

## State Administrative Tribunal

Western Australia

Conferral of Experts: chaired conferral of experts and other relevant considerations when appearing before the State Administrative Tribunal

Senior Member Maurice Spillane

**Local Government Planners Association Breakfast UWA Club Crawley WA** 

22 August 2013



## Introduction - The use of expert evidence in SAT

- **SAT**
  - reviews (hears administrative appeals against)
    the vast majority of administrative decisions made
    by State and local government authorities and
    officials, in respect of which review (appeal) rights
    are conferred
  - exercises original jurisdiction in specialist statutory areas, such as guardianship and administration, building disputes, strata titles, land compensation and commercial tenancy matters



- determines review and disciplinary
   proceedings in relation to vocations licensed under State law
- Expert evidence is a feature in many areas of SAT's broad jurisdiction, such as vocational regulation, guardianship and administration, town planning, building disputes, natural resources and land valuation proceedings



- SAT's main objectives are -
  - to achieve the resolution of questions,
     complaints or disputes, and make or review decisions, fairly and according to the
     substantial merits of the case
  - to act as speedily and with as little formality
     and technicality as is practicable, and minimise
     the costs to the parties
  - to make appropriate use of the knowledge and experience of Tribunal members

(State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004 (WA) s 9)



- Consistently with these objectives and in order to maximise the value of expert evidence given to the Tribunal, SAT has adopted a **model for expert evidence** which includes -
  - articulation of expert witness' obligations to
     Tribunal
  - written statement of expert witness' evidence
  - conferral and joint statement of expert witnesses
  - concurrent evidence of expert witnesses at final hearing



#### Conferral and joint statement of expert witnesses

- Expert evidence in chief is generally by written statement filed and exchanged usually two weeks before final hearing
- In most types of proceedings, **expert witnesses** in **each field** are generally required to **confer with one another** before final hearing, in the absence of the parties or their representatives (either on their own or before a SAT member), and to **prepare and file a joint statement** of -



- the issues arising in the proceeding which are within their expertise
- the matters upon which they agree in relation to those issues
- the matters upon which they disagree in relation to those issues
- the reasons for any disagreement
- Conferral may be 'chaired' or 'unchaired' by SAT
- A party will not be permitted to present any evidence inconsistent with any agreement in the joint statement unless the Tribunal grants leave





## Experts in the 'hot tub' - Concurrent expert evidence

'Concurrent expert evidence ... reflects an important change in practice. In New South Wales, in particular, as well in many administrative tribunals, it is becoming increasingly common for expert evidence to be taken from a number of experts at the same time ("in the hot tub"), thereby allowing experts to engage in debate with one another, issues more effectively to be crystallised for the court and new forms of cross-examination to make experts accountable for their views.'

(Ian Freckelton SC and Hugh Selby *Expert Evidence Law, Practice, Procedure and Advocacy* (Lawbook Co., Sydney, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2009) page xxii)



- Concurrent expert evidence is significantly different to the traditional method of placing expert opinion evidence before a decision-maker and is a response to 'the apparent escalating disillusionment' with that model (Freckelton and Selby, page 497, note 1) -
  - Delay between experts in the same field
  - Lack of direct interaction and response between experts
  - Evidence only given through the medium of parties' questions
  - Expert may not initiate discussion
  - Cross-examination forensic battle
  - Encourages adoption of a partisan and defensive position



- Concurrent evidence involves the witnesses -
  - sitting together in the witness box
  - being asked questions by the Tribunal, generally on the basis of the joint statement
  - being given the opportunity and encouraged by the
     Tribunal to respond directly to each other's evidence
  - being given an opportunity to ask each other any questions they think might assist the Tribunal
  - being asked questions by the parties or representatives



- The **Tribunal sets** the **order** in which topics are addressed, but may first discuss this with the parties or representatives
- The **Tribunal** leads 'a structured professional discussion between peers in the relevant field.' (New South Wales Law Reform Commission, *Expert Witnesses*, NSWLRC Report 109 (NSWLRC, Sydney, 2005)



# Benefits

- Emphasises that experts are there to assist the Tribunal to resolve the matter the 'symbolic and practical importance of removing the experts from their positions in the camp of the party who called them'
- Enables and encourages expert witnesses to maintain their role as experts and not become advocates for a cause or participants in a forensic contest
- Facilitates the identification of points of professional agreement as early as possible and enables focus on the real areas of professional disagreement and the reasons for it



- All evidence in relation to a topic is given at the same time and expert witnesses are able to directly question and respond to their colleagues' evidence
- Improves the quality of the expert evidence
- Improves the quality and utility of questions asked by parties and their representatives
- Saves considerable time and costs
- Encourages experts who might be unwilling to subject themselves to the traditional approach to be expert witnesses
- Greatly assists prompt and reliable decision-making