



020 3334 0200 electronic-execution@lawcommission.gov.uk

### **Electronic execution of documents: Consultation**

### Introduction

This form accompanies the consultation paper on the electronic execution of documents, available at <a href="https://www.lawcom.gov.uk/project/electronic-execution-of-documents/">https://www.lawcom.gov.uk/project/electronic-execution-of-documents/</a>. Please answer as many questions as you can, in as much detail as you can. However, you do not need to answer all the questions.

Please save a copy of your completed form and email it back to us at <u>electronic-execution@lawcommission.gov.uk</u> by **23 November 2018**.

Where possible, it would be helpful if comments were sent using the online form at <a href="https://consult.justice.gov.uk/law-commission/electronic-execution">https://consult.justice.gov.uk/law-commission/electronic-execution</a> or using this form. However, comments can also be sent in an email to <a href="mailto:electronic-execution@lawcommission.gov.uk">electronic-execution@lawcommission.gov.uk</a>, or by post to: Commercial and Common Law Team, Law Commission, 1st Floor, Tower, 52 Queen Anne's Gate, London, SW1H 9AG.

### Consultation principles

The Law Commission follows the Consultation Principles set out by the Cabinet Office, which provide guidance on type and scale of consultation, duration, timing, accessibility and transparency. The Principles are available on the Cabinet Office website at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/consultation-principles-quidance

We treat all responses as public documents in accordance with the **Freedom of Information Act 2000** and we may include the names of respondents and attribute comments in any publication relating to this consultation. If you want your submission to remain confidential, you should contact us before sending your response. (Please note that we disregard automatic IT-generated confidentiality statements.)

For information on how we handle your personal data, please see our Privacy Notice.

Your details	
Name	
Organisation	
Type of response	Personal response
	Response on behalf of above named organisation
Email address	
Telephone number	

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please explain to us why you regard the information as confidential. As explained above, we will take full account of your explanation but cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances.

## Electronic signatures and other preliminary questions (Consultation Questions 1 to 6)

# Question 1. Our provisional conclusion is that an electronic signature is capable of satisfying a statutory requirement for a signature under the current law, where there is an intention to authenticate the document. Do consultees agree? (See paragraph 3.87 of the consultation paper.) Yes No Other

### Question 2.

Our provisional conclusion is that the requirement under the current law that a deed must be signed "in the presence of a witness" requires the physical presence of that witness. Do consultees agree? (See paragraph 4.57 of the consultation paper.)

Yes No Other

Question 3.			
			sdictions have dealt with paragraph 6.19 of the
consultation paper.)			
Question 4.			
documents (for examp attorney), that is a matt	le, to protect vulnerat ter for specific legislati	ole parties, particular on or regulation, and	tion to certain types of rly for lasting powers of d not for the general law a 6.41 of the consultation
Yes	No	Other	

is capa	nsider that legislative	atutory requirement fo	ary to confirm that an elect or a signature. Do consultee	-
	Yes	No	Other	

### Question 6.

We provisionally propose that an industry working group should be established, potentially convened by Government, to consider practical, technical issues. Do consultees agree? (See paragraph 7.28 of the consultation paper.)

Yes No Other

### **Deeds (Consultation Questions 7 to 14)**

## Question 7. We provisionally propose that it should be possible to witness an electronic signature via video link and then attest the document. Do consultees agree? (See paragraph 8.32 of the consultation paper.) Yes No Other

### Question 8.

If witnessing by video link is to be permitted, how do consultees consider the witness should complete the attestation:

- (1) Via a signing platform which the signatory and witness both log into?
- (2) With the document being emailed to the witness by the signatory immediately after signing?

(See paragraph 8.33 of the consultation paper.)

### Question 9.

Do consultees consider that it should be possible to "witness" an electronic signature through an online signing platform in real time, without a video link or any direct communication between the signatory and the witness? (See paragraph 8.42 of the consultation paper.)

Yes No Other

### Question 10.

Our view is that the witnessing and attestation requirement for electronic signatures on deeds should not be replaced with a requirement for a particular type of technology, such as a digital signature using Public Key Infrastructure. Do consultees agree? (See paragraph 8.50 of the consultation paper.)

Yes No Other

witnessing	Itees think that there is g and attestation in the	e context of deeds e	way from the traditional cor xecuted electronically, allo the consultation paper.)	-
	Yes	No	Other	
Please ex	pand on your answer.			
` '	v should electronic ac , text message, in pers	•	effected (for example, b	y email,
24 hours		acknowledgement	escribed period of time (for emust occur after signin	-
(3) Hov	v should the witness red	cord the signatory's a	cknowledgement?	

Our view is that the requirement that deeds must be delivered does not impede the electronic execution of deeds in practice. Do consultees agree? (See paragraph 8.70 of the consultation paper.)			
	Yes	No	Other
Question	13.		
We consider that legislative reform is unnecessary and inappropriate to address the implications of the Mercury decision. Do consultees agree? (See paragraph 8.83 of the consultation paper.)			
	Yes	No	Other

Question 12.

Question 14.			
Do consultees think that a project? (See paragraph 8.5)		leeds should be a future Lav n paper.)	v Commission
Yes	No	Other	
Impact of reform			
Impact of reform			
Question 15.			
requirement for a signature consultees believe that this	, provided there is ar s will result in increas	nature is capable of satisfying intention to authenticate a sed confidence in the legality re needed? (See paragrap	document. Do y of electronic
Yes	No	Other	

### Question 16.

What do consultees believe would be the financial value of increased confidence in the legality of electronic execution in England and Wales? For example, do consultees think there could be a reduction in transaction costs by as much as 10% to 30%? (See paragraph 8.94 of the consultation paper.)

Yes No Other

### Question 17.

Do consultees agree that the Law Commission's proposal to establish an industry working group, to consider practical, technical issues, would do any of the following? (See paragraph 8.95 of the consultation paper.)

(1) Provide benefits such as reduced transaction costs? If so, how much?

(2) Provide non-monetary benefits? If so, what benefits?

Que	stion 18.
prese exan	have canvassed several options for electronically executing deeds without the physical ence of a witness. We welcome evidence from consultees on the benefits (for apple, reduced delays in completing transactions) or costs which might result from the wing. (See paragraph 8.96 of the consultation paper.)
(1)	The capacity to execute deeds electronically without the physical presence of a witness.

(2) Any or all of the specific options for electronically executing deeds described above, namely via video link, signing platform, or acknowledgement.