



**Standards
Legal Psychology
(009.0)**

Version:
Date of approval:
Date of effect:

1.1
24th of May 2018
5th of June 2018

Contents

Part I. General Introduction to Standards.....	4
§ 1. <i>Background to and aim of the Standards.....</i>	4
§ 2. <i>Types of applicants</i>	4
§ 3. <i>Justification of Standards.....</i>	5
§ 4. <i>Validity of Standards.....</i>	5
§ 5. <i>Version management and formal revision history</i>	5
5.1. <i>Version management.....</i>	6
5.2. <i>Formal revision history.....</i>	6
Part II. Demarcation of Legal Psychology	7
§ 1. <i>Introduction</i>	7
§ 2. <i>Approach.....</i>	7
§ 3. <i>Core activities Legal Psychology</i>	7
§ 4. <i>Boundaries of the field of expertise of Legal Psychology</i>	8
§ 5. <i>Registration</i>	9
Part III. Registration requirements for Legal Psychology	10
§ 1. <i>Article 12(2) sub-paragraph a</i>	10
1.1. <i>Initial applicant: independent reporter</i>	10
1.2. <i>Initial applicant: reporter without work of his own</i>	11
1.3. <i>Repeat applicant: after full registration.....</i>	11
1.4. <i>Repeat applicant: after provisional registration</i>	11
§ 2. <i>Article 12(2) sub-paragraph b</i>	12
§ 3. <i>Article 12(2) sub-paragraph c</i>	13
§ 4. <i>Article 12(2) sub-paragraph d.....</i>	13
§ 5. <i>Article 12(2) sub-paragraph e</i>	14
§ 6. <i>Article 12(2) sub-paragraph f.....</i>	14
§ 7. <i>Article 12(2) sub-paragraph g.....</i>	14
§ 8. <i>Article 12(2) sub-paragraph h</i>	15
§ 9. <i>Article 12(2) sub-paragraph i</i>	15
§ 10. <i>Hardship clause.....</i>	15
Part IV. Assessment procedure for Legal Psychology	16
§ 1. <i>General</i>	16
§ 2. <i>Assessment procedure per type of applicant.....</i>	16
2.1. <i>Initial applicant: independent reporter</i>	16
2.2. <i>Initial applicant: reporter without work of his own</i>	17
2.3. <i>Repeat applicant: after full registration.....</i>	18

2.4. Repeat applicant: after provisional registration	18
Annex A NRGD Glossary	19
Annex B Revision History.....	21

Part I. General Introduction to Standards

§ 1. Background to and aim of the Standards

Reporting forensic experts play a crucial role in the administration of justice. The NRGD aims to ensure justified confidence in forensic expertise for stakeholders. This confidence must be based on the demonstrable independently safeguarded quality of forensic investigators and their reports on the basis of (inter)national forensic-specific standards.

The NRGD is managed by the Court Experts Board (hereinafter: the Board). The Board's core task is to rule on the applications for registration or repeat registration in the register of the NRGD (register). To that end the Board first defines the field of expertise. This is important in order to inform applicants, assessors and users of the register (e.g. judge, public prosecutor and attorney) about the activities an expert in the field of expertise in question engages in and about the activities that fall outside the field of expertise. The demarcation of the field of expertise is set out in Part II of these Standards.

The Board also determines the criteria on the basis of which an assessment is made for each field of expertise as to whether an application complies with the quality requirements. The generic requirements are set out in the Register of Court Experts in Criminal Cases Decree (Besluit register deskundige in strafzaken). These requirements are elaborated further for each field of expertise. This elaboration is set out in Part III of these Standards.

Furthermore the Board determines the assessment procedure. This procedure is described in Part IV of these Standards.

The NRGD has a system of periodic repeat registration. Court experts must demonstrate every five years that they still meet the requirements in force at that time. The Standards are dynamic and are being developed further in order to enhance the quality of the experts. These Standards set out the current state of the (sub-)field of expertise.

§ 2. Types of applicants

The NRGD distinguishes two types of applicants: the initial applicant and the repeat applicant. The initial applicant is a reporter who at the time of submission of the application is not yet registered for the field of expertise to which the application relates. The repeat applicant is an expert who is already registered for the field of expertise to which the application relates.

These two types of applicants are subdivided as follows:

Initial applicant

- (i) independent reporter: a reporter who has independently written and signed the required number of case reports;
- (ii) reporter without work of his own: a reporter who has not independently written and signed the number of case reports required for registration.

If the assessment is favourable, the reporter without work of his own will only qualify for a provisional registration.

Repeat applicant

- (i) Repeat applicant after a full registration;
- (ii) Repeat applicant after a provisional registration.

The initial applicant is an applicant who at the time of submission of the application does not have an NRGD registration. An initial applicant could be:

- the independently reporting expert;
- the newly-trained expert;
- the applicant whose earlier application has been rejected by the Board;
- the applicant whose registration was previously stricken.

In respect of initial applicants, it is necessary to make a clear distinction between the independent reporter and the reporter without work of his own. An example of a reporter without work of his own is the newly-trained expert. This expert has completed the forensic training, but has not yet been able to independently write the number of reports required for the assessment because these are written under the supervision of a tutor during the training. Another example of a reporter without work of his own is the reporter whose earlier application was rejected and who has been working (partly) under supervision following this rejection.

The Board adopts the following principle. Every applicant must draw up a List of Case Information. This list must include a specific number of cases in a period specified by the Board immediately preceding the application. If the List of Case Information includes one or more cases which have been prepared under supervision, the applicant will be qualified as a 'reporter without work of his own'. Additional requirements apply to the applicant whose application was rejected earlier: the case reports must have been drawn up after the date of the Board's decision rejecting the earlier application (Policy Framework for Application after Rejection).

The distinction between the various types of repeat applicants is important in the context of the assessment procedure: the documents a repeat applicant must submit, the composition of the Advisory Committee on Assessment and the assessment method.

§ 3. Justification of Standards

The draft of these Standards has been published on the NRGD website for public consultation. These Standards have been established by the Board in accordance with the Register of Court Expert in Criminal Cases Decree (Besluit register deskundige in strafzaken) and the Expert in Criminal Cases Act (Wet deskundige in strafzaken).

§ 4. Validity of Standards

The Standards are valid from the date shown on the cover. The validity runs until the moment of publication of a new version. In principle it will be checked annually to make sure it is up-to-date. This check can lead to a new version. The aim is to publish a new version no more than once a year. Intermediate alterations can be incorporated in an addendum, which will be published on the NRGD website as well.

§ 5. Version management and formal revision history

All changes made to the Standards lead to a new version. Newer versions of (parts of) the Standards are designated with a higher version number.

5.1. Version management

In the case of editorial changes, the old version number is increased by 0.1. Editorial changes have no substantive impact. In the case of substantive changes the version number is increased by 1.

5.2. Formal revision history

The revision history starts with version 1.0 as the first formally approved version. Substantive changes made are briefly described in the revision history (Annex B). This makes it possible to trace at all times which Standards are valid at any given moment.

Part II. Demarcation of Legal Psychology

§ 1. Introduction

The core questions answered by experts within the field of Legal Psychology concern the validity¹ of statements, the evaluation of deception and the scientific value of evidence. Experts in Legal Psychology evaluate eyewitness' and suspects' statements, assess deception-detection (tools), and examine cognitive biases in investigative techniques as far as these are relevant to the evidence.

Evaluations by Legal Psychology experts can pertain to pre-trial and post-trial issues in this domain. Examples are witness intoxication, the effect of imprisonment and time lapse on statements during appeal.

§ 2. Approach

Registered Legal Psychology experts draw upon relevant scientific literature in experimental psychology, cognitive psychology, social psychology, and decision-making theory. Legal Psychology experts generally answer the question of how likely they think a proposed scenario is compared with relevant alternative scenarios. Experts in Legal Psychology assess the relevant empirical literature in terms of how it matches the case at hand and whether professional academic literature can be applied to this particular case. They also employ test theory and psychometrics to evaluate evidence that has been collected and whether the evidence is sufficient to answer the question at hand. In addition, Legal Psychology experts may rely on the outcomes of their own tailor-made experiments based on accepted scientific procedures, to address case-specific questions. This could, for example, involve establishing the quality of witness perception under specific environmental conditions or determining the evidentiary value of a specific line-up.

The Legal Psychology expert should be aware of the limitations of the approach mentioned above.

§ 3. Core activities

Legal Psychology experts draw upon the scientific knowledge base of fundamental psychological functions (e.g. perception, memory, and decision making) and social dynamics (e.g. compliance and suggestibility) to address forensic questions concerning the validity of statements made by eyewitnesses, victims, and suspects. Their expertise involves how internal (e.g. intoxication) and circumstantial factors (e.g. interrogation techniques) may affect the validity of such statements.

Experts within the field of Legal Psychology chiefly conduct evaluations that fall within the following three subfields:

¹ In the field of legal psychology, the term 'validity' has a specific meaning that is distinct from the term 'reliability'. Validity refers to the extent to which the statement corresponds to what has happened in the past. Reliability refers to the extent to which the story told within one or multiple statements is consistent.

009.1 The validity of statements

Within this subfield, Legal Psychology experts conduct evaluations on the validity of statements made by victims, suspects, and witnesses (including those made by children and individuals especially vulnerable to suggestion or pressure) for instance allegations of criminal acts, confessions or recanted statements, and descriptions of witnessed events. Experts within this subfield take into account how victims, suspects, and witnesses have been interviewed (including specialized interview methods for children and individuals vulnerable to suggestion or pressure) and how this may affect the quality of their statements. They also look into environmental influences on statements (e.g. perception conditions, imprisonment, sleep deprivation).

009.2 Deception relevant to statements

Within this subfield, experts on Legal Psychology conduct evaluations related to deception detection techniques, including expert opinions on verbal and non-verbal credibility assessment techniques and tests to detect malingering (faking symptoms of illness or disorder) and declared memory dysfunction.

009.3 Psychology of evidence and evidence-gathering

Within this subfield, experts on Legal Psychology try to advise triers of fact by applying principles of psychological decision theory (e.g. the literature on cognitive biases) to evidence (e.g. outcomes of line-ups). Experts within this subfield take into account the reliability and validity of investigative methods. These include identification and identification procedures of persons (e.g. line-ups, show-ups), objects (e.g. evidence line-up) and voices.

Legal Psychology experts also provide second opinion reports on the topics listed above.

§ 4. Boundaries of the field of Legal Psychology

The field of Legal Psychology and the field of 003.0 Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology (FPP) as determined by the Board are different fields of expertise. The core questions answered by experts within the field of Legal Psychology concern the validity of statements, evaluation of deception and the scientific value of evidence. Experts in Legal Psychology evaluate witness statements, assess deception-detection (tools), and examine cognitive biases in investigative techniques as far as these are relevant to the evidence. In contrast, FPP primarily concerns diagnostic assessment of the psychopathology of the suspect in relation to the alleged crime. FPP expertise assists the judge in answering the third and fourth question raised in article 350 Sv, pertaining to criminal responsibility of the suspect and the determination of sanctions. Legal Psychology experts, on the other hand, assist the judge in answering a different question, namely the first issue raised in 350 Sv: whether the suspect has committed the alleged crime. Hence, Legal Psychology expertise contributes to fact finding. In doing so, Legal Psychology experts may use information from the field of FPP. For example, when evaluating the value of a confession, Legal Psychology experts may take into account the psychopathology of the suspect. As another example of the overlapping knowledge base between Legal Psychology and FPP experts, Legal Psychology experts may evaluate witnesses reports of memory loss, thereby relying on psychometric tools for assessing symptom validity (e.g., malingering). In addressing issues of psychopathology and malingering, Legal Psychology experts respect the boundaries of their expertise, which specifically implies that they do not make psychiatric diagnoses.

The field of Legal Psychology as defined by the NRGD is also separate from that of investigative psychologists working in a police context. Although Legal Psychology experts and investigative psychologists may rely on a similar knowledge base, their respective roles within legal proceedings are distinctly different. Investigative psychologists provide advice to law enforcement employees and/or to the prosecutor during the (pre-trial) investigative phase. Legal Psychologists report to courts of law and are considered experts in terms of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

§ 5. Registration

For registration as an expert within the field of Legal Psychology, the following subfields are defined:

- 009.1 Statement Validity;
- 009.2 Deception Detection;
- 009.3 Psychology of Evidence.

When submitting a request for registration, the expert must stipulate which specific subfield(s) is requested and will be assessed accordingly by the NRGD.

Part III. Registration requirements for Legal Psychology

The general (repeat) registration requirements are given below in italics with a reference to the article in the Register of Court Expert in Criminal Cases Decree (Besluit register deskundige in strafzaken).

An expert will only be registered as an expert in criminal cases upon submission of the application if, in the opinion of the Board, the expert:

- a. has sufficient knowledge and experience in the field of expertise to which the application relates;
- b. has sufficient knowledge of and experience in the field of law concerned, and is sufficiently familiar with the position and the role of the expert in this field;
- c. is able to inform the commissioning party whether, and if so, to what extent the commissioning party's question at issue is sufficiently clear and capable of investigation in order to be able to answer it on the basis of their specific expertise;
- d. is able, on the basis of the question at issue, to prepare and carry out an investigation plan in accordance with the applicable standards;
- e. is able to collect, document, interpret and assess investigative materials and data in a forensic context in accordance with the applicable standards;
- f. is able to apply the current investigative methods in a forensic context in accordance with the applicable standards
- g. is able to give, both orally and in writing, a verifiable and well-reasoned report on the assignment and any other relevant aspects of their expertise in terms which are comprehensible to the commissioning party;
- h. is able to complete an assignment within the stipulated or agreed period;
- i. is able to carry out the activities as an expert independently, impartially, conscientiously, competently, and in a trustworthy manner.

§ 1. Article 12(2) sub-paragraph a

(...) has sufficient knowledge and experience in the field of expertise to which the application relates.

1.1 Initial applicant: independent reporter

- Basic requirements:
- Should have completed an academic Master's Degree in the domain of psychology or a PhD in the domain of psychology;
 - Should demonstrate, preferably active, participation in the academic community in the field of expertise, for example, by publications or peer reviewing;
 - Should have recent experience in interpreting and reporting about cases at the time of the application.
 - Should have current knowledge of the relevant scientific literature and must apply this knowledge to an individual case;

Specific requirements:

- have drawn up at least 5 case reports not older than 5 years, which have been subjected to collegial review;
- *In case the applicant is also acting as a supervisor, at least 1 report on the List of Case Information should be independently prepared reports.*
- have spent an average of 40 hours per year in the past 5 years on forensically relevant professional development (e.g. attending conferences, running or attending courses, publishing articles etc.).

1.2 Initial applicant: reporter without work of his ownBasic requirements:

- Should have completed an academic Master's Degree in the domain of psychology or a PhD in the domain of psychology.
- Should demonstrate, preferably active, participation in the academic community in the field of expertise, for example, by publications or peer reviewing;
- Should have recent experience in interpreting and reporting about cases at the time of the application;
- Should have up-to-date knowledge about the relevant scientific literature and must apply this knowledge to an individual case.

Specific requirements:

- have drawn up at least 3 reports not older than 2 years which have been subjected to collegial review and/or supervision and of which at least one report has been drawn up under supervision;
- have spent an average of 40 hours per year in the past 2 years on forensically relevant professional development (e.g. attending conferences, running or attending courses, publishing articles etc.).

1.3 Repeat applicant: after full registration

[Will be determined within two to three years]

1.4 Repeat applicant: after provisional registrationBasic requirements:

- Should have completed an academic Master's Degree in the domain of psychology or a PhD in the domain of psychology.
- Should demonstrate, preferably active, participation in the academic community in the field of expertise, for example, by publications or peer reviewing;
- Should have recent experience in interpreting and reporting about cases at the time of the application.
- Should have up-to-date knowledge about the relevant scientific literature and must apply this knowledge to an individual case.

Specific requirements:

- have drawn up at least 2 reports during the registration period which have been subjected to collegial review;
In case the applicant is also acting as a supervisor, at least 1 report on the List of Case Information should be independently prepared reports.
- have spent an average of 40 hours per year during the registration period on forensically relevant professional development (e.g. attending conferences, running or attending courses, publishing articles etc.).

§ 2. Article 12(2) sub-paragraph b

(...) has sufficient knowledge of and experience in the field of law concerned, and is sufficiently familiar with the position and the role of the expert in this field.

- In general an applicant should have adequate knowledge of Dutch criminal law:
 - Context of criminal law:
 - Trias Politica, distinction between civil law, administrative law and criminal law.
 - Criminal law procedure:
 - pre-trial investigation;
 - coercive measures;
 - stages of the proceedings;
 - actors in the criminal justice system (tasks/powers/responsibilities);
 - regulations concerning experts laid down in the Dutch Code of Criminal Procedure (position and powers of commissioning party, legal position of expert, position and powers of lawyer, forms of counter-analysis, register of experts in the context of criminal law);
 - legal decision-making framework of the court in criminal cases (decision-making schedule laid down in Section 350 of the Dutch Criminal Code of Procedure), also with a view to the relevance of the commission to the expert and to the question at issue;
 - course of the criminal trial;
 - position of the expert in the court procedure.
 - Substantive criminal law:
 - sanctions and grounds for exemption from criminal liability (very basic).
 - Knowledge of the legal context of safeguarding the quality of the expert and the analysis/investigation:
 - position and role of the co-operating organisations in the criminal justice system in safeguarding the quality of the reports;
 - professional codes and relevant regulations in relation to the NRGD Code of Conduct.

§ 3. Article 12(2) sub-paragraph c

(...) is able to inform the commissioning party whether, and if so, to what extent the commissioning party's question at issue is sufficiently clear and capable of investigation in order to be able to answer it on the basis of their specific expertise.

An applicant for the field of expertise of Legal Psychology:

- Should return (part of) the assignment to the commissioning party or refer the commissioning party to another expert or another field of expertise, where the applicant's expertise does not cover the core question(s) of the assignment and/or if the available data is (of) insufficient (quality) to perform the work;
- Should inform the commissioning party if on the basis of his specific expertise the commissioning party's questions should be adjusted in order to benefit the forensic evaluation;
- Should reflect in his/her reports and oral presentation in court:
 - o An awareness of the limitations of his/her expertise;
 - o An awareness of the limitations of the applied methods and conclusions;
 - o A pro-active attitude, which means that the expert should ask the commissioning party for additional information that may be essential for answering the question at hand but was not initially provided.

§ 4. Article 12(2) sub-paragraph d

(...) is able, on the basis of the question at issue, to prepare and carry out an investigation plan in accordance with the applicable standards.

An applicant for the field of expertise of Legal Psychology:

- Has an academic embedding, as reflected in one or more of the following:
 - o Access to relevant scientific journals;
 - o Membership of relevant scientific associations such as the European Association of Psychology and Law (EAPL), American Psychology-Law Society (AP-LS), and Association for Psychological Science (APS);
 - o Peer-review of the applicant's reports by colleagues in academia.
- Has knowledge of and experience with scientific research, as reflected in one or more of the following:
 - o Publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals, handbooks etc.;
 - o Attendance and/or presentation at relevant academic conferences;
 - o Involvement in ongoing research in relevant fields;
 - o Supervision of graduate students in relevant fields;
 - o Membership of relevant Ph.D.-committees and/or research funding committees;
- Should translate the referral question into hypotheses and/or scenarios.

§ 5. Article 12(2) sub-paragraph e

(...) is able to collect, document, interpret and assess investigative materials and data in a forensic context in accordance with the applicable standards.

An applicant for the field of expertise of Legal Psychology:

- Should be aware of the possibilities and limitations of any tools and methods that have been employed previously in the investigation;
- Should oversee and identify the relevant sources of information for the examination and adapt the conclusions to the available data;
- Should refrain from making conclusions based on insufficient data;
- Should gather information in a systematic and critically reflective way;
- Has knowledge and experience with scientific research, as reflected in use of:
 - o Empirically supported methods;
 - o Reliable and valid instruments (if applicable).

§ 6. Article 12(2) sub-paragraph f

(...) is able to apply the current investigative methods in a forensic context in accordance with the applicable standards.

An applicant for the field of expertise of Legal Psychology:

- Should demonstrate that he/she is knowledgeable regarding the relevant scientific literature;
- Should demonstrate capacity to independently and correctly apply scientific methods to an individual case;
- Should demonstrate taking precautions to prevent being influenced by biases of all sorts (e.g., expectancy effects, confirmation bias, hindsight bias, allegiance bias, belief perseverance);
- Should be trained to use relevant psychometric tools (whenever appropriate training is available), such as symptom validity tests, statement validity tests, and suggestibility tests.

§ 7. Article 12(2) sub-paragraph g

(...) is able to give, both orally and in writing, a verifiable and well-reasoned report on the assignment and any other relevant aspects of their expertise in terms which are comprehensible to the commissioning party.

An applicant for the field of expertise of Legal Psychology:

- Should formulate the question in a clear way;
- Should give a clear explanation of the method applied in answering the question;
- Should provide academically referenced reports demonstrating that the applicant is anchored in the existing scientific knowledgebase;
- Should effectively communicate scientific literature and its application, including the conclusions, in a comprehensive way to triers of fact;
- Should carefully document all communications with involved parties and list all consulted sources of information during the examination in the final report;
- Should demonstrate awareness of potentially biasing communications with involved parties (if applicable);
- Should reflect hypothesis-driven and/or scenario-based reasoning when reporting.

§ 8. Article 12(2) sub-paragraph h

(...) is able to complete an assignment within the stipulated or agreed period.

An applicant for the field of expertise of Legal Psychology:

- Should inform the commissioning party immediately in case of delay or more time needed due to the complexity of the case.

§ 9. Article 12(2) sub-paragraph i

(...) is able to carry out the activities as an expert independently, impartially, conscientiously, competently, and in a trustworthy manner.

See the NRGD Code of Conduct determined by the Court Experts Board and published on the website of the NRGD.

§ 10. Hardship clause

If the applicant wants the Board to make an exception for him on the grounds of what is set out above, the applicant must submit a request for exception to the Board. The substantiated request must be submitted as an accompanying letter with the (repeat) application.

Part IV Assessment procedure for Legal Psychology

§ 1. General

In all fields of expertise the assessment will be based on the written information provided, including as a minimum requirement case reports and items of evidence, supplemented in principle with an oral assessment. However, such an oral assessment will not be necessary if the applicant's expertise has already been clearly demonstrated by the written information.

The assessment will in principle be carried out on the basis of the information provided by the applicant:

- general information as part of the application package;
- documentary evidence of competence.

If it is felt necessary in the context of the assessment an additional case report and/or information, for example information about the way collegial review and/or supervision is organized within the organization, can be requested.

§ 2. Assessment procedure per type of applicant

2.1 Initial applicant: independent reporter

Documents to be submitted:

- NRGD application form;
- Certificate of Good Conduct;
- A clearly legible copy of a valid passport or identity card;
- copies of documents relating to the highest level of professional qualification;
- A curriculum vitae (CV), preferably in English;
- Overview of Continuing professional development Legal Psychology;
- List of Case Information Legal Psychology;
- 3 case reports not older than 5 years selected by the applicant from the List of Case Information. For each subfield the applicant should have at least two case reports. When several subfields are combined in one case report, it is possible to provide the same case report for different subfields. If possible the case reports should also contain the testimony delivered in court;
The case reports should provide a clear and broad picture of the applicant's competences.

- Assessment method:
- a. administrative, by the NRGD Bureau;
 - b. substantive, by an Advisory Committee for Assessment (ACA) made up of at least three people on the basis of the available written material, including possible supplementary written information. In principle this ACA consists of a legal expert and two subject-matter experts;
 - c. substantive, by the ACA specified at b. by means of an oral assessment. This oral assessment will be waived if the applicant's expertise has already been clearly established;
 - d. decision by the Board: registration, provisional registration or no registration.

2.2 Initial applicant: reporter without work of his own

- Documents to be submitted:
- NRGD application form;
 - Certificate of Good Conduct;
 - A clearly legible copy of a valid passport or identity card;
 - copies of documents relating to the highest level of professional qualification;
 - A curriculum vitae (CV), preferably in English;
 - Overview of Continuing professional development Legal Psychology.
 - List of Case Information Legal Psychology;
 - 3 case reports drawn up in the past 2 years selected by the applicant from the List of Case Information. For each subfield the applicant should have at least two case reports. When several subfields are combined in one case report, it is possible to provide the same case report for different subfields. If possible the case reports should also contain the testimony delivered in court;
The case reports should provide a clear and broad picture of the applicant's competences.

- Assessment method:
- a. administrative, by the NRGD Bureau;
 - b. substantive, by an Advisory Committee for Assessment (ACA) made up of at least three people on the basis of the available written material, including possible supplementary written information. In principle this ACA consists of a legal expert and two subject-matter experts;
 - c. substantive, by the ACA specified at b. by means of an oral assessment. This oral assessment will be waived if the applicant's expertise has already been clearly established;
 - d. decision by the Board: provisional registration or no registration.

2.3 Repeat applicant: after full registration

[Will be determined within two to three years]

2.4 Repeat applicant: after provisional registration

Documents to be submitted

- NRGD application form;
- An updated curriculum vitae (CV), preferably in English;
- copies of documents relating to the highest level of professional qualification (if changed);
- Overview Continuing Professional Development Legal Psychology;
- List of Case Information Legal Psychology;
- 2 case reports drafted during the registration period selected by the applicant from the List of Case Information. For each subfield the applicant should have at least two case reports. When several subfields are combined in one case report, it is possible to provide the same case report for different subfields. If possible the case reports should also contain the testimony delivered in court;
The case reports should provide a clear and broad picture of the applicant's competences.

Assessment method

- a. administrative, by the NRGD Bureau;
- b. substantive, by an Advisory Committee for Assessment (ACA) made up of at least three people on the basis of the available written material. In principle this ACA consists of a legal expert and two subject-matter experts;
- c. substantive, by the ACA specified at b. by means of an oral assessment. This oral assessment will be waived if the applicant's expertise has already been clearly established;
- d. decision by the Board: registration, provisional registration or no registration.

Annex A NRGD Glossary

Advisory Committee for Assessment	A committee appointed by the Board which advises the Board on the (repeat) applicant's (degree of) suitability for (repeat) registration.
Applicant	Natural person submitting an application to the NRGD in order to be (re)registered in the register.
Assessor	A member of an Advisory Committee for Assessment.
Board	The Court Experts Board is the body as referred to in Section 51k(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and is charged with managing the register.
Brdis	Register of Court Experts in Criminal Cases Decree (Besluit register deskundige in strafzaken).
Bureau	The NRGD Bureau that supports the Board.
Collegial review	The assessment of another person's work for the purpose of continuous quality control of a person's expertise. The relationship between reviewer and reviewed is not a hierarchical one but a horizontal one between colleagues specialised in the same subject area. The reviewer does not sign the report.
Continuing professional development	All (training) activities that contribute to the ongoing development of knowledge and skills, which is desirable and necessary in order to be able to continue performing the role of court expert in a professional manner.
Independent reporter	A reporter who has independently prepared and signed the required number of case reports.
Initial applicant	An applicant who applies for registration and does not have an NRGD registration at the time when the application is submitted.
Intervision	Intervision is a structured (interdisciplinary) meeting between people who are working or training in the same professional area. The subject of discussion is in any case the forensic work carried out and the associated problems. The aim is to enhance the expertise of those involved and improve quality of work. Unlike supervision, there is no hierarchical relationship between the participants.
NRGD	The Netherlands Register of Court Experts, consisting of the Board of Court Experts and the Bureau.

Provisional registration	The registration of an expert for a period specified by the Board and possibly under certain conditions which must be met within that period. In principle the period to be specified by the Board is two years.
Register	The national public register as referred to in Section 51 k(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which lists the court experts which the Board deems suitable.
Registered expert	An expert who is entered in the register.
Registration	Entry in the register.
Repeat applicant	An expert who at the time of submitting a repeat application already has a NRGD registration, possibly for a provisional registration
Report	An individual who issues a report for the administration of justice and/or gives testimony in court.
Reporter with no own work	A reporter who has not independently completed and signed the number of case reports required for registration.
Supervision	The assessment of another person's work, the joint consideration of the work and the supervision of a supervisee as part of a training or additional training process. Supervisor and supervisee are thereby in a hierarchical relationship. The supervisor will observe the subject of the investigation (the investigated person) in such a way that they can check the supervisee's investigation, and can endorse and take responsibility for the conclusions thereof. The supervisor will sign the report in all cases.
User	Someone who uses the register in order to find and potentially engage a registered expert.

Annex B Revision History

Version	Date	Revisions made
1.1	Juni 2018	Adjustments made on the basis of Template Standards 3.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- changes in policy e.g. provisional registration- generic textual changes and harmonisation- editorial changes in English terminology- Statement NRGD added to Application Form
1.0	1 May 2017	First edition