
ISRAEL COUNTRY CHAPTER

Prepared by: Yael Efron, Noam Ebner, Yifat Winkler & Galit Manobla-Landman



Overview of ADR in Israel

1. Commercial Disputes

A. SMEs and the Israeli Economy:

There is general acknowledgement in Israel to the important contribution of small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) to the economy. SMEs form a major portion of the employer-pool in the local market, and their contribution to export is substantial. As in many other countries, the Israeli government, recognizing this fact, has set up a government agency serving as a clearinghouse of knowledge, advice and contacts as well as representing the Israeli market externally. The government, through the SME Development Agency and other venues has put a great deal of effort into developing bilateral, international and regional ties, including initiating a large number of agreements for knowledge sharing, commercial delegation-swapping and joint ventures. Israel has learned the value of SMEs – as well as the problems they often face and the types of support they require – through the experience gained from the rise of the Israeli high-tech industry in the mid- to-late 1990s. They are especially valued due to their low initiation and setup costs, and to their contribution to developing Israel’s peripheral areas.

B. The Israeli Legal and Judicial System:

Israel is an extremely adversarial and litigious society, as evidenced by the fact of over a million writs or claims being filed every year. Several formal and informal mechanisms are in place in order to deal with this – including the courts system, mediation and arbitration services as well as several other “in-house” processes utilized in specific frameworks.

Israel has need of a highly developed court system, designed to handle a highly litigious population. The legal system is based on the Anglo-American common law system, and the substantive content of these systems are heavily borrowed from in court decisions. Rather than being elected by the public as they are in the American system, judges are chosen on the merits of their professional ability – including the ability to quickly clear cases off their docket.



Even so, there is no way the court system could ever hope to cope with the flood of litigation that has been threatening to strangle it ever since the late 1980's. Faced with over 1,000,000 motions filed each year and a backlog reaching back 3 or 4 years, the system has been on the verge of collapsing numerous times.

These figures are exacerbated by the fact that even after a wave of recent appointments, the court system includes, in order to handle this flood of legal activity, only about 600 judges. Simple math will show that each judge must be assigned an impossible amount of motions and claims in order to keep up with the flow. As if this wasn't enough, the Israeli Bar numbers today over 30,000 members – and rising – which boils down to about 1 lawyer for every 200 citizen. By comparison, in the United States, long held to lead the field in litigation, there is one lawyer per approximately 360 capita. This intense overpopulation of attorneys contributes its share to keeping the litigation pot boiling.

The court system is comprised of three main components:

i. The Civil Court System:

Handles the major portion of litigation as well as all criminal and administrative matters

ii. The Religious Court System:

Comprised of separate courts for Jews, Christians and Moslems, these courts are responsible for all matters pertaining to marriage, divorce and personal status.

iii. The Labor Court System:

The Labor Courts are separated from the main civil court system due to both the historic evolution of the courts and to an acknowledgement of the need for particular expertise and suitable mechanisms for labor related issues. This system is primarily responsible for employee – employer suits and for large scale disputes between organized labor and management. In addition, this system is charged with Social Security claims, disability suits and suchlike.



Under this system, it is the task of the Civil Court system to deal with all commercial litigation, with the exception of labor disputes. Bankruptcy proceedings, as well as investment disputes, are included in its substantive jurisdiction.¹

As such, it seems proper to expound a bit on the structure of this system. The Civil Court system comprises three levels:

a. Magistrate Courts:

The Magistrate Courts, the lowest level of the court system, handles civil litigation with a value cap of approximately \$500,000, as well as relatively light criminal offences. The Magistrate Courts handle the largest mass of civil and commercial litigation, and are notoriously overwhelmed and understaffed. The Magistrate Courts also operate Small-Claims Courts, which deal with claims filed by private citizens against each other or against corporations and businesses, with a claim value-cap of approximately \$4,000. There are 30 Magistrate Courts in Israel, sited in major cities as well as in satellite cities and smaller towns.

b. District Courts

For various legal and administrative purposes, Israel is divided into five districts. Each district has a District Court, which serves two main functions:

1. An appeals court for cases heard in the Magistrate Courts located within the district.
2. A court of first instance for: civil claims valued at over \$500,000, company-dissolving proceedings, certain types of real estate claims, certain administrative matters and major criminal trials.

c. The Supreme Court

¹ Sometimes this can cause multiple jurisdictions regarding a single issue. For example, if a company has fired all its employees and then entered proceedings for the company's dissolving, the employees might originally file suit against the company for unpaid salaries and compensation in the Labor Court. However, the dissolving procedure, which might include members of the corporate government, creditors, investors etc., would be filed in the District Courts. Employees might also join these District Court proceedings in certain situations in which they would be considered as creditors.



The Supreme Court serves as a court of appeals for cases tried in the lower courts of the legal system. Additionally, the Court serves as the High Court of Justice charged with deciding constitutional and major administrative issues. This dual function is similar to the American model in that it sets the Supreme Court at the pinnacle of every type of legal issue as well as casting it in the role of the gatekeeper of human rights and constitutionality. Supreme Court decisions form precedents binding the lower courts. However, the major difference between the American model and the Israeli system is that while in the U.S the Supreme Court gets to pick and choose among the many cases submitted to it, selecting the major issues to be set on its agenda and denying certiorari to the vast majority of petitions, the Israeli Supreme Court must deal with just about every appeal and petition sent its way. With 14 members on the bench, the Supreme Court is overburdened, with a heavy backload of cases on its docket.

C. Definition / Classification of Commercial Disputes:

Commercial disputes have no separate definition in Israel's legal framework, rather, they are classified as civil disputes, and as such are handled by the Civil Court System at its different levels. The main exception to this rule, as we have mentioned, is the separation of labor disputes from other issues, and having them dealt with in the framework of the Labor Courts. Other exceptions are antitrust issues, and issues involving en-masse use of certain commercial contract forms, which are dealt with by special tribunals. Another mentionable anomaly is the issue of corporate insolvency / bankruptcy / dissolving. This issue remains in the Civil Court system, however, it is dealt with solely by the District Courts and not by the Magistrate Courts. Similarly, there are no specialized local formal frameworks for dispute resolution in investment / foreign investment disputes.

D. Arbitration Services

As we will describe below, arbitration is an alternative method of dispute resolution which is often preferred by players in the commercial world. However, while the law sets up a fairly well-rounded legislative framework for arbitral proceedings, **there is no official arbitration body, center or institute; neither is there any legislative mandatory arbitration.** In order to meet the market's demand for arbitration services, private practitioners have established themselves as



service providers – working either by themselves or setting up partnerships or other commercial frameworks. Additionally, quite a few professional guilds have set up arbitration panels for “in-house” disputes. Other entities serve as a clearinghouse for arbitration services, without actually providing these services themselves.

E. Mediation Services

As we will expand on below, the past 10 years have seen an impressive rise in the use of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution method. An even more impressive jump has been seen in the number of practitioners offering their services in the field.

As with arbitration, there is no official center or institute charged with providing mediation services. While formal institutions exist for promoting use of ADR (focusing on mediation), as well as for regulating the niche of court-connected mediation, providing the actual services is left, for the most part, to private practitioners.²

While there seems to be a certain rise in the degree to which “private” mediation is employed (i.e., cases in which parties choose to mediate their disputes without being referred to the process through the court system, after a claim has been filed), there is no doubt that the large majority of cases mediated in Israel are referred to mediation by the court system. Due to the multiple-court system framework, comprehensive data on court referrals is difficult to obtain and to quantify, however, it is certainly worth mentioning that *all* of the different court systems described above refer cases to mediation to some extent.

² It should be mentioned that the past couple of years have seen a rise in the amount of “in-house” mediation services offered by courts, mainly on an informal basis decided by the administrator or presiding judge of a particular courthouse.



2. Arbitration

Arbitration is the veteran ADR process in Israel, as it is elsewhere, and is utilized in a great many disputes. Many disputing parties choose this flexible alternative, particularly in disputes requiring specific expert knowledge, quick verdicts or secrecy.

A. The Legal Framework for Arbitration:

The Arbitration Act, 1968, regulates the application of arbitration in Israel. This is, to a large extent, an evolution of the English laws on arbitration dating back to about 1889, inherited through the period of the British Mandate on Palestine.

Generally speaking, the Arbitration Act grants parties wide discretion in designing their own arbitration mechanism and process. Parties can choose their own arbitrator or panel, and grant the neutral whatever amount of power and discretion they wish. They can decide the arbitral procedure, the range of possible awards and the methods through which evidence and briefs will be presented. They can even decide which law will govern the case (i.e, parties can agree that the arbitrator, although sitting in Tel Aviv, must decide the case according to Finnish law). However, parties rarely utilize this broad discretion, and make do with a simple arbitration clause in wider pre-dispute agreements, or with choosing the name of an arbitrator in post-dispute agreements. If parties have not designed their own process, the Arbitration Act sets out a model process of its own, by which the case will be governed by default. This default procedure grants far-reaching authority to the arbitrator, who can set his own procedural rules. He is also authorized to decide the case by whatever set of standards he sees proper, and is not bound to make his decision based on any set of legal rules, Israeli or otherwise. The outcome is far-reaching arbitrator power and authority, which often leads to both parties complaining or feeling unsatisfied with the procedure.

The Arbitration Act, true to its “hands-off” policy, guarantees the court’s intervention only in cases where a party attempts to avoid arbitration after having committed to the process, or in cases where the procedure is being managed in a grossly unprofessional or unfair manner.



B. When Can a Dispute Reach Arbitration?

Parties can proceed to arbitration only if they have *agreed* to do so (there is no law under which arbitration is ever mandated). This agreement can be agreed to long before the dispute erupted, or post-dispute. According to the Courts Act, 1984, a judge may suggest to disputing parties that the case be submitted to arbitration rather than adjudicated. However, this referral is contingent on the parties' agreement. Once someone has agreed to arbitration, his participation in the procedure is mandatory; he cannot renege on his agreement and seek to resolve the dispute in court.

C. Ad-hoc Arbitration:

As discussed above, ad-hoc arbitration – in the sense of an agreement to arbitrate that does not detail the identity of the arbitrator or does not detail the arbitral procedure - is very commonly encountered. Whether due to legal oversight or to parties being unaware of their ability to tailor-design a process suited to their needs, this situation is, in fact, close to being the norm.

In some cases, parties agree for their dispute to be arbitrated by a particular organization or service provider, which implies acceptance of the procedural methods employed by that body – avoiding the procedural vacuum.

To summarize, ad-hoc arbitration is a common practice, and the rules most commonly employed in such a case is the default procedure defined by the Arbitration Act.

D. Arbitration Conventions and Foreign Arbitration Awards

Israel is a signatory to the New York and Washington conventions. Israel has also signed (though not yet ratified) the recent Hague Convention on Private International Law regarding jurisdiction clauses in inter- and multi- national commercial contracts (this is of proximal interest, as it does not deal with arbitration).



Generally speaking, foreign arbitral awards are executed in the country without extraordinary examination or delay; we were unable to obtain precise data on the length of the procedure.

E. Domestic Arbitral Awards:

Parties settling their dispute through arbitration can have the arbitrator's verdict confirmed and carried out by the court system, as if it were a court verdict given by a judge. This procedure is not automatic. The winning side must file a request for confirmation of the award by the court (usually in the District Court). This request carries a filing fee, and is almost always granted. Conversely, the loser can challenge the award, either by requesting that the court annul the arbitrator's award or by objecting to the winner's request for confirmation. The courts do **not** view this challenge as an appeal, they will hardly ever open a case to examine its substantive content and only very rarely will they intervene. Court intervention will be only in rare cases when gross unfairness, bribery of the arbitrator etc. are manifest. Knowing that courts rarely rule in their favor, losers rarely request annulment of arbitration awards, granting the mechanism of arbitration a great deal of finality.

There is no such procedure as "appealing" an award inherent in the arbitral process. The only way such an appeal is possible would be for such a provision to be implicitly agreed on in the arbitration agreement the parties signed. While there is nothing to stop parties from including such a mechanism in their agreements, this is rarely done.

Recently, there have been proposals, mainly from the side of the Israeli Bar Association, to include an appeals clause into a standard arbitration clause or agreement.

F. Arbitration Service Providers:

There is no public Arbitration Center in Israel with official ties to the Ministry of Justice or the Ministry of Commerce. There are several private organizations, ranging from private arbitration



offices to non-profit organizations who receive referrals from the courts and private cases, and refers them to its members (in other words, these bodies are incorporated or affiliated with a non-profit referral network, but might be for-profit enterprises as far as the actual service providers are concerned). One mentionable one in the context of this report might be the center affiliated with the Association of Chambers of Commerce. Some professional institutions/guilds have their own in-house arbitration service.

Due to the private nature of these enterprises, there is no readily accessible data on their rulings, statistics on court rejections / upholding etc. Most of these institutions have their own default procedure, however, they will also usually accept agreements the parties have reached on procedure.

Many private practitioners have established themselves as service providers – working either by themselves or setting up partnerships or other commercial frameworks. They market their expertise to the general public as well as to commercial organizations. However, these professionals and centres are not organized as a guild, they do not share any prescribed arbitral procedure, and they do not collaborate formally with each other or with any national or public organization. Many private or semi-public institutions (i.e, privately registered institutions that provide services to a wide public) use their own in-house arbitrators to handle their disputes. These include trade and professional guilds – such as the Contractor’s Union, the Football Union and others - as well as community and settlement movements. Other entities serve as a clearinghouse for arbitration services, without actually providing these services themselves. Most notable is the Israeli Bar Association, which maintains rosters of attorneys offering arbitration services in different specialties, and refers cases to these attorney / arbitrators rather than operating its own “Bar Arbitration Center”. Other professional guilds without in-house panels often receive requests for aid in appointing arbitrators, and provide informal assistance or referral services.

G. Use of Standard Arbitration Clauses in Commercial Contracts:



Due to the lack of centralized arbitration institutions, there is no one to promote use of standard arbitration clauses as a matter of form. Use of such clauses depends on the contractual party's prior experience with arbitration, or on its attorney's drafting habits. Recently, there have been suggestions originating in the Israeli Bar Association to educate lawyers as to the advantages of arbitration and to promote use of standard arbitration clauses.

H. Compulsory Recourse to a Specific Domestic Arbitration Center:

Use of a particular center or service provider is compulsory only if pre-agreed to by the parties, or ordered to do so by the court in case of disagreement on nominating the arbitrator (see below). Often these pre-agreements are incorporated inside long-term contracts with a view towards keeping dispute resolution an in-house matter. For example, members of the *kibbutz* (communal settlement) movement pre-agree to settle disputes between themselves and the *kibbutz* (and in some cases – between themselves) before the movement's arbitration unit. A similar pre-agreement – and in-house arbitration panel – exists in the contractual relationship between professional football players, teams and leagues.

I. Confidentiality:

One of the advantages of arbitration is the privacy of the process. The ability to shut the door on the proceedings and keep the public out of it is often beneficial to parties to commercial arbitration.

Parties may agree to cast confidentiality over the proceedings in their pre-dispute or their ad-hoc arbitration agreement; in this case, parties are contractually bound to confidentiality. The arbitrator's commitment to confidentiality would depend on his contract with the parties; in many cases, an arbitrator's agreement to take on a case in which the parties have promised each other to respect the confidentiality of the proceedings would be construed as a contractual undertaking on his part to preserve confidentiality. Indirectly, courts have referred to the secrecy cast over arbitration proceedings as an inherent part of the process, and have taken this into account (for example, when deliberating whether to refer a case to arbitration, or to uphold an arbitration clause,



judges have decided to prefer formal adjudication in cases where there was a dominant public interest in public hearings).

Neither the Arbitration Act nor the default arbitration procedure it defines includes confidentiality as a rule of the process. As part of the arbitrator's wide discretion, if he was not ordered otherwise by the parties ahead of the proceedings, he has the authority to order confidentially as a procedural rule.

As explained above, parties wishing to approve the arbitral award and have it carried out through the court system must file a request with the court. These proceedings are held in an open-door courthouse; additionally, once the award is approved, the court's decision is a matter of public record.

J. Appointment of Arbitrators:

i. Nominating Procedures

Arbitrators can be chosen by any mechanism agreed to by the parties. In practice, several common trends have emerged:

1. Naming a specific arbitrator in the arbitration agreement
2. Naming the holder of a post as the arbitrator (such as “Should dispute arise, we will petition the head of the Israeli Bar Association to serve as arbitrator”)
3. Agreeing that each side will choose an arbitrator
4. Agreeing that each side will choose an arbitrator, and a third panelist will be chosen jointly – by the parties or by their appointed arbitrators
5. Agreeing that a specific person or the holder of a post will appoint the arbitrator (“Should dispute arise, we will petition the head of the Israeli Bar Association to appoint an arbitrator”)

The judiciary is only involved in arbitrator nomination if the parties are unable to do so on their own. Usually this occurs when one of the parties feels that the other is stalling on the joint nomination process. In this case, one of the parties (or both) can petition the court to nominate an



arbitrator. In practice, and informally, judges trying to persuade disputants to transfer to arbitration will also provide them with the name and telephone number of the arbitrator of their choice.

One of the major advantages of arbitration is, of course, the ability to personally choose and appoint the person reviewing your case. Parties to commercial disputes can often turn to a third party known to both of them from their joint professional environment. Therefore, parties to disputes rarely complain about the nomination procedure until they hit a snag. This is usually the other party's objection to their preferred arbitrator, or their feeling that the other party is dragging its heels on the nomination issue in order to stall. In this case, it falls upon the court to nominate an arbitrator, and their degree of satisfaction with this process often depends upon their degree of trust in the nominating judge.

The legal profession would prefer that arbitration always be conducted by lawyers, jurists or retired judges. The general claim is that the arbitration procedure mirrors the legal process, and arbitrators need legal expertise in order to properly conduct a process. Additionally, they suggest that the customers expect a fair outcome, based on fair proceedings, and that both these expectations are met only when the process is conducted in a legalistic fashion. Finally, as the court is often requested to affirm and carry out arbitral awards, it is necessary that the judges trust the fairness and legality of the process. Many lawyer/arbitrators would prefer to see arbitration as a domain ruled by lawyers, who call in external expertise only when they consider it necessary.

Arbitrators from outside the legal community claim that subject expertise, or an innate ability to come up with good or fair solutions, are traits much more valuable than legal knowledge, when it comes to settling disputes and satisfying parties' expectations. They also stress that overlegalization of the arbitration process can strip it of some of its most obvious advantages – speed, cost efficiency and flexibility. At a disadvantage due to judges' personal familiarity with attorneys and with the Bar, arbitrators often send letters including their CVs and describing their arbitration experience and subject expertise, to courthouses and to individual judges suggesting that cases be referred to them.



ii. Arbitrator qualification:

Under the Arbitration Act there are *no qualifications whatsoever*; the only qualification is the parties' agreement.

iii. Can sitting judges be nominated as arbitrators?

The Arbitration Act does not expressly prohibit judges from arbitrating, just as it does not disqualify zookeepers or even criminals; it casts no limits on the personality, as long as the parties agree or he is otherwise chosen according the arbitration agreement. However, judges are bound by the general limitations restricting outside employment of civil servants, as well as by a clause in The Basic Law: Judiciary forbidding judges to take part in private enterprises or extra-judiciary activities without permission of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the Minister of Justice. In short, judges are not considered an option for arbitration activity (the question has really only been raised in extraordinary cases, such as the question of whether a sitting arbitrator nominated to the bench in the middle of an arbitration proceeding could continue and finish the proceeding).

It might be noted that there is a procedure under the Courts Act known as “Compromise Judgment”, wherein parties to a civil case may jointly request the sitting judge to decide the case not necessarily on its legal merits, but according to any manner he sees fit. In this procedure, parties allow the judge to waive any judicial procedure or legal substance, and to decide the case more or less as he wishes – this is, in essence, a type of arbitration (although, officially, it is an official court verdict, and one with a great deal of finality as it is very rarely overturned on appeal).

As a point of interest, arbitration is a profession of choice for retired judges. Quite a few have developed lucrative private practices, utilizing the skills they acquired on the bench as well as the public's trust in the judiciary to jumpstart their practice.

iv. Arbitrator lists and rosters:

The court system claims that formal lists do not exist, and that parties are urged to find a professional on their own. Informal lists do exist; either put together by individual judges or



maintained by private, for-profit, arbitration services providers. The Israeli Martindale-Hubble directory includes listings for attorney-arbitrators. Other directories, including descriptions of individual arbitrators' expertise or experience, are also available. These directories are, in essence, advertisement and do not indicate any official qualification, eligibility or recognition.

v. Nomination of foreign arbitrators:

There are no restrictions on the arbitrator's nationality. Naturally, when arbitrators are nominated / suggested by the court, there is an obvious tendency to appoint local experts.



3. Mediation

A. Introduction

After arbitration, mediation is the leading ADR method or mechanism utilized in Israel. Resort to other processes is negligible; therefore, this chapter will focus solely on mediation.

Mediation is growingly a popular alternative in many types of disputes. Its widest use in Israel is in family and divorce issues. It is also very commonly encountered in labor disputes. Both the Family Courts and the Labor Courts have integrated mediation methods and mechanisms into their day-to-day operation. There are no mentionable customs or cultural obstacles preventing application of mediation to disputes in Israel.

B. Mediation Institutionalization:

Mediation was rarely encountered in Israel prior to the late 1990s. Leading the effort to import and implement the process were the court system and the Ministry of Justice. This led to the establishment of two important bodies:

i. The Court Administration's Advisory Committee on Court-connected Mediation (Hereinafter: the "Advisory Committee") which was charged with approving mediators and mediators training qualification for court-connected mediation;

ii. The Ministry of Justice's National Center for Mediation and Dispute Resolution (Hereinafter: NCMDR), established as an independent unit in the Ministry of Justice, was charged with promoting use of mediation, and raising public awareness as to its benefits. This body is played a key role in some of the major developments in the Israeli mediation scene. Recently, it was instrumental in orchestrating the signing of two major "Mediation Treaties" in the commercial/industry sector and in the labor sector, calling for use of mediation in disputes encountered in these fields.



Later on, other institutional players became involved. Most notable, perhaps, is the Israeli Bar Association, which established a section on Dispute Resolution as well as a Mediation Institute offering mediation services to the public and the courts. Local Bar Association chapters followed route, establishing similar institutes.

C. Mediation Services Providers:

Israel has a thriving mediation scene, with many service providers. A random search on the Internet will instantly offer disputing parties hundreds of potential service providers. Mediation services are offered for just about any imaginable topic – divorce and family matters, commercial affairs, community issues, labor disputes etc.

While many professionals offer services on their own, the “mediation center” has been the preferred organizational framework for mediation activities. This holds true for all sectors: private, community and public sector; mediation initiatives will usually bond together into an entity defined as a private mediation *center*, a community mediation *center*, a campus mediation *center*, a professional guild’s mediation *center*. Of course, “Center” is not an officially recognized method of incorporation; it is merely a name given to a framework that seems to have developed some special characteristics. Centers were – and still are - usually initiated by a single mediator or at most 2-3 partners, aided perhaps by a 1 or 2 person support staff or freelance mediators.

Attempting to compile a list of Israeli mediation service providers including individual practitioners would be an exhausting task; Appendix C contains a list of the major Mediation Centers and a selection of other service providers.

In general, there would appear to be no outstandingly famous and recognized mediators in Israel; however, it is quite possible that different sectors have their own preferred and recognized service providers. One can easily access lists of mediators (some detailing experience, education etc.) through use of the Court Roster (which is open to public view and use), through the NCMDR



as well as through the Internet. The Israeli Martindale-Hubble legal directory devotes a large section to mediation services.

D. Mediator Qualifications:

i. Regulation

It is important to stress that mediation is not a regulated profession, in the sense that anybody can advertise himself as a mediator, open an office and wait for the public to knock on his door. There are no regulatory qualifications for anyone seeking to serve as a mediator; as in arbitration, parties' agreement is paramount.

However, the field is somewhat regulated by the fact that most of the cases reaching mediation are court-referred. The courts are supposed to refer cases to mediators included in the court's Mediators Roster. The criteria for inclusion in the Roster as well as instructions for its upkeep and managing are laid down in The Courts Regulations (Mediator Roster), 1996.

In order to be included in the Roster, a mediator must be approved by the Court's Advisory Committee, mentioned above. In order to gain such approval, a mediator must have:

- A) Completed of a 40 hour training course, approved by the committee;
- B) An undergraduate degree, at the least;
- C) 5 years minimum experience in his own professional field.

There are at present approximately 2,000 approved mediators on the court's Mediator Roster. However, many service providers are not included in this roster, whether due to under-qualification or as a matter of preference.

ii. Informal prerequisite mediator characteristics for commercial disputes:

The Israeli business community is generally dominated by middle-upper class males, 40-60 years old, of Western/European origin. Therefore, most female mediators, young (20-40 years old) mediators, or mediators belonging to an ethnic minority (new immigrants, non-Jews, etc.), might



find it harder to gain a reputation as prominent business mediators. This is not due to under-qualification, but rather is due to the fact that they don't belong to the "network", lack instantly apparent relevant experience and don't have the connections needed to get cases referred to them. That is not to say that there are not excellent mediators with these characteristics; however, they might be the first to admit that it is an uphill battle for them.

iii. Training

Most of the first Israeli mediators were trained by experts from abroad who came to Israel to conduct training sessions, in the early to mid-1990s. These experts, generally speaking, represented American East Coast problem-solving mediation. Since 1997, local Mediation Centers have branched out into mediation training; indeed, there was a period during which many Centers saw the bulk of their income from training activities, due to low consumer awareness to mediation among actual disputing parties. Within a few years, thousands of people underwent mediation training to one extent or another.

As with mediation practice, anyone can offer mediation training services. However, in order for such training to be recognized by the courts for the purpose of inclusion in the Mediator Roster, the training organization had to have its curriculum and trainers approved by the Advisory Committee. In order to meet the Advisory Committee's criteria, most training organizations adopted a 40 hour (later – 60 hour) training course, focusing on issues that the Advisory Committee decided on as being relevant for court-connected mediation.

While there is no need for qualification in order to serve as a mediator in general, and while a 40-60 hour training course is enough to qualify a mediator for inclusion in the Mediator Roster, few options exist for further professional development, mainly private Mediation Centers offering training in areas such as family mediation, business mediation, legal aspects of mediation and so on.

Noting the need for mediators to acquire practical experience before engaging in private practice, the Ministry of Justice's NCMDR established a program aimed at providing both a



suitable platform and proper supervision for this advanced training. The NCMDR undertook to broker a three-way agreement between the courts, the Mediation Centers and the NCMDR itself as representing the public interest in the availability of quality mediation services. The result was an advanced practical training course known as the *Practicum*. The courts referred large quantities of Small Claims Court cases to approved training centers, which brought in the mediation trainees and supplied the trainers to mentor them. In the course of the *Practicum*, a trainee performs intake of the potential parties to mediation, mediates 4 to 6 cases and observes over a dozen more, all under close supervision by experienced mentors. This training – standardized and constantly overseen by the NCMDR – has supplied hundreds of mediator trainees with their first practical experience. Although proposals are under review to amend the Court Regulations (Mediator Roster) in such a way as to give Practicum-trained mediators a degree of precedence over other mediators on the Mediator Roster, this has not yet been effected.

E. Public Awareness of Mediation:

i. Legal professionals:

Awareness, both to the availability of mediation services and to the process's advantage, is increasingly growing. 10 years ago, the word mediation caused the average legal professional to raise an eyebrow questioningly. Today, a jurist who is not familiar with the terms would arouse surprise. The embrace of mediation by the legal profession was sparked by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court publicly voicing his support for the use of ADR and extolling the advantages of these procedures. Only then did the legal community start to take these mechanisms seriously, as a practical option, rather than a theoretical idea. The Israeli Bar Association heard the message loud and clear, and its ambivalent approach to the process was replaced by its jumping on the bandwagon and setting up its own institutions and training programs. Many attorneys offer mediation services along with their legal services. Almost all judges in the court system have undergone mediation training organized by the court administration, and so have many members of the court system's administrative staff.



ii. *The business community:*

Arbitration was always seen as the major ADR process, and it is only in the past 3-4 years that awareness of mediation has grown. In 2003 ago a much-publicized treaty was signed amongst the major commercial corporations and the Chambers of Commerce declaring that the use of mediation will be preferred over litigation. A similar treaty was signed a year later between labor unions and trade / employer unions. It is unclear whether this has brought about change in the dispute resolution habits and norms of specific corporations.

iii. *Government and public agencies:*

Israel's Attorney General has issued a directive ordering all government agencies to consider use of mediation, particularly in inter-departmental or inter-agency disputes. The NMCADR has published a report dealing with the participation of the state in mediation processes. Some governmental departments have a relatively high degree of awareness to the process's advantages and uses; for example – the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Education.

Of course, the judiciary is the branch of government most directly affected by the rise of mediation, and is fully aware of its benefits. The court system has reorganized itself in a manner better suited to incorporate use of ADR as a day-to-day part of the system. Each courthouse has set up a case intake unit; one of its functions is to identify cases suitable for mediation or arbitration at a very early stage of the litigative process, and to suggest to disputants that their case be referred to appropriate professionals.

iv. *Law students:*

Every law faculty offers at least one elective ADR course in its curriculum, some offer more. As opposed to courses on Arbitration, which - as previously stated - tend to be legally oriented and not designed to train arbitrators, Mediation courses are usually taught in a hands-on, workshop-style method designed to transfer practical skills to participants. It is safe to say that every law student in Israel today is aware of the existence and availability of mediation.



F. Mediation Outcomes and Enforcing of Agreements:

If no agreement is reached through the mediation process, or if the mediator decides to halt the process, the process comes to an end. In the case of a privately-initiated mediation, parties can search for alternative methods (including litigation). In the case of court-referred mediation, the mediator notifies the court, without giving any substantial explanation for the lack of agreement or his decision. The court picks up where it left off, and reschedules the case for its next step in the litigation procedure.

If, on the other hand, the mediation process culminates in an agreement settling the dispute, parties can decide how they want to frame that agreement, as well their future relationship with the referring court. Essentially, parties have three choices:

- a) They can agree on a handshake, not forming their agreement into a legal document, and simply jointly petition the court to drop the case.
- b) They can shape their agreement into a binding, formal, legal contract, and simply jointly petition the court to drop the case.
- c) They can shape their agreement into a binding, formal, legal contract, and petition the court to affirm it, thereby giving it the power of a court decision or verdict.

Besides having the empowering effect of enabling parties to write their own verdict, option (c) also has significant practical implications in the event that one party is suspected by the other to be in breach of the mediated agreement. If their contract has been officially stamped by a judge and converted into a verdict, they do not need to sue the other party in court to obtain their contractual rights – they have the agreement-verdict immediately executed through the court system, skipping the judicial stage as a verdict has already been given. This option, usually the preferred one by parties to court-referred mediation, is what gives the process both its teeth and its allure – the knowledge that in a quick procedure one can reach an agreement that will be as binding as any judicial decision.



In order to clarify, we should stress that due to a 2003 amendment to the Courts Act, option C - enabling parties to transform an agreement into a judgment - is available not only in court-referred mediation, but in privately initiated cases as well. Parties to a privately initiated case can take their agreement to the court that would have dealt with their case had a suit been filed, and petition the court to affirm the agreement as a judicial decision.



4. Other ADR Mechanisms

A. Current State of the Field

Arbitration and mediation are by far the most commonly encountered mechanisms outside of the courts. Other, traditional, dispute resolution processes do exist, however their impact on commercial life is negligible.

In the Israeli-Arab community, the process of *Sulcha* is used primarily for settlement of blood feuds and inter-communal disputes. In this process, a panel of dignitaries fulfill a number of functions, ranging from “go betweens” for passing messages between parties, to arbitrators deciding the outcome of an issue. Even outside of the formal process of *Sulcha*, it is quite common to find disputants in disputes ranging from marital to commercial requesting help from a local dignitary or communal leader. These processes might be a mixture of consultation, arbitration or mediation.

In the Jewish Orthodox community, there are substantial sectors who try to avoid using the civil court system, preferring to settle matters “in-house”. In cases where both disputants are from this community, they will usually go to a “private” court to have the case adjudicated by rabbis according to Halachic (Jewish Orthodox) Law. From a legal standpoint, this is essentially a type of arbitration, and this is how the state views such institutions and judgments. Outside of this adjudicative process, is quite common to find religious parties to disputes ranging from marital to commercial jointly requesting help from a rabbinic figure; his assistance might take the forms reminiscent of consultation, arbitration or mediation.

Recently, attempts have been made to promote the use of Early Neutral Evaluation; however this has not yet caught on.

B. Suggested Strategies for Promoting Use of Mediation and Other ADR Processes:

While there are many ways to advance these goals, we will focus (due to the general purpose of this report) on areas where external help might be especially useful.



i. Increasing awareness education:

We would suggest two strategies that need to be stressed under this heading:

First, the general public should be subjected to a widespread media campaign raising their awareness to the existence and advantages of ADR. Primarily due to lack of funding, there has never such a media campaign; private mediation centers cannot afford to initiate anything beyond sporadic advertisement of their services in newspapers or on the Internet.

Second, possibilities for incorporating conflict resolution and management courses into business school education should be explored and promoted. In most programs aimed at management education, the most one can hope to encounter is a short, elective negotiation workshop.

ii. Improvement of services quality:

Due to the relatively low level of training, and even lower level of professional or regulatory supervision in the mediation field, there have naturally been cases of mismanagement or even negligence, leading disputants to avoid taking part in mediation in the future. In such a small country, it takes very little to give a new concept or trend a bad name. This situation could be improved in many ways:

One possibility would be to offer incentives or subsidize mediation centers offering high-quality (according to set criteria) services to the courts. This would encourage mediation centers to have their senior, experienced mediators handle these cases, instead of having them handled by junior associates due to their relatively low value to the center (mediator fees are capped in court-referred cases).

Another possibility would be providing professionals with scholarships to support professional training and development abroad. As discussed, there is relatively few possibility for professional development and advanced training beyond the basic training course.



iii. Research

ADR mechanisms must be suited to the Israeli social, legal and business environment if they are to pose a suitable alternative to litigation. Very little local research has been initiated. We propose supporting research projects aimed at identifying methods and best practices of mediation and ADR particularly suited to the local climate.

In our opinion, government support, as well as support originating in foreign governments or investors, would be very useful and have positive and empowering effects on the development and use of ADR in Israel.



5. Arbitration, Dispute Resolution and Mediation in Higher Education

There are no university programs dealing primarily with arbitration. Law schools invariably offer elective courses on the legal framework of arbitration; these courses are not practice-oriented. There are several practice-oriented training courses, offered by private, for-profit, arbitration services providers. There is no official accreditation for such programs.

There are two established graduate and doctoral programs in Conflict Resolution, at Bar Ilan University and at Hebrew University. A third graduate program has been opened recently at Tel Aviv University. It should be stressed that while these programs do offer courses and seminars on dispute resolution, much of their focus is on conflict resolution in the international, societal or intercultural level.

Bar Ilan University's Law Faculty offers Mediation as a specialty field in its general Master of Laws (LL.M) program.

There are no programs in Peace Studies offered in Israeli universities. However in Haifa University and in Tel-Hai College, Peace Education is offered as a specialty field in the School of Education.

Mediation courses are sometimes offered as electives in academic programs focusing on business, social work and education.



Appendix A: Trade Organizations

	Institute	Address	Phone	Fax	Web site
1	Israel SME Authority	Hamered 29 Tel-Aviv	03-7968100	03-5107557	http://www.asakim.org.il/
2	Federation of Israel Chambers of Commerce	84 Haashmonaim St. Tel-Aviv 67132	03-563-1020	03-561-9027	http://www.chamber.org.il/english/Contacts/Index.asp?CategoryID=38 chamber@chamber.org.il
3	Israeli Association of Crafts and Trades	Contact Person: Yaniv Haluta, Head of Legal Dept., haluta@aci.org.il	03-7959115		www.aci.org.il



Appendix B

Legal Organizations

	Institute	Address	Phone	Fax	Web site
1.	Ministry of Justice	Salah-A-Din 29, Jerusalem	02-6466666		www.justice.gov.il
2.	Supreme Court	Kiryat Ben-Gurion, Jerusalem, 91909	02-6593666	02-6759648	www.court.gov.il
3.	Court Administration	22 Kanfei Nesharim St. Jerusalem 95464	02-6556789		www.court.gov.il
4.	Advisory Committee to the Court Administration on Court-connected Mediation	Committee Chair: Judge Ezra Kama Contact the Committee through: Ms. Nicole Peretz Ozmat Institute Supreme Court Kiryat Ben-Gurion, Jerusalem, 91909	02-6750400	02-6759611	
5.	Israeli Bar Association	Daniel Frish 10 Tel Aviv	03-6918691	036918696	www.israelbar.org



Appendix C

Dispute Resolution Organizations

Appendix C(1) - Dispute Resolution Umbrella Organizations					
	Institute	Address	Phone	Fax	Web site
1	The National Center for Mediation and Dispute Resolution in the Ministry of Justice	2 Hashlosa St. P.O.B 9299 Tel-Aviv 61092	03-6899800	03-6899758 03-6899792	www.justice.gov.il
2	The IBA's National Mediation Institute	10 Daniel Frish St. Tel-Aviv 64731	03-6092268	03-6091641	www.israelbar.org.il



Appendix C(2) - Mediation Service Providers

	Institute	Address	Phone	Fax	Web site
1	"Amir-Moran Gishurim"*	P.O.B 123 Timrat 23840	04-6546854 04-6545681	04-6543330	
2	"Amot-Gishur"*	44 She'erit Hapleta St. P.O.B 55830 Haifa 34987 - and - 13 Beit Oved st. Tel-Aviv 67211	04-8246065 03-6874302	04-8246065 03-6874316	http://www.amot-gishur.co.il/
3	"Bar-Siah"*	28 Reger St. P.O.B 555 Beer-Sheva 84105	08-6650112	08-6209367	b-siach@zahav.net.il
4	"Benoam" – center of mediation at the Sharon	6a Ha'tothanim St. Kfar-Saba 44537	09-7655842	09-7666208	
5	"Derech Gishur"*	7 Aba Hilel St. Ramat-Gan 52522	03-6139977	03-6139555	
6	"Gevim" center of mediation*	22 Zecharia St. Tel-Aviv	03-6024576 054-565677	03-5445959	www.gevim.co.il
7	"Gishur Hever Hamegashrim"	194 Aco via St. Kiriath Bialik	04-8744683	04-8747954	
8	"Gishur Israel-north "	31 Haoranim St. Kiriath-Tivon	04-9536999	04-9832532	
9	"Gishur"	100 Harimon St. Neve Monson	03-5339702 03-5336643	03-5337682	
10	"Gishur" *	4 Shenkar St. Herzlia Industrial Area P.O.B 12643 Herzlia 46733			
11	"Gishur"	84 Sokolov St. Ramat-Hasharon	03-5407936	03-5496107	
12	"Gishurim-ADR"*	1 Berenstein st. Ramat-Gan	03-6776081	03-6776133	www.gishurim-adr.com
13	Neve Tzedek Mediation*	29 Hamered St. Tel-Aviv 68125	03-5105059 09-7653426 052-806434	03-5168386	
14	"Goma"*	10 Dizingof St. Tel-Aviv	099577516	09-9573053	www.gome-gishur.co.il
15	"Gsharim"	18 Lincoln St. Tel-Aviv	03-6242691	03-6242713	www.engineers.org.il
16	"Hasharon" center of mediation	15 Abab Hilel St. Ramat-Gan 52522 2 Hazait St. Ra'anana 43263	03-7526006 09-7662829	03-7525004 09-7442830	
17	"Haskamot"*	19a Tashach St. P.O.B 1130 Zichron-Ya'akov 30900	04-6290301	04-6290577	www.haskamot.com
18	"Gishur – Israel"*	12 Hatzfira St. Jerusalem 93102	02-5661199 03-5661133	02-5663355 03-5661188	www.gishur-israel.com
19	"Maagalim"	3 Jerusalem St.	04-8666341	04-8666338	



		Haifa			
20	"Maavarim	17 Kovshei Katamon St. Jerusalem 93663	02-5634033	02-5617181	
21	"Melamed Dispute Management" *	35 Rotshild St. Tel-Aviv 66883	03-5604488	03-5604499	
22	"Merchav"*	13 Harav Chava St. Ramat-Gan 52482	03-6700860 052-8433495	03-5444349	
23	"Mifgash" –	18/1 Ze'ev Sharf St. Jerusalem 97842	02-5851344	02-5852266	
24	"Ne'emanim"	2 yegia kapaim St. Tel-Aviv	03-6888474	03-6888473	http://gishur.org
25	"Nekudat Mifne" *	12 Karmi'ia St. Tel-Aviv	03-6858861	03-6852429	www.nekudat-mifne.com
26	"Noam"	4 Shvil Ha'Izdarechet St. P.O.B 161 Nahariya 22101	04-9001883	04-9001885	
27	"Pitronot"	23 Sheshet Haiamim St. Jerusalem	02-5811663	02-9992857	
28	"Pitronot"	Kubutz Yachad St. P.O.B Misgav 20182	04-6789568 054-225279	04-6789568	
29	"Shani" *	5 Mikve Israel St. Tel-Aviv 65115	03-6202387 03-5608986	03-5608991	
30	"Tachlit" *	43a Emek Refaim St. Jerusalem 93141	02-5637482 08-9718071	02-5663833	
31	"Yesh Motza"	40 Habanim St. Ramat Hasharon 47223	03-5470177	03-5406062	
32	Adam Institute	12 Emek Refaim St. Jerusalem	02-5617181	02-5617181	
33	Adler institute	1 Yasmin St. Ramat Efal	03-5357513	03-5357525	
34	ADM*	56 Ashkenazi St Tel-Aviv	03-6489890 050-289858	03-6489931	www.gishur-adm.co.il/gishur-adm.asp
35	ADR	51 Weizmann St. Tel-Aviv	03-6958426	03-6962205/6	
36	Gat Hamutal, advocate*	92a Osishkin St. Ramat Hasharon	03-5474189	03-5473481	
37	Geser institute	4b Benei Moshe St. Tel-Aviv	03-6055230 03-5445120/1	03-9021510	
38	Gesher institute *	55 Moria St. Haifa 34401 19 Mark Chagall St. Haifa	04-8241760	04-82252584	http://lehmann-ofri.tripod.com/
39	Mediation Institute	3 Jerusalem St. Haifa	04-8667166	04-8660215	
40	Mediation Office	23 Derech Petach Tikva St.	03-7101616	03-7101617	



		Tel-Aviv			
41	Naomi Asia, advocate	32 Habarzel St. P.O.B 13125 Tel-Aviv 69710	03-6444808	03-6444818	www.computer-law.co.il
42	Silfer Israel *	9 Kehilat Venezia St. Neot Afeka Tel-aviv 69400	03-6497544 052-425323	03-6497544	
43	The Center for Business Mediation	29 Ha'mered St. P.O.B 50135 Tel-Aviv 61500	03-7537683	03-7537684	
44	The center of dispute management in real estate and land planning matters	28 Smadar St. P.O.B 1137 Ramat-Gan 52596	03-7519642	03-5754454	
45	Herzelia Mediation Center	2 Achi Dakar St. Herzelia Pituach	09-9513945	09-9580366	
46	The Israel Center for Negotiation and Mediation*	122 Moria St. Haifa	8112811-04	8112813-04	www.icn.org.il
47	The Israeli Center for Family Mediation	Sheraton city tower 3 Begin St. Ramat-Gan 52136	03-7537683	03-7537684	www.mitgashrim.co.il/8index.html (Hebrew)
48	The Israeli Center of Mediation	2 Shaar Palmar St. Haifa 33031	04-8627067	04-8625257	
49	Mediation Office	10 Rabbi Akiva St. Jerusalem	02-6222627	02-6236104	

*Certified to train mediators for the court system



APPENDIX C(3) – Arbitration Service Providers					
	Institute	Address	Phone	Fax	Web site
1	"Derech Gishur"	7 Aba Hilel St. Ramat-Gan 52522	03-6139977	03-6139555	
2	Adler Baruch advocate and notary	7 Menachem Begin St. Ramat-Gan 52521	03-6114475	03-6114476	
3	Asia Naomi, advocate	32 Habarzel St. P.O.B 13125 Tel-Aviv 69710	03-6444808	03-6444818	www.computer-law.co.il
4	Asnin Orit, advocate and mediator	44 Hameginim St. P.O.B 33863 Haifa 33863	04-8554060	04-8554070	
5	Balter, Guth, Aloni & Co.	2 Kaufman St. Tel Aviv 68012	03-5111111	03-5102166	www.bgalaw.co.il
6	Caspi & Co.	33 Yavetz St. Tel Aviv 65258	03-7961000	03-7961001	www.caspilaw.com
7	Cohen Lahat & Co.	7 Menachem Begin St. Ramat Gan 52521	03-6110611	03-6110600	www.cldlaw.co.il
8	Dan Cohen, Spigelman, Barak, Zamir & Co. Attorneys at Law	20 Lincoln Street Tel Aviv 67134	03-6254666	03-6254669	
9	Dan Marwitz & Co. Law Office & Notary	1A Keller St. Haifa 34483	04-8385175	04-8371525	
10	Danziger, Klagsbald & Co. Law Offices	28 Bezalel St. Ramat Gan 52521	03-6110700	03-6110707	www.danklaw.co.il
11	Dlayahu Ronen and co.	1 Uri David St. Tel Aviv 64954	03-6915678	03-6915679	www.dlayahu.co.il
12	Dr. Shlomo Nass & Co. Law Offices	7 Menachem Begin Rd. Ramat Gan 52521	03-6114455	03-6133343	
13	Elroi-Manor, advocates	15 Aba Hillel st. Ramat-Gan 52522	03-7525676	03-7525677	
14	Erdinest, Ben Nathan & Co., advocates	25 Nachmani St. P.O.B 14140 Tel-Aviv 65794	03-6212500	03-5250896	www.ebnlaw.co.il
15	Eshkar Daniel, law office	6 Hatania St. Tel-Aviv 62481	03-5223313 02-6234974 08-6372015 052-2457511		
16	Frish Sara, Judge (retired) –	14 Moshe Dayan 14 Petach Tikva 49518	03 - 9239010	03 – 9239015 03 - 9239016	



17	Gil Ron, Keinan and Co. Law Office	32 Weizmann St. Tel Aviv 62091	03-6967676	03-6967673	
18	Gishur Israel	12 Ha'Tzfira St. Jerusalem 39102	02-5661199	02-5663355	www.gishur-israel.com
19	Goldfarb, Levy, Eran & Co.	2 Weizmann St. Tel Aviv 64239	03-6089999	03-6089907	www.glelaw.com
20	Gutzagn Gal, Judge (retired)	24 Raul Valenberg St. Tel-Aviv 69719	03 - 7668920	03 - 7668928	
21	Herzog, Fox & Neeman Law Offices	4 Weizman St. Tel Aviv 64239	03-6922020	03-6966464	www.hfn.co.il
22	Joseph Samuel & Co. Law Offices & Notaries	13 Tuval Sr. Ramat Gan 52522	03-6128000	03-6128800	
23	Kantor, Elhanani, Tal & Co.	74-76 Rothschild Blvd. Tel Aviv 65785	03-7140400	03-7140401	www.ketlaw.co.il
24	M. Porath & Co. Advocates & Notaries	23 Menachem Begin St. Tel Aviv 66183	03-5664411	03-5606464	www.porathlaw.co.il
25	Mediation Plus Dispute Resolution Center	6 Ha'Nechoshet Tel Aviv 69710	03-7683121	03-6481777	
26	Meitar, Liquornik, Geva & Leshem, Brandwein Law Offices	16 Abba Hillel Silver Rd. Ramat Gan 52506	03-6103100	03-6103111	www.meitar.com
27	Melcer & Co. Law Offices	2 Kaplan St. Tel Aviv 64734	03-6951160	03-6951104	
28	Nantel Abraham & Co. Law Offices & Notary	71 Ramataim Road P.O.B 61 Hod-Hasharon 45100	09-7406322 09-7406881	09-7405824	www.nantelaw.com
29	Oliel Avi, advocate	61 Carmey Tzur Carmey Tzur 90400	02-9309385 050-5651384	02-9309385	
30	Pnina Merfish Attorney at Law	6 Ha'Nechoshet St. Tel Aviv 69710	03-7683121	03-6481777	
31	Ram Noam Law Offices	50 Dizengof St. Tel Aviv 64332	03-5284990	03-5285082	
32	Raved, Magriso, Benkel & Co. Advocates & Notaries	37 Shaul Hamelech Blvd. Tel Aviv 64928	03-6060260	03-6060266	
33	Rony Golan Advocate	19 Hayetzira St. Ramat Gan 52521	03-5757755	03-5755762	www.golan-law.co.il



34	Strikovsky, Gal, Barouch, Porat & Co.	63 Rothschild Blvd. Tel Aviv 65785	03-5252650	03-5252651	
35	Tulchinsky - Stern & Co. Law Offices	14 Abba Hillel Road Ramat Gan 52506	03-7519181	03-7511127	www.tslaw.co.il
36	Uri Chen Law Offices	7 Menachem Begin Street Ramat Gan 52521	03-6129612	03-6129616	
37	Yechiel Bronner, Adv.	5 Jabotinski St. Ramat Gan 52520	03-7522522 052-6946646	03-7521195	
38	Yuval Levy & Co. Law Offices & Notary	8 Ness Ziona St. P.O.B 26379 Tel Aviv 63904	03-5172303	03-5164185	www.yuvalaw.co.il
39	Zahavi, Blau & Co. Law Offices & Notary	98 Yigal Alon St. Tel Aviv 67891	03-6919166	03-6963696	

