

Update on a 2nd opinion for comparison to the Senior Architect's Technical Report

Dear Owners,

I would like to provide a clear and factual update on the current position regarding the infrastructure programme, the proposed independent second opinion, & recent communications circulating among owners.

Overall approach & current process

I fully recognise the concerns many owners have regarding both the scale of the works & the potential financial implications. As an owner myself, I share those concerns.

As President, my responsibility is to ensure that any decisions taken by the Community are based on:

- verified technical evidence
- competitive & transparent pricing
- proper financial & legal oversight

The process we are following remains structured & deliberate:

- Technical assessment of the existing condition (completed)
- Independent validation through a second opinion (in progress)
- Market testing of contractors & pricing (to follow)
- Development of a realistic phasing & timetable
- Presentation of financing options for owner decision

No final commitments have been made. The objective is to ensure that when decisions are taken, they are based on reliable & complete information. **Certainty for all owners remains a key driver.**

Current position – second opinion

There has been recent communication outside official channels suggesting that the second opinion has been “secured” & is awaiting formal approval.

To clarify: **this is not the current position.**

While the Working Group has indicated that a quotation has been obtained, the **formal proposal & contract have not been shared with the President, our Industrial Engineer or Adenjo.** At the same time, authorisation has been requested to proceed with payment in advance of that disclosure.

This creates a clear governance issue.

The President & Administrator are responsible for ensuring that any expenditure of community funds is properly documented & contractually defined before payment is authorised.

Without sight of the proposal & contract, it is not possible to:

- verify the scope of work & deliverables
- confirm the level of detail in the cost breakdown (Bill of Quantities)
- understand the contractual terms & overall cost structure
- assess what is included within the stated budget & what may fall outside it
- identify the contracting entity & ensure accountability

For this reason, the request to authorise €38k, which can be expected to rise to over €40k, cannot be authorised at this stage.

A simple & immediate solution has already been proposed:

- the proposal & contract are shared confidentially with the President & Industrial Engineer
- a review is completed within 24–48 hours
- authorisation is given promptly thereafter

This allows the second opinion to proceed without delay while maintaining proper governance.

Clarification on urgency and safety

Recent communications outside official channels have also suggested that the question of whether the works are “urgent” should be determined before any action is taken.

It is important to clarify that **a second opinion is not a prerequisite for acting on safety concerns.**

Based on the existing technical reports & communications with our Technical Architect, there are already identified risks relating to elements of the façades (including Doñana & Triana) & the condition of the Giralda garage.

As President, **I have not agreed that all actions should be deferred pending a second opinion.** Where potential safety issues exist, the Community has a duty to act with appropriate caution &, where necessary, take timely measures.

The second opinion is intended to strengthen & refine decision-making, not to delay actions where safety may be a factor.

Role of the second opinion

The independent second opinion is a useful & entirely standard step in projects of this nature.

However, it is important to understand its role correctly.

The original technical reports were prepared by an experienced Senior Technical Architect, formally commissioned by the Community, and shared with all owners. These reports form the **current technical baseline.**

The second opinion will provide an additional, independent perspective. It may confirm, refine, or challenge aspects of the existing assessment. It should therefore be seen as complementary - **not as replacing or overriding the initial work.**

This is not a question of “trust” versus “verification.” The Community’s process is based on:

- professional technical input
- transparency of information
- collective decision-making by owners

No single report determines the outcome - owners will ultimately decide based on all available information.

Integrity of Communications & Information Sources

A number of messages have recently circulated on social media and other informal channels.

Owners are, of course, entitled to express their views. However, some of the information being shared:

- is based on partial or unverified interpretations
- presents conclusions that have not been agreed within the formal process
- in some cases, appears to draw on information originally shared in confidence within the ‘working group’ & therefore subject to the President’s ‘Terms of Reference’ for good group practice.

There are currently **no ‘Official Señorío’ social media groups**, & any Facebook or WhatsApp channels using the Community’s name are informal and unauthorised.

Given the complexity and importance of the decisions ahead, I would strongly encourage all owners to rely on **complete, verified, & formally communicated information** when forming their views.

To **remind you: there is a professional practical team of experts** representing your interests:

- Adenjo: Community Administrator with **over 20yrs extensive experience**
- Victor Javier Porras Santamaría: Senior Industrial Engineer
- Francisco Manuel López Chacón: **Senior Technical Architect**
- Belen Villena: Lawyer and Urban Planning Expert

Ensuring progress

Finally, I want to be clear that the Community’s progress will not be allowed to stall.

The Working Group has been asked to share the formal proposal and contract for the second opinion so that it can be reviewed and authorised in line with proper governance. This remains the preferred and most straightforward path.

However, if this documentation is not provided this week, the Administration will proceed to **introduce alternative proposals from two independent, highly reputable technical firms** capable of delivering the same second opinion.

These proposals will be shared transparently with owners and assessed in the same structured manner, ensuring that the Community can move forward without unnecessary delay.

The objective is not who provides the second opinion, but that it is carried out:

- independently
- professionally
- and under proper contractual and financial oversight

CONCLUSION & NEXT STEPS

There is no disagreement about the objective:

- to fully understand the condition of the buildings
- to identify the correct technical solutions including damage control & root causes
- to ensure costs are justified & controlled
- to allow owners to make informed decisions, especially around financing options that enable owners to pay their share under reasonable terms & conditions, & that do not shift the burden of responsibility onto other owners.

There is also no intention to delay or obstruct progress of obtaining a second opinion

As soon as the proposal for the second opinion is shared, it will be reviewed as a priority so that the process can move forward without unnecessary delay.

If you have any questions or would like clarification, you are welcome to contact myself, the Vice President, or Adenjo directly.

Kind regards,

John Riley – President SdA