

## EuroExpert e-bulletin

The Expert Conference season is nearly over and the various events that were mentioned in the previous bulletin have now all taken place. The events were well attended and successful providing yet again an excellent opportunity for Experts to meet, network and more importantly to share experiences and different practices. Time and time again as I travel I am reminded of the importance of sharing experience and best practice by those I meet. The commonality of problems such as getting paid and making sure that the instructions are correct are sometimes surprising given the different legal systems in which we operate. The way in which they are evolving is an illustration of the way systems are converging.

In previous bulletins we have talked about a simple set of 8 principles that define Experts' responsibilities and evidence known as the Ikarian Reefer Rules. For simplicity they are shown below:

- ❑ Expert evidence presented to the court should be, and should be seen to be, the independent product of the expert uninfluenced as to form or content by the exigencies [pressures] of the litigation.
- ❑ An expert witness should provide independent assistance to the

court by way of objective, unbiased opinion in relation to matters within his expertise.



- ❑ An expert witness should never assume the role of an advocate.
- ❑ An expert witness should state the facts or assumptions upon which his opinion is based. He should not omit to consider material facts which could detract from his concluded opinion.
- ❑ An expert witness should make it clear when a particular question or issue falls outside his expertise.
- ❑ If an expert's opinion is not properly researched because he considers that insufficient data is available, then this must be stated with an indication that the opinion is no more than a provisional one. In cases where an expert witness, who has prepared a report, could not assert that the report contained the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth without some qualification, that qualification should be stated in the report.

continued on **page 2**

Featured this issue  
NEUTRAL EXPERTS IN  
CONSTRUCTION CASES p3



UPDATES TO USE OF  
TECHNOLOGY  
IN AUSTRIAN COURTS p7



EuroExpert Finder



The e-Bulletin is published periodically. It provides useful information for those who are either acting as an expert, who use their services or are in charge of setting standards for experts. EuroExpert (EE) is a point of contact between national and European judicial and legal authorities, government departments, official and private bodies and other appropriate tribunals.

Contributions are received in English from across Europe. For many of the authors English is a second language. Whilst some editing does take place it is kept to a minimum in order to best reflect and reproduce the original intentions of the author.

If you would like to submit a contribution for consideration please email: [editor@euroexperts.org](mailto:editor@euroexperts.org)

continued from page 1

- If, after exchange of reports, an expert witness changes his view on a material matter having read the other side's expert's report or for any other reason, such change of view should be communicated (through legal representatives) to the other side without delay and when appropriate to the court.
- Where expert evidence refers to photographs, plans, calculations, analyses, measurements, survey reports or other similar documents, these must be provided to the opposite party at the same time as the exchange of reports (Guide to Commercial Court Practice).

These principles have stood the test of time and help reduce the challenge for experts in performing in their role properly. It was therefore very interesting to note a recent judgement in the Technology and Construction Court in London where yet again these very points were emphasised by the Judge in his judgement.

**Van Oord UK Limited, SICIM Roadbridge Limited and Allseas UK Limited** (Neutral Citation Number: [2015] EWHC 3074 (TCC). The judgement shows how an expert can easily fall foul of his duties and that in the end his evidence can be of little or no value to those instructing him. The Judge gave a number of reasons for why this was

the case such as he had pleaded claims at face value and did not check the underlying documents that supported or undermined them. He had only prepared his report by reviewing the witness statements prepared by those instructing him thus making his report and his evidence inevitably biased.

The judge went on further to say:

*"I am bound to find that Mr X was not independent and his evaluations (to the extent that he did any independent valuations which were relevant) were neither appropriate nor reliable. I am obliged to disregard his evidence in full."*

The challenge for Experts to be able to demonstrate they have understood and fulfilled their role in the wake of increasing judicial criticism is becoming much harder.

The damage done to an expert when they fail in their duty does not just impact on their practice as an expert but also more importantly and often significantly it impinges on their main professional practice as well. This will provide an increasing challenge for Experts given the litigious society we now live in.

Against this back drop Experts may want to consider other ways in which they can offer their services and this edition carries an interesting article from our

Russian colleague Dr Zakharov who looks at the increasing use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in construction disputes and in particular the use of the Neutral Expert. It is interesting to note that there is an increasing awareness of other ways to utilise experts and forms of ADR and only recently in Germany at their Expert's Day they held an interesting session on different forms of ADR and how they are used in different countries. At the Conference they heard from Belgium, France, Germany, Austria and Great Britain. It is hoped that in our next bulletin we will be able to report more about the papers given in Germany and I am sure that this topic is one that we will expand on in future bulletins in the coming year.

This edition also brings an interesting interview with the Federal Ministry of Justice in Austria looking at how Information Technology has become an increasing valuable tool particularly from a prosecutors point of view. Experts need to be aware of the increasing changes in technology and how they impact on them and their work. I am sure this is a topic that we will return to in the future as this arena continues to develop.

As we are nearing the end of 2015 I should like to take the opportunity to send Seasons Greetings and best wishes for 2016 which I am sure will bring new challenges and opportunities to us all.

## EuroExpert

### The Organisation

EuroExpert (EE) is a membership organisation whose members are representing substantial bodies of Experts in their own country. Each organisation must demonstrate to EE that they have appropriate standards for Experts.

### Philosophy

EuroExpert's philosophy is self-regulation by Experts and the establishment of agreed common professional standards is in the best interests of society.

Nicola Cohen is Chairman of EuroExpert and Chief Executive of The Academy of Experts in the United Kingdom



Construction Projects dominate the skyline in Moscow

the plans/specifications is unclear or ambiguous - or when the plans are contradictory to the specifications. Typically, there is an implied warranty on the part of the owner that the plans/specifications are correct, adequate, accurate, and buildable. Of course, there are always exculpatory clauses in the contract by which the owner attempts to shift that responsibility to the contractor. The battle is often between the implied warranty and the enforcement of the exculpatory clause.

The scope of work between the contractor and subcontractor. Often, the contractor will ask the subcontractor to bid a particular scope of work by identifying a specific sub trade of work without specifying in detail the plans and specifications applicable to that scope of work. Thus, the subcontractor is determining what that scope means. When the subcontractor bids only a portion of work - but the contractor had the expectation that the subcontractor bid a different and larger scope - a dispute arises.

### Shop drawings and submittals

A corollary to disputes arising from the plans/specifications are disputes arising over shop drawings and other submittals. Primary among these are delays, either in

## Use of Neutral Experts as an ADR tool in large construction projects

The problem - preventing costly and contentious litigation.

The continuing escalation of litigation has prompted the parties in large investment projects to find other possibilities to resolve construction disputes in large projects outside of the courtroom.

The main problem is that during the contract performance the Contractor very often (to be more exact - Always) discover that design documentation, site geological survey documentation etc. are incorrect. In this case, many additional works

have to be done. Moreover, a contract price should be increased accordingly. The key problem to be solved in such situation - is there a real reason for increasing the scope of works and contract price? This is mostly important in the contract with the fixed price where the Contractor must not only prove that there is an additional scope of works, but show that he has a right for additional payment. The answer can be found only after a special analysis of all the project documentation, contract, special codes, governing law and site inspection.

### Typical construction disputes:

#### Plans and specifications/scope of work

Disputes over the contract scope of work, represented by the plans and specifications (as modified or amended), are some of the most significant areas of dispute on a construction project. Typically occurring between the owner and the general contractor/subcontractor, contractors and design professionals often interpret the documents differently, particularly if the description of the work in

the timeliness of the contractor/subcontractor submitting shop drawings and submittals or in the design professionals responding back in a timely fashion. The other common problem is the interplay between the design professional and the contractor/subcontractor, with the design professional rejecting submittals without adequate explanation and the contractor/subcontractor providing inadequate submittals.

## Change orders/extra or out-of-scope work

Typically, disputes over change orders and extra work or out-of-scope work boil down to the change order price and whether or not the contractor/subcontractor is entitled to extra time. Frequently, the owner requests pricing for the changed work but then disagrees with that price and time extension request - ordering the work to proceed as scheduled. This situation leaves the parties to fight over the amount and time at project's end.

## Differing site condition

There are two different approaches regarding the owner's responsibility for existing site conditions. The majority approach is that the owner has the duty to disclose all information in its possession. Even if there are no studies, the owner warrants that the construction is feasible and cannot contract away that implied warranty. Therefore, general exculpatory clauses arguably do not relieve the owner of its warranty.

## Construction sequencing/project access

The owner typically warrants that the contractor/subcontractor will have access to the project site. Disputes arise, for example, when the owner fails to provide access

particularly in remodels of occupied buildings, to obtain required permits or easements, to coordinate multiple prime contractors, or to timely provide owner-supplied equipment.

## Construction defects

During the course of construction, the owner may identify work that is not in conformance with the plans/specifications. If the contractor/subcontractor does not agree with the owner's assertion of that defective construction, a dispute arises. Typically, both the general contract and subcontracts allow the owner and general contractor, respectively, to order the removal and replacement or repair of the allegedly defective work. Assuming the contractor/subcontractor complies, it will have a claim against the owner at the conclusion of the project if the contractor/subcontractor had conformed to the plans and specifications. High possible cost losses and reputation risks - are the main factors that forced to look for new dispute resolution methods to prevent disputes from the outset of a project.

As a result, preventing claims and, ultimately, costly and contentious litigation, is becoming a business imperative for project owners, engineers and architects.

## Right decision - the use of Neutral Experts

In recent years, the construction industry has taken steps to avoid litigation and control disputes on projects through a variety of methods, which can be used at almost any stage of a construction project. They range from simple negotiation to Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) techniques. The primary goals are to resolve the conflict sooner rather than later and in a less confrontational manner.

In the past, the construction industry most often relied upon arbitration for resolving disputes. But complex contract disputes involving huge cost overruns, long schedule delays, and complicated technical specifications and requirements are, in many cases, not best decided by arbitrators, who do not have special knowledge in the field of construction. In addition, lawyers, well trained in the law, but often without a practical understanding of the construction process, argue the legal merits of the case before a judge with a similar lack of technical knowledge.

Once regarded as the sole alternative to litigation, arbitration now is often considered just as much of a last resort as the courtroom and is utilized after other efforts have failed.

Most recently, the use of experts - a non-binding process - has been gaining more and more acceptance in large investment projects. Needless to say, the process is only as good as the parties' commitment to use it and the skill of experts.

But now the construction industry is looking to an exciting new concept to prevent and resolve disputes that incorporates dispute resolution techniques from the outset of a project.

The Neutral Expert provides all parties to a dispute with an independent expert analysis of the claim. The Neutral Expert- actually a team comprised of construction industry experts - objectively and independently performs fact-finding technical analysis, delay and damage evaluations and provides recommendations so that the parties can settle their own differences and avoid the relationship-destroying results that frequently follow a claim.

The Neutral Expert team assigned to a dispute is headed by an expert who is experienced to help parties to understand the results of expert's research. Such expert also must have professional skills of a mediator, so that if so called "expert mediation" becomes necessary, the parties can move quickly to reach a mutually acceptable solution.

While the Neutral Expert is an innovative way to resolve existing claims, it can also be implemented at project inception to resolve disputes that occur during a project. The Neutral Expert concept is based upon one tenet: disputes are inevitable, but claims are not. How you deal with disputes during the project will determine whether or not you have a claim.

Neutral Experts are assigned to monitor the project's progress, respond to disputes that are presented to them by the parties and provide independent expert opinions to both sides. Thus, the chance to solve the disputes amicably and quickly increases dramatically.

The use of Neutral Experts has several common benefits whether it is used as a preventive measure or when a dispute has surfaced:

- ❑ Construction industry experts - immediately available and already knowledgeable about the project and the people - who are committed to the project and available to act quickly.
- ❑ Independent fact-finding performed by technical specialists and experts with access to the documents and records of both parties - reducing duplication of effort and cost.
- ❑ Ability to objectively analyze and evaluate the specific issues of liability, costs, schedule impact and damages.

- ❑ Conclusions and recommendations provided to the parties and then active participation in resolution of the dispute, including expert mediation, already familiar with the issues and the project.
- ❑ Costs, delays and disruptions minimized allowing the primary focus to remain on the primary objective (i.e., the successful project).

The parties maintain control in a private process, dealing only with knowledgeable professionals.

Now the Neutral Expert services have been used by both the public and private sector to resolve existing disputes, as well as to flag potential disputes and resolve them as they arise.

While the length of any resolution process depends upon the parties' willingness, a typical period for the Neutral Expert process in large investment projects is only about 2 months.

The construction industry is already finding that this next generation in ADR or the Neutral Expert — is a valuable and effective tool for dispute resolution whether disputes and claims have already occurred, or if used as a technique to avoid them in the future.

## How to use Neutral Experts?

It is a common knowledge that large investment projects contain a lot of facts, data and documents, the events and the agreements reached between parties. Therefore, a one-time involvement of neutral experts will be as expensive as the court expertise. However, neutral experts will have the same independent view on the issue, as well as court experts. Because a significant number of facts from the project are unknown for such experts or cannot be used

on procedural reasons- verbal agreements for example.

There is a new and innovative way to resolve construction disputes to prevent them from festering, becoming major claims and disrupting the successful completion of a project. This method we call real-time Neutral Expert Claim Service (NECS).

There are several approaches to real-time NECS. One is to have the parties, at the time of entering into the contract, designate a Neutral Expert. The Neutral Expert is a trained dispute resolution specialist who joins the project at its inception and follows the building process from groundbreaking to completion. The Neutral Expert, unlike any other player of the construction team, has only one client: the project itself.

The Neutral Expert is used to mediate and facilitate the resolution of disputes that cannot be resolved at the project management level and, if the parties agree, to actually rule on matters so that disputes can be resolved on an ongoing basis. Using a proactive approach, the Neutral Expert can also work with the project team to look ahead and avoid many disputes altogether by identifying and addressing potential problems before they happen.

However, there are some important problems to be solved.

## 1. Who can be a Neutral Expert and where the parties can find it?

Certain experts can be found in different experts registers, but today there are only official registers of experts according to the law of the certain country. There are no registers of ADR experts and Neutral Experts as well.

To solve this problem the International Register of Experts for

Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures (ADR) was established and is maintained by International Centre for Judicial Expertise of the European Arbitration Chamber (Brussels). This register includes not only experts from EU countries, but experts from non-EU countries as well. This register was founded firstly for experts in cross-border projects and claims.

## 2. How can one party be sure that the expert will be really neutral?

It is a very complicated problem and there are many tasks to be solved especially and first of all - between the parties. Nevertheless, the fundamental principal is – the parties should make a trilateral contract with an Expert or Expert Team.

Of course, there a lot of examples from our expert practice where after

appointing our team as a Neutral Expert the result was that the parties reached a negotiated settlement. Our expert report formed the basis of, and became an integral part of, the party's final decision and subsequent contract modification.

Dr Sergey Zakharov is a Partner in the ASN Expert Group (Czech Republic), head of International Centre for Judicial Expertise of the European Arbitration Chamber (Belgium), honorary member of the Czech Chamber of Court Experts, member of the European Expertise & Expert Institute (France), founder and member of the Board of the Russian Chamber of construction expert witnesses.

**NOTE - EuroExpert has its own Expert Witness location service for Accredited Expert Witnesses across Europe.**

**[www.euroexpert.org](http://www.euroexpert.org)**

### Neutral Expert Claim Service (NECS) is usually used in the following situations

- Hindrance and delay by other contractors.
- Hindrance and delay from engineering and design.
- Changed conditions.
- Effects of additional scope.
- Cost of multiple changes.
- Neutral expert fact-finding and adjudication.
- Litigation and expert witness support.

### Key Questions to Solve by NECS

- Who initiated certain changes?
- Scope change or minor change
- When to use contingency funds
- Change order amount approved versus funds spent
- Duplicated or inaccurate costs
- Inadequate documentation
- Claimed delays versus actual time
- Construction defects
- Effect on general conditions and administration costs.
- Who caused the delays, when, where, why, what extent
- Unknown conditions, claimed, verifiable.
- Adequacy of surveys, inspections, tests, etc.
- Design engineer, architect, project manager or contractor errors, who is responsible.
- Inadequate correspondence, meeting notes, etc



For these reasons you will find, beginning on the following pages, an interview that Dr. Alexander Schmidt, the in-house and legal advisor of the central association of the Austrian generally sworn and certified court experts, made with Dr Martin Schneider, Deputy Director General and Chief Information Officer and Mag. Christian Gesek, Senior Public Prosecutor both from the Federal Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Austria.

It becomes clear from these statements that it is about time to discuss the aspects, chances and risks of the future work situation of court experts, not only on a domestic level and in one member state alone but rather in a discourse comprising all members of EuroExpert.

EuroExpert provides a unique opportunity to air views and be at the forefront of this rapidly changing arena.

## More Changes to e-justice in Austria

# Court Experts, Courts of Justice, State Prosecutors – e-justice is proceeding!

Previously, in January 2014, this publication has reported in detail on the subject of “Court Experts and e-justice in Austria” (issue 2 of the third volume of EuroExpert). The rapid progress in the field of electronic communication and in particular the cross-border utilization of new technologies requires the court expert not only to face the challenges of the present time but also to keep an eye on future developments and to be part of them.

With the strategic initiative Justiz 3.0 the Austrian Federal Ministry of Justice has set itself the task of remodelling the future working places in the courts and in the State Prosecutor’s Offices, herein involving the professional groups concerned.

Thus modern technologies shall be used in a way that the justice system in spite of a steadily increasing workload and multiplying challenges can be enabled to manage its services provided for citizens and

enterprises in a modern and efficient manner.

Here the experts working for the courts and for the state prosecutors cannot stand idly by. It will rather be decisive for them in the future not to lose touch with technological developments but to help design their future working environment to be as useful as possible.

Matthias Rant  
is President of  
Hauptverband der  
allgemein beeideten  
und gerichtlich  
zertifizierten  
Sachverständigen  
Österreichs



Austrian Ministry of Justice in the Palace Trautson, Vienna

“Palais Trautson” by Thomas Ledl - Own work. Licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0 via Commons

Interview with the Austrian Federal Ministry of Justice

## Information Technology in Austrian Courts

**In the Austrian courts and public prosecutors' offices IT has been a valuable tool for managing day-to-day tasks for many years. Have the objectives pursued by IT changed? Which objectives are specifically pursued by the use of IT 3.0?**

For many decades the Austrian justice system has been a role model in Europe when it comes to using information technology successfully.

While in the 1990s the aim was, in particular, rationalisation through use of IT and full equipment of the entire justice system staff with IT systems, today the aim is to find the best possible IT support

for all the different user groups up to all-electronic handling of cases in the light of current technical trends and possibilities for the purposes of an overall view of the justice system.

This was already done in the past, e.g. by means of strategies such as the migration to service-oriented applications and agile development, re-use of functionalities, but the strategic initiative Justiz 3.0 initiated another large step.

The strategic initiative Justiz 3.0 plans to create an IT workplace for all staff of the justice system that integrates the existing Case Automation in the Justice System (Verfahrensautomation

Justiz/VJ) more comprehensively and, apart from providing a digital file that is available in a mobile form and can be structured individually, is thus ergonomic and combines all relevant advantages of a digital way of working. Apart from an advanced use of structuring tools and search tools, this also includes the creation of basic IT support for court cases as well as use of modern tools to support the operations, such as, e.g., by means of a cross-system calendar system and integrated processing of files, which enables binding communication between and within courts, prisons and the like independent of the

respective case. Measures to expand electronic legal communication (ELC) as well as the opening of additional electronic communication channels between the business sector and the citizens (e.g. electronic inspection of files) are on the digital agenda of the project as well. As the advisory board laid down the requirement that decision-making officers should be free to choose between file management on paper or electronic file management, modern IT equipment of the workplace and in the courtroom is to promote use of the provided digital tools.

In short, Justiz 3.0 intends to create a digital file and an electronic processing of files that by far outdoes traditional paper in terms of convenience and functionality and will therefore be welcomed by the staff.

**In what specific way does the Ministry of Justice intend to implement such a major project?**

Justiz 3.0 is a programme which consists of a bundle of different projects that are being realised in parallel even today.

During the first phase, which lasted a little bit over a year, areas such as “Incoming and Compilation of Files”, “Decisions and Orders” and “Workplace of the Decision-making Officer”



were considered in detail together with justice system staff from a large number of user groups and areas in different specialised working groups.

In addition to and based on the results formulated in the specialised working groups the future architectures of information systems and technologies were designed.

An overall report concluding phase 1 was published in mid-2014.

Based on that report and the implementation plan contained therein, phase 2 of Justiz 3.0 was started, and currently several parallel projects are carried out to establish the bases of digital file management. Among other things, the prerequisites for a viable Austrian-wide scanning process and text recognition, a file document management and workflow system are being created.

A pilot run for fully digital file management has been envisaged for March 2016, which is intended to provide the basis for further development and improvement steps.

What effects will this intensive use of IT have on the day-to-day work of court staff, lawyers, notaries and other agencies dealing with the justice system?

A turn to fully digital file management and further

development of electronic communication can be seen as centrepieces of the results of Justiz 3.0 that have been obtained so far, which are expected to have a number of advantages for all those who are involved in the work of the justice system.

Provided that the relevant party possesses the necessary authorisation, the digital file may be accessed by several parties simultaneously at any point in time. This leads to an elimination of waiting times and shortens the duration of legal proceedings. Accordingly, files can be inspected and information can be obtained at any time, and it will also be easier to make file copies.

Due to the possibility of accessing files by means of mobile devices from anywhere, time-consuming and costly transportation of paper files will no longer be necessary, on the one hand, and easier handling of file management provides benefits in certain work situations such as on-site court hearings, on the other.

In future, the entire text of a file may be searched and text passages may easily be transferred through Copy & Paste. The contents of the file can be flexibly structured, i.e. one can choose between any of the offered standard views or a structure according to specific preferences which have been adapted to the

subject matter of the case or the working method of the decision-making officer.

From the above we are expecting easier file studies and, thus, easier preparation of hearings and easier drafting and writing of decisions.

It is planned that data from digital file management "automatically" generates the major part of necessary register information and statistical data, where possible, and thereby provides more precise information, on the one hand, and relieves justice system staff of such tasks, on the other.

Further development of electronic communication channels both within the justice system and with customers of the justice system is intended to increase existing potential for cost reductions and for expediting proceedings, which also includes an expansion of current possibilities to inspect files electronically.

Ideally, the possibility to inspect files electronically will be used more and more due to the considerably larger offer of information as a result of digital availability of all parts of a file.

**There are more than 9,000 court-appointed and certified experts in Austria. What can they expect in future? In what way will their working conditions as assistants of the justice system change? In what form will court-appointed experts be involved in the development of the new IT structure?**

The group of court-appointed and certified experts makes an indispensable contribution to the operation of the justice system. The most important changes in that cooperation will be the effects of increased electronic communication.

Sending paper files to the expert in preparation for drawing up the expert opinion as this has been required so far will be replaced by electronic provision of the file contents in future; especially in this case "serial" transmission of files to one expert at a time as this is still done today will be replaced by parallel and simultaneous transmission of information.

Above all, this effect seems to be suited to significantly contribute to making proceedings faster.

On the other hand, most expert opinions and other documents from experts will be sent to the judicial authorities electronically, which process has already begun. The technical conditions are highly favourable

thanks to the fact that experts are equipped with suitable digital certificates throughout Austria.

**Experts in Austria already transmit opinions to the courts offices electronically on a voluntary basis. What does the Ministry think about imposing an obligation to use the new technologies on them as well as on legal and other professional partners of the justice system? Will any extra work that becomes necessary be remunerated as is the case with lawyers?**

Digital transformation has extended to nearly all areas of life, both at work and at home.

Therefore, experts prepare most of their expert opinions electronically, which is why electronic transmission is merely the logical consequence and continuation of that development.

It should also be considered that fully electronic proceedings require digitalisation of all contents. Presenting documents in hard copy therefore means a disruption of the medium, which leads to unnecessary work and a quite considerable loss of quality. However, all users will benefit from fully digital files of top quality, as will experts when they prepare their opinions.

We therefore plan to introduce an obligation to use new technologies from 1 July 2016; the formulation of the planned statutory provision will take into account the technical and staff-related framework conditions that are available to experts, as this has been done in this area so far.

There should be no extra work compared to sending expert opinions by post.

**What added value do you see for experts in connection with the IT 3.0 project?**

In the outlined projects I see an opportunity for both sides to further develop and improve the successful cooperation.

The entire justice system, including all contributors, will benefit from the described advantages, which will enable optimised handling of proceedings.

Thus, Justiz 3.0 ensures that requirements can be met on an adequate and state-of-the-art platform.

Dr. Alexander Schmidt, Interviewed Dr Martin Schneider, Deputy Director General and Chief Information Officer and Mag. Christian Gesek, Senior Public Prosecutor both from the Federal Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Austria.

## Members of EuroExpert



**Austria**  
Hauptverband der allgemein beeideten und gerichtlich zertifizierten Sachverständigen Österreichs

**Croatia**  
Hrvatsko društvo sudskih vještaka

**Czech Republic**  
Komora soudních znalců ČR

**Germany**  
Bundesverband öffentlich bestellter und vereidigter sowie qualifizierter Sachverständiger e. V.

**Hungary**  
Budapesti Igazságügyi Szakértői Kamara

**Portugal**  
Associação Portuguesa dos Avaliadores de Engenharia

**Spain**  
Asociación Española de Peritos Tasadores Judiciales

**United Kingdom**  
The Academy of Experts

**Secretary General:**  
Bernhard Floter  
+49 (0)221 9127710  
secretary-general@euroexpert.org

### Associate Members

**Russia**  
Российская Палата Строительных Экспертов

**Switzerland**  
Swiss Chamber of Technical and Scientific Forensic Experts

**Chairman:**  
Nicola Cohen CAE  
+44 (0)20 7430 0333  
chairman@euroexpert.org

[www.EuroExpert.org](http://www.EuroExpert.org)  
For further information about the e-bulletin or EuroExpert