lejacie

AN EVIDENCE-TO-PRACTICE BRIEF · 2025

From Conference to Tuesday

What the 2025 International Access to Justice Forum could mean for a legal service, a court or a regulator on the first working day after everyone gets home.

International Access to Justice Forum 2025
New York University School of Law and Fordham University School of Law
New York City, 26 and 27 September 2025

Written as at the close of the Forum. Developments since are boxed, current to 15 October 2026.

Chami Rupasinghe · Admitted Australian lawyer (non-practising) · Founder, Lejacie

INDEPENDENT DEMONSTRATION BY LEJACIE · DRAFT 2 · NOVEMBER 2026

WHO THIS IS FOR

- A manager at a legal assistance service
- A court registrar
- A policy officer at a regulator
- A funder who has heard the Forum mentioned and wants to know what it could mean for their work
- Anyone who was not in the room

CONTENTS

Before you read About this brief	1
1 What the room knew	2
2 Where the room disagreed	3
3 What nobody owns	5
4 What we still don't know	6
5 What can happen Tuesday	7
6 What needs more than a conference	8
4:47pm The test	10
The main action layer 30 days, 90 days, 12 months	12
Traceability Sources	13

Draft 2, 4 November 2026. This is an independent demonstration piece by Lejacie, built from the Forum's published program and public post-event reporting. It is not an official publication of the Forum, NYU Law, Fordham Law or any organisation that presented, and Lejacie did not attend. Every statement is labelled as reported, interpretation or recommendation so the reasoning can be inspected. Draft 2, 4 November 2026: the Draft 1 content, current to 15 October 2026, set in Lejacie's current design.

BEFORE YOU READ

About this brief

This is an independent demonstration piece by Lejacie. It is not an official publication of the Forum, NYU Law, Fordham Law or any organisation that presented, and Lejacie did not attend. It was written for people who were not in the room: a manager at a legal assistance service, a court registrar, a policy officer at a regulator, or a funder who has heard the Forum mentioned and wants to know what it could mean for their work.

35+
panels and two plenary sessions over two days, 26 and 27 September 2025 **[1, pp. 4 to 7]**

~300
participants from more than 20 countries, including Australia **[1, p. 3; 4]**

17
public sources opened for this brief; none of them a transcript of what was said

HOW TO READ IT

REPORTED A source says it. The number in square brackets points to that source in the list at the end, with a page number for the program.

INTERPRETATION Lejacie's reading of what the reported material adds up to.

RECOMMENDATION A step Lejacie proposes. The labels are there so the reasoning can be inspected and disagreed with.

The 2025 International Access to Justice Forum ran over two days, 26 and 27 September 2025, at New York University School of Law and Fordham University School of Law in New York City. The program lists more than 35 panels and two plenary sessions **[1, pp. 4 to 7]**. The organisers' welcome note describes almost 300 participants from more than 20 countries, including Australia **[1, p. 3; 4]**. The conference co-chairs were Matthew Diller, Bruce Green, David Udell and Paolo Galizzi (Fordham) and Janet Sabel, Margaret Satterthwaite and Sukti Dhital (NYU) **[2]**.

What it is built from

Public material only: the published program **[1]**, the Forum's own pages **[2, 3, 4]**, and post-event write-ups by the Legal Services Research Centre of the Victorian Legal Services Board and Commissioner **[5]**, the Victoria Law Foundation **[6, 7]**, the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System (IAALS) **[8, 9]** and the Right Question Institute **[10]**. A program establishes that a subject was scheduled and who spoke. It does not establish what was concluded, where people agreed or disagreed, or who took responsibility for anything. Where a panel is mentioned by its title only, that is because no public account of what was said was found in the material reviewed for this brief.

When it is written from

The brief is written as at the close of the Forum, 27 September 2025. Developments since then that change the advice are set apart in boxes headed "Since the Forum", current to 15 October 2026. The most important is that the Small Area Modelling interactive map, described at the Forum as forthcoming, went live on 26 November 2025 **[15]**.

Why six questions

The brief is organised around six questions rather than a session-by-session recap, because proceedings that list every session are the format nobody reads. The questions are: what the room knew, where the room disagreed, what nobody owns, what we still don't know, what can happen on Tuesday, and what needs more than a conference. The headings are the product's format; the labels inside each section carry the evidential weight.

1 · QUESTION ONE

What the room knew

Four themes recur across the public record. The program shows they were scheduled, often more than once, and the write-ups show what some presenters said about them. That is the evidence for calling them "what the room knew". It is not evidence that everyone in the room agreed, and this section does not claim that.

Legal need is bigger than lawyers can meet

REPORTED The organisers' welcome note describes access to justice as essential to the enforcement of rights and, in practice, the exception rather than the norm [1, p. 3]. Dr Georgie Rychner of the Legal Services Research Centre wrote that every big question the Forum raised sat inside a current global access to justice crisis [5]. The Victoria Law Foundation's earlier note on this Forum series observed that access to justice problems are highly consistent around the world [7].

INTERPRETATION With participants from Argentina to Zimbabwe [1, p. 3], the premise that the same gap appears in very different legal systems was built into the event rather than argued at it.

Community justice workers are part of the solution

REPORTED Rychner's account says this was a common thread: several American states are moving away from a lawyer-only model and trialling justice worker models, in which people without law degrees (social workers, health aides, teachers) are trained and authorised to give limited-scope legal help, and that community justice workers from several jurisdictions attended and shared their experience [5]. The Alaska program, run by the Alaska Legal Services Corporation since 2019 with the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium and Alaska Pacific University, is the reference case; it reaches communities with no road access and no lawyers [5, 7]. The program lists a Friday Session 4 panel, Evidence and Promise of US Community Justice Worker Movement, with Nikole Nelson, Matthew Burnett, Rebecca Sandefur and Sarah Carver [1, p. 5], and a Saturday panel, Cross-state Partnerships: Advancing A2J through legal empowerment [1, p. 7].

INTERPRETATION Of the four themes, this is the one with the most direct public testimony about what was said, and the one the Victorian attendees chose to write home about. Treat it as the Forum's headline.

Access to justice is tied to democracy

REPORTED The Saturday plenary was titled Meeting the Moment: Access to Justice, Legal Empowerment and Democracy, with Vivek Maru of Namati and Rebecca Sandefur of the American Bar Foundation, moderated by David Udell [1, p. 7; 2]. Rychner lists two of the Forum's framing questions as whether access to justice is intrinsic to democracy, and what access looks like in nations that are becoming more autocratic, which she reports as home to an estimated 3.1 billion people [5]. A Saturday panel was titled Public Interest Lawyering in the Age of Autocratization [1, p. 7]. No public account of what was said in either plenary was found.

The evidence base is thin and people want it thicker

REPORTED Three panels were about measurement: Measuring and Understanding People Centered Justice, Conceptualizing and Quantifying Legal Need and Legal Assistance [1, p. 4], and New Survey Measures, Methods and Insights for Legal Needs and Outcomes [1, p. 5]. The Victoria Law Foundation presented three papers from its Public Understanding of Law Survey: on bushfires and legal need, on how disadvantage compounds legal need, and on a service delivery model of people-centred justice, the Measure for Measure project [6]. Rychner presented the Legal Services Research Centre's Small Area Modelling project, which applies survey-derived estimates of legal need to unit-level Census data and aggregates them to small areas across Victoria; she described it as something nobody had done before [5].

INTERPRETATION The Victorian contribution to this Forum was almost entirely about measurement. For an Australian reader, that is the part of the program with the most direct local application.

A fifth theme underneath the four: involve the people affected

REPORTED IAALS's Logan Cornett presented a framework for involving the community being studied in shaping research questions and reflecting on findings, with the implementation challenges acknowledged [8]. The Right Question Institute's Naomi Campbell presented on the panel Fostering Individual Agency and Community Engagement in Legal Settings, arguing that asking questions and participating in decisions are themselves tools for access to justice [10].

SINCE THE FORUM

The Small Area Modelling interactive map went live on 26 November 2025. It shows estimated prevalence of everyday legal problems across Victorian neighbourhoods, postcodes and electorates, down to SA1 level (blocks of 200 to 800 people), and is intended for legal service providers, government agencies, community organisations, researchers and policy makers [15]. Anything in this brief that says "when the dashboard launches" should be read as "now".

2 · QUESTION TWO

Where the room disagreed

The public material does not record any argument. What it records is three tensions: positions scheduled against each other on the program, or framed differently by different write-ups. This section sets each out as its defenders would, then says what the tension means for practice.

Artificial intelligence: service tool, or decision-maker

REPORTED IAALS's Ericka Byram presented AI as a potential way to deliver legal services directly to the public and help close the access to justice gap [8]. IAALS's published position on regulation is a phased approach: a first phase of soft-power tools (guidance, standards, monitoring) while the technology and its effects are being learned, then a second phase considering formal regulatory change [9]. IAALS reported that many attendees approached them afterwards about regulatory responses to AI [8]. Rychner's account frames the question differently: as governments and businesses adopt AI, what recourse do low-income people have when large language models make arbitrary decisions about their benefits, housing or employment, and raise the barriers to contesting them [5]. The program lists a Friday panel, Achieving Harmony in Algorithmic Justice? Diminishing Benefits and Augmented Outcomes in Inevitable Automation, and another, Artificial Intelligence Overview: Pros/Cons, with Milan Markovic, George Newhouse and Sateesh Nori [1, pp. 4 to 5], and a Saturday panel, AI and Inclusivity, with Byram, Natalia Antolak-Saper of Monash University, Emma Jones and Catherine Hastings [1, p. 7]. No public account of the Pros/Cons or Algorithmic Justice panels was found.

INTERPRETATION The two framings are not contradictory. One is about AI as a service tool; the other is about AI, or automation more generally, as a decision-maker. But they point to different first priorities. Hold the first view and you invest in piloting AI-assisted help and regulating providers. Hold the second and you invest in explanation, review and human appeal paths for automated decisions. The material reviewed does not show the Forum settling which comes first.

Who may give legal help: more lawyers, or trained non-lawyers

REPORTED The justice worker thread (section 1) sat on the same program as Right to Counsel and Models for Full A2J, with Bonnie Hugh, Larisa Bowman, Andrew Ashbrook of the National Coalition for a Civil Right to Counsel and Neil Steinkamp [1, p. 5], and Theoretical, Jurisprudential and Empirical Perspectives in Lawyerless Courts, with Colleen Shanahan, Benjamin Barton and others [1, p. 6]. The Victoria Law Foundation's earlier note recorded that a scheme to introduce legal support workers in Washington State started and then stalled, in contrast to Alaska [7].

INTERPRETATION A guaranteed right to a lawyer and a trained non-lawyer workforce are not mutually exclusive, but they compete for the same funding and the same regulatory attention. The Washington State example is a reminder that justice worker models depend on a regulator's consent and can lose it.

Fill the gap, or remove the barrier

REPORTED One Saturday panel was titled Human Rights and Access to Justice: Removing Barriers instead of Filling Gaps [1, p. 7]. No public account of its content was found.

INTERPRETATION The title states a position. Most of the program is about filling gaps: more workers, more tools, more data. This panel's framing asks whether the obstacles that create the gap can be taken away instead. For a reader planning Tuesday, the question is which of their problems is a gap to be filled and which is a barrier someone could remove.

3 · QUESTION THREE

What nobody owns

INTERPRETATION THROUGHOUT This section names the jobs that the reported material treats as important and that, on the public record, no single organisation on the program has responsibility for. The claim is not that nobody anywhere owns them; it is that the responsibility is split across bodies that do not plan together, and the material reviewed shows no one convening them.

Training, supervising and authorising community justice workers

The Alaska model needed three things to line up: a legal aid organisation willing to train, a health system willing to lend its workforce, and a Supreme Court willing to change the rule on who may give legal help (a new Alaska bar rule approved in 2022) [7, 14]. In most places those sit with different bodies. In Australia the equivalent pieces would be legal aid commissions and community legal centres (training), health, settlement and community services (workforce), and the legal profession's regulators and courts (authorisation).

Recourse when an automated decision goes against someone

Rychner's question about low-income people facing arbitrary automated decisions on benefits, housing or employment [5] has no owner on the program. Legal assistance services see the downstream problem; the agencies deploying the systems own the systems; regulators of AI, where they exist, are not regulators of legal need.

Keeping legal need data current, and turning it into decisions

The Small Area Modelling project produces estimates; Rychner described it as an iterative product that others will build on [5]. Who updates the estimates when the Census moves, who funds the next survey wave, and who is responsible for turning an estimate into a funding decision are not settled in the material reviewed.

Carrying a pilot into a permanent service

The Victoria Law Foundation's earlier note reports the Alaska leadership's view that getting beyond pilot or localised programs is critical to lasting impact [7]. That step belongs to funders and government, who attend such events but rarely present at them.

Court fines and fees

The Friday panel Fines, Fees and Funding, moderated by NCAJ's Lauren Jones, with Judith Resnik, Lisa Foster, Brian Highsmith and Susanne Augenhofer [1, p. 4; 4], concerns systems in which courts fund themselves partly through the people least able to pay. Reform cuts across treasury, courts and legislatures. No public account of the panel's content was found.

4 · QUESTION FOUR

What we still don't know

These are questions the reported material treats as important and does not answer. Each is bounded to what the public materials reviewed for this brief establish; none is a claim that no evidence exists anywhere.

Do justice worker models change outcomes for the person, not only reach?

REPORTED Rychner's account and the Victoria Law Foundation's note describe the Alaska program's reach: remote communities served, workers trained [5, 7]. The Forum panel title, Evidence and Promise of US Community Justice Worker Movement [1, p. 5], pairs the two words. The materials reviewed do not describe outcome findings presented at the Forum.

INTERPRETATION The public record of the Forum shows the reach case being made. It does not show the outcomes case being made, which may reflect the limits of the write-ups rather than of the panel.

> **SINCE THE FORUM**
>
> In November 2025 the American Bar Foundation's Access to Justice Research Initiative published a research brief on the social and economic impact of the Alaska Community Justice Worker Program from 2021 to 2025. It reports that community justice workers provide effective and impactful services, reach areas and groups otherwise unserved, and deliver a strong return on investment [11]. It covers one program in one state. Whether the result transfers to a different legal system, workforce and regulator is an open question, and the brief itself is the baseline against which that question can now be tested.

How much legal need is there locally, and does knowing change decisions?

REPORTED The Small Area Modelling project answers the first half for Victoria [5, 15]. The materials reviewed say the estimates are intended for strategic planning, resource allocation, legal needs assessments and funding applications [15]; they do not yet report any decision made on the basis of them.

What is the right amount of legal help?

REPORTED The Victoria Law Foundation's Measure for Measure project, presented by Bridget McAloon, is building a service delivery model of people-centred justice from surveys and interviews with legal assistance services, courts and other justice stakeholders, and is described as foundational work to fill critical knowledge gaps [6]. The Foundation has since listed a separate event on how much legal help is enough, the "dosage" question [6].

How does disadvantage compound legal need, and who should be prioritised?

REPORTED Dr Hugh McDonald's paper from the Public Understanding of Law Survey examines how legal and capability needs grow as disadvantage (long-term illness, financial distress, disability) accumulates, and how the most disadvantaged rely more on public legal assistance [6].

INTERPRETATION The analysis exists. The policy translation, who is prioritised when services are rationed, is not in the material reviewed.

What do disasters do to legal need over time?

REPORTED McAloon's bushfires paper reports Public Understanding of Law Survey findings on the 2019 to 2020 Victorian bushfires, showing a rising burden on affected communities and services [6]. How long the burden lasts, and whether early legal help changes recovery, are not addressed in the materials reviewed.

Whether AI-delivered legal help is safe for the people most likely to use it

REPORTED IAALS's phased approach to regulation is explicitly a response to the technology and its effects still being learned [9]. The materials reviewed do not describe any Forum panel presenting outcome data on consumers who used AI legal tools.

Whether community-engaged research changes what is found

REPORTED IAALS's framework for involving the community in shaping research questions and reflecting on findings was presented as a method, with implementation challenges acknowledged [8]. Whether it changes findings, or only how they are received, is not addressed in the materials reviewed.

5 · QUESTION FIVE

What can happen Tuesday

RECOMMENDATION THROUGHOUT These are small steps organisations can assess and begin within existing responsibilities. They still use staff time and some will need an internal sign-off (changing an intake field, asking clients a new question, altering a form), so each is framed as something to assess and start, not something that costs nothing. The full action layer, with what each step becomes at 30 days, 90 days and 12 months and what it needs from outside, is the table after the 4:47pm test. This section gives the first step only.

A legal assistance service

Map the non-lawyers who already touch your clients' legal problems (settlement workers, family violence practitioners, financial counsellors, community health workers, school wellbeing staff). Then pick one problem type and write down which tasks in it require legal expertise, which could be supported by another worker under supervision, and where escalation to a lawyer becomes necessary. Add one intake question: did this problem begin with a government or business decision the client could not get explained? Open the Small Area Modelling map [15] for your catchment and compare its estimates with your own intake.

A court or tribunal

Count, for one list, the proportion of matters where neither party has a lawyer; the Lawyerless Courts panel [1, p. 6] starts from that number. Read your three most-used forms as a person who has never seen a court, and note where a form leaves no room to ask a question [10]. Check which of your processes, from fee waivers to diversion, depend on a person's capacity to pay [1, p. 4].

A legal profession regulator

Write, in one page, what a trained non-lawyer may and may not do under your current rules. If the page is hard to write, that is the finding; Alaska needed a rule change before its program could scale [14]. Read IAALS's phased model for regulating AI in consumer-facing legal services [9] and record which phase you are in.

A funder or commissioner

Ask grantees, in their next report, which tasks in their matters required legal expertise, which could be supported by another worker, and where escalation became necessary. That is service-design evidence a simpler question ("which problems did not need a lawyer?") would not produce. Lay your funding map over the Small Area Modelling map [15] and note where they diverge.

A researcher

Before designing the next study, ask the community being studied what the question should be [8]. If evaluating a justice worker model, measure outcomes for the person and not only reach, and use the ABF Alaska brief [11] as the comparison baseline.

6 · QUESTION SIX

What needs more than a conference

INTERPRETATION Built on the reported material in sections 1 to 4, this section lists the changes that cannot be made by any organisation acting alone, so that a Tuesday step is not mistaken for the whole job. Section 3 says who would need to come together; this section says what they would need to produce.

A rule that lets trained non-lawyers give legal help

Every justice worker model runs into the rule against unqualified legal practice. Alaska needed its Supreme Court to change the bar rule in 2022 [14]; Washington State's scheme stalled [7]; the ASU Justice Worker Lab notes a federal case in New York challenging rules that bar trained non-lawyers from giving basic legal help [12]. In Australia the equivalent rule sits in the Legal Profession Uniform Law and with each state's legal services regulator. Changing it is a law reform project.

Permanent funding for what works past the pilot

The Alaska leadership's reported view is that staying at pilot scale forecloses lasting impact [7]. Moving a pilot into a permanent service is a budget decision for government.

A usable right to contest an automated decision

Australian social security law already provides free internal review by an Authorised Review Officer and external review at the Administrative Review Tribunal [16, 17]. The reform question raised by Rychner's framing [5] is not whether a review right exists but whether people affected by automated decisions can understand it, reach it and use it in time, and whether anyone is funded to help them. Where the decision-maker is a business rather than government, the review right itself may be missing.

A phased regulatory regime for AI legal services

IAALS's proposal [9] has a first phase a regulator can start on its own (guidance, standards, monitoring) and a second phase that needs legislation and the first phase's evidence. The two have to be sequenced across years.

A standing evidence base, funded as infrastructure

The Public Understanding of Law Survey, the Small Area Modelling project and the Measure for Measure project are all Victorian, all recent and all dependent on continued funding to repeat [5, 6, 15]. The Legal Services Research Centre has said the models will be refined with data from its ongoing Legal Understanding and Lawyer Use survey [15], which is itself a funding commitment.

Organised cross-border learning

The Forum is the mechanism and it runs once a year. The Victoria Law Foundation's support for Victorian presenters, up to $5,000 per organisation [6], shows what organised participation costs. Turning the annual exchange into shared measures or shared evaluation would need a secretariat no single law school provides.

SINCE THE FORUM

The Victoria Law Foundation lists a 2026 International Access to Justice Forum, themed on bridging the gap between empirical research and person-centred justice [6]. The theme is close to the one this brief's section 4 arrives at: the evidence exists and the translation into decisions does not. Details of the 2026 Forum were not reviewed for this brief.

4:47PM

The test

A brief is only useful if it survives contact with a real afternoon. The scenario below is invented. The review pathway in it is real [16, 17].

It is 4:47pm on a Tuesday at a community legal centre in outer Melbourne. A settlement worker from the agency next door walks in with a client. The client's Family Tax Benefit has been cut. The letter says the decision was based on income information and gives a number to call. She called it, waited forty minutes, and was told she can ask for an explanation or apply for a formal review. She does not have a computer, and she did not understand the difference between the two. The settlement worker has known her for two years, speaks her language, and has sat with her through three other government letters this year. The centre's one lawyer is in a family violence intervention order list until 6pm.

Three things the first version of this brief got wrong, and that a reader should not assume either. A decision made on income data is not necessarily an AI decision; it may be a rule applied by a system, and the brief's point about recourse applies either way. A trusted settlement worker is not an authorised community justice worker; trust is necessary and not sufficient. And a review right does exist: most Family Tax Benefit decisions can be formally reviewed, free, by an Authorised Review Officer who was not involved in the original decision, generally within 52 weeks, without asking for an explanation first, and with a further review available at the Administrative Review Tribunal [16, 17]. The problem at 4:47pm is not the absence of a pathway. It is whether this person can understand it and use it in time.

So the test is not whether someone improvises a rescue. It is whether the service can answer five questions.

1 Is there an agreed task?

Has the centre written down that helping a client lodge a formal review request is a task a supervised non-lawyer may do, and what the task includes (completing the form or online request, recording the date, explaining the time limit) and excludes (advising on the merits)? If not, the settlement worker is guessing at her scope, and so is the centre.

2 Is there a competent worker?

Has anyone shown the settlement worker the Services Australia review form and the difference between an explanation and a formal review? Competence here is narrow and teachable in an hour. It has to have happened before 4:47pm.

3 Has the client consented?

Does the client know that the settlement worker is helping her lodge a request, not giving legal advice, and that the centre's lawyer will look at it afterwards? Has she agreed to the centre holding her information?

4 Is the review route accessible to this person?

The pathway exists **[16]**. Can she use it without a computer, in her language, inside 52 weeks, and with her payments continuing or her debt paused while it runs **[17]**? If the answer to any of those is no, that is the gap the brief's sections 3 and 6 are about.

5 Is there a clear escalation?

When does this stop being a form and start being a matter for the lawyer: a debt, a tax assessment change, a child support interaction, a time limit already passed? Is that written down, and does the settlement worker know it?

If the centre can answer all five, the settlement worker helps the client lodge the request before 6pm, the lawyer reviews it on Wednesday, and the intake record notes that the problem began with a government decision the client could not get explained. If it cannot, the honest outcome is that the client waits until the lawyer is free, and the centre has found the Tuesday step it needs to take: write the agreed task, train the worker, and agree the escalation.

Sections 1 and 2 of this brief say why that step matters beyond one centre. The five questions are the justice worker model at the scale of one afternoon.

THE MAIN ACTION LAYER

30 days, 90 days, 12 months

RECOMMENDATION This table is the main action layer; section 5 gives the first step for each thread. The first three columns are steps an organisation can assess and begin within existing responsibilities. The last column is what has to come from outside before the thread can finish.

THREAD	30 DAYS	90 DAYS	12 MONTHS	NEEDS FROM OUTSIDE
Justice workers	Map the non-lawyers already touching clients' legal problems; pick one problem type and sort its tasks into: needs legal expertise, could be supported by another worker, must escalate	Write the agreed task, the one-hour training, the consent wording and the escalation rule; run it with one partner agency under lawyer supervision	A supervised pilot with a named partner, recorded matters, person-level outcomes and a lawyer-time comparison; a written case to the regulator	A rule or guidance from the profession's regulator on what a supervised non-lawyer may do [14]; pilot funding
Decisions people cannot get explained	Add the intake question: did this problem begin with a government or business decision the client could not get explained?	Pull the first quarter's count; identify the two agencies and decision types that recur most; check which have a formal review route and whether clients used it [16, 17]	A short evidence paper to the responsible department and the relevant ombudsman: the count, the decision types, where the review route exists and why it was not used	Funded help to use existing review rights; review rights where the decision-maker is a business
Local legal need data	Open the Small Area Modelling map for the catchment [15]; name one person to own it	Compare the map's estimates with intake data and record where they diverge and why	Use the comparison in the next funding submission and service plan	Continued funding for the Public Understanding of Law Survey and the modelling [15]
AI legal tools	Record which IAALS phase the organisation is in: none, soft-power, formal [9]	Adopt a written position on whether and how staff and clients use AI legal tools, with a monitoring log	Share the log and position with the regulator as phase-one evidence	A phased regulatory regime; sector-wide guidance [9]
Courts and tribunals	Count the proportion of matters in one list with no lawyer on either side	Review the three most-used forms as a first-time user; fix the one that blocks a question [10]	Report the self-represented proportion and the form changes to the court's access committee	Fee and fine reform through treasury and the legislature [1, p. 4]
Evidence and research	Ask the community what the next study's question should be [8]	Add person-level outcome measures to any justice worker evaluation, using the ABF Alaska brief as the comparison baseline [11]	Publish the first comparison	A standing funding line for legal need research

TRACEABILITY

Sources

Numbers match the references in square brackets. All sources are public and were opened for this brief. Program page numbers refer to the 36-page published program **[1]**. Sources 11, 15, 16 and 17 post-date the Forum or were used only for the "Since the Forum" boxes and the 4:47pm test.

	SOURCE
[1]	**2025 International Access to Justice Forum program**, NYU Law and Fordham Law, 36 pages. Welcome note p. 3; Friday 26 September session grid pp. 4 to 5; Saturday 27 September session grid pp. 6 to 7; panellist biographies pp. 8 to 36. canva.com/design/DAGyx4kI-hU/RDaYpGD-AMGhnEdXCoiBRA/view
[2]	**International Access to Justice Forum 2025**, NYU Law Center on Civil Justice. Overview, plenaries, co-chairs. law.nyu.edu/centers/civiljustice/a2j2025
[3]	**International Access to Justice Forum 2025**, The Docket, NYU Law, 28 August 2025. Venues, format, registration. docket.law.nyu.edu/?p=60167
[4]	**The International AtJ Forum 2025 is Happening this Week in New York City**, National Center for Access to Justice, 24 September 2025. Participant numbers and countries; NCAJ-moderated sessions. ncaj.org/news/international-atj-forum-2025-happening-week-new-york-city
[5]	**Observations from the 2025 International Access to Justice Forum**, Dr Georgie Rychner, Legal Services Research Centre, Victorian Legal Services Board and Commissioner, 13 October 2025. Framing questions, community justice workers, Small Area Modelling. lsbc.vic.gov.au/research-centre/news/observations-2025-international-access-justice-forum
[6]	**International Access to Justice Forum 2025**, Victoria Law Foundation. The three Public Understanding of Law Survey presentations; attendance support; listing of the 2026 Forum and the "dosage" event. victorialawfoundation.org.au/scheduled-events/international-access-to-justice-forum-2025
[7]	**Notes from the International Forum on Access to Justice**, Victoria Law Foundation. An earlier Forum in the same series; the Alaska program's origins and the Washington State comparison. victorialawfoundation.org.au/news/notes-from-the-international-forum-on-access-to-justice
[8]	**IAALS Brings Research and AI Leadership to International Access to Justice Forum**, Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System, 22 October 2025. Community-engaged research framework; AI and legal services. iaals.du.edu/news/iaals-brings-research-and-ai-leadership-international-access-justice-forum
[9]	**Regulating AI in the Delivery of Consumer-Facing Legal Services**, IAALS. The two-phase regulatory proposal. iaals.du.edu/publications/regulating-ai-delivery-consumer-facing-legal-services
[10]	**International Access to Justice Forum 2025**, Right Question Institute. The Fostering Individual Agency and Community Engagement panel. rightquestion.org/events/international-access-to-justice-forum-2025
[11]	**Research Brief: Analysis of the Social and Economic Impact of the Alaska Community Justice Worker Program (2021 to 2025)**, American Bar Foundation Access to Justice Research Initiative, November 2025. americanbarfoundation.org/resources/research-brief-analysis-of-the-social-and-economic-impact-of-the-alaska-community-justice-worker-program/

[12] **Justice Worker Lab**, Arizona State University. The New York federal case on non-lawyer legal help; Alaska projects.
thesanfordschool.asu.edu/research/centers-initiatives/justice-worker-lab

[13] **Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on the civil justice system**, Alaska Legal Services Corporation, 15 July 2024. Background on the Alaska model.
alsc-law.org/?p=19248

[14] **Nikole Nelson champions a national model to bring legal services to those without access**, Frontline Justice. The 2022 Alaska Supreme Court bar rule change.
assets.frontlinejustice.org/nikole-nelson-champions-a-national-model-to-bring-legal-services-to-those-without-access-1.pdf

[15] **Now live: Small Area Modelling interactive map**, Dr Georgie Rychner, Legal Services Research Centre, 26 November 2025. Launch, coverage, intended users, next steps.
lsbc.vic.gov.au/research-centre/news/now-live-small-area-modelling-interactive-map

[16] **Formal review of a Family Tax Benefit decision**, Services Australia, page last updated 8 February 2024. Time limits and the formal review right.
servicesaustralia.gov.au/when-you-can-apply-for-formal-review-family-tax-benefit-decision

[17] **Centrelink payments: appealing a Centrelink decision**, Legal Aid NSW. Authorised Review Officer review, pause on debt repayments, Administrative Review Tribunal time limits.
legalaid.nsw.gov.au/my-problem-is-about/government-benefits/centrelink-payments

VERSION

Draft 2, 4 November 2026: the Draft 1 content, written as at the close of the Forum and with "Since the Forum" boxes current to 15 October 2026, set in Lejacie's current design. Chami Rupasinghe · Admitted Australian lawyer (non-practising) · Founder, Lejacie.

Feedback. If something is wrong, out of date or hard to understand, email **info@lejacie.com** with the page number.

This is an independent demonstration piece by Lejacie, built from the Forum's published program and public post-event reporting. It is not an official publication of the Forum, NYU Law, Fordham Law or any organisation that presented, and Lejacie did not attend. Every statement is labelled as reported, interpretation or recommendation so the reasoning can be inspected.