

Coordinating Forensic Collection Across Multiple Offices And Countries

This guide outlines a methodology for coordinating forensic collection across multiple international sites. It addresses legal challenges, data transfers, and synchronisation, providing a framework for consistent evidence gathering in complex, cross-border e-discovery matters.

e-discovery.uk, Computer Forensics Lab. Published 2026-08-30.

<https://e-discovery.uk/library/coordinating-forensic-collection-across-multiple-offices-and-countries>

MULTI - SITE & CROSS - B ORDER COLLECTION · A GUIDE FOR UK LAWYERS

Coordinating Forensic Collection Across Multiple Offices and Countries One Methodology, Many Sites: Consistency, Local Law and the Campaign Plan COMPUTER FORENSICS LAB

§ ABOUT THE AUTHOR PREPARED BY COMPUTER FORENSICS LAB E-DISCOVERY TEAM
ACPO / NPCC DIGITAL EVIDENCE PRINCIPLES MULTI-SITE CAMPAIGN
COORDINATION CPR PART 35 EXPERT REPORT S FULL CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY
DOCUMENTATION

§ CONTENTS In this guide 01 Executive summary 02 The problem in plain English: many sites, one standard 03 The campaign model: hub, spokes and the methodology pack 04 Who collects where: laboratory teams, remote agents, local personnel 05 The legal terrain: transfers, blocking statutes and local process 06 Synchronisation, sequencing and tip-off risk 07 Moving and consolidating the evidence 08 The consolidated record: one campaign, one file 09 Worked examples 10 Common mistakes and technical limitations 11 Questions to ask · Suggested wording 12 Checklist and red flags · When to involve a digital forensic expert 13 Frequently asked questions 14 Glossary · References · Disclaimer · How a specialist laboratory can assist

§ 01 · ORIENTATION Executive summary THE HEADLINE POINT:
CONSISTENCY IS THE CAMPAIGN 'S PRODUCT

§ 02 · FIRST PRINCIPLES The problem in plain English: many sites, one standard

§ 03 · THE ARCHITECTURE The campaign model: hub, spokes and the methodology pack

§ 04 · HANDS Who collects where: laboratory teams, remote agents, local personnel

§ 05 · THE LEGAL TERRAIN The legal terrain: transfers, blocking statutes and local process

§ 06 · THE CLOCK Synchronisation, sequencing and tip-off risk

§ 07 · FREIGHT Moving and consolidating the evidence

§ 08 · THE FILE The consolidated record: one campaign, one file

§ 09 · IN THE WILD Worked examples EXAMPLE 1 · THE SYNCHRONISED FIRST WAVE
EXAMPLE 2 · THE SPOKE THAT RAN ITS OWN SHOW EXAMPLE 3 · THE BLOCKING -
STATUTE PIVOT

§ 10 · WHERE IT GOES WRONG Common mistakes and technical limitations Common mistakes
Technical limitations 39 plan with two site annexes does the work.

§ 11 · INTERROGATORIES & DRAFTING AIDS Questions to ask · Suggested wording Ask
your client Ask your opponent Ask your e Discovery / forensic provider SUGGESTED
WORDING · CAM PA IGN CLAUSES FOR THE MASTER PROTOCOL SUGGESTED WORDING ·
LOCAL PERSONNEL ENGAGEMENT (CORE TERMS)

§ 12 · QUICK CONTROL Checklist and red flags · When to involve a digital forensic expert The
multi-site campaign checklist Red flags When to involve a digital forensic expert

§ 13 · COMMON QUESTIONS Frequently asked questions Do we really need local counsel in
every country, or is that gold-plating? Can one UK laboratory really run a global campaign, or
do we need providers in each country? How do we handle a jurisdiction that will not let the data
leave? What does synchronisation actually require: must every site be the same hour? Who
gives the expert evidence about a campaign executed by many hands? How much longer does a
coordinated campaign take than letting sites run in parallel on their own?

§ 14 · REFERENCE Glossary Sources and authoritative references DISCLAIMER

§ HOW A SPECIALIST LABORATORY CAN ASSIST Working with Computer Forensics Lab 35
where the matter warrants. Through e-discovery.uk, the consolidated evidence flows into a
single processing Speak to a forensic examiner, not a salesperson. INSTRUCT THE LAB
NEW ENQUIRIES EMAIL - DISCOVERY

Questions and answers

Do we really need local counsel in every country, or is that gold-plating?

Need one short advice per jurisdiction whose data or personnel the campaign touches: yes, as a rule: the cost is small and the failure modes (works-council grievances, transfer breaches, blocking-statute exposure with personal liability) are not. The proportionate version scales with risk: adequacy-covered European jurisdictions with cooperative subsidiaries may need a page; secrecy-regime jurisdictions need real analysis. What is never proportionate is discovering the requirement from the regulator's letter, per Example 2.

Can one UK laboratory really run a global campaign, or do we need providers in each country?

The hub-and-spokes answer: one laboratory runs the campaign (methodology, coordination, the contested spokes, remote acquisition of managed estates) and engages vetted local hands where geography or local law requires them, under the pack and sampling. What you should avoid is the opposite architecture: independent providers per country, each with their own methodology, coordinated by nobody: that is Example 2 franchised. One standard, many hands; never many standards.

How do we handle a jurisdiction that will not let the data leave?

Example 3's pivot: collect in-country to the campaign standard, process and first-review locally on infrastructure the hub specifies, transfer only reviewed, relevant, law full y transferable material under a recorded basis, preserve the balance in-country, and say all of this plainly in the DRD. English courts deal with such constraints regularly; what they, and opponents, respond badly to is the constraint asserted vaguely, discovered late, or used as cover: the documented pivot is a compliance credential, the undocumented gap is a disclosure hole.

What does synchronisation actually require: must every site be the same hour?

Only where tip-off risk demands it, and only for the sensitive spokes: the contested custodians' sites in one window (same morning regionally, same day globally), preservation every where before h and, and the announcement synchronised with execution. Friendly spokes (cooperative offices, server estates, cloud tenancies) then proceed on the ordinary schedule. Full-campaign simultaneity is rarely necessary and always expensive; targeted simultaneity, per Example 1, is the discipline that pays.

Who gives the expert evidence about a campaign executed by many hands?

The examiner-in-charge: methodology, supervision, verification and consolidation are theirs to prove, exhibit in g the packs, sampling results, logs and manifest; spoke personnel provide statements (or local evidence) about their own executions where specific acts are contested. This is the standard architecture of supervised work, and it is precisely why the hub's records exist: the expert who says "I designed the standard, trained the hands, verified the samples and reconciled the results" is giving evidence, not hearsay, about the campaign as a system.

How much longer does a coordinated campaign take than letting sites run in parallel on

their own?

Usually none: the spokes still run in parallel; what the campaign adds is a planning phase up front (the packs, the legal advices, the schedule: typically two to four weeks for a multi-country matter) and a consolidation rhythm alongside execution. Uncoordinated parallelism only looks faster because its costs land later: the re-collections, the satellite disputes and the methodology cross-examination all post-date the "saved" fortnight, at multiples. Example 2's arithmetic is the standing answer. cflab. u k · e-disc ove r y. u k ©2026
Computer Forensics Lab Ltd · cflab.uk · e-discovery.uk · info@cflab.uk · +44 (0)20 7164 6915
Page 17 of 20

Source: <https://e-discovery.uk/library/coordinating-forensic-collection-across-multiple-offices-and-countries>.
Free to read and share with attribution to Computer Forensics Lab, e-discovery.uk.