

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT _____

[PLAINTIFF],

Plaintiff,

v.

[DEFENDANT],

Defendant.

CASE NO. [CASE #]

**[MODEL] AGREEMENT
REGARDING
DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY
STORED
INFORMATION AND
[PROPOSED] ORDER**

[The italicized portions below set forth guidance and instruction to the parties in formulating their agreement but may be deleted from the text of the final agreement as adopted.]

The parties hereby stipulate to the following provisions regarding the discovery of electronically stored information (“ESI”) in this matter:

A. General Principles

1. An attorney’s zealous representation of a client is not compromised by conducting discovery in a cooperative manner. The failure of counsel or the parties to litigation to cooperate in facilitating and reasonably limiting discovery requests and responses raises litigation costs and contributes to the risk of sanctions.

2. The proportionality standard set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) must be applied in each case when formulating a discovery plan. To further the application of the proportionality

1 standard in discovery, requests for production of ESI and related responses should be reasonably
2 targeted, clear, and as specific as possible.

3 **B. ESI Disclosures**

4 Within 30 days after the Rule 26(f) conference, or at a later time if agreed to by the
5 parties, each party shall disclose:

6 1. Custodians. The five custodians most likely to have discoverable ESI in their possession,
7 custody or control. The custodians shall be identified by name, title, connection to the instant
8 litigation, and the type of the information under his/her control.

9 2. Non-custodial Data Sources. A list of non-custodial data sources (e.g. shared drives,
10 servers, etc.), if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI.

11 3. Third-Party Data Sources. A list of third-party data sources, if any, likely to
12 contain discoverable ESI (e.g. third-party email and/or mobile device providers, “cloud”
13 storage, etc.) and, for each such source, the extent to which a party is (or is not) able to
14 preserve information stored in the third-party data source.

15 4. Inaccessible Data. A list of data sources, if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI
16 (by type, date, custodian, electronic system or other criteria sufficient to specifically
17 identify the data source) that a party asserts is not reasonably accessible under Fed. R. Civ.
18 P. 26(b)(2)(B). [*Section (C)(3)(a)(i) below sets forth data sources and ESI which are*
19 *not required to be preserved by the parties. Those data sources and ESI do not need to be*
20 *included on this list.*]

21 **C. Preservation of ESI**

22 The parties acknowledge that they have a common law obligation to take reasonable and
23 proportional steps to preserve discoverable information in the party’s possession, custody or
24 control. With respect to preservation of ESI, the parties agree as follows:

25 1. Absent a showing of good cause by the requesting party, the parties shall not be
26 required to modify the procedures used by them in the ordinary course of business to back-up

1 and archive data; provided, however, that the parties shall preserve all discoverable ESI in
2 their possession, custody or control.

3 2. All parties shall supplement their disclosures in accordance with Rule 26(e) with
4 discoverable ESI responsive to a particular discovery request or mandatory disclosure where
5 that data is created after a disclosure or response is made (unless excluded under (C)(3) or
6 (D)(1)-(2) below).

7 3. Absent a showing of good cause by the requesting party, the following categories of
8 ESI need not be preserved:

- 9 a. Deleted, slack, fragmented, or other data only accessible by forensics.
- 10 b. Random access memory (RAM), temporary files, or other ephemeral data
11 that are difficult to preserve without disabling the operating system.
- 12 c. On-line access data such as temporary internet files, history, cache, cookies, and
13 the like.
- 14 d. Data in metadata fields that are frequently updated automatically, such as last-
15 opened dates (see also Section (E)(5)).
- 16 e. Back-up data that are substantially duplicative of data that are more
17 accessible elsewhere.
- 18 f. Server, system or network logs.
- 19 g. Data remaining from systems no longer in use that is unintelligible on the systems
20 in use.
- 21 h. Electronic data (e.g. email, calendars, contact data, and notes) sent to or from
22 mobile devices (e.g., iPhone, iPad, Android, and Blackberry devices), provided
23 that a copy of all such electronic data is routinely saved elsewhere (such as on a
24 server, laptop, desktop computer, or “cloud” storage).

25 *[The parties should confer regarding any other categories of ESI that may not need to be*
26 *preserved, such as text messages and social media data, in light of the General Principles*
set forth above, and determine whether they can agree that such categories can be added to the
non- preservation list above.]

D. Privilege

[The parties should confer regarding the nature and scope of privilege logs for the
case, including whether categories of information may be excluded from any logging

1 *requirements and whether alternatives to document-by-document logs can be exchanged.]*

2 1. With respect to privileged or work-product information generated after the filing of the
3 complaint, parties are not required to include any such information in privilege logs.

4 2. Activities undertaken in compliance with the duty to preserve information are protected
5 from disclosure and discovery under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3)(A) and (B).

6 3. Information produced in discovery that is protected as privileged or work product shall
7 be immediately returned to the producing party, and its production shall not constitute a waiver
8 of such protection, if: (i) such information appears on its face to have been inadvertently
9 produced or (ii) the producing party provides notice within 15 days of discovery by
10 the producing party of the inadvertent production.

11 4. Privilege Log Based on Metadata. The parties agree that privilege logs shall
12 include a unique identification number for each document and the basis for the claim (attorney-
13 client privileged or work-product protection). For ESI, the privilege log may be generated
14 using available metadata, including author/recipient or to/from/cc/bcc names; the subject matter
15 or title and date created. Should the available metadata provide insufficient information for the
16 purpose of evaluating the privilege claim asserted, the producing party shall include such
17 additional information as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

18 **E. ESI Discovery Procedures**

19 1. On-site inspection of electronic media. Such an inspection shall not be permitted
20 absent a demonstration by the requesting party of specific need and good cause or by
21 agreement of the parties.

22 2. Search methodology. [*The Court presumes that in the majority of cases, the use*
23 *of search terms will be reasonably necessary to locate or filter ESI likely to contain*
24 *discoverable information.] The parties shall timely attempt to reach agreement on appropriate
25 search terms, or an appropriate computer- or technology-aided methodology, before any such
26 effort is undertaken. The parties shall continue to cooperate in revising the appropriateness of*

1 the search terms or computer- or technology-aided methodology.

2 In the absence of agreement on appropriate search terms, or an appropriate computer- or
3 technology-aided methodology, the following procedures shall apply:

4 a. A producing party shall disclose the search terms or queries, if any, and
5 methodology that it proposes to use to locate ESI likely to contain discoverable information. The
6 parties shall meet and confer to attempt to reach an agreement on the producing party's search
7 terms and/or other methodology.

8 b. If search terms or queries are used to locate ESI likely to
9 contain discoverable information, a requesting party is entitled to no more than 5 additional
10 terms or queries to be used in connection with further electronic searches absent a showing of
11 good cause or agreement of the parties. The 5 additional terms or queries, if any, must be
12 provided by the requesting party within 14 days of receipt of the producing party's production.

13 c. Focused terms and queries should be employed; broad terms or queries,
14 such as product and company names, generally should be avoided. Absent a showing of
15 good cause, each search term or query returning more than 250 megabytes of data ~~are~~is
16 presumed to be overbroad, excluding Microsoft PowerPoint files, image and audio files, and
17 similarly large file types.

18 d. The producing party shall search both non-custodial data sources and ESI
19 maintained by the custodians identified above.

20 3. Format. The parties agree that ESI will be produced to the requesting party with
21 searchable text, in a format to be decided between the parties. Acceptable formats include, but
22 are not limited to, native files, multi-page TIFFs (with a companion OCR or extracted text
23 file), single-page TIFFs (only with load files for e-discovery software that includes metadata
24 fields identifying natural document breaks and also includes companion OCR and/or extracted
25 text files), and searchable PDF. Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, files that are not easily
26 converted to image format, such as spreadsheet, database and drawing files, should be

1 produced in native format.

2 4. De-duplication. The parties may de-duplicate their ESI production across
3 custodial and non-custodial data sources after disclosure to the requesting party.

4 5. Metadata fields. If the requesting party seeks metadata, the parties agree that
5 only the following metadata fields need be produced: document type; custodian and duplicate
6 custodians; author/from; recipient/to, cc and bcc; title/subject; file name and size; original file
7 path; date and time created, sent, modified and/or received; and hash value.

8

9 DATED: _____

10 PARTY 1

PARTY 2

11 By _____ By _____
12

13 **ORDER**

14 Based on the foregoing, IT IS SO ORDERED.

15

16 DATED: _____
17

18

19

20

21

22

The Honorable _____
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23

24

25

26

1 use with the document management system (e.g., Concordance® or Summation®), as agreed
2 to by the parties.

3 b. If appropriate to the particular case, the parties shall consider whether
4 or not the full text of each electronic document shall be extracted ("Extracted Text") and
5 produced in a text file. If the parties so agree, the Extracted Text shall be provided in
6 searchable ASCII text format (or Unicode text format if the text is in a foreign language) and
7 shall be named with a unique Bates Number (e.g. the unique Bates Number of the first page
8 of the corresponding production version of the document followed by its file extension).

9 c. If a document is more than one page, the unitization of the document
10 and any attachments and/or affixed notes shall be maintained as they existed in the
11 original document.

12 3. Metadata fields. The parties are to confer and agree on whether metadata is to
13 be produced or may be excluded from discovery. Metadata may not be relevant to the issues
14 presented or, if relevant, may not be reasonably subject to discovery, or may be subject to
15 cost- shifting, considering the factors set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C). For example, if
16 one party is producing only paper documents, and the other party is producing ESI, the
17 parties should confer on whether the additional cost and burden of producing metadata
18 by the party producing ESI is reasonable or should be shifted under the facts and
19 circumstances of the case. If the parties agree to produce metadata, and unless otherwise
20 agreed, each party shall produce the following metadata associated with ESI to the extent
21 reasonably accessible: (a) the author(s) of the ESI; (b) the recipient(s) of the ESI; (c) the
22 date the ESI was created; and (d) the source from which the ESI was produced. The
23 "source" of ESI shall be the name of the person who was the custodian of the ESI or, if
24 the name of a person is not available, the storage location (e.g., "Regulatory Shared
25 Drive-Wayne, PA"). This information will be included in the "Author," "Recipient,"
26 "Date," and "Source" fields (respectively) for each document in the load file

1 associated with the document images. Although it is presumed generally that the above
2 list of metadata fields will be provided, the list of metadata fields is intended to be flexible
3 and may be changed by agreement of the parties, particularly in light of advances and
4 changes in technology, vendor and business practices.

5 4. Hard-Copy Documents. If the parties elect to produce hard-copy documents
6 in an electronic format, the production of hard-copy documents shall include a cross-
7 reference file that indicates document breaks and sets forth the Custodian or Source
8 associated with each produced document. Hard-copy documents shall be scanned using
9 Optical Character Recognition technology and searchable ASCII text files shall be produced
10 (or Unicode text format if the text is in a foreign language), unless the producing party can
11 show that the cost would outweigh the usefulness of scanning (for example, when the
12 condition of the paper is not conducive to scanning and will not result in accurate or
13 reasonably useable/searchable ESI). Each file shall be named with a unique Bates Number
14 (e.g. the Unique Bates Number of the first page of the corresponding production version of
15 the document followed by its file extension).

16 5. Privilege Log Based on Metadata. The parties agree that privilege logs shall
17 be provided 30 days after the date agreed upon for final production in this matter. ~~The
18 privilege log shall include a unique identification number for each document and the basis for
19 the claim (attorney-client privileged or work-product protection). For ESI, the privilege log
20 may be generated using available metadata, including author/recipient or to/from/cc/bcc
21 names; the subject matter or title and date created. Should the available metadata provide
22 insufficient information for the purpose of evaluation the privilege claim asserted, the
23 producing party shall include such additional information as required by the Federal Rules of
24 Civil Procedure.~~