GAR Global Arbitration Review

The Guide to Evidence in International Arbitration - Third Edition

Best practices for presenting quantum evidence

The Guide to Evidence in International Arbitration - Third Edition

Released to coincide with the new IBA rules on evidence, *The Guide to Evidence in International Arbitration* steers a course through what can otherwise be one of the most divisive topics in international arbitration. The Guide to Evidence in International Arbitration fills a gap in the literature by bringing together law and practice and providing a holistic view of the issues surrounding evidence in international arbitration, from strategic, cultural and ethical questions to what to do in certain settings. Along the way it offers various proposals for improvements to the received approach.

Generated: September 11, 2025

Best practices for presenting quantum evidence

Owain Stone
Alvarez & Marsal

Summary

EVOLUTION OF EXPERT EVIDENCE PRESENTATION
FROM TRADITIONAL CROSS-EXAMINATION TO MORE COOPERATIVE APPROACHES
AUSTRALIAN INNOVATION AND GLOBAL ADOPTION
CRAFTING EFFECTIVE EXPERT INSTRUCTIONS AND SCOPE MANAGEMENT
PREPARING COMPELLING EXPERT REPORTS
MANAGING EXPERT CONFERENCES AND COOPERATIVE PROCESSES
PRESENTING EVIDENCE AT HEARINGS
TECHNOLOGY AND MODERN PRACTICE
FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND EMERGING TRENDS
CONCLUSION

This chapter draws from extensive experience serving as a quantum expert witness across numerous jurisdictions and international arbitrations. Over that time, I have seen, at first hand, how the presentation of quantum (damages) evidence can have a significant effect on the outcome of a case. The landscape of expert evidence presentation has evolved significantly during this time, with new procedural innovations, technological advances and changing expectations from tribunals and courts. What follows represents practical insights gained from hundreds of expert assignments, reflecting not just the theoretical best practices but real-world lessons learned along the way.

EVOLUTION OF EXPERT EVIDENCE PRESENTATION

Expert evidence serves as a critical bridge between complex technical, financial or industry-specific matters and the legal framework of a dispute. Quantum experts, in particular, translate intricate economic effects into quantifiable damages, providing the trier of fact with the necessary tools for informed decision-making. The increasing complexity of international commercial and investment disputes necessitates highly specialised insights that often extend beyond the purview of legal practitioners alone. The fundamental role of expert witnesses is to assist the tribunal in understanding these nuances, ensuring a well-informed assessment of the issues at hand. This assistance is not merely about presenting calculations; it involves elucidating methodologies, clarifying assumptions and providing a clear opinion explained with a coherent narrative that enables the tribunal to grasp the economic realities of a dispute.

For many years, the traditional adversarial approach to expert evidence has faced significant scrutiny. Experts themselves have voiced concerns that the process, at times, falls short of 'achieving the better education of trier(s) of fact'.[1] Common critiques have included the perception of experts acting as hired guns, a lack of clarity on the precise points of agreement and disagreement, and the often-protracted 'intellectual table tennis' of sequential reports that can extend into double digits.[2] This iterative process often leads to inefficiencies and can obscure, rather than clarify, the core issues.

FROM TRADITIONAL CROSS-EXAMINATION TO MORE COOPERATIVE APPROACHES

When I began providing expert evidence in the mid-1990s, the traditional approach dominated: Prepare your report, survive cross-examination and hope the tribunal understood your technical analysis. The expert witness was largely a passive participant, responding to questions rather than actively educating the decision makers. This adversarial model, while still prevalent in many jurisdictions, has often given way to more cooperative and educational approaches that better serve the ultimate goal of assisting tribunals in understanding complex quantum issues.

The shift towards what might be termed 'expert collaboration' has been driven by several factors. Tribunals increasingly recognise that technical disputes benefit from expert dialogue rather than mere advocacy. The traditional phenomenon of 'ships passing in the night', where experts appeared to address entirely different questions, has been largely addressed through procedural innovations such as joint expert conferences, concurrent evidence and structured expert dialogue.

Our experience suggests that this evolution has been particularly pronounced in quantum matters, where the technical complexity of financial models, valuation methodologies and economic analysis demands more sophisticated presentation techniques. The days when

an expert could simply present their calculations and expect the tribunal to follow complex financial reasoning without extensive explanation are largely behind us.

AUSTRALIAN INNOVATION AND GLOBAL ADOPTION

Australia's development of concurrent evidence and expert conferences in the 1970s, beginning with the Competition Tribunal, represents one of the most significant procedural innovations in expert evidence presentation. These innovations have had a transformative effect on how expert evidence, including quantum evidence, is presented and understood. These days it is rare for these techniques not to be used in any but the simplest of cases, whether in Australian courts or arbitrations with a connection to Australia.

The key insight underlying these innovations is that experts, when largely freed from the constraints of formal cross-examination and allowed to engage directly with each other, can provide much clearer exposition of their disagreements and the technical reasoning underlying their positions. This is particularly valuable in quantum disputes, where differences in methodology, assumptions or data interpretation can lead to vastly different damage calculations.

International arbitration has been at the forefront of adopting these techniques, partly due to the procedural flexibility that characterises arbitral proceedings. The incorporation of witness conferencing guidelines into international arbitration practice reflects the global recognition of these innovations' value. However, as someone who has participated in expert conferences across multiple jurisdictions, I can confirm that successful implementation requires careful planning and active tribunal management.

CRAFTING EFFECTIVE EXPERT INSTRUCTIONS AND SCOPE MANAGEMENT

FOUNDATION OF PERSUASIVE EXPERT EVIDENCE

As Voltaire is said to have commented: 'Judge a [person] by [their] questions rather than [their] answers.' The quality of expert instructions can fundamentally determine the effectiveness of quantum evidence presentation.

Poorly drafted instructions are a common cause of ineffective expert reports and confused tribunal decision-making. This section addresses the critical elements of instruction-drafting from the perspective of someone who has received hundreds of expert briefs across various types of quantum disputes.

The most effective instructions I have received share several characteristics. They clearly delineate the scope of the assignment while providing sufficient flexibility to address related technical issues that may arise during analysis. They clearly identify any instructed assumptions, while allowing the expert sufficient scope to make their own assumptions where appropriate. Overly prescriptive instructions risk constraining the expert's ability to provide comprehensive technical analysis, while overly broad instructions can lead to unfocused reports that fail to address the key issues in dispute.

COLLABORATIVE INSTRUCTION DEVELOPMENT

The best results often occur when instructions are developed through early consultation between counsel and the expert. This collaborative approach allows the expert to identify potential technical complexities, suggest alternative analytical approaches and highlight areas where additional information may be required. From a practical perspective, this early

engagement has consistently resulted in more focused analysis and more persuasive expert reports.

The development of clear concise instructions can also be facilitated by the use of consulting experts, colloquially known as 'dirty experts'. Although there are cost considerations from having both testifying and consulting experts, for the more complex cases involving large damages claims, it is essential. However, the involvement of a consulting expert does not remove the need for early discussions between the testifying expert and counsel.

One particularly effective approach I have encountered involves staging the instruction process. Initial instructions establish the broad parameters of the assignment and identify key legal and factual assumptions. Following preliminary analysis, supplementary instructions can address specific technical issues that emerge and refine the analytical framework. This iterative approach accommodates the reality that quantum analysis often reveals complexities not apparent at the outset of an assignment.

MANAGING MULTIPLE EXPERT COORDINATION

The timing of expert work-product delivery requires careful orchestration since complex quantum disputes may increasingly involve multiple experts addressing different aspects of the damages analysis, which can give rise to 'nested expert reports', where one expert's report forms the basis of an instructed assumption for the next expert witness. The successful coordination of multiple experts requires clear delineation of responsibilities and careful attention to the interfaces between different experts' work. Technical experts (such as engineers or industry specialists) typically must complete their analysis before the quantum expert can finalise their damage calculations. This sequencing can create scheduling challenges, particularly when expert deadlines are compressed. Early identification of these dependencies and realistic scheduling is essential for avoiding last-minute complications that can compromise the quality of expert analysis.

Effective coordination begins with ensuring that all expert witnesses, whichever party they are instructed by, operate under consistent legal and factual assumptions and, to the extent necessary, the same set of documents. Variations in these fundamental parameters can create apparent disagreements between experts that reflect differences in instructions or documents (or both) rather than genuine technical disputes. I have seen cases where experts might have appeared to have fundamental disagreements about valuation methodology when the real issue was that they were valuing different scenarios or applying different legal frameworks.

PRESERVING EXPERT INDEPENDENCE WITHIN INSTRUCTIONAL FRAMEWORKS

The requirement for expert independence creates a fundamental tension in instruction drafting. Instructions must provide sufficient guidance to ensure the expert addresses relevant issues while preserving the expert's ability to reach independent conclusions. This balance is particularly delicate in quantum matters, where the expert's analytical choices can significantly affect damage calculations.

Legal assumptions represent one area where this tension is most apparent. Quantum experts routinely receive instructions to assume certain legal conclusions (such as whether particular government actions constitute expropriation or whether certain contractual provisions are enforceable). These assumptions are appropriate and necessary, as they allow the expert to provide analysis relevant to the legal framework being argued by counsel.

However, instructions that venture into areas of technical methodology or require the expert to adopt specific analytical approaches that conflict with their professional judgment raise independence concerns. I have encountered instructions that prescribed specific discount rates, required particular valuation methodologies, or mandated acceptance of certain industry benchmarks without adequate supporting analysis. Such instructions risk transforming the expert from an independent analyst into an advocate for predetermined conclusions. All instructions need to be capable of being proven, which is something that all instructing lawyers should bear in mind when trying to be overly prescriptive with instructions.

The most effective approach to preserving independence while providing necessary guidance involves clearly distinguishing between legal or factual assumptions (which the expert should accept as instructed) and technical methodology (which should remain within the expert's professional discretion). When counsel have strong views about technical approaches, these are best addressed through professional discussion rather than mandatory instruction.

PREPARING COMPELLING EXPERT REPORTS

AUDIENCE-FOCUSED REPORT STRUCTURE

The most persuasive reports are those written with a clear understanding of the tribunal's needs and constraints. Tribunals in complex quantum disputes face the challenge of understanding technical analysis while managing extensive factual records and legal arguments. While individual styles may differ, expert reports that acknowledge these constraints and structure their content accordingly are invariably more effective. Unfortunately, too many expert reports contain several pages of rambling analysis before their opinions are dropped on the unsuspecting reader, without clear reasoning or structure.

The executive summary has emerged as perhaps the most critical component of quantum expert reports. Tribunal members often form their initial understanding of the expert's analysis based on the executive summary, making its clarity and comprehensiveness essential. An effective executive summary should provide sufficient detail for tribunal members to understand the expert's key conclusions and the analytical framework supporting those conclusions, while serving as a road map for the detailed analysis that follows.

The body of the report should be structured to build the tribunal's understanding progressively. Starting with the answers to the questions put to the expert, followed by the analytical framework and methodology before diving into detailed calculations helps tribunal members follow the expert's reasoning. This approach contrasts with reports that present the expert's conclusions without adequate foundation in methodology and assumptions.

It may appear trite but effective use of footnotes, internal cross-references, table numbers and references to analysis and data used can help the tribunal to digest the information provided, particularly if there are extensive appendices and annexures.

The length of an expert report does not necessarily correlate with quality, much less clarity. Mark Twain's comment that 'I didn't have time to write a short letter, so I wrote a long one instead' is an adage that many experts should ponder. Often, less is more!

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS PRESENTATION

Quantum analysis often involves complex financial models with hundreds of variables and assumptions. The challenge lies in presenting the analysis in a manner that allows tribunal members to understand both the overall analytical approach and the key drivers of the expert's conclusions. The most effective approach involves layering the presentation from high-level methodology to detailed calculations.

Visual presentation of analytical results has become increasingly important as quantum disputes have grown more complex. Well-designed charts and graphs can clarify analytical relationships that would be difficult to understand from textual description alone. However, visual aids must be carefully integrated with textual explanations to ensure tribunal members understand both what the graphics show and why the depicted relationships are significant.

The treatment of alternative scenarios and sensitivity analysis represents another critical aspect of quantum report preparation. Tribunals often find it helpful to understand how different assumptions or legal conclusions would affect damage calculations; not all assumptions are equal in their effect. This information assists in their ultimate decision-making by clarifying which analytical elements are most significant to the overall conclusion.

MANAGING COMPLEX DATA AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Modern quantum disputes often involve extensive data analysis, particularly in cases involving long-term projects or complex commercial relationships. The expert report must present this analysis in a manner that allows tribunal members to understand both the data sources and the analytical techniques employed. This presentation challenge has been complicated by the increasing volume of electronic data available in contemporary disputes.

Native format production of supporting materials has become standard practice, but this creates both opportunities and challenges for expert report preparation. While native format documents allow more detailed analysis, they also require careful organisation and presentation to ensure tribunal members can follow the expert's analytical trail. Providing clear references to specific cells in financial models, along with explanatory text describing the calculations, helps tribunal members understand complex analytical relationships. This also makes it easier for the expert when subject to examination in the witness box, whether in concurrent evidence or the more traditional approach; clear references (often through footnotes) make it easier for everyone to follow the mathematics and logic of damages calculations. There are few aspects of being examined that are likely to be less productive or useful to the tribunal than counsel trying to ask an expert how Cell [x] relates to Cell [z] in a spreadsheet.

Subject to the expert's instructions, the verification and validation of data inputs may represent a critical but often underemphasised aspect of quantum analysis. If within the expert's scope, their report should clearly describe the steps taken to verify data accuracy and identify any limitations or uncertainties in the underlying information. This transparency builds tribunal confidence in the expert's analysis and helps identify areas where additional information might be beneficial.

MANAGING EXPERT CONFERENCES AND COOPERATIVE PROCESSES

MECHANICS OF EXPERT COLLABORATION

Expert conferences have become a standard feature of quantum disputes in many jurisdictions, particularly those in or connected with Australia. They have potential value in

clarifying technical disagreements and focusing tribunal attention on the most significant issues in dispute. However, successful expert conferences require careful preparation and active management to achieve their intended objectives.

Pre-conference preparation should begin with a thorough review of all expert reports and supporting materials. The goal is not merely to understand the opposing expert's conclusions but to comprehend their analytical framework and identify the specific points where methodological or factual disagreements arise. This preparation allows for more focused discussion during the conference itself.

The conference agenda typically follows the structure of the quantum analysis, addressing methodology, key assumptions, data sources and calculations in sequence. However, the most productive conferences often involve departures from rigid agenda adherence when productive technical dialogue develops around particular issues. The key is maintaining a focus on technical matters while allowing sufficient flexibility for genuine professional exchange.

JOINT REPORT PREPARATION

The joint report emerging from expert conferences represents one of the most valuable documents in quantum disputes. When properly prepared, these reports provide tribunals with clear identification of agreed facts, precise articulation of disagreements and insight into the technical reasoning underlying different analytical approaches. However, preparing effective joint reports requires balancing comprehensiveness with clarity.

The most effective joint reports follow a clear structure: agreed methodology and principles, agreed factual inputs, areas of disagreement with specific reasoning and quantification of the impact of different approaches. This structure allows tribunal members to distinguish between disagreements about fundamental methodology and disputes about specific parameters or assumptions.

One challenge in joint report preparation involves managing the level of detail included in the document. Overly detailed joint reports can obscure the key issues in dispute, while overly summarised reports may not provide sufficient information for tribunal decision-making. The most effective approach involves providing summary-level discussion in the main joint report while referring to detailed supporting analysis in appendices or expert reports.

Historically, there was some jostling by experts involved in a conference when deciding which expert was going to 'hold the pen' when drafting of the joint expert report started. It was thought there might be some forensic advantage through being akin to the editor of the joint report. However, the increased use of collaborative platforms such as SharePoint, together with an increased use of facilitators, has made this issue less relevant.

MANAGING EXPERT DYNAMICS

Expert conferences bring together professionals with different analytical approaches, methodological preferences and communication styles, as well as different expectations of how much of an advocate for their respective client they are supposed to be. Managing these dynamics to achieve productive technical dialogue requires both professional maturity and active facilitation. The most successful conferences occur when experts focus on technical analysis rather than advocacy for their respective clients' positions. However, this can be challenging when one or more of the experts is clearly trying to be more of an advocate for their client.

The role of the facilitator, where one is appointed, is critical to conference success. Effective facilitators keep discussions focused on technical matters, ensure all experts have opportunities to express their views and help identify areas of genuine agreement. However, facilitators must balance active management with allowing sufficient space for professional dialogue to develop naturally. In general, the use of a facilitator is recommended to minimise the chances of one or more experts trying to exert themselves on the process and prevail through weight of personality.

The absence of legal counsel from expert conferences creates a different dynamic from traditional expert examination. The apparent 'lack of adult supervision' during the expert conference can be exceedingly challenging for lawyers, who like at least to attempt to control the narrative throughout a dispute. However, the lack of legal representation in the expert conference can encourage an environment that allows for more direct technical exchange and requires experts to take greater responsibility for ensuring their positions are clearly articulated and understood. Preparation for this environment involves not just technical readiness but also consideration of how to communicate complex technical concepts to other experts who may have different analytical backgrounds.

NOT A NEGOTIATION OR MEDIATION

It is important for all the experts to understand their role in the joint expert conference. The aim is to bring clarity to the tribunal on where the experts agree and disagree, and why they disagree. To the extent that agreement on issues can be reached, perhaps because there is a computational error that the expert now corrects, that can be useful. However, it is the nature of a complex world that reasonable experts may differ in their opinions. The joint expert conference is neither a mediation nor a negotiation. It is not appropriate for an expert to be saying to another expert, 'You concede on this and I will concede on that', if only because the tribunal may neither agree with the concessions nor understand the basis for such concessions.

PRESENTING EVIDENCE AT HEARINGS

DIRECT EXAMINATION AND OPENING PRESENTATIONS

The hearing represents the culmination of weeks and often months of analytical work and report preparation. Effective presentation at hearings requires different skills from those needed for report writing, emphasising verbal communication, visual presentation and real-time interaction with tribunal members. The most effective hearing presentations combine clear technical explanation with responsiveness to tribunal questions and concerns.

Opening presentations have become increasingly common in quantum expert evidence. These presentations provide opportunities to establish the analytical framework, highlight key conclusions and address areas likely to be explored during examination. However, effective opening presentations require careful balance between comprehensiveness and focus. Attempting to cover too much material can overwhelm tribunal members, while overly narrow presentations may not provide an adequate foundation for subsequent examination. It is also essential that the expert, who should advocate for their opinions, is not seen as an advocate for the client paying their bills – a difficult balance in a report and arguably more so in an opening presentation.

The use of visual aids in quantum evidence presentation can be crucial. Well-designed graphs, diagrams and charts can help to clarify complex analytical relationships and help tribunal members follow the underlying calculations. However, visual aids must be carefully integrated with verbal presentation to ensure tribunal members understand both the content being displayed and its significance to the overall analysis. Providing hard copies of presentation materials allows tribunal members to follow along more effectively and take notes on specific slides.

CROSS-EXAMINATION STRATEGIES

Cross-examination of quantum experts typically focuses on methodology, assumptions, data sources and alternative analytical approaches. Effective preparation for cross-examination involves anticipating likely areas of challenge and ensuring familiarity with all supporting materials and calculations. This preparation extends beyond the expert's own analysis to include an understanding of the opposing experts' positions and potential areas of vulnerability in their approach.

The availability of native format models during cross-examination has transformed the dynamics of quantum expert examination. Real-time exploration of model calculations allows examining counsel to test the expert's understanding of their own analysis and identify potential errors or inconsistencies. However, this capability requires experts to maintain thorough familiarity with their models and be prepared to explain specific calculations or assumptions in detail. This feature is becoming rarer, as an outcome of joint expert conferences is that errors or inconsistencies may be rectified in the joint expert report.

One particularly effective cross-examination approach involves exploring sensitivity analysis and alternative scenarios. By testing how different assumptions affect the expert's conclusions, examining counsel can help tribunal members understand which analytical elements are most significant to the damage calculation. Experts should be prepared to discuss these sensitivities and explain why their chosen assumptions are appropriate. It is almost always the case that an expert should concede that if a particular assumption (whether instructed or otherwise) is changed, then the outcome of the experts' calculations will necessarily change.

MANAGING TECHNOLOGY AND VIRTUAL HEARINGS

The increasing prevalence of virtual hearings has created new challenges and opportunities for quantum expert evidence presentation. Virtual hearings require greater attention to technical setup, document presentation and interaction with tribunal members. However, they also provide opportunities for more sophisticated visual presentation and real-time document sharing.

Document management in virtual hearings requires careful preparation. Experts need access to all supporting materials in electronic format, organised for efficient navigation during examination. Multiple monitor setups have become standard, allowing simultaneous access to hearing proceedings, supporting documents and analytical models. However, this technological complexity requires advance testing and backup preparation.

The reduced visual cues available in virtual hearings affect both expert testimony and tribunal interaction. Experts must pay greater attention to verbal communication and ensure their technical explanations are sufficiently detailed to compensate for limited visual feedback. Similarly, responding to tribunal questions requires greater care in ensuring the

question is fully understood before providing detailed technical responses. When the tribunal are writing and not looking at you, then it is best to pause. However, those visual clues can be more difficult to pick up when in a virtual hearing. One trick, if you have control of the screens available to you, is to make sure that the camera facing the arbitrator or panel is pinned to the centre of your screen so you can focus on that while talking and, hopefully, see more clearly what the tribunal are doing.

TECHNOLOGY AND MODERN PRACTICE

DIGITAL MODEL MANAGEMENT AND PRODUCTION

Native format production has become standard practice but this creates challenges for model organisation and documentation. Models developed for analytical purposes may not be optimally structured for litigation use, requiring reorganisation to ensure clarity and accessibility. This process should include clear documentation of key assumptions, data sources and calculation methodologies to facilitate understanding by non-experts.

Version control represents a critical but often overlooked aspect of model management in litigation. As analysis evolves and new information becomes available, maintaining clear records of model changes and their rationale becomes essential. This documentation serves both to support the expert's testimony and to provide transparency to opposing parties and tribunals.

DATA ANALYTICS AND VISUALISATION

The increasing availability of electronic data has expanded the scope of quantum analysis while creating new challenges for data management and presentation. Large data sets require sophisticated analytical techniques, but the results must be presented in ways that allow tribunal members to understand both the analytical approach and the significance of the results.

Data visualisation has emerged as a critical skill for quantum experts. Effective charts and graphs can clarify patterns in complex data sets that would be difficult to understand from numerical tables alone. However, visualisation must be carefully balanced with detailed supporting analysis to ensure tribunal members understand both what the graphics show and why the depicted relationships are significant.

The verification and validation of large data sets may present significant challenges in quantum analysis, particularly when data sets involve multiple sources or complex processing procedures.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYTICAL ENHANCEMENT

Emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning, are beginning to affect quantum analysis in international arbitration. These technologies offer opportunities for more sophisticated pattern recognition and predictive analysis, but they also raise questions about transparency and verifiability that must be addressed in expert evidence presentation.

The use of AI-enhanced analysis tools requires careful consideration of how to explain analytical methodologies to tribunal members who may not be familiar with these technologies. Expert reports must provide sufficient detail about analytical techniques to allow tribunal members to understand and evaluate the reliability of the results. This

requirement may involve balancing technical accuracy with accessibility for non-expert audiences.

Validation of AI-enhanced analysis presents particular challenges, as the complex algorithms underlying these tools may not be easily explainable in traditional terms. Experts using these technologies must develop approaches for demonstrating the reliability and appropriateness of their analytical techniques while maintaining the transparency expected in litigation contexts.

It will be interesting to see how arbitration institutions evolve their thinking about the use of AI, including generative AI in expert evidence (and beyond). A recent Practice Note from the New South Wales Supreme Court now requires experts to seek permission from the court before using generative AI in expert engagements.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND EMERGING TRENDS

EVOLUTION OF EXPERT COOPERATION

The trend towards greater expert cooperation is likely to continue, driven by tribunal preferences for clearer technical exposition and more efficient dispute resolution. Further developments of structured expert dialogue techniques are anticipated, possibly including expanded use of technical workshops and multi-stage expert conferences. These innovations would allow for more detailed technical exchange while maintaining the benefits of expert independence.

International arbitration's procedural flexibility positions it at the forefront of these developments. Arbitrators' willingness to experiment with innovative procedures, combined with party autonomy in procedure design, creates opportunities for further refinement of expert cooperation techniques. The success of these innovations in arbitration may subsequently influence court practice in various jurisdictions.

One area of particular development involves the integration of expert collaboration with alternative dispute resolution techniques. Technical workshops conducted in mediation or early neutral evaluation contexts may help resolve quantum disputes without the need for formal arbitration or litigation. This approach could provide significant cost and time advantages while maintaining the benefits of expert technical analysis.

Another approach to expert evidence in arbitrations is to order the first expert report to be the joint report (i.e., no single expert reports initially). This reflects how useful arbitrators find such reports and the costs that are often incurred with single experts' reports, responsive reports, etc. This approach requires the experts to be instructed with the same set or sets of questions, the same assumptions and the same documents. Some arbitrators, and even some judges, are pushing for this approach but it does not seem to have yet received universal approval.

TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION AND VIRTUAL PROCEDURES

The acceleration of virtual hearings during the covid-19 pandemic has permanently changed expectations about using technology in the presentation of expert evidence. Future practice is likely to involve hybrid approaches that combine the benefits of in-person interaction with the efficiency and accessibility of virtual procedures. This evolution requires continued development of technological capabilities and procedural frameworks.

Advanced virtual reality and augmented reality technologies may eventually enhance expert evidence presentation by allowing more immersive demonstration of complex technical concepts. These technologies could be particularly valuable in quantum disputes involving physical assets or complex operational processes that benefit from visual demonstration.

The development of collaborative analytical platforms may facilitate real-time expert interaction during conferences and hearings. These platforms could allow experts to modify and test analytical models in real time, providing tribunals with immediate feedback on the implications of different assumptions or methodological approaches.

REGULATORY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The increasing sophistication of quantum expert evidence is driving the development of professional standards and best practices. Professional organisations are beginning to develop specific guidance for expert witness work, including standards for analytical methodology, report preparation and hearing presentation. These developments may lead to greater standardisation of expert practice across jurisdictions.

Educational programmes focused specifically on expert witness skills are emerging to address the unique requirements of litigation support work. These programmes recognise that effective expert witness practice requires skills beyond technical expertise, including communication, visual presentation and understanding of legal processes. The development of these educational resources should improve the overall quality of expert evidence presentation.

The international nature of many quantum disputes is driving convergence of expert evidence practices across different legal systems. While jurisdictional differences will continue to exist, the fundamental principles of effective expert evidence presentation are increasingly recognised as universal. This convergence may facilitate more efficient expert practice in multi-jurisdictional disputes.

INTEGRATION WITH SETTLEMENT AND MEDIATION

The increasing use of expert evidence in settlement negotiations and mediation processes is changing how quantum experts approach their work. Analysis prepared for these alternative dispute resolution contexts may require different emphasis and presentation techniques compared with traditional litigation or arbitration. Experts must be prepared to adapt their analytical approaches to support various dispute resolution processes.

Early expert involvement in dispute resolution may become more common, with experts providing preliminary analysis to support settlement negotiations before formal proceedings commence. This approach could provide significant cost advantages while ensuring that settlement discussions are informed by realistic assessments of potential quantum outcomes.

The development of expedited expert procedures for smaller disputes may expand access to sophisticated quantum analysis for cases that cannot justify traditional expert costs. These procedures might involve simplified analytical frameworks, streamlined reporting requirements or innovative fee structures that make expert analysis more accessible.

CONCLUSION

The landscape of quantum expert evidence presentation continues to evolve, driven by technological advancement, procedural innovation and changing tribunal expectations. The

most effective practitioners are those who embrace these changes while maintaining a focus on the fundamental goal of assisting tribunals in understanding complex technical issues.

Success in this environment requires mastery of both traditional analytical skills and emerging presentation techniques. Experts must be prepared to work collaboratively with colleagues, leverage technology effectively and adapt their approaches to different procedural contexts. Most importantly, they must maintain their independence and professional integrity while serving the ultimate goal of facilitating informed tribunal decision-making.

The future of quantum expert evidence presentation lies in continued integration of technical sophistication with procedural efficiency. As disputes grow more complex and stakeholder expectations increase, the role of quantum experts will continue to expand and evolve. Those who can successfully navigate this changing landscape while maintaining the highest standards of professional practice will find themselves well-positioned to contribute to the effective resolution of increasingly complex international disputes.

Looking ahead, the key to successful quantum expert practice lies not just in technical competence but in understanding how to present complex analysis in ways that truly assist decision makers. This requires ongoing attention to communication skills, technological capabilities and procedural innovation. The experts who thrive in this environment will be those who view themselves not just as technical analysts but as educators and facilitators of understanding in the service of justice.

ENDNOTES

[1] Ian Freckelton, et al., 'Australian Judicial Perspectives on Expert Evidence: An Empirical Study', Australian Institute of Judicial Administration, Melbourne, 1999.

[2] See *Evans Deakin Pty Ltd v. Sebel Furniture Ltd* [2003] FCA 171, https://www.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/viewdoc/au/cases/cth/FCA/2003/171.html.

Owain Stone ostone@alvarezandmarsal.com

http://www.alvarezandmarsal.com