

## **Pioneers and Pathfinders: Christina Wojcik**

(This transcript was generated through AI technology.)

### **Steve Poor**

Hi, this is Steve Poor and you're listening to Pioneers and Pathfinders.

Our guest this week is Christina Wojcik, Head of Innovation and Partnerships at Pierson Ferdinand LLP and a true pioneer in legal, tech and professional. Christina's career started on the business side of law, where she built high performing teams and supported major transactions and reviews. But as technology began reshaping the legal landscape, she leaned in, becoming one of the early leaders in AI powered document analysis and helping to find a new era of legal service delivery. Now, at Pierson Ferdinand, Christina leads strategy around innovation and partnerships working to deliver smarter, more efficient solutions for clients. She's also the founder of the Tampa Legal Network, a group that brings in-house legal professionals together across roles, lawyers and allied professionals alike, with an emphasis on inclusion and collaboration.

In our conversation, Christina reflects on what we learned from the shift from paper to electronic communications, how she stays ahead in a fast moving tech environment, the exciting work she's doing at Pierson Ferdinand, and her advice for anyone looking to build a career in legal tech. It was a great conversation with one of the fields was forward thinking voices. I hope you enjoy listening in. Thanks for making the time.

Christina, welcome to Pioneers and Pathfinders. Thanks so much for making the time.

### **Christina Wojcik**

Stephen, thank you so much for inviting me. I'm really excited to have this conversation.

### **Steve Poor**

You've had really a remarkable journey. You've worked across legal services, operations, AI, innovation at all sorts of different companies. We'll talk with each of them. But as you, as you look back on your career, not that you're anywhere near finished, is there a particular theme or through line that sort of knits these operations together. When you went to law school, is this what you thought your career as a lawyer was going to be?

### **Christina Wojcik**

Absolutely not. I mean, I think when I went to law school, this was not actually an opportunity as a career, as a lawyer, right? So, the model was you went to law school, you did your clerkships or your internships, you graduated, you got a position with whomever you did, your clerkships or internships with, and then you just started building your way up through the associate partnership, direct or to the government side of law. And I had done my clerkships at the US Attorney's Office for the Northern and Western District of New York, so I was heading more towards that government law side. And

when I graduated law school, I moved to Washington, DC, to focus on human rights law. Unfortunately, I quickly realized that that doesn't actually pay back your student debt.

**Steve Poor**

No, it doesn't. It does good things for the world, but...

**Christina Wojcik**

Yes, yes. So unfortunately or fortunately I had to pivot. So I pivoted into the services side, into the business side of law and just started building my career from there. And then the journey that I've taken is all about what is that thing that I think could bring better value for the people in my life, the people who I am either supporting at a law firm or in-house or in a business development role. What are those things that are causing people pain? What are those things that I think have a solution for? And how do we find the right groups of people or organization that are trying to tap that specific pain point and then really helping to spread the word? Hey, listen, there's a better way of doing this. And if it's uncomfortable right now, I think that this will find that this approach is going to bring you more value to your personal and professional journey, so that's really kind of how I've gone from position to position is there's got to be a better way. Let's try and figure out what that better way is.

**Steve Poor**

Why the first pivot into sort of the business side of law? This was, now, sort of what turn of the century? Kind of 2000, 2005, somewhere in that range.

**Christina Wojcik**

I feel I should have a Victorian hat on or something.

**Steve Poor**

Oh, trust me.

**Christina Wojcik**

No, I think that. That, that, that timing is about right. So in the early 2000s and what was happening at that time was kind of the first evolution of pulling legal work away from law firms into facilities that can do high volume, low value legal work, and I think low value is probably misnomer because this was the first iteration of large scale document review outside of the law firm. So in the shops of staff attorneys, contract attorneys. And so I got my basis in those types of second requests, investigations, litigations, large scale reviews with setting up those shops and working with the law firms on providing better quality and better price services for that scale. Because this is at a time when we are moving from and there's still a little bit of this left, but from the bankers' boxes of documents and facilities to generation one of eDiscovery technology.

**Steve Poor**

It was a fascinating time period, wasn't it?

**Christina Wojcik**

Yeah, yeah. I mean it. Was it was and I didn't know it at the time. Right. I didn't know what kind of a big deal this was. And so first generation of eDiscovery technology and moving away from paper into electronic communications, and it really gave me a foothold into how you set up an efficient and cost effective shop to bring value to the ultimate customer but doing it in a way that didn't necessarily provide that fear, uncertainty and doubt because it was still onshore. It was still using highly supervised by the law firms. And it was a little bit more comfortable of a transition, so that that I thought was exciting, right? There's a better way of doing this large scale, better way of bringing costs down. And so, I started my journey there.

**Steve Poor**

I want to talk about various stops you've made along the way below, pick up on something you said, which is as you think back on the transition from bankers boxes to computers. What lessons do you learn from that that can be applied to the current AI transformation and the adoption issues and the fear issues because there are some similarities, are there not?

**Christina Wojcik**

There absolutely are. And so I think, you know, watching the evolution of technology assistance in the legal practice, right. So you're starting with the technology assisted reviews and eDiscovery and then we went through the technology assisted reviews, leveraging machine learning like semantic and indexing, natural language processing with contract analytics and now we're kind of putting all of that and then generative AI and large language models into the entire scope of what can be delivered from a legal perspective. And some of the lessons learned are generation 1 is always going to be with the worst generation of that technology, right. So, recognizing the opportunities for misses and precision, recall, hallucinations, whatever that might be. But knowing that every iteration of that technology from version 1 is going to be better and better and better and just. Sticking with it and understanding where the technology is strong, understanding where there might be additional investments necessary to get that technology to where you need it to be in order to rely on that information in the first instance and then always understanding where the people need to be in the loop, right, that's a very common saying, "Always have a human in the loop." And as the technology matures, the human in the loop, the world changes slightly. Right now, it's human in the loop, almost at every step, and eventually I think what we'll see is that human the loop becomes less and less of a focus and will become more and more of a reliance on that technology and the output from that technology. So I think that the themes are very similar. Every generation that we've seen over the past 20 something years.

**Steve Poor**

One of the differences to me is the speed of change of the technology. Currently we had a longer time to sort of think and adopt and yell about it and oppose it. Back in the early 2000s.

**Christina Wojcik**

For sure.

**Steve Poor**

We don't have that now. How do you keep up with the change in the technology?

**Christina Wojcik**

Well, it's a really interesting question because you're right, this is the first time that we haven't had the grace of long stretches of runway in order to understand whether or not we've made the right investment in a technology and whether that is from an onboarding perspective or not. So it's almost become paralyzing for some people to select a technology in order to move forward because they know right around the corner is going to be something that's a little bit better. And so the challenge becomes how do we as a profession stay on top of the latest technology, but give our interior stakeholders the opportunity to get comfortable with what we're bringing in. And so it's aligning yourself with the right technology providers or if you're building in house, the right visionaries to understand that this is going to be an incredibly accelerated journey and we all have to be in it together because if it at any stage one of those components that's falling behind, then you have to think about, well, what do I need to bring on next? How do I stay ahead or at least on top of everything without become stagnant without having my stakeholders have to change to something brand new every single day? That's one of the biggest things is does that road map with the technology that you're leveraging align with your road map and are you able to stay on pace with each other? Because if one does the other, then it's just a recipe for disaster and then you lose professional integrity within your position because someone said you told me that this was the best and then you have to be like, "It was. The day I selected it, it was the best."

**Steve Poor**

The next day, something else came out.

**Christina Wojcik**

And so I always prevent that with having a bench, right? So you select the technology that is the best for your use case at that time and then you have that bunch of technologies that are kind of the ankle biters that are coming up and staying on top of that and having an appropriate transition plan. If the provider that you've selected isn't going in the same strategic direction that you need them to go. Or maybe an acquisition has happened and their strategic vision has completely changed. At the time you've licensed that product or decide to move forward with the relationship.

## **Steve Poor**

As you look at building your tech stack in this sense, are you focused on sort of point solutions or one overall platform solution or where do you think the market's going in that respect?

## **Christina Wojcik**

I mean, in the ideal world, and I love ideal worlds, it would be one platform solution that could solve for all. However the reality of that is that these organizations that are developing the latest and greatest technology are being funded to solve a points problem and in order to solve a point problem you have to have significant financial resources as well as internal talent to be able to solve for that one point problem effectively enough that it brings significant value to the person who's going to purchase it. So if you look at the providers that are trying to be that one stop shop and building it from the beginning, right? So building it from the ground up, that one stop shop, the resources are too thinly allocated across the platform for any one of those solutions within the platform to drive, I think, the necessary power for the consumer to get value from I mean. Think about what it takes to build up a CLM shop to build up an eDiscovery shop to build up an IP shop, right? All of that is incredibly expensive. I think we see this at the Legal Tech Fund, right? So even where everyone is trying to buy for those dollars. And if you do everything slightly OK. Slightly OK isn't good enough. So one of the strategies that I always look at is at the end of the day, I want to make sure my internal stakeholders or my external clients are happy with what we're doing. How do I take these various point solutions and integrate them in a way that gives my users a seamless experience and maybe white label all of the products into like fill in your logo and so that the workflow allows the user never to really know what product they're in because at the end of the day it doesn't matter as long as that product brings value and just have that seamless solution so you can go into a system them and say I need to build a contract and the workflow takes you to your contracting solution or I need to have a litigation hold, you know, whatever it takes, you takes you in that direction without having to have different logins at different times. You know, if you can have that seamless experience, I think that gets you where you need to go and there's only a couple of big shops out there that have made a lot of acquisitions and we know who those are who do have the opportunity to offer that single platform play because they already have a lot of the tech components in house. But for the people who are just starting out and they want to be good at everything, I don't know if that's really possibility.

## **Steve Poor**

It's really hard, isn't it?

## **Christina Wojcik**

It's very hard.

## **Steve Poor**

Particularly when the stakeholders and users within the organization, they're actually looking for a point solution without knowing that's what they're looking for. They care about what's going to fix their particular practice or create their contract, and they don't really care about litigation because they're not in litigation.

### **Christina Wojcik**

I think that's right. Exactly right. And I think that's the thing that a lot of providers don't understand, especially when you get into the big organizations, right? So if you're developing products for corporates, legal departments versus law firms, there's not as much overlap as people might think, right? The litigation group is a bit more siloed from the corporate transactional group. And even within those different practices, there are silos that exist. So, saying, I solve for litigation. What does that mean? Because there's different groups within each one of those groups, and if you say, well, I can solve litigation and I can solve for corporate, OK, what, what does that mean? Let me see what you're talking about because it makes me start to think that you don't actually have experience in-house. And so you can't actually relate to the pain that I'm experiencing in-house and the transaction or litigation side.

### **Steve Poor**

Absolutely. Let's change focus just a little bit. You're currently with Pierson Ferdinand, which is a new entity. It's certainly new to me before we talk about your specific role there, talk to me about the organization, what makes it different, what makes it unique in the market.

### **Christina Wojcik**

So I was first introduced via a press release to Pierson Ferdinand and what caught my attention was the name Michael Pierson because I had a dear friend in law school named Michael Pierson. And as I dug in I realized, Oh my God, that's my friend Michael Pierson from law school. So as I read the press release, I started to get that. And I got sense that I get with certain organizations that there's something special about. One. So just over a year ago, a year and a quarter ago at this point, Pierson Ferdinand launched and it was one of the largest law firm, if not the largest law firm launch in history with over 110 partners and essentially the business model is very different I think about it as turning the Cravath model on its head, where it's only partners. It's a distributed model. There are no hourly requirements, right? So you don't have to build 2400 hours a year. There's 100% transparency. So all partners can see what all of their partners are making and their technology LED. So the focus is how can we bring in technology to streamline the back office functions that the partners have to go through. So what are those annoying things that partners have to do that they don't like to do? And let's try to automate that to the extent possible, so that way they can focus on just doing the work to deliver good services to their customers. And it increases professional happiness because nobody likes to do that type of...well, maybe some people...but not many people don't want to do that type of thing.

**Steve Poor**

No partner I've ever met.

**Christina Wojcik**

Exactly so then...

**Steve Poor**

And it's a long list of stuff.

**Christina Wojcik**

Oh, and there is and the things that they have already solved for it just really blew my mind as I started the conversations with Michael and Joel. And then also looking at the opportunities to provide better outputs for our customers, right. So they were looking at how can we use technology in order to analyze and have access to the most data possible so that as we're thinking about our clients needs, we can make sure that we've been able to give the kind of the global perspective on what the right strategic vision is for the output of that matter? And so they're taking this combination of business, the practice of law to provide their, their customers with more value based services. And that just struck a chord with me because I have to tell you there's very few people—and I'm sure present company excluded Steven—very few people who just love. Working with their law firms, right, and they love the relationships. They have one-on-one with the partners that they're working with, but they really hate how the rates increase exponentially every year. They really don't like the fact that they have to pay for a lot of services that end up being write offs for the law firms right? First and Second year associates are oftentimes just write offs, the hourly requirement. Right, that there's an opportunity for hourly requirements to be potentially padded in order to hit that number, right? So there's just a lot of things that Pierson for and then has removed from the equation, which ultimately gives the partners additional professional satisfy. Action and we're seeing the results from the client side, right, because like finally you're doing things differently. And so those. Are all the things I had seen and then had started having conversations with Michael and Joel and really starting to play out has been amazing.

**Steve Poor**

A couple of questions on that. One: when you say distributed model, what do you mean by that?

**Christina Wojcik**

So there's no office, there's no set office space, so everyone works remotely.

**Steve Poor**

Okay, even administrator, there's no conference rooms?

**Christina Wojcik**

So there's no office overhead. Now there's... There are some partners who will have their own office space. I actually have rented my own office space just to get me out of my house every once in a while in co-shared space, but it's not something that the firm provides and thus far it has not been any problem as far as I'm aware for our clients as well as the reduction in costs, right, not having real estate reduces cost significantly, which is reflected in the rates.

**Steve Poor**

Oh that's huge. Two follow-up questions on that because this is fascinating to me. One you hear about return to work returned to the office and one of the arguments is you need people physically in an office space in order to maintain and build culture and cohesion. Obviously you guys have done it without office space. So I'm curious as to how that's. How that's happened? And the second question is it affirmed of all partners, how do you staff matters that sometimes actually could use a team of lawyers, big piece of litigation or whatever?

**Christina Wojcik**

So to answer the first question first. That was a concern of mine. As well you know. I have been reporting into an office when I was at Citibank and then I had opportunities to be hybrid, hybrid and remote throughout my career. And one thing that I've noticed is that this team is incredibly collaborative. Every day I log on and there are requests for support in different areas. So the partners can lean on each other. So I guess I'm answering question one and two a little bit and then I'll go more directly. So the partners can really lean on each other. Essentially they say, "Does anyone have experience in this? Here's the rate that we're looking at." And usually within 10 minutes, the note comes back out saying, "Found someone. This is great. Thanks." So, there's this camaraderie and team membership that we have because we know that we're working with in a different structure than what you would have if you had groups of associates there to help. Joel and Michael are also fantastic in terms of just staying in touch with all the partners, so birthdays, anniversaries, names, medical events, everything that you know is known to Michael and Joel. They reach out and they're constantly in touch. They also host off site networking events. So I went to one in Amelia Island, Florida, and it was amazing getting to know everyone. And everyone brought their families; it was just absolutely lovely. We've got another event coming up in a few months. And I haven't experienced that isolation that I thought we might because of the constant communication and like I said, the camaraderie amongst the partners.

**Steve Poor**

That's nice.

**Christina Wojcik**



Joel and Michael are very, very focused on that culture. And then to your point about not having that associated class, a couple of things: because we are only partners, oftentimes we can answer questions much more efficiently and quickly. And you know, going through the associate process and to partners for sign-off for those big litigation matters, we have partnerships, you know in spaces that can provide additional headcount or additional technology. If it's not something that we have in house. So we are able to staff up for large scale projects to the extent that we need to do that. Also what I'm exploring now is adding that layer of we already have some, but adding another layer of large language models with AI to be able to provide all some of that associate level thinking to the matters that our partners are working on so they can interact with the technology in a way as if it wasn't associated doing a first pass first draft first, whatever to first take on that particular matter or research and then having the lawyers, just the partners, dive in a little bit more deeply into those areas where they need to. So we're able to kind of balance all of that out and we're looking at ways that we can help support the training of associates in the future. So it's not something that we're doing today, but I think we have an opportunity to make sure that we have a constant stream of quality talent that's coming up through the pipeline, but right now it's really working incredibly well, and we're only a year and a quarter old, so we have a great opportunity to continue to build the foundation for the future, now using the best technology available.

**Steve Poor**

And your role that the firm is?

**Christina Wojcik**

So, I am the head of innovation and partnerships. So, I have the opportunity to set the strategy on what we can do to continue to reduce the friction back office for technology as well as forward in providing support and opportunities to deliver better value to our external customers and then partnerships: finding those relationships to make it all happen.

**Steve Poor**

You make a really fascinating point about the use of AI and large language models. The argument in the industry is that in fact that will begin to replace—maybe not replace—augment associates and provide additional powers to more senior lawyers who can operate at the top of their license. You guys have taken a bigger step in that direction than anybody I know by having just partners and technology. How do you see that evolving over the near future in terms of using technology, using AI as a augmentation to the partners, and I don't want to say replacement because that always gets me in trouble. But to facilitate the practice without having to hire loads of associates.

**Christina Wojcik**

Yeah, I think that from. And I reserve the right to change my mind at any time, because all of this is very much working theory. But what I see right now from an associate

perspective is you now have the opportunity to work with a highly skilled partner with which is your technology. With the natural language questions, you can ask a lot of the technology and how do I do this? What do you think about this approach? What is the case law saying with regards to this. You can have a lot of that strategy in training with your technology partner which we never had access to before. It is amazing to see what this technology can do in terms of interacting with the people who are using it. From the partner perspective, they now have access, so they know their stuff, right? But now they have access to have further arguments. So if the opposing side says X, what do you think my best approach is for Y, and the partners can have an even deeper level of representation for their customers because a lot of the platforms today have access to huge warehouses of data that would just simply take too much time for a partner to dig into or try to find through the typical means of legal research or document creation or summarization. Right? So allowing the partners have that first pass, which does one of two things: it allows us to potentially create more budget predictability for the end client. So if I can start looking at the data to understand, OK, these types of things typically take this long and we have predictability because we know the machines can help us get to that answer faster. I can then start talking to our clients and saying, hey, listen. For these types of matters, this is what your price is going to be. And as an in house buyer at one point that would be huge. But also the goal is to have better outcomes. So if the partners have access to more data more quickly, can we have better outcomes for our clients even if those outcomes are this case does not look good for you. Let's think about taking a different approach versus, you know, fighting it, maybe settling it right, so you can have better business relationships and business guidance with your clients when you have access to more data more quickly.

### **Steve Poor**

With the tech focus like this, which I find fascinating, I promise I'm not going to use up all of our time talking about Pierson Ferdinand.

### **Christina Wojcik**

I would love to. I could do it all day.

### **Steve Poor**

How do you keep people up to date on the capabilities of the various technology as it's changing and morphing and adding additional capabilities because you guys have grown incredibly quickly. I saw a press release where you're the fastest growing one year old firm in history, you're up to several 100 lawyers. I can't remember now what the number was. But that brings challenges in terms of understanding the capabilities and technologies in any organization. You guys seem to have solved, maybe not completely solved the problem because they are lawyers and they are partners, but how do you how do you tackle that challenge?

### **Christina Wojcik**

So that's one of my primary responsibilities: staying up to date with the market, with the tech market and doing so by bucketing by different categories of technology. But understanding what the pain points are that my partners are experiencing in terms of their current tech stack or in terms of their current delivery model and understanding the pain points that our ultimate customers are experiencing. And so I have a multi-tiered program approach that I'm developing right now. I'm one month in. But I'm starting to launch different aspects of it, so one of those aspects is going to be something as simple as a monthly tech highlight in a certain category, right? So all the partners can see in this category, here's how some of the best technologies are approaching this, because that's also inspiration for, oh, well, in my category, maybe I could have something similar? And so approaching it with highlighting different technologies and different categories every month. But in the back end, also having those conversations. So that way we can start exploring what technology will provide the most value for to our customers at the right price because there is a balance between, is that technology worth that financial investment in terms of a license or subscription? Or can our partner still deliver the value based on the tools that they have or the experience that they have? And we can still find that cost savings with the traditional approach and we just have to continue to explore that. But there is always a fear we will always miss something, right. And hopefully what we'll do as I'm building out our program is that we'll miss less. But we also have to make very smart decisions because based on what how our conversation initially started, it moves so fast that you don't want to move so fast, but you also can't move slowly, if that makes sense, right? You want to make sure you will make the right the right decisions.

### **Steve Poor**

It does make sense.

### **Christina Wojcik**

Not I'm going to have 200 partners. Very angry with me, and I prefer that never to be the case. Slightly angry. OK, but very angry is not.

### **Steve Poor**

That's no, that's not an objective. I understand that. Do you do much custom development?

### **Christina Wojcik**

So we do. Custom development both in terms of some of the tools that we bring in where we see an opportunity to tailor to what our needs are, but then also when there are gaps in the market building it ourselves and we've been able to do that and have a an incredible complex check process where we can run conflict checks in a matter of minutes, if not even faster and it's really decreased the time it takes for us to respond to our potential clients or our clients on certain matters as well as when we bring in new partners in understanding where there may be potential conflicts and getting ahead of

those. But there's a number of other things that we're we are looking to build in our. All day.

**Steve Poor**

It's an exciting strategic choice, isn't it, to decide what to build, what not to build, what to modify, what to buy, what can you afford to buy? What's the value? It's sort of business strategy 101. It's just so interesting to me.

**Christina Wojcik**

Yeah. And what's really hard is trying to kind of contain the excitement and I saw this at Citibank all the time where someone kind of be like, Oh my God, I saw the latest and greatest thing. I'm so excited. We have to get this. Christina, we have to get this like, OK, let's take a look at it. You take a look at it. They don't have any of the security infrastructure in place. They don't have any funding. And it's just one person with a really good idea and passion which I support good ideas and passion don't get me wrong, but if you don't have some of those other key thing in place, it's a "not yet" right? Let's incubate them. Let's support them. But we cannot offer that to our internal or external stakeholders, because if something goes wrong, the risk is too high and no one wants to experience that.

**Steve Poor**

Gee, I I've never seen that dynamic play out before. It's how unique.

**Christina Wojcik**

Right.

**Steve Poor**

If I could just change...You've had such a fascinating career, I could spend all day talking to you of it. But one thing that jumped out at me, you mentioned your time at city, the legal innovation lab. What was the idea behind that and what did it become?

**Christina Wojcik**

So the idea behind that was to allow us a safe space to test and tinker with various technologies that fit the use cases that had been identified. Historically what we would do is have a tech provider come in, give some demos, maybe run a proof of concept and then make a decision pretty quickly without having the opportunity to really kick the tires hard and what I wanted to do was to have a more systematic approach to testing and understanding the technology before we made the commitment to bringing it on board because the onboarding process could take up to two years, it requires tens if not hundreds of stakeholders. It was a very, very big program once you decided to onboard the technology. So I wanted to make sure that we are making the right selections, but I also wanted the opportunity to have an incubator program for those technologies that

were mature but not mature enough for a tier one highly regulated financial institution where the stakes are incredibly high. So for those organizations that I thought were interesting or groundbreaking, I was able to bring in my city ventures team to add capital if necessary. If the company was a little bit more mature and was looking for bigger events to happen, I could bring in the banking organization. And so we had this incredible infrastructure ecosystem where we able to not only test the up and coming technology in a very safe environment, opportunity to fail fast, which is also very important. For those technologies that showed significant promise, but just weren't ready for us. At the time, give them an opportunity to learn what it takes to be installed at an organization like Citi. Get the funding necessary to those organizations so that way they can build the resources and technology necessary to be onboarded at a complex organization and then ultimately from the business side, the city could look at a potential financial positive financial impact if there is an exit for that organization. And so it was a really cool experience that allowed us to pick the right technology for a long term strategic play, but then also start creating that bench and incubating that bench, so if that organization that we initially selected was no longer suited for purpose, we had a couple of other options that we could pull from that were about ready, if not ready to go.

### **Steve Poor**

It's such a fascinating idea in particular organization like Citi. Was it a difficult sell internally or did people go, "Oh yeah, that's a great idea."

### **Christina Wojcik**

In my mind, it wasn't difficult because there was almost a no-brainer, but I had the support from Nitin Batra, who was an absolute visionary. He's now at Clifford Chance and he saw the vision. He understood the value proposition and so we were able to build the business case presented to the general counsel at the time. And also saw that vision because these are the very early days of user driven machine learning and so this is before and so in order to be able to test things like machine learning, I needed to have a very safe space because it was just the potential risk wasn't well known, even though for my use cases, it was very low risk because looking at machine learning for bias in contracts or having the machine creating bias for contracts that are already executed, the bias is already in the contracts. If there's bias is already there, the machine is likely not going to create additional bias.

### **Steve Poor**

Right, right. You're just fine. You're just figuring it out.

### **Christina Wojcik**

Right. But so we just had a very, very supportive management team within the bank. And then I was able to partner with the business. So this was something that the business had an innovation department with in the London and Tel Aviv offices. And so I was able to develop relationships with them because they had the resources already on site, so the cost was a bit less. And one of the things that I really focused on is listen,

Legal has always been seen as a bottleneck for these business endeavors if I can help you, we'll leave that bottleneck through the use of technology and you guys can help support. In terms of headcount and financially for some of the products we went in together with the business and legal, I will help with that change management to get the legal onto that technology in order for the business to have faster answers to the questions that they're having. So it was a very good relationship that we had built and it was advantageous to the bank essentially, as a whole, our bankers, our ventures team. Little so it was, you know, the vision was there. And again, lots of lots of support from the legal management team. So they in in and of themselves, you know, visionaries.

**Steve Poor**

Oh, that's awesome. It's so cool to see.

**Christina Wojcik**

It's not easy. I make it sound super easy. It takes some working around but it was fun. It was really fun.

**Steve Poor**

You know, creating that organization within an organization as complex and as sophisticated and as large as Citi is a huge challenge and a huge accomplishment. And yes, you made it sound straightforward that everybody got it.

**Christina Wojcik**

Everyone should just. Do it.

**Steve Poor**

Everyone should just do it. Everybody should just think maybe they should. Last question, I promise. And I know I've kept you longer than I said I would and I apologize for that. We could indeed. So your careers crossed all sorts of providers, ASP's and law firms and big corporations. So people come to you, I assume, looking to start out wanting to think about similar careers in the intersection of law and technology and innovation. What advice do you typically give somebody who's starting out, wants to go down this type of path that back in the day was an alternative path and now is a fairly well established career path?

**Christina Wojcik**

I think, and this probably sounds pretty cheesy, but follow your gut if you want to go and practice law at a law firm like that's fantastic. And that's an absolute path that you should take if you've done that for a little while and you want to get into the tech or services space, find that group of people that have built a company that you can believe in, not only the output of whatever that service or technology is, but also the group of people that you're joining. The group of people, the culture is probably even more

important than the technology itself, and you have to follow your instincts. If you have been in house or a law firm or a tech, and you see a challenge that needs to be solved and you can find a collective or if you can do it yourself, go after it. Because if you know that that's a pain point for someone, or if that was a pain point for you, it's absolutely going to be a pain point for someone else. And there might be a market for that. I've always established myself with very small shops to begin with and help them grow through their journey and ultimately to an exit and that's really what I've done is like, I hate that my customers had to experience this. That company is trying to solve for that, and I love the kind of the foundational team. I'm going to go help them do that because I know how to pitch to those people who are experiencing the same pain points that I have and that's it. And so again, that kind of has led me to my journey at Pierson Ferdinand, where here's a law firm that is approaching the market differently--hiring some of the best talent out there, who also want to approach their careers differently, providing an excellent level of service, providing rates that are blowing people's minds because they don't have the overhead that a lot of the traditional law firms have. And at the end of the day, they're really good people. We just came off of Legal Week in every meeting we had, Can I join you guys? That was so much fun. Like hanging with you, Michael, and Joel. And again, Michael and Joe are brilliant, brilliant lawyers, but they're just good people, too. And that's my advice: Find good people with a product or service that you believe in. And go for it and just give it everything because it's going to be scary. You start with a weird no name software company with five people like. Yes, it can be incredibly fruitful and potentially lucrative at the end of that journey.

### **Steve Poor**

Sometimes you just have to make the leap, don't you?

### **Christina Wojcik**

You do.

### **Steve Poor**

Well, Christina, you've had such a fascinating career and it just continues to do great things. And I'll be fascinated to watch what you accomplish at Pierson Ferdinand. And I look forward to seeing you at the next legal tech event.

### **Christina Wojcik**

I will absolutely see you there. Thank you so much for this opportunity. It's been so much fun. Thank you, Stephen.

### **Steve Poor**

Thanks for listening to Pioneers and Pathfinders. Be sure to visit [thepioneerpodcast.com](http://thepioneerpodcast.com) for show notes and more episodes, and don't forget to subscribe to our podcast on your favorite platform.