



THE SEDONA CONFERENCE® COOPERATION PROCLAMATION

*Dialogue Designed to Move the Law
Forward in a Reasoned and Just Way*

COPYRIGHT © 2008, THE SEDONA CONFERENCE®

The
sedona
conference®



THE SEDONA CONFERENCE®
COOPERATION
PROCLAMATION

REPRINTS

The Sedona Conference® hereby expressly grants any interested party
royalty-free reprint rights to this specific document.

Copyright © 2008, The Sedona Conference®
All Rights Reserved.

wgsSM

The Sedona Conference®
Visit www.thesedonaconference.org

The Sedona Conference® Cooperation Proclamation

The Sedona Conference® launches a coordinated effort to promote cooperation by all parties to the discovery process to achieve the goal of a “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action.”

The costs associated with adversarial conduct in pre-trial discovery have become a serious burden to the American judicial system. This burden rises significantly in discovery of electronically stored information (“ESI”). In addition to rising monetary costs, courts have seen escalating motion practice, overreaching, obstruction, and extensive, but unproductive discovery disputes – in some cases precluding adjudication on the merits altogether – when parties treat the discovery process in an adversarial manner. Neither law nor logic compels these outcomes.

With this Proclamation, The Sedona Conference® launches a national drive to promote open and forthright information sharing, dialogue (internal and external), training, and the development of practical tools to facilitate cooperative, collaborative, transparent discovery. This Proclamation challenges the bar to achieve these goals and refocus litigation toward the substantive resolution of legal disputes.

Cooperation in Discovery is Consistent with Zealous Advocacy

Lawyers have twin duties of loyalty: While they are retained to be zealous advocates for their clients, they bear a professional obligation to conduct discovery in a diligent and candid manner. Their combined duty is to strive in the best interests of their clients to achieve the best results at a reasonable cost, with integrity and candor as officers of the court. Cooperation does not conflict with the advancement of their clients’ interests - it enhances it. Only when lawyers confuse *advocacy* with *adversarial conduct* are these twin duties in conflict.

Lawyers preparing cases for trial need to focus on the full cost of their efforts – temporal, monetary, and human. Indeed, all stakeholders in the system – judges, lawyers, clients, and the general public – have an interest in establishing a culture of cooperation in the discovery process. Over-contentious discovery is a cost that has outstripped any advantage in the face of ESI and the data deluge. It is not in anyone’s interest to waste resources on unnecessary disputes, and the legal system is strained by “gamesmanship” or “hiding the ball,” to no practical effect.

The effort to change the culture of discovery from adversarial conduct to cooperation is not utopian.¹ It is, instead, an exercise in economy and logic. Establishing a culture of cooperation will channel valuable advocacy skills toward interpreting the facts and arguing the appropriate application of law.

¹ Gartner RAS Core Research Note G00148170, *Cost of eDiscovery Threatens to Skew Justice System*, 1D# G00148170, (April 20, 2007), at <http://www.h5technologies.com/pdf/gartner0607.pdf>. (While noting that “several . . . disagreed with the suggestion [to collaborate in the discovery process] . . . calling it ‘utopian’”, one of the “take-away’s” from the program identified in the Gartner Report was to “[s]trive for a collaborative environment when it comes to eDiscovery, seeking to cooperate with adversaries as effectively as possible to share the value and reduce costs.”).

Cooperative Discovery is Required by the Rules of Civil Procedure

When the first uniform civil procedure rules allowing discovery were adopted in the late 1930s, “discovery” was understood as an essentially cooperative, rule-based, party-driven process, designed to exchange relevant information. The goal was to avoid gamesmanship and surprise at trial. Over time, discovery has evolved into a complicated, lengthy procedure requiring tremendous expenditures of client funds, along with legal and judicial resources. These costs often overshadow efforts to resolve the matter itself. The 2006 amendments to the Federal Rules specifically focused on discovery of “electronically stored information” and emphasized early communication and cooperation in an effort to streamline information exchange, and avoid costly unproductive disputes.

Discovery rules frequently compel parties to meet and confer regarding data preservation, form of production, and assertions of privilege. Beyond this, parties wishing to litigate discovery disputes must certify their efforts to resolve their difficulties in good faith.

Courts see these rules as a mandate for counsel to act cooperatively.² Methods to accomplish this cooperation may include:

1. Utilizing internal ESI discovery “point persons” to assist counsel in preparing requests and responses;
2. Exchanging information on relevant data sources, including those not being searched, or scheduling early disclosures on the topic of Electronically Stored Information;
3. Jointly developing automated search and retrieval methodologies to cull relevant information;
4. Promoting early identification of form or forms of production;
5. Developing case-long discovery budgets based on proportionality principles; and
6. Considering court-appointed experts, volunteer mediators, or formal ADR programs to resolve discovery disputes.

The Road to Cooperation

It is unrealistic to expect a *sua sponte* outbreak of pre-trial discovery cooperation. Lawyers frequently treat discovery conferences as perfunctory obligations. They may fail to recognize or act on opportunities to make discovery easier, less costly, and more productive. New lawyers may not yet have developed cooperative advocacy skills, and senior lawyers may cling to a long-held “hide the ball” mentality. Lawyers who recognize the value of resources such as ADR and special masters may nevertheless overlook their application to discovery. And, there remain obstreperous counsel with no interest in cooperation, leaving even the best-intentioned to wonder if “playing fair” is worth it.

² See, e.g., *Board of Regents of University of Nebraska v BASF Corp.* No. 4:04-CV-3356, 2007 WL 3342423, at *5 (D. Neb. Nov. 5, 2007) (“The overriding theme of recent amendments to the discovery rules has been open and forthright sharing of information by all parties to a case with the aim of expediting case progress, minimizing burden and expense, and removing contentiousness as much as practicable. [citations omitted]. If counsel fail in this responsibility—willfully or not—these principles of an open discovery process are undermined, coextensively inhibiting the courts’ ability to objectively resolve their clients’ disputes and the credibility of its resolution.”).

This “Cooperation Proclamation” calls for a paradigm shift for the discovery process; success will not be instant. The Sedona Conference® views this as a three-part process to be undertaken by The Sedona Conference® Working Group on Electronic Document Retention and Production (WG1):

Part I: Awareness - Promoting awareness of the need and advantages of cooperation, coupled with a call to action. This process has been initiated by The Sedona Conference® Cooperation Proclamation.

Part II: Commitment - Developing a detailed understanding and full articulation of the issues and changes needed to obtain cooperative fact-finding. This will take the form of a “Case for Cooperation” which will reflect viewpoints of all legal system stakeholders. It will incorporate disciplines outside the law, aiming to understand the separate and sometimes conflicting interests and motivations of judges, mediators and arbitrators, plaintiff and defense counsel, individual and corporate clients, technical consultants and litigation support providers, and the public at large.

Part III: Tools - Developing and distributing practical “toolkits” to train and support lawyers, judges, other professionals, and students in techniques of discovery cooperation, collaboration, and transparency. Components will include training programs tailored to each stakeholder; a clearinghouse of practical resources, including form agreements, case management orders, discovery protocols, etc.; court-annexed e-discovery ADR with qualified counselors and mediators, available to assist parties of limited means; guides for judges faced with motions for sanctions; law school programs to train students in the technical, legal, and cooperative aspects of e-discovery; and programs to assist individuals and businesses with basic e-record management, in an effort to avoid discovery problems altogether.

Conclusion

It is time to build upon modern Rules amendments, state and federal, which address e-discovery. Using this springboard, the legal profession can engage in a comprehensive effort to promote pre-trial discovery cooperation. Our “officer of the court” duties demand no less. This project is not utopian; rather, it is a tailored effort to effectuate the mandate of court rules calling for a “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action” and the fundamental ethical principles governing our profession.

Judicial Endorsements

as of October 30, 2009

Alabama

Hon. John L. Carroll
Retired
Birmingham

Hon. William E. Cassidy
U.S. District Court for the Southern District
of Alabama
Mobile

Arizona

Hon. Andrew D. Hurwitz
Vice Chief Justice, Arizona Supreme Court
Phoenix

Arkansas

Hon. Jerry W. Cavaneau
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas
Little Rock

California

Hon. Robert Block
U.S. District Court for the Central District
of California
Los Angeles

California
Hon. Susan Y. Illston
U.S. District Court for the Northern District
of California
San Francisco

Hon. Elizabeth D. Laporte
U.S. District Court for the Northern District
of California
San Francisco

Hon. Louisa S. Porter
U.S. District Court for the Southern District
of California
San Diego

Hon. David C. Velasquez
Orange County Superior Court
Santa Ana

Hon. Carl J. West
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Los Angeles

Colorado

Hon. Morris B. Hoffman
Colorado 2nd Judicial District Court
Denver

Hon. Craig B. Shaffer
U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado
Denver

District of Columbia

Hon. Francis M. Allegra
U.S. Court of Federal Claims
Washington

Hon. Herbert B. Dixon, Jr.
Superior Court of the District of Columbia
Washington

Hon. John M. Facciola
U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia
Washington

Chief Judge Royce C. Lamberth
U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia
Washington

Hon. Gregory Mize
Retired
Washington

Florida

Hon. Barry L. Garber
U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida
Miami

Hon. Thomas E. Morris
U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida
Jacksonville

Hon. Richard A. Nielsen
13th Judicial Circuit
Tampa

Hon. Thomas B. Smith
Ninth Judicial Circuit
Orlando

Illinois

Hon. Martin C. Ashman
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. David G. Bernthal
U.S. District Court for the Central District of Illinois
Urbana

Hon. Geraldine Soat Brown
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. Jeffrey Cole
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. Susan E. Cox
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. Morton Denlow
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. Peter Flynn
Illinois Superior Court
Chicago

Hon. John A. Gorman
U.S. District Court for the Central District of Illinois
Peoria

Hon. James F. Holderman
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. Arlander Keys
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. P. Michael Mahoney
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Rockford

Hon. Michael T. Mason
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. Richard Mills
U.S. District Court for the Central District of Illinois
Springfield

Hon. Nan R. Nolan
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. Sidney Schenkier
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. Susan P. Sonderby
U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District
of Illinois
Chicago

Hon. Maria Valdez
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
Chicago

Indiana

Hon. Kenneth H. Johnson
Marion County Superior Court
Indianapolis

Kansas

Hon. J. Thomas Marten
U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas
Wichita

Hon. James P. O'Hara
U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas
Kansas City

Hon. K. Gary Sebelius
U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas
Topeka

Hon. David Waxse
U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas
Kansas City

Louisiana

Hon. Sally Shushan
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District
of Louisiana
New Orleans

Hon. Eldon E. Fallon
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District
of Louisiana
New Orleans

Maryland

Hon. Lynne A. Battaglia
Maryland Court of Appeals
Annapolis

Hon. Stuart R. Berger
Circuit Court for Baltimore City
Baltimore

Hon. Paul W. Grimm
U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland
Baltimore

Hon. Michael D. Mason
Montgomery County Circuit Court
Rockville

Hon. Albert J. Matricciani, Jr.
Maryland Court of Special Appeals
Baltimore

Hon. Steven I. Platt
Prince Georges County Circuit Court
Upper Marlboro

Massachusetts

Hon. Robert B. Collings
U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts
Boston

Hon. Timothy Hillman
U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts
Worcester

Hon. Allan van Gestel
Retired
Boston

Mississippi

Hon. Jerry A. Davis
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of
Mississippi
Aberdeen

Nevada

Hon. Elizabeth Gonzalez
Nevada Eighth Judicial District Court
Las Vegas

New Jersey

Hon. Katherine S. Hayden
U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey
Newark

Hon. John Hughes
U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey
Trenton

New York

Hon. Leonard B. Austin
New York Supreme Court
Mineola

Hon. Carolyn E. Demarest
New York Supreme Court, Commercial Division
Brooklyn

Hon. Helen Freedman
New York State Court, Appellate Division
New York

Hon. Marilyn D. Go
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District
of New York
Brooklyn

Hon. Richard B. Lowe, III
New York Supreme Court, New York County
New York

Hon. Frank Maas
U.S. District Court for the Southern District
of New York
New York

Hon. Andrew S. Peck
U.S. District Court for the Southern District
of New York
New York

Hon. David E. Peebles
U.S. District Court for the Northern District
of New York
Syracuse

Hon. Shira A. Scheindlin
U.S. District Court for the Southern District
of New York
New York

Hon. Lisa Margaret Smith
U.S. District Court for the Southern District
of New York
New York

Hon. Richard J. Sullivan
U.S. District Court for the Southern District
of New York
New York

Hon. Ira B. Warshawsky
New York Supreme Court, Commercial Division
Mineola

North Carolina

Hon. Albert Diaz
North Carolina Business Court
Charlotte

Hon. John R. Jolly, Jr.
North Carolina Business Court
Raleigh

Hon. Ben F. Tennille
North Carolina Business Court
Greensboro

Ohio

Hon. William H. Baughman, Jr.
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio
Cleveland

Hon. John P. Bessey
Franklin County Court of Common Pleas
Columbus

Hon. Richard A. Frye
Franklin County Court of Common Pleas
Columbus

Hon. Thomas H. Gerken
Hocking County Common Pleas Court
Logan

Hon. George J. Limbert
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio
Youngstown

Hon. Michael R. Merz
U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio
Cincinnati

Hon. Kathleen McDonald O'Malley
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio
Cleveland

Oklahoma

Hon. Robert E. Bacharach
U.S. District Court for the Western District
of Oklahoma
Oklahoma City

Hon. Robin J. Cauthron
U.S. District Court for the Western District
of Oklahoma
Oklahoma City

Hon. Stephen P. Friot
U.S. District Court for the Western District
of Oklahoma
Oklahoma City

Oregon

Hon. Dennis J. Hubel
U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon
Portland

Pennsylvania

Hon. Linda K. Caracappa
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of
Pennsylvania
Philadelphia

Hon. Lisa P. Lenihan
U.S. District Court for the Western District
of Pennsylvania
Pittsburgh

Hon. Christine Ward
Allegheny Court of Common Pleas
Pittsburgh

Tennessee

Hon. Diane K. Veskovo
U.S. District Court for the Western District
of Tennessee
Memphis

Texas

Hon. Martin Hoffman
68th District Court
Dallas

Hon. Martin Lowy
101st District Court
Dallas

Hon. Nancy S. Nowak
U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas
San Antonio

Washington

Hon. James P. Donohue
U.S. District Court for the Western District
of Washington
Seattle

Hon. Barbara Jacobs Rothstein
U.S. District Court for the Western District
of Washington
Seattle

Hon. Karen Strombom
U.S. District Court for the Western District
of Washington
Seattle

Wisconsin

Hon. Aaron Goodstein
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District
of Wisconsin
Milwaukee