## **Round A Evaluation Sheet**

Name of team with name of University : \_\_\_\_\_

(name of the opposite team with university name : \_\_\_\_\_)

Name of referee : \_\_\_\_\_

Every item should be evaluated with 5 ranks. It is an Absolute evaluation. It is not comparative evaluation vis a vis the performance of the opposite party. Therefore, both team may gain the highest result.

Evaluation criteria is as follows (if the full score is 2.5, the following scores are to be reduced to one half):

1 point: poor

 $2 \ {\rm points}$ : not satisfactory as students

3 points : average

4 points : good in relation to the standard as students

5 points : excellent


1. Persuasiveness (total 25 points)

Persuasiveness of arguments, including opening statement and closing statement. Logic. If supporting facts, cases and doctrines were sufficiently and clearly stated. (Persuasiveness: logicalness and clearness)


(1)contents of sales contract



(2) force majeure




(3)amount of damages



(4)If opening statement and closing statement are well prepared.



(5)Persuasiveness of all arguments



total of = \_\_\_\_(1)

2. Manner and team cooperation (10 points)

(1) attitude and manner (if anyone became too emotional, if there was personal attack, if they tried to persuade arbitrators.)


(2)team cooperation (if everyone performed his given role.)

total of the above : \_\_\_\_\_(2)

3. Preparation (10 points)

(1)Sufficiency of understanding of given facts, rules and UNIDROIT principles and

other norms to be applied.




(2) persuasiveness of the brief prepared beforehand

Total of the above : \_\_\_\_\_(3)

4. Total evaluation of performance (5 points)

Strength of arguments taking into consideration of the hypothetical arbitration award.



point =\_\_\_\_(4)

The aggregate of (1) + (2) + (3) + (4) =\_\_\_\_\_\_/50 points