

National Association of Forensic Economics

P.O. Box 394
Mount Union, PA 17066

(866) 370-6233
(814) 542-3253 FAX

nancy@nafe.net
http://nafe.net

Journal of Forensic Economics

Statement of Ethical Principles and Principles of Professional Practice National Association of Forensic Economics (NAFE)

(Effective October 1, 2004)

When providing expert opinion for use as evidence by the trier of fact, a NAFE member pledges, as a condition of membership, adherence to the following:

1. Engagement

Practitioners of forensic economics should decline involvement in any litigation when they are asked to assume invalid representations of fact or alter their methodologies without foundation or compelling analytical reason.

2. Compensation

Practitioners of forensic economics should not accept contingency fee arrangements, or fee amounts associated with the size of a court award or out-of-court settlement.

3. Diligence

Practitioners of forensic economics should employ generally accepted and/or theoretically sound economic methodologies based on reliable economic data. Practitioners of forensic economics should attempt to provide accurate, fair and reasonable expert opinions, recognizing that it is not the responsibility of the practitioner to verify the accuracy or completeness of the case-specific information that has been provided.

4. Disclosure

Practitioners of forensic economics should stand ready to provide sufficient detail to allow replication of all numerical calculations, with reasonable effort, by other competent forensic economics experts, and be prepared to provide sufficient disclosure of sources of information and assumptions underpinning their opinions to make them understandable to others.

5. Consistency

While it is recognized that practitioners of forensic economics may be given a different assignment when engaged on behalf of the plaintiff than when engaged on behalf of the defense, for any given assignment, the basic assumptions, sources, and methods should not change regardless of the party who engages the expert to perform the assignment. There should be no change in methodology for purposes of favoring any party's claim. This requirement of consistency is not meant to preclude methodological changes as new knowledge evolves, nor is it meant to preclude performing requested calculations based upon a hypothetical--as long as its hypothetical nature is clearly disclosed in the expert's report and testimony.

6. Knowledge

Practitioners of forensic economics should strive to maintain a current knowledge base of their discipline.

7. Discourse

Open, uninhibited discussion is a desired educational feature of academic and professional forensic economic conferences. Therefore, to preserve and protect the educational environment, practitioners of forensic economics will refrain from the citation of oral remarks made in an educational environment, without permission from the speaker.

8. Responsibility

Practitioners of forensic economics are encouraged to make known the existence of, and their adherence to, these principles to those retaining them to perform economic analyses and to other participants in litigation. In addition, it is appropriate for practitioners of forensic economics to offer criticisms of breaches of these principles.

President

Frank D. Tinari
Seton Hall University

Vice Presidents

Christopher J. Bruce
University of Calgary

Lawrence M. Spizman
SUNY-Oswego

At Large Vice Presidents

Elizabeth A.W. Gunderson
Hamline University

President Elect

Gary R. Skoog
Legal Econometrics, Inc.

Kurt V. Krueger

John O. Ward & Associates

Edward Foster

University of Minnesota

Steven J. Shapiro

University of New Haven

Executive Director

George A. Schieren
Appalachian State University

Editors, *Journal of Forensic Economics*

Michael J. Piette
Analytical Economics, Inc.

Steven J. Shapiro

University of New Haven

Editor Emeritus

John O. Ward
University of Missouri-Kansas City