



APPLIED DISCOVERY WHITE PAPER

The Truth About Native File Review

LexisNexis®
 Applied Discovery®

Introduction

There is a lot of talk in the electronic discovery industry about “native file review,” “native file format,” and “native file production.” Many electronic discovery providers are scrambling to assure their clients that they support so-called native file capabilities. The claim is that native file review is required by courts, government agencies, and by the proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“FRCP”) which, absent an act of Congress, are scheduled to take effect December 1, 2006. But is this really true? Simply stated, native file review is not a de facto standard or requirement of courts and government agencies. Indeed, courts are more focused on electronic document search capabilities and the inclusion of metadata rather than a purely native file production. The proposed FRCP amendments also do not require native file production. So why the push for native file production? Is it cheaper and faster? Is it really less expensive? Is it more efficient?

Native File Review

In order to debunk the myths about native file review, let’s first look at “true” native file review. True native file review does not require any kind of service—it is as simple as a client copying its files onto a disk and handing the disk over to counsel for review. Counsel then reviews the documents on its computers using the software applications used to create the documents. Native file production is made by providing a copy of the original data to the adversary. And in smaller cases with relatively few documents, it can be as simple as that.

But in substantial litigation and government investigations that involve thousands, if not millions of documents that exist over several servers, in different formats, and different locations, true native file review is impracticable. The services of an e-discovery provider are often vital for complex discovery where retrieval and review of information is much more complicated than copying electronic files to a disk or providing data to an adversary. So, although many e-discovery providers are claiming they provide native file review—because it appears to be inherently less expensive and time-consuming than processing information into another usable format such as PDF—what they are touting is not true native file review at all, but rather, exactly like converted formats, the ability to review the documents as they appear natively. Although this may appear to be a distinction without meaning, the difference is quite important because true native file review has many disadvantages that any good litigator will want to avoid.

The Disadvantages of True Native File Review

The most expensive part of any document production is the time it takes for attorneys to review the data and documents once they have been retrieved. Therefore, while true native file review may cost less and take less time in the beginning of a production (because the electronic files are simply copied to a disk without the need for third-party assistance), these costs are offset by the lack of functionality of true native file review.

✓ Limited Review Functionality/Inability to Bates Stamp

In true native file review, there is no key or index across all of the documents because they are not stored in a central repository. Once the review is underway, a true native file review cannot capture the progress of the project across reviewers. Reviewing documents in different programs also precludes Bates numbering or branding the documents sequentially and tagging “hot documents” for others to see. True native file review also limits the amount of metadata available to the viewer; for example, a “bcc” field in an email can be viewed only as part of the sender’s email. Similarly, emails cannot be viewed in context, and any attachments to emails must be viewed in the program in which they were created. Once the review is complete, privileged or redacted documents must be removed from the original CD, because true native file review cannot support redaction; nor can a privilege log be automatically created as the documents are reviewed.

✓ Software Licensing/Purchasing Required for Review

Counsel must also buy, license, and load all of the versions of all of the programs that support the true native file formats. Large document reviews can often involve fifty or more contract attorneys; each with a computer, each needing to access these programs. Review of this kind is further complicated by the fact that some documents will have been created using older programs that no longer exist or new versions of commonly upgraded software. Information is often lost when documents created in older programs are viewed in upgraded versions. Moreover, in order for the reviewer to access the metadata, each reviewer must be trained on the specifics of each version of each program.

✓ Spoliation Risks

The biggest risk of true native file review, however, is that when a document is reviewed in its native format, the metadata are automatically changed. While a copy of the document can be made before review, the copy itself changes the metadata (e.g. making a copy without taking necessary precautions can change the “date modified” field in some common programs). If a copy is not made, reviewers looking at original data run a real risk of spoliation. Any party using true native file review cannot certify to a court that the documents are in their true, original form; this can leave parties and their attorneys open to tremendous liability.

In short, true native file review more often than not costs far more money in attorney review time and technical difficulties than what it saves on initial processing. This cost, in combination with the risk associated with spoliation, usually makes true native file review less than a desirable option in most cases.

True Native File Review vs. Converted Images

So, if true native file review is undesirable, why are some in the industry encouraging it? And if the native file review touted by some vendors is not true native file review, what is it?

What many vendors are calling “native file review” still requires the processing of data, no matter how the documents look or in what format they are reviewed. It is necessary to process data in order to create even the most primitive of discovery tools: an index. Additionally, critical metadata must be extracted and written to a database structure in order to take advantage of many of the basic functions of e-discovery review tools: the ability to search fields such as “date created” or to identify the author or custodian of a document.

Once the data are processed, some e-discovery providers then convert the data into a usable format such as PDF (portable document format), while others maintain it as a text extract of the files, convert to TIFF (tagged image file format), or offer some sort of pseudo-native file format such as RTF (rich text format). The initial processing makes up about 80 percent of the overall cost of any e-discovery vendor service. By contrast, the cost of conversion is minimal but provides many benefits.

Some e-discovery providers argue that converting files to PDF drastically increases the costs of e-discovery because all the files are converted up front. They compare this with other methods—which leave files in native format and convert to PDF or TIFF only at the time of production—but their arguments are misplaced. The confusion likely stems from a misunderstanding of the basics of e-discovery technical processes and confusion about the various pricing options that are available to meet today’s e-discovery needs.

PDF is also one of the most efficient ways of sharing and reviewing documents. PDFs can be reviewed or printed from any computer regardless of the type of software that was used to create the document. PDFs can be shared with anyone as long as they have Adobe® Reader, which is available as a free download. Because PDFs have automatic file compression, they are one-tenth the size of a TIFF image, so they contain more information and are faster to send and download. Moreover, contrary to some reports, PDFs are searchable and do capture all of the metadata of the original document.

PDFs look exactly like the original documents as created in their native programs, and preserve all of the graphics, formatting, fonts, and color. And although a PDF review format is far superior to reviewing native files because it provides secure access to the files and enables the documents to be stored, searched, and categorized in one format in a single depository, most e-discovery applications allow certain file types to be reviewed natively when it makes sense. This is especially helpful for reviewing the formulas in Microsoft® Excel® spreadsheets (the most troublesome file type to review in a converted format).

When considering the fact that up-front processing for search capabilities and metadata extraction make up the majority of the overall processing time and cost in e-discovery and the actual cost of conversion to a standard file format like PDF is minimal, choosing a provider with high-volume processing capabilities and other important document review features can often provide the best of both worlds.

Native File Production

But what about the government agencies and the amended federal rules? Do they require native file review? Not one agency has promulgated any formal rule requiring native file production for litigation or government inquiry. In fact, the FTC recommends that electronic documents be produced in searchable PDFs as a best practice for merger investigation procedures. See <http://www.ftc.gov/bc/bestpractices/applieddiscovery.pdf>. The SEC has also indicated that it prefers production of electronic documents in formats compatible with Concordance or Summation; this requires up-front processing, which means that the documents are no longer in their true native formats.

Likewise, the FRCP amendments do not mandate native file production. The changes require that parties to civil litigation try to reach an agreement on how documents will be produced. See Proposed Amendment to Rule 26(f), found at www.uscourts.gov. If an agreement cannot be reached, the documents must be produced either in the form in which they are ordinarily maintained or in a form that is reasonably usable. See Proposed Amendment to Rule 34. While commentators argue that “ordinarily maintained” is a nod in the direction of native file production, a fair reading of the statute and the committee notes suggests otherwise. The comments to the proposed amendments,

published on July 25, 2005, explicitly note the disadvantages of native file production, such as “the inability to redact, leading to privilege problems, an inability to Bates-stamp the ‘documents’ for purposes of litigation management and control, which is not an insignificant consideration, particularly in complex multi-party litigation.” See Comments to Proposed Rule 34. Even if the courts ultimately decide that this language is synonymous with native file production, a party will also have the option to produce in a reasonably usable format, which would most likely include such widely used formats as PDF. In fact, the federal courts initiative known as the Case Management/Electronic Case Files project (CM/ECF) encourages litigants to file case documents electronically, and the only file format allowed is PDF. The CM/ECF project was initiated in 2001 and is being implemented in federal district and appellate courts nationwide. See www.uscourts.gov/cmecf.

Unfortunately, courts have offered little guidance on their interpretation of the Proposed Amendments to Rule 34. However, courts continue to express their preference that electronic documents be produced in a word-searchable format that retains the underlying metadata. See *In re Priceline.com Inc. Securities Litigation*, 2005 U.S. Dist. Lexis 33636, *United States v. Magnesium Corporation of America*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53911. Both PDF and TIFF formats satisfy these requirements. There are, however, circumstances where it might make sense to produce a limited number of documents in their native format. For example, where Excel spreadsheets include formulas that are relevant to the litigation, those specific files may need to be segregated and produced in their native format. See *Williams v. Sprint*, 2005 U.S. Dist. Lexis 21966 (D. Kansas 2005).

Any top tier provider can produce data in their native formats upon request, even if the file has been first converted to PDF for ease and efficiency during the review process. Because conversion to PDF does not cost more than any other processed data, and carries with it tremendous advantages, best practices would dictate that counsel first review the documents in the most efficient and effective manner, and then handle documents in native file format only if required at the time of production.

Comparing the Options

The true native file review discussed at the beginning of this whitepaper does not typically involve an e-discovery provider of any kind. Instead, attorneys and their clients simply copy data and open the files in desktop applications for review. When an e-discovery provider purports to offer native file review, there is other work to be done to make the files searchable and viewable in a commercial e-discovery application. It may be helpful to review a side-by-side comparison of the various stages of the case when considering whether native file review should be an option.

| NATIVE FILE REVIEW | PDF FILE REVIEW | PREFERRED METHOD? |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Up-Front Costs | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|

- Per-unit charges from provider will include initial document processing to capture the text and metadata so documents can be searched. Without this processing, there is no way to search across different file types or even between email messages and their attachments.

- Per-unit charges include processing fees similar to native review processing. The bulk of the expense for either method is associated with indexing text and/or numerical data for searchability and sortability.

Tied:
Both methods require up-front processing in order to make the data usable in discovery review.

| | | |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Document Review | | |
|------------------------|--|--|

- Commercially available application viewers for native file formats enable the review team to see documents as they appeared in native file types.
- The ability to search between different file types or between emails and their attachments can be greatly limited, depending on the viewer selected.
- Native viewers do not enable the review team to share collaborative workspace for making notes and annotations, etc.
- With this method, there are no administrative rights for dividing documents into different groups for review, allowing only certain reviewers to redact, etc.

- E-discovery applications enable viewers to utilize PDF as the common file format so functionality like Bates numbering, redacting, searching, sorting, accessing metadata, reviewing “parent-child” email messages in order and in context of a conversation, creating an automated privilege log, etc., can be employed from the beginning of the project.
- Documents are all stored in a common repository so the review team can share and access information as the project progresses.

PDF:
The functionality and workflow benefits of PDF review far outweigh any perceived convenience of “staying in native” for the review process. The actual review process is at the heart of the case in e-discovery, so this is often the determining factor in making a decision about review format.

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Document Production | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|

- A subset of the documents reviewed in native format is typically converted to either TIFF or PDF for hosting in a litigation support database like Concordance or Summation, and for production to opposing counsel.
- Providers charge to convert the subset of selected documents to the client’s chosen file format. In only rare situations are native files actually produced to requesting party.

- The documents designated for production are already in PDF, and can be handled in any number of ways.
- The production set can be stored in the online repository, burned to a CD, or transferred to a desktop litigation support database.
- The output format can be PDF, TIFF or native files, as selected by the client according to the needs of the case.
- Charges for output of the documents are only a fraction of the up-front processing costs.

Tied:
For either review method, there may be some fee for creating a production set. The myth is that one would be somehow “paying twice” for the PDF option, when the reality is that the up-front charges and production charges are comparable with either method.

Conclusion

So why have native file review and production become such a hot issue? What it really comes down to is price. All providers have to process data, which costs about the same from provider to provider. Differences in price in the industry, therefore, lie not with what type of format is chosen for document review, but in the services a provider offers above and beyond just the conversion of data. Factors that go into pricing include: turn-around time for processing, client services, 24-hour support, training programs, and supplemental services such as document-retention and litigation-preparedness consulting. Cost differentials can also be related to product features, such as real-time redaction, creation of a privilege log at the click of a mouse, scrolling documents in real time, and ease of use. (Clients say that PDFs simply look better and are easier to read than other formats; this increases reviewer productivity).

These additional services and features deliver ultimate savings for the client because reviewers are able to review the documents much more efficiently. Some providers offer à la carte pricing, where each line item appears reasonable, but the sum of the charges can be overwhelming. Other service providers bundle the majority of services they offer, so the “sticker price” may look higher, but the actual cost of the project is likely to be the same or even lower.

The best investment, however, is in an e-discovery service provider that has experience. With the current wave of spoliation cases resulting in huge jury verdicts, hiring a proven winner is an important safeguard in the discovery process.

The notion of native file review as a superior legal practice is nothing more than a red herring. The real issue behind these arguments lies in the cost structure of how an e-discovery project is managed. It is a myth that converting documents to a user-friendly, reliable file type like PDF necessarily has to be more expensive than reviewing in native format. In the end, the true costs must be compared side by side and the true value of any e-discovery provider will not be related to the type of formatting it offers, but rather to the usability and functionality of the data once they are in that format—and to the peace of mind the client receives in the process.

Pioneers in the field of electronic discovery, LexisNexis® Applied Discovery® provides a full line of e-discovery services to the nation's top law firms and corporations. Our patent-pending technology displays virtually any electronic document in a fully searchable and secure file without compromising the integrity of the original file format. Services include records and information management, data collection, forensics, media restoration through data processing, online review and document production in the format that each client requires. Applied Discovery also operates a series of best practices courses for e-discovery, available throughout the year for CLE credit.

Applied Discovery is based in Seattle with East Coast headquarters in New York City and regional offices in Washington, D.C., Chicago, Dallas, Houston, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Atlanta, and Minneapolis. For more information, please visit www.lexisnexis.com/applieddiscovery.

For updated summaries of electronic discovery case law,
visit Applied Discovery's online Law Library at
www.lexisnexis.com/applieddiscovery.



T O T A L P R A C T I C E S O L U T I O N S
Client Development Research Solutions Practice Management Litigation Services

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Applied Discovery is a registered trademark of Applied Discovery, Inc. Other products or services may be trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective companies. © 2006 Applied Discovery, Inc. All rights reserved. AD00190-1 1006