

METHODOLOGY

STATE-BY-STATE REPORT ON AUTHENTICATION OF ONLINE LEGAL RESOURCES

Richard J. Matthews
Mary Alice Baish

Session One: AALL's State-by-State Report on Authentication of Online Legal Resources
Richard J. Matthews, Chair
AALL 2005-2006 Access to Electronic Legal Information Committee

Panelists and Reactors

- Judy Meadows, Chair
AALL Permanent Public Access to Legal Information
Committee
- Michele L. Timmons, Revisor of Statutes
State of Minnesota
- Adam Jansen, Digital Archivist
State of Washington
- Herbert B. Dixon, Jr., Associate Judge
Superior Court of the District of Columbia
Co-Chair, ABA Judicial Division Committee on Court
Technology

PART II: Electronic Documents Available

**Appendix D-3
Survey Instrument**

Administrative Code

- (QA1-1) URL:
- (QA1-2) Publisher:
- (QA1-3) Are the documents available in (check all that apply):
 .PDF HTML ASCII Text MS Word Other
- (QA1-4) Does the website use PURLs? No Yes
- (QA1-5) Is there documented "chain of custody" information? No Yes
- (QA1-6) Are the documents "official"? No Yes
- (QA1-7) Is there any disclaimer about the official status and/or accuracy of the information? No Yes
- (QA1-8) Are the documents "authenticated"? No Yes
If so, with a (check all that apply):
 digital signature digital watermark other
- (QA1-9) Is the information available for (check all that apply): free fee per use subscription?
- (QA1-10) What years are covered?
- (QA1-11) Does the publisher ensure "permanent public access"? No Yes

- (QA2-1) URL:
- (QA2-2) Publisher:
- (QA2-3) Are the documents available in (check all that apply):
 .PDF HTML ASCII Text MS Word Other

The findings and conclusions of the *State-by-State Report* are supported by (1) evidence gathered through the survey – particularly the disclaimer information associated with online legal resources – and (2) independent research into any corroborative law.

Appendix A Analytical Table

	Administrative code	Administrative register	Statutes	Session laws	High court opinions	Intermediate appellate court opinions
Alabama				see note A		
Alaska		O¹ PPA²			a. 0 traits³ b.	a. 0 traits³ b.
Arizona						a. see note 4 b.
Arkansas	n/a ^{5,6}	see note 8				
California	0 traits⁷		0 traits⁸	PPA^{9,9}	a. 0 traits¹⁰ b.	a. 0 traits¹⁰ b.
Colorado	see note 11	n/a ¹²			a. see note 13 b.	a. see note 13 b.
Connecticut	n/a	n/a		see note A		
Delaware	see note C			see note A		
District of Columbia	see note C		O¹⁴	see note 15	0 traits¹⁶	
Florida	see note 17	see note 17	a. see note 18 b. c.			a. see note 19 b. c. d. e.

The alarming truth, borne out by our careful study, is that online *official* legal resources are replacing print *official* sources.

Final statements of the law are now being delivered to citizens and law researchers in digital versions without authentication or trustworthy long-term preservation.