



FINAL REPORT

ELSA MOOT COURT COMPETITION ON WTO LAW

7TH EDITION 2008-2009



world
trade
institute



elsa

The European Law Students' Association



The European Law Students' Association

The European Law Students' Association – Philosophy Statement

Vision

A just world in which there is respect for human dignity and cultural diversity.

Purpose

To contribute to legal education, to foster mutual understanding and to promote social responsibility of law students and young lawyers.

Means

- Providing opportunities for law students and young lawyers to learn about other cultures and legal systems in a spirit of critical dialogue and scientific co-operation.
- Assisting law students and young lawyers to be internationally minded and professionally skilled.
- Encouraging law students and young lawyers to act for the good of society.



The European Law Students' Association

Table of Content

The European Law Students' Association – Philosophy Statement.....	1
Vision	1
Purpose	1
FOREWORD:.....	6
Disseminating EMC ² Spirit over Different Continents	7
GENERAL BACKGROUND	8
INTRODUCTION	8
STRUCTURE OF THE COMPETITION	8
THE SELECTION ROUNDS	9
ELSA Regional Rounds:	9
Asia (non-ELSA) Regional Round:.....	9
Pacific (non-ELSA) Regional Round:	9
Latin American (non-ELSA) Regional Round:	9
North American (non-ELSA) Regional Round:	10
International Written Round:	10
NATIONAL ROUNDS	10
National Round in Ukraine.....	11
REGIONAL ROUNDS	12
The ELSA Regional Round of Barcelona	12
Academic quality	12
Timekeepers	13
Participants	13
Awards.....	13
Scores in numbers.....	15



The European Law Students' Association

Concluding remarks.....	20
The ELSA Regional Round of Frankfurt-Oder, Germany.....	21
Academic quality.....	21
Timekeepers.....	21
Participants.....	22
Awards.....	22
Scores in numbers.....	24
Concluding remarks.....	29
The non-ELSA Pacific 'Written' Regional Round of the EMC ² 2008-2009.....	30
A) Pacific Regional Round Organiser.....	30
B) Academic Quality of the Pacific 'Written' Regional Round.....	30
C) Pacific Regional Round Participant Teams.....	30
D) Pacific 'Written' Regional Round Awards.....	31
E) Academic Supervisor's Concluding Remarks.....	32
The non-ELSA ASIA Regional Round of the EMC ² 2008-2009.....	33
A) ASIA Regional Round Organiser.....	33
B) Academic Quality of the ASIA RR.....	33
C) Timekeepers.....	34
D) ASIA RR Participating Teams.....	35
E) ASIA RR Sponsors and Awards.....	35
F) Academic Supervisor's concluding Remarks.....	43
The North America Regional Round of the EMC ²	44
Academic Quality.....	44
Panellists.....	44
Timekeepers.....	45



The European Law Students' Association

Participants	45
Rankings and Awards.....	46
Other comments.....	49
Organisational Issues.....	49
Logistics	49
Finances.....	50
Miscellaneous.....	50
Concluding remarks.....	50
The Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Round of the EMC ²	52
Academic Quality	52
List of Panellists:	52
Timekeepers	53
Other comments.....	53
Logistics	53
Organisational.....	53
Finances.....	53
Rankings and Awards.....	54
Conclusions and Recommendations by the Academic Supervisor.....	58
INTERNATIONAL WRITTEN ROUND.....	59
FINAL ORAL ROUND	60
Academic quality.....	60
Timekeepers	61
Participants	61
Awards.....	62
Rankings in Scores	64



The European Law Students' Association

Concluding remarks.....	72
APPRECIATION	73
FINAL ORAL ROUND CO-Organiser.....	73
ACWH – Asian Center for WTO and International Health Law and Policy	73
TECHNICAL PARTNER	73
World Trade Organisation - Technical Partner	73
INTERNATIONAL SPONSORS.....	74
World Trade Institute	74
University of Barcelona – IELPO	74
PANELLIST POOL	75
ACADEMIC SUPERVISORS	81
Members of the International Organising Secretariat and International Organising Committee	81
ELSA.....	81
ACWH.....	82



The European Law Students' Association

FOREWORD:

Dear Reader,

The 7th edition of the ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO law (EMC²) has come to an end. This is the Final Report which concludes the competition year 2008/2009.

After hosting the Final Oral Round (FOR) in Geneva, Switzerland during the first six years of the competition ELSA International believed that the EMC² was ready for a global expansion. Therefore this year's competition was organised in cooperation with the Asian Centre for WTO and International Health Law & Policy (ACWH), headed by its Executive Director Professor Chang-fa Lo. As a result of this new cooperation the Final Oral Round was held in Taipei between 19th and 24th of May 2009.

First, I would like to thank my wonderful friends and colleagues in the International Board of ELSA; Anna, Antti, Ivana, Jean-Marc, Kamil and Torkil for all their support during the year. I have also had the pleasure of working with most hardworking Coordinator Mr. Koen Klootwijk from ELSA (The Netherlands). Your efforts were fantastic and it was great fun to work with you.

A foreword in connection to the EMC² cannot be written without mentioning our Academic Supervisors; Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi, Ms. Ieva Zebryte and Dr. Laura Nielsen. You have all been tremendous throughout the year by your support and advice.

My sincere gratitude goes to all Panellists who have been involved in the competition from the regional rounds to the Final Oral Round, as well as, those who have been involved in scoring the Written Submissions. I hope you will all continue to support ELSA in our work.

Our International sponsors; The World Trade Institute and IELPO, as well as all regional rounds sponsors, national rounds sponsors as well as team sponsors. Finally, the technical support received from the WTO has been an excellent contribution to the success of the competition.

This year has included extra challenges with a new global concept. But we have made it happen, and we will again. The competition will continue to expand globally in the years to come, and I encourage you all to involve yourselves. Please keep monitoring www.elsamootcourt.org.

On behalf of ELSA International I would also like to thank our corporate partner: C'M'S, our auditing partner: Deloitte and our Human Rights partner: Council of Europe.

Sincerely yours,

Morten Rydningen

Vice President Academic Activities

ELSA International 2008/2009



The European Law Students' Association

Disseminating EMC² Spirit over Different Continents

Chang-fa Lo

NTU Chair and life-time Distinguished Professor; Director of ACWH; Patron of ELSA

It was a great privilege for the Asian Center for WTO and International Health Law and Policy of National Taiwan University College of Law (ACWH) to host the 2009 Final Oral Round (FOR) in cooperation with ELSA International in May 2009. It was the first time that the FOR was held in a city other than Geneva. We appreciate that ELSA International adopts the policy to have this great event being held in different continents from this year.

Although it was a long and effort-demanding process to prepare the competition, it was also a fascinating experience to team up a secretariat composed of my students to make everything ready to receive the competing teams, their coaches and the judges and to accommodate a high quality competition. We thought that it is not merely a competition. It is a process of legal education and also an important opportunity for young and talented law students to make friends and to network among themselves and with judges. Since there were more than 20 judges with great WTO experiences and expertise, we decided to hold a conference in tandem with the competition. I was very pleased to see many team members and their coaches participate in the conference.

Of course, there were important factors contributing to the smoothness of the event. First, the young and capable colleagues from ELSA International have accumulated valuable know-how in handling the WTO competition and helped managing a lot of administrative and policy matters. It was a very pleasant experience working with them. Second, the great passion of and the contributions from our Case Author Professor Bradley Condon and Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi were also the key to the success. The Panellists and Academic Supervisors contributing their valuable time to review the Case and to judge the competition were indispensable. We are thankful to these well-respected Panellists for their thoughtfulness of agreeing to fly economy class from far-away places to Taipei. Of course the generous supports of the local and international sponsors were vital to this event.

An additional point that I would like to mention is the kindness of ELSA International inviting me to be one of its Patrons. It was a tremendous honour for me. I was happy to accept the invitation to show my recognition of the achievement of ELSA International and my support of its activities and with the hope that the goals of having EMC² will also be shared by more people in different parts of the world.



The European Law Students' Association

GENERAL BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

The European Law Students' Association, ELSA, is an international, independent, non-political, and non-profit-making organisation comprised and run by law students and young lawyers. Founded in 1981 ELSA is today the world's largest independent law students' association and is present in more than 220 law faculties in 40 countries across Europe with a membership in excess of 30,000 students and young lawyers.

The **vision of ELSA** is:

“A just world in which there is respect for human dignity and cultural diversity”

ELSA's main purpose is to contribute to legal education, to foster mutual understanding and to promote social responsibility amongst law students and young lawyers. It does this by providing opportunities for their members to learn about other cultures and legal systems through critical dialogue and scientific co-operation. ELSA has been involved in legal education in Europe for 28 years, and we will be in years to come. ELSA is glad to be contributing towards the development of law students worldwide.

ELSA chose WTO Law as the basis for its international moot court competition due to the growth in global trade since the 1990's and the necessity to provide security and stability to those involved in such trade through regulations. The World Trade Organization, which was established in 1995 and based on the old GATT Agreement, aims to create a system for efficiently regulating international trade. Although the WTO as an organisation and its Agreements has created controversies, the present structure and regulations will promote and enhance international trade for years to come.

STRUCTURE OF THE COMPETITION

The Case for the Competition was issued on 1st of October 2008 with teams required to register for participation by the 19th of December 2008. Only one team per law faculty or law school was allowed to participate in the Competition.

The EMC² consists of two different Selection Rounds where teams can qualify for the Final Oral Round of the EMC², which was held in Taipei. Teams from regions where there was an organised Regional (Oral) Round qualified through this mechanism, whilst teams from regions where there was no Regional (Oral) Round qualified for the Final Oral Round through ELSA's International Written Round. Before entering either a Regional (Oral) Round or the International Written Round, every team had to tender their Written Submissions for both the complainant and respondent parties



The European Law Students' Association

of the EMC² Case. Documents were originally required to be submitted to ELSA International by the 16th of February 2009.

ELSA National Groups were also given the opportunity to organise National (Oral) Rounds of the EMC². The winning teams from the National Rounds were then allocated to the two ELSA European Regional Rounds.

The Final Oral Round of the EMC² was held at the Howard International House in Taipei between 19th and 23rd of May 2009.

THE SELECTION ROUNDS

ELSA International has geo-politically attributed countries to specific EMC² Selection Rounds as detailed below.

ELSA Regional Rounds:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and United Kingdom.

Asia (non-ELSA) Regional Round:

Bhutan, Brunei-Darussalam, Cambodia, Chinese Taipei (Taiwan)., Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Macau China, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Philippines, Republic of China, Republic of (South) Korea, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam.

Pacific (non-ELSA) Regional Round:

Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu.

Latin American (non-ELSA) Regional Round:

Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, México, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.



The European Law Students' Association

North American (non-ELSA) Regional Round:

Canada and the United States of America

International Written Round:

Teams from WTO Member or Observer states not listed above.

Africa: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Republic of Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tomé Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Middle East: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kingdom of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Georgia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Kyrgyz Republic, Lebanese Republic, Maldives, Mauritius, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan and Yemen.

Teams were chosen either through the International Written Round or from the Regional (Oral) Rounds. This year two teams qualified through the International Written Round, whilst another 18 through their respective Regional (Oral) Rounds. Unfortunately the team from Mekelle University in Ethiopia did not make it to the Final Oral Round in Taipei.

At the Final Oral Round, 19 teams pled against each other in the Preliminary Rounds – once as complainant and once as respondent. The four best teams progressed to the Elimination Rounds (Semi-Finals), where they pled once each. The winners of the two Semi-Finals contested against each other for the title - Winner of the EMC² 2008/2009.

NATIONAL ROUNDS

During the 7th edition of the ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO Law (EMC²) only one national round (NR) was held within the ELSA Network. The NR took place in Kiev, Ukraine. The round consisted of 8 teams, in which two of them proceeded to the regional round in Frankfurt-Oder, Germany. Unfortunately the two teams, the winner and the runner up, did not make it to Frankfurt-Oder.



The European Law Students' Association

National Round in Ukraine

The EMC² is one of the interesting and largest events of ELSA Ukraine. From 29th February to 1st March ELSA Ukraine hosted Third National Round of EMC². National round was organized by members of local group ELSA Irpin with support of members of National Board.

This year, only six teams of the ten teams that were registered could take part in the National round. Teams represented six Higher Educational institution of Ukraine.

Oral pleadings rounds took place in premises of National University of State Tax service of Ukraine. All participants showed a high level of preparation and ability to argue their position.

The panel consisted of senior lecturers from famous university of Ukraine, practicing lawyers and other experienced specialists in field of WTO law.

Sincerely

Vladimir Lola

Vice President Academic Activities

ELSAUkraine



The European Law Students' Association

REGIONAL ROUNDS

The ELSA Regional Round of Barcelona

The first ELSA Regional Round took place in Barcelona, Spain from 11th to 14th of March 2009.

First of all, I'd like to highly compliment Ms. Susana Alesón. As head of the Organising Committee for this Regional Round, she managed to organise the whole event, while having a serious human recourse problem.

Besides Susana, there were around five or six helpers who made this event in Barcelona possible. With their great efforts, it turned out to be a great week, both on the academic and social level, for the participants, as well as the Panellists and the organisers themselves.

Therefore, a big thanks to everybody in Barcelona who ensured this great event.

Academic quality

List of Panellists:

Dr. Arthur Appleton

Dr. David Luff

Dr. Thorbjørn Daniel Bugge

Dr. Roberto Rios Herran

Mr. Stefan Amarasinha

Mr. Lothar Ehring

Mr. Andreas Sennekamp

In the ELSA Regional Round of Barcelona we had a team of Panellists, half of which were EMC² veterans and for the others it was their first year. We ensured we had a mixture between academics and practitioners of WTO law. Although all Panellists were males, this did not affect the evaluation of teams. We do hope that in 2010 the ELSA Regional Rounds attracts more female Panellists..

Both from our own observations and from participant feedback, we can conclude that the Panellists did their utmost to ensure a fair competition with a high academic value. Because we had invited the minimum amount of Panellists, they all had to work hard, thereby judging almost every oral pleading session and thereby ensuring consistency of marks. We thank the Panellists for their professionalism and enthusiasm for this competition.

The only glitch in this regard was the amount of time needed to deliberate after the Grand Final. Of course at the time the Panellists needed this time because it was a very hard decision between the



The European Law Students' Association

both teams. We are in the position however that this should be prevented in the future and we will instruct both Panellists and Academic Advisors in this regard.

Timekeepers

Because of the human recourse problem of ELSA Barcelona we weren't equipped with many Timekeepers. More than once ELSA International or the ROC had to substitute to ensure there were enough Timekeepers. This is a situation that should be avoided in the future, as those individuals all have their own tasks and don't have much extra time for timekeeping.

However, with the limited recourses no problems arose, which was also due to the fact that half of the individuals had previous experience with timekeeping and were able to do the job without much hassle.

Participants

Ten teams from European universities came to Barcelona to compete against each other in the Regional Round of Barcelona. More than 50 participants had to work very hard to prove their academic and presentation talents, something they prepared for a long time.

The teams came from Germany, Greece, Hungary, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Romania, Russia, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, with participants of sixteen different nationalities.

There was a noticeable difference in level between teams from universities with some more mooted and WTO experience than other universities. However, all teams learned from the experience and I certainly hope that all participants will encourage their fellow students to register for the competition next year. From my view all teams learned a lot this week and, maybe as important, got to know a lot of others from all corners of Europe.

Awards

All teams came together in a restaurant on Saturday evening for the Award Ceremony. During the ceremony a fantastic Spanish meal was served and the ambiance was great.

The ranking was as follows:

Preliminary Rounds:

1st ranked team: 018 – Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg – Germany

2nd ranked team: 020 – University of Bucharest – Romania

3rd ranked team: 042 – King's College London – United Kingdom

4th ranked team: 060 – University of Luxembourg – Luxembourg



The European Law Students' Association

5th ranked team: 040 – Geneva University – Switzerland

6th ranked team: 027 – Saint-Petersburg State University – Russia

7th ranked team: 031 – University of Amsterdam – The Netherlands

8th ranked team: 046 – Aristotle University of Thessaloniki – Greece

9th ranked team: 008 – State University Higher School of Economics – Russia

10th ranked team: 056 – University of Debrecen – Hungary

Elimination Rounds:

Semi-final 1:

Team 018 vs. team 042. Winner: Team 018

Semi-final 2:

Team 020 vs. team 060. Winner: Team 020

Participation Certificates were distributed to all teams registered for the ELSA Regional Round. Certificates were also awarded for the following:

Winner of the Regional Round:

Team 018 – Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg – Germany

Runner-up of the Regional Round:

Team 020 – University of Bucharest – Romania

Best Complainant Written Submission:

Team 018 – Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg – Germany

Best Respondent Written Submission:

Team 046 – Aristotle University of Thessaloniki – Greece

Best overall Written Submission:

Team 018 – Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg – Germany

Best orator preliminary rounds:

Floria Dragusin, Team 020 – University of Bucharest – Romania

Best orator Semi-finals:

Floria Dragusin, Team 020 – University of Bucharest – Romania

Best orator Grand Final:

Floria Dragusin, Team 020 – University of Bucharest – Romania

Scores in numbers

i) Team Rankings after the Preliminary Rounds

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score (70%) & Written Submission Score (30%)
018	257,00	260,25	462,13
020	242,00	249,00	438,20
042	210,00	243,00	394,80
040	186,00	209,75	376,71
060	243,00	149,00	364,63
027	155,00	197,00	327,33
046	149,25	154,25	307,10
031	167,25	157,75	302,13
008	154,75	182,00	297,61
056	80,00	120,00	175,40

*The Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score is the overall team score from each of the three Panellists added together.



The European Law Students' Association

The Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score is the overall team score from each of the three Panellists added together.

The Total of Overall Oral Pleading Score & Written Submission Score consists of 70% of the Oral Pleading Score and 30 % of Written Submission.

Each member of the Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent. The scores given by each of the Panellists would then be added together.

Therefore, the maximum score for each oral argument any Team presented was 300 points. Each Team pleaded twice in the Preliminary Rounds – once as Complainant and once as Respondent. Therefore, the ranking was determined by adding up the points of the two sessions.

Total of 600 points could have been received by one Team throughout the Preliminary Rounds.

ii) Best Orator after the Preliminary Rounds

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Floria Dragusin	020	231,50	258,00	489,50
Lingxi Wang	042	208,00	245,00	453,00
Katherine Lim	042	211,50	239,00	450,50
Cristiana Soare	020	193,25	249,00	442,25
Luis Lopez Linaldi	040	183,75	200,25	384,00
Maria Alterman	027	174,50	200,75	375,25
Michael Kocitai	031	173,75	183,00	357,50
Alexandra Tsybizova	008	159,00	197,00	356,00
Roberto Recalde	040	186,25	148,75	335,00
Oksana Tsymbriska	031	174,50	152,00	326,75

Alyona Vitrak	031	179,50	144,00	323,50
Eirini Tsifopoulou	046	149,75	149,75	299,50
Effrosyni Bacirtzi	046	147,25	145,25	292,50
Ioana-Stefana Pristavu	020	267,50	0,00	267,50
Anara Karagulova	018	261,00	0,00	261,00
Lars Raabe	018	0,00	260,00	260,00
Stephanie Engel	018	0,00	254,50	254,50
Diana Knofe	018	254,00	0,00	254,00
Ariel Devillers	060	242,00	0,00	242,00
Mihaela Mazilu	060	237,00	0,00	237,00
David Itzes	056	110,00	125,50	235,50
Tanya Bratko	027	0,00	199,00	199,00
Amalia-Anca Bejinaru	020	0,00	192,25	192,25
Irina Smirnova	008	0,00	170,00	170,00
Gergey Nagy	056	65,00	100,00	165,00
Sari Kupiainen	060	0,00	159,75	159,75
Marianne Kuusakoski	060	0,00	152,75	152,75
Katrin Esipova	027	147,00	0,00	147,00
Alina Leonova	008	145,00	0,00	145,00
Aleksandra Kasatkina	008	0,00	0,00	145,00
Maxim Kamenkov	027	122,50	0,00	122,50

Please note: According to the Rules of EMC², an orator had to plead twice during the Preliminary Rounds – once as Complainant and once as Respondent to qualify for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Round Awards.

The Total Score for Complainant Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

The Total Score for Respondent Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

Individual performance of the Teams members was assessed based on the same general criteria as the performance of the Teams' oral pleadings. The Panellists were guided by factors such as: competence, inclusion of all relevant facts, structure and logic of the argument, soundness of the argument presented, response to questions by The Panels, time management, role of Team members etc. Each member of the

Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent per Team member for an individual performance.

iii) Team Ranking – Semi Final Round

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
020	0,00	243,00	243,00
018	240,75	0,00	240,75
060	234,00	0,00	234,00
042	0,00	223,00	223,00

iv) Orator Ranking – Semi Final Round

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Floria Dragusin	020	0,00	245,50	245,50
Katherine Lim	042	0,00	245,00	245,00
Amalia-Anca Bejinaru	020	0,00	238,50	238,50

Anara Karagulova	018	238,25	0,00	238,25
Ariel Devillers	060	233,00	0,00	233,00
Diana Knotte	018	232,75	0,00	232,75
Lingxi Wang	042	0,00	232,00	232,00
Mihaela Mazilu	060	229,50	0,00	229,50
Cristiana Soare	020	0,00	222,75	222,75

v) Team Ranking – Grand Final

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
018	0,00	502,00	502,00
020	499,00	0,00	499,00

vi) Oralist Ranking – Grand Final

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Floria Dragusin	018	530,50	0,00	530,50
Stephanie Engel	020	0,00	494,00	494,00
Ioana Stefana Pristavu	018	476,25	0,00	476,25
Cristiana Soare	018	470,75	0,00	470,75
Lars Raabe	020	0,00	463,75	463,75

*The Grand Final consisted of six (6) Panellists.



The European Law Students' Association

** Each member of the Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent. The scores given by each of the Panellists would then be added together.

Therefore, the maximum score for each oral argument any Team presented was 600 points.

Concluding remarks

As mentioned above, the ROC in Barcelona had the complicated task to organise a high quality academic event with only a few people. ELSA International is very grateful for those dedicated ELSA members who fought to have the ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO law in Barcelona, because it turned out to be a great event, in which participants, Panellists and organisers worked very hard and still found time to meet each other in the evenings and had a very good time together. So I'd like to thank all those individuals again, for helping ELSA to fulfil its goal of *facing the global challenge!*

Sincerely,

Koen Klootwijk

EMC² Coordinator for ELSA International

ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO Law – 2008-2009



The European Law Students' Association

The ELSA Regional Round of Frankfurt-Oder, Germany.

The second ELSA Regional Round took place in Frankfurt-Oder, Germany from 19th to 22nd of March 2009.

The regional round organising committee did an amazing job throughout the whole event, especially taken into consideration the problems that occurred due to the stomach troubles some participants, Panellists and organisers experienced. You all gave your best in the true ELSA Spirit.

Even though the event was being held in Frankfurt-Oder, it was only possible due to the efforts of the German National Board lead by Ms. Stephanie Denowell. During the competition the German national board attended the event and helped out with the organisation as well as timekeeping.

Therefore, a big thank to everybody in Frankfurt-Oder who ensured this great event.

Academic quality

List of Panellists:

Dr. Lorand Bartels
Ms. Ruta Zarnauskaite
Ms. Lourdes Catrain
Ms. Natalie McNelis
Ms. Jan Yves Remy
Mr. Christopher Clinton
Mr. George-Dian Balan
Ms. Olga Nartova
Ms. Sofya Matteotti

In the ELSA Regional Round of Frankfurt-Oder we had a team of Panellists which had a good mixture of practitioners, academics and representatives from the World Trade Organization (WTO). As the Barcelona Regional Round was very male dominated, conversely this regional round was female dominated with two gentleman and seven ladies. As the regional round in Frankfurt-Oder was one day shorter than the regional round in Barcelona, there were more Panellists present, and more extensive preliminary rounds.

I conclude that the Panellists did a great effort in order to ensure that all teams were evaluated on the same basis, and I thank them for their shown professionalism and enthusiasm for the competition.

Timekeepers

Timekeepers did an excellent job during the competition, and it was a pleasure to have so many people available at all times.



The European Law Students' Association

Participants

Ten teams from European universities were scheduled to be in Frankfurt-Oder to participate in the regional round of Frankfurt-Oder. Unfortunately the two teams from Ukraine cancelled two days before the competition due to money- and visa issues. Therefore only 8 teams participated in this round, however the participants had to show what they were made of.

The teams came from Belarus, Lithuania, The Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Spain(x3) and Switzerland. The large number of Spanish team in this round is due to the policy that teams from a country where a regional round is held, is automatically sent to the other Regional Round in Europe.

The level of the participants was very high, and there was not much difference between the teams. The round was very close, and the level of knowledge was very high. I believe all teams learned from the experience and I certainly hope that all participants will encourage their fellow students to register for the competition next year.

Awards

All teams came together at the award ceremony on Saturday evening. During the ceremony a great buffet was served and the ambiance was great.

The ranking was as follows:

Preliminary Rounds:

1st ranked team: 025 – Maastricht University – The Netherlands

2nd ranked team: 006 – University of Barcelona – Spain

3rd ranked team: 049 – Studies Geneva – Switzerland

4th ranked team: 041 – London School of Economics – The United Kingdom

5th ranked team: 017 – Belarussian State University – Belarus

6th ranked team: 033 – Universidad Autonoma de Madrid – Spain

7th ranked team: 021 – Myklos Romeris University–Lithuania

8th ranked team: 016 –University Ramon Lull– Spain

*The teams from Ukraine which withdrew were not scored.

Elimination Rounds:

Semi-final 1:



The European Law Students' Association

Team 025 vs. team 049: Winner: Team 025

Semi-final 2:

Team 006 vs. team 041: Winner: Team 006

Grand Final:

Team 006 vs. team 025: Winner: team 006

Participation Certificates were distributed to all teams registered for the ELSA Regional Round. Certificates were also awarded for the following:

Winner of the Regional Round:

Team 006 – University of Barcelona – Spain

Runner-up of the Regional Round:

Team 025 – Maastricht University – The Netherlands

Best Complainant Written Submission:

Team 025 – Maastricht University – The Netherlands

Best Respondent Written Submission:

Team 025 – Maastricht University – The Netherlands

Best overall Written Submission:

Team 025 – Maastricht University – The Netherlands

Best Orator Preliminary Rounds:

Sanne Boer, Team 025 – Maastricht University – The Netherlands

Best Orator Semi-finals:

Maria Alcover, Team 006 – University of Barcelona– Spain

Best Orator Grand Final:

Maria Alcover, Team 006 – University of Barcelona – Spain

Scores in numbers

i) Team Ranking after the Preliminary Rounds

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score (70%) & Written Submission Score (30%)
025	252,00	227,50	441,48
006	235,00	230,25	420,93
049	237,00	211,50	410,10
041	206,25	215,25	392,25
017	199,25	230,60	381,38
033	253,00	185,50	379,63
021	198,50	196,75	368,63
016	178,25	149,25	291,05

The Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score is the overall team score from each of the three Panellists added together.

The Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score is the overall team score from each of the three Panellists added together.

The Total of Overall Oral Pleading Score & Written Submission Score consists of 70% of the Oral Pleading Score and 30 % of Written Submission.

Each member of the Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent. The scores given by each of the Panellists would then be added together.

Therefore, the maximum score for each oral argument any Team presented was 300 points. Each Team pleaded twice in the Preliminary Rounds – once as Complainant and once as Respondent. Therefore, the ranking was determined by adding up the points of the two sessions.

Total of 600 points could have been received by one Team throughout the Preliminary Rounds.

ii) Orator Ranking - Preliminary Rounds

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Sanne Boer	025	252,25	240,00	492,25
Bassant El Attar	049	236,25	234,50	470,75
Olga Konsek	025	237,25	225,25	462,50
Gintare Mocrute	021	219,25	241,75	461,00
Vivian Choi	049	242,75	213,50	456,25
David Fanego Otero	033	254,00	194,25	448,25
Augustin Sezzano de Haro Sanchez	033	251,25	193,50	444,75
Babette Anceny	049	232,50	208,75	441,25
Alesia Tsiabus	017	203,50	231,50	435,00
Daniel Perez Rodrigues	033	225,75	203,50	429,25
Oliver Lewis	041	210,25	216,00	426,25
Artsiom Tozik	017	189,75	230,50	420,25
Rytis Valunas	021	181,75	207,25	389,00

Kira Krissinel	041	173,75	203,75	377,50
Milda Bareisaite	021	145,50	150,50	296,00
Maria Alcover	006	247,75	0,00	247,75
Diego Pol	006	0,00	247,50	247,50
Linda Bore	041	232,25	0,00	232,25
Blanca Salas	006	226,75	0,00	226,75
Merel Van Rens	025	0,00	221,50	221,50
Isabel Vilaseca	006	0,00	213,75	213,75
Camilla Graham	041	0,00	202,00	202,00
Sajni Hotchandani	016	186,50	0,00	186,50
Elisabet Martinez	016	171,50	0,00	171,50
Marta Gonzalez	016	0,00	147,75	147,75
Xavi Sanmarti	016	0,00	143,75	143,75

Please note: According to the Rules of EMC², an orator had to plead twice during the Preliminary Rounds – once as Complainant and once as Respondent to qualify for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Round Awards.

The Total Score for Complainant Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

The Total Score for Respondent Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

Individual performance of the Teams members was assessed based on the same general criteria as the performance of the Teams' oral pleadings. The Panellists were guided by factors such as: competence, inclusion of all relevant facts, structure and logic of the argument, soundness of the argument presented, response to questions by The Panels, time management, role of Team members etc. Each member of The Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent per Team member for an individual performance. Total of 600 points could have been received by one Team throughout the Preliminary Rounds.

iii) Team Ranking – Semi Final Round

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
006	256,25	0,00	256,25
025	0,00	228,75	228,75
041	0,00	223,75	223,75
049	216,75	0,00	216,75

iv) Orator Ranking – Semi Final Round

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Maria Alcover	006	266,25	0,00	266,25
Blanca Salas	006	246,50	0,00	246,50
Sanne Boer	025	0,00	244,00	244,00
Camilla Graham	041	0,00	239,25	239,25
Olga Konsek	025	0,00	223,00	223,00
Kra Krissinel	041	0,00	219,00	219,00
Basasnt EL Attar	049	218,75	0,00	218,75
Babette Ancen	049	210,50	0,00	210,50
Vivian Choi	049	209,00	0,00	209,00
Merel van Rens	025	0,00	206,25	206,25
Oliver Lewis	041	0,00	203,75	203,75

v) Team Ranking – Grand Final

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
006	437,25	0,00	437,25
025	0,00	400,50	400,50

*The Grand Final Panel consisted of 5 Panellists, the maximum total score was 500.

vi) Orator Ranking – Grand Final

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Maria Alcover	006	434,75	0,00	434,75
Sanne Boer	025	0,00	398,00	398,00
Olga Konsek	025	0,00	387,50	387,50
Blanca Salas	006	379,75	0,00	379,75
Merel van Rens	025	0,00	349,50	349,50

*The Grand Final consisted of five (5) Panellists.

** Each member of the Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent. The scores given by each of the Panellists would then be added together.

Therefore, the maximum score for each oral argument any Team presented was 500 points.



The European Law Students' Association

Concluding remarks

The stomach problem that occurred for many participants, Panellists and organisers made the event a big challenge. However, all parts did excellent in order to ensure a high quality event. ELSA International is very grateful for the efforts you all showed in difficult moments. Without all your efforts this event would not have been possible.

I hope you will all contribute towards the European Law Students' Association and the competition's goal of facing the global challenge.

Sincerely,

Morten Rydningen
Vice President Academic Activities
ELSA International

Head of Organisation Committee
ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO Law – 2008-2009



The European Law Students' Association

The non-ELSA Pacific 'Written' Regional Round of the EMC² 2008-2009

A) Pacific Regional Round Organiser

For the 4th year -the Institute for International Trade (IIT) - University of Adelaide were the Regional Round Organiser and former WTO Deputy-Director General and IIT Executive Director, Mr Andrew Stoler, was the Regional Round Administrator (RRA).

At the close of Team Registrations in January 2009, only three teams from the Pacific had registered for the event. ELSA International, in keeping with the agreement entered into with IIT, immediately converted the 'oral' event into the Pacific 'Written' Regional Round.

B) Academic Quality of the Pacific 'Written' Regional Round

i) Written Submissions

As the Written Submissions were already a component of the Regional (Oral) Rounds, the conversion to a 'Written' Regional Round was seamless. IIT had already identified two Panellists to mark each team's tendered Written Submissions. The quality of the documents were on-par with teams globally as was evident by Team 002 (University of Melbourne, Australia) being awarded the Best Overall Written Submission prize at the Final Oral Round.

C) Pacific Regional Round Participant Teams

Three teams from the Pacific region registered for the Pacific Regional Round and another three expressed interest. Unfortunately, due to the world financial crisis, most Australian Law Schools restricted assistance for financial support of students wishing to enter mooting competitions.

Although the event was converted to a 'Written' Regional Round with three teams, ELSA International agreed that notwithstanding the fact that only three teams were registered, that the Winner and Runner-up would proceed to the Final Oral Round in Taipei.

The Australian and New Zealand teams that proceeded to the Final Oral Round in Taipei were of a very high calibre and performed extremely well in both the Preliminary Rounds and Elimination Rounds. Congratulations to all the Pacific Regional Round teams who participated in the competition, notwithstanding the disappointment that we all feel for the cancellation of the regional oral round.



The European Law Students' Association

D) Pacific 'Written' Regional Round Awards

i) Written Submissions Rankings

Ranking of the teams to proceed to the Final Oral Round in Taipei was based on the marks of the two Panellists combining the complainant and respondent Written Submissions scores.

ELSA International and the Institute for International Trade wish to thank Emeritus Professor Mary Hiscock (Bond University, Australia) and Ms Meredith Lewis (University of Victoria - Wellington, New Zealand) for undertaking the important task of being 'Written Submission Panellist'.

The teams were ranked as follows:

1st Ranked: Team 002 – University of Melbourne, Australia

2nd Ranked: Team 022 – University of Otago, New Zealand

3rd Ranked: Team 047 – University of Sydney, Australia

Team No:	Total Complainant Written Submission Score	Total Respondent Written Submission Score	Total of Overall Written Submission Scores
002	176.00	177.75	353.75
022	147.00	159.75	306.75
047	163.25	129.00	292.25

Participation Certificates were distributed to all teams registered for the Pacific 'Written' Regional Round. Certificates were also awarded for the following:

Best Complainant Written Submission:

Team 002 – University of Melbourne, Australia

Best Respondent Written Submission:



The European Law Students' Association

Team 002 – University of Melbourne, Australia

Best Overall Written Submissions:

Team 002 – University of Melbourne, Australia

The team from University of Melbourne was also extremely successful at the Final Oral Rounds in winning the:

Best Overall Written Submissions - Letizia Raschella-Sergi Award; and the Winner of the EMC² 2008-2009 – The World Trade Institute Award

Congratulations Rudi, Laura, Christopher and Erica on your outstanding achievement and on behalf of ELSA International, we trust that you will enjoy your prize – the World Trade Institute Postgraduate WTO Summer Programme, to be held in Switzerland in July/August 2009.

Also we would like to remind you that your winning Written Submissions will be posted on the EMC² website which you can then utilise as an example of your skills in job interviews and applications for post-graduate programmes.

E) Academic Supervisor's Concluding Remarks

I have been involved with the EMC² competition since its inception in 2002. Personally, 2008-2009 has been my most challenging year with also supervising the first Final Oral Round held outside of Geneva. Notwithstanding the difficulties experienced in the Pacific Regional Round, the competition continues to expand globally and gain prestige in the various government ministries that handle WTO policy and disputes as well as law firms and research centres.

Congratulations to all the 2008-2009 EMC² participants, you have taken part in an event that has challenged your intellect and legal research skills whilst developing your diplomatic advocacy skills. I have no doubt that your experience will positively assist you in your future international trade law careers!

Finally, as a consequence of the conversion to a Pacific 'Written' Regional Round, ELSA International is reviewing the location of the 2009-2010 Pacific Regional Round in order to assist more teams to participate in the event.

Sincerely

Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi

EMC² Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor



The European Law Students' Association

The non-ELSA ASIA Regional Round of the EMC² 2008-2009

A) ASIA Regional Round Organiser

For the fourth consecutive year, National Taiwan University's Asian Centre for WTO and International Health Law and Policy (ACWH) was appointed the Regional Round Organiser (RRO), and Professor Chang-Fa Lo, former Dean of the College of Law (NTU) was appointed as Regional Round Administrator (RRA). Professor Lo was once again secured a number of WTO experts to participate in this professionally organised competition. The ASIA Regional Round was held from 25th to 28th March, in Taipei, Taiwan at the GIS Convention Centre.

B) Academic Quality of the ASIA RR

i) Panellists

The individuals chosen to judge the ASIA Regional Round were all qualified WTO practitioners and academics and we were particularly fortunate to have Mr Andreas Sennekamp – Legal Officer –WTO Appellate Body Secretariat judge the two Semi Finals and Grand Final of the event.

A number of the Panellists stated that they had thoroughly enjoyed the experience of judging and especially assisting young law students from their region to develop their analytical and advocacy skills. Similar to other regional rounds, many of the 'Panellist Alumni' took part in the 2006, 2007, and 2008 Asia Regional Round.

Some Panellists indicated that they would like to read the participants' Written Submissions. A randomly selected complainant and respondent Written Submission were sent to all Panellists. All commented that the participants had indeed developed their pleadings since tendering their documents.

Our sincere thanks to all our Panellists for their enthusiasm, dedication and at times, highly complex questions. Their participation made the ASIA Regional Round a wonderful experience for the participants and an event which is likely to attract many teams for the region in the future:

Mr Andreas Sennekamp – Legal Officer - WTO Appellate Body Secretariat, Switzerland

Ms Jen-ni Yang – Deputy Chief Representative - Multilateral Trade Affairs, Bureau of Foreign Trade, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Taiwan

Mr Chern-chyi Chen – Negotiator (Rules & Legal Affairs) - Multilateral Trade Affairs, Bureau of Foreign Trade, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Taiwan

Professor (Dr) Shin-yi Péng – Director Institute of Law for Science & Technology, National Tsing



The European Law Students' Association

Hua University, Taiwan

Ambassador Manickam Supperamaniam - Former Ambassador/ Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the WTO, Malaysia

Ms Margaret Liang – Special Consultant WTO Issues and former Deputy Permanent Representative to the WTO and UN – Singapore Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade, Singapore

Mr Arthur Kurup – Former WTO legal Affairs Intern and Legal and Communications Secretary, Youth bureau for Political Affairs, Malaysia

Assistant Professor Pasha L. Hsieh – Former WTO Appellate Body Secretariat Intern and National Chung Cheng University Faculty of Law, Taiwan

Mr Chi-His Chao – Assistant Professor National Taiwan University College of Law and Senior International Law Counsel, Chien Yeh Law Offices, Taiwan

Mr Pi-jan Wu – Adjunct Associate Professor Soochow University School of Law and Senior Counsel, LCS & Partners, Taiwan

Mr Li-Pu Lee – Partner, Formosan Brothers Foundation, Taiwan

Mr Matt Chih-Ching Liu – Associate Partner, Tsar & Tsai Law Firm, Taiwan

Mr Benjamin Y. Li – Attorney, Lee and Li Attorneys, Taiwan

ii) Oral Pleading Sessions

The Preliminary Round pleading sessions were conducted concurrently over two days. Ambassador Supperamaniam and Ms Liang kindly agreed to Chair all the Preliminary Round sessions as well as the Grand Final session, thereby lending a consistency to the process. All Panellists were mindful of the EMC² Rules and only permitted oralists to run over time if they were answering the Panel's questions. Participants were reminded of the importance of time management, paced oral submissions and the fact that for all participants in the Asia Regional Round that English was not their first language (for either participants and most of the Panellist) – hence articulation of arguments was crucial.

C) Timekeepers

The Panels were assisted with time management by members of the Asia RRO Secretariat who acted as Timekeepers for all the pleadings sessions. Timers were utilised and this made it easier to record each oralists' pleading time as well as the overall team pleading time. In addition, they provided the Panel Chair with additional information regarding any breaches of the time rules. Furthermore, the Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor monitored all sessions, allocated Panellist to hearings, managed the assessment sheets and any breaches of the EMC² Rules as well as answered competitors and Panellists questions.

iv) Written Submissions

For the fourth year, Professor Shin-yi Péng and the Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor, Mrs Letizia Raschella-Sergi (Institute for International Trade - University of Adelaide) judged all the Written Submissions. The Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor also briefed the Panellists, during the Panellists' Briefing session, in relation to arguments put forward by teams in their Written Submissions, as of the 16th February 2009. As experienced in other regional round the teams progressed from their Written Submission pleadings by the time they orally pleaded in Taipei.

D) ASIA RR Participating Teams

The Asia Regional Round has growth in is now a prestige mootng competition in the region. In 2009 we were delighted that 10 teams from Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, the Philippines South Korea, Taiwan and Vietnam registered for the Asia Regional Round competition.

With WTO experts such as Mr Andreas Sennekamp, Ms Jen-ni Yang, Mr Chern-chi Chen and the 2007-2008 Case Author, Professor Péng, not only was the students knowledge of WTO tested, but also their understanding of environmental issues and international environmental law which were relative to the legal arguments in question. All Panellists commented on the superior advocacy skills displayed by the team participants.

Congratulations to all the ASIA RR teams on their performance at the competition!

E) ASIA RR Sponsors and Awards

Professor Chang-Fa Lo is to be congratulated for securing Taiwan's major trade law firms in to sponsor the Asia RR. Such sponsorship ensured that quality judges would participate as well as providing certificates for all the participants and Panellist and magnificent trophies for the winners.

Participants were awarded their trophies and certificates whilst Panellist received thank you certificates at the official ASIA Regional Round Presentation Dinner - which was held after the Grand Final on Saturday, 28th March at the prestigious Westin Taipei Hotel – a truly magnificent venue for an auspicious occasion.

At the conclusion of the Preliminary Rounds the top four teams were ranked as follows:

- 1st ranked: Team 045 – National Taiwan University, Taiwan
- 2nd ranked: Team 009 – University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
- 3rd ranked: Team 007 –Gujarat National Law University, India
- 4th ranked: Team 011 – Yokohama National University, Japan
- 5th ranked Team 035 – Ateneo de Manila Univeristy, Philippines

6th ranked Team 032 – West Bengal national University of Juridical Sciences, India

7th ranked Team 019 – Diplomatic Academy, Vietnam

8th ranked Team 012 – Universitas Pelita Harpan, Indonesia

9th ranked Team 039 – National Chiao Tong University, Taiwan

10th ranked Team 061 – Yonsei University, South Korea

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score (70%) & Written Submission Score (30%)
045	258.75	263.00	466.63
009	249.25	256.25	453.75
007	246.50	255.50	442.90
011	239.25	238.50	436.21
035	244.75	229.00	429.88
032	248.25	223.50	427.73
019	243.75	225.00	424.58
012	233.50	205.00	408.65
039	218.00	222.75	403.78
061	204.50	222.25	392.26

Elimination Round Teams

As per Rules the elimination teams mooted per the following schedule:

Semi-Finalists 1: Team 045 (ranked 1st) vs. Team 007 (ranked 3rd)

= Winner - Team 045

Semi-Finalists 2: Team 011 (ranked 4th) vs. Team 009 (ranked 2nd)

= Winner Team 009

The Semi Finals consisted of 5 Panellist per session

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
045	450.00	0.00	450.00
007	0.00	429.75	429.75
011	444.50	0.00	444.50
009	0.00	445.50	445.50

Grand Final: Team 009 vs. Team 045

= Winner Team 045

The Grand Final consisted of 7 Panellist

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
045	0.00	531.00	531.00
009	519.00	0.00	519.00

iii) Awards

The following teams and individuals received trophies and certificates generously donated by all the sponsors of the ASIA RR:

Winner of the EMC² Asia Regional Round

Team 045 – National Taiwan University, Taiwan

Runner-up of the EMC² Asia Regional Round

Team 009 – University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong



The European Law Students' Association

Best Complainant Written Submission

Team 011 Yokohama National University, Japan

Best Respondent Written Submission

Team 045 National Taiwan University, Taiwan

Honourable Mention for the Overall Written Submissions

Team 012 Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Best Overall Written Submissions

Team 011 Yokohama National University, Japan

Team No:	Total Complainant Written Submission Score	Total Respondent Written Submission Score	Total of Overall Written Submission Scores
007	150.50	154.50	305.00
009	166.50	166.50	333.00
011	170.75	168.50	339.25
012	170.50	168.50	339.00
019	164.50	157.00	321.50
032	165.50	159.50	325.00
035	166.25	161.25	327.50
039	161.00	156.50	317.50
045	169.00	169.00	338.00
061	157.50	154.25	311.75



The European Law Students' Association

5th Best Oralist Preliminary Rounds

Team 011 Yokohama University, Japan – Mr Weibo Yan, Japan

4th Best Oralist Preliminary Rounds

Team 007 Gujarat National Law University, India – Mr Soham Badheka

3rd Best Oralist Preliminary Rounds

Team 009 University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, Mr Henry Hon Gi Cheng

2nd Best Oralist Preliminary Rounds

Team 045 National Taiwan University, Taiwan, Mr Chien-Fei Li

Best Oralist Preliminary Round

Team 045 National Taiwan University, Taiwan, Mr Hsien Wu

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Hsien Wu	045	268.00	256.75	524.75
Chien-fei Li	045	238.75	265.00	503.75
Henry Hon Gi Cheng	009	244.25	252.50	496.75
Soham Badheka	007	246.75	248.25	495.00
Weibo Yan	011	263.25	224.75	488.00
Aditi Suresh	007	237.00	246.25	483.25
Gladys Qiao Ying Moon	009	230.25	248.50	478.75
Medha Marathe	032	243.50	233.75	477.25
Veronica Koman	012	239.50	232.75	472.25
Yi-Chun Lai	039	240.00	229.50	469.50

Sri Ranga Pujitha Gorantla	007	231.75	232.25	464.00
Francela Davila Montero	011	238.00	221.50	459.50
Yunita Fransisca	012	227.50	228.00	455.50
Chen-Chi Hung	039	212.25	240.75	453.00
Jerry Shalmont	012	226.50	221.50	448.00
Jau Sanklecha	032	248.00	199.50	447.50
Yu Mi Jo	061	193.75	223.50	417.25
Sarah Sin Wa Ho	009	0.00	260.00	260.00
Joseph Alenn Gregorio	035	250.75	0.00	250.75
Maria Cristina Aurora Baldemor Ma	035	250.50	0.00	250.50
Luz Danielle Bolong	035	0.00	238.00	238.00
Yu-shan Kao	045	0.00	239.50	239.50
Thao Nguyen Thi Phuong	019	235.50	0.00	235.50
Yi Se Park	061	0.00	232.50	232.50
Claudia Ching Kwan Fung	009	230.50	0.00	230.50
Ha Bui Thi Viet	019	225.00	0.00	225.00
Micah Saturday Alciso	035	0.00	220.00	220.00
Thao Tran Da	019	0.00	219.50	219.50
Jen-Heisen Huang	039	215.75	0.00	215.75
Mai Naugen Phuong	019	0.00	217.25	217.25
Hsin-Yi Hu	039	0.00	215.75	215.75
Wei-chen Hung	045	208.00	0.00	208.00
Seung Kwan Kang	061	176.75	0.00	176.75

Best Oralist Semi Final Rounds

Team 011 Yokohama Univeristy, Japan – Mr Weibo Yan, Japan

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Wei Bo	011	459.25	0.00	459.25
Chien-Fei Li	045	453.53	0.00	453.53
Hsien Wu	045	448.25	0.00	448.25
Henry Hon Gi Cheng	009	0.00	446.50	446.50
Wei-Chen Hung	045	442.00	0.00	442.00
Soham Badheka	007	0.00	441.00	441.00
Sarah Sin Wa Ho	009	0.00	439.00	439.00
Francela Davila Montero	011	430.00	0.00	430.00
Gladys Qiao Ying Moon	009	0.00	429.00	429.00
Aditi Suresh	007	0.00	427.50	427.50
Sri Ranga Pujitha Gorantla	007	0.00	421.25	421.25

Best Oralist Grand Final Round

Team 045 National Taiwan University, Taiwan, Mr Chien-Fei Li

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Chien-Fei Li	045	0	637	637
Hsien Wu	045	0	630	630
Henry Hon Gi Cheng	009	605.75	0	605.75
Claudia Ching Kwan Fung	009	598.25	0	598.25
Gladys Qiao Ying Moon	009	586.25	0	586.25
Yu-shan Kao	045	0	566.50	566.50

*7 panelists were assigned to the Grand Final Panel. The maximum score was 700.



The European Law Students' Association

F) Academic Supervisor's concluding Remarks

The fourth Asia RR was a highly successful event, Professor Chang-fa Lo and his 2008-2009 Regional Round Coordinator, Mr C.L. Patrick Lin and Assistants, Ms Sarah Tsai-Ping Tang and Ms Rou-yun Tu are to be sincerely congratulated for the professional organization of the moot court competition.

All participants were provided with a folder pack containing the event information and welcome gifts. Participants, Panellists and sponsors were attended to with efficiency, courtesy and professionalism

ACWH arranged for professional designers to brand the event and produced various promotional material including; event programs, acrylic document case; banners, posters, event name tags; place table tags as well as wonderful participation certificates. It is suggested that the EMC² follows ACWH's lead and instigate a brand marketing campaign to raise the profile of the competition and the marketability to employers of all participants.

The organization of the ASIA Regional Round continues to push the standard of the EMC² for all Regional Round Organisers – my sincerest congratulations to Professor Lo on an outstanding event and I very much look forward to working with him and his new team in 2010!

Sincerely

Mrs Letizia Raschella-Sergi
EMC² Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor

The North America Regional Round of the EMC²

This year seven teams from USA and Canada travelled to Washington D.C. to participate in oral rounds from 11th to 13th March and be judged by top qualified WTO specialists. Two teams were selected to continue to the Final Oral Round in Taipei, Taiwan.

Academic Quality

Panellists

The NARR had more Panellists than last year. The following individuals participated in judging this year's competition:

Written Submissions' Panel

Ms Mélida Hodgson | Foley Hoag

Professor Katrin Kuhlmann | President, Trade, Aid and Security Coalition A Project of Global Works Foundation

Ms Tanya Lat | Peterson Institute for International Economics

Professor Marguerite Trossevin | Jochum Shore & Trossevin

Professor Donald Dinan | Roetzel & Andress

Ms Amy Stanley | King & Spaulding

Mr Renato Gomes | Georgetown SJD

Ms Sara Marzal | Georgetown SJD

Mr Eric M.Solovy | Sidley Austin

Oral Pleadings' Panel

Ms Jennifer A. Hillman | WTO Appellate Body

Professor Marguerite Trossevin | Jochum Shore & Trossevin

Professor Katrin Kuhlmann | President, Trade, Aid and Security Coalition A Project of GlobalWorks Foundation

Professor John R. Magnus | Tradewins and Miller & Chevalier

Professor Jacob Werksman | Program Director of Institutions and Governance at the World Resources Institute

Professor Donald Dinan | Roetzel & Andress

Professor Charles Verrill | Wiley Rein

Ms Tanya Lat | Peterson Institute for International Economics



The European Law Students' Association

Ms Sara Marzal | Georgetown SJD

Ms Pamela Coke-Hamilton | Trade Expert, Trade Unit, Organization of American States (OAS)

Ms Mélida Hodgson | Foley Hoag

Ms Mara Burr | Deputy Assistant United States Trade Representative for Environment and Natural Resources

Ms Jabin Vahora | Commerce Department

Ms Edna Ramirez | JIEL Editorial Assistant

Ms Andrew W. Shoyer | Sidley Austin

Ms Amy Stanley | King & Spaulding

Mr Renato Gomes | Georgetown SJD

Mr Paul Piquado | Executive Director, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Office of Trade Policy

Mr Matthew Nicely | Miller & Chevalier

Mr Matthew E. Fischer | Katten Muchin Rosenman

Mr Eric M. Solovy | Sidley Austin

Mr Christophe J. Larouer | Georgetown SJD

Due to the tight schedule of the event the quality of the Semi Finals' panel, as compared to the other regional rounds, was compromised. This must be avoided in the future through the control of the Academic Supervisor and better organizational practices.

Timekeepers

The work of the interns from ILI, who served as the timekeepers, made sure the competition ran smoothly and this raised the level of the competition. The teams were also better than last year, as evidenced by the fact that one of the NARR teams made it to the Grand Final in the FOR.

Participants

004	University of Ottawa, Canada
010	George Washington University, USA
024	York University, Canada
026	Duke University, USA
028	University of Kansas School of Law, USA
034	Washington and Lee University School of Law, USA
044	American University, USA

Rankings and Awards

Awards Ceremony of the North America Regional Round of the ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO law took place on Thursday, 12 March 2009.

i) Teams' Ranking after the Preliminary Rounds - NARR

Team Code	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Ranking Scores, namely Total of Oral Pleading Score (70%) & Written Submission Score (30%)
026	263,50	268,13	481,86
004	256	274,50	469,83
010	264,75	265,25	461,68
028	217,75	245,25	425,05
044	243,63	229,75	412,06
024	232,25	205,75	395,55
034	156,25	260,25	367,53

ii) Best Orator Preliminary Rounds - NARR

TEAM NUMBER and COMPETITOR NAMES	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Gregory Dixon of 026	266,50	276,00	542,50
Hina Hussein of 010	272,00	267,25	539,25
Fabio Leonardi of 010	267,50	265,50	533,00
Michael Gilles of 026	265,00	257,00	522,00
Blake Urban of 044	255,75	252,75	508,50
Michael Lore of 044	263,50	238,00	501,50
Beau Jackson of 028	219,25	255,50	474,75

Ben Sharp of 028	211,75	244,75	456,50
Ariel Thomas of 024	232,00	221,25	453,25
Ian Medcalf of 024	233,75	213,25	447,00
Jorge Rueda of 044	239,75	198,00	437,75
Brian Hall of 024	231,50	200,25	431,75
Katrina Reyes of 004	0,00	275,00	275,00
Jonathan Wright of 034	0,00	272,00	272,00
Chris Fetzer of 034	0,00	266,25	266,25
Noah Arshinoff of 004	262,00	0,00	262,00
Timothy Reibold of 026	0,00	261,75	261,75
Neida Gonzales of 004	0,00	260,00	260,00
Jingting Li of 010	0,00	259,00	259,00
Jonathan Skinner of 026	259,00	0,00	259,00
Roberto Aburto of 004	251,00	0,00	251,00
Paul Kraczek of 010	249,00	0,00	249,00
Christina Elmore of 028	0,00	242,50	242,50
Carrie Bader of 028	215,50	0,00	215,50
David Kiebler of 034	163,00	0,00	163,00
Michael Freeman of 034	160,00	0,00	160,00

Please note: According to the Rules of EMC², an orator had to plead twice during the Preliminary Rounds – once as Complainant and once as Respondent to qualify for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Round Awards.

The Total Score for Complainant Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

The Total Score for Respondent Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

Individual performance of the Teams members was assessed based on the same general criteria as the performance of the Teams' oral pleadings. The Panellists were guided by factors such as: competence, inclusion of all relevant facts, structure and logic of the argument, soundness of the argument presented, response to questions by The Panels, time management, role of Team members etc. Each member of The Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent per Team member for an individual performance.

Semi-finals and the Grand Final Rounds

Winner – 026

Runner-up – 028

Other Semi Finalists 010 and 004

Best Orator Grand Final - Michael Gilles of Team 026

iii) Best Orator Semi Final Round

Best Orator Semi Finals	
TEAM NUMBER and	Overall Orator's
COMPETITOR NAMES	Score
Timothy Reibold of R026	283,00
Gregory Dixon of R026	282,00
Michael Gilles of R026	262,50
Beau Jackson of C028	261,00
Hina Hussein of C010	249,50
Carrie Bader of C028	247,25

Ben Sharp of C028	245,00
Paul Kraczek of C010	242,00
Katrina Reyes of R004	239,75
Neida Gonzales of R004	234,50
Fabio Leonardi of C010	227,50

Written Submissions' Awards

Best Complainant Written Submission – Team 026

Best Written Respondent Submission – Team 026

Best Overall Written Submission – Team 026

In addition, three most valuable Panellists' honourable mentions took place as our devoted Panellists changed their plans in accordance with out rescheduling needs:

Ms Edna Ramirez Robles

Prof. Don Dinan

Mr Matthew E. Fischer

Other comments

Organisational Issues

This year the organizational hardships were minimal due to close involvement of the ILI in organizational aspects of the event, as well as due to the help of Ms Edna Ramirez. Also, the organizers (in essence one organizer – Zeeshan Hafeez) did a much better job building on the previous experience.

Logistics

The participants from out of town were accommodated at the Georgetown Suites that was given high approval by all. All costs were absorbed by the participation fees. A reception was organized at “Paper Moon”, which was enjoyed by all in attendance. This year all the results of the preliminary



The European Law Students' Association

rounds were announced at the reception. Competing teams were feted at a dinner and an awards reception at Bistro Francais, in Georgetown. The competition was truly an effective way to foster new networks and engage more law students in international trade law.

Finances

The International Law Institute - ILI provided financial, logistical and organizational support, whereas Georgetown University Law Center provided the pleading venues.

In the future increased involvement of universities and the law firms is desirable. This year we could not fly in Panellists from other states of the USA or other countries (the EMC² International Panellists' Pool). Due to abundance of great WTO law and International Trade law minds in Washington D.C. there were hardly any shortcomings to the work of the panels (if there were any, they were due to organizational problems). However, for moot court continuity and enhanced international experience it is desirable that funds are raised to bring in at least two "out of town" Panellists.

Both ELSA and Academic Supervisors would greatly appreciate a report by the organizers on the receipt and usage of funds related to the NARR. The NARR 2009 budget was never submitted though MOA demands that for financial management purposes and to allow the Academic Supervisor to help ensure the financial viability of the project; such Budget is submitted within 30 days of signing of the relevant RR's MOA.

Miscellaneous

In the view of the Academic Supervisor, clearly the NARR requires a patronage like that provided for the Regional Rounds of the Pacific or Asia. Due to this shortcoming we are missing out on some valuable expertise, contacts and stability in the competition.

Concluding remarks

The competition has the potential to grow and stabilize in the coming years. The following are the goals the organizers of 2008-2009 see for the 2010 competition:

"Increase the number of participating teams to at least 12". (Note by the Academic Supervisor: There are natural limitations to this number as not all law schools have international trade law programs.)

"Retain high quality Panellists and find more" (Note by the Academic Supervisor: The proportion must be kept to the number of teams involved. Previous regional rounds experience indicates that too big regional panel results in inconsistency of marking and lack of transparency.).

"Increase academic quality of competition <...>".



The European Law Students' Association

“Obtain sponsorships from the private sector (namely, law firms)”.

“Create and maintain a website for marketing and administrative purposes as part of the ILI (sponsor 2008 and 2009) site”.

“Recruit and train additional organizers to guarantee posterity”.

The Academic Supervisor agrees with these suggestions as they both report the successes and the shortcomings, and indicate the areas which must be improved from the 2009 experience, namely all this report is intended to do.

Sincerely,

Ms. Ieva Zebryte LL.M.

EMC² Americas Academic Supervisor

The Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Round of the EMC²

The organizers of the LARR 2009 have set very high standards in terms of WTO law expertise and EMC² experience of the Panellists. The organizers achieved their goals for the LARR panel composition (best representation of the EMC² International Panellists' Pool so far in the LARR) and team participation (seven). The number of team attended was the biggest in the history of the LARR.

Academic Quality

List of Panellists:

Written Submissions' Panel

Mr. Pablo Ciotti
Dr. Jan Bohanes
Ms. Chantal Ononaiwu
Dr. Roberto Rios-Herran
Mr. Eduardo Mantilla
Dr. Felipe Jaramillo
Prof. Don Dinan

Oral Pleadings' Panel

Mr. Alan Janovich
Dr. Jan Bohanes
Ms. Chantal Ononaiwu
Dr. Roberto Rios-Herran
Dr. Santiago Rojas
Mr. Eduardo Mantilla
Dr. Felipe Jaramillo
Mr. Santiago Wills



The European Law Students' Association

Timekeepers

The Timekeepers must be instructed prior to the event by the organizers and then meet the Academic Supervisor right before the event. Only minimal changes should be done to the composition of the team of time keepers. They must coordinate their actions with the organizers and the Academic Supervisor at all times. This year only minor problems with timekeeping occurred. However, even they are to be avoided in the future.

Finally, María Camila Celis, Adelaida Casteña, the Wills brothers and all of those helping out with timekeeping, directions, coffee advice, printing, copies.

Other comments

Logistics

Aside from delays due to traffic and organizers not maintaining all possible contact details for in-town and out-of-town Panellists, the participants, the Panellists and the academic supervisor were provided with all necessary logistics. Some more prior preparation next time would be needed by the organizers in order to provide the participants and Panellists with Wi-Fi access and some other necessities, but this in no way influenced the academic aspects of the event. Finally, as for the oral pleading rooms, they should have better sound isolation. When selecting pleading room the organizers are recommended to more carefully select the venues for the Preliminaries (proximity of the pleading rooms and other facilities).

Accommodation, food, transportation and other facilities were of very good quality. They were provided by the organizing Universities. The final party was an excellent activity in the true EMC² and ELSA spirit, enjoyed alike by the participants, Panellists and organisers.

Organisational

The organizers should very carefully read the Manual and draw on the advice provided therein. The team must be better organized and a core of 5 persons should work together as of signing the MOA up to the follow up of the event. The organizers should use the opportunity of the Academic Supervisors and ELSA training professionals being available to provide trainings (Project Management, Time Management, Team Management etc.) and specific EMC² instruction. That being said, during the event the team performed

Finances

Both ELSA and Academic Supervisors would greatly appreciate a report by the organizers on the receipt and usage of funds related to the LARR. The preliminary budget for Panellists was received by the Academic Supervisor, however, the overall budget of the event was never submitted though MOA demands that for financial management purposes and to allow the Academic Supervisor to help ensure the financial viability of the project such Budget is submitted within 30 days of signing of the relevant RR's MOA.



The European Law Students' Association

Though due to university accounting procedures some refunds were delayed and timely but aggravated reaction of the organizers to the failed fundraising attempts took place, in general only positive evaluation of financial management of the LARR 2009 can be delivered.

The Sponsors of the EMC² LARR 2009:

Lewin & Wills

Estudios Palacios – Lleras

Gomez Pinzon Zuleta

Esguerra Barrera Arriaga

CEDI

Departamento de Derecho Economico de la Javeriana (University)

Universidad del los Andes

Participants

014	Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores de Occidente, Mexico
023	Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Colombia
043	Universidad de los Andes, Colombia
051	UNIVERSIDAD DEL ROSARIO, Colombia
053	National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico
054	Norman Manley Law School, Jamaica
059	Universidad Sergio Arboleda Escuela de derecho, Colombia

Rankings and Awards

Latin American Regional Round of the ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO Law (EMC², Awards Ceremony, EMC2 LARR, Friday, 20th March 2009

i) Teams' Ranking after the Preliminary Rounds

Team Code	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Ranking Scores, namely Total of Oral Pleading Score (70%) & Written Submission Score (30%)
043 LARR	275,50	268,75	477,35
023 LARR	270,00	257,75	457,70
053 LARR	270,75	228,50	443,83
051 LARR	194,00	273,25	412,05
054 LARR	205,00	228,50	403,58
014 LARR	143,25	168,75	308,40
059 LARR	137,50	161,25	277,68

ii) Best Orator Preliminary Rounds

TEAM NUMBER and COMPETITOR NAMES	Score
Gustavo Andres Gomez of 051	552,25
Alberto Madero of 023	538,00
Maria Alejandra Encinales of 023	517,25
Ana Constanza Conover	499,75
Carmen Lucia Lopez Perez	487,00
Jose Alejandro Mejia	463,50
Oscar Alejandro Quiroz Chavez	387,00
Enrique Salcedo Rivera	326,75
Diego Felipe Romero	321,25

Diana Alejandra Rojas Kaiser	297,75
Andres Felipe Sanchez	296,00
Mario R. Osorio H.	278,75
Diego O. Romero C.	276,50
Luis A. Camacho S.	268,00
Stacie - Ann Christmas	247,25
Alexandra Hernandez	243,50
Andres Garcia A.	243,50
Nadia Westcarr	233,00
Anneil Coote	205,00
Pedro Miguel Alvarez Giraldo	197,75
Harrington McDermott	193,75
Ingrid Mosquera	183,00
Carolina Pineda Martinez	175,25
Daniel Fajardo	133,25
Natalia Basto	114,25

Please note: According to the Rules of EMC², an orator had to plead twice during the Preliminary Rounds – once as Complainant and once as Respondent to qualify for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Round Awards.

The Total Score for Complainant Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

The Total Score for Respondent Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

Individual performance of the Teams members was assessed based on the same general criteria as the performance of the Teams' oral pleadings. The Panellists were guided by factors such as: competence, inclusion of all relevant facts, structure and logic of the argument, soundness of the

argument presented, response to questions by The Panels, time management, role of Team members etc. Each member of The Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent per Team member for an individual performance.

iii) Semi-finals and the Grand Final rounds

Winner – 023

Runner-up – 043

Semi Finalists – 053, 051

Best Orator Grand Final – Mario Osorio of 043

iv) Best Orator Semi Final Rounds

TEAM NUMBER and COMPETITOR NAMES	Overall Orator's Score
Mario Osorio of 043	287,50
Ana Constanza Conover	277,00
Luis Andres Camacho	272,50
Carmen Lucia Lopez	270,25
Alberto Madero	265,00
Gustavo Andres Gomez	264,00
Alejandra Encinales	260,25
Jose Alejandro Mejia	245,00
Ingrid Mosquera	244,00
Alexandra Hernandez	243,50



The European Law Students' Association

Written Submissions' Awards

Best Complainant Written Submission – 043

Best Written Respondent Submission – 054

Best Overall Written Submission – 054

Conclusions and Recommendations by the Academic Supervisor

All in all we had a high quality regional round with more teams and more international Panellists attending than ever before in the LARR.

We had a delightful though slightly disturbing (on account of the late arrival) visit by 26 Latin American trade officials who were attending the WTO regional training course in Bogota the time of which coincided with the LARR event. One of these trade officials served on the LARR panels. The EMC² and its regional rounds, such as the LARR, is functioning in the regions, especially those including the developing countries, as the basis for promotion of WTO law and International Trade Law as such into the curricula of the universities, as well as capacity building exercise for the trade officials. We should continue building up on this experience.

Carefully review and set the Agenda for the event as proposed by organizers. The problems this year occurred related to room availability (timing) and the Preliminary rounds' schedule.

Better mix of Panellists must be ensured on the individual panels. Always set drawing of the lot to pair up the teams for preliminaries the night before the Preliminaries actually start. This way you get enough time to arrange and rearrange the panels in case of conflict of interest and if change is needed to provide a better mix of EMC² experienced and Panellist without previous moot court experience, practicing lawyers and academics etc. on the oral pleadings' panels.

Invest more time and effort into promotion of the EMC² in the Latin America and the Caribbean. Next year a goal of having teams from more than 3 countries should be set and achieved.

Sincerely,

Ms. Ieva Zebryte LL.M.

EMC² Americas Academic Supervisor



The European Law Students' Association

INTERNATIONAL WRITTEN ROUND

The International Written Round, organised by ELSA International, was designed to select teams from WTO Member and Observer States not covered by either the National or Regional Rounds.

The quality of the documents was equivalent to teams entering via the oral selection rounds. The team who entered the EMC² competition via this mechanism did not have the benefit of orally testing their legal pleadings in front of a panel until the Final Oral Round in Taipei

During the 7th edition two teams registered for the International Written Round, and in accordance to the set division of teams for the Final Oral Round, both teams proceeded to Taipei. Unfortunately Mekelle University from Ethiopia withdrew from the competition. Therefore only the team from Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia proceeded to and participated in Taipei.

It is the aim of ELSA International to remove the international written round, and expand the competition into the Middle East and Africa with two new Oral Rounds.

Sincerely,

Morten Rydningen

Vice President Academic Activities

ELSA International



The European Law Students' Association

FINAL ORAL ROUND

The Final Oral Round (FOR) took place in Taipei from 19th to 24th of May 2009.

The International Organising Secretariat lead by Mr. Patrick Ching-Fu Lin, Ms. Sarah Tsai-Ping Tang and Ms. Rou-yun Tu were totally amazing. Their performance was world class when it came to hospitality and organisation.

Due to the great support from Professor Chang-fa Lo over several years, The European Law Students' Association (ELSA) decided to make Prof. Lo an honourable patron of ELSA.

Academic quality

List of Panellists:

Prof. Mitsuo Matsushita
Prof. Mary Hiscock
Prof. Bradley Condon (Case Author)
Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi
Ms Jen-ni Yang
Ms. Victoria Donaldsson
Ms. Marie-Isabelle Pellan
Ms. Aegyounng Jung
Mr. Lothar Ehring
Professor (Dr) Shin-yi Péng
Mr Chi-His Chao
Mr Pi-Jan Wu
Prof. Bryan Mercurio
Prof. David Morgan
Mr. Arthur Kurup
Dr. Krista Schafer
Ms. Meredith Lewis

In the Final Oral Round there was a mix of Panellists from all over the world. As the FOR took place in Taipei, there were naturally an hihger of Panellists from the Asia-Pacific region.



The European Law Students' Association

The Panellists were a fine mixture of WTO Member government officials, academics, practitioners, and representatives from the World Trade Organization (WTO).

The Panellists were tough but fair in their evaluations which led to close scorings in several of the sessions. I conclude that the Panellists did a great effort in order to ensure that all teams were evaluated on the same basis, and I thank them for their professionalism and enthusiasm for the competition.

Timekeepers

Timekeepers did an excellent job during the competition, and it was a pleasure to have so many people available at all times. ELSA International was represented together with ACWH during every oral pleading session, as the Timekeepers consisted of one representative from ELSA and one representative from ACWH.

Participants

A total number of 19 teams participated in the Final Oral Round. The FOR was supposed to consist of 20 teams, but due to a cancellation of the Ethiopian team, the FOR only consisted of 19 teams.

ELSA Regional Round in Barcelona, Spain

Team 018 – Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg – Germany

Team 020 – University of Bucharest – Romania

Team 042 – King's College London – United Kingdom

Team 060 – University of Luxembourg – Luxembourg

ELSA Regional Round in Frankfurt-Oder, Germany

Team 025 – Maastricht University – The Netherlands

Team 006 – University of Barcelona – Spain

Team 049– Studies Geneva – Switzerland

Team 041 – London School of Economics – The United Kingdom

International Written Round

Team 036 - Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia



The European Law Students' Association

Non-ELSA Asia Regional Round in Taipei

Team 045 – National Taiwan University, Taiwan

Team 009 – University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Team 007 – Gujarat National Law University, India

Team 011 – Yokohama National University, Japan

Non-ELSA South East Asia & Pacific Regional Round in Adelaide, Australia

Team 002 – University of Melbourne, Australia

Team 022 – University of Otago, New Zealand

Latin American Regional Round in Bogota, Colombia

Team 023 - Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Colombia

Team 043 - Universidad de Los Andes, Colombia

North American Regional Round in Washington DC, USA

Team 028 – University of Kansas School of Law, USA

Team 026- Duke University, USA

Awards

Winner EMC² 2008/2009 –World Trade Institute Award

- Team 002 – University of Melbourne, Australia



The European Law Students' Association

Runner-up EMC2 2006/2007 – IELPO Award

- Team 026 – Duke University, USA

Other Semi-Finalists:

- Team 025 – Maastricht University, The Netherlands
- Team 043– Universidad de Los Andes, Colombia

Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds

- Mr. Beau Jackson - Team 028 – University of Kansas School of Law, USA

Best Orator of the Semi Final Rounds

- Mr. Christopher Tran - Team 002 – University of Melbourne, Australia

Best Orator of the Grand Final:

- Mr. Timothy Reibold – Team 026 – Duke University, USA

Overall Best Written Submissions of the International Written Round

- Team 036 – Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Best Complainant Written Submission of the International Written Round

- Team 036 – Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Best Respondent Written Submission of the International Written Round

- Team 036 – Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Overall Best Written Submissions - Final Oral Round – Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi Award:

- Team 002 – University of Melbourne, Australia

Best Complainant Written Submission - Professor Gabrielle Marceau Award:

- Team 026 –Duke University, USA

Best Respondent Written Submission - Valerie Hughes Award:

- Team 018 –Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

Rankings in Scores

i) Teams ranking after the Preliminary Rounds

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score (70%) & Written Submission Score (30%)
026	254,00	260,75	464,96
025	260,00	240,00	453,73
043	250,75	246,75	452,58
002	219,75	257,75	444,68
006	238,25	247,00	439,21
042	240,25	227,25	426,48
028	245,25	245,50	423,48
018	239,00	206,00	415,83



The European Law Students' Association

023	249,00	197,50	410,58
007	232,00	220,50	408,25
009	250,50	177,75	399,68
022	218,75	199,00	394,81
045	178,50	238,25	393,13
049	208,75	209,00	391,13
020	210,00	204,00	388,50
060	193,75	192,00	366,33
011	246,75	112,50	353,26
041	191,50	172,50	352,00
036	187,25	155,25	312,80

Please note: The Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score is the overall team score from each of the three Panellists added together.

The Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score is the overall team score from each of the three Panellists added together.

The Total of Overall Oral Pleading Score & Written Submission Score consists of 70% of the Oral Pleading Score and 30 % of Written Submission.

Each member of the Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent. The scores given by each of the Panellists would then be added together.

Therefore, the maximum score for each oral argument any Team presented was 300 points. Each Team pleaded twice in the Preliminary Rounds – once as Complainant and once as Respondent. Therefore, the ranking was determined by adding up the points of the two sessions.

Total of 600 points could have been received by one Team throughout the Preliminary Rounds.

ii) Oralist ranking after the Preliminary Rounds

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Beau Jackson	028	259,25	262,75	522,00
Greg Dixon	026	255,00	264,25	519,25
Sanne Merleen Boer	025	267,75	245,00	512,75
Michael Gilles	026	244,50	265,25	509,75
Olga Paulina Konsek	025	248,50	245,50	494,00
Rudi Kruse	002	235,00	259,00	494,00
Alberto Madero	023	272,00	206,00	478,00
Lingxi Wang	042	238,75	239,00	477,75
Soham Badheka	007	251,00	222,25	473,25
Ben Sharp	028	244,75	228,25	473,00
Christopher Tran	002	212,75	259,00	471,75
Katherine Lim	042	233,50	221,75	455,25
Alejandra Encinales	023	238,75	208,50	447,25
Aditi Suresh	007	235,50	219,25	445,75
Henry Hon Gi Cheng	009	259,25	185,00	444,25
Bassant El Attar	049	214,00	230,00	444,00
Sooan Vivian Choi	049	218,50	224,00	442,50
Andrew Tringham	022	225,00	209,50	434,50
Cristiana Soare	020	215,75	218,25	434,00

Sri Ranga Pujitha Gorantla	007	221,00	205,00	426,00
Hsien Wu	045	178,50	247,00	425,50
Grace Brown	022	213,25	211,00	424,25
Gladys Qiao Ying Moon	009	245,75	174,75	420,50
Chien-Fei Li	045	177,00	241,25	418,25
Floria Dragusin	020	213,50	204,50	418,00
Ariel Cardozo-Devillers	060	223,00	290,75	413,75
Babette Ancery	049	203,00	202,50	405,50
Anna Jacobs	022	204,50	192,00	396,50
Weibo Yan	011	247,60	141,50	389,10
Linda Bore	041	194,00	184,50	378,50
Nino Parsadanishvili	036	195,50	179,50	375,00
Ann Robakidze	036	196,00	171,50	367,50
Sari Susanna Kupiainen	060	178,25	188,75	367,00
Francela Davila Montero	011	237,50	113,75	351,25
Diego Pol	006	0,00	265,00	265,00
Timothy Reibold	026	0,00	262,75	262,75
Laura Bellamy	002	0,00	261,00	261,00
Maria Alcover	006	259,50	0,00	259,50
Andres Garcia	043	254,50	0,00	254,50
Mario Ricardo Osorio Hernandez	043	0,00	252,50	252,50
Anara Karagulova	018	250,00	0,00	250,00
Diego orland Romero	043	247,25	0,00	247,25
Caroline Bader	028	241,25	0,00	241,25

Blanca Salas	006	239,75	0,00	239,75
Jonathan Skinner	026	239,50	0,00	239,50
Christina Elmore	028	0,00	239,50	239,50
Alexandra Hernandez	023	239,25	0,00	239,25
Claudia Ching Kwan Fung	009	237,50	0,00	237,50
Merel van Rens	025	0,00	237,50	237,50
Isabel Vilaseca	06	0,00	237,00	237,00
Yu-shan Kao	045	0,00	236,75	236,75
Diana Knotte	018	232,00	0,00	232,00
Stephanie Engel	018	0,00	228,25	228,25
Luis Andres Camacho	043	0,00	219,00	219,00
Mihaela Mazilu	060	203,50	0,00	203,50
Lars Raabe	018	0,00	198,50	198,50
Amalia Anca Bejinaru	020	0,00	198,50	198,50
Erica Leaney	002	193,25	0,00	193,25
Ioana Stefana Pristavu	020	192,25	0,00	192,25
Marianne Kuusakoski	060	0,00	192,25	192,25
Ivane Abashidze	036	190,50	0,00	190,50
Sarah Sin Wa Ho	009	0,00	186,75	186,75
Oliver Lewis	041	0,00	185,00	185,00
Wei-Chen Hung	045	181,00	0,00	181,00
Kira Krissinel	041	178,50	0,00	178,50
Carolina Pineda	023	0,00	175,75	175,75
Temur Pipia	036	0,00	155,50	155,50

Please note:

According to the Rules of EMC2, an orator had to plead twice during the Preliminary Rounds – once as Complainant and once as Respondent to qualify for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Round Awards.

The Total Score for Complainant Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

The Total Score for Respondent Presentation is the individual score from each of the three judges, added together.

Individual performance of the Teams members was assessed based on the same general criteria as the performance of the Teams' oral pleadings.

The Panellists were guided by factors such as: competence, inclusion of all relevant facts, structure and logic of the argument, soundness of the argument presented, response to questions by The Panels, time management, role of Team members etc.

Each member of The Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent per Team member for an individual performance.

Total of 600 points could have been received by one participant throughout the Preliminary Rounds.

iii) Teams Ranking after Semi Final Rounds

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
002	0,00	463,00	463,00
026	0,00	460,75	460,75
025	444,50	0,00	444,50
043	431,50	0,00	431,50

iv) Oralist Ranking after Semi Final Rounds

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Christopher Tran	002	0,00	473,50	473,50
Michael Gilles	026	0,00	464,50	464,50
Laura Bellamy	02	0,00	456,50	456,50
Timothy Reibold	026	0,00	455,75	455,75
Sanne Merleen Boer	025	454,75	0,00	454,75
Rudi Kruse	002	0,00	448,00	448,00
Olga Paulina Konsek	025	439,25	0,00	439,25
Greg Dixon	026	0,00	433,00	433,00
Diego orland Romero	043	420,00	0,00	420,00
Andres Garcia	043	410,25	0,00	410,25

v) Teams Ranking after Grand Final Round

Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
002	846,50	0,00	846,50
026	0,00	812,75	812,75

vi) Oralists Ranking after Grand Final Round

Name	Team No:	Total Complainant Oral Pleading Score	Total Respondent Oral Pleading Score	Total of Oral Pleading Score
Timothy Reibold	026	0,00	839,75	839,75
Rudi Kruse	002	826,75	0,00	826,75
Laura Bellamy	002	823,25	0,00	823,25
Christopher Tran	002	823,00	0,00	823,00
Greg Dixon	026	0,00	802,25	802,25
Michael Gilles	026	0,00	795,50	795,50

*The Grand Final Panel consisted of nine (9) Panellists.

** Each member of the Panel could assign a maximum score of 100 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent. The scores given by each of the Panellists would then be added together.

Therefore, the maximum score for each oral argument any Team presented was 900 points.



The European Law Students' Association

Concluding remarks

The level of knowledge and mooting technique amongst the participants was extremely high, and it was not much difference between the teams which also can be seen from the scores. I believe all teams learned from this experience, and I certainly hope that all participants will encourage their fellow students to register for the competition next year. You are all winners who took part in the EMC².

The European Law Students' Association and the EMC² competition's goal of facing the global challenge brought around 120 people from different legal backgrounds together in Asia. It was fantastic to see the great organisation, and to see the development of the teams during the competition.

It has been an honour to cooperate with ACWH and everyone involved in the making of the Final Oral Round.

As the competition will continue its tour around the globe, I hope that you will all continue to contribute.

Sincerely,

Morten Rydningen

Vice President Academic Activities

ELSA International

Head of Organisation

ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO Law – 2008-2009



The European Law Students' Association

APPRECIATION

FINAL ORAL ROUND CO-Organiser

ACWH – Asian Center for WTO and International Health Law and Policy

Founded in 2003 after Taiwan's accession to the WTO, the Asian Center of WTO & International Health Law and Policy (ACWH) is designed to closely monitor the development of WTO rules, conduct in-depth research on the effect of the WTO rules on Taiwan's economy, and put forth policy proposals. Besides providing legal advice as government's think tank, the ACWH, as an educational institute under NTU, also endeavours to carry out its pedagogical mission by dedicating itself to ensuring that future lawyers in Taiwan are well versed in the WTO and its rules. This dual-role approach is the distinguishing feature which separates the ACWH from other WTO research institutes.

The ACWH enthusiastically takes part in WTO-related activities. It holds related international conferences annually and invites distinguished scholars to exchange ideas. In 2005, international conferences held by the ACWH included “International Conference on International Law in Public Health: Reflection on International Health Regulations Revision and Future Implementations”; International Conference on “Policy and Law Aspects of Asia and WTO: Challenges and Opportunities”; “International Conference on Global Governance & Partnership under Framework Convention on Tobacco Control”; and “The Second International Conference on Implementation of the International Health Regulations (2005): Are We Ready for the New Era?”. We are glad to have experts, scholars and government representatives from around the world to share their unique experiences and opinions about international trade and health issues with us.

TECHNICAL PARTNER

World Trade Organisation - Technical Partner

The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only international organization dealing with the global rules of trade between nations. Its main function is to ensure that trade flows as smoothly, predictably and freely as possible. The WTO currently consists of 153 member nations.

Essentially, the WTO is a place where member governments go, to try to sort out the trade problems they face with each other. The WTO was born out of negotiations, and everything the WTO does is the result of negotiations. The goal of the WTO is to improve the welfare of the peoples of the member countries



The European Law Students' Association

The ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO law therefore supports WTO's enforcement of the rules via the Dispute Settlement Understanding system.

INTERNATIONAL SPONSORS

World Trade Institute

The World Trade Institute (WTI) is one of the world's leading academic institutions dedicated to the regulation of international trade. The WTI is a centre of advanced studies of the University of Bern, Switzerland with close ties to leading trade institutions in Geneva. The WTI transcends boundaries by fusing law, economics and international relations in interdisciplinary research, training and advisory services.

The Master of International Law and Economics (MILE) is the flagship programme of the WTI. The MILE combines a multidisciplinary perspective on international trade regulation with a strong applied focus. The MILE was the first and is the most experienced programme taught by an outstanding global faculty.

As host institution of the Swiss National Centre of Competence in Research on Trade Regulation, the WTI is at the core of a global research network connecting our students to researchers, practitioners and our own alumni in the field.

The WTI is a proud sponsor of the ELSA Moot Court and awards the winning team with scholarships to its Summer Academy.

More information on the MILE programme, the Summer Academy on international trade regulation and current events can be found at www.wti.org.

University of Barcelona – IELPO

The University of Barcelona's Masters of Law in International Economic Law and Policy (LL.M. IELPO) features 33 weeks of learning from many of the most renowned experts drawn from leading law and economics faculties, international organisations, and research centres around the world.

The IELPO LLM will prove attractive to students with a background in law, economics and/or international relations and whose professional interests include international legal practice, economic diplomacy, public sector consulting as well as careers in leading regional and international organizations.

More information can be found at www.ielpo.org.



The European Law Students' Association

PANELLIST POOL

From the inception of a Moot Court Competition on WTO Law, ELSA secured the support of numerous WTO and International Trade Law experts across the globe. In order to ensure the highest quality event, the following individuals agreed to advise and support ELSA in organising the Competition and by joining the Panellists' Pool of the EMC².

Ms. Kerry Allbeury

WTO Legal Affairs Division (Switzerland)

Mr. Stefan Amarasinha

Directorate-General for Trade, European Commission (Belgium)

Dr. Arthur Appleton

Appleton Luff, Geneva (Switzerland)

Dr. David Luff

Appleton Luff, Brussels (Belgium)

Ms. Vassiliki Avgoustidi

Gide Loyrette Nouel (Belgium)

Prof. Luiz Olavo Baptista

WTO Appellate Body Member (Brazil)

Dr. Lorand Bartels

University of Cambridge (United Kingdom)

Mr. Pablo Bentes

WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (Switzerland)

Mr. Johannes Bernabe

International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development

Mr. Georg Berrisch

Covington & Burling (Belgium)

Dr. Jan Bohanes

Sidley Austin Geneva (Switzerland)

Prof. Peter. Van Den Bossche

University of Maastricht (The Netherlands)



The European Law Students' Association

Prof. Jacques Bourgeois

WilmerHale Brussels (Belgium)

Dr. Marco Bronckers

WilmerHale Brussels (Belgium)

Mr. Matt Busheri

International Law Institute Barcelona (Spain)

Mr. Jorge Castro

WTO Legal Affairs Division (Switzerland)

Prof. Thomas Cottier

University of Berne and WTI (Switzerland)

Dr. Bugge Daniel

University of Southern Denmark (Denmark)

Ms. Victoria Donaldson

WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (Switzerland)

Prof. Piet Eeckhout

King's College London (United Kingdom)

Prof. Claus-Dieter Ehlermann

WilmerHale (Belgium)

Mr. Lothar Ehring

Directorate-General for Trade, European Commission (Belgium)

Prof. Frank Emmert

Indiana University School of Law (USA)

Prof. Mary Footer

University of Nottingham School of Law (United Kingdom)

Dr. David A. Gantz

The University of Arizona, Rogers College of Law (USA)

Ms. Pettina Gappah

Advisory Centre on the WTO Law (Switzerland)

Mr. Folkert Graafsma

Vermulst Waer & Verhaeghe (Belgium)



The European Law Students' Association

Prof. Heinz Hauser

University of St. Gallen (Switzerland)

Prof. Robert Howse

Michigan University (USA)

Mr. Jorge A. Huerta Goldman

Mission of Mexico to the WTO

Ms. Valerie Hughes

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP (Canada)

Mr. Alejandro Jara

Deputy Director General of the WTO (Switzerland)

Ms. Aegyung Jung

Legal Affairs Division, WTO Secretariat (Switzerland)

Mr. Sufian Jusuh

WTI, University of Berne (Switzerland)

Prof. Christine Kaufmann

University of Zurich (Switzerland)

Prof. Margret Liang

WTO Consultant to the Singapore Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Singapore)

Prof. Chang-fa Lo

Executive Director, Asian Centre for WTO & Health Law & Policy - National Taiwan University (Taiwan)

Dr. Gabrielle Marceau

WTO Secretariat - Counsellor for Director General's Division (Switzerland)

Mr. Philip Marsden

The British Institute of International and Comparative Law (England)

Dr. James H. Mathis

International Law Department of Amsterdam University (The Netherlands)

Prof. Mitsuo Matsushita

Tokyo University (Japan)

Ms. Teisha Mattison

E-Training, Technical Cooperation Division, WTO Secretariat (Switzerland)



The European Law Students' Association

Prof. Petros Mavroidis

University of Neuchatel (Switzerland)

Ms. Natalie McNelis

WilmerHale (Belgium)

Mr. Niall Meagher

Senior Counsel at the Advisory Centre on WTO Law (Switzerland)

Dr. Andrew Mitchell

University of Melbourne (Australia)

Prof. Elisabetta Montaguti

European Commission, Legal Service (Belgium)

Dr. Laura Nielsen

University of Copenhagen (Denmark)

Mr. Hunter Nottage

Advisory Centre on the WTO Law (Switzerland)

Mr. Bernard O'Connor

O'Connor and Company – European Lawyers (Belgium)

Dr. Barbara Oliveira

E-Training, Technical Cooperation Division, WTO Secretariat (Switzerland)

Mr. Serge Pannatier

Baker & McKenzie Geneva (Switzerland)

Prof. Joost Pauwelyn

Graduate Institute of International Studies (HEI), Geneva, King & Spalding LLP

Mrs. Maria J. Pereyra

Legal Affairs Division, WTO Secretariat (Switzerland)

Dr. Christian Pitschas

WTI Advisors (Switzerland)

Mrs. Letizia Raschella – Sergi

Institute for International Trade - University of Adelaide (Australia)

Dr. Roberto Rios-Herran

Appleton Luff, Warsaw (Poland)



The European Law Students' Association

Ms. Edna Ramírez Robles
DEA European Law (Switzerland)

Prof. Giorgio Sacerdoti
WTO Appellate Body Member (2001 to present) (Italy)

Mr. Iain Sandford
Minter Ellison (Australia)
Mr. Hannes Schloemann
Director of WTI Advisors (Switzerland)

Dr. Soren Schonberg
Directorate-General for Trade, European Commission (Belgium)

Ms. Julia S. Selivanova
Energy Charter Secretariat (Brussels)

Mr. Andreas Sennekamp
WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (Switzerland)

Mr. Andrew Stoler
Executive Director, Institute for International Trade – University of Adelaide (Australia)

Prof. Christian Tietje
University of Halle (Germany)

Mr. Raul Torres
Legal Officer, Development Division, WTO Secretariat (Switzerland)

Prof. Joel Trachtman
Tufts University (USA)

Mr. Arun Venkataraman
The United States Trade Representative

Dr. Tania Voon
University of Melbourne (Australia)

Mrs. Jayashree Watal
Intellectual Property Division WTO Secretariat (Switzerland)

Prof. Rolf Weber
University of Zurich (Switzerland)

Mr. Jasper Wauters
White & Case (Switzerland)



The European Law Students' Association

Prof. Jan Wouters

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium)

Ms. Ruta Zarnauskaite

Directorate-General for Trade, European Commission (Belgium)

Dr. Werner Zdouc

Director of the WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (Switzerland)

Ms. Jan Yves Remy

WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (Switzerland)

Mr. Christopher Clinton

WTO Legal Affairs Division (Switzerland)

Ms. Sofya Matteotti-Berkutova

World Trade Institute (Switzerland)

Professor (Dr) Shin-yi Péng

Director Institute of Law for Science & Technology, National Tsing Hua University (Taiwan)

Mr. Pi-jan Wu

Adjunct Associate Professor Soochow University School of Law and Senior Counsel, LCS & Partners (Taiwan)

Ms. Olga Nartova

World Trade Institute (Switzerland)

Mr Arthur Kurup

Youth bureau for Political Affairs (Malaysia)

Dr. Krista Nadavukaren Schefer

World Trade Institute and University of Basel (Switzerland)

Mr. George-Dian Balan

Associated lecturer in EU law, Petre Andrei University Iasi and avocat (Romania)



The European Law Students' Association

ACADEMIC SUPERVISORS

On behalf of The European Law Students' Association I would also like to thank our Academic Supervisors for all the help they have provided us during the year we worked on the Organising of the EMC².

Without their help, we would not have managed to conduct this wonderful event:

Ms. Ieva Zebryte – EMC² - Academic Supervisor for the Americas

Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi – EMC² Academic Supervisor for Asia-Pacific

Dr. Laura Nielsen – EMC² Academic Supervisor for Europe and Africa

Members of the International Organising Secretariat and International Organising Committee

Last, but not least, words of appreciation should be given to all those ELSA and ACWH Members who helped organise the event and turn the EMC² into a point of pride for the whole network:

ELSA

Mr. Koen Klootwijk

Ms. Anna Ziemnicka

Ms. Ivana Buric

Mr. Jean-Marc Lauwers

Mr. Antti Husa

Dr. Torkil Norstrøm

Mr. Kamil Szymanski

Ms. Marje Mulder

Ms. Maria Narloch

Ms. Justyna Slowikow



The European Law Students' Association

Ms. Susana Aleason

Ms. Mariana Gimeno De Izuzquiza

Ms. Maria Boren Teran

Ms. Jennifer Hamaoui

Mr. Emil Edissonov

Ms. Sofia Guijarro Tomas

Ms. Amanda Bertilsson-Nilsson

Ms. Stephanie Denowell

Ms. Nina Prantl

Mr. Frank Ingenrieth

Mr. Thomas Öller

Mr. Jan Mortitz Lang

ACWH

Patrick Ching-Fu Lin

Sarah Tsai-ping Tang

Rou-yun Tu

Yun-chi Hsieh

Jia-huey Lin

Wen-hsin Pan

Ting Sun

Eric Yi-hsin Yeh

Chi-wei Chan

Tsung Ling Lee

Oli Nai-fang Wong



The European Law Students' Association

Mark Shope

Chao-hsin Ting

Janie Su-juan Kan

Bigi Lin-chun Huang

Hui-chih Chen

Ji-Yang Zheng

Shih-Yu Yang

Yun-ya Huang

Pei-ju Wang

Morten Rydningen
Vice President Academic Activities
E-mail: vpaa@elsa.org

ELSA International
239, Boulevard Général Jacques
B-1050 Brussels, Belgium
Phone: +32-2-646-2626 Fax: +32-2-646-2923
E-mail: elsa@elsa.org Website: www.elsa.org



The European Law Students' Association