*description of item 4, 5, 6, and 7 has been amended

ROUND A (English) Nov.24 ver.

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? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
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? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4(Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
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? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
4 [β Case :Logical Presentation]	Were necessary facts and the legal basis for the claim and/or defense presented clearly and at an appropriate time? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
5 [β Case:Persuasiveness]	Were the factual basis and legal reasoning of the team persuasive? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
6 [Event Case:Logocal Presentation]	Were necessary facts and the legal basis for the claim and/or defense presented clearly and at an appropriate time? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
7 [Event Case:Persuasiveness]	Were the factual basis and legal reasoning of the team persuasive? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
8 [Legal Arguments]	Were the legal arguments well-structured, persuasive and based on accurate understanding of the contracts and UNIDROIT Principles? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
9 [Facts]	Did the team understand the given facts accurately and sufficiently? Did they research and present appropriate information on the factual background? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
10 [Responsiveness to the Other Side]	Did the team respond appropriately and in a timely fashion toward the other side's arguments? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
11 [Responsiveness to the Arbitrators]	Did the team respond appropriately, respectfully, and in a timely fashion toward the questions and instructions of the arbitrators? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
12 [Closing Statement]	Was the closing statement effective in conveying the overall picture of the team's arguments, reflecting the overall proceding? Did she/he finish it within the time limit? Did she/he use the time effectively? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
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? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
14 [Lawyerly Manner]	Were the team's attitude and performance appropriate as attorneys in arbitration? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
15 [Teamwork]	Did each member of the team perform his/her role appropriately? Did any member perform too dominantly, or make no contribution? 0 (Fail) … 1 (Poor) — 1.5 — 2 (Fair) — 2.5 — 3 (Avg.) — 3.5 — 4 (Excellent) — 4.5 — 5 (Outstanding)
Total: ( )/75 Points	