mira

Legal AI Matter Pricing Readiness Scorecard

In about 10 minutes, find out which matter types your firm can price with confidence, and what your data needs before an AI model can predict them.

For Managing Partners, Pricing Directors, Finance, and Practice Group Leaders

BY THE END YOU WILL HAVE

- An overall pricing readiness score
- Scores by readiness dimension
- A shortlist of matter types to price first
- A recommended starting stage
- A practical 30-day action plan

WHY THIS SCORECARD EXISTS

Clients keep asking for fixed fees and alternative fee arrangements, but most firms still quote from partner memory. The cost data exists, trapped in billing and matter systems. This scorecard gives partners, finance, and IT a shared way to judge readiness across four areas: pricing pressure, historical data depth, process repeatability, and systems and governance. Complete it once and leave with an evidence-based recommendation for which matter type to price first.

HOW TO COMPLETE IT

1. **Firm snapshot**
   Your role, firm type, billing systems, and data history.
2. **Score four dimensions**
   Rate each item from 1 to 5. Low scores are useful signals.
3. **List candidate matter types**
   Name up to five transactional matter types you price often.
4. **Tally and interpret**
   Calculate your stage and shortlist.
5. **30-day plan**
   Assign owners and dates for next steps.

Firm snapshot

Complete this before scoring. It frames the rest of the worksheet and helps interpret your results.

ORGANISATION / FIRM NAME

YOUR ROLE / TITLE

FIRM TYPE (AM LAW / MID / BOUTIQUE / IN-HOUSE)

APPROX. ATTORNEYS / FEE EARNERS

PRIMARY JURISDICTION(S)

PRIORITY TRANSACTIONAL PRACTICES (M&A, COMMERCIAL, REAL ESTATE, FINANCE, ETC.)

BILLING / MATTER SYSTEMS (ADERANT, ELITE, CLIO, 3E) AND DMS (IMANAGE, NETDOCUMENTS)

YEARS OF CLOSED-MATTER HISTORY WITH FINAL COSTS

SHARE OF FEES UNDER FIXED FEE / AFA TODAY

Score each dimension from 1 to 5. On the next pages, rate every criterion, then total each dimension. Use the notes column for brief evidence such as matter volumes, systems, owners, or blockers.

SCALE 1 Not ready 2 Weak 3 Partial 4 Strong 5 Pilot-ready

DIMENSION 1 Pricing pressure

Is better pricing worth it for this work? Consider client demand, estimate variance, and margin leakage.

CRITERION	1	2	3	4	5	NOTES / EVIDENCE
AFA and fixed-fee demand. Clients ask for fixed fees, caps, or budgets before engaging	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Estimate variance. The same matter type gets different estimates depending on who you ask	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Budget overruns. Matters run past estimate, leading to write-downs or write-offs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Billing friction. Invoices trigger disputes, discounts, or strained relationships	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Strategic fit. Pricing certainty supports growth, margin, or winning against larger firms	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dimension 1 subtotal (max 25) · average (/5)						

CANDIDATE MATTER TYPES

Examples: asset purchase agreements · commercial lease reviews · credit facilities · MSAs · entity formations

#	MATTER TYPE	PRACTICE GROUP	MATTERS / YEAR	PRICING PAIN (1 TO 5)
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

SCALE 1 Not ready 2 Weak 3 Partial 4 Strong 5 Pilot-ready

DIMENSION 2 Historical data depth

Does your firm have enough closed-matter history for a model to learn from?

CRITERION	1	2	3	4	5	NOTES / EVIDENCE
History length. Closed matters with final costs recorded go back five years or more	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Comparable volume. Enough closed matters of the same type to compare against	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Time-entry detail. Time is recorded to matters, and ideally to phases or task codes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Matter attributes. Jurisdiction, deal size, complexity, and counterparty are captured	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Data consistency. Matter types, codes, and naming are applied the same way over time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dimension 2 subtotal (max 25) · average (/5)						

A model needs a minimum of five years of closed-matter data with final costs. If yours is shorter or patchy, start with a data readiness check before any prediction work.

SCALE 1 Not ready 2 Weak 3 Partial 4 Strong 5 Pilot-ready

DIMENSION 3

Process repeatability

Does the work follow a repeatable process that makes its cost predictable?

CRITERION	1	2	3	4	5	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Repeatable workflow. Matters of this type follow the same document formats and stages	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Defined phases. Clear stages from intake to close, such as diligence, drafting, and closing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Current estimating method. How estimates are produced today is known and written down	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Fee-structure rules. Criteria for hourly, fixed, capped, or blended fees are agreed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Budget tracking. Actual cost is compared with the estimate while the matter is open	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dimension 3 subtotal (max 25) · average (/5)						

Prediction works where the underlying process repeats. Transactional work such as M&A, commercial contracts, real estate, and lending fits. Litigation, arbitration, criminal defense, and family law do not.

SCALE 1 Not ready 2 Weak 3 Partial 4 Strong 5 Pilot-ready

DIMENSION 4 Systems and governance

Can your systems and people support a pricing assistant without new risk?

CRITERION	1	2	3	4	5	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Billing system access. APIs or exports from Aderant, Elite, Clio, or Thomson Reuters 3E	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Matter context. Matter records and precedent in iManage or NetDocuments are findable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Data residency. Billing and matter data can stay inside a firm-controlled environment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Partner review. Partners review the reasoning behind each estimate and make the final call	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Pricing ownership. A named owner, committee, or pricing director is accountable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dimension 4 subtotal (max 25) · average (/5)						

PAUSE FLAGS Check any that apply. Two or more means fix fundamentals before choosing a pilot.

- ☐ Fewer than five years of closed-matter data with final costs
- ☐ Target matter type is litigation, arbitration, or another non-repeatable practice
- ☐ Time entries are not linked to matters, phases, or task codes
- ☐ No one owns pricing decisions or estimate accuracy
- ☐ Leadership expects a model to set fees without partner review
- ☐ Billing data only reachable through ad-hoc spreadsheets or manual exports

Your results

Transfer the four dimension subtotals from the previous pages. Overall score equals the sum of the four dimension averages (maximum 20).

DIMENSION	SUBTOTAL (OUT OF 25)	AVERAGE (OUT OF 5)
1. Pricing pressure		
2. Historical data depth		
3. Process repeatability		
4. Systems and governance		
Overall (sum of averages, max 20) or raw total / 100		

YOUR RECOMMENDED STARTING STAGE

Based on the overall score out of 20

0 to 8
FOUNDATION
Fix data capture first: final costs, time-entry coding, and a pricing owner.

9 to 13
PREPARE
Choose one repeatable matter type. Clean its history and document how it is estimated today.

14 to 17
PILOT
Run a 30 to 60 day pilot, predicting one matter type alongside partner estimates.

18 to 20
SCALE
Extend to related matter types. Add staffing recommendations and budget alerts.

PRICING SHORTLIST Rank your top three matter types

RANK	MATTER TYPE	WHY THIS FIRST	DATA GAPS TO FIX FIRST	MATTERS / YEAR
1				
2				
3				

ONE-SENTENCE PILOT RECOMMENDATION

30-DAY NEXT STEPS

WEEK 1	Confirm the pilot matter type with the pricing owner and practice lead	Owner _____	By _____
WEEK 2	Pull a sample of closed matters and check costs, codes, and attributes	Owner _____	By _____
WEEK 3	Compare past estimates with final costs to set an accuracy baseline	Owner _____	By _____

Book a MIRA data readiness session

Your assessment identified matter types worth pricing with data. Book a MIRA session to check whether your closed-matter history can support a prediction model, and leave with a practical first pilot scope.

Book a MIRA session