys, a choice of data region, or on-premises hosting	Not offered.
An independent penetration test report	Not available today.
Contractual audit or inspection rights over Ramtek's systems	Not offered.
A HIPAA business associate agreement	Discuss with us before uploading protected health information.
A notice-before-change commitment for subprocessors	Ask for it in a DPA.

Part 3: Carrier and renewal worksheet

Insurers and brokers have reported asking law firms about AI use, governance, training and verification, and some are adding AI exclusions or conditions. Application wording varies, so this lists the topics rather than any one form. Answer from your written policy and records, and keep a copy of what you send.

Topics to be ready for

Topic	How to prepare	Your answer
Does the firm use generative AI tools? Which ones, and for what kinds of work?	List each tool, its purpose and who approved it (table below).	
Is there a written AI policy, and who owns it?	Part 4 is a starter. Name the owner and the adoption date.	
Do lawyers review all AI-assisted work, and verify cases, statutes and facts?	Describe the step. Ramtek's review mark and Activity Log can evidence it.	
Is client information entered into AI tools? Is it used to train the vendor's models?	Part 2 answers this for Ramtek. Ask the same of every tool.	
Has each vendor been vetted for confidentiality and security? Where is the file?	Part 2 is the file for Ramtek.	
Are clients told about AI use, and when is their consent obtained?	Record your rule from Part 1.	
How is AI time billed?	Record your rule from Part 1.	
What training have lawyers and staff had?	Keep dates and attendees.	
Has AI use contributed to any error, near miss, complaint or claim?	Answer truthfully and note what changed.	
Do court rules or standing orders require disclosure of AI use, and how do you comply?	Keep the list from Part 1.	
Does the policy have an AI exclusion, sublimit or condition?	Ask your broker in writing and file the answer.	

AI tools in use at your firm

Fill in one row per tool, and keep this page with the vendor file.

Tool	Used for	Client information allowed? (yes / no / limited)	Approved by	Date	Vendor file location

Part 4: AI use policy starter

Edit the bracketed parts, delete what does not fit, and have a managing lawyer approve it. Keep it to a page or two so people read it.

1. Purpose and scope

This policy sets how [Firm name] lawyers and staff may use generative AI tools in the firm's work. It applies to every tool that produces or analyzes text, whether or not the firm pays for it.

2. Approved tools

Only tools on the firm's approved list may be used with client information: [list]. The AI owner, [name], approves additions after completing a vendor review (Part 2). A tool that is not on the list may not receive client information.

3. What may and may not go in

Permitted: [for example, drafts, routine correspondence, contract review, deadline extraction]. Restricted, with the AI owner's approval: [for example, information a client has asked us to limit]. Not permitted: [for example, sealed or grand jury material, protected health information, anything a court order bars].

4. Review before use

A lawyer reads every AI-assisted document before it is sent, filed or relied on, and is responsible for it. Every case, statute, rule and quotation is checked against a primary source. Facts are checked against the file. The reviewing lawyer's name is recorded on the saved work.

5. Courts

Before filing, the responsible lawyer checks the court's rules and the judge's standing orders for AI disclosure or certification and complies.

6. Clients

We will tell a client about our use of AI [when asked / when their confidential information goes into a tool / when it affects cost or handling / when required]. Where consent is needed, we obtain it in writing, specific to the tool and the information.

7. Billing

We bill the time a lawyer actually spends. We do not bill time spent learning a tool. We do not bill the time AI saved as if a person had worked it. Any charge for a tool is disclosed and agreed in advance.

8. Security

Each person uses their own login with two-factor sign-in turned on. Access is removed the day a person leaves. We do not paste client information into consumer AI products.

9. Training

New lawyers and staff are trained on this policy before using any AI tool. We repeat the training [every year].

10. Errors and incidents

Report an AI error, near miss or suspected leak to [name] the same day. We correct it, assess whether a client or court must be told, and record what changed.

11. Review

The AI owner reviews this policy and the vendor files [every year] and whenever a tool, its terms or a rule changes. Owner: [name]. Adopted: [date]. Last reviewed: [date].

Part 5: Records to keep, and how to pull Ramtek's

A checklist that is not backed by records does not help in an audit, a claim or a renewal. Keep these in one folder.

Put these in one folder

- ☐ This checklist, completed, with the date and the name of the person who completed it.
- ☐ The signed AI use policy and the training log.
- ☐ A dated copy of each vendor's terms, privacy notice and security page. Ramtek's: ramtekintelligence.com/terms, [/privacy](https://ramtekintelligence.com/privacy), [/security](https://ramtekintelligence.com/security), [/ethics](https://ramtekintelligence.com/ethics) and [/trust](https://ramtekintelligence.com/trust).
- ☐ Written answers from vendors to your questions, and any Data Processing Agreement.
- ☐ Your state bar's AI guidance, ABA Formal Opinion 512 and any court rules you rely on, with the dates you checked them.
- ☐ The list of courts and standing orders checked for AI rules.
- ☐ Your broker's written answer on AI coverage.
- ☐ The AI Activity Log exports (below), taken at least quarterly.

How to pull Ramtek's records

Record	How
The AI Activity Log	Sign in, choose "AI activity" in the sidebar. "Saved work and review" lists each saved result with the person, tool, time and source, and who marked it reviewed. "All AI actions" lists each action. Firm admins can download either as CSV.
The review mark	On "Saved work and review", choose "Mark as reviewed" next to a result once a lawyer has checked it. Only the reviewer or a firm admin can clear it.
A person's own activity	Members see their own rows. A firm admin sees everyone and can filter by person, tool and date.
Ramtek's current statements	Save the pages listed above as PDF when you complete the vendor file, and again when you review it.
Anything not covered	Email support@ramtekintelligence.com for the database provider and region, the data processing agreement, a fuller data export, or deletion.

References and where to check them

Check each against the official source before relying on it. Summaries here are ours.

- ABA Formal Opinion 512, Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools (July 2024): competence, confidentiality (including informed consent for tools that learn from inputs), communication, candor and meritorious claims, supervision, and fees.
- ABA Formal Opinion 477R (2017), Securing Communication of Protected Client Information: reasonable efforts to protect confidential information in technology.
- ABA Formal Opinion 08-451 (2008), Lawyer's Obligations When Outsourcing Legal and Nonlegal Support Services: supervising outside providers.
- ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7 to 1.9, 3.1, 3.3, 5.1, 5.3, 7.1, 8.4(c).
- Florida Bar Ethics Opinion 24-1 (2024), and your own state bar's guidance. Ramtek's Bar Ethics page (ramtekintelligence.com/ethics) lists several states.

- AI Product Evaluation Checklist for Law Firms and Judicial Offices, 2026 District Court Conference (twelve evaluation domains). Part 2's structure follows it; the questions and answers are Ramtek's own.
- Broker and insurer commentary on AI and professional liability underwriting, for example Gallagher, "The Efficiency Tool That Became a Liability: AI Risk in Law Firms" (2026), and the ABA Journal, "Does your professional liability insurance cover AI mistakes? Don't be so sure" (2025). These are commentary, not policy language.

Ramtek Intelligence, LLC. This file reflects Ramtek as of October 2026 (version 1.1). Ask support@ramtekintelligence.com for the current version or for anything marked "on request".