

18th Intercollegiate Negotiation Competition

Handbook for Participants

(Oct.1, 2019 version)

Steering Committee

Intercollegiate Negotiation Competition

Introduction

We started the Intercollegiate Negotiation Competition ("INC") in 2002 to provide students an opportunity to compete in mock negotiations and arbitrations with students from other universities in Japan and other countries. Our aim is to spark greater interest in negotiation and arbitration and provide an incentive for learning more about those fields. Our mission now is to offer young people good learning opportunities to become better negotiators so that they will create new values and settle differences so as to make a better world.

INC provides participants with both arbitration and negotiation opportunities in business settings, which specifically require them (i) to understand and learn the pros and cons of both negotiation and arbitration, (ii) to acquire oral and written negotiation skills in a language other than their own, (iii) to develop good teamwork in business settings, and (iv) to promote networking with various people including alumni of INC.

INC is a growing endeavor, which is supported by its sponsors, judges, teachers and past, present and future participants. Every year we attract more than 100 judges from the Japanese and international bar, Japanese and foreign universities, and internationally acclaimed companies. We hope that the efforts of all those who attend help make INC better as a whole.

Many of our judges are past participants of INC. They have demonstrated their leadership by helping the Leaders' Camp held in every autumn, assisting with practice matches held locally or coaching the students of the participating universities. We believe that their activities play an important role towards our mission: offering young people good learning opportunities to become better negotiators.

The Steering Committee hopes that participants gain something precious for their life, through preparation and performances for the two days of the competition.

The Steering Committee of Intercollegiate Negotiation Competition

I . About the Competition

1. Overview

The Intercollegiate Negotiation Competition is a two-day invitation-based competition that is held every year, with both a Japanese-language division and English-language division. The Competition is sponsored by many organizations, such as The Sumitomo Group Public Affairs Committee.

We conduct arbitration of an international business dispute on the first day and negotiation on the second day. The problem is more than 30 pages long, including contract documents. Participants deal with international business matters between Red Corporation of Negoland and Blue Corporation of Arbitria in a fictitious world, representing one of the parties, spending about two months in preparation for the two days of the actual competition.

The applicable substantive law is the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts 2016. For the arbitration round, each team has to submit its preliminary memorandum and memorandum for counter-argument prior to the competition date.

For the negotiation round, confidential information for Red Corporation and Blue Corporation is provided to each side respectively, in addition to the general information provided to both. Each participant is assigned a role, such as vice president or manager of a specified division, and each person is expected to conduct negotiations from the perspective of the respective role.

The Competition is judged by many business persons, judges, lawyers, and university professors, including the alumni of this Competition. Learning opportunities from such professionals is one of the attractive features of the Competition.

2. Participating Universities and Winners in the Past Competitions

Participating universities and winners in the past Competitions are as follows:

		Number of Univ.	Number of Participants	Winner	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
1	2002	4	74	Tokyo						
2	2003	8	129	Tokyo	Kyushu	Sophia	Osaka			
3	2004	12	173	Tokyo	Kyushu	Hitotsubashi	Osaka	Doshisha	Sophia	
4	2005	14	205	Kyoto	Tokyo	Nagoya	Hokkaido/ Sophia	Hitotsubashi		
5	2006	16	209	Australia	Kyoto	Doshisha	Sophia	Nagoya		
6	2007	17	250	Australia	Tokyo	Hitotsubashi	Doshisha	Sophia		
7	2008	16	260	Tokyo	Hitotsubashi	Kyoto	Waseda	Sophia		
8	2009	15	240	Tokyo	Doshisha	Waseda	Kyushu	Sophia		
9	2010	17	270	Tokyo	Hitotsubashi	Osaka	Australia	Waseda /Sophia		
10	2011	19	263	Waseda	Sophia	Osaka	Keio	Tokyo		
11	2012	18	247	Keio	Waseda	Kyoto	Sophia	Kyushu		
12	2013	16	232	Tokyo	Nagoya	Kyushu	Chuo	Sophia		
13	2014	20	258	Tokyo	Kyushu	Australia	Keio	Sophia		
14	2015	21	251	Singapore	Tokyo	Osaka	Kyoto	Hitotsubashi		
15	2016	19	235	Austraria	Singapore	Osaka	Sophia	Kyoto/ Hitotsubashi		
16	2017	28	293	Kyoto	Australia	Sophia	Chuo/Tokyo		Singapore/ Ritsumeikan	
17	2018	31	271	Australia	Singapore	Tokyo	Osaka	Sophia	Kyoto	Mongolia

3. Resources

At the website of INC you will find selected materials from the past symposiums and briefs provided by the winning universities.

In addition, reports regarding the previous Competition and comments from advisers, judges and participants are published in Japanese every year in the March issue of the legal journal "Hogaku Kyoshitsu".

4. Major changes from 17th Competition

The major changes of the Rule from 17th competition are:

- In Round A, the maximum length of the memorandum is increased from 11 to 12 pages.
- In Round B, the submission of the preliminary memorandum is not required. In exchange, the length of the meeting with judges is increased from 5 to 10 minutes and each team needs to provide judges with documents about the content of its presentation during the meeting.
- In Round B, the exchange of name cards is abolished.
- Evaluation criteria is reduced from 15 to 10.

II. Overview of the 18th Competition, 2019

Program and Schedule

(1) Date : November 23, Saturday and 24, Sunday, 2019

(2) Place : Sophia University (Kioi-cho 7-1, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo)

(3) Program:

<Day1/November 23>

11:00-12:00	Staff and Judge Meeting
12:00-12:50	Opening Ceremony
13:00-17:00	Round A (Arbitration)
17:00-18:00	Evaluation
18:00-20:00	Welcome Party

<Day2/November 24>

08:30-09:20	Staff and Judge Meeting
09:20-13:30	Round B (Negotiation)
13:30-15:30	Evaluation, Lunch, Afternoon Tea
15:30-17:30	Closing Ceremony

(4) Time Schedule:

1. October 1 (Mon): Release of the Problem & Rules
2. October 11 (Fri), 15:00: Registration Deadline
3. October 16 (Wed):
Distribution of Confidential Information and Match Table
4. Deadlines for questions about the Problem and Rules:
October 11 (Fri), 15:00: 1st Deadline
October 21 (Mon), 15:00: 2nd Deadline
October 30 (Wed), 15:00: 3rd Deadline
5. November 12 (Tue), Noon:
Deadline for Preliminary Memorandum for Round A
6. November 19 (Tue), Noon:
Deadline for Preliminary Memorandum for Round B &
for Round A Response

※There's a possibility that the schedule may be modified.

※All Deadlines are based on Japanese standard time (GMT+9).

III. Registration

1. Registration of participation

- (1) Each participating university shall register by 15:00 on October 11 (Fri.) (Japanese standard time), using the specified format on the website. The format will be available from October 1.
- (2) Each university may register 1 or 2 teams for the Japanese language division and 1 or 2 teams for the English language division, in total up to 3 teams. Each team shall be composed of 4 or 5 members in principle, except there is a reasonable reason to change the number of members and/or teams, admitted by the Steering Committee from the point of educational purpose and so on (Rule 4 (5)).
- (3) Upon registration, please designate the name of the representatives and an instructor of your university, in accordance with Rule 4(7).
- (4) If any participant has experience as a practicing attorney or business person for one year or more, please make a declaration in accordance with Rule 4(8).
- (5) Upon registration, please indicate in the registration form whether participants need accommodation to be booked by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee reserves rooms in several hotels and Inns. Participants from universities which come from outside Japan, Hokkaido University, and universities from Kyoto and further west, could stay at a hotel on both November 22 (Fri) and November 23 (Sat), while participants from other universities could stay on November 23 (Sat). Since it is up to each participant and/or each University whether to apply for the accommodation, please declare clearly whether it is needed or not.
- (6) 3 extra bonus points will be added to the score for universities that send teams to both the English and Japanese divisions (Rule 11(7)).

2. Registration Fees

Registration fee per participant is 5,000 JPY (2,000 JPY, if accommodation booking by the Steering Committee is not necessary). Each university shall pay the total amount of registration fees for all members by Friday, October 25 (Fri). The Steering Committee will inform the instructor of each university of the banking account number for such payment.

IV. Problem, Rules and Newsletters

1. Problem

(1) Problem

The Problem consists of 1) general information common for all participants and 2) specific confidential information for each party. The latter is used only for Round B. The former will be released through the website of the Competition and the latter will be sent to the representative and Adviser of each University by e-mail.

(2) Questions about the Problem and Revision of the Problem

After the release of the Problem, the representative participant of each university may ask questions to the Committee up until October 30 in MS-Word format. Each question needs to be accompanied by an explanation of the reasons for the question. If the Committee finds it necessary to respond to the questions, it will do so, in principle, by revising the Problem.

In the event participants have questions, please send them as early as possible. The expected schedule for responding to questions is as follows:

Questions made by October 11: Will be answered by October 18

Questions made by October 21: Will be answered by October 30

Questions made by October 30: Will be answered by November 5

The Problem will be amended as necessary to reflect questions/answers, and may be amended for other reasons, in the determination of the Steering Committee. The final version of the Problem will be announced by about November 5.

Every year the Committee receives many questions. Most questions, however, are not specifically replied to, for the following types of reasons: The initial version of the Problem contains sufficient issues to be disputed or discussed. Even if some questions may be considered important in practice, trying to address all questions might make the Problem overly complicated. Also, many questions attempt to add some facts which may give an advantage to one side or the other. We are careful not to amend the Problem in a manner that would give some advantages to one party unless such amendment is absolutely necessary to clarify the situation. Furthermore, we have declined to answer

questions when we expect the participants to consider the matters by themselves or when the answers are reasonably clear from the context. In sum, there are many reasons why the Committee does not answer all of your questions.

(3) Relationship between the Simulated Case and the Real World

The Problem is a simulation, taking place in an imaginary world, so some of the situations presented in this case may be at variance with the real world. With this in mind, the fictional facts and situations presented in the Problem should be treated as fact for the purposes of this Competition.

Not all the facts are specified in the simulated case of the Problem. The unspecified parts may be supplemented by general understandings in the real world. However, the purpose of this Competition is NOT to discuss whether some facts are true or not. While certain facts not outlined in the Problem can be agreed upon by the competing parties, effort should be given NOT to debate which facts are true and which facts are not. In some cases, the judge may decide the facts in order to expedite the Competition proceedings and in such cases the continuing discussions will be based on the decided facts.

2. Rules

The Competition is held based on the rules published every year. Please read the rules carefully and understand them thoroughly before participating in the Competition.

3. Newsletters

The Steeling Committee issues Newsletters in order to give important information about the Competition. Newsletters will be uploaded to the Competition website. Instructors and representatives of each university will be informed by email when a Newsletter is issued.

V. Key Rules

* Please be sure to read the newest version of the Rules on your own.

1. Team composition and roles of members

- Each team shall be composed of four or five members
(on an exceptional basis, teams of three or six members may also be allowed).
- Members shall perform their roles as follows:
 - Round A: all members act as attorneys of the Company
 - Round B: each member acts in a specific role, including those specified in the Problem. Who would perform which role shall be clarified in the materials handed to Judges at the Meeting with Judges in Round B.

2. Round A

(1) Applicable substantive law: the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts 2016

(2) Memoranda: In Round A, two types of documents should be submitted as follows. Please pay attention to the specified forms and time schedule.

① Preliminary Memorandum: by noon of November 12 (Tuesday)

Not to exceed 12 pages excluding the cover page, for both the English and Japanese divisions.

There is no restriction on choice of fonts and size thereof, nor on line spacing for the memoranda. Charts and/or indexes can be used. Appearance and readability are evaluated.

② Response: by noon of November 19 (Tuesday) :

Not to exceed 2 pages excluding the cover page, for both the English and Japanese divisions.

The response should be composed of arguments and supporting reasons that counter the preliminary memorandum of your counter party.

·Exceeding the length limit, violation of format rules (as set forth in Rule

7(4)), and late submission will result in the deduction of points. For details please refer to Rule 7(6).

•In the submission of a memorandum and a response, no additional materials, exhibits or appendix may be attached.

Rule 7 (4) Each team shall submit a preliminary memorandum by the deadline specified in Rule 2 (2) by sending it as an email attachment to the Steering Committee. A university which has two or more teams shall submit the preliminary memorandums of all teams at the same time (in case preliminary memorandums of one university are submitted in 2 or more e-mails, the memorandum of that university is considered to be submitted at the time when the last memorandum of that university is arrived). The format of the memorandum shall be as follows:

①The memorandum shall be submitted as a PDF file, with A4 size page setting. The maximum length of a memorandum is twelve (12) pages for both the Japanese and English divisions.

②A cover page shall be attached to the memorandum, which sets forth the name of the university, team number, which company (Red or Blue) the team represents, and the names of team members. Please send the memorandum and cover page as one PDF file.

③The file name of the PDF file shall be “Memo A by English 1 (or 2) NEGO (name of university only in capital letters)”

④Each margin (upper, lower, right, left) of each page shall be 25 mm and the page number shall be placed at the bottom center of each page.

⑤The choice of fonts and size thereof, spacing of lines, and the number of letters per line, and/or whether using charts, etc., are matters for discretion of each team. Please note that legibility may also be included in the scope of evaluation by the judges.

⑥The upper limit of the maximum file size is about 3MB.

- In this Competition, in which both parties submit their own preliminary memorandum at the same time, the preliminary memorandum shall contain the counter-argument against expected assertions from the other Party. However, it would not be necessary to describe unnatural way of argument, such as “even if the other Party would raise (A) to assert (B) …”. On the contrary, for example, as a part of their own asserting story, “In addition, (A) would not influence on our assertion, since…” or “In addition, (A) should be considered as…” might be described in the memorandum in order to assert no influence on the legitimacy of their own statement, even if it seems to become some disadvantage for their

own assertion. The response has only 2 pages, and its main purpose is to make counter-argument against the assertions of the other Party that are not expected and counter-argued in the preliminary memorandum.

(Rule 7 (10))

In the memorandum, all the issues listed in the Problem must be addressed, giving consideration to reasonably expected counter-arguments. The memorandum should be drafted with an easy to understand and logical structure, by using concise sentences, sub-section headings, etc.

(3) Schedule of the First Day

13:00-13:10	Setting (arrangement of the room)
13:10-16:20	Opening Statement and Hearing, for each set of major issues (as specified in the Problem) For each case, each party will provide a 3-minute opening statement; the opening statements will be followed by oral arguments before the arbitrators, conducted in accordance with directions from the arbitrators
16:20-16:30	Preparation time for Closing Arguments (5-minute for each party)
16:30-16:40	Closing Arguments by Red and Blue
16:40-17:00	Comments by the arbitrators

(4) Rules for the Procedures on the First Day

① Arguments which have not been mentioned in memoranda may be made on the Day of the Competition.

(Rule 7 (11))

...Arguments not set forth in the memorandum are permitted to be made orally in Round A, but failure to cover an important point in the memorandum, or making an oral argument that conflicts with a position set forth in the memorandum, may be negatively evaluated by the judges.

② Proceedings

(Rule 7 (16))

The arbitration panel's method of procedure may vary from group to group. For example, based on experiences in past competitions, in some groups the panel will focus on the parties exchange with the panel, in other groups the panel will focus on exchange and discussion between the parties, and in some groups the panel will allot a specific amount of time in which each party is to express their assertions and reasoning, with no opportunity for questions and answers. Whatever the method may be, the arbitration panel has an obligation to treat both parties fairly, and may not give one party an unfair advantage due to the procedure adopted. Parties who have doubts regarding the fairness of the arbitration panel's method of procedure may raise an objection during the arbitration, and parties who are unsatisfied with the response from the panel may make appeal to the Steering Committee. However, objections must be made before the end of the round.

③ Applicable Procedure

Procedure of the arbitration shall be governed by the 2010 UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules and the place of arbitration is Japan. In the event of a conflict between the aforementioned UNCITRAL provisions, the Problem and the Rules of this Competition take priority, and the UNCITRAL provisions take second priority.

④ Burden of Proof

Rule 7 (17) Participants should take note that, as a general matter, each side has an obligation to persuade the arbitration panel as to its claims, by backing up its arguments with facts or reasoning, based on matters contained in the Problem, Exhibits and/or other materials.

⑤ Issues NOT Specified in the Problem

Issues for the arbitration should be limited to the ones specified in the Problem.

⑥Caucus Time

Rule 7 (18) Each team may request 5 minutes of caucus time per hour. However, the arbitration panel may postpone a request for a caucus for up to 20 minutes, as it deems appropriate for the orderly progress of the arbitration.

⑦Opening Statements and Closing Statement

One or a few members of a team may present opening and closing statements (Rule 7 (15)).

3. Round B

(1)Sharing the respective roles.

(Rule 8 (1)) Participants shall share responsibilities and carry out their respective roles in order to ensure smooth operation of their team (points may be deducted by the judges, or a warning issued by the Steering Committee, in the event that a participant is simply not engaged).

(2)Proceeding of Round B

9:20-9:30	Setting (arrangement of the room)
9:30-12:15	Round B Meeting with Judges: 10 minutes for each team Negotiation: about 140 min.
12:15-12:30	Preparation for Self-Evaluations
12:30-12:50	Self-Evaluations①
12:50-13:10	Self-Evaluations②
13:10-13:30	Overall Evaluation and Comments

- At the beginning of Round B, the representatives of teams will decide which party shall go first for the explanation to judges and self-analysis by rock-paper-scissors before judges. The winner shall choose which it will go first, the explanation to judges or self-analysis. The team that makes the explanation to judges first will later make self-analysis second (Rule 8 (11)④).
-

- Negotiation that judges are not able to observe, such as negotiation outside the match room or negotiation using digital devices, is prohibited.

(3) Meeting with judges to explain the goals and strategies of negotiation

- At the beginning of Round B, each team will explain the goals and strategies of negotiation about (i) the goals which is to be achieved in Round B, (ii) the strategies to reach the goals, and (iii) other matters, such as necessary for the explanation to Judges. (Judges will ask questions for each team to make more clarifications. In this case, the explanation will be made to Judges, but not to the President nor the Senior Partner and so on.) Explanation can be conducted either solely by the representative or by some members sharing the roles. At Meeting with judges, Each team shall hand out some materials in a proper form and length that helps for explanation to judges' understanding of the content of the explanation of above items (i)-(iii) as well as the sharing of roles by members..

→PowerPoint slides and/or materials in addition to the papers mentioned the above may be used to explain the goals and strategies of negotiation at the meeting with judges in Round B.

(4) Confirmation of Agreement

- After reaching an agreement, it is important to confirm whether the agreement is clear and appropriate and whether there exists any disparity in understanding of the agreement between the parties. In order to achieve this purpose, we required the participants to make a written memorandum of agreement in the past competitions.
- However, it is sometimes difficult to complete a written memorandum within the limited competition time. In addition, some teams submitted their drafts of memorandum even before starting negotiation on specific issues. Because we fear the past rule set out an inappropriate incentive, we have revised the rule and now require Confirmation of Agreement in such a manner that the judges are able to confirm the content of the agreement.
- The key of judges' evaluation is whether the agreement is clear and appropriate and whether there exists any disparity in understanding of the agreement among the parties. Therefore, it is sufficient to orally confirm the content of the agreement.
- However, this revised rule just considers the limited time constraint of the

competition, and it is quite important in practice to make a written memorandum which precisely and accurately reflects the content of the agreement.

(Rule 8 (6)) In the event any agreement is reached, the content of the agreement shall be confirmed by the parties in a manner appropriate to a given situation, whether orally, on screen or in writing. Though the written confirmation is not the essential requirement, judges will evaluate whether the agreement is unambiguous, clear and reasonable, whether the manner of the confirmation is appropriate with the time available for the parties and under the given circumstances.

(5) Self-Evaluation

(Rule 8(4)③)

...each team shall have 20 minutes to deliver an oral self-evaluation on the performance of the team before the judges. The presentation to judges may be made either by one representative or by two or more team members. The self-evaluation must cover the questions set forth below (in about 10 minutes); during the remaining time, team members are to answer questions that the judges may ask (about 10 minutes):

- Have you achieved the objectives/goals of the negotiation?
- Have your negotiation strategies worked effectively?
- If the same negotiation were to be repeated tomorrow under the same conditions, which aspects of the teams approach would you choose to repeat, and which would you choose to change?
- What were the good points and/or bad points in the performance of the counter party?

One or a few members of a team may give an explanation to judges and/or Self-Evaluation (Rule 8 (4) ①③) .

4. Materials

Rule 9

- (1) Each university may use documents and/or presentation tools to support its claims in Round A and Round B.
- (2) If a team wants to use a projector, each team must bring its own machine(s) and equipment(s) (extension cords, etc.).
- (3) The counter party may request sufficient time to examine the materials after receiving them.
- (4) Judges and arbitrators may prohibit the use of any set of materials or item(s) when there is a valid reason for doing so, such as in the case that the use of such materials may hinder the efficient procedure.
- (5) In both the Japanese and English divisions, any materials not in the official language of the division must be accompanied by a translation in the official language of the division.

5. Using Blackboards and Other Facilities

There was a case that one team dominantly used the blackboards, projectors and other facilities and the other team could not use them. Now a rule has been made for this kind of case.

Rule 10(2)

When using blackboards, projectors or other facilities and setting rooms in Round A and B, each team shall negotiate with its counterparty in an amicable manner and use them in the spirit of give and take.

6. Complaints

Complaints against another school can be raised pursuant to Rule 18 as follows.

- (1) Complaints that another university has violated the Rules must be lodged with the Steering Committee within 10 minutes of the close of each round by the university representative.
- (2) When immediate response is thought necessary, the representatives of each university may, even in the middle of a round, ask the judges to confirm the Rules, and request that the behavior of the other university be corrected. If the judge determines that such a request is for good

reason, the judge may issue such direction as he or she deems appropriate, or consult with the Steering Committee concerning any action to be taken.

7. Video Recording

- Participants may take a video during the Competition sessions. Also, video recording and photographing by the Committee and sponsors will be made.

Rule 19

- (1) Participants, judges and instructors consent to the listing of their names, affiliations and photos in the brochure made by the Steering Committee, the video made by the Sumitomo Group Public Affairs Committee, the official website of this Competition and other materials or publications deemed necessary by the Steering Committee, and the collection and use, including shared use, of their personal information for the above mentioned purposes.
- (2) Participants, judges, instructors and visitors consent to the video recording of the proceedings, and to the use of such recording in future education, training, research and public relations of the Intercollegiate Negotiation Competition.
- (3) Participants may make a record of the competition sessions. If a team wants to arrange for the video recording of sessions, such team must bring the necessary video equipment (such as extension cords, etc.) and media.
- (4) This Competition is open to visitors. Friends and family of the participants are free to watch the competition provided they follow the necessary procedures at the reception on the day of the competition.
- (5) The Steering Committee may publicize the scores and memoranda submitted by universities which receive awards in the closing ceremony, in newsletters, or on the website of INC, etc.

8. Recommendation for the International Negotiation Competition (Rule 15)

- The Steering Committee will select and recommend a university from among the Japanese universities that have participated in the Competition as the representative of Japan for the International Negotiation Competition (Rule 15). The competition will be held in June or July annually, in English, with 2 persons in the team.

- The Steering Committee will ask the university that achieved the best score in the English division in Round B if the university will send a team. If that university will not send a team, the Steering Committee will ask the university that achieved the second best score in the English division in Round B if it will send a team (if necessary, the same process will continue in order of the rankings).

9. Management of Confidential Information

- Confidential information and strategies of each team should be handled carefully. In past competitions the steering committee had to revise the confidential information because of disclosure of such information by participants (ex., uploading pictures of team meeting on SNS, in which confidential information written on the blackboard was found in the pictures; sharing confidential information with teammates by using a group site which can be accessed by public). Leakage of information in Round B may lead to deduction of points. Please refer to Rule 5 (4) for details.

10. Coaching

- The Supervising Professors of each university team and the alumni of the Intercollegiate Negotiation Competition are strongly encouraged to give advice and coaching to the teams preparing for the competition. (Rule 12 (1))
- Judges may coach the participants after the release of the Problem provided they be registered with the Steering Committee. The registration is not required when a judge was a former participant and that he or she coaches a team at the *alma mater*. Any judge that coached the students of a university may not judge a match of the Competition held in the same year participated by those students. Judges who coach the participants shall not disclose any information that only judges know or could have known regarding the problem and/or evaluation of that year's Competition. (Rule 11 (8))

VI. Judging and Awards

1. Judging & Standard of Criteria

- Scoring and evaluation are conducted based on 10 criteria both in Round A and Round B. Judges evaluate each criterion on a scale from 1 to 5, by 0.5 point increments. Details of evaluation criteria and the system of evaluation for each year are uploaded to the website of the Competition. The draft of evaluation criteria for the 18th competition is on the Attachment 1, the detailed explanation of the evaluation system of the 17th competition is on the Attachment 2, and the results of evaluation of the 17th competition is as in the Attachment 3. A newsletter will inform participants when the evaluation sheets are uploaded. Evaluation is made by objective evaluation of each team on the basis of its own performance, not the relative evaluation between the two competing teams.
- Judges are subject to the following instructions.
 - There might be advantages or disadvantages for the role of Blue or Red depending on the contents of the problem. Even though we prepared the problem carefully so as not to create such advantages/disadvantages, due to the nature of the problem, certain advantages and disadvantages cannot be avoided. Also, due to structural restraints of the competition (a match between two universities needs to be completed in a few hours), the problem may contain scenarios which are unlikely to occur or may appear unnatural in the real world.
 - No participating team shall receive an unfavorable or favorable evaluation due to such advantages/disadvantages or unreal situation that are inherent in the problem as described above. In other words, scoring is based on the fact that the participating teams performance is or is not at an expected level under the given circumstances, and not on the actual outcome, i.e., the winning or losing of a particular point.
 - Language ability: Language ability such as pronunciation or fluency is outside the scope of evaluation.
 - Please make your best efforts to evaluate in an impartial and fair manner without being influenced by the name or previous performance of a university.

2. Judges

- Three judges make up a panel. In last year's Competition, 124 judges served, and they came from the following backgrounds:
 - Persons of Companies, Public Authorities, etc. 28
 - Judges 3
 - Lawyers 54
 - Professors 15
 - Alumni 24

The Judges in charge of each match will be announced on the day of the Competition.

The judges shall be registered with the Steering Committee when they coach participants with respect to the Competition after the release of the Problem, except for the case when past participants coach to their graduating universities. When participants request the judges to coach, the judges, the advisors or the representative of the teams shall notify the Steering Committee in advance.

A judge who has made instruction to a participating university is not entitled to evaluate the matches of the university. In addition, when making instructions, judges shall not disclose any information that only judges know or could have known regarding the problem and/or evaluation of that year's Competition. (Rule 11 (8)).

3. Awards

- Awards are given to the first ranked to seventh ranked universities.
- The first ranked university will receive the Sumitomo Cup.
- In addition, the following special awards will be given:
 - The best Japanese arbitration
 - The best Japanese negotiation
 - The best English arbitration
 - The best English negotiation
 - The best team work

VII. Others

1. How to Contact the Committee

- When sending registration, submission of preliminary memorandum and questions to the Committee, make sure to send emails to the following two addresses in order to avoid email errors:
Inc.steering.committee@gmail.com AND tetsu-mo@sophia.ac.jp.
- Also, please include in the subject line of emails, "RE: INC: XX University".
- If you have any questions or requests regarding the competition, feel free to ask the Steering Committee.

2. Manners as Business Persons

- Please pay attention to acting in an appropriate business manner throughout the Competition, including emailing to others and other activities during the preparation period, the opening and closing ceremonies, the reception of the Competition, and staying at a hotel.

3. Invitation to Family and Friends

- The Competition welcomes guests. If your family or friends want to observe the Competition, please invite them. After registration at the reception of the Competition, they will receive visitor nametags and brochures so they may observe any sessions freely.

4. Prohibitions

The following matters are prohibited:

- ① Communication, information exchanges, and/or negotiation on the Problem with other university or universities (including but not limited to face-to-face meetings, telephone calls, and e-mail exchanges).
- ② Communication, information exchange, and/or negotiation during the rounds on the Problem with other persons than the member of the

same team by using digital devices or any other means (members of the same team may freely communicate with other members).

- ③ Matters prohibited by these rules.
- ④ Failure to comply with Steering Committee directions.
- ⑤ Failure to comply with directions given by the judges.
- ⑥ Breach of copyright and other laws.
- ⑦ Obstruction of the competition.
- ⑧ Behavior which is against the manner expected of ordinary business persons.
- ⑨ Giving gifts, such as drinks and sweets, to judges during the Competition.

Attachment 1

○Round A

1 (Preparatory Memoranda/Response (Persuasiveness)) Are the claims that should be asserted [identified and expressed] effectively? Are the documents as a whole logical and persuasive?

1 [準備書面・反論書(説得力)] 主張すべきことをしっかりと主張しているか。全体として論理的であり説得力があるか。

2(Preparatory Memoranda/Response (Expression, Organization) In relation to each argument, is the basis in fact, contract and/or law etc. shown appropriately and accurately? (Are the documents) easy to read and understand?

2 [準備書面・反論書(表現・構成)] 各論点について、事実、契約書、法等の根拠が適切・正確に示されているか。読みやすく分かりやすいか。

3 (Oral Argument: Case 1) Did the team make their claims logically and persuasively, based on the given facts, the contract and/or law etc?

3 [弁論：第一事件] 事実、契約書、法等を踏まえ、主張すべきことを、論理的に説得力あるかたちで主張したか。

4 (Oral Argument: Case 2) Did the team make their claims logically and persuasively, based on the given facts, the contract and/or law etc.?

4 [弁論：第二事件] 事実、契約書、法等を踏まえ、主張すべきことを、論理的に、説得力あるかたちで主張したか。

5 (Overall persuasiveness) Through the documents and oral argument, and based on the facts of the problem, was there a persuasive and acceptable story advanced?

5 [全体としての主張の説得力] 書面・弁論を通じ、問題の事実関係のもと、説得力があり納得できるストーリーが主張されていたか。

6 (Interactions with the Arbitrators) Were [the teams] able to respond precisely and promptly to questions and directions from the arbitrators?

6 [仲裁人とのやりとり] 仲裁人の質問や指示に対して、的確かつ機敏に対応できていたか。

7 (Responses to claims and counter arguments from the other side) Were [the teams] able to respond precisely and promptly to claims and counter arguments from the other side?

7 [相手方の主張・反論への対応] 相手方の主張や反論に的確かつ機敏に対応できていたか。

8 (Opening Statement/Closing Statement) Was the Opening Statement clear and effective? Was the Closing Statement persuasive and effective?

8 [冒頭陳述・最終弁論] 冒頭陳述は分かりやすく効果的なものであったか。最終弁論は効果的で説得力があるものであったか。

9 (Manner of Advocacy) Were the manner of oral argument and the way in which claims were made appropriate for a lawyer representing a client in front of an arbitral panel?

9 [弁論態度] 弁論における態度、主張の仕方は、依頼者のために仲裁に臨む代理人として適切であったか。

10 (Teamwork) During the oral argument, was there an appropriate allocation of roles and division [of work]; was good teamwork evident?

10 [チームワーク] 口頭審理では、適切な役割分担や助け合い等の良いチームワークがみられたか。

○Round B

1 (Negotiation Planning: Setting Objectives) Did the teams set appropriate objectives, having understood what were the genuinely important issues for their own company, based on the given facts and in light of a full exploration of their own and the other company's situation, the market conditions etc.?

1 [交渉方針：目標設定] 問題の事実を前提に、自社や相手方の状況、市場環境等を掘り下げたうえで、自社にとって真に重要なことを理解し、適切な目標設定を行っていたか。

2 (Negotiation Planning: Negotiation Strategies) In light of the negotiation objectives, did the team set out appropriate negotiation strategies?

2 [交渉方針：交渉戦略] 交渉目標に照らして、適切な交渉戦略を立てていたか。

3 (Negotiation Planning: Explanation) Were the oral presentation and materials about the negotiation objectives and strategies clear and appropriate?

3 [交渉方針：説明] 交渉方針の説明や資料は、全体として、分かりやすく適切なものであったか。

4 (Understanding the other side) Through its preparation and effective engagement during the negotiation, did the team appropriately understand the interests, views and strategy of the other side?

4 [相手方についての理解] 事前の準備や交渉における効果的なやりとり等を通じて、相手

方の利害・考え・戦略等を適切に理解していたか。

5 (Proposals/Persuasion) Based on the objectives and strategies of the negotiation and on the other side's interest, did the team advance reasonable and constructive proposals and persuasive arguments in a flexible and effective manner?

5 [提案・説得] 交渉の目標や戦略、相手方の利害を踏まえ、合理的で建設的な提案や説得ある主張を柔軟かつ効果的に行ったか。

6 (Agreement) Without compromising too readily or departing from its authorities, did the team endeavor to reach a good agreement that aligned with their company's interests? Was the content of the agreement (or where the teams did not reach agreement, the content of what they were trying to agree upon) clear and reasonable?

6 [合意] 安易に妥協したり、権限を逸脱したりすることなく、自社の利益につながる良い合意に向けた努力を行ったか。合意内容(合意に至らなかった場合には合意しようとしていた内容)は明確で合理的なものであったか。

7 (Strategies) Were the negotiation strategies of the team worked effectively? Was the team able to modify these in response to the other side's reaction and situation and carry out an effective negotiation?

7 [戦略] 交渉戦略は効果的に機能したか。相手方の対応や状況の変化に対応して適切に戦略の修正等を行い、効果的な交渉戦略を実施していたか。

8 (Teamwork) Did the team members fulfil the roles that their positions required and did they use good teamwork to negotiate?

8 [チームワーク] チーム全員が役職に応じた役割を果たし、チームワーク良く交渉したか。

9 (Attitude to the negotiation) Did the team members demonstrate an attitude that was appropriate and ethical for a businessperson, considering the relationship with the other party?

9 [交渉態度] 交渉態度は、相手方とのあるべき関係を踏まえ、ビジネス・パーソンとして適切で交渉倫理に適うものであったか。

10 (Reflection) Based on the process and the outcome of the negotiation, was the team able to reflect upon and evaluate their own and the other team's performance in a fair and objective manner?

10 [自己評価] 交渉の経緯と結果を踏まえ、彼我をフェアかつ客観的に反省・批評できたか。

Attachment 2

Evaluation System of the Competition

The following is the explanation that the Steering Committee makes to the judges about the evaluation of the Competition.

1. Overall Method of Evaluation

- Evaluation will be made using a point system. Judges must mark appropriate sections on the mark sheet (bubble sheet) with a pencil. When filling in the mark sheet, please fill it as carefully as possible. Please fill the circle completely with your pencil and do not mark outside each circle. (If a circle is not filled completely or a mark runs outside of a circle, the machine reader for the mark sheet will not read it correctly.)
- Evaluation must be made by objective evaluation of each team on the basis of its own performance, not the relative performance between two competing teams. Thus, both teams may get good points or poor points. This will enable an appropriate determination of an overall ranking of all the teams.
- Marking is based on 15 separate criteria for each of the arbitration round and the negotiation round. Evaluation of each criteria will be made on a scale of 0(minimum score) to 5 (highest score), in increments of 0.5 (except that there is no 0.5). This provides a total scale of 10 increments. Therefore, for each round, the total score given by each judge will be from 0 points to 75 points and the total score of all three judges will be from 0 points to 225 points.

<Reference> On the mark sheet, the scores are explained as follows:

0 (Fail) - 1 (Poor) - 1.5 - 2 (Fair) - 2.5 - 3 (Avg.) - 3.5 - 4 (Excellent) - 4.5 - 5 (Outstanding)

* The explanations, "Fail", "Poor," "Fair," "Avg," "Excellent" and "Outstanding" are simply a guide, and they correspond to the academic assessment standards of most universities. However, some universities use "F," "C," "B," "A" and "A+."

* The following are rough guides for 0 - 5 grades.

0: No trace of minimum preparation is observable, which would adversely affect the other party. Lack of effort and seriousness are obvious.

1: Though trace of minimum preparation is observable, the

- performance is far from satisfactory. Obvious misunderstandings or careless mistakes are frequently seen.
- 2: Though a reasonable effort at preparation is recognizable, the performance is not satisfactory, as if reciting from memory.
- 3: Performed at a level normally expected of undergraduate students who have prepared for the competition enthusiastically for 2 months. While occasional insufficiency is observable, the overall performance is reasonable in light of the flow of arbitration or negotiation.
- 4: Impressively well prepared. Excellent performance is frequently observed. The responses are appropriate in accordance with the situation, the addressee and developments; and you feel as though you can rest assured observing them. .
- 5: Superb performance for university students, at a level that you might expect of young colleagues in your office or business. You are impressed and thrilled by their level of performance.

2. Evaluation Guidelines

- Please evaluate in the following manner, bearing in mind the above explanations.
 - A. As shown in the evaluation sheet, the average score (default score) is 3. If the team's performance is better than the average, add appropriate points, and if the team's performance is poorer than the average, deduct appropriate points.
 - B. The average score (default score) of 3 is generally awarded to those who "performed at a level normally expected of undergraduate university students who have prepared for the competition enthusiastically for 2 months."
 - C. However, if the team contains graduate students (or those with business/legal practice experience), the average points will be awarded to those who "performed at a level normally expected of graduate students (or those with business/legal practice experience) who have prepared for the competition enthusiastically for 2 months." In this case, a higher level of performance is required to earn the same 3-point score than the undergraduate university students in Section B above.
- * Whether a student is an undergraduate student or a graduate student can be confirmed by referring to the list of participating teams in the brochure.

- * Participating teams are required to declare at the time of registration whether or not the team has individuals with business/legal experience. If there are participants with business/legal practice experience, judges will be notified the contents of the declaration submitted by the team on the day of competition.
- * Evaluation sheets and the scores of individual judges will be kept confidential. If a university requests, the total score of three judges (including the score on each evaluation item) will be provided to the university.

<Reference: The Scores in the past Competitions>

	16th		15th	
	Round A	Round B	Round A	Round B
Average of all teams	143.733 (47.911) (3.194)	141.958 (47.319) (3.155)	146.67 (48.89) (3.26)	145.74 (48.58) (3.24)
Highest Score	165.5 (55.167) (3.678)	165.5 (55.167) (3.678)	169.5 (56.5) (3.77)	161.5 (53.83) (3.59)
Lowest Score	111.5 (37.167) (2.478)	117 (39) (2.6)	121 (40.33) (2.69)	130 (43.33) (2.89)
Average Score of 1-5 ranked universities (In 16 th , 1-6 ranked universities)	151.861 (50.62) (3.375)	152.111 (50.704) (3.38)	154.1 (51.37) (3.42)	150.97 (50.32) (3.35)
Average Score of 6-10 ranked universities (In 16 th , 8-12 ranked universities)	147.677 (49.226) (3.282)	143.588 (47.862) (3.191)	147.5 (49.17) (3.28)	147.2 (49.07) (3.27)
Average Score of universities 11- 18 ranked (In 16 th , 13-17 ranked universities)	137.375 (45.791) (3.053)	138.042 (46.014) (3.067)	141.05 (47.02) (3.13)	141.18 (47.06) (3.14)
16 th : Average Score of 18-23 ranked universities	133.192 (44.397) (2.960)	129.385 (43.128) (2.875)		

*In each cell, the 1st line shows the total score of all 3 judges, 2nd line is the score of 1st line/3 (i.e., the average total score per judge), and the 3rd line shows the score of 2nd line/15 (i.e., the average score per judge, per item).

3. General Remarks on the Judging

- There may be advantages or disadvantages for the role of Blue or Red depending on the contents of the problem. Even though we prepared the problem carefully so as not to create such advantages/disadvantages, due to the nature of the problem, certain advantages and disadvantages cannot be avoided. Also, due to structural restraints of the competition (a match between two universities needs to be completed in a few hours), the problem may contain scenarios which are unlikely to occur, or which may appear unnatural in the real world.
- Please make sure that no participating team receives a favorable or unfavorable evaluation due to such advantages/disadvantages or unreal situations that are inherent in the problem as described above. In other words, you should make your judgment based on the fact that the participating teams performance is or is not at an expected level under the given circumstances, and not on the actual outcome, i.e., the winning or losing of a particular point.
- Language ability: Language ability such as pronunciation or fluency is outside the scope of evaluation.
- Please make your best efforts to evaluate in an impartial and fair manner without being influenced by the name or previous performance of a university.

4. Specific Items and Methods of Evaluation

《Round A : Arbitration》

- 1 [Expression & Organization of the Briefs] Does the brief use adequate and precise expressions? Is it easy to read and comprehend? Is it well organized?
⇒Please consider whether, as a legal document, sufficient consideration is given to the legal structure, essential facts, arguments, burden of proof and evidence.

2 [Persuasiveness of the Briefs] On each issue, is the brief well founded with respect to facts, legal provisions, and other authorities? Is it logical and persuasive?

⇒ Please evaluate substantive persuasiveness (overall impression, feeling of agreement and appropriateness of outcome) along with legal persuasiveness.

3 [Opening Statement] Was the opening statement effective in conveying the overall picture of the team's arguments? Did she/he finish it within the time limit? Did she/he use the time effectively?

⇒ Objective evaluation of time usage may be determined by selecting a time keeper from among the judges who will record the effective use of time limits by each team.

4, 5 [β Case] , 6, 7 [Event Case] As to each case, were necessary facts and the legal basis for the claim and/or defense presented clearly and at an appropriate time? Were the factual basis and legal reasoning of the team persuasive on each case?

⇒ Please evaluate the structure of arguments and persuasiveness for each case. Please evaluate if students made effective and pertinent arguments reflecting the difference in importance of each issue.

8 [Legal Arguments] Were the legal arguments well-structured, persuasive and based on accurate understanding of the contracts and UNIDROIT Principles?

⇒ Please evaluate if the team understands the contracts and UNIDROIT Principles accurately and applies them to the relevant facts appropriately without making unreasonable interpretation or application.

9 [Facts] Did the team understand the given facts accurately and sufficiently? Did they research and present appropriate information on the factual background?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether evidence-based arguments were presented.

10 [Responsiveness to the Other Side] Did the team respond appropriately and in a timely fashion toward the other side's argument?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether logical and/or reasonable (counter) arguments could be developed at appropriate timing.

11 [Responsiveness to the Arbitrators] Did the team respond appropriately, respectfully, and in a timely fashion toward the questions and instructions of the

arbitrators?

⇒ We consider that respectful attitude toward the arbitrators is also a point to be evaluated.

12 [Closing Statement] Was the closing statement effective in conveying the overall picture of the team's arguments, reflecting the overall proceeding? Did she/he finish it within the time limit? Did she/he use the time efficiently?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether the closing statement was effective in conveying the overall picture of the team's arguments, reflecting the overall proceeding. Objective evaluation of time usage may be determined by selecting a time keeper from among the judges who will record the effective use of time limits by each team.

13 [Presentation and Speech] Did the team members speak in a clear and confident manner? Did the team members become excessively excited, emotional, or confused?

⇒ This is to evaluate the team's performance, not the contents of presentation or speech.

14 [Lawyerly Manner] Were the team's attitude and performance appropriate as attorneys in arbitration?

⇒ This is to evaluate how successfully the team demonstrated their pride and confidence as professionals.

15 [Teamwork] Did each member of the team perform his/her role appropriately? Did any member perform too dominantly, or make no contribution?

⇒ We consider this as an essential evaluation point, for this competition is a team competition. It is not expected that every member speaks for the same length of time. It is to be negatively evaluated if there is a member who makes no contribution or if the team significantly rely on only one or two limited members. On the other hand, if team members cooperate with each other in difficult situations, it is to be positively evaluated.

《Round B : Negotiation》

1 [Preliminary Memo] Does the preliminary memorandum set forth a clear plan for the negotiation?

⇒ This is to evaluate the preliminary memorandum.

2 [Objective/Goal Setting] Did the team set and understand the objectives/goals

for the negotiation reasonably? (Was the sought-after win-win solution set in an appropriate direction with reasonable prospects, given the context of the negotiation?)

⇒ This is an important evaluation point, as the overall negotiation skills are evaluated in light of the objectives of the negotiation.

3 [Strategy for Negotiation] Was the team's strategy appropriate to achieve the objectives/goals of the negotiation?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether the team intentionally and reasonably selected an appropriate negotiation strategy and executed the strategy in a flexible manner.

4 [Constructive Proposal of Alternatives] Under the objectives/goals and the strategy for the negotiation, did the team propose constructive alternatives in a flexible and appropriate manner?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether the team presented creative and constructive proposals to resolve the issues.

5 [Effective Discussion] In view of the objectives/goals and the strategy for the negotiation, were the team's discussions effective and persuasive?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether the team developed their discussion in a convincing fashion.

6 [Responsiveness] Did the team respond sincerely, properly, and in a timely fashion to the arguments and proposals of the other side?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether the team was able to respond to the arguments and proposals within the flow of the negotiation.

7 [Communication/Mutual Understanding] Did the team communicate effectively, so as to understand the other side's views and interests?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether the team listened to the other sides arguments well and was able to deepen understanding of the other party.

8 [Principled Negotiation] Did the team compromise too easily? Did the team push too hard? (Did the team pursue the objectives/goals of negotiation in an appropriate manner?)

⇒ This is to evaluate whether the team was able to carry out principled negotiation.

(Principled Negotiation is negotiation based on both sides working toward a "win-win," and therefore mutually satisfactory, outcome.)

9 [Business Manner] Were the speech and manners of the team appropriate and reasonable for business people in this field?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether the team negotiated in the manner of a top-class business-person.

10 [Teamwork/Role Assignments] Did each member of the team appropriately perform his/her own role? Was the assignment of responsibility appropriate?

⇒ We consider this as an essential evaluation point, as this competition is a team competition.

11 [BATNA] Did the team pursue the maximization of their company's interest? Did the team negotiate within its authority? Did the team make a deal worse than BATNA?

⇒ This is to evaluate whether the team proceeded with its negotiation, keeping in mind BATNA.

("BATNA" is the abbreviation for Best-Alternative-to-a-Negotiated-Agreement" and means that a party understood its strengths and weaknesses based on alternatives it had in the event a deal could not be reached with the other side, and also understood its strength/weakness considering the estimated BATNA of the other side. The possible agreement on the ongoing negotiation with the same value as BATNA is referred to as "Reservation Value.")

12 [Good Working Relationship] Did the team make efforts to build a good working relationship with the other side?

⇒ We think that building a proper working relationship is a key to successful business negotiation.

13 [Agreement] Is the agreement between parties unambiguous, clear and reasonable? Is there a genuine agreement between parties? (If no outline is drafted, a score of 2.5 should ordinarily be given, although the score may be adjusted depending on the reason for non-agreement.)

⇒ When parties reach an agreement, it is the important process to confirm whether the agreement is clear and reasonable, and whether there is a genuine agreement between parties. For the 2017 competition, the rule requested the parties to make a written memorandum when an agreement is reached. However, it turned out to be difficult for them to complete a written memorandum within a limited time. Further, some teams prepared and showed their written memorandum to their counterparties at the early

stage of their negotiation. So, we have changed the rule to request parties to confirm their agreement in any appropriate manner under the circumstances. Therefore, it is sufficient to orally confirm the agreement. However, it is important to keep in mind that a last-minute agreement will be evaluated mainly under "8. [Principled Negotiation]" and that a rushed, last-minute agreement also will affect the quality of the agreement.

⇒ When parties do not reach an agreement, 2.5 is the basic score. However, it is not necessary for the parties to agree on all issues. It is important that they reach agreement on essential issues.

14 [Negotiation Ethics] Did the team perform ethically? The default score is 3, and the score may be adjusted depending on the process and content of the negotiation.

⇒ There are different levels of negotiation ethics. Although attacking a gray zone or taking advantage of the other party's mistakes are most likely not against ethics, depending on the degree of such attack, it could harm the trust relationship with the other party as a necessary business partner in light of the objectives of the negotiation, which in turn would be harmful to long-term interests. Therefore, evaluation should be made based on a comprehensive judgment.

15 [Self-Evaluation] Did the team report the process and results of the negotiation clearly and sufficiently? Did they analyze their own performance objectively? Were they fair in depicting and evaluating the performance of the other side?

⇒ Negotiation is only possible when there is another party. Self-evaluation includes evaluation of the other party and evaluation of the relationship between the other party and oneself. The person who engages in the negotiation has the duty to explain, and thus he/she needs to be capable of providing appropriate explanation concerning the progress and results of negotiation.

Attachment 3

		Round A	Round B	Total
Winner	チーム・オーストラリア Team Australia	156.75	156.5	318.25
2nd	シンガポール国立大学 National University of Singapore	155.5	151	306.5
3rd	東京大学 The University of Tokyo	145.75	155.5	306.25
4th	大阪大学 Osaka University	146.167	151.833	303
5th	上智大学 Sophia University	147.5	149.125	301.625
6th	京都大学 Kyoto University	144.5	152	301.5
7th	モンゴル国立大学 National University of Mongolia	151.75	143	299.75

	Round A	Round B
全チーム平均点 Average of all teams	144.603	144.931
最高点 Highest Score	165.5	164
最低点 Lowest Score	114.5	123.5
1-7位の大学の平均点 Average of 1-7 ranked universities	149.72	151.67
8-12位の大学の平均点 Average of 8-12 ranked universities	144.95	146.73
13-17位の大学の平均点 Average of 13-17 ranked universities	138.23	144.83
18-23位の大学の平均点 Average of 18-23 ranked universities	132.14	134.96

最終順位で示した以外の大学の合計点は、次のようになっています。

The total scores of other universities than top 7 universities are as follows:

8th: 295, 9th: 294.5, 10th: 294.167, 11th: 293.5, 12th: 292.25, 13th: 290.75,
14th: 290.625, 15th: 288.5, 16th: 288, 17th: 278.875, 18th: 276.5, 19th: 276,
20th: 269.833, 21st: 268.167, 22nd: 265, 23rd: 259.5