

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

by

Mark Koehn, Esq.  
[Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP](#)

Dharmesh Shingala  
[Capital Legal Solutions](#)

for

Georgetown University Law Center's  
Sixth Annual Advanced E-Discovery Institute  
November 12-13, 2009, Washington, DC

## 1. eDiscovery Project Management

Project management is mostly about defining and following a process or methodology to accomplish a project. Central to any approach to project management is a focus on the who, what, when, where, and why of communicating with other project members and documenting project work.<sup>1</sup> In many fields, including software development, project management methodologies are well-known and many are available for purchase and project-specific tailoring. In contrast, electronic discovery project management methodologies are not well-known.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For an example of a relatively simple project management methodology, visit [Cornell University's website about its project management methodology](#), including a guidebook and examples of project management documentation.

<sup>2</sup> Notably, on October 15, 2009, a Google search on "project management methodology" returned over 225,000 hits, a search on "software development project management methodology" returned over 6,000 hits, and a search on "electronic discovery project management methodology" returned no hits. A Yahoo search on "electronic discovery project management methodology" also returned no hits.

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

We are not aware of any published, "off-the-shelf," electronic discovery project management (EDPM) methodologies that can be purchased and tailored to fit the needs of a particular litigation. Regarding EDPM tools, the ediscovery literature is well-stocked with checklists of questions to ask and information to consider and suggestions about software to help organize and track progress on ediscovery tasks. But largely missing from the ediscovery literature are concrete examples of simple documentary tools used in EDPM and guidance on developing a repeatable EDPM methodology. In this article, we attempt to scratch the surface by identifying a few considerations to be covered in a well-designed EDPM methodology and examples of a few EDPM documentary tools.

## 2. Project Stakeholders

Developing a EDPM methodology begins with a clear understanding of the broad range of project stakeholders. When asked, most lawyers will say that an ediscovery project involves the client, outside counsel, and an ediscovery vendor. This view is too limited. An ediscovery project also involves opposing counsel and the court. Any approach to EDPM must consider these stakeholders along several dimensions.

**Client.** The client's goals and interests are paramount although often constrained by legal requirements, available evidentiary support, time, budget and a host of other competing goals and interests. Increasingly, the client's inhouse counsel should be expected to pursue an active role in EDPM for budgetary and other reasons. For larger clients, inhouse counsel may include attorneys specializing in ediscovery and who may coordinate with national ediscovery counsel. The client's IT staff will be involved as gatekeeper to most of the client's IT infrastructure. Further, key department

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

heads and potential witnesses or other custodians expected to control or know the whereabouts of potentially relevant electronically stored information (ESI) also will be involved.

**Outside Counsel.** Increasingly, senior trial counsel is substantively involved in EDPM although often day-to-day EDPM leadership comes from the senior associate through junior partner ranks. Outside counsel team members may also include other attorneys, legal assistants, case managers, IT staff and, for many larger firms, staff ediscovery specialists. In most cases, an outside counsel's staff ediscovery specialists are non-lawyer counterparts to the ediscovery vendor's project manager.

**Ediscovery Vendor.** Most ediscovery vendors specialize in bulk edocument preservation, collection, review, and production; edocument forensics (e.g., unearthing deleted information from "slack spaces" on a hard drive); or both. Generally, ediscovery vendor personnel are non-lawyers, including project managers (who often double as sales reps), data collection experts, and data filtering and review experts.

**Opposing Counsel.** Sensibly framing the scope of any ediscovery project must consider opposing counsel's pleadings, discovery requests, and other communications. FRCP 26(g) requires that all discovery responses, starting with initial disclosures, must reflect the results of "a reasonable inquiry." Resolving the question of what is enough to satisfy the "reasonable inquiry" standard may involve negotiations with opposing counsel and should involve negotiations as a prelude to resolving the question through discovery motions practice. Even if the substance of an edocument production is not

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

disputed, FRCP 26(f)(3)(C) requires that opposing counsel be consulted regarding the form of edocument production.

**Court.** EDPM must consider the court's ubiquitous influence. The court sets deadlines and limits or expands the scope of discovery primarily through (1) case management and scheduling orders, (2) status conferences where discovery disputes may be resolved informally or guided toward resolution, and (3) orders resolving discovery motions. Courts have been increasingly vigilant regarding ediscovery practice, leading some to issue decisions imbedding guidance to the legal profession<sup>3</sup> and elaborate sanctions that force consideration of improved ediscovery practices.<sup>4</sup>

### 3. EDPM Methodology And Documentary Tools

In addition to understanding the relevant stakeholders, developing a EDPM methodology must involve the design and use of documentary tools that help define a repeatable process. Although any documentary tools invariably must be tailored to address the needs of each particular ediscovery project, having an extensive inventory of sample documentary tools and experience in using them enlightens and speeds that tailoring effort. A well-designed EDPM methodology will aim for sensible collaboration

---

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., *Zubulake v. UBS Warburg, LLC*, 217 F.R.D. 309, 322 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (cost-shifting factors) and *Mancia v. Mayflower Textile Servs. Co.*, 253 F.R.D. 354, 357 (D. Md. 2008) (FRCP 26(g) implications).

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., *Qualcomm, Inc. v. Broadcom Corp.*, No. 05cv1958-B, 2008 WL 66932, \*18-20 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2008) (ordering a broad range of sanctions for ediscovery misconduct including development of a case management protocol), *vacated and remanded in part*, 2008 WL 638108 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2008).

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

and not merely collaboration for the sake of including every team member. Designing appropriate documentary tools will inform EDPM decisions about who should, who might, and who should not be involved in various ediscovery tasks.

In the next subsections, we describe one way to view an ediscovery project as a series of four phases. For each phase, we provide a few considerations to be covered in a well-designed EDPM methodology and examples of a few EDPM documentary tools.

**3.1. Phase I: Preservation, Planning & Budgeting**

In Phase I, the focus is on identifying and preserving potentially responsive ESI, planning how to meet ediscovery obligations, and developing an initial budget estimate.

***Identifying And Preserving Potentially Relevant ESI.*** The case law and ediscovery literature addresses when to begin preserving potentially responsive ESI and how to go about directing the client to take steps to preserve such ESI through a litigation "directive" or "hold" or otherwise. A well-designed EDPM methodology may include collecting and inventorying a range of sample litigation holds that provide a good starting point for drafting other litigation holds. Clients that frequently (even continuously) find themselves in litigation should consider whether certain aspects of their litigation holds should be uniform or nearly uniform for all or some kinds of litigation. However, keep in mind that striving for a repeatable *process* does not mean using the same litigation hold or other documentary tools in every case. Keep in mind also, the interplay between any applicable document retention/destruction policies

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

(including backup tape recycling) and any directive to preserve information relative to pending or anticipated litigation.

Even as initial preservation efforts commence, a formal characterization of the client's IT infrastructure may improve preservation efforts as well as confirm the adequacy of preservation efforts already taken. Developing a formal characterization of the client's IT infrastructure may involve counsel interviewing the client's IT staff and may be enlightened by participation of the ediscovery vendor. A wide variety of documentation may adequately characterize the client's IT infrastructure for ediscovery purposes. See the Appendix for a simplified example of one document that may be used to characterize an IT infrastructure.

***Planning How To Meet eDiscovery Obligations.*** Planning is nearly always a critical first step in any project. In the ediscovery project context, however, formal planning often takes a backseat to the initial effort to undertake preservation procedures. Particularly in cases involving alleged theft of trade secret, workplace discrimination, insider trading, or other cases where an individual's secreted actions may be the focus of discovery, ediscovery project planning may take place after ephemeral evidence (such as voicemails, text messages, chat, and the like) may be either preserved or lost within relatively short timeframes.

Although some ediscovery vendors have suggested the use of sophisticated project planning tools such as [Gantt Charts](#) and [PERT diagrams](#), for all but the very largest ediscovery projects such tools are the equivalent of a jackhammer when a hammer is needed. A well-designed EDPM methodology should include an extensive

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

list of potential ediscovery tasks that may be considered for initial project planning and rough budgeting purposes. See the Appendix for a partial example showing only a few potential ediscovery tasks for illustrative purposes.

***Developing An Initial Budget Estimate.*** Examples of budget estimates for ediscovery project are readily available and reflect a variety of levels of detail and sophistication, such as consideration of "best case" and "worst case" scenarios.<sup>5</sup> In our experience, many clients already have budgeting templates and preferences that should be considered in developing any ediscovery budget.

A well-designed EDPM methodology may include that the initial budget estimate, later budget estimates, and actual costs be routinely monitored and considered against the relative value of the ESI being preserved, collected, reviewed and produced. In other words, the EDPM methodology may expressly include consideration of the seven *Zubalake* factors<sup>6</sup> and whether to pursue a strategy to shift all or some ediscovery project costs to the discovery proponent.

---

<sup>5</sup> Searching the internet for both "electronic discovery" and "budget estimate" leads to over a dozen examples from various sources.

<sup>6</sup> *Zubalake*, 217 F.R.D. at 322 (cost-shifting factors: (1) the extent to which the request is specifically tailored to discover relevant information; (2) the availability of such information from other sources; (3) the total cost of production compared to the amount in controversy; (4) the total cost of production compared to the resources available to each party; (5) the relative ability of each party to control costs and its incentive to do so; (6) the importance of the issue at stake in the litigation and; (7) the relative benefits to the parties of obtaining the information).

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

**3.2. Phase II: Collection**

In Phase II, the focus is on identifying and physically collecting potentially responsive ESI anticipated to be the subject of initial or higher priority review efforts. Tasks to be addressed in the collection phase, include review and analysis of any written discovery requests and conducting initial interviews – usually of the client's IT staff and various Department Heads – to identify potential sources of responsive ESI. See the Appendix for an example of a document useful for capturing initial impressions about potential sources of responsive ESI.

The collection phase also includes identifying and interviewing key witnesses and collecting their potentially responsive ESI. A well-designed EDPM methodology may note that this task should be repeated later with respect to any witness later designated to provide FRCP 30(b)(6) testimony.<sup>7</sup> It also may include consideration of meet and confer opportunities with opposing counsel and/or motions practice seeking a protective order clearly establishing that certain ESI need not be reviewed for potentially responsive documents or need not be reviewed at the discovery respondent's expense.

Generally, counsel interviews those witnesses anticipated to have knowledge of the underlying facts and have or know the whereabouts of potentially responsive ESI. Documentary tools helpful for this work include detailed interview outlines and guidance

---

<sup>7</sup> *Qualcomm, Inc.*, 2008 WL 66932, \*12 ("numerous warning flags" that should have lead to discovery and production of the withheld documents included failure to search the computers of its Rule 30(b)(6) witnesses for responsive email and other documents).



eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

and templates for documenting counsel's impressions of interview results in a uniform fashion.

In light of the interview results, counsel generally deploys either the client's IT staff or ediscovery vendor to collect groups of ESI anticipated to be deserving of initial or higher priority review. Often this involves one or more visits to the client's offices to create backups of ESI located on laptops and other individually-controlled storage devices. Depending on the circumstances, so-called "image copies" of harddrives may be created for later forensic analysis, for instance, to unearth previously deleted ESI. The results of this collection effort may include an inventory of the backups physically collected, including a serial number or other identifier for the backup, the date it was created, the person who created it, the procedures used to create the backup, and a clear identification of the contents of the backup – e.g., "image of harddrive of ABC Company, Laptop #3849, assigned to John Smith." See the Appendix for a simplified example of an inventory of preserved media.

**3.3. Phase III: Review**

Phase III is typically the most resource intensive. In most cases, the sheer quantity of information collected (let alone preserved) is far more than could possibly be reviewed for production or privilege logging prior to the close of discovery. The review phase usually involves characterization of selected backups, "filtering" to reduce the number of files – e.g., individual electronic documents – to be reviewed, followed by review that may involve multiple and overlapping review efforts.

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

**Characterization.** Characterizing selected backups is an important first step in identifying responsive documents. Many backups will contain enormous amounts of irrelevant material that may be identified through modest characterization efforts. For example, one characterization technique involves obtaining from the ediscovery vendor a "File Extension Report" and "Pathname/Filename Report" for a particular backup.

**File Extension Reports.** These reports are usually generated relative to a particular item of media (e.g., a particular server or harddrive backup) and list each unique file extension or type (e.g., ".doc", ".pdf", ".xls", etc.) found on the media, a brief description of what such file extension are typically used for, the total number of such files on the media, the total file size (usually expressed in byte size – e.g., MBs or KBs), and the average size per file. Such reports give a quick "heads up" as to the sheer volume of files that may be expected to contain potentially responsive ESI. See the Appendix for an example of a file extension report.

**Path Name/File Name Reports.** These reports also are usually generated relative to a particular item of media and list file directory information, such as path name and file name (e.g., "C:/Documents and Settings/My Documents/ABC Project/Project Team Org Chart.doc") and file size, as well as some file "meta-data", such as creation date, last modified date, author name, etc. Such reports give a useful overview of the files that may be expected to contain potentially responsive ESI – especially if path name and file names are expected to be descriptive of file contents. Obtaining such reports in spreadsheet form is preferred so that sort and search features can be used to identify, for instance, all files authored by a particular person or modified

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

during a particular period. See the Appendix for an example of a path name/file name report that illustrates how path names and file names alone may arguably reveal potentially responsive ESI.

**Filtering.** In light of information obtained through characterization techniques, other information, and the particular goals of the review, the content of a particular backup may be "filtered" to identify and segregate ESI not expected to be reviewed and group the remaining ESI to facilitate various review techniques. In identifying and segregating ESI not expected to be reviewed, filtering criteria applied may involve identification by certain path names, file extensions, date ranges, custodian names, metadata (e.g., last accessed date), and keywords. A well-designed EDPM methodology may note that this step may include consideration of meet and confer opportunities with opposing counsel and/or motions practice seeking a protective order clearly establishing that certain ESI need not be reviewed for potentially responsive documents or need not be reviewed at the discovery respondent's expense.

Once a portion of the ESI is segregated from the filtering process based on these or other criteria, the remaining ESI that otherwise would be subject to further review is typically "de-duplicated" so that the ESI to be reviewed only includes one copy of each file for which the backup may have contained one or more identical copies.

Through additional filtering, the remaining ESI to be reviewed may then be grouped into several categories that may overlap but nonetheless allow for sophisticated review techniques designed for expediting the review effort while increasing the likelihood of a high quality result. ESI review groupings may include

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

groupings by date range, department, custodian, keyword(s), "near-duplicates," and "microclusters." These last two groupings deserve special attention. A review grouping based on "near-duplicates" will include a particularly identified document – e.g., a contract, employee performance review, or technical specification – and all other drafts or versions of it and, depending upon the filtering criteria used, may include other documents that include a large proportion of the same words and phrases found in the particularly identified document. A review grouping based on "microclusters" will be comparable to a grouping based on "near-duplicates" but may be slightly broader to include, for instance, all continuations of a particular email thread.

**Review.** Generally, the greatest expense and possibly the greatest value of an ediscovery project will result from the review of ESI that has been appropriately filtered into various groups. A well-designed EDPM methodology may include consideration of state-of-the-art review strategies, tools, and techniques, including:

- Reviewer Selection
  - Attorney v. Nonattorney
  - Outside Counsel v. Contract Attorney
  - Technical Specialist v. No Specialized Knowledge
  - Client Personnel (e.g., remote use of document review portal to have a custodian categorize and code his/her own documents)
  - Outsourcing
    - Domestic v. Overseas
- Review Tool Selection

## eDiscovery Project Management: Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

- eDiscovery Vendor v. Other Hosting
- Advanced Visual Presentation, Including [Visual Analytics](#)
- Multi-Pass Review
  - *E.g.*, First Pass Tagging (including by document or ESI groupings)
    - Responsive/Not Important
    - Responsive
    - Responsive/Important
    - Responsive/Privileged-Protected
    - Not Responsive
    - Needs Further Review
    - Unable To Access
  - *E.g.*, Second Pass Coding
    - Attorney, Technical Specialist, or Other Notes
  - *E.g.*, Quality Control Review
- Reviewer Training
  - Case Background
  - Review Tool
  - Guidelines For Uniform Tagging & Coding
- Keyword Selections
- Prioritizing Review Of Various ESI Groupings
- Reviewer Workload Allocations v. Budget v. Deadlines
- Monitoring Progress & Adjusting Staffing And Workloads

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

A well-designed EDPM methodology also may include consideration of approaches to design and staff the review process to be flexible and resilient to revised goals, strategies, and deadlines.

**3.4. Phase IV: Production**

In Phase IV, the focus is redaction review and quality control. In this phase, documents identified for production or privilege logging are reviewed again for a variety of purposes, including redacting privileged or other protected content and considering additional pre-production investigation and followup.

Quality control includes ensuring that the correct ESI is produced. Doing everything right through this stage may be compromised if, for instance, the ESI actually produced is somehow comingled with ESI withheld as not review, not responsive, or privileged or otherwise protected. Quality control also includes ensuring that the form of production is precisely as agreed upon with opposing counsel, for instance to include a certain form of document image (e.g., .pdf or .tif), associated OCR text, and any agreed upon metadata (e.g., author, creation date, and linking data identifying, for instance, attachments associated with an email).

A well-designed EDPM methodology may identify various quality control procedures that may be appropriately implemented by the ediscovery vendor. Such quality control procedures may include:

- Reviewer Categorization Cross-Checks And Business Rules, Collisions And Exception Reporting

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

- Content Analytics Based Cross-Checks: Similarity/Near-Deduplicate Content Matching For Privilege And Redacted Content
- Statistical Random Sampling On Quality And Consistency Of Reviewer Categorization Decisions
- Form(s) Of Production Quality Assurances Procedures in Accordance To Requirements
  - Test Load Files, Data, Text And Image Verification
  - Text Encoding And Date Formatting Validation
  - Output Structure And Deliverables Verification

Also, a well-designed EDPM methodology may identify the post-production period as a time to review the entire production effort and, if appropriate, next steps for additional preservations, collections, reviews, or productions.

#### **4. Developing Your Own EDPM Methodology And Documentary Tools**

Some leading law firms and ediscovery vendors already have their own proprietary EDPM methodologies and documentary "tool kits" that generally inform their work on ediscovery projects. For clients interested in developing their own EDPM methodologies and documentary "tool kits," we have attempted to identify a few considerations to be covered in a well-designed EDPM methodology and examples of a few EDPM documentary tools. In our experience, greater client familiarity with the EDPM process leads to improved ediscovery project results and lower costs.

eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

About the Authors: **Mark Koehn** is of counsel in the litigation and intellectual property practice groups of [Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP's](#)



Washington DC office. He is a former information technology consultant turned litigator and registered patent attorney. In addition to handling a broad range of patent litigation, including in disputes regarding medical devices, pharmaceuticals, and software, Mr. Koehn has litigated and arbitrated several disputes regarding failed software development projects. Prior to earning his law degree, Mr. Koehn was a senior consultant with the predecessor to Accenture, where he supervised design and installation of information systems including the pilot for the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission's Electronic Data Gathering

and Retrieval (EDGAR) system. Mr. Koehn received his J.D. from the Georgetown University Law Center, graduating *cum laude*. He received his B.S. in operations research and industrial engineering, *with distinction*, from Cornell University where he studied project management techniques and was appointed to Tau Beta Pi – the engineering honor society. He is admitted to practice in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia as well as the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Mr. Koehn can be reached at [markkoehn@paulhastings.com](mailto:markkoehn@paulhastings.com), 202.551.1876 (office), and 202.551.0276 (fax). **Note:** *The statements and opinions expressed in this article are not those of the firm or its clients.*



**Dharmesh Shingala** is President and Chief Technology Officer of [Capital Legal Solutions](#). Mr. Shingala founded Capital Legal Solutions in 2002 after more than a decade developing efficient and cost-effective solutions to difficult technology challenges for corporate and government clients. He created the company to respond to a growing demand from clients, including top national law firm IT managers and savvy litigators, seeking to gain an edge in electronic discovery. Born in India, Mr. Shingala was a National

Merit Scholar and a graduate of the prestigious National Institute of Technology Calicut before coming to the United States for graduate studies in systems engineering. He holds a Master's Degree from Virginia Tech University. Mr. Shingala can be reached at [dharmesh@capitallegals.com](mailto:dharmesh@capitallegals.com), 703.533.8020 (office), and 703.532.5274 (fax).



eDiscovery Project Management:  
Guidance On Developing A Methodology And Documentary Tools

Appendix

Sample eDiscovery Tools

## Planning (Overview)

Sample eDiscovery Tools														
Planning (Overview)														
Steps To Consider Include:														
1	Define the ediscovery project to include several Phases and identify the anticipated tasks to be included in each phase.													
2	The ediscovery literature includes many recommended tasks although there is no one-size-fits-all list of ediscovery project tasks.													
3	For each task, consider the team members who may be involved, estimated hours to be billed for each task, target deadlines, and any firm deadlines.													
4	For large, complex ediscovery projects consider use of project management software to document and track progress against each task.													
5	For many ediscovery projects, basic spreadsheet documents may provide effective, easy to maintain project management documentation.													
Many Documentation Options, Including:														
Phase	Task	Description	Outside Counsel	eDiscovery Vendor	Client Inhouse Counsel	Client IT Staff	Client Other Personnel	Opposing Counsel	Court	Est. Senior Atty Hrs	Est. Junior Atty Hrs	Est. eDiscov Vendor Hrs	Target Deadline	Firm Deadline*
I	1	Preservation, Planning & Budgeting												
I	2	Draft and issue initial litigation hold (include scoping call with inhouse counsel and IT staff)	P	M	P	P	P	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
I	3	Identify and retain ediscovery vendor	P	P	P	M	N	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
I	4	Interview client IT staff and collect documents to characterize client systems and prepare draft preliminary IT infrastructure working description	P	M	P	P	N	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
I	etc.	Prepare draft document request/potential sources worksheet	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
I	etc.	Interviews and updates to draft document request/potential sources worksheet	P	M	P	P	P	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
I	etc.	Prepare draft preliminary ediscovery project plan	P	P	M	M	N	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
I														
II		<u>Collection</u>												
II	etc.	Identify anticipated key witnesses, interview relative to potential sources of responsive documents and prepare document(s) reflecting impressions of the same.	P	N	P	M	P	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
II														

P=Probably involved, M=May be involved, N=Not typically involved

\*=deadline set by FRCP, scheduling or other court order, or agreement with opposing counsel

Planning (Overview)

Phase	Task	Description	Outside Counsel	eDiscovery Vendor	Client Inhouse Counsel	Client IT Staff	Client Other Personnel	Opposing Counsel	Court	Est. Senior Atty Hrs	Est. Junior Atty Hrs	Est. eDiscov Vendor Hrs	Target Deadline	Firm Deadline*
<u>III</u>		<u>Review</u>												
III	etc.	Discuss and prepare strategy for document review	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
III	etc.	Define and prepare reports to characterize content of identified samples of preserved media	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
	etc.	Define and implement search procedures for identifying and segregating potentially privileged materials	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
III														
<u>IV</u>		<u>Production</u>												
IV	etc.	Discuss and prepare strategy for final pre-production review, including additional procedures for identifying and segregating potentially privileged materials	P	P	M	N	N	N	N	??	??	??	YYYY-MM-DD	YYYY-MM-DD
IV														
		Totals												
		Rough Avg Hrly Rates									\$XX	\$YY	\$ZZ	
		Rough Fees for Hourly Billed Work									\$XXXX	\$YYYY	\$ZZZZ	

P=Probably involved, M=May be involved, N=Not typically involved

\*=deadline set by FRCP, scheduling or other court order, or agreement with opposing counsel







File Extension Report

Sample eDiscovery Tools					
File Extension Report					
Many Documentation Options, Including:					
Passive Media: Server 1 (full) backup, Serial # 48728, Created by IT Staff on 2008-10-31 for disaster recovery purposes					
File Ext.	Typically	Total Files	Total Size (in KB)	Avg. Size (in KB)	% of Backup
.DOC	WordStar Document, WordPerfect Document, Microsoft Word Document, Document or Documentation (many programs/formats),MS Word Document, Ensoniq SQ80 file, FlowChart; EasyFlow 6.x-8.x, ChiWriter high resolution screen font, Ensoniq VFX-SD file, Fax (Eve, MS BIFF File, MS Briefcase Database, MS Rich Text Format Document , MS Word for Windows Document , Text File , WordPerfect Document , MS Word for DOS Document	999	999	999	x%
.MPG	MPEG animation, MPEG Animation [Viewer],MPEG 1 System Stream, ReaGeniX code generator : Rea-C-Time application parameter file, MPEG movie file., MPEG encoded file. This file is an MPEG movie, and can be played with QuickTime Player., MPEG 1 Animation , NetFRAME MPEG 2 Animation , Xing MPEG Animation	999	999	999	x%
.PDF	Adobe Acrobat Portable Document Format, Printer Description,Adobe Acrobat File,Netware Printer Definition File,MS Package Definition File (Inventory-related), Windows Performance Monitor Settings, Plazmic Media Engine File, Pagemaker Group File (EPS graphic), OS/2 : Program manager information, Pegasus Mail Message Folder Index File, PADGen Program Information, PageMaker 4 library, Pegasus Mail Distribution List, Windows NT Performance Monitor Log, Adobe Acrobat Reader file which can only be read by Adobe Acrobat (to get file downloaded Adobe Acrobat from our Download Page., Portable Document file (Adobe Acrobat) (displayable with a Web browser), Printer Definition File (Netware), Graphics file (ED-SCAN 24bit), Adobe Portable Document Format , Novell Print Definition File	999	999	999	x%
.PPT	Microsoft PowerPoint presentation, PowerPoint Presentation, Omnis Quartz data; also QD1 ... QD9, Omnis Quartz data file - segment 1, Microsoft PowerPoint presentation., PowerPoint presentation (Microsoft), PowerPoint presentation (filename extension)., MS BIFF File, MS Briefcase Database, MS PowerPoint Slides/Add-on	999	999	999	x%
.XLS	Microsoft Excel worksheet, Excel Worksheet, Fortran file, Microsoft Excel File., Worksheet file (Microsoft Excel), MS BIFF File, MS Briefcase Database, MS Excel Worksheet/Add-In/Temp.	999	999	999	x%
	*	*	*	*	*
	*	*	*	*	*
<b>Totals</b>					<b>100%</b>

