

The AI-Ready Lawyer



winmark

| 2026

FLIT
NETWORK

A Special Thanks to the Contributors

Eleven expert in-house lawyers contributed to this report without which it would not have been possible to create. Nine are listed below as two requested to be anonymous.

- Satoru Hamada, Director, Legal & Innovation, Ubisoft
- Elodie Garoux, Responsable Juridique, Groupe LesEchos -LeParisien (LVMH)
- Nour Lana Karam, Legal Counsel, artidis
- Dorian Souquet, Legal Counsel, Krafton Inc
- Inès Trabelsi, Legal counsel – Data Privacy, Groupe iliad
- Audrey Gromat, Legal Counsel, Idemia
- Léa Vandenhautte, Data Protection Lawyer, Cure51
- Océane Béal, Legal Counsel, Lydia-Sumeria
- Celine Wormser, Senior Legal Counsel, trainline

There was a surprisingly strong consensus across the entries, and also great practical ideas that make this report so useful. The report editor was John Jeffcock, CEO, Winmark.

***Insights from the
Global GC Academy
Scholarship Challenge.***

The Challenge:
*How should lawyers be
developed in an AI-enabled
world without losing the
essential foundations of the
profession?*



“Legal professionals must know when and how to leverage AI, while remembering that their core duties remain firmly theirs. AI can analyze, assist, and accelerate, but it cannot walk into a room and take a stand. Upholding that responsibility, and the thrill of our work, remains ours, even as AI makes us ten times more efficient at fulfilling it.”

Elodie Garoux, Responsable Juridique, Groupe LesEchos -LeParisien (LVMH)

EU AI Act

It is recommended that all readers of this report review the **EU AI Act**, see:

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/en/article/20230601STO93804/eu-ai-act-first-regulation-on-artificial-intelligence>

Copyright & Sharing Notice

© 2026 Winmark & FLIT. All rights reserved.

This report has been produced by **Winmark for the Global GC Academy** and may be freely shared, circulated and referenced for professional and educational purposes, provided that **Winmark and FLIT and the**

Global GC Academy are clearly acknowledged as the source.

The report, or extracts from it, may not be republished, reproduced commercially, materially altered, or presented as the work of another organisation without the prior written permission of Winmark.

When quoting or referencing this report, please use the attribution:

Source: Winmark & FLIT | Global GC Academy, 2026

The insights in this report draw on contributions from FLIT made to Global GC Academy competitions and associated research. Individual contributions have been anonymised where appropriate.

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Protect the foundations
2. AI as a Partner
3. Redesign the Apprenticeship
4. AI Users to AI Auditor & Supervisor
5. Reinvest the AI dividend
6. Accelerate Business Immersion & Develop Judgement

Conclusions & Actions for GCs

Executive Summary

AI creates an apparent paradox for the legal profession. It can remove much of the repetitive work through which generations of lawyers learned their craft. At the same time, using AI safely requires precisely the judgement, technical understanding and professional scepticism that this traditional apprenticeship helped develop. The challenge is therefore not simply how to teach lawyers to use AI. It is how to redesign legal development so that AI accelerates the development of better lawyers rather than simply producing faster ones.

Across the submissions, there is strong agreement on what should remain unchanged. Legal reasoning, technical expertise, ethics, judgement, accountability and commercial understanding become more important as AI becomes more capable, not less. As one submission puts it:

“The lawyer of tomorrow is not a power user. They’re a thinker.”

Another captures the principle equally succinctly:

“The next generation of lawyers should be trained to use AI only after they have learned how to think without it.”

What needs to change is the development model around those foundations. AI can increasingly undertake first-pass drafting, research, document review, summarisation and administrative activity. Rather than preserving those activities simply because they once trained junior lawyers, legal functions should deliberately replace them with better development experiences: critiquing AI outputs, defending recommendations, participating in negotiations, learning from senior lawyers, working across functions and understanding the commercial consequences of legal decisions.

Five Priorities Emerge

1. **Protect the foundations.** Lawyers must develop sufficient independent legal capability to recognise when AI is wrong.
2. **Use AI to develop judgement.** AI should become a challenger and sparring partner, not simply an answer engine.
3. **Redesign the apprenticeship.** If AI removes traditional junior work, organisations need deliberate alternatives for building expertise.
4. **Reinvest the efficiency dividend.** Time saved should move lawyers towards business exposure, relationships, strategy and leadership—not simply greater throughput.
5. **Develop lawyers as supervisors of intelligent systems.** Lawyers increasingly need to determine what AI can do, where humans intervene and who remains accountable.

The ambition should ultimately extend beyond AI-ready lawyers. It should be to develop AI-enabled legal leaders: technically excellent, technologically fluent, commercially immersed and trusted to exercise judgement when there is no obvious answer.

AI changes the work and how lawyers should be developed

Much of the debate about legal AI has concentrated on productivity: how quickly contracts can be reviewed, documents drafted, research undertaken or information retrieved. The submissions suggest that this is too narrow.

“Efficiency is the floor. Leadership is the ceiling.”

The more significant consequence of AI is what happens when routine execution no longer occupies such a large proportion of a lawyer's career. Historically, junior lawyers learned partly through volume. They reviewed documents, researched questions, produced first drafts and repeatedly performed relatively basic legal activities. Much of the work was inefficient, but it created familiarity with legal language, structures, precedent, risk and the consequences of getting things wrong. AI potentially breaks that model. As one submission observes:

“Junior lawyers have traditionally developed their judgement through repetitive, lower-value tasks such as document review, contract annotation and legal research.”

If those activities disappear, legal leaders face a choice. They can preserve old processes to protect the apprenticeship or design a better apprenticeship. The submissions overwhelmingly point towards the second.

The Practical Implication

Legal functions should stop treating AI adoption and talent development as separate programmes. Every decision to automate work should trigger a corresponding development question:

What capability did lawyers previously develop by doing this work, and how will we develop that capability now?

That question should become part of every significant legal AI implementation.

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Protect the foundations

2. AI as a Partner

3. Redesign the Apprenticeship

4. AI Users to AI Auditor & Supervisor

5. Reinvest the AI dividend

6. Accelerate Business Immersion & Develop Judgement

Conclusions & Actions for GCs

Think first, AI Second

There is remarkable consistency around what should not change. The foundations of an excellent lawyer remain:

- technical legal competence;
- structured legal reasoning;
- drafting and interpretation;
- critical thinking;
- ethics and professional responsibility;
- commercial judgement;
- communication; and
- accountability for the final advice.

The difference is that AI makes weaknesses in these foundations potentially more dangerous. A lawyer confronted with a badly written answer may recognise that something is wrong. A fluent, authoritative and plausible AI-generated answer is harder to challenge. One submission makes the problem explicit:

“An AI can summarize a 100-page document in seconds, but only a skilled human mind can spot what it missed or hallucinated.”

Another argues:

“The tool only helps the lawyer who could already have written the answer slowly. Speed without a foundation just produces confident errors, faster.”

Form an Independent Position

For selected developmental work, junior lawyers should first form an independent position. Only then should they introduce AI. They can compare the outputs and ask:

- **What did AI identify that I missed?**
- **What did I identify that AI missed?**
- **Where do we disagree?**
- **What evidence supports each conclusion?**
- **Has AI understood the commercial context?**
- **What is my final recommendation—and am I prepared to defend it?**

This turns AI into an instrument for improving reasoning rather than bypassing it and points towards a simple principle for development:



Contents

Executive Summary

1. Protect the foundations

2. AI as a Partner

3. Redesign the Apprenticeship

4. AI Users to AI Auditor & Supervisor

5. Reinvest the AI dividend

6. Accelerate Business Immersion & Develop Judgement

Conclusions & Actions for GCs

Make AI the sparring partner, not the shortcut

The submissions contain a particularly useful idea for legal development:

“AI as sparring partner, not shortcut.”

That distinction matters. Most AI training currently starts with what the technology can produce. A more valuable question for lawyer development is what AI can challenge.

A lawyer can form a view and ask AI to argue the opposite position. A contract strategy can be tested from the counterparty's perspective. Advice can be challenged as if by a regulator. A negotiation can be simulated before the lawyer enters the room.

This changes the role of AI from answer generator to intellectual opponent. As another submission says:

“The metric for success is not how fast someone can produce an output. It’s how confidently they can stand behind it.”

The AI Challenge

Legal teams could introduce a standard development exercise:

1. **Form your position** - Analyse the issue without AI and decide what you recommend.
2. **Build the strongest opposing case** - Use AI to identify contrary arguments, alternative interpretations and overlooked risks.
3. **Stress-test your reasoning** - Ask AI to behave as opposing counsel, regulator, customer, CFO or another relevant stakeholder.
4. **Verify** - Check sources, authorities, facts and assumptions.
5. **Reconsider** - Determine whether any challenge changes the recommendation.
6. **Defend** - Explain the final position to another lawyer or stakeholder.

This develops judgement precisely because the lawyer remains responsible for choosing between competing answers.

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Protect the foundations

2. AI as a Partner

3. Redesign the Apprenticeship

4. AI Users to AI Auditor & Supervisor

5. Reinvest the AI dividend

6. Accelerate Business Immersion & Develop Judgement

Conclusions & Actions for GCs

Redesign the Apprenticeship

rather than preserving low-value work

The most important talent question raised by AI may be what happens to junior lawyers. Automation of repetitive work is attractive precisely because that work consumes significant time. Yet historically it has also provided practice. The wrong response would be to retain inefficient work purely as a training mechanism. Instead, the submissions point towards a deliberate redesign of the junior experience. One proposes:

“Promotion should follow the same logic. Replace the billable-hour ladder with a defended-position record.”

The underlying idea has much broader applicability. Rather than measuring development largely through time served or tasks completed, organisations can increasingly assess demonstrated capability.

The objective is not to make junior development easier. In some respects it should become harder. AI can remove intellectual drudgery while allowing development to focus more quickly on judgement, ambiguity, communication and decision-making. One submission captures the opportunity:

“Leadership stops being a late-career reward. It becomes the actual training ground, at every level.”

Traditional Development ➔ Deliberate Development

Traditional Development

Produce routine first drafts

Repetitive research

Document review

Observe negotiations late in career

Learn through volume

Individual know-how

Years served

Produce the answer

AI-Enabled Deliberate Development

- ➔ Audit and improve AI drafts
- ➔ Verify, synthesise and interpret AI research
- ➔ Identify what automated review missed
- ➔ Participate earlier
- ➔ Learn through structured challenge
- ➔ Human + AI knowledge systems
- ➔ Capabilities demonstrated
- ➔ Form, challenge and defend the recommendation

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Protect the foundations
2. AI as a Partner
3. Redesign the Apprenticeship
4. AI Users to AI Auditor & Supervisor
5. Reinvest the AI dividend
6. Accelerate Business Immersion & Develop Judgement

Conclusions & Actions for GCs

Teach Lawyers to Audit AI

AI literacy needs to mean considerably more than prompt engineering.

Lawyers do not necessarily need to become engineers, but the submissions argue strongly that they need sufficient technical understanding to recognise the limitations of the systems on which they increasingly depend.

“A lawyer who does not understand AI will either overtrust it or be overtaken by it.”

The future lawyer therefore needs to understand not only **how to obtain an output**, but how to interrogate it.

AI can generate legal language. It cannot assume professional responsibility for using it. Lawyers need a **Practical AI Assurance Framework**.

Practical AI Assurance Framework

Before relying materially on AI-generated work, lawyers should consider seven questions:

1. **SOURCE — Where did this come from?** Can the underlying source or authority be identified?
2. **CONFIDENTIALITY - what may I put in?**
3. **ACCURACY — Is it correct?** Have the important facts, citations and conclusions been independently verified?
4. **COMPLETENESS — What is missing?** Has AI overlooked an exception, jurisdictional issue, contractual interaction or alternative interpretation?
5. **CONTEXT — Does it understand the business?** Does the output reflect the organisation's objectives, relationships, history and risk appetite?
6. **CONSEQUENCE — What if it is wrong?** The appropriate level of human oversight should increase with the potential consequence of error.
7. **ACCOUNTABILITY — Who owns the decision?** AI can recommend. The lawyer remains responsible for professional judgement.

AI User to AI Supervisor

A further development is already visible in the submissions: the move from lawyers using general-purpose AI towards legal functions deploying specialised agents and AI-enabled workflows. Potential applications identified include contract review, regulatory monitoring, negotiation preparation, knowledge management and other repeatable activities. That requires a different skill set. Future lawyers will increasingly need to answer:

- ☐ What should AI be permitted to do?
- ☐ What information should it access?
- ☐ What quality threshold is acceptable?
- ☐ Which outputs need checking?
- ☐ What triggers escalation?
- ☐ Which decisions require human judgement?
- ☐ How do we know whether the system remains reliable?
- ☐ Who is accountable when something goes wrong?

One submission describes a significant evolution of the future GC as building a:

“legal operating system: trusted agents, human checkpoints, clear risk appetite, reusable knowledge, business-facing tools and continuous learning loops.”

A Practical Human–AI Decision Matrix

Legal functions can begin by categorising work:

- **AUTOMATE:** High-volume, repeatable and sufficiently low-risk activity.
- **ASSIST:** AI produces analysis or a first pass; a lawyer verifies the result.
- **CHALLENGE:** The lawyer develops the position; AI stress-tests it.
- **HUMAN-LED:** Strategic, highly contextual, ethical or high-consequence decisions where AI remains supporting infrastructure.

The exercise of deciding where work belongs is itself valuable development. It forces lawyers to articulate exactly where professional judgement adds value.

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Protect the foundations
2. AI as a Partner
3. Redesign the Apprenticeship
4. AI Users to AI Auditor & Supervisor
5. Reinvest the AI dividend
6. Accelerate Business Immersion & Develop Judgement

Conclusions & Actions for GCs

Reinvest the AI Dividend

If AI saves lawyers time, where should that time go? This may be the most important commercial question in the report. There is a danger that organisations treat AI entirely as a productivity tool:

10 hours of work becomes five; therefore produce twice as much.

The submissions propose something more valuable.

“A lawyer who uses AI merely for speed is efficient: one who uses it to reclaim time becomes a leader.”

Recovered capacity should be deliberately invested in activities that make Legal more valuable to the organisation. This creates an important new metric. **Don't just measure hours saved. Measure hours reinvested.** For example, a legal function might report: AI capacity released: 1,000 hours.

Capacity reinvested into: strategic projects; business partnering; negotiation; professional development; preventative risk management.

This provides a more compelling business case than productivity alone. It demonstrates that AI is changing not only the cost of Legal, but the value created by Legal.

Reinvest in activities that make Legal more valuable to the organisation:

- understanding business strategy;
- engaging stakeholders;
- participating earlier in decisions;
- negotiating;
- anticipating risk;
- developing relationships;
- collaborating across functions;
- developing junior colleagues; and
- tackling strategic problems previously crowded out by routine work.

Measure better lawyers, not simply faster lawyers

AI adoption creates a temptation to measure what is easiest:

- licences;
- prompts;
- adoption rates;
- documents produced;
- time saved.

These measures matter, but they are incomplete. The real ambition is better legal capability. A more sophisticated scorecard would therefore examine four dimensions.

Efficiency

- Cycle-time reduction
- Administrative hours removed
- Speed of research and drafting
- Cost-to-serve

Quality

- Accuracy
- Consistency
- Rework
- Identification of AI errors
- Quality of final recommendations

Commercial impact

- Earlier Legal involvement
- Business responsiveness
- Strategic projects supported
- Risks anticipated rather than remediated
- Capacity reinvested into higher-value work

Capability

- Ability to critique AI output
- Technical legal competence
- Commercial understanding
- Quality of judgement
- Stakeholder exposure
- Ability to defend recommendations

The question moves from: ***“Are our lawyers using AI?”***
to: ***“Is AI helping us build a more capable legal function?”***

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Protect the foundations
2. AI as a Partner
3. Redesign the Apprenticeship
4. AI Users to AI Auditor & Supervisor
5. Reinvest the AI dividend

6. Accelerate Business Immersion & Develop Judgement

Conclusions & Actions for GCs

Accelerate business immersion

The submissions consistently identify commercial understanding as one of the capabilities that becomes more valuable as AI improves. AI can know the wording of a contract without understanding why a particular clause matters in a specific relationship. It can identify legal options without knowing which option is commercially realistic. It can describe risk without necessarily understanding which risk an organisation should accept.

One submission makes the distinction particularly well:

“AI may identify the clause, but only a lawyer who understands the wider context can assess its real impact.”

Another observes that AI cannot fully understand:

“the systems, the business, the ecosystem, the people, the trade-offs and the real consequences of decisions.”

This suggests a major change to development.

Put lawyers closer to the business, earlier

Capacity released by AI should enable junior and mid-career lawyers to spend more time with:

- **Finance** - understanding economics and investment decisions.
- **Operations** - seeing how contractual and regulatory decisions work in practice.
- **Technology** - understanding systems, data and AI.
- **Commercial teams** - learning how organisations win customers and generate value.
- **Leadership** - seeing how senior executives make decisions under uncertainty.

The resulting lawyer should be capable of moving beyond:

“Here is what the law says.” towards: *“Here are our options, here are the consequences, and this is what I recommend we do.”*

That is a much closer approximation of the role of a high-performing General Counsel.

Develop judgement by making lawyers defend decisions

AI increases the importance of a capability that legal development does not always test explicitly: the ability to take a position and defend it.

One submission argues that young lawyers need:

“enough nerve to take a position and hold it under pressure.”

Another describes leadership as the ability to:

“allocate attention, make trade-offs and take responsibility for decisions.”

These are fundamentally different capabilities from producing technically correct analysis.

Introduce the Defended Position

Introduce the Defended Position

Legal teams could incorporate short Defended Position Reviews into development. Give the lawyer a realistic problem. Allow them to use all appropriate resources, including AI. Then require them to present:

- The recommendation
- The legal basis
- The commercial rationale
- The principal risks
- The alternatives rejected
- What AI contributed
- What they did not accept from AI—and why

Senior colleagues then challenge the recommendation. The lawyer can change their position. Indeed, recognising a better argument is itself good judgement. But they must ultimately own the answer. This reflects how senior lawyers operate in practice: not simply producing analysis, but making recommendations in rooms where intelligent people disagree.

Make AI learning continuous, practical and social

AI is developing too quickly for legal capability to depend on an annual training course. The submissions favour practical experimentation and continuous learning. One proposes AI “matter reviews” after significant work: teams identify where AI added value, where it created risk and where human judgement remained decisive. Another advocates reverse mentoring, pairing junior lawyers' familiarity with technology with senior lawyers' experience and judgement. Both approaches recognise that AI capability is distributed across the organisation.

Build a learning loop: A simple operating rhythm could be:

- **EXPERIMENT** - Use approved AI on appropriate real work. ↓
- **REVIEW** - Identify successes, failures and surprises. ↓
- **SHARE** - Circulate useful prompts, approaches and lessons. ↓
- **STANDARDISE** - Turn proven approaches into playbooks and workflows. ↓
- **CHALLENGE** - Periodically reassess whether they remain appropriate. ↓
- **IMPROVE** - This moves the organisation from individual experimentation to institutional capability.

It also creates a healthier relationship between generations. Junior lawyers can teach senior colleagues about emerging technology. Senior lawyers can help junior colleagues recognise risk, context and nuance. Expertise flows in both directions.

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Protect the foundations
2. AI as a Partner
3. Redesign the Apprenticeship
4. AI Users to AI Auditor & Supervisor
5. Reinvest the AI dividend
6. Accelerate Business Immersion & Develop Judgement

Conclusions & Actions for GCs

The Emerging Model: Expert, Architect, Leader

Taken together, the submissions suggested a useful model for the lawyer of the future. The Expert, The Architect and The Leader. AI strengthens the need for all three. Expertise without technology risks becoming inefficient.

THE EXPERT

Understands law deeply enough to recognise when an apparently convincing answer is wrong.

Core capabilities:

Legal expertise | reasoning | ethics | critical thinking | professional accountability

THE ARCHITECT

Understands how human and artificial intelligence should work together.

Core capabilities:

AI literacy | workflow design | verification | governance | agent supervision | risk-based human oversight

THE LEADER

Turns legal expertise and technology into better organisational decisions.

Core capabilities:

Commercial judgement | influence | communication | empathy | relationships | courage | decision-making

Technology without expertise creates uncontrolled risk. Expertise and technology without leadership create a highly efficient legal technician. The opportunity is to combine all three. ***“The lawyer of tomorrow must therefore be an expert, an architect and a leader.”***

The GC Action Agenda - Over the next 30 days

1. **Define your non-negotiable foundations.** Agree what every lawyer must know and be able to do independently of AI.
2. **Map human versus AI work.** Classify significant activities as automate, assist, challenge or human-led.
3. **Introduce “think first, AI second”.** For selected development exercises, require lawyers to establish their own position before consulting AI.
4. **Start AI Challenge Sessions.** Use AI to attack recommendations and expose blind spots.
5. **Review the junior apprenticeship.** Identify what young lawyers currently learn through tasks likely to disappear.
6. **Introduce Defended Positions.** Require lawyers to present and defend AI-assisted recommendations.
7. **Establish AI matter reviews.** Capture what worked, what failed and what required human judgement.
8. **Create reverse-mentoring partnerships.** Combine technological confidence with accumulated professional judgement.
9. **Track capacity reinvestment.** Measure where hours released by AI are actually going.
10. **Accelerate business exposure.** Move lawyers earlier into commercial, operational and strategic discussions.

The Opportunity is more than efficiency

AI will make legal work faster. That is increasingly the least interesting part of the transformation. The more profound opportunity is to reconsider what lawyers spend their careers learning and doing. Routine execution can increasingly move towards machines. But responsibility cannot. The future lawyer will still need deep foundations in legal reasoning, ethics and technical expertise. On top of those foundations must sit technological fluency: the ability to use, challenge, govern and supervise increasingly capable systems. And on top of both must sit something more important still: judgement. The ability to understand context, balance competing interests, navigate ambiguity, earn trust and take responsibility for a recommendation remains fundamentally human. As one submission puts it:

“AI can accelerate research, drafting and document review. It cannot take responsibility, build trust or decide what risk is acceptable for a particular organisation.”

That distinction provides a useful direction for the profession. AI should do more of the processing. Lawyers should do more of the thinking, challenging, advising and leading. The goal should therefore not be to create the world's most efficient generation of lawyers. It should be to use AI to develop a generation of lawyers who reach judgement, commercial maturity and leadership earlier, and who understand technology well enough to know when not to trust it. Or, in the words of one of the submissions:

“The lawyers of tomorrow will not be those who compete with AI, but those who know how to leverage it.”

Global GC Academy



The Global GC Academy, is delivered in collaboration with The Dickson Poon School of Law, King's College London.

Worldclass Cohort & Development

The Global GC Academy has one clear purpose: **To develop technically outstanding Legal professionals into world-class GCs and strategic business leaders.**

The Academy has been designed for:

1. Current GCs seeking to operate at an even more strategic level.
2. Legal Directors & Heads of Legal preparing for GC roles.
3. High-potential Legal leaders with ambitions to reach the C-Suite.

Worldclass Faculty



Prof. Dan Hunter
Executive Dean
The Dickson Poon School of Law
King's College London



Omiyinka Doris (The Netherlands)
Group General Counsel
VEON



Spencer Davis MBA (UK)
Chief Legal Officer
Lifezone Metals



Mine Hifzi (UK)
General Counsel and
Company Secretary
Heathrow Airport



Prof. Christoph Kletzer
Professor of Law,
Vice Dean International
The Dickson Poon School of Law
King's College London



Amitabh Lal Das (India)
Chief Legal Officer
Hyundai Motor India



Chris Fowler (UK)
Chief Operating Officer -
Legal, Governance and
Corporate Affairs
Rio Tinto



Katja Roth Pellanda (Switzerland)
Group General Counsel
Zurich Insurance



Salah Mostafa (Switzerland)
Head of Legal Immunology
Novartis



Yoko Oshima (Japan)
Head of CELA Japan, Associate
General Counsel
Microsoft



Mark Cockerill (Ireland)
Senior Vice President, Legal -
Corporate, M&A and
International Development
ServiceNow



Harry Borovick (UK)
General Counsel & AI
Governance Officer
Luminance



Filippo Cossalter (UAE)
Head of Legal Europe, Middle
East & Africa
Ericsson



Claude Bahoshy (UK)
Legal Director, Global
Procurement & Legal
Operations
Reckitt

Report Partners: FLIT & Winmark



Enabling the Global C-Suite

Winmark is a global C-Suite network and leadership development organisation, bringing together senior executives from across the world to **learn, connect and lead more effectively**.

Through executive networks, world-class academies, research and peer-to-peer learning, Winmark enables C-Suite leaders develop their capabilities, share best practice and navigate the challenges of today.

2,000+ executives | 20+ countries | Global C-Suite



winmarkglobal.com



The network for in-house lawyers in tech and startups

FLIT brings together more than 800 in-house lawyers working across the French and European tech ecosystem. Membership is by application and every candidate is reviewed, which is what keeps the quality and relevance of our exchanges high. Our members include:

- In-house lawyers in startups and scale-ups
- In-house lawyers in tech companies
- In-house lawyers in major global technology groups
- Heads of Legal and Legal Directors leading digital, IT and innovation, including outside the tech sector

Founded and run by [Audrey Délérís](#) and [Pierre Landy](#).

flit-network.com