

1 DRAFT
2 FOR DISCUSSION ONLY
3 UNIFORM ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS ACT

4
5
6
7 NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
8 ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS
9

10 Draft
11 August 15, 1997
12
13 UNIFORM ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS ACT
14
15 With Notes
16

17 COPYRIGHT 1997
18 BY
19 NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
20 ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

21
22 The ideas and conclusions herein set forth, including drafts of
23 proposed legislation, have not been passed on by the National
24 Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. They do not
25 necessarily reflect the views of the Committee, Reporter or
26 Commissioners. Proposed statutory language, if any, may not be
27 used to ascertain legislative meaning of any promulgated final
28 law.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

**DRAFTING COMMITTEE FOR
UNIFORM ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS ACT**

10 PATRICIA BRUMFIELD FRY, University of North Dakota, School of
11 Law, P.O. Box 9003, Grand Forks, ND 58202, Chair
12 STEPHEN Y. CHOW, 30th Floor, One Beacon St., Boston, MA 02108
13 KENNETH W. ELLIOTT, Suite 630, 119 N. Robinson, Oklahoma City, OK
14 73102
15 HENRY DEEB GABRIEL, JR., Loyola University, School of Law, 526
16 Pine St., New Orleans, LA 70118
17 RICHARD O. GREGERSON, 300 S. Phillips Ave., Suite 300, Souix
18 Falls, SD 57104-6322
19 BION M. GREGORY, Office of Legislative Council, State Capitol,
20 Suite 3021, Sacramento, CA 95814-4996
21 PAMELA MEADE SARGENT, P.O. Box 429, Abingdon, VA 24212
22 D. BENJAMIN BEARD, University of Idaho, College of Law, 6th and
23 Rayburn, Moscow, ID 83844-2321, Reporter

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

EX OFFICIO

33 GENE N. LeBRUN, P.O. Box 8250, 9th Floor, 909 St. Joseph Street,
34 Rapid City, SD 57709, President, National Conference
35 HENRY M. KITTLESON, P.O. Box 32092, 92 Lake Wire Drive, Lakeland,
36 FL 33802, Chair, Division A, National Conference

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

37 FRED H. MILLER, University of Oklahoma, College of Law, 300
38 Timberdell Road, Norman, OK 73019, Executive Director
39
40 WILLIAM J. PIERCE, 1505 Roxbury Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48104,
41 Executive Director Emeritus.
42

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

Copies of this Act may be obtained from:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS
676 St. Claire Street, Suite 1700
Chicago, Illinois 60611
312/915-0195

1 SECTION 206. ADMISSIBILITY INTO EVIDENCE.
2 SECTION 207. RETENTION OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS.

3 PART 3
4 SECURE ELECTRONIC RECORDS AND SIGNATURES

5 SECTION 301. SECURE ELECTRONIC RECORDS.
6 SECTION 302. SECURE ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES.
7 SECTION 303. PRESUMPTIONS.

8 PART 4
9 ELECTRONIC CONTRACTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

10 SECTION 401. EFFECTIVENESS BETWEEN PARTIES.
11 SECTION 402. FORMATION AND VALIDITY.
12 SECTION 403. ATTRIBUTION; TRANSMISSION ERRORS.
13 SECTION 404. TIME AND PLACE OF SENDING AND RECEIPT.
14 SECTION 405. ELECTRONIC ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT.
15 SECTION 406. TRANSFERABLE RECORDS.

16 PART 5
17 PUBLIC ELECTRONIC RECORDS

18 SECTION 501. USE OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS BY STATE AGENCIES.

1
2
3
4
5

PART 6

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- SECTION 601. SEVERABILITY.**
- SECTION 602. EFFECTIVE DATE.**
- SECTION 603. SAVINGS AND TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.**

1 manner in which one authenticates a record. The manner of
2 authentication is found in the definition of signature and
3 electronic signature, and is expanded in Section 204 regarding
4 the effect of a signature.

5 At the May meeting the comment was made that authentication
6 as defined in Article 2B and the prior models was circular in
7 defining authentication as signing, and signing as
8 authentication. Others questioned the need to define
9 authenticate at all since it is not currently defined in the UCC
10 and revised Article 5 determined not to define the term.

11 The definition of authenticate makes clear that when one
12 "signs" a writing "with present intent to authenticate", the
13 unstated assumption is that one intends to identify oneself as
14 the signer, indicate agreement or adoption of the terms in the
15 writing, and verify the integrity of the contents of that which
16 is signed. Of course, the signer can indicate that only 1 or 2
17 of these purposes was intended. However, this definition, and the
18 provisions in Section 204, are intended to make clear the norm
19 when one "signs" a record.

20 In this draft a recurring theme will be an attempt to
21 demonstrate and establish the legal equivalence of electronic
22 records and signatures with current understandings of writings
23 and signatures in the paper environment. This approach is
24 consistent with the premise that records and signatures should be
25 effective regardless of the media in which they appear or are
26 communicated.

27 Concern has been expressed that the use of the term
28 authenticate in the rules of evidence may create confusion with
29 the defined term in this Act and other commercial statutes such
30 as Article 2B. Professor Leo Whinery, Reporter for the revision
31 of the Uniform Rules of Evidence, advised me that the Evidence
32 drafting committee has not yet addressed the issue of
33 authentication. I have provided Professor Whinery with a copy of
34 this draft, and will be working with him to resolve any conflicts
35 or potential confusion. For the present, the Drafting Committee
36 should consider whether an alternative term (e.g., confirm,
37 validate) should be used in place of "authenticate" in this Act.

38 (3) "Automated transaction" means a transaction
39 formed or performed, in whole or in part, by electronic records
40 in which the records of one or both parties will not be reviewed
41 by an individual as an expected step in forming a contract or
42 performing under an existing contract.

43 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a)(18).

44 **Reporter's Note:** This is essentially the definition of
45 "Electronic transaction" appearing in Article 2B. The term has
46 been changed to "automated transaction" for clarity and to avoid

1 confusion in light of the title of this Act as the "Electronic
2 Transactions Act."

3 As with electronic agents, this definition addresses the
4 circumstance where electronic records may result in action or
5 performance by a party although no human review of the electronic
6 records is anticipated. Section 401(c) provides specific
7 contract formation rules where one or both parties do not review
8 the electronic records.

9
10 (4) "Computer Program" means a set of statements or
11 instructions to be used directly or indirectly to operate an
12 information processing system in order to bring about a certain
13 result. The term does not include any information created or
14 communicated as a result of the operation of the system.

15 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a)(5).

16 **Reporter's Note:** This definition is from Article 2B. The term
17 is used principally with respect to the definition of "electronic
18 agent" and "information." Questions were raised at the May
19 meeting regarding its necessity. Is it a necessary definition?
20 Is it an accurate definition?

21 (5) "Conspicuous" means so displayed or presented that a
22 reasonable individual against whom or whose principal it operates
23 ought to have noticed it. A term is conspicuous if it is:

24 (A) a heading in all capitals (e.g., NON-NEGOTIABLE
25 BILL OF LADING) equal or greater in size to the surrounding text;

26 (B) language in the body or text of a record or
27 display in larger or other contrasting type or color than other
28 language;

29 (C) a term prominently referenced in the body or
30 text of an electronic record or display which can be readily
31 accessed from the record or display;

1 (D) language so positioned in a record or display
2 that a party cannot proceed without taking some additional action
3 with respect to the term or the reference; or

4 (E) language readily distinguishable in another
5 manner.

6 In the case of an electronic record intended to evoke a response
7 without the need for review by an individual, a term is
8 conspicuous if it is in a form that would enable a reasonably
9 configured electronic agent to take it into account or react to
10 it without review of the record by an individual

11 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a)(7).

12 **Reporter's Note:** This definition has been retained in the event
13 the Drafting Committee determines the need for special consumer
14 rules. The definition has been modified for clarity by placing
15 the reference to electronic records which are not intended to be
16 reviewed in a separate sentence at the end.

17 (6) "Consumer" means an individual who, at the time of
18 entering into a transaction does so primarily for personal,
19 family, or household purposes. [The term does not include a
20 person that enters into a transaction primarily for profit
21 making, professional, or commercial purposes, including
22 agricultural, investments, research, and business and investment
23 management, other than management of an ordinary person's
24 personal or family assets.]

25 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a)(8).

26 **Reporter's Note:** This definition has been modified to eliminate
27 the specific licensing context of Article 2B. It has also been
28 broadened to cover any transaction entered into by a person in a
29 consumer capacity. The bracketed language appears in Article 2B.
30 Query whether it is necessary?

1 (7) "Contract" means the total legal obligation which
2 results from the parties' agreement as affected by this [Act] as
3 supplemented by other applicable rules of law.

4 **Source:** UCC Section 1-201(11).

5 (8) "Electronic" means electrical, digital, magnetic,
6 optical, electromagnetic, or any other form of technology that
7 includes capabilities similar to these technologies.

8 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(15).

9 **Reporter's Note:** This definition serves to assure that the Act
10 will be applied broadly as new technologies develop. While not
11 all technologies listed a technically "electronic" in nature
12 (e.g., optical fiber technology), the need for a recognized,
13 single term warrants the use of "electronic" as the defined term.
14 Query whether the definition is broad enough?

15 (9) "Electronic agent" means a computer program or other
16 electronic or automated means used, selected, or programmed by a
17 party to initiate or respond to electronic records or
18 performances in whole or in part without review by an individual.

19 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a)(17).

20 **Reporter's Note:** An electronic agent, as a computer program or
21 other automated device employed by a person, is a tool of that
22 person. As a general rule, the employer of a tool is responsible
23 for the results obtained in the use of that tool since the tool
24 has no independent volition of its own. However, an electronic
25 agent by definition is capable, within the parameters of its
26 programing, of initiating, responding or interacting with other
27 parties or their electronic agents once it has been activated by
28 a party, without further attention of that party. This draft
29 contains provisions dealing with the efficacy of, and
30 responsibility for, actions taken and accomplished by electronic
31 agents in the absence of human intervention.

32 While this Act proceeds on the paradigm that an electronic
33 agent is capable of performing only within the technical
34 strictures of its preset programing, it is conceivable that,
35 within the useful life of this Act, electronic agents may be
36 created with the ability to act autonomously, and not just
37 automatically. That is, through developments in artificial
38 intelligence, a computer may be able to "learn through
39 experience, modify the instructions in their own programs, and
40 even devise new instructions." Allen and Widdison, "Can Computers

1 Make Contracts?" 9 Harv. J.L.&Tech 25 (Winter, 1996). At such
2 time as this may occur, "Courts may ultimately conclude that an
3 electronic agent is equivalent in all respects to a human
4 agent..." Article 2B-102, Reporter's Note 10.

5
6 (10) "Electronic record" means a record stored,
7 generated, received, or communicated by electronic means for use
8 by, or storage in, an information system or for transmission from
9 one information system to another.

10 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a)(17); Illinois Model
11 Section 103(7).

12 **Reporter's Note:** An electronic record is a subset of the broader
13 defined term "record." Unlike the term "electronic message" used
14 in Article 2B, the definition is not limited to records intended
15 for communication, but extends to any information contained in an
16 electronic medium. It is also used in this Act as a limiting
17 definition in those provisions in which it is used.

18
19
20 (11) "Electronic signature" means [letters, characters,
21 numbers, or other] symbols in electronic form, attached to or
22 logically associated with an electronic record, executed or
23 adopted by a party with present intent to authenticate the
24 electronic record.

25 **Source:** UCC Section 1-201(39); Illinois Model Section 103(8).

26 **Reporter's Note:** As with electronic record, this definition is a
27 subset of the broader defined term "signature" which is
28 substantially the definition set forth in UCC Section 1-201(39).
29 The purpose of the separate definition is principally one of
30 clarity in extending the definition of signature to the
31 electronic environment. Query whether the bracketed language is
32 necessary for clarity?

33 It would be possible to rely solely on the UCC definition
34 which provides that a signature includes "any symbol executed or
35 adopted by a party with present intention to authenticate a
36 writing." However, as with the concept of authentication,
37 certain assumptions attach to the extant definition. For
38 example, it is assumed that the symbol adopted by a party is
39 attached to or located somewhere in the same paper that is
40 intended to be authenticated. These tangible manifestations do
41 not exist in the electronic environment, and accordingly, this
42 definition expressly provides that the symbol must in some way be
43 linked to, or associated with, the electronic record being

1 authenticated. This linkage is consistent with the regulations
2 promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration. 21 CFR Part 11
3 (March 20, 1997).

4 An electronic signature includes any symbol adopted by a
5 party, so long as the requisite intent to authenticate the
6 electronic record is present. Accordingly a digital signature
7 utilizing public key encryption technology would qualify, as
8 would the mere appellation of one's name at the end of an e-mail
9 message - so long as in each case the party applied the symbol
10 with the intention to authenticate the electronic record with
11 which it was associated. It is the adoption of the symbol with
12 intention to authenticate that is controlling. See Parma Tile
13 Mosaic & Marble Co. v. Estate of Short, 87 NY2d 524 (1996) where
14 it was held that the automatic imprint of a firm name, programmed
15 into a fax machine, was not a sufficient signature because of the
16 absence of any intention to authenticate each document sent over
17 the fax.
18

19 (12) "Good faith" means honesty in fact and the
20 observance of reasonable commercial standards of fair dealing.

21 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a) (20).

22 (13) "Information" means data, text, images, sounds,
23 codes, computer programs, software, databases, and the like.

24 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a) (22); Illinois Model
25 Section 103(10).

26 (14) "Information system" means a system for generating,
27 sending, receiving, storing or otherwise processing information,
28 including electronic records.

29 **Source:** Uncitral Model Article 2(f).

30 **Reporter's Note:** This term is used in the definition of
31 electronic record and in Section 404 regarding the time and place
32 of receipt of an electronic record. Query the accuracy and
33 completeness of this definition?

34 (15) "Manifest of Assent" means that a party or its
35 electronic agent has signed or otherwise clearly indicated that a
36 record or term in a record has been adopted or accepted by the
37 party or its electronic agent. A party or its electronic agent

1 manifests assent by engaging in affirmative conduct or operations
2 with actual knowledge of the terms or after having an opportunity
3 to review the terms, and with the opportunity to decline to sign
4 or engage in the conduct. A manifestation of assent to a record
5 or term in a record does not result merely by retention of the
6 record or term without objection by the party or its electronic
7 agent. If assent to a particular term in addition to assent to a
8 record is required, action taken by a party or its electronic
9 agent does not manifest assent to that term unless there was an
10 opportunity to review the term and the action taken relates
11 specifically to that term.

12 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-112(a-c).

13 **Reporter's Note:** Derived from Article 2B, this term, together
14 with the term "opportunity to review," is critical in determining
15 what constitutes the agreement of parties when that agreement is
16 formed electronically. Because of the nature of electronic
17 media, it may well be the case that a party does not deal with a
18 human being on the other side of a transaction.

19 In an electronic environment where computers are often pre-
20 programmed and operate without human review of the operations in
21 any particular, discreet transaction, it is not always the case
22 that two humans have reached a "bargain in fact," i.e., a
23 "meeting of the minds." Rather, the agreement is often the
24 result of one party or its electronic agent manifesting assent to
25 terms or records presented to it on a "take it or leave it (i.e.,
26 exit)" basis, similar to the presentation of a standard form
27 document in the paper environment.

28 The situations where parties participate in detailed
29 negotiations leading to the formation of an integrated contract
30 setting forth all the terms to which both parties have agreed are
31 largely limited to transactions involving large amounts. Even
32 outside the electronic environment, the use of pre-printed
33 standard forms has supplanted detailed negotiations in many small
34 amount transactions. Accordingly the concept of manifestation of
35 assent to a record or terms of a record has supplemented the
36 notion of actual agreement in determining that to which the
37 parties have agreed to be bound (See Restatement (Second)
38 Contracts Section 211, UCC Section 2-207).

39 Even in an electronic environment it remains possible to
40 negotiate to agreement. In such a case, if parties engage in e-
41 mail correspondence which results in a classic offer and

1 acceptance of the terms (and only the terms) set forth in the
2 correspondence, the electronic signatures appended to the e-mail
3 messages serve to authenticate the records and result in contract
4 formation. This is the case since an electronic signature, by
5 definition, is made with intent to authenticate the record.

6 Contrasted with such a negotiated electronic contract is the
7 situation where one calls up a provider on the Internet. The
8 person determines to purchase the goods or services offered and
9 is walked through a series of displayed buttons requesting the
10 purchaser to agree to certain terms and conditions in order to
11 obtain the goods and services. With each click on screen, the
12 purchaser is indicating assent to that term in order to obtain
13 the desired results. So long as the action of clicking in each
14 case relates to a discreet term, or follows the full presentation
15 of all terms, the actions of the purchaser can be said to clearly
16 indicate assent to the terms available for review. As with the
17 exchange of standard paper forms, there is no requirement that
18 the terms be read before the on screen click occurs, so long as
19 they were available to be read. Indeed, in such a scenario the
20 problem of additional and conflicting terms which have so
21 confused courts in the battle of the forms is not present.

22 Accordingly, the concept of manifesting assent has been
23 included in the term "agreement" in this Act.
24

25 (16) "Merchant" means a person that is a professional in
26 the business involved in the transaction, that by occupation
27 purports to have knowledge or skill peculiar to the practices
28 involved in the transaction, or to which knowledge or skill may
29 be attributed by the person's employment of an agent or broker or
30 other intermediary that purports to have the knowledge or skill.

31 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a)(30).

32 **Reporter's Note:** This definition has been modified to eliminate
33 the specific licensing context of Article 2B. It has been
34 retained in this draft in the event particular consumer rules are
35 ultimately included.

36 (17) "Notify" means to communicate, or make available,
37 information to another person in a form and manner as appropriate
38 or required under the circumstances.

39 **Source:** Illinois Model Section 103(22).

40 **Reporter's Note:** As with the definition of receive, a notice sent
41 to a party must be in a proper format to permit the recipient to
42 use and understand the information. For example, sending a

1 message notice to a recipient in the United States in Chinese
2 would not suffice to notify the recipient of the content of the
3 message, in the absence of proof that the recipient understood
4 Chinese. Similarly, sending a notice in WordPerfect 7.0 may not
5 be appropriate when many people do not have the capability to
6 convert from that format. In such a case, a more universal
7 format such as ASCII would be required.

8 (18) "Opportunity to Review" means that a record or a
9 term of a record is made available in a manner designed to call
10 it to the attention of the party and to permit review of its
11 terms or to enable an electronic agent to react to the record or
12 term.

13 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-113(a).
14 **Reporter's Note:** See Reporter's Note to Manifest Assent, supra.

15 (19) "Organization" means a person other than an
16 individual.

17 **Source:** UCC Section 1-201(28).
18 **Reporter's Note:** This is the standard Conference formulation for
19 this definition.

20 (20) "Person" means an individual, corporation, business
21 trust, estate, trust, partnership, limited liability company,
22 association, joint venture, [government, governmental
23 subdivision, agency or instrumentality,] or any other legal or
24 commercial entity.

25 **Source:** UCC Section 1-201(30).
26 **Reporter's Note:** This is the standard Conference formulation for
27 this definition.

28 (21) "Receive," with respect to an electronic record,
29 means that the electronic record has entered an information
30 system in a form capable of being processed by a system of that

1 type and the recipient uses or has designated that system for the
2 purpose of receiving such records or information.

3 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a) (34).

4 **Reporter's Note:** This definition only addresses receipt of
5 electronic records. Receipt in this context requires both that
6 the record be sent to a designated or known system of the
7 recipient, and that the record be in a format which can be
8 processed by that system. The burden of assuring the form is
9 processable by the receiving system is on the sender. See
10 comment to Notify.

11 (22) "Record" means information that is inscribed on a
12 tangible medium or that is stored in an electronic or other
13 medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

14 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-102(a) (35).

15 **Reporter's Note:** This is the standard Conference formulation for
16 this definition.

17 (23) "Rule of law" means a statute, regulation,
18 ordinance, common-law rule, court decision, or other law relating
19 to commercial or governmental transactions enacted, established,
20 or promulgated by this State , or any agency, commission,
21 department, court, other authority or political subdivision of
22 this State.

23 **Source:** Oklahoma Model Section II.F; Illinois Model Section
24 103(19).

25 **Reporter's Note:** The definition is drafted broadly with the
26 single limitation of laws relating to commercial and governmental
27 transactions, consistent with the Scope of the Act.

28 (24) "Security procedure," with respect to either an
29 electronic record or electronic signature, means a commercially
30 reasonable procedure or methodology, established by agreement,
31 mutually adopted by the parties, or otherwise established to be a
32 commercially reasonable procedure, for verifying (I) the identity
33 of the sender, or source, of an electronic record, or (ii) the

1 integrity of, or detecting errors in, the transmission or
2 informational content of an electronic record. A security
3 procedure may require the use of algorithms or other codes,
4 identifying words or numbers, encryption, callback or other
5 acknowledgment procedures, key escrow, or any other procedures
6 that are reasonable under the circumstances.

7 **Source:** UCC Section 4A-201; Article 2B Draft Section 2B-110(a);
8 Illinois Model Section 103(21); Oklahoma Model Section III.B.2.

9 **Reporter's Note:** This is a new definition derived from the
10 sources indicated. The two key aspects of the procedure are to
11 identify the sender and assure the informational integrity of the
12 record. The definition does not identify any particular
13 technology but relies on the concept of commercial
14 reasonableness. This permits the use of procedures which the
15 parties select or which otherwise are appropriate in light of all
16 the surrounding circumstances relating to a given transaction.
17 It permits the greatest flexibility among the parties and allows
18 for future technological development.

19 (25) "Signature" includes any symbol executed or adopted
20 by a person with a present intent to authenticate a record.

21 **Source:** UCC Section 1-201(39).

22 **Reporter's Note:** This definition reflects the current UCC
23 definition. As noted, the definition of electronic signature is
24 a subset of this definition.

25 (26) "State agency" means any executive, legislative or
26 judicial agency, department, board, commission, authority,
27 institution, or instrumentality of this State or of any county,
28 municipal or other political subdivision of this State.

29 **Source:** New.

30 **Reporter's Note:** This definition is required as a result of the
31 expanded scope of the Act to cover governmental transactions.
32

33 (27) "Transferable record" means a record, other than a
34 writing, that is an instrument or chattel paper under Article 9

1 of the [Uniform Commercial Code] or a document of title under
2 Article 1 of the [Uniform Commercial Code].

3 **Source:** Oklahoma Model Section II.H.

4 **Reporter's Note:** This definition is necessary in the event the
5 Drafting Committee decides to retain the applicability of this
6 Act to such records. See Section 406.

7 (28) "Writing" includes printing, typewriting, or any
8 other reduction to tangible form. "Written" has a corresponding
9 meaning.

10 **Source:** UCC Section 1-201(46).

11 **Reporter's Note:** This definition reflects the current UCC
12 definition.

13 **SECTION 103. PURPOSES.** The underlying purposes of this Act
14 are

15 a) to facilitate and promote commerce and governmental
16 transactions by validating and authorizing the use of electronic
17 records and electronic signatures;

18 b) to eliminate barriers to electronic commerce and
19 governmental transactions resulting from uncertainties relating
20 to writing and signature requirements;

21 c) to simplify, clarify and modernize the law governing
22 commerce and governmental transactions through the use of
23 electronic means;

24 d) to permit the continued expansion of commercial and
25 governmental electronic practices through custom, usage and
26 agreement of the parties;

27 e) to promote uniformity of the law among the states (and
28 worldwide) relating to the use of electronic and similar

1 technological means of effecting and performing commercial and
2 governmental transactions;

3 f) to promote public confidence in the validity,
4 integrity and reliability of electronic commerce and governmental
5 transactions; and

6 g) to promote the development of the legal and business
7 infrastructure necessary to implement electronic commerce and
8 governmental transactions.

9 **Sources:** Illinois Model Section 102; UCC Section 1-102(2).
10 **Reporter's Note:** This section is compiled from purposes set
11 forth in the sources. It is intended to direct Courts in
12 construing the Act to permit flexibility in addressing new
13 technologies as they arise.

14 Despite an admonition from members of the Style Committee
15 that purpose clauses are to be avoided because they cause
16 mischief by creating uncertainty as to the substantive provisions
17 of the Act, this section has been retained in light of the
18 Drafting Committee's sense that it is appropriate for this Act.
19 The purposes can be relegated to comment if the Drafting
20 Committee believes that is more appropriate.
21

22 **SECTION 104. SCOPE.** Except as otherwise provided in Section
23 105, this Act applies to records generated, stored, processed,
24 communicated or used for any purpose in any commercial or
25 governmental transaction.

26 **Source:** New.

27 **Reporter's Note:** The purpose of this Act is to validate and
28 effectuate electronic records and electronic signatures used in
29 any commercial or governmental transaction. The idea of a
30 commercial transaction is to be broadly understood. In a
31 footnote, the Uncitral Model Law provides that

32 The term "commercial" should be given a wide interpretation
33 so as to cover matters arising from all relationships of a
34 commercial nature, whether contractual or not. Relationships
35 of a commercial nature include, but are not limited to, the
36 following transactions: any trade transaction for the supply
37 or exchange of goods or services; distribution agreement;
38 commercial representation or agency; factoring; leasing;

1 construction of works; consulting; engineering; licensing;
2 investment; financing; banking; insurance; exploitation
3 agreement or concession; joint venture and other forms of
4 industrial or business cooperation; carriage of goods or
5 passengers by air, sea, rail or road.

6 At the May meeting the Drafting Committee expressed strong
7 reservations about applying this Act to all writings and
8 signatures, as is contemplated in the Illinois, Massachusetts and
9 other models. The requirement of a global search and replace in
10 state legislation was considered too burdensome and was believed
11 would jeopardize the ability to obtain broad (never mind uniform)
12 enactment of this Act. Nonetheless there was sentiment among the
13 observers for just such a broad, all encompassing Act. This
14 draft adopts a compromise position consistent with the Uncitral
15 Model Law.

16 Consistent with the expanded scope of the Act approved by the
17 Scope and Program Committee this summer, the scope has been
18 expanded to cover governmental transactions. Since the
19 circumstances under which any given State may wish, or be able to
20 adopt electronic means of conducting its business, this Act
21 simply provides authority for state entities to adopt the means
22 to go electronic. Part 5 authorizes state entities to adopt
23 rules and regulations to implement electronic transactions.

24 Query for the Drafting Committee: Is it sufficient to leave
25 the scope of commercial transactions and governmental
26 transactions to commentary, or should the Act set forth specific
27 definitions for these terms?

28 Section 105 sets forth a preliminary list of transactions
29 which would not be covered by this Act. Furthermore, the
30 specific provisions relating to writings and signatures include
31 subsections identifying areas which would not be affected by
32 those provisions.

33 **SECTION 105. TRANSACTIONS SUBJECT TO OTHER LAW.**

34 (a) [Unless otherwise expressly agreed by the parties,] This
35 [Act] does not apply to the extent that a transaction is governed
36 by:

37 (1) rules of law relating to the creation or execution of
38 a will;

39 (2) rules of law relating to the transfer, deposit or
40 withdrawal of money or financial credit;

1 (3) rules of law relating to the creation, performance or
2 enforcement of an indenture, declaration of trust or power of
3 attorney;

4 (4) rules of law relating to the conveyancing of real
5 property;

6 (5) [OTHER]

7 (b) A transaction subject to this [Act] is also subject to:

8 (1) any applicable rules of law relating to consumer
9 protection;

10 (2) [OTHER].

11 (c) In the case of a conflict between this [Act] and a rule
12 of law referenced in subsection (b), such rule of law governs.

13 **Source:** Article 2 Draft Section 2-104 (July 1997 Draft); Oklahoma
14 Model Sections III.B and IV.D.

15 **Reporter's Note:** Subsection (a) lists those transactions which
16 are excluded from the operation of this Act. Query whether
17 parties should be able to opt into the Act? What other
18 transactions should be totally excluded? Should there be a
19 provision, as in the Oklahoma Model, which excludes

20 any rule of law which expressly prohibits the use of a record
21 other than a writing to convey information....The mere
22 requirement in a rule of law that such information be "in
23 writing" shall not be sufficient to satisfy the requirement
24 of an express prohibition.

25 The Oklahoma Bankers Model includes a similar exclusion relating
26 to signatures. The question is whether such exclusions can be
27 left to the states to adopt by amendment to existing legislation,
28 considering that existing legislation would not be more specific
29 than requiring transactions to be "in writing," and therefore
30 would not be covered by the exclusion in any event.

31 Subsections (b) and (c) take a less exclusionary approach.
32 They simply highlight those transactions (for now limited to
33 consumer transactions) where conflicts are to be resolved in
34 favor of the other source of law.

35 **SECTION 106. VARIATION BY AGREEMENT.** (a) As between parties
36 involved in generating, storing, sending, receiving, or otherwise

1 processing or using electronic records or electronic signatures,
2 and except as otherwise provided, the provisions of this [Act]
3 may be varied by agreement.

4 (b) The presence in certain provisions of this [Act]
5 of the words "unless otherwise agreed" or words of similar import
6 does not imply that the effect of other provisions may not be
7 varied by agreement under subsection (a).

8 (c) This [Act] does not, nor shall it be construed
9 to, require that information or signatures be created, stored,
10 transmitted, or otherwise used or communicated by electronic
11 means or in electronic form.

12 **Source:** UCC Section 1-102; Illinois Model Section 104.

13 **Reporter's Note:** Given the principal purpose of this Act to
14 validate and effectuate the use of electronic media in commercial
15 and governmental transactions, it is important to preserve the
16 ability of the parties to establish their own requirements
17 concerning the method of generating, storing and communicating
18 with each other. This Act affects substantive rules of contract
19 law in only limited ways (See especially Part 4). Even in those
20 cases, the parties remain free to alter the timing and effect of
21 their communications.

22 **SECTION 107. APPLICABLE LAW.**

23 (a) An agreement by parties to a transaction governed in
24 whole or in part by this [Act] that their rights and obligations
25 with respect are to be determined by the law of this state or
26 another state or country is effective, whether or not the
27 transaction bears a reasonable relation to that state or country,
28 unless:

29 (1) the transaction is a consumer transaction and
30 that state or country is neither

1 (A) the state or country in which the consumer
2 resides at the time the transaction becomes enforceable or will
3 reside within 30 days thereafter, nor

4 (B) the state or country in which, pursuant to the
5 contract establishing the transaction, the goods, services, or
6 other consideration flowing to the consumer are to be received by
7 the consumer or a person designated by the consumer;

8 (2) the law of that state or country is contrary to a
9 fundamental public policy of the state or country whose law would
10 govern if the parties had not selected the governing law by
11 agreement; or

12 (3) the agreement of the parties selects the law of a
13 country other than the United States and the transaction does not
14 bear a reasonable relationship to a country other than the United
15 States.

16 SUBSECTION (B) ALTERNATIVE 1

17 (b) If subsection (a) does not apply or the agreement of
18 the parties under subsection (a) is ineffective, this [Act]
19 applies to transactions bearing an appropriate relation to this
20 state.

21 SUBSECTION (B) ALTERNATIVE 2

22 (b) If subsection (a) does not apply or the agreement of
23 the parties under subsection (a) is ineffective, the law
24 determining the rights and obligations of parties with respect to
25 any aspect of a transaction governed by this [Act] is the law
26 that would ordinarily be selected by application of this state's

1 conflict of laws principles[; provided, however, that if
2 application of such principles to a transaction that is not a
3 consumer transaction would result in the unenforceability of all
4 or part of an agreement that is enforceable under the law of this
5 state, the law governing those rights and obligations is the law
6 of this state unless the transaction does not bear an appropriate
7 relationship to this state].

8 **Source:** Article 1 Draft Section 1-302; UCC Section 1-105(1).

9 **Reporter's Note:** Subsection (a) gives wide flexibility to the
10 parties in choosing the law applicable to their transaction. The
11 only limits placed on party autonomy in this regard relate to 1)
12 consumer transactions, 2) where the choice would result in the
13 violation of a fundamental public policy of the forum state, and
14 3) in the international context, where the law of a country with
15 no reasonable relation to the transaction is selected.

16 Alternative 1 Subsection (b) adopts the so-called "imperial
17 clause" found in the last sentence of current UCC Section 1-
18 105(1). The intention of including such a clause in this Act is
19 similar to the purpose of originally adopting the clause in the
20 UCC - to encourage broad, uniform enactment of this Act. In
21 addition, such a clause would give greater protection to
22 transactions conducted electronically.

23 Alternative 2 Subsection (b) sets forth the proposed revision
24 of Article 1. The April draft proposes a conflict of laws rule,
25 i.e., the applicable law is that designated by the State's
26 conflict of law rules. The bracketed language provides an
27 exception where the law which would otherwise be chosen would
28 invalidate the transaction which would not be invalid under the
29 law of the state applying its conflict of laws rules.

30 **SECTION 108. CHOICE OF FORUM.** The parties may choose an
31 exclusive judicial forum. However, in a consumer contract the
32 choice is not enforceable if the chosen jurisdiction would not
33 otherwise have jurisdiction over the consumer, the consumer did
34 not have adequate notice of the choice of forum term and the
35 choice [is fundamentally unfair to] and [unreasonably burdens]
36 the consumer. A choice of forum in a term of an agreement is not
37 exclusive unless the agreement expressly so provides.

1 **Uniform Law Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-107.
2 **Reporter's Note:** The following Notes are from the Article 2B
3 Reporter's Note to that section.

4 **Selected Issue:**

5 a. Should the choice of forum be validated in Internet
6 transactions, independent of the consumer or other issue
7 under the rationale in Cruise Lines?

8 **Reporter's Notes:**

9 1. This section deals with choice of an exclusive judicial
10 forum. It does not cover contract terms that **permit** litigation
11 to be brought in a designated jurisdiction, but do not require
12 that result. Although earlier case law viewed forum choices
13 with some disfavor, the trend of modern case law enforces
14 choice of forum clauses, even if in standard form contracts, so
15 long as enforcement does not unreasonably disadvantage a party.
16 Since 1972, courts have shown an increasing willingness to
17 enforce this type of contract provision, subject to due process
18 restrictions. See *Bremen v. Zapata Offshore Co.*, 407 U.S. 1,
19 10 (1972) (choice of forum clauses are "prima facie valid").
20 This case law does not differentiate between standard form and
21 nonstandard contracts. See *Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc. v.*
22 *Shute*, 111 S.Ct. 1522 (1991). However, constitutional concerns
23 about fairness and notice may provide a limiting role. Thus,
24 the US Supreme Court held that a choice of arbitration under
25 New York law in a standard form contract could not be enforced
26 to apply New York law prohibiting punitive damage awards in
27 arbitration where that substantive effect was not highlighted
28 or brought to the affected party's attention. Similarly, some
29 courts hold such clauses to be unenforceable where they impinge
30 on concepts of fundamental unfairness. See also *Perkins v. CCH*
31 *Computax, Inc.*, 106 N.C. App. 210, 415 S.E.2d 755 (1992);
32 *Lauro Lines v. Chasser*, 490 U.S. 495 (1989); *Sterling Forest*
33 *Assocs., Ltd. v. Barnett-Range Corp.*, 840 F.2d 249 (4th Cir.
34 1988).

35 2. The importance of choice of forum provisions in
36 transactions in modern cyberspace was highlighted by a series
37 of cases involving jurisdictional issues on Internet and
38 related online environments. See, e.g., *CompuServe v.*
39 *Patterson*, 89 F.3d 927 (6th Cir. 1996). (allowing jurisdiction
40 of Texas provider in Ohio because of contract contacts with
41 Ohio online provider). The Supreme Court enforced a choice of
42 forum in a standard form contract even though the choice
43 effectively denied a consumer the ability to defend the
44 contract and the choice was contained in a non-negotiated form
45 and not presented to the consumer until after the tickets had
46 been purchased. See *Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc. v. Shute*, 111
47 S.Ct. 1522 (1991). [Language in the syllabus of the decision
48 has] relevance to Internet contracting...:

49 [I]t would be entirely unreasonable to assume that a
50 cruise passenger would or could negotiate the terms of
51 a forum clause in a routine commercial cruise ticket

1 form. Nevertheless, including a reasonable forum
2 clause in such a form well may be permissible for
3 several reasons. Because it is not unlikely that a
4 mishap in a cruise could subject a cruise line to
5 litigation in several different fora, the line has a
6 special interest in limiting such fora. Moreover, a
7 clause establishing ex ante the ... forum has the
8 salutary effect of dispelling confusion as to where
9 suits may be brought... Furthermore, it is likely that
10 passengers purchasing tickets containing a forum clause
11 ... benefit in the form of reduced fares reflecting the
12 savings that the cruise line enjoys...

13 End of Article 2B Reporter's Note.

14 Recognizing the prima facie validity of forum selection clauses
15 following Bremen, this section approves forum selection clauses
16 generally, with separate protections in the consumer context. The
17 protections are based on common sense (if the forum would otherwise
18 have jurisdiction, the forum clause is irrelevant), and
19 considerations outlined in Carnival Cruise Lines and subsequent
20 cases (adequate notice and fundamental fairness). In Carnival
21 Cruise Lines the Supreme Court was concerned with bad faith and
22 overreaching by the party imposing the clause and the possibility
23 that a party might be effectively denied an opportunity to litigate
24 a meritorious claim. It is to be noted that in Carnival Cruise
25 Lines the Supreme Court concluded that the party against whom the
26 clause operated had not satisfied the "heavy burden of proof"
27 necessary to set aside the clause on the ground of inconvenience.

28 The standards of fundamental unfairness and unreasonable burden
29 are different formulations of essentially the same concerns
30 expressed by the courts. These concerns relate to (1) fraud, undue
31 influence and overwhelming bargaining power, (2) whether a selected
32 forum is so inconvenient as to deprive a party of its day in court
33 and (3) whether enforcement of the clause would violate a strong
34 public policy of the forum in which suit is brought. See *Bonny v.*
35 *Society of Lloyd's*, 3 F.3d 156 (7th Cir., 1993).

36
37
38 **SECTION 109. APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION.** This [Act] must be
39 liberally construed and applied consistently with commercially
40 reasonable practices under the circumstances and to promote its
41 underlying purposes and policies.

42 **Source:** UCC Section 1-102.

1 **SECTION 110. COURSE OF PERFORMANCE, COURSE OF DEALING, AND**
2 **USAGE OF TRADE.**

3 (a) A "course of performance" is a sequence of conduct
4 between the parties to a particular transaction that exists if:

5 (1) the agreement of the parties with respect to the
6 transaction involves repeated occasions for performance by a
7 party;

8 (2) that party performs on one or more occasions; and

9 (3) the other party, with knowledge of the nature of
10 the performance and opportunity for objection to it, accepts the
11 performance or acquiesces to it without objection.

12 (b) A "course of dealing" is a sequence of previous conduct
13 between the parties to a particular transaction that is fairly to
14 be regarded as establishing a common basis of understanding for
15 interpreting their expressions and other conduct.

16 (c) A "usage of trade" is any practice or method of dealing
17 having such regularity of observance in a place, vocation or trade
18 as to justify an expectation that it will be observed with respect
19 to the transaction in question. The existence and scope of such a
20 usage are to be proved as facts. If it is established that such a
21 usage is embodied in a trade code or similar record the
22 interpretation of the record is a question of law.

23 (d) A course of performance or course of dealing between
24 the parties or usage of trade in the vocation or trade in which
25 they are engaged or of which they are or should be aware is
26 relevant in ascertaining the meaning of the parties' agreement, may

1 give particular meaning to specific terms of the agreement, and may
2 supplement or qualify the terms of the agreement. A usage of trade
3 applicable where only part of the performance under the agreement
4 is to occur may be so utilized as to that part of the performance.

5 (e) The express terms of an agreement, terms with respect
6 to which a party has manifested assent, and any applicable course
7 of performance, course of dealing or usage of trade shall be
8 construed wherever reasonable as consistent with each other. If
9 such a construction is unreasonable:

10 (1) express terms prevail over terms with respect to
11 which either party has manifested assent, course of performance,
12 course of dealing, and usage of trade;

13 (2) terms with respect to which either party has
14 manifested assent prevail over course of performance, course of
15 dealing, and usage of trade;

16 (3) course of performance prevails over course of
17 dealing and usage of trade; and

18 (4) course of dealing prevails over usage of trade.

19 (f) Evidence of a relevant usage of trade offered by one
20 party is not admissible unless that party has given the other party
21 such notice as the court finds sufficient to prevent unfair
22 surprise to the latter.

23 **Source:** Article 1 Draft Section 1-304.

24 **Reporter's Note:** This section follows the existing priority of
25 construction found in UCC Sections 1-205 and 2-208. In addition,
26 the priority to be given terms with respect to which either party
27 has manifested assent has been added.

1 PART 2

2 ELECTRONIC RECORDS AND SIGNATURES GENERALLY

3 SECTION 201. LEGAL RECOGNITION OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS. A

4 record may not be denied legal effect, validity or enforceability
5 solely because it is in the form of an electronic record.

6 **Source:** Uncitral Model Article 5; Illinois Model Section 201.

7 **Reporter's Note:** This section establishes the fundamental
8 premise of this Act: That the form in which a record is
9 generated, presented, communicated or stored may not be the only
10 reason to deny the record legal recognition. On the other hand,
11 section 201 should not be interpreted as establishing the legal
12 effectiveness, validity or enforceability of any given record.
13 Where a rule of law requires that the record contain minimum
14 substantive content, the legal effect, validity or enforceability
15 will depend on whether the record meets the substantive
16 requirements. However, the fact that the information is set
17 forth in an electronic, as opposed to paper record, is
18 irrelevant.

19 SECTION 202. WRITINGS.

20 (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), if a rule of law
21 requires a record to be in writing, or provides consequences if
22 it is not, an electronic record satisfies that rule of law.

23 (b) This section does not apply to: _____.

24 **Source:** Oklahoma Model Section III; Uncitral Model Article 6;
25 Illinois Model Section 202.

26 **Reporter's Note:** This section, like sections 203, 205 and 207,
27 is a particularized application of Section 201. Its purpose is
28 to validate and effectuate electronic records as the equivalent
29 of writings, subject to all of the rules applicable to the
30 efficacy of a writing, except as such other rules are modified by
31 the more specific provisions of this Act.

32 Illustration 1: A sends the following e-mail to B: "I hereby
33 offer to buy 100 widgets for \$1000, delivery next Tuesday. /s/ A"
34 B responds with the following e-mail: " I accept your offer to
35 purchase 100 widgets for \$1000, delivery next Tuesday. /s/ B"
36 The e-mails of each party qualify as records, and the records
37 otherwise satisfy the requirements of UCC Section 2-201(1). The

1 transaction may not be denied legal effect solely because there
2 is not a pen and ink "writing."

3 Illustration 2: A sends the following e-mail to B: "I hereby
4 offer to buy widgets from you, delivery next Tuesday. /s/ A" B
5 responds with the following e-mail: "I accept your offer to buy
6 widgets for delivery next Tuesday. /s/ B" Though the e-mails
7 qualify as records, there is no quantity stated in either record,
8 and the parties' agreement would be unenforceable under existing
9 Section 2-201(1).

10 The purpose of the Section is to validate electronic records in
11 the face of legal requirements for paper writings. Where no
12 legal requirement of a writing is implicated, electronic records
13 are subject to the same proof issues as any other evidence.

14 **SECTION 203. SIGNATURES.** (a) If a rule of law requires a
15 signature, or provides consequences in the absence of a
16 signature, that rule of law is satisfied with respect to an
17 electronic record if the electronic record includes an electronic
18 signature.

19 (b) A party may establish reasonable requirements regarding
20 the method and type of signatures which will be acceptable to it.

21 (c) The provisions of this article do not apply to:

22 **Source:** Uncitral Model Article 7; Illinois Model Section 203;
23 Oklahoma Model Section IV.

24 **Reporter's Note:** This section, consistent with the existing UCC
25 definition of a signature as "any symbol executed or adopted by a
26 party with present intention to authenticate a writing," merely
27 reiterates for clarity the rule that an electronic record
28 containing an electronic signature satisfies legal requirements.
29 The critical issue in either the signature or electronic
30 signature context is what the signer intended when the symbol was
31 executed, attached or incorporated into the record.

32 This section is technology neutral - it neither adopts nor
33 prohibits any particular form of electronic signature. However,
34 it only validates electronic signatures for purposes of
35 applicable legal signing requirements and does not address the
36 legal sufficiency, reliability or authenticity of any particular
37 signature. As in the paper world, questions of the signer's
38 intention and authority, as well as questions of fraud, are left
39 to other law. The effect and proof of electronic signatures is
40 addressed in the next Section.

1 Subsection (b) preserves the right of a party to establish
2 reasonable requirements for the method and type of signatures
3 which will be acceptable. Accordingly, and consistent with
4 Section 106(c), a party may refuse to accept any electronic
5 signature and of course establish the method and type of
6 electronic signature which is acceptable.

7 Finally, the section leaves open the possibility that
8 particular transactions should be excluded from the operation of
9 this particular provision, although such transactions have not
10 been excluded from the general applicability of this Act under
11 section 105.

12 **SECTION 204. ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES EFFECT AND PROOF;**
13 **SIGNATURES BY ELECTRONIC AGENTS.**

14 (a) Unless the circumstances otherwise indicate that a party
15 intends less than all of the effect, an electronic signature is
16 intended to establish the signing party's identity, its adoption
17 and acceptance of a record or a term, and the authenticity of the
18 record or term.

19 (b) Operations of an electronic agent constitute the
20 electronic signature of a party if the party designed, programed,
21 or selected the electronic agent for the purpose of achieving
22 results of that type.

23 (c) [An electronic record is signed as a matter of law if
24 the party complied with a security procedure. Otherwise,] An
25 electronic signature may be proved in any manner sufficient to
26 demonstrate

27 (1) the signer's intention to authenticate the electronic
28 record, or term thereof, to which the electronic signature is
29 attached or relates, including by showing that a procedure
30 existed by which a party must of necessity have executed a

1 symbol, or manifested assent, in order to proceed further in the
2 processing of the transaction, or

3 (2) that the party is bound by virtue of the operations
4 of its electronic agent.

5 (d) The authenticity of, and authority to make, an electronic
6 signature is admitted unless specifically denied in the
7 pleadings. If the validity of an electronic signature is denied
8 in the pleadings, the burden of establishing validity is on the
9 person claiming validity.

10 [(e) If a rule of law requires that a signature be notarized
11 or acknowledged for the electronic record to be enforceable or
12 filed of record, that requirement shall be deemed satisfied with
13 respect to an electronic record which has not been notarized if
14 (I) the electronic record includes a secure electronic signature,
15 or (ii) the creation, transmission and storage of the electronic
16 record itself, or the symbol or methodology adopted for signing
17 such electronic record, provide substantial evidence of the
18 identity of the person signing the electronic record. Whether
19 the substantial evidence standard has been met is for decision by
20 the court.]

21 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-114; UCC Section 3-308;
22 Illinois Model Section 203.

23 **Reporter's Note:** An electronic signature is any symbol or
24 methodology adopted with present intent to authenticate a
25 writing. This Act includes a definition of authenticate in order
26 to make clear what a signer intends by authenticating a document,
27 i.e., to identify oneself, adopt the terms of the signed record,
28 and verify the integrity of the informational content of the
29 record which is signed. By identifying the multi-purpose effect
30 of authenticating a record, this Act clarifies the assumption as
31 to the intent of one signing any writing. Subsection (a) simply
32 applies this assumption to the electronic signature. As with a

1 signature on paper, the signing party remains free to prove that
2 the signing was intended to accomplish only 1 or 2 of the normal
3 purposes associated with a signing.

4 Subsection (b) extends signing to the electronic agent,
5 automated context. Its purpose is to establish that by
6 programing an electronic agent, a party assumes responsibility
7 for electronic records and operations "executed" by the program.
8 While the electronic agent may or may not execute a symbol
9 representing an electronic signature (i.e., with present intent
10 to authenticate the electronic record), the party programing the
11 electronic agent has indicated its authentication of records and
12 operations produced by the electronic agent within the parameters
13 set by the programing. Accordingly, the party should be bound
14 and deemed to have signed (authenticated) the records of the
15 electronic agent.

16 Subsection (c) provides that an electronic signature may be
17 proved by any evidence establishing the signer's intention to
18 authenticate, or that the party is bound by the operations of its
19 electronic agent under Subsection (b). It also makes clear that
20 proof of an electronic signature may be made by showing that a
21 process existed which had to be followed to obtain the results
22 achieved. This addresses the increasingly common "point and
23 click" processes in on-line and on-screen programs. An issue for
24 the Drafting Committee relates to the bracketed language
25 providing that a record is signed as a matter of law if a
26 security procedure was followed. A related issue arises in Part
27 3, Section 303 regarding the propriety of presumptions where
28 secure electronic records and signatures are involved. This
29 Section is limited to the issue of whether factual questions
30 regarding whether the signature occurred (separate from the issue
31 of the effect, validity or authenticity of the signature) should
32 be foreclosed if a security procedure is followed.

33 Subsection (d) borrows from Article 3 in raising the
34 procedural requirements for denying the validity of a signature.
35 Unless the validity of an electronic signature is specifically
36 denied in the pleadings, the authenticity of and authority to
37 make the signature are admitted. However, if the validity of the
38 signature is put in issue by an express denial, the party
39 asserting validity must carry the burden of so establishing. In
40 the event that the Drafting Committee adopts presumptions
41 regarding the validity of secure electronic signatures, the party
42 asserting validity would be aided by such a presumption in the
43 face of an express denial.

44 Although there was concern raised by the Drafting Committee
45 regarding the propriety of addressing notarial requirements in
46 this Act, the bracketed subsection (e) has been retained for
47 further discussion, if desired.

48 **SECTION 205. ORIGINALS - INFORMATION ACCURACY.** (a) If a
49 rule of law [or a commercial practice] requires a record to be

1 presented or retained in its original form, or provides
2 consequences for the record not being presented or retained in
3 its original form, that requirement is met by an electronic
4 record if [the electronic record is shown to reflect accurately]
5 [there exists a reliable assurance as to the integrity of] the
6 information set forth in the electronic record from the time when
7 it was first generated in its final form, as an electronic record
8 or otherwise.

9 (b) The criteria for assessing the integrity and accuracy of
10 the information in an electronic record shall be determined by
11 whether the information has remained complete and unaltered,
12 apart from the addition of any endorsement and any change which
13 arises in the normal course of communication, storage and
14 display. The standard of reliability required shall be assessed
15 in the light of the purpose for which the information was
16 generated and in the light of all the relevant circumstances.

17 (c) The provisions of this article do not apply to the
18 following:_____.

19 **Source:** Uncitral Model Article 8; Illinois Model Section 204.

20 **Reporter's Note:** This section deals with the serviceability of
21 electronic records as originals. As was noted at the May
22 meeting, the concept of an original electronic document is
23 problematic. For example, as I draft this Act the question may
24 be asked what is the "original" draft. My answer would be that
25 the "original" is either on a disc or my hard drive to which the
26 document has been initially saved. Since I periodically save the
27 draft as I am working, the fact is that at times I save first to
28 disc then to hard drive, and at others vice versa. In such a
29 case the "original" may change from the information on my disc to
30 the information on my hard drive. Indeed, as I understand
31 computer operations, it may be argued that the "original" exists
32 solely in RAM and, in a sense, the original is destroyed when a
33 "copy" is saved to a disc or to the hard drive. In any event, the
34 concern focuses on the integrity of the information, and not with

1 its "originality." Given the recognition of this problem, the
2 title of the section has been expanded to reflect the concern
3 regarding the informational integrity of an electronic record;
4 integrity which is assumed to exist in the case of an original
5 writing.

6 A second question raised at the May meeting related to when
7 the law requires an "original." Except in the context of paper
8 tokens such as documents of title and negotiable instruments,
9 most requirements for "originals" derive from commercial practice
10 where the assurance of informational integrity is a concern. The
11 comment to Illinois Model Law Section 204 (derived largely from
12 Uncitral Model Law Summary Paragraph 62) identifies some of these
13 situations as follows:

14 The requirement that a document be "an original" occurs in a
15 variety of contexts for a variety of reasons. Documents of
16 title and negotiable instruments, for example, typically
17 require the endorsement and presentation of an original. But
18 in many other situations it is essential that documents be
19 transmitted unchanged (i.e., in their "original" form), so
20 that other parties, such as in international commerce, may
21 have confidence in their contents. Examples of such
22 documents that might require an "original" are trade
23 documents such as weight certificates, agricultural
24 certificates, quality/quantity certificates, inspection
25 reports, insurance certificates, etc. Other non-business
26 related documents which also typically require an original
27 form include birth certificates and death certificates. When
28 these documents exist on paper, they are usually only
29 accepted if they are "original" to lessen the chance that
30 they have been altered, which would be difficult to detect in
31 copies.

32 Since requirements for "originals" are often the result of
33 commercial practice and not an actual rule of law, the section
34 includes the bracketed language regarding requirements derived
35 from commercial practice. As a policy matter it is not at all
36 clear that legislation should override established commercial
37 practice. This is a question which must be resolved by the
38 drafting committee.

39 So long as there exists reliable assurance that the
40 electronic record accurately reproduces the information, this
41 section continues the theme of establishing the functional
42 equivalence of electronic and paper-based records. This is
43 consistent with Fed.R.Evid. 1001(3) and Unif.R.Evid. 1001(3)
44 (1974) which provide:

45 If data are stored in a computer or similar device, any
46 printout or other output readable by sight, shown to reflect
47 the data accurately, is an "original."

1 The bracketed alternatives for testing the reliability of the
2 informational content of an electronic record are provided for
3 the Drafting Committee's consideration. At the May meeting
4 concern was expressed that the "reasonable assurance" standard
5 was too vague. The first alternative tracks the language in the
6 rules of evidence and focuses on the accuracy of the information
7 presented.

8 Another issue relates to the use of originals for evidentiary
9 purposes. In this context the concern principally relates to the
10 "best evidence" or "original document" rule. The use of
11 electronic records in evidence is addressed in the next section
12 and its notes.

13 **SECTION 206. ADMISSIBILITY INTO EVIDENCE.** (a) In any legal

14 proceeding, nothing in the application of the rules of evidence
15 shall apply so as to deny the admissibility of an electronic
16 record or electronic signature into evidence:

17 (1) on the sole ground that it is an electronic record
18 or electronic signature; or

19 (2) on the grounds that it is not in its original form
20 or is not an original.

21 (b) Admissible information in the form of an electronic
22 record or electronic signature shall be given evidential weight
23 by the trier of fact. In assessing the evidential weight of an
24 electronic record or electronic signature, the trier of fact
25 shall consider the manner in which the electronic record or
26 electronic signature was generated, stored, communicated, or
27 retrieved, the reliability of the manner in which the integrity
28 of the electronic record or electronic signature was maintained,
29 the manner in which its originator was identified or the
30 electronic record was signed, and any other relevant information
31 or circumstances.

32 **Source:** Uncitral Model Article 9; Illinois Model Section 205.

1 **Reporter's Note:** Like sections 202 and 203, subsection (a)(1)
2 prevents the nonrecognition of electronic records solely on the
3 ground of the media in which information is presented. Subsection
4 (a)(2) also precludes inadmissibility on the ground an electronic
5 record is not an original. This section may be deleted in light
6 of the provisions of section 205 and the rules of evidence.

7 Nothing in this section relieves a party from establishing
8 the necessary foundation for the admission of an electronic
9 record. Subsection (b) gives guidance to the trier of fact in
10 according weight to otherwise admissible electronic evidence.

11 **SECTION 207. RETENTION OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS.** (a) If a

12 rule of law requires that certain documents, records, or
13 information be retained, that requirement is met by retaining
14 electronic records, provided that the following conditions are
15 satisfied:

16 (1) the information contained in the electronic record
17 remains accessible so as to be usable for subsequent reference;
18 and

19 (2) the electronic record is retained in the format in
20 which it was generated, stored, sent or received, or in a format
21 which can be demonstrated to reflect accurately the information
22 as originally generated, stored, sent or received; and

23 (3) such information, if any, is retained as enables the
24 identification of the source of origin and destination of an
25 electronic record and the date and time when it was sent or
26 received.

27 (b) A requirement to retain documents, records or
28 information in accordance with subsection (a) does not extend to
29 any information the sole purpose of which is to enable the record
30 to be sent or received.

1 (c) A person may satisfy the requirement referred to in
2 subsection (a) by using the services of any other person,
3 provided that the conditions set forth in paragraphs (1), (2),
4 and (3) of subsection (a) are met.

5 (d) The provisions of this section do not apply to
6 documents, records, or information excluded from the provisions
7 of Section 202 (Writings) or Section 203 (Signatures).

8 (e) Nothing in this section shall preclude any Federal or
9 state agency from specifying additional requirements for the
10 retention of records, either written or electronic, that are
11 subject to the jurisdiction of such agency.

12 **Source:** Uncitral Model Article 10; Illinois Model Section 206.

13 **Reporter's Note:** At the May meeting concern was expressed that
14 retained records may become unavailable because the storage
15 technology becomes obsolete and incapable of reproducing the
16 information on the electronic record. Subsection (a)(1)
17 addresses this concern by requiring that the information in the
18 electronic record "remain" accessible, and subsection (a)(2)
19 addresses the need to assure the integrity of the information
20 when the format is updated or changed.

21 This section would permit parties to convert original written
22 records to electronic records for retention so long as the
23 requirements of subsection (a) are satisfied. Accordingly, in the
24 absence of specific requirements to retain written records,
25 written records may be destroyed once saved as electronic records
26 satisfying the requirements of this section.
27

28
29 **PART 3**

30 **SECURE ELECTRONIC RECORDS AND SIGNATURES**

31 **SECTION 301. SECURE ELECTRONIC RECORDS.** If, through the
32 application of a security procedure, it can be verified that an
33 electronic record has remained unaltered since a specified time,
34 the record is a secure electronic record from that time forward.

1 **Source:** Illinois Model Section 301.
2 **Reporter's Note:** See Reporter's Note following section 303.

3 **SECTION 302. SECURE ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES.** If, through the
4 application of a security procedure, it can be verified that an
5 electronic signature was, at the time it was made, unique to the
6 person using it, capable of verification, under the sole control
7 of the person using it, and linked to the electronic record to
8 which it relates in a manner such that if the record was changed
9 the electronic signature would be invalidated, the signature is a
10 secure electronic signature.

11 **Source:** Illinois Model Section 302.
12 **Reporter's Note:** See Reporter's Note following section 303.
13 This section has been revised to clarify that the requirements
14 for determining an electronic signature's status as a secure
15 electronic signature must exist at the time the signature is
16 made. This avoids the possibility that a party would divulge the
17 security procedure to another party after the fact in order to
18 avoid operation of the presumptions raised in section 303.

19 **SECTION 303. PRESUMPTIONS.**

20 (a) With respect to a secure electronic record, there is a
21 rebuttable presumption that the electronic record has not been
22 altered since the specific time to which the secure status
23 relates.

24 (b) With respect to a secure electronic signature there is a
25 rebuttable presumption that;

26 (1) the secure electronic signature is the signature of
27 the party to whom it relates; and

28 (2) the secure electronic signature was affixed by that
29 party with the intention of signing the record.

1 (c) In the absence of a secure electronic record or a secure
2 electronic signature, this [Act] does not create any presumption
3 regarding the authenticity and integrity of an electronic record
4 or an electronic signature.

5 **Source:** Illinois Model Section 303.

6 **Reporter's Note:** Part 3 raises the fundamental issue for the
7 Drafting Committee of whether to create any presumptions favoring
8 secure records and signatures, and if so, what level of
9 specificity is necessary to create secure records and signatures
10 before the presumptions will apply. Professor Whinery has
11 indicated that the question of whether or not to create a
12 presumption is a matter of policy to be decided by this Drafting
13 Committee. The Rules of Evidence address the effect of a
14 presumption and the level of evidence necessary to overcome a
15 presumption. However the question of whether a fact should be
16 entitled to the benefits of a presumption under appropriate
17 circumstances is a question of policy relating to the substantive
18 law. He cited the example of the presumption of legitimacy
19 accorded a child born during wedlock.

20 Professor Whinery indicated that the current draft of Rule
21 301(a) follows existing Rule 301(a) by reallocating the burden of
22 persuasion to the party against whom the presumption operates.
23 This approach is contrasted with the so-called "bursting bubble
24 approach which simply shifts the burden of producing evidence to
25 the party against whom the presumption operates. McCormick
26 contends that regardless of the strength accorded a presumption
27 under the various rules of evidence, the differing levels of
28 significance underlying various presumptions results in the
29 courts treatment of presumptions in different ways. Accordingly,
30 a secondary issue for the drafting committee relates to the
31 strength and effect of any presumption given to secure electronic
32 records and signatures, i.e., would such a presumption shift the
33 burden of proof or only the burden of persuasion.

34 An alternative approach may be through procedural rules such
35 as appear in Section 204(d) (specific denial of the signature in
36 the pleadings required), and the operation of the attribution
37 rules in section 403. If the guiding premise of this Act is to
38 establish the legal equivalence of writings/electronic records
39 and signatures/electronic signatures, it may be inappropriate to
40 accord even secure electronic records and signatures greater
41 weight than handwritten writings and signatures.
42

1 (1) A contract is formed by the interaction of two
2 electronic agents if the interaction results in each agent
3 engaging in operations that signify agreement, such as by
4 engaging in performing the contract, ordering or instructing
5 performance, accepting performance, or making a record of the
6 existence of a contract.

7 (2) A contract may be formed by the interaction of
8 an electronic agent and an individual. A contract is formed if
9 an individual has reason to know that the individual is dealing
10 with an electronic agent and performs actions the person should
11 know will cause the electronic agent to perform or to permit
12 further use, or that are clearly indicated as constituting
13 acceptance regardless of other contemporaneous expressions by the
14 individual to which the electronic agent cannot react.

15 (3) The terms of a contract resulting from an
16 automated transaction include terms of the parties' agreement,
17 terms which the electronic agent could take into account, and, to
18 the extent not covered by the foregoing, terms provided by law.

19 (d) If an electronic record initiated by a party or an
20 electronic agent evokes an electronic record in response and the
21 records reflect an intent to be bound, a contract exists when:

22 (1) the response signifying acceptance is received; or

23 (2) if the response consists of electronically performing
24 the requested consideration in whole or in part, when the
25 requested consideration, to be performed electronically, is

1 received, unless the originating record prohibited that form of
2 response.

3 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Sections 2B-203(e & f) and 2B-204(a);
4 Uncitral Model Article 11.

5 **Reporter's Note:** Subsection (a) makes clear that offer and
6 acceptance in the context of contract formation may be
7 accomplished by electronic means.

8 Subsections (b) and (c) are taken from Article 2B's
9 provisions regarding contract formation in electronic
10 transactions, i.e. those transactions not involving human review
11 by one or both parties. Subsection (b) provides a rule to
12 expressly validate a fully automated transaction. Subsection (c)
13 sets forth the circumstances which demonstrate the formation of a
14 contract under a fully automated transaction and under an
15 automated transaction where one party is an individual.

16 Finally, subsection (d) deals with timing in the formation of
17 a contract by electronic means. Subsection (d)(2) makes clear
18 that acceptance by performance, either in whole or in part, when
19 the performance is electronic, occurs on receipt. When
20 acceptance of an offer by performance occurs other than
21 electronically (e.g. by the shipment of product), acceptance is
22 governed by other rules of law such as the UCC and common law. As
23 to timing of receipt see section 404.

24 **SECTION 403. ATTRIBUTION; TRANSMISSION ERRORS.** (a) As
25 between the parties, an electronic record received by a party is
26 attributable to the party indicated as the sender if:

27 (1) it was sent by that party, its agent, or electronic
28 agent;

29 (2) the receiving party, in good faith and in compliance
30 with a security procedure concluded that it was sent by the other
31 party; or

32 (3) subject to subsection (b), the electronic record:

33 (A) resulted from acts of a person that obtained
34 access to a security procedure, access numbers, codes, computer
35 programs, or the like from a source under the control of the

1 alleged sender creating the appearance that the electronic record
2 came from the alleged sender;

3 (B) the access occurred under circumstances
4 constituting a failure to exercise reasonable care by the alleged
5 sender; and

6 (c) the receiving party reasonably relied to its
7 detriment on the apparent source of the electronic record.

8 (b) In a case governed by subsection (a) (3), the following
9 rules apply:

10 (1) The receiving party has the burden of proving
11 reasonable reliance, and the alleged sender has the burden of
12 proving reasonable care.

13 (2) Reliance on an electronic record that does not
14 comply with an agreed security procedure is not reasonable unless
15 authorized by an individual representing the alleged sender.

16 (c) If an electronic record was transmitted pursuant to a
17 security procedure for the detection of error and the record
18 contained an error the following rules apply:

19 (1) If the sender complied with the security procedure
20 and the error would have been detected had the receiving party
21 also complied with the security procedure, the sender is not
22 bound.

23 (2) If the sender, pursuant to a security procedure,
24 receives a notice of the content of the record as received, the
25 sender has a duty to review the notice and report any error
26 detected by it, in a commercially reasonable manner.

1 (d) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (a)(1) and
2 (c), if a loss occurs because a party complies with a security
3 procedure that was not commercially reasonable, the party that
4 required use of the commercially unreasonable security procedure
5 bears the loss unless it disclosed the nature of the risk to the
6 other party or offered commercially reasonable alternatives that
7 the party rejected. The party's liability under this section is
8 limited to losses that could not have been prevented by the
9 exercise of reasonable care by the other party.

10 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-111.

11 **Reporter's Note:** This section follows Article 2B and sets forth
12 risk allocation rules in the context of record attribution and
13 content error. The section sets forth rules establishing the
14 circumstances under which a party will be bound by (be
15 attributable for) an electronic record sent to another party, and
16 when a party may be bound by an error in an electronic record.

17 Subsection (a)(1) relies on general agency law, including the
18 new concept of electronic agency, to bind the sender.
19 Subsections (a)(2) and (3) deal with allocations of risk where
20 security procedures are involved. Under subsection (a)(2) an
21 electronic record will be attributed to the sender if the
22 recipient complied, in good faith, with a security procedure
23 which confirmed the source of the electronic record. Subsection
24 (a)(3) binds the purported sender of an electronic record where
25 the sender's negligence in maintaining security procedures or the
26 like has permitted the record to be sent and the recipient
27 reasonably relied on the record to its detriment.

28 Similarly, subsection (c) allocates the risk of errors in
29 transmission to the party that could have best detected the error
30 through the use of a security procedure.

31 Through the application of loss allocation rules relating to
32 the implementation of security procedures, this section may
33 provide an alternative to the creation of presumptions in section
34 303, as a means of giving heightened protection to secure
35 electronic transactions.
36

37 **SECTION 404. TIME AND PLACE OF SENDING AND RECEIPT. (a)**

38 Unless otherwise agreed between the sender and the recipient, an
39 electronic record is sent when it enters an information system

1 outside the control of the sender or of a person who sent the
2 electronic record on behalf of the sender.

3 (b) Unless otherwise agreed between the sender and the
4 recipient, the time of receipt of an electronic record is
5 determined as follows:

6 (1) if the recipient has designated a specific
7 information system for the purpose of receiving electronic
8 records, receipt occurs:

9 (A) at the time when the electronic record enters
10 the designated information system; or

11 (B) if the electronic record is sent to an
12 information system of the addressee that is not the designated
13 information system, at the time when the electronic record is
14 retrieved by the recipient;

15 (2) if the recipient has not designated a specific
16 information system, receipt occurs when the electronic record
17 enters an information system of the recipient.

18 (c) Subsection (b) applies notwithstanding that the place
19 where the information system is located may be different from the
20 place where the electronic record is considered to be received
21 under subsection (d).

22 (d) Unless otherwise agreed between the sender and the
23 recipient, an electronic record is considered to be sent from the
24 place where the sender has its place of business, and is
25 considered to be received at the place where the recipient has
26 its place of business. For the purposes of this subsection:

1 (1) if the sender or the recipient has more than one
2 place of business, the place of business is that which has the
3 closest relationship to the underlying transaction or, if there
4 is no underlying transaction, the principal place of business;

5 (2) if the sender or the recipient does not have a place
6 of business, reference is to be made to its habitual residence.

7 (e) Subject to section 405, an electronic record is effective
8 when received, even if no individual is aware of its receipt.

9 (f) The provisions of this section do not apply to the
10 following; [. . .].

11 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-204(b); Uncitral Model
12 Article 15.

13 **Reporter's Note:** This section provides default rules regarding
14 when and where an electronic record is received. As with
15 acknowledgments of receipt under section 405, this section does
16 not address the efficacy of the record that is received. That
17 is, whether a record is unintelligible or unusable by a recipient
18 is a separate issue from whether that record was received.

19 In the case of a sender which has designated a specific
20 information system, receipt of a record is keyed to entry into
21 that information system. Where the sender has designated a
22 particular system for receipt, it is reasonable to assume that
23 the record, once it has entered that information system is
24 available to the recipient. If a specific system is designated
25 but the record is sent to a system other than the designated
26 system, receipt occurs only on retrieval of the record by the
27 recipient, since immediate availability to the recipient cannot
28 be assumed. Where no system has been designated by the sender
29 receipt occurs upon entry into any system of the recipient.

30 Subsections (b) and (c) provide default rules for determining
31 where a record will be considered to have been received. The
32 focus is on the place of business of the recipient and not the
33 physical location of the information system. As noted in
34 paragraph 100 of the commentary to the Uncitral Model Law,

35 It is not uncommon for users of electronic commerce to
36 communicate from one State to another without knowing the
37 location of information systems through which communication
38 is operated. In addition, the location of certain
39 communication systems may change without either of the
40 parties being aware of the change.

41 Accordingly, where the place of sending or receipt is an issue,
42 the relevant location should be the location of the sender or

1 recipient and not the location of the information system.
2

3 Subsection (b) rejects the mailbox rule and provides that
4 electronic records are effective on receipt. This approach is
5 consistent with Article 4A and, as to electronic records, Article
6 2B.

7 **SECTION 405. ELECTRONIC ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT.**

8 (a) If the sender of a record requests or agrees with the
9 recipient of the record that receipt of the record must be
10 acknowledged electronically, the following rules apply:

11 (1) If the sender indicates in the record or otherwise
12 that the record is conditional on receipt of an electronic
13 acknowledgment, the record does not bind the sender until
14 acknowledgment is received and lapses if acknowledgment is not
15 received in a reasonable time.

16 (2) If the sender requests electronic acknowledgment but
17 does not state that the record is conditional on electronic
18 acknowledgment, does not specify a time for receipt and
19 electronic acknowledgment is not received within an reasonable
20 time after the record is sent, on notice to the other party, the
21 sender may either revoke the record or specify a further
22 reasonable time within which electronic acknowledgment must be
23 received or the message will be treated as not having binding
24 effect. If electronic acknowledgment is not received within that
25 additional time, the sender may treat the record as not having
26 binding effect.

27 (3) If the sender requests electronic acknowledgment
28 and specifies a time for receipt, if receipt does not occur

1 within that time the sender may [treat the record as not having
2 binding effect] [exercise the options in subsection (2)] .

3 (b) Receipt of electronic acknowledgment establishes that
4 the record was received but, in itself, does not establish that
5 the content sent corresponds to the content received.

6 **Source:** Article 2B Draft Section 2B-205; Uncitral Model Article
7 14.

8 **Reporter's Note:** This section deals with functional
9 acknowledgments as described in the ABA Model Trading Partner
10 Agreement. The purpose of such functional acknowledgments is to
11 confirm receipt, and not necessarily to result in legal
12 consequences flowing from the acknowledgment.

13 Subsection (a) permits the sender of a record to be the
14 master of its communication by requesting or requiring
15 acknowledgment of receipt. The subsection then sets out default
16 rules for the effect of the original message under different
17 circumstances. Article 2B Section 205(a)(3) permits the sender
18 of a record who has requested acknowledgment by a specified time,
19 if the acknowledgment is not timely received, to either revoke
20 the record or specify a further period for acknowledgment, upon
21 notice to the recipient under subsection (2). This draft has an
22 alternate provision which permits the sender to treat the record
23 as lapsing without further action.

24 As noted in subsection (b) the only effect of a functional
25 acknowledgment is to establish receipt. The acknowledgment alone
26 does not affect questions regarding the binding effect of the
27 acknowledgment nor the content, accuracy, time of receipt or
28 other issues regarding the legal efficacy of the record or
29 acknowledgment.

30 **SECTION 406. TRANSFERABLE RECORDS.** If the identity of the
31 rightful holder of a transferable record can be reliably
32 determined from the record itself or from a method employed for
33 recording, registering, or otherwise evidencing the transfer of
34 interests in such records, the rightful holder of the record is
35 considered to be in possession of the record, and any
36 indorsements required by applicable rules of law to effect
37 transfer to the rightful holder are considered to have been
38 given.

1 **Source:** Oklahoma Model Section III.B.2.
2 **Reporter's Note:** This section has been retained for discussion
3 by the Drafting Committee on whether such documents should be
4 covered by this Act.

5 **PART 5**

6 **PUBLIC ELECTRONIC RECORDS**

7 **Section 501. USE OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS BY STATE AGENCIES.**

8 (a) [Except where expressly prohibited by statute,] Every
9 state agency, through the adoption of appropriate regulations,
10 may create and retain electronic records in lieu of written
11 records and may also convert written records to electronic
12 records. [Rules governing the disposition of written records
13 after conversion to electronic records shall be established by
14 the secretary of state.]

15 (b) Any state agency that accepts the filing of records, or
16 requires that records be created or retained by any person, may
17 authorize, through the adoption of appropriate regulations, the
18 filing, creation or retention of records in the form of
19 electronic records [except where expressly prohibited by
20 statute].

21 (c) In any case governed by subsection (a) or (b), the state
22 agency, by appropriate regulation giving due consideration to
23 security, [may] [shall] specify:

24 (1) the manner and format in which the electronic records
25 must be filed, created or retained;

26 (2) where electronic records must be electronically
27 signed, the type of electronic signature required (including, if

1 applicable, requiring the use of a secure electronic signature),
2 and the manner and format in which the electronic signature must
3 be affixed to the electronic record;

4 (3) control processes and procedures as appropriate to
5 ensure adequate integrity, security, confidentiality, and
6 auditability of electronic records; and

7 (4) any other required attributes for electronic records
8 that are currently specified for corresponding non-electronic
9 records.

10 (d) Nothing in this [Act] shall be construed to require any
11 state agency to use or permit the use of electronic records or
12 signatures.

13 **Source:** Illinois Model Section 1001; Massachusetts Electronic
14 Records and Signatures Act Section 3 (Draft - April 17, 1997);
15 Florida Electronic Signature Act, Chapter 96-324, Section 7
16 (1996).

17 **Reporter's Note:** This section is new and addresses the expanded
18 scope of this Act.

19 Subsection (a) authorizes state agencies to use electronic
20 records generally for intra-governmental purposes. It is
21 permissive and not obligatory (see Subsection (d)). It also
22 authorizes the destruction of written records after conversion to
23 electronic form. In this regard, the bracketed language requires
24 the secretary of state to issue regulations governing such
25 conversions. Should this regulatory function reside in the
26 secretary of state or be left to the affected state agency under
27 subsection (c)?

28 Subsection (b) authorizes state agencies to accept filings
29 and permit the creation and retention of electronic records in
30 lieu of written records for statutory and regulatory purposes
31 related to private persons. Again, the provision is permissive
32 and not obligatory (see subsection (d)).

33 Subsection (c) authorizes state agencies to establish
34 regulations governing the quality of the electronic records and
35 signatures which will be acceptable. The question here is
36 whether the state agencies should be required, or merely
37 permitted, to promulgate such regulations before accepting
38 electronic records? Should the task of promulgating regulations
39 be left with the secretary of state or other central authority?

1 Finally, subsection (d) makes clear that nothing in this Act
2 requires any state agency to accept or use electronic records.

3 **PART 6**
4 **MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

5 **SECTION 601. SEVERABILITY.** If a provision of this [Act], or
6 an application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held
7 invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or
8 applications of the [Act] that can be given effect without the
9 invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions
10 of this [Act] are severable.

11 **Source:** Article 1 Draft Section 1-106.

12 **SECTION 602. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

13 **Source:**

14 **SECTION 603. SAVINGS AND TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.**

15 **Source:**