



NATIONAL NOTARY ASSOCIATION

March 10, 2011

Mr. Robert A. Stein
President, National Conference of Commissioners
on Uniform State Laws
111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010
Chicago, IL 60602

RE: NNA's Support of Revised Uniform Law on Notarial Acts

Dear Mr. Stein:

On behalf of the National Notary Association (NNA)—the leader in best practices, training, and advocacy for the nation's 4.8 million Notaries Public—I would like to commend the Uniform Law Commission for its Revised Uniform Law on Notarial Acts (RULONA).

The RULONA, with its Prefatory Note and Comments, will be helpful to state lawmakers as they work to modernize and strengthen their respective statutory Notary codes. The new Act reflects the societal, technological, marketplace and economic changes that have impacted Notaries and notarization since the Uniform Law on Notarial Acts was first promulgated in 1982. In particular, RULONA addresses electronic notarization and it mandates that any signer must appear in the physical presence of the Notary, whether the notarized document is paper or electronic.

The RULONA subscribes to the same basic philosophy, principles and practices of notarization that have been the foundation of the NNA's Model Notary Acts of 1984, 2002 and 2010.

For example, RULONA's unification of the rules for paper-based and electronic notarization is congruent with similar rules set forth in the most recent Model Notary Act, which was contributed to the public domain by the NNA for use by state lawmakers on January 1, 2010. Also congruent are the RULONA's and MNA's requirement of the use of tamper-evident technologies in the notarization of electronic documents and their permission for each Notary to employ more than one tamper-evident technology in performing different electronic notarizations.

Mr. Robert A. Stein
March 10, 2011
Page 2

While the Model Notary Act is broader in scope than the RULONA, there are numerous areas of overlap and congruency, including their respective sections on beneficial interest, satisfactory evidence of identity, competence of the signer, commission qualifications, examination of applicants, and prohibited acts.

There is also significant agreement between the RULONA and the MNA on their respective rules for maintaining a Notary journal—although RULONA as a unifying law acknowledges the journal's controversiality in some jurisdictions by giving legislators the option of not mandating a journal, while the MNA as a model law makes the journal a requirement for all Notaries.

The RULONA demonstrates a deep understanding of the issues American Notaries deal with on a daily basis. Members of the RULONA drafting panel, chaired by Ms. Patricia Brumfield Fry, are to be congratulated for updating, expanding and strengthening the ULONA of 1982.

It is most gratifying that the two major standards guiding state legislators today in modernizing and improving Notary statutes across the nation are in step with each other as they prepare and support Notaries in this ongoing new age of electronic documents and electronic notarization.

Sincerely,



Marc Reiser
Chief Executive Officer

Cc: John A. Sebert, Executive Director, NCCUSL
Patricia Brumfield Fry, Chair, RULONA Drafting Committee