

# AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

**Formal Opinion 477R\***

**May 11, 2017**

**Revised May 22, 2017**

## **Securing Communication of Protected Client Information**

*A lawyer generally may transmit information relating to the representation of a client over the internet without violating the Model Rules of Professional Conduct where the lawyer has undertaken reasonable efforts to prevent inadvertent or unauthorized access. However, a lawyer may be required to take special security precautions to protect against the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of client information when required by an agreement with the client or by law, or when the nature of the information requires a higher degree of security.*

### **I. Introduction**

In Formal Opinion 99-413 this Committee addressed a lawyer's confidentiality obligations for email communications with clients. While the basic obligations of confidentiality remain applicable today, the role and risks of technology in the practice of law have evolved since 1999 prompting the need to update Opinion 99-413.

Formal Opinion 99-413 concluded: "Lawyers have a reasonable expectation of privacy in communications made by all forms of e-mail, including unencrypted e-mail sent on the Internet, despite some risk of interception and disclosure. It therefore follows that its use is consistent with the duty under Rule 1.6 to use reasonable means to maintain the confidentiality of information relating to a client's representation."<sup>1</sup>

Unlike 1999 where multiple methods of communication were prevalent, today, many lawyers primarily use electronic means to communicate and exchange documents with clients, other lawyers, and even with other persons who are assisting a lawyer in delivering legal services to clients.<sup>2</sup>

Since 1999, those providing legal services now regularly use a variety of devices to create, transmit and store confidential communications, including desktop, laptop and notebook

---

\*The opinion below is a revision of, and replaces Formal Opinion 477 as issued by the Committee May 11, 2017. This opinion is based on the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct as amended by the ABA House of Delegates through August 2016. The laws, court rules, regulations, rules of professional conduct, and opinions promulgated in individual jurisdictions are controlling.

1. ABA Comm. on Ethics & Prof'l Responsibility, Formal Op. 99-413, at 11 (1999).

2. ABA Comm. on Ethics & Prof'l Responsibility, Formal Op. 08-451 (2008); ABA COMMISSION ON ETHICS 20/20 REPORT TO THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES (2012), [http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/ethics\\_2020/20120508\\_ethics\\_20\\_20\\_final\\_resolution\\_and\\_report\\_outsourcing\\_posting.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/ethics_2020/20120508_ethics_20_20_final_resolution_and_report_outsourcing_posting.authcheckdam.pdf).

computers, tablet devices, smartphones, and cloud resource and storage locations. Each device and each storage location offer an opportunity for the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of information relating to the representation, and thus implicate a lawyer's ethical duties.<sup>3</sup>

In 2012 the ABA adopted "technology amendments" to the Model Rules, including updating the Comments to Rule 1.1 on lawyer technological competency and adding paragraph (c) and a new Comment to Rule 1.6, addressing a lawyer's obligation to take reasonable measures to prevent inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of information relating to the representation.

At the same time, the term "cybersecurity" has come into existence to encompass the broad range of issues relating to preserving individual privacy from intrusion by nefarious actors throughout the internet. Cybersecurity recognizes a post-Opinion 99-413 world where law enforcement discusses hacking and data loss in terms of "when," and not "if."<sup>4</sup> Law firms are targets for two general reasons: (1) they obtain, store and use highly sensitive information about their clients while at times utilizing safeguards to shield that information that may be inferior to those deployed by the client, and (2) the information in their possession is more likely to be of interest to a hacker and likely less voluminous than that held by the client.<sup>5</sup>

The Model Rules do not impose greater or different duties of confidentiality based upon the method by which a lawyer communicates with a client. But how a lawyer should comply with the core duty of confidentiality in an ever-changing technological world requires some reflection.

Against this backdrop we describe the "technology amendments" made to the Model Rules in 2012, identify some of the technology risks lawyers face, and discuss factors other than the Model Rules of Professional Conduct that lawyers should consider when using electronic means to communicate regarding client matters.

## II. Duty of Competence

Since 1983, Model Rule 1.1 has read: "A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation."<sup>6</sup> The scope of this requirement was

---

3. See JILL D. RHODES & VINCENT I. POLLEY, *THE ABA CYBERSECURITY HANDBOOK: A RESOURCE FOR ATTORNEYS, LAW FIRMS, AND BUSINESS PROFESSIONALS* 7 (2013) [hereinafter *ABA CYBERSECURITY HANDBOOK*].

4. "Cybersecurity" is defined as "measures taken to protect a computer or computer system (as on the internet) against unauthorized access or attack." *CYBERSECURITY*, MERRIAM WEBSTER, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cybersecurity> (last visited Sept. 10, 2016). In 2012 the ABA created the Cybersecurity Legal Task Force to help lawyers grapple with the legal challenges created by cyberspace. In 2013 the Task Force published *The ABA Cybersecurity Handbook: A Resource For Attorneys, Law Firms, and Business Professionals*.

5. Bradford A. Bleier, Unit Chief to the Cyber National Security Section in the FBI's Cyber Division, indicated that "[l]aw firms have tremendous concentrations of really critical private information, and breaking into a firm's computer system is a really optimal way to obtain economic and personal security information." Ed Finkel, *Cyberspace Under Siege*, A.B.A. J., Nov. 1, 2010.

6. A LEGISLATIVE HISTORY: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ABA MODEL RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, 1982-2013, at 37-44 (Art Garwin ed., 2013).

clarified in 2012 when the ABA recognized the increasing impact of technology on the practice of law and the duty of lawyers to develop an understanding of that technology. Thus, Comment [8] to Rule 1.1 was modified to read:

To maintain the requisite knowledge and skill, a lawyer should keep abreast of changes in the law and its practice, including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology, engage in continuing study and education and comply with all continuing legal education requirements to which the lawyer is subject. (Emphasis added.)<sup>7</sup>

Regarding the change to Rule 1.1's Comment, the ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 explained:

Model Rule 1.1 requires a lawyer to provide competent representation, and Comment [6] [renumbered as Comment [8]] specifies that, to remain competent, lawyers need to “keep abreast of changes in the law and its practice.” The Commission concluded that, in order to keep abreast of changes in law practice in a digital age, lawyers necessarily need to understand basic features of relevant technology and that this aspect of competence should be expressed in the Comment. For example, a lawyer would have difficulty providing competent legal services in today's environment without knowing how to use email or create an electronic document.<sup>8</sup>

### III. Duty of Confidentiality

In 2012, amendments to Rule 1.6 modified both the rule and the commentary about what efforts are required to preserve the confidentiality of information relating to the representation. Model Rule 1.6(a) requires that “A lawyer shall not reveal information relating to the representation of a client” unless certain circumstances arise.<sup>9</sup> The 2012 modification added a new duty in paragraph (c) that: “A lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized access to, information relating to the representation of a client.”<sup>10</sup>

---

7. *Id.* at 43.

8. ABA COMMISSION ON ETHICS 20/20 REPORT 105A (Aug. 2012), [http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/ethics\\_2020/20120808\\_revised\\_resolution\\_105a\\_as\\_amended.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/ethics_2020/20120808_revised_resolution_105a_as_amended.authcheckdam.pdf). The 20/20 Commission also noted that modification of Comment [6] did not change the lawyer's substantive duty of competence: “Comment [6] already encompasses an obligation to remain aware of changes in technology that affect law practice, but the Commission concluded that making this explicit, by addition of the phrase ‘including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology,’ would offer greater clarity in this area and emphasize the importance of technology to modern law practice. The proposed amendment, which appears in a Comment, does not impose any new obligations on lawyers. Rather, the amendment is intended to serve as a reminder to lawyers that they should remain aware of technology, including the benefits and risks associated with it, as part of a lawyer's general ethical duty to remain competent.”

9. MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.6(a) (2016).

10. *Id.* at (c).

Amended Comment [18] explains:

Paragraph (c) requires a lawyer to act competently to safeguard information relating to the representation of a client against unauthorized access by third parties and against inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure by the lawyer or other persons who are participating in the representation of the client or who are subject to the lawyer's supervision. See Rules 1.1, 5.1 and 5.3. The unauthorized access to, or the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, information relating to the representation of a client does not constitute a violation of paragraph (c) if the lawyer has made reasonable efforts to prevent the access or disclosure.

At the intersection of a lawyer's competence obligation to keep "abreast of knowledge of the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology," and confidentiality obligation to make "reasonable efforts to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized access to, information relating to the representation of a client," lawyers must exercise reasonable efforts when using technology in communicating about client matters. What constitutes reasonable efforts is not susceptible to a hard and fast rule, but rather is contingent upon a set of factors. In turn, those factors depend on the multitude of possible types of information being communicated (ranging along a spectrum from highly sensitive information to insignificant), the methods of electronic communications employed, and the types of available security measures for each method.<sup>11</sup>

Therefore, in an environment of increasing cyber threats, the Committee concludes that, adopting the language in the ABA Cybersecurity Handbook, the reasonable efforts standard:

. . . rejects requirements for specific security measures (such as firewalls, passwords, and the like) and instead adopts a fact-specific approach to business security obligations that requires a "process" to assess risks, identify and implement appropriate security measures responsive to those risks, verify that they are effectively implemented, and ensure that they are continually updated in response to new developments.<sup>12</sup>

Recognizing the necessity of employing a fact-based analysis, Comment [18] to Model Rule 1.6(c) includes nonexclusive factors to guide lawyers in making a "reasonable efforts" determination. Those factors include:

- the sensitivity of the information,

---

11. The 20/20 Commission's report emphasized that lawyers are not the guarantors of data safety. It wrote: "[t]o be clear, paragraph (c) does not mean that a lawyer engages in professional misconduct any time a client's confidences are subject to unauthorized access or disclosed inadvertently or without authority. A sentence in Comment [16] makes this point explicitly. The reality is that disclosures can occur even if lawyers take all reasonable precautions. The Commission, however, believes that it is important to state in the black letter of Model Rule 1.6 that lawyers have a duty to take reasonable precautions, even if those precautions will not guarantee the protection of confidential information under all circumstances."

12. ABA CYBERSECURITY HANDBOOK, *supra* note 3, at 48-49.

- the likelihood of disclosure if additional safeguards are not employed,
- the cost of employing additional safeguards,
- the difficulty of implementing the safeguards, and
- the extent to which the safeguards adversely affect the lawyer's ability to represent clients (e.g., by making a device or important piece of software excessively difficult to use).<sup>13</sup>

A fact-based analysis means that particularly strong protective measures, like encryption, are warranted in some circumstances. Model Rule 1.4 may require a lawyer to discuss security safeguards with clients. Under certain circumstances, the lawyer may need to obtain informed consent from the client regarding whether to the use enhanced security measures, the costs involved, and the impact of those costs on the expense of the representation where nonstandard and not easily available or affordable security methods may be required or requested by the client. Reasonable efforts, as it pertains to certain highly sensitive information, might require avoiding the use of electronic methods or any technology to communicate with the client altogether, just as it warranted avoiding the use of the telephone, fax and mail in Formal Opinion 99-413.

In contrast, for matters of normal or low sensitivity, standard security methods with low to reasonable costs to implement, may be sufficient to meet the reasonable-efforts standard to protect client information from inadvertent and unauthorized disclosure.

In the technological landscape of Opinion 99-413, and due to the reasonable expectations of privacy available to email communications at the time, unencrypted email posed no greater risk of interception or disclosure than other non-electronic forms of communication. This basic premise remains true today for routine communication with clients, presuming the lawyer has implemented basic and reasonably available methods of common electronic security measures.<sup>14</sup> Thus, the use of unencrypted routine email generally remains an acceptable method of lawyer-client communication.

However, cyber-threats and the proliferation of electronic communications devices have changed the landscape and it is not always reasonable to rely on the use of unencrypted email. For example, electronic communication through certain mobile applications or on message boards or via unsecured networks may lack the basic expectation of privacy afforded to email communications. Therefore, lawyers must, on a case-by-case basis, constantly analyze how they communicate electronically about client matters, applying the Comment [18] factors to determine what effort is reasonable.

---

13. MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.6 cmt. [18] (2016). "The [Ethics 20/20] Commission examined the possibility of offering more detailed guidance about the measures that lawyers should employ. The Commission concluded, however, that technology is changing too rapidly to offer such guidance and that the particular measures lawyers should use will necessarily change as technology evolves and as new risks emerge and new security procedures become available." ABA COMMISSION REPORT 105A, *supra* note 8, at 5.

14. See item 3 below.

While it is beyond the scope of an ethics opinion to specify the reasonable steps that lawyers should take under any given set of facts, we offer the following considerations as guidance:

1. Understand the Nature of the Threat.

Understanding the nature of the threat includes consideration of the sensitivity of a client's information and whether the client's matter is a higher risk for cyber intrusion. Client matters involving proprietary information in highly sensitive industries such as industrial designs, mergers and acquisitions or trade secrets, and industries like healthcare, banking, defense or education, may present a higher risk of data theft.<sup>15</sup> "Reasonable efforts" in higher risk scenarios generally means that greater effort is warranted.

2. Understand How Client Confidential Information is Transmitted and Where It Is Stored.

A lawyer should understand how their firm's electronic communications are created, where client data resides, and what avenues exist to access that information. Understanding these processes will assist a lawyer in managing the risk of inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of client-related information. Every access point is a potential entry point for a data loss or disclosure. The lawyer's task is complicated in a world where multiple devices may be used to communicate with or about a client and then store those communications. Each access point, and each device, should be evaluated for security compliance.

3. Understand and Use Reasonable Electronic Security Measures.

Model Rule 1.6(c) requires a lawyer to make reasonable efforts to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized access to, information relating to the representation of a client. As Comment [18] makes clear, what is deemed to be "reasonable" may vary, depending on the facts and circumstances of each case. Electronic disclosure of, or access to, client communications can occur in different forms ranging from a direct intrusion into a law firm's systems to theft or interception of information during the transmission process. Making reasonable efforts to protect against unauthorized disclosure in client communications thus includes analysis of security measures applied to both disclosure and access to a law firm's technology system and transmissions.

A lawyer should understand and use electronic security measures to safeguard client communications and information. A lawyer has a variety of options to safeguard communications including, for example, using secure internet access methods to communicate, access and store client information (such as through secure Wi-Fi, the use of a Virtual Private Network, or another secure internet portal), using unique complex

---

15. See, e.g., Noah Garner, *The Most Prominent Cyber Threats Faced by High-Target Industries*, TREND-MICRO (Jan. 25, 2016), <http://blog.trendmicro.com/the-most-prominent-cyber-threats-faced-by-high-target-industries/>.

passwords, changed periodically, implementing firewalls and anti-Malware/Anti-Spyware/Antivirus software on all devices upon which client confidential information is transmitted or stored, and applying all necessary security patches and updates to operational and communications software. Each of these measures is routinely accessible and reasonably affordable or free. Lawyers may consider refusing access to firm systems to devices failing to comply with these basic methods. It also may be reasonable to use commonly available methods to remotely disable lost or stolen devices, and to destroy the data contained on those devices, especially if encryption is not also being used.

Other available tools include encryption of data that is physically stored on a device and multi-factor authentication to access firm systems.

In the electronic world, “delete” usually does not mean information is permanently deleted, and “deleted” data may be subject to recovery. Therefore, a lawyer should consider whether certain data should *ever* be stored in an unencrypted environment, or electronically transmitted at all.

4. Determine How Electronic Communications About Clients Matters Should Be Protected.

Different communications require different levels of protection. At the beginning of the client-lawyer relationship, the lawyer and client should discuss what levels of security will be necessary for each electronic communication about client matters. Communications to third parties containing protected client information requires analysis to determine what degree of protection is appropriate. In situations where the communication (and any attachments) are sensitive or warrant extra security, additional electronic protection may be required. For example, if client information is of sufficient sensitivity, a lawyer should encrypt the transmission and determine how to do so to sufficiently protect it,<sup>16</sup> and consider the use of password protection for any attachments. Alternatively, lawyers can consider the use of a well vetted and secure third-party cloud based file storage system to exchange documents normally attached to emails.

Thus, routine communications sent electronically are those communications that do not contain information warranting additional security measures beyond basic methods. However, in some circumstances, a client’s lack of technological sophistication or the limitations of technology available to the client may require alternative non-electronic forms of communication altogether.

---

16. See Cal. Formal Op. 2010-179 (2010); ABA CYBERSECURITY HANDBOOK, *supra* note 3, at 121. Indeed, certain laws and regulations require encryption in certain situations. *Id.* at 58-59.

A lawyer also should be cautious in communicating with a client if the client uses computers or other devices subject to the access or control of a third party.<sup>17</sup> If so, the attorney-client privilege and confidentiality of communications and attached documents may be waived. Therefore, the lawyer should warn the client about the risk of sending or receiving electronic communications using a computer or other device, or email account, to which a third party has, or may gain, access.<sup>18</sup>

#### 5. Label Client Confidential Information.

Lawyers should follow the better practice of marking privileged and confidential client communications as “privileged and confidential” in order to alert anyone to whom the communication was inadvertently disclosed that the communication is intended to be privileged and confidential. This can also consist of something as simple as appending a message or “disclaimer” to client emails, where such a disclaimer is accurate and appropriate for the communication.<sup>19</sup>

Model Rule 4.4(b) obligates a lawyer who “knows or reasonably should know” that he has received an inadvertently sent “document or electronically stored information relating to the representation of the lawyer’s client” to promptly notify the sending lawyer. A clear and conspicuous appropriately used disclaimer may affect whether a recipient lawyer’s duty under Model Rule 4.4(b) for inadvertently transmitted communications is satisfied.

---

17. ABA Comm. on Ethics & Prof’l Responsibility, Formal Op. 11-459, Duty to Protect the Confidentiality of E-mail Communications with One’s Client (2011). Formal Op. 11-459 was issued prior to the 2012 amendments to Rule 1.6. These amendments added new Rule 1.6(c), which provides that lawyers “shall” make reasonable efforts to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent access to client information. *See, e.g.*, Scott v. Beth Israel Med. Center, Inc., Civ. A. No. 3:04-CV-139-RJC-DCK, 847 N.Y.S.2d 436 (Sup. Ct. 2007); Mason v. ILS Tech., LLC, 2008 WL 731557, 2008 BL 298576 (W.D.N.C. 2008); Holmes v. Petrovich Dev Co., LLC, 191 Cal. App. 4th 1047 (2011) (employee communications with lawyer over company owned computer not privileged); Bingham v. BayCare Health Sys., 2016 WL 3917513, 2016 BL 233476 (M.D. Fla. July 20, 2016) (collecting cases on privilege waiver for privileged emails sent or received through an employer’s email server).

18. Some state bar ethics opinions have explored the circumstances under which email communications should be afforded special security protections. *See, e.g.*, Tex. Prof’l Ethics Comm. Op. 648 (2015) that identified six situations in which a lawyer should consider whether to encrypt or use some other type of security precaution:

- communicating highly sensitive or confidential information via email or unencrypted email connections;
- sending an email to or from an account that the email sender or recipient shares with others;
- sending an email to a client when it is possible that a third person (such as a spouse in a divorce case) knows the password to the email account, or to an individual client at that client’s work email account, especially if the email relates to a client’s employment dispute with his employer...;
- sending an email from a public computer or a borrowed computer or where the lawyer knows that the emails the lawyer sends are being read on a public or borrowed computer or on an unsecure network;
- sending an email if the lawyer knows that the email recipient is accessing the email on devices that are potentially accessible to third persons or are not protected by a password; or
- sending an email if the lawyer is concerned that the NSA or other law enforcement agency may read the lawyer’s email communication, with or without a warrant.

19. *See* Veteran Med. Prods. v. Bionix Dev. Corp., Case No. 1:05-cv-655, 2008 WL 696546 at \*8, 2008 BL 51876 at \*8 (W.D. Mich. Mar. 13, 2008) (email disclaimer that read “this email and any files transmitted with are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed” with nondisclosure constitutes a reasonable effort to maintain the secrecy of its business plan).

6. Train Lawyers and Nonlawyer Assistants in Technology and Information Security.

Model Rule 5.1 provides that a partner in a law firm, and a lawyer who individually or together with other lawyers possesses comparable managerial authority in a law firm, shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that all lawyers in the firm conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct. Model Rule 5.1 also provides that lawyers having direct supervisory authority over another lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the other lawyer conforms to the Rules of Professional Conduct. In addition, Rule 5.3 requires lawyers who are responsible for managing and supervising nonlawyer assistants to take reasonable steps to reasonably assure that the conduct of such assistants is compatible with the ethical duties of the lawyer. These requirements are as applicable to electronic practices as they are to comparable office procedures.

In the context of electronic communications, lawyers must establish policies and procedures, and periodically train employees, subordinates and others assisting in the delivery of legal services, in the use of reasonably secure methods of electronic communications with clients. Lawyers also must instruct and supervise on reasonable measures for access to and storage of those communications. Once processes are established, supervising lawyers must follow up to ensure these policies are being implemented and partners and lawyers with comparable managerial authority must periodically reassess and update these policies. This is no different than the other obligations for supervision of office practices and procedures to protect client information.

7. Conduct Due Diligence on Vendors Providing Communication Technology.

Consistent with Model Rule 1.6(c), Model Rule 5.3 imposes a duty on lawyers with direct supervisory authority over a nonlawyer to make “reasonable efforts to ensure that” the nonlawyer’s “conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer.”

In ABA Formal Opinion 08-451, this Committee analyzed Model Rule 5.3 and a lawyer’s obligation when outsourcing legal and nonlegal services. That opinion identified several issues a lawyer should consider when selecting the outsource vendor, to meet the lawyer’s due diligence and duty of supervision. Those factors also apply in the analysis of vendor selection in the context of electronic communications. Such factors may include:

- reference checks and vendor credentials;
- vendor’s security policies and protocols;
- vendor’s hiring practices;
- the use of confidentiality agreements;
- vendor’s conflicts check system to screen for adversity; and

- the availability and accessibility of a legal forum for legal relief for violations of the vendor agreement.

Any lack of individual competence by a lawyer to evaluate and employ safeguards to protect client confidences may be addressed through association with another lawyer or expert, or by education.<sup>20</sup>

Since the issuance of Formal Opinion 08-451, Comment [3] to Model Rule 5.3 was added to address outsourcing, including “using an Internet-based service to store client information.” Comment [3] provides that the “reasonable efforts” required by Model Rule 5.3 to ensure that the nonlawyer’s services are provided in a manner that is compatible with the lawyer’s professional obligations “will depend upon the circumstances.” Comment [3] contains suggested factors that might be taken into account:

- the education, experience, and reputation of the nonlawyer;
- the nature of the services involved;
- the terms of any arrangements concerning the protection of client information; and
- the legal and ethical environments of the jurisdictions in which the services will be performed particularly with regard to confidentiality.

Comment [3] further provides that when retaining or directing a nonlawyer outside of the firm, lawyers should communicate “directions appropriate under the circumstances to give reasonable assurance that the nonlawyer’s conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer.”<sup>21</sup> If the client has not directed the selection of the outside nonlawyer vendor, the lawyer has the responsibility to monitor how those services are being performed.<sup>22</sup>

Even after a lawyer examines these various considerations and is satisfied that the security employed is sufficient to comply with the duty of confidentiality, the lawyer must periodically reassess these factors to confirm that the lawyer’s actions continue to comply with the ethical obligations and have not been rendered inadequate by changes in circumstances or technology.

---

20. MODEL RULES OF PROF’L CONDUCT R. 1.1 cmts. [2] & [8] (2016).

21. The ABA’s catalog of state bar ethics opinions applying the rules of professional conduct to cloud storage arrangements involving client information can be found at: [http://www.americanbar.org/groups/departments\\_offices/legal\\_technology\\_resources/resources/charts\\_fyis/cloud-ethics-chart.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/departments_offices/legal_technology_resources/resources/charts_fyis/cloud-ethics-chart.html).

22. By contrast, where a client directs the selection of a particular nonlawyer service provider outside the firm, “the lawyer ordinarily should agree with the client concerning the allocation of responsibility for monitoring as between the client and the lawyer.” MODEL RULES OF PROF’L CONDUCT R. 5.3 cmt. [4] (2016). The concept of monitoring recognizes that although it may not be possible to “directly supervise” a client directed nonlawyer outside the firm performing services in connection with a matter, a lawyer must nevertheless remain aware of how the nonlawyer services are being performed. ABA COMMISSION ON ETHICS 20/20 REPORT 105C, at 12 (Aug. 2012), [http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/ethics\\_2020/2012\\_hod\\_annual\\_meeting\\_105c\\_filed\\_may\\_2012.auth\\_checkdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/ethics_2020/2012_hod_annual_meeting_105c_filed_may_2012.auth_checkdam.pdf).

#### IV. Duty to Communicate

Communications between a lawyer and client generally are addressed in Rule 1.4. When the lawyer reasonably believes that highly sensitive confidential client information is being transmitted so that extra measures to protect the email transmission are warranted, the lawyer should inform the client about the risks involved.<sup>23</sup> The lawyer and client then should decide whether another mode of transmission, such as high level encryption or personal delivery is warranted. Similarly, a lawyer should consult with the client as to how to appropriately and safely use technology in their communication, in compliance with other laws that might be applicable to the client. Whether a lawyer is using methods and practices to comply with administrative, statutory, or international legal standards is beyond the scope of this opinion.

A client may insist or require that the lawyer undertake certain forms of communication. As explained in Comment [19] to Model Rule 1.6, “A client may require the lawyer to implement special security measures not required by this Rule or may give informed consent to the use of a means of communication that would otherwise be prohibited by this Rule.”

#### V. Conclusion

Rule 1.1 requires a lawyer to provide competent representation to a client. Comment [8] to Rule 1.1 advises lawyers that to maintain the requisite knowledge and skill for competent representation, a lawyer should keep abreast of the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology. Rule 1.6(c) requires a lawyer to make “reasonable efforts” to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of or access to information relating to the representation.

A lawyer generally may transmit information relating to the representation of a client over the internet without violating the Model Rules of Professional Conduct where the lawyer has undertaken reasonable efforts to prevent inadvertent or unauthorized access. However, a lawyer may be required to take special security precautions to protect against the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of client information when required by an agreement with the client or by law, or when the nature of the information requires a higher degree of security.

---

**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY**

321 N. Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois 60654-4714 Telephone (312) 988-5328

CHAIR: Myles V. Lynk, Tempe, AZ ■ John M. Barkett, Miami, FL ■ Arthur D. Burger, Washington, DC ■ Wendy Wen Yun Chang, Los Angeles, CA ■ Robert A. Creamer, Cambridge, MA ■ Hon. Daniel J. Crothers, Bismarck, ND ■ Keith R. Fisher, Arlington, VA ■ Douglas R. Richmond, Chicago, IL ■ Hope Cahill Todd, Washington, DC ■ Allison Wood, Chicago, IL

**CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY:** Dennis A. Rendleman, Ethics Counsel; Mary McDermott, Associate Ethics Counsel

©2017 by the American Bar Association. All rights reserved.

---

23. MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.4(a)(1) & (4) (2016).