| Round | Ⓐ ● | | Red Co | ◯ |
| Language | Ⓔ ● | | Blue Inc. | ● |

| Judge | ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ |
| | ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ |

| | Tokyo | Keio | Sophia | Kyush | Hitotsu | Aus |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| University | TKYO | KEIO | SOPH | KYSH | HITO | AUSI |
| Team | ① ② ③ | | | | | |

| Match No | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ |

| University | Team |
|---|---|
| | |

Judge's Name (          )

| No | Category | Aspects for Evaluation | Score (3 is average) | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Pre-Memo, Pre-Meeting With President | Does the preliminary memorandum explain a clear plan for the negotiatinon? Did they explain the objective and reasons for the negotiation to the President in an organized manner, and get his/her approval on the plan reasonably? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |
| 2 | Objective, Strategy | Did the team set and understand the objectives for the negotiation reasonably? Was the team's strategy appropriate to achieve the goals of the negotiation? Did the team aim for a win-win solution? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |
| 3 | Effective Discussion | Under the objectives and strategy for the negotiation, were the discussions effective? Did the team propose alternatives in a flexible and appropriate manner? Did the negotiation strategy work well? Did the team respond flexibly? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |
| 4 | Relationship with counter party | Did they make questions effectively, so as to understand the other side's views and interests? Did mutual distrust or mutual dissatisfaction arise? Did the team succeed in building a good working relationship with the other side? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |
| 5 | Result of negotiation | Judging from the team's objectives, did the team maximize its interests? Did the negotiations result in a win-win solution? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |
| 6 | Document of the Agreement | Is the agreement stated appropriately and clearly in the document? Was the documentation process reasonable and appropriate? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |
| 7 | Speech Explanation Attitude | Did the team members speak clearly, in a confident manner? Did they explain their views in an easy to understand fashion? Did they unintentionally become too emotional? Were the speeches & manners appropriate for business? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |
| 8 | Report to President Self-evaluation | Did the team report the results of negotiation clearly and sufficiently? Did the team respond to the President's or the Judges' questions appropriately? Did they analyze their own performance objectively and understand good and bad points? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |
| 9 | Teamwork Role Assignments | Did each member of the team appropriately perform his/her own role? Was the assignment of responsibility appropriate? Did any member perform too dominantly, or make no contribution? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |
| 10 | Negotiation Authority, Ethics | Did the team perform within its authority? Did the team make a deal worse than BATNA? Did the team perform ethically? | 1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5 <br> ① ①̱5 ② ②̱5 ③ ③̱5 ④ ④̱5 ⑤ <br> Poor   Fair   Avg.   Exc.   Outst. | |

| Good | ● |
| | ⊘ |
| Bad | ⊙ |
| | ◖■ |

< Remarks for Evaluation >

1) Evaluation should be made on an absolute basis (rather than in comparison with the other team).

2) Please mark the score and also write the score clearly for each item. You may award half-points, such as giving a score of 2.5 or 3.5 for an item.

3) In evaluating the team's performance, please take into consideration the composition of the team (i.e., whether it is composed of undergraduate students or graduate students or persons with legal practice experience). If the team's performance meets the judge's expectations for a team of that level, a score of 3 should be awarded. (If it exceeds that level, the score should be 4; if it greatly exceeds it, 5; if it falls below that level, 2; and if it falls far below that level, 1).

4) Please remember that "3: Good" is for average performance, in other words, 3 is the baseline.
If the team includes members with experience in business or legal practice, please hold the team to a higher standard.

5) Evaluation should be made by each judge independently. However, to ensure accuracy and fairness, we ask the judges to share their views on the scores with each other prior to submitting the evaluation sheets.