

FOREWORD

Between the 25th and the 30th of April 2006 the Fourth Edition of the Final Oral Round of the ELSA Moot Court Competition on WTO Law (EMC²) took place in Geneva, Switzerland. For this year's Edition more than 60 teams entered the competition, either through the International Written Round, Regional Rounds or National Rounds. Eighteen teams qualified for the Final Oral Round in Geneva.

This being the Fourth Edition of the EMC², ELSA has gained much experience in Organising the event. Nonetheless, this year's Edition had its difficulties in the Organising process. Consequently, one of the aims of this Report is to improve the Organising process of future EMC². Notwithstanding, we hope that everyone that was involved with the EMC² 2005/2006, learnt from their experience.

We would like to commence by thanking several people who, though being under great time pressure, have relentlessly and voluntarily worked to ensure the academic quality of the Competition. Our thanks go firstly to the EMC² 2005/2006 Case authors: Professor Jacques Bourgeois, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, Belgium; Professor David A. Gantz, the University of Arizona, Rogers College of Law and Dr. Laura Nielsen, LL.M Assistant Professor in International Trade Law at the University of Copenhagen, Faculty of Law. Secondly, the EMC² 2005/2006 Case Review Board, which consisted of the following WTO law specialists: Ms. Valerie Hughes, former Director of the WTO Appellate Body Secretariat and her successor, Mr. Werner Zdouc as well as, Ms. Victoria Donaldson and Mr. Iain Sandford, WTO Appellate Body Secretariat; Ms. Maria J. Pereyra-Friedrichsen, WTO Secretariat Legal Affairs Division; Dr. Arthur Appleton, White & Case, Geneva, Switzerland and Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi (EMC² Academic Supervisor Asia-Pacific Regional Rounds and Associate Lecturer, Institute for International Business, Economics & Law - The University of Adelaide).

Furthermore, we would like to thank the partners, sponsors and supporters of the EMC² Competition for their continued encouragement and involvement:

**The World Trade Institute
O'Connor and Company - European Lawyers
Cambridge University Press
APCO Europe
Thomson
University of Geneva**

And ELSA International's Corporate Partners: **Cambridge ILEC, CMS, Deloitte and Microsoft.**

We would also like to thank the WTO for the use of their facilities for the Grand Final of the Final Oral Round of the EMC² and the invaluable technical support they have generously provided for this event.

Halvor Lekven
Vice President Academic Activities
ELSA International 2006/2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	1
1. GENERAL BACKGROUND	3
A. INTRODUCTION	3
B. STRUCTURE OF THE COMPETITION.....	3
2. THE SELECTION ROUNDS	5
A. NATIONAL ROUNDS.....	6
1. HUNGARY	6
2. ROMANIA.....	6
3. NORWAY.....	7
B. REGIONAL ROUNDS	8
1. THE ELSA NORTHERN EUROPE REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC ² 2005/2006.....	8
2. THE ELSA SOUTHERN EUROPE REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC ² 2005/2006	10
3. THE NON-ELSA SOUTH EAST ASIAN & PACIFIC REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC ² 2005/2006.....	12
4. THE NON-ELSA ASIA REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC ² 2005/2006.....	16
5. THE NON-ELSA SOUTH WEST ASIAN SUB-CONTINENT REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC ² 2005/2006.....	19
6. THE NON-ELSA LATIN AMERICAN REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC ² 2005/2006.....	21
C. INTERNATIONAL WRITTEN ROUND.....	24
3. PARTICIPANTS OF THE FINAL ORAL ROUND	26
4. AWARDS	27
A. RANKING OF THE 18 PARTICIPATING TEAMS AFTER THE PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	28
B. DETAILED SCORES OF THE PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	29
C. BEST ORATORS OF THE PRELIMINARY ROUNDS RANKING.....	30
D. RESULTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WRITTEN ROUND AND THE OVERALL BEST MEMORIAL RESULTS.....	32
5. APPRECIATION	33
A. ADVISORY BOARD AND JUDGES' POOL OF THE ELSA MOOT COURT COMPETITION ON WTO LAW.....	33
B. SPONSORS OF THE EMC ² 2005/2006	37
C. ACADEMIC SUPERVISORS FOR THE EMC ² 2005/2006	38
D. MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANISING COMMITTEE.....	38

1. GENERAL BACKGROUND

A. 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 200 law faculties in 35 countries across Europe with a membership in excess of 30,000 students and young lawyers.

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 25 years, and Moot Court Competitions for most of this time. However, ELSA considered that it would be more beneficial to develop this experience into an international moot court competition aimed at 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.

B. STRUCTURE OF THE COMPETITION

The Case for the Competition was issued on 1st September 2005 with teams required to register for participation by the middle of December. 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 is held in Geneva; Switzerland. 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 of the EMC² Case. Documents were originally required to be submitted to ELSA International by the 9th January 2006. As most of the Written Submission judges were unable to commence marking on this date due to their involvement in WTO cases, ELSA decided to extend the deadline to 15th January 2006.

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 University of Geneva and at the WTO Centre in Geneva between 25th and 30th of April 2006. Teams participating in the Final Oral Round were chosen either through the International Written Round or from the Regional (Oral) Rounds. This year five teams qualified through the International Written Round, whilst another 13 through their respective Regional (Oral) Rounds. We are pleased to inform you that for the first time, all continents were represented at the Final Oral Rounds in Geneva.

At the Final Oral Round, 18 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 2005/2006.

2. THE SELECTION ROUNDS

The Selection Rounds were organised as follows:

ELSA National (Oral) Rounds were organised by ELSA Hungary, ELSA Romania, ELSA Norway and ELSA United Kingdom, with one team (the Winners) per National Round qualifying for the ELSA European Regional (Oral) Rounds to be held in Vilnius and Rome.

The Northern Europe ELSA Regional (Oral) Round was organised by ELSA Lithuania and ELSA Norway and held in Vilnius, Lithuania. The Southern Europe ELSA Regional (Oral) Round was organised by ELSA Italy and ELSA Malta and held in Rome, Italy.

The non-ELSA South-East Asia & Pacific Regional (Oral) Round (*Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Singapore, Brunei, Malaysia, Indonesia, Cambodia, Thailand, Vietnam and Laos*) was organised by the Institute for International Business, Economics & Law (IIBE&L) - University of Adelaide and held in Adelaide, Australia.

The non-ELSA Asia Regional (Oral) Round (*Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan, South Korea, Japan, Republic of China, Mongolia and the Philippines*) was organised by National Taiwan University - Asian Centre for WTO and Health Law and Policy (ACWHLP) and held in Taipei, Taiwan.

The non-ELSA South West Asia Sub-Continent Regional (Oral) Round (*India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal and Myanmar, as well as Azerbaijan, Oman, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Kingdom of Bahrain, Qatar, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Armenia, Kyrgyz Republic, Bhutan, Tajikistan and Yemen*) was cancelled and replaced with the South West Asia Sub-Continent International Written Regional Round.

The non-ELSA Latin American Regional (Oral) Round (*Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, México, Panama, Paraguay, Perú, República Dominicana, Uruguay, Venezuela, and other Latin-American WTO Member and Observer States*) was organised by COLADIC-Guatemala (Guatemala Chapter of the Latin American Council of International and Comparative Law) and held in Guatemala City, Guatemala.

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

A. NATIONAL ROUNDS

Since the first Edition of the EMC², ELSA International has encouraged ELSA Groups to host National Oral Rounds in order to ensure an “ELSA” international participation during the Final Oral Rounds. Consequently, ELSA International allowed several National Groups to organise National Oral Rounds as well as the first European Regional Rounds. The winning teams from the four National Oral Rounds qualified to participate in the two Regional Rounds held in Europe.

The four National (Oral) Rounds were held in:

- Hungary
- Romania
- Norway
- United Kingdom

A short summary of the National (Oral) Rounds follows:

1. HUNGARY

The EMC² ELSA Hungary National (Oral) Round took place on 18th of February 2006 in Pécs. It was organised by ELSA Pécs, one of the local groups in Hungary. ELSA was given the honour to hold the competition in the University of Pécs most prestigious assembly hall.

All Hungary’s prominent law faculties were represented in the competition. Four teams entered the contest. The winning team qualified was given the honour of representing both Hungary and ELSA Hungary in the Southern Europe Regional Round, to be held in Rome. The participants were very well-prepared and plead their arguments and made out their case convincingly. The Panel, consisting of Hungarian international law experts (both professors and practicing lawyers), had a difficult time in deciding which Team’s argument would best represent Hungary in Rome.

The fundraising for the Hungarian National Round was very successful. The 3rd place team was awarded 100 Euros courtesy of the Faculty of Law, University of Pécs. The Bar Association of Pécs awarded the 2nd place team 200 Euros whilst the Winning team received 400 Euros donated by the Regional Court of Appeal seated in Pécs. These funds were given to assist the teams with their travel costs to the Southern Europe Regional Round.

The Competition event concluded with a formal dinner in Pécs most enchanting restaurant and attended by the EMC² participants, Panel members and the Dean, Faculty of Law, University of Pécs. It was a pleasure for ELSA Hungry to welcome amongst our guests, Ms Paula Calatan, the Director for Moot Court Competition of ELSA International.

ELSA Pécs is very proud to have had the opportunity to organise this National Round.

2. ROMANIA

For the second year ELSA Romania hosted the National (Oral) Round of EMC², from the 22nd - 26th of February 2006 held in Iasi.

Teams from Bucharest, Craiova and Iasi had the courage to respond, on a high level, to the challenge that the Case on WTO Law presented. The competition provided the occasion for these students to demonstrate their legal analytical skills and knowledge as well as show their advocacy abilities by pleading complex WTO Law arguments in the Preliminary Rounds. All teams pleaded both as complainant and respondent in front of a panel.

The participants enjoyed the city as the competition period was accompanied by a relaxed social programme such as sightseeing, and in the spirit of ELSA, night parties.

The most exciting part of the competition was the Grand Final of the National (Oral) /Round held in "The Palace of Justice"- Iasi, where the Teams 021 and 024 pleaded in front of a panel of three judges. Team 024, *Alexandru Ioan Cuza University* from Iasi, was declared the Winner team, to represent Romania at the Southern European Regional Round. Meanwhile, Simina Suciu, form Team 021, *University of Bucharest*, was awarded the Best Orator of the competition. All the participants received their awards in a special ceremony held at the "Tribunal" Iasi.

3. NORWAY

On the 8th and 9th of February, ELSA Norway hosted the National (Oral) Round of the EMC² in Oslo. The teams came from all three law faculties in Norway and were welcomed by the Organising Committee (OC) consisting of members from the National Board of ELSA Norway and members from the Local Group of ELSA Oslo, all lead by Director for the National (Oral) Round in Norway, Elisabet Kjørstad Bøe.

The judges were once again head-hunted from the Norwegian Supreme Court, the Centre for European Law and well-known law firms. After two days of competing, the Team 043 from *Universitetet i Bergen* finally convinced the Panel with their advocacy skills. Ms. Lene Knapstad from the winning team was also rewarded the Best Orator of the National (Oral) Round, and was also interviewed by national radio in relation to the Competition in Norway.

The venue for the National (Oral) Round took place in an old, refurbished auditorium at the University of Oslo, "Gamle Festsal", which created an atmosphere of importance and significance for both participants and spectators.

All participants received flowers, diplomas and law-related books, sponsored by a Norwegian law firm. The OC also organised an ELSA-quiz for the audience, where they could win books on various legal topics. This somewhat encouraged students' to join as spectators, even though the small number of spectators was the only drawback for this year's edition of the National (Oral) Round of the EMC² in Norway.

B. REGIONAL ROUNDS

In accordance with the ELSA International Council Decision (Budva, October 2003), ELSA desires the EMC² to become an international moot court competition assisting law students around the globe in becoming professionally skilled and internationally minded. The EMC² is open to registered teams from law faculties (or business faculties that include the teaching of law) from WTO Member or Observer States within one of the four non-ELSA Regional Rounds, or to registered teams from law faculties (or business faculties that include the teaching of law) from countries who have National Groups of ELSA within one of the two ELSA Regional Rounds.

Below, you will find brief reports by the Academic Supervisors for the Regional Rounds organised for the EMC² 2005/2006.

1. THE ELSA NORTHERN EUROPE REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC² 2005/2006

A) Northern Europe Regional Round Organiser

The inaugural Northern Europe Regional Round was held in Vilnius, Lithuania from the 16th to the 18th of March 2006, and the organisation of the event was very good. The Organising Committee (OC), headed by Ms. Giedre Tijusaite, did a wonderful job ensuring that both participants and judges were accommodated and taken care of, including collecting everyone from the airport.

The OC also ensured that contacts were established with the Lithuanian authorities so that the Grand Final could be held in the most impressive venue: The Court of Appeals in Vilnius. Moreover, the Director of the Foreign Trade Policy Department from the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Raimundas Karoblis, assisted the OC to ensure both high level support for the event and provided presents courtesy of the Ministry - which many of us are very thankful for.

Finally, the OC should be applauded for the various social events - in particular the Awards Ceremony held in Chodkeviciu Palace, the impressive surroundings were extremely appropriate for the function.

B) Academic Quality of the Event

i) Panellists

The Panellists secured for the event, were all qualified trade lawyers, which was a good achievement for the OC.

However, for future reference, Panellists should be encouraged to pose questions to the teams in order to avoid "silent" rounds with very few, if any, questions. Perhaps this could be done during the Judge's briefings - and the Panellist should agree in each Panel amongst themselves to pose questions.

As to the assessment of the scoring, the Panellist did a good job. I was personally under the impression that all judges were objective and professional – and perfectly capable of judging the sessions in such a manner.

As to the representation of scholars, practitioners and WTO people, we did not have any WTO Secretariat staff present, but we had many scholars and a few practitioners. The people chosen were, as mentioned, well versed in trade law and the representation was in my opinion satisfactory.

Finally, it should be mentioned that all judges were happy with participating in the event and we can without doubt attract many of them again next year.

ii) *Time keepers*

The time keepers were very professional and did a wonderful job. A big congratulation to them!

C. *Participant Teams*

Nine teams participated in the inaugural Northern Europe ELSA Regional Round. It was a pleasure to meet so many intelligent and wonderful students. All teams were well prepared and the competition is surely a success in promoting the up-and-coming generation of trade lawyers.

Huge congratulations to all the teams and best wishes in the future.

D) *Awards*

i) *Preliminary Round Rankings*

Four teams from the Northern Europe Regional Round automatically qualified for the Final Oral Round in Geneva. At the conclusion of the Preliminary Rounds the teams were ranked as follows:

- *1st Ranked: Team 025 - London School of Economics and Political Sciences, England*
- *2nd Ranked: Team 012 - King's College London, England*
- *3rd Ranked: Team 016 - Martin Luther University, Faculty of Law, Germany*
- *4th Ranked: Team 045 - Helsinki University, Finland*

ii) *Elimination Round Teams*

The following teams were assigned to the following pleading sessions:

- *Semi-Finalists 1: Team 045 (ranked 4th) vs. Team 012 (ranked 2nd) – Winner Team 012*
- *Semi-Finalists 2: Team 025 (ranked 1st) vs. Team 016 (ranked 3rd) – Winner Team 025*
- *Grand Final: Team 025 vs. Team 012*

iii) *Awards*

The following teams and individuals received awards:

- *Winner: Team 025*
- *Runner-up: Team 012*

- *Best Orator Preliminary Round: Team 005 University of Maastricht, Faculty of Law (Ms. Joya van Hout)*
- *Best Orator of Elimination Round: Team 025 (Mr. Hussein Haeri)*
- *Best Complainant Written Submission: Team 004 - University of Potsdam, Germany*
- *Best Respondent Written Submission: Team 016 - Martin Luther University, Faculty of Law, Germany*
- *Best Overall Written Submissions: Team 016 - Martin Luther University, Faculty of Law, Germany*

E) *Academic Supervisor's Concluding Remarks*

I was very thankful for attending such a well organised event. There was one issue, which neither Giedre nor I had any prior experience in handling – so we made a “wrong” ruling – that is, only one person could present arguments during the rebuttals. We could not overturn the ruling upon realization of the mistake because some teams were already in session. There were no major complaints on the issue as we admitted our mistake up front. We changed the ruling for the Final.

I would also like to thank Giedre for a wonderful job. It was such a pleasure to work with her – she has all the qualities an organiser should have – competent, independent, fair and responsible.

Sincerely

Dr. Laura Nielsen

EMC² Academic Supervisor Europe and Africa

Assistant Professor - International Trade Law

2. THE ELSA SOUTHERN EUROPE REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC² 2005/2006

A) *Southern Europe Regional Round Organiser*

The inaugural Southern Europe Regional Round was held at the University Luiss in Rome, Italy on 10th and 11th of March 2006. The Organising Committee (OC) headed by Mr. Federico Scaramucci, Vice President of Academic Activities ELSA Italy, arranged for the Regional Round to receive patronage from the Municipality of Rome, University Luiss, and the Italian delegation to the EU as well as the EU Parliament, amongst others.

B) *Academic Quality of the Event*

i) *Panellists*

Our sincere thanks to all our Panellists for their participation and enthusiasm, especially considering this was the first time any have judged the EMC² competition:

- *Professor Claudio Dordi - University Bocconi, Milan (International Relations)*
- *Professor Francesco Bestagno - University Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan (International Law and EU Law)*
- *Professor Andrea Gattin - University of Padua (EU and International Law)*
- *Professor Roberto Mastroianni - University of Naples (EU Law)*
- *Professor Ernesto Irac - University Luiss, Rome (Litigation Law and WTO Law)*

C. *Participant Teams*

Six teams participated in the inaugural Southern Europe ELSA Regional Round which included the winners from the Hungary and Romania ELSA National (Oral) Rounds.

D) *Awards*

i) *Preliminary Round Rankings*

Four teams from the Southern Europe Regional Round automatically qualified for the Final Oral Round in Geneva. At the conclusion of the Preliminary Rounds the teams were ranked as follows:

- *1st Ranked: Team 006 - University of Amsterdam, Netherlands*
- *2nd Ranked Team 009 – St. Petersburg State University, Faculty of Law, Russia*
- *3rd Ranked Team 067 - Padova University, Italy*
- *4th Ranked Team 018 - University of Lund, Sweden*

ii) *Elimination Round Teams*

The following teams were assigned to the following pleading sessions:

- *Semi-Finalists 1: Team 009 (ranked 2nd) vs. Team 018 (ranked 4th) – Winner Team 009*
- *Semi-Finalists 2: Team 006 (ranked 1st) vs. Team 067 (ranked 3rd) – Winner Team 006*
- *Grand Final: Team 006 vs. Team 009*

iii) *Awards*

The following teams and individuals received awards:

- *Winner: Team 006*
- *Runner-up: Team 009*
- *Best Orator Preliminary Round: Team 006 (Mr. Scott Martin)*
- *Best Orator of Elimination Round: Team 006 (Mr. Scott Martin)*
- *Best Complainant Written Submission: Team 067*
- *Best Respondent Written Submission: Team 067*
- *Best Overall Written Submissions: Team 067*

E) *Concluding Remarks*

Due to organisational difficulties experienced by the OC, the Academic Supervisor was unable to attend the Southern Europe Regional Round.

ELSA acknowledges the quality of events arranged by the ELSA National Groups allocated to the region. In assessing the Southern Europe event's quality, ELSA has taken in to consideration the fact that this was the first time Regional Rounds were organised in Europe and that many members of the OC were inexperienced organisers and subsequently issues have arisen. Therefore, the IOC would like to address the following issues to assist ELSA Groups in the organisation of future EMC².

To maintain and secure the highest academic quality of the EMC² on all levels, it is important that ELSA International and the Academic Supervisor's oversee all Regional Rounds both in terms of panellist selection and organisational aspects.

In relation to the selection of Panellists for all EMC² oral rounds, ELSA has appointed Academic Supervisor's who are not only familiar with the WTO as an organisation, but also individuals who are expert practitioners and/or academics in WTO Law. The Academic Supervisors are currently in the process of developing a global "Panellist List" which will include individuals who are interested in participating as either Written Submission and/or Oral panellists, on a voluntary basis only. The "Panellist List" will identify experts globally and allocate them to individual regional rounds as well as the Final Oral Round. It is anticipated that having such expert's judge the regional rounds, will ensure that the best teams progress to the Final Oral Round.

In addition, as many governments are engaging private law firms or research centres to assist them with their trade policy development and/or trade dispute, if these experts adjudicate the EMC² competition, it not only adds to the quality and prestige of the event, but also gives participants an opportunity to showcase their knowledge and advocacy skills before potential future employers.

Organisational aspects of an EMC² event are as important as Panellist selection. Consequently, it is imperative that as soon as ELSA International appoints an Organising Committee to conduct a regional round, that it immediately liaises with its allocated Academic Supervisor. Such liaison will ensure that an Organisational Tasks and Timeline List is developed to address issues such as: marking of Written Submissions, timekeeping, inviting individuals to participate in the competition and ascertaining their requirements, organising panellist travel arrangements; liaising with panellist on regular basis, providing panellist with the Bench Memorandum; arranging and conducting panellist briefings, organising promotional material, organising event venues and social programme, engaging local dignitaries and/or authorities to participate in the programme, preparing the event report for the IOC, to name but a few.

If the organisational aspects of a regional round are of a high standard then teams progressing to the Final Oral Round will be adequately prepared for what awaits them in Geneva. Good cooperation between the IOC, OC's, the Academic Supervisors and other ELSA members experienced in moot court projects will ensure successful EMC² events.

Sincerely
Mr. Halvor Lekven
Vice President Academic Activities
ELSA International 2006/2007

3. THE NON-ELSA SOUTH EAST ASIAN & PACIFIC REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC² 2005/2006

A) SEA&P Regional Round Organiser

For the 2nd year -the Institute for International Business, Economics and Law (IIBE&L) - University of Adelaide were the Regional Round Organiser and former WTO Deputy-Director General and IIBE&L Executive Director, Mr. Andrew Stoler, was the Regional Round Administrator (RRA). IIBE&L did an outstanding job of organising the competition, which was held in Adelaide, Australia from the 15th to 18th March. All official events were held at the prestigious National Wine Centre, commencing with the informal Welcome

Reception in the Pod Bar where participants had the opportunity to sample many of South Australia's famous wines whilst socializing with each other, academics, sponsors and judges.

B) Academic Quality of the SEA&P RR

i) Panellists

For 2006 a number of the SEA&P "judge alumni" returned to participate in the oral pleading sessions. All the Panellists for the event were qualified WTO lawyers/academics and trade policy specialists. In fact, a number of the judge alumni are also former WTO diplomats or Secretarial staff – securing these individuals was a wonderful achievement by IIBE&L for the EMC². Several of the Panellists had also been involved in the actual WTO cases referred to in the Case of the EMC² 2005/2006. Many of the Panellists stated that the Case, Clarifications and the Bench Memorandum were the most professional that had been produced for the EMC² to date.

All Panellists indicated that they would like to read at least one complainant and respondent Written Submission, so they could gauge the student's arguments. One randomly selected complainant and respondent Written Submissions were sent to all Panellists for their perusal with a strong warning that participants were likely to have developed their arguments in the two months interim between tendering the documents and presenting oral arguments. At the conclusion of the event all Panellist confirmed that reading these documents had little effect as the students had indeed developed their pleadings in the interim.

Our sincere thanks to all our Panellists (see below) for their enthusiasm, dedication and at times, probing questions. Their participation made the SEA&P RR a wonderful experience for the participants and an outstanding academic event:

- *Mr Scott Gallacher – Minter Ellison (and former NZ trade diplomat)*
- *Mr Siva Somasundram – Minter Ellison (and former Singapore trade diplomat)*
- *Mr Iain Sandford – Minter Ellison (former NZ trade diplomat and WTO Legal Officer)*
- *Ms Melissa Bray – Australian Department of Foreign Affairs (WTO Disputes Section)*
- *Ms Tania Voon – University of Melbourne (former WTO Legal Officer)*
- *Mr Andrew Mitchell – University of Melbourne (former WTO and IMF Legal Officer)*
- *Ms Robyn Burnett – University of Technology Sydney (former NZ trade diplomat)*
- *Mr Andrew Stoler – IIBE&L-University of Adelaide (former WTO Deputy Director-General)*

ii) Oral Pleading Sessions

All the Preliminary Round pleading sessions were conducted consecutively due to judge and room availability (rooms were at a premium in Adelaide due to their hosting of the bi-annual Adelaide Festival of Arts and the Fringe Festival). Therefore, judge alumni Ms Robyn Burnett, acted as Chair for all five Preliminary Round secessions. Ms Burnett was extremely mindful of the EMC² Rules and managed to keep all oralists and teams on track with their timing. Ms Burnett stressed to the students that Time Management was crucial for the FOR and their future careers; not only from a competition perspective but that it assisted students with refining their pleadings.

iii) Time Keeper(s)

The Panels were assisted with time management by the Academic Supervisor who acted as Timekeeper for all the pleadings sessions. In 2006 new timers were introduced and this made

it easier to record each oralist's pleading time as well as the overall team pleading time. In addition it provided the Panel Chair with additional information regarding any breaches of the time rules.

iv) Written Submissions

In 2006 the SEA&P RR was extremely fortunate that we had two former WTO Secretariat, Legal Officers (Ms Tania Voon along and Mr Andrew Mitchell) who judged all the Written Submissions. Ms Voon and Mr Mitchell also generously briefed the other judges, during the Judge's Briefing session, in relation to arguments put forward by teams in their Written Submissions, as of the 15th January 2006. It was anticipated, and realized, that the teams would progress from their Written Submission pleadings by the time they orally pleaded. In addition and in-keeping with ELSA International's objective to promote education, an academic conference was held in conjunction with the competition. Two highly topical papers were presented by Ms Voon (*Cultural Products in the World Trade Organization*) and Mr Mitchell (*The Role of Principles in WTO Dispute Settlement*).

C) SEA&P RR Participant Teams

In 2006 five Australian universities participated in the SEA&P. This was the first year that the competition had been expanded to include universities from South East Asian countries. We received numerous enquires but due to lack of trade expertise in these countries many, universities expressed that they would be unable to field a team until the 2007 competition - we look forward to a much expanded SEA&P RR competition next year.

From an academic and practitioner perspective the quality of the 2006 EMC² teams was very impressive. It was obvious that extensive preparation had taken place, especially bearing in mind that there is limited access to WTO law specialists throughout the region and the complicated scope of this year's Case. Furthermore, some of the Panellists also stated that many of the teams had extensively improved their knowledge and understanding of the issues, as well as the procedural aspects and form during the competition. Congratulations to all the SEA&P teams on their performances!

D) SEA&P RR Sponsors and Awards

Once again, in 2006 the Asia-Pacific law firm - Minter Ellison - was the SEA&P's major sponsor. Minter's provided three WTO experts to judge: Mr Scott Gallacher, Mr Siva Somasundram and Mr Iain Sandford. In keeping with tradition, Mr Gallacher repeated his 2005 role and was the Grand Final Panel Chairperson. Minter's generously paid all expenses for their staff to participate, as well as provided the competition awards.

The Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) also generously provided an oral judge and paid all its staff's expenses. Ms Melissa Bray, Executive Officer of the WTO Disputes Section, WTO Trade Law Branch represented DFAT and judged both the Preliminary and Elimination Rounds.

In 2006, the SEA&P RR attracted a new minor sponsor in Rymill Wines of Coonawarra - one of Australia's premier wine growing regions. Rymill Wine's have since 2001 produced a EMC² vintage made from Cabernet Sauvignon, Merlot and Cabernet France. We were extremely fortunate that Rymill provide us with one bottle for each judge as a gift of this expensive vintage, which is only available at the cellar door in Coonawarra. In addition,

Rymill agreed to sponsor the Final Oral Round and I personally carried a dozen bottles of the EMC² wine, in my hand luggage to Geneva, which was given as gifts to the judges of the Grand Final Panel.

Participants were awarded their trophies and certificates whilst judges received thank you gifts of the EMC² wine at the official SEA&P RR Presentation Dinner, which was held after the Grand Final on Saturday, 18th March at the National Wine Centre. Participants, judges and supporters enjoyed themselves into the late hours of the night as the stress of three days of competition ebbed with the flow of excellent Australian wine.

i) Preliminary Round Rankings

Only the winner of the SEA&P RR automatically qualified for the Final Oral Round in Geneva. At the conclusion of the Preliminary Rounds the teams were ranked as follows:

- *1st ranked: Team 001 - University of Sydney, Faculty of Law, Australia*
- *2nd ranked: Team 032 - University of Technology Sydney, Faculty of Law, Australia*
- *3rd ranked: Team 033 - Bond University, Faculty of Law, Australia*
- *4th ranked: Team 023 - Macquarie University, Division of Law Australia*

ii) Elimination Round Teams

The four highest ranked teams were assigned to the following pleading sessions:

- *Semi-Finalists 1: Team 023 (ranked 4th) vs. Team 032 (ranked 2nd) - Winner Team 023*
- *Semi-Finalists 2: Team 001 (ranked 1st) vs. Team 033 (ranked 3rd) - Winner Team 001*
- *Grand Final: Team 001 vs. Team 023*

iii) Awards

The following teams and individuals received trophies and certificates generously donated by Minter Ellison's:

- *Winner: Team 001*
- *Runner-up: Team 023*
- *Best Orator Preliminary Round: Team 001 (Ms Odette Murray)*
- *2nd Placed Orator Preliminary Round: Team 032 (Mr Tadeuz Gielas)*
- *3rd Placed Orator Preliminary Round: Team 001 (Ms Rebeccsa Mann)*
- *Best Orator of Elimination Round: Team 023 (Mr Awais Ahmad)*
- *Best Complainant Written Submission: Team 033*
- *Best Respondent Written Submission: Team 033*
- *Best Overall Written Submissions: Team 033*

F) Academic Supervisor's Concluding Remarks

A special mention must be made in relation to judge alumnus, Mr David Morgan (University of Melbourne and Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade [*on leave*]). Mr Morgan has judged the SEA&P RR since its introduction to the region and was scheduled to do so again in 2006. Unfortunately, en route to the competition he was involved in a serious car accident. On behalf of ELSA we wish him a speedy recovery and look forward to seeing him as a judge at the 2007 SEA&P RR in Adelaide, Australia.

Once again the SEA&P was a truly successful event with a record number of five teams participating; a number which we expect will increase in 2007 due to the fact that the

University of Sydney were the eventual winners of the Final Oral Round. Sincerest congratulations to Mr Andrew Stoler and his IIBE&L team of Ms Marie Gutsche and Ms Narelle Disibio, for the professionally organised event and making the participants, sponsors and judges welcome. I look forward to working with again IIBE&L in 200.

Sincerely

Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi

EMC² Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor

Associate Lecturer International Trade Law and Policy

4. THE NON-ELSA ASIA REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC² 2005/2006

A) ASIA Regional Round Organiser

National Taiwan University's Asian Centre for WTO and International Health Law and Policy (ACWHLP) was appointed the Regional Round Organiser (RRO) for the inaugural Asia Regional Round event. Professor Chang-Fa Lo Dean, College of Law (NTU) and former WTO Appellate Body Member Professor Mitsuo Matsushita, were jointly appointed as Regional Round Administrators (RRA). These two highly respected WTO academics from the Asia region combined their resources to attract a number of WTO experts to participate in this highly professionally organised competition. The ASIA Regional Round was held from 22nd to 24th March, in Taipei, Taiwan at the GIS Convention Centre.

B) Academic Quality of the ASIA RR

i) Panellists

The individuals chosen to judge the inaugural ASIA Regional Round were all qualified WTO practitioners and academics. Professor Matsushita and Ms Liang have also been involved in many actual WTO dispute settlement cases - their experience was evident in their questioning when they pushed participants to think outside the legal realm and reflect on policy issues. A number of the Panellists stated that they had thoroughly enjoyed the experience of judging and assisting young law students from their region to develop their analytical and advocacy skills. Similar to other regional rounds, the individuals have all agreed to be "judge alumni" and we look forward to seeing them at the 2007 Asia Regional Round in Taipei.

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

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

- *Professor Mitsuo Matsushita - Tokyo University and former WTO Appellate Body Member (1995-2000)*
- *Ms Margaret Liang - Special Consultant WTO Issues and former Deputy Permanent Representative to the WTO and UN - Singapore Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade*
- *Mr "Jack" Chen-Huan Hsiao - Deputy Director Multilateral Trade Affairs, Bureau of Foreign Trade, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Taiwan*

- Associate Professor Shin-yi Peng – National Tsing Hua University and Associate ACWTHLP
- Ms Joyce C. Fan – Special Legal Counsel to Ministry of Economic Affairs on WTO Matters and Partner, Lee and Li Law Firm, Taiwan
- Mr C. Y Huang – Partner, Tsar & Tsai Law Firm, Taiwan
- Mr Stephen Y. Tan – Partner, Baker & McKenzie Law Firm, Taiwan

ii) *Oral Pleading Sessions*

The Preliminary Round pleading sessions were conducted consecutively in one day due to the number of teams participating. Professor Matsushita and Ms Liang alternated in acting as Panel Chair for the Preliminary Round sessions. Both Chairpersons were extremely 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 judges) – hence articulation of arguments was crucial.

iii) *Time Keeper(s)*

The Panels were assisted with time management by the Academic Supervisor and one member of the Asia RR Secretariat who acted as Timekeeper 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, it provided the Panel Chair with additional information regarding any breaches of the time rules.

iv) *Written Submissions*

For the inaugural Asia RR, Associate Professor Shin-yi Peng and the Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor judged all the Written Submissions. Professor Peng and Mrs Raschella-Sergi also briefed the other judges, during the Judge's Briefing session, in relation to arguments put forward by teams in their Written Submissions, as of the 15th January 2006. It was anticipated, and realized, that the teams would progress from their Written Submission pleadings by the time they orally pleaded in Taipei. For 2006, it was decided that no academic conference would be held at the Asia RR as the RRO should focus on ensuring a successful event. Given the outstanding organisation by ACWHLP, such a component will be included in the 2007 programme.

C) *ASIA RR Participating Teams*

Initially four teams from Taiwan, South Korea and Hong Kong registered for the Asia RR. Unfortunately the South Korean team had to withdraw just prior to the event due to unforeseen reasons. Three very high quality teams went on to participate in the competition. With experienced WTO dispute settlement judges such as former Appellate Body Member, Professor Matsushita and Ms Margaret Liang, the students were often pushed to their limits of WTO knowledge. All participants displayed solid advocacy skills and sought to appease the Panel without losing too much "diplomatic" ground – a skill definitely required in the WTO dispute arena.

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

D) *ASIA RR Sponsors and Awards*

Professor Chang-Fa Lo is to be congratulated for engaging and securing all the major trade law firms in Taipei (Lee & Li Law Firm; Tsar & Tai Law Firm; Baker & McKenzie) to sponsor the Asia RR. Such sponsorship ensured that quality judges would participate as well as providing beautiful trophies and certificates for all the participants, judges and winners.

Participants were awarded their trophies and certificates whilst judges received thank you certificates at the official ASIA RR Presentation Dinner - which was held after the Grand Final on Friday, 24th March at the luxurious Shangri-la Far Eastern Plaza Hotel - a truly magnificent venue for an auspicious occasion. At the Presentation Dinner all participants, who had been seated at separate team tables, joined their tables and enjoyed one another's company! My comment to Professor Matsushita and Professor Lo is that we were witnessing the birth of future diplomats and that they truly embodied the ELSA spirit of co-operation and networking!

i) Preliminary Round Rankings

Only the winner of the ASIA RR automatically qualified for the Final Oral Round in Geneva. At the conclusion of the Preliminary Rounds the teams were ranked as follows:

- *1st ranked: Team 054 – National Taiwan University, College of Law, Taiwan*
- *2nd ranked: Team 011 – University of Hong Kong, Faculty of Law, Hong Kong*
- *3rd ranked: Team 026 – Soochow University, Faculty of Law, Taiwan*

ii) Elimination Round Teams

The teams were assigned to the pleading session as follows:

- *Grand Final: Team 011 vs. Team 054*

iii) Awards

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

- *Winner: Team 054*
- *Runner-up: Team 011*
- *Best Orator Preliminary Round: Team 011 (Ms Deanna [Wai Shan] Law)*
- *Best Orator Grand Final: Team 011 (Ms Deanna [Wai Shan] Law)*
- *Best Complainant Written Submission: Team 011*
- *Best Respondent Written Submission: Team 054*
- *Best Overall Written Submissions: Team 054*

E) Academic Supervisor's Concluding Remarks

The inaugural Asia RR was a highly successful event, notwithstanding the fact that ACWHLP was not appointed as RRO until mid November 2005. Professor Lo and his ASIA RR Secretariat staff (Associate Professor Michael Sheng-Ti Gau and the graduate law students; Bigi, Vivien and Thalia who essentially carried out all the tasks) are to be heartily congratulated for the professional organisation of the moot court competition. Participants were provided with a folder pack containing the event information and welcome gifts. Participants, judges and sponsors were attended to with efficiency, courtesy and professionalism.

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

The organisation of this the ASIA RR has now raised 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 team in 2007!

Sincerely

Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi

EMC² Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor

Associate Lecturer International Trade Law and Policy

5. THE NON-ELSA SOUTH WEST ASIAN SUB-CONTINENT REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC² 2005/2006

A) *SWAS Regional Round Organiser*

The non-ELSA South West Asia Sub-Continent Regional (Oral) Round was cancelled just prior to the scheduled round. The decision to cancel the round was taken by the IOC due to the fact that the contracted organiser was unable to ensure timely arrangements for the event. In order so that the registered SWAS RR teams would still have an opportunity to qualify for the Final Oral Round, ELSA immediately converted the round into the South West Asia Sub-Continent International Written Regional Round.

B) *Academic Quality of the SWAS RR*

i) *Written Submissions*

As the Written Submissions were already a component of the Regional (Oral) Rounds, the conversion to a Written Round was seamless. The IOC arranged for two judges from the “international pool of judges” to mark each team’s tendered Written Submissions. The quality of the documents was on-par with teams globally – given that the Written Submissions are tendered some three months prior to the Final Oral Round in Geneva and all teams substantially developed their pleadings in the interim.

C) *SWAS Participant Teams*

Initially eight teams from India registered for the SWAS RR. Unfortunately two teams withdrew for unforeseen reasons. With six teams registered, this meant that only one would be permitted to proceed to the Final Oral Round in Geneva. ELSA sought to compensate the SWAS RR teams for the last minute change to the oral selection round by allowing the two teams with the highest ranked Written Submissions (i.e. both complainant and respondent documents) to proceed to the Final Oral Round.

The two Indian teams that proceeded to the Final Oral Round in Geneva were of a very high calibre and performed extremely well in both the Preliminary Rounds and Elimination

Rounds. Congratulations to all the SWAS RR teams who participated in the competition, notwithstanding the disappointment that we all feel for the cancellation of the regional oral round.!

D) SWAS RR Awards

i) Written Submissions Rankings

Ranking of the teams to proceed to the Final Oral Round in Geneva was based on the marks of the two judges combining the complainant and respondent Written Submissions scores:

- *1st Ranked: Team 042 - West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata, India*
- *2nd Ranked: Team 060 - Hidayatullah National Law University, Chhattisgarh, India*

ii) Awards

Participation Certificates were distributed to all teams registered for the SWAS RR. Certificates were also awarded for the following:

Best Complainant Written Submission:

- *Team 042 - West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata, India*

Best Respondent Written Submission:

- *Team 042 - West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata, India*

Best Overall Written Submissions:

- *Team 042 - West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata, India*

The team from West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences was also extremely successful at the Final Oral Rounds in winning the **Gabrielle Marceau Award - Best Complainant Written Submission - Final Oral Round**.

Congratulations, Neha, Uday and Pingal on your outstanding achievement – remember a win for your Written Submissions is not only a permanent record of your achievement but can be utilized as an example of your skills in job interviews and application for post-graduate programmes.

E) Academic Supervisor's Concluding Remarks

As a consequence of the cancellation, ELSA has been forced to withdraw the event from the region. For 2007, teams from this region wishing to participate in the EMC² will be directed to other Regional (Oral) Rounds. It is anticipated that this mechanism will continue until ELSA has been able to secure a professional partner who understands WTO Law and will ensure the academic quality and logistics of an EMC² event in the region.

Sincerely
Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi
EMC² Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor
Associate Lecturer International Trade Law and Policy

CONCLUDING REMARKS BY ASIA-PACIFIC ACADEMIC SUPERVISOR

I have been involved with the EMC² competition since its inception in 2002. Personally, 2006 has been my most challenging year with the extension and development of the SEA&P RR and the introduction of two new regional rounds, ASIA RR and the SWAS RR.

Notwithstanding the difficulties experienced in the SWAS RR, 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 2006 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!

Sincerely

Mrs. Letizia Raschella-Sergi

EMC² Asia-Pacific Academic Supervisor

Associate Lecturer International Trade Law and Policy

6. THE NON-ELSA LATIN AMERICAN REGIONAL ROUND OF THE EMC² 2005/2006

A) Latin America Regional Round Organiser

In 2007 the Latin America Regional Round was held in Guatemala City, Guatemala and was hosted by COLADIC-Guatemala. The organisation of the event was at a very high level. The Organising Committee (OC) worked tirelessly throughout the year. It was extremely efficient to have only one contact person, Ms Ana Sofia, which ensured that all questions were answered quickly and problems addressed immediately. It was even nicer to see that there actually was more than one individual helping out. I very much enjoyed the professionalism with which Andréa Bolaños Coloma, Vice President - COLADIC Guatemala, and all the Timekeepers handled the event.

The OC should be congratulated on involving their host academic institution to such an extensive level. The authorities of Universidad Francisco Marroquín were involved, aware and present at the event not only adding prestige to it, but also allowing for a display of the University's support for one of ELSA's main goals pursued through the EMC² - the promotion of the WTO Law into the curricular of the law schools around the world.

Social programme events were great. The Awards Ceremony and the awards very appropriately reflected the truly international nature of the Competition at wonderfully low Guatemalan prices.

B) Academic Quality of the ASIA RR

i) Panellists

As the Latin American Regional Round encompasses many countries, more international panellists are needed to compliment the local panellists. In general there were too many judges for the number of teams participating in the Competition. Naturally, it made the management of the entire Competition cumbersome.

Unfortunately, allegations of “panellist’s bias” by some teams could not be discarded as completely groundless because a radical shift in the scoring of the last session of the Preliminary Rounds. A host country team and a guest team were involved and the allegation shadowed the admirable atmosphere of the Competition.

Assessment and grading (scoring) in the Preliminary Rounds are based on the “overall impression” of each individual panellist. Separate panels cannot set individual points of reference. The trend in scoring must be agreed upon during the Judges’ Briefing session with the Academic Supervisor and must not change throughout the Preliminary Rounds; it eventuated that this was not the case in this Competition.

During the last Preliminary Round Panel, the Panellists decided that they wanted to have a clear distinction between which ranges the particular team fell in terms of that session (rather than the entire Preliminary Rounds). The scores clearly indicated that the Panellists arbitrarily reviewed the last session. There was no evidence presented to substantiate the claims of corruption or bias. However, the Panellists breached the rule of independent grading as they changed the point of reference in the middle of the competition. The Panellists should have discussed this at the Judges’ Briefing, not arbitrarily between themselves. Although the arbitral change in the scoring process indicates a lack of experience on the Panellists’ behalf and lack of control on behalf of the OC and the Academic Supervisor, this does not legitimize their actions into an official EMC² “grading policy”.

Panellists should have been better prepared (some of them did not have necessary documents till the very last minute and did not contact the OC for them, but nevertheless were allowed to participate in the oral pleading sessions). Because of public relations issues it was very difficult to handle some high profile local specialists. However, the interests of the Competition and its academic quality must be placed first.

On the other hand, the OC tried to fill in the gaps and have judges instructed at the last moment. The Panellists should have shared their experiences to assist new judges. In future it is recommended that a Judge’s Briefing take place at the commencement of each day of the Preliminary and Elimination Rounds. The Judge’s Briefing must include a discussion of scoring guidelines etc.

ii) Timekeepers

Timekeepers did an absolutely wonderful job; they very well trained and had a professional approach. There were mistakes made once, but the Timekeepers acknowledged that the problem which occurred was within their performance and not that of the teams. The Panel was instructed to disregard the time issue while assessing the performance of the teams involved. The issue was dealt with in a very professional manner on behalf of the OC.

C) Participating Teams

In 2006, four teams participated in the Latin America Regional Round I was very impressed with the level of the preparation of the teams. It was amazing bearing in mind limited access to WTO Law specialists throughout the region (with exception of one or two states) and the complicated scope of this year’s Case. Congratulation to all the teams!

D) Awards

i) *Preliminary Round Rankings*

Only the winner of the Latin America Regional Round automatically qualified for the Final Oral Round in Geneva. At the conclusion of the Preliminary Rounds the teams were ranked as follows:

- *1st ranked: Team 031 – Pontifica Universidad Javeriana – Facultad De Ciencias Juridica, Columbia*
- *2nd ranked: Team 036 – Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo De México (ITAM)*
- *3rd ranked: Team 039 - Facultad de Derecho Universidad Francisco Marroquín, Guatemala*
- *4th ranked: Team 038 - Faculdade de Direito/ Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Brazil*

ii) *Elimination Round Teams*

The teams were assigned to the pleading session as follows:

- *Grand Final: Team 031 vs. Team 036*

iii) *Awards*

The following teams and individuals received awards:

- *Winner: Team 031*
- *Runner-up: Team 036*
- *Best Orator Preliminary Rounds: Team 036 (Mr Enrique Orellana)*
- *2nd Best Orator Preliminary Rounds: Team 036 (Mr Yahir Acosta)*
- *3rd Best Orator Preliminary Rounds: Team 031 (equal placement: Mr Felipe Serrano-Pinilla and Mr Rafael José Rincón Ordonez)*
- *Best Orator of Elimination Round: Team 031 (Mr Rafael José Rincón Ordoñez)*
- *Best Complainant Written Submission: Team 036*
- *Best Respondent Written Submission: Team 031*
- *Best Overall Written Submissions: Team 036*

E) *Academic Supervisor's Concluding Remarks*

As Academic Supervisor I enjoyed my time immensely! However, I should have been more involved with every individual panel to avoid or mitigate the effects of the problems which occurred. On the other hand, the judges should be made more aware that an IOC representative “has a last word” on nearly everything in the Competition. Naturally, it must be done in the most diplomatic way possible, but in the excitement of the event judges sometimes failed to consult the Academic Supervisor on the interpretation of the Rules.

Sincerely,
Ms. Ieva Zebryte
EMC² Academic Supervisor for the Americas

C. INTERNATIONAL WRITTEN ROUND

A) *International Written Round Organiser*

Finally, 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 (Oral) Rounds. Two judges were selected by the International Organising Committee (IOC) from the international pool of WTO expert judges, to mark each registered team's tendered Written Submissions.

B) *Academic Quality of the International Written Round*

The quality of the documents was equivalent to teams entering via the oral selection rounds. Teams 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 Geneva. Notwithstanding this perceived disadvantage, at the conclusion of the Preliminary Rounds in Geneva, four of the five teams selected for the FOR were ranked above teams who had entered via an oral selection round.

Congratulations to all the teams who participated in the competition through the International Written Round!

C) *IWR Participant Teams*

For 2006 seven teams registered for the International Written Round. Five teams were selected to proceed to the FOR based on the ranking of the Written Submissions. Four teams hailed from the USA and for the first time in the EMC²'s history a team from Africa participated in the FOR.

A special mention must be made in relation to the African team which hailed from Dire Dawa University located in the developing country of Ethiopia. As stated by a number of EMC² supporters, this competition is likely to have the net result of producing the next generation of trade diplomats. Interestingly, Ethiopia currently holds WTO Observer State status only as it still to accede to the international trade organisation. We at ELSA International sincerely hope that participation in the EMC² competition by the four members of the Dire Dawa Team, has contributed to developing the local pool of WTO experts so that as Ethiopia progresses in its WTO Accession process, these individuals can assist their country by secure the best "trade" deals which will benefit all Ethiopian citizens.

D) *IWR Awards*

i) *Written Submissions Rankings*

The five highest ranked teams of the International Written Round automatically qualified for the Final Oral Round in Geneva. The following teams were ranked by the Written Submissions judges:

- *1st Ranked: Team 028 - Duke University, USA*
- *2nd Ranked: Team 059 - Howard University School of Law, USA*
- *3rd Ranked: Team 002 - Georgetown University, USA*
- *4th Ranked: Team 037 - New York University, USA*

- 5th Ranked: Team 027 - Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia

ii) Awards

Overall Best Written Submissions of the International Written Round:

- Team 028 - Duke University, USA

Best Complainant Written Submission - International Written Round:

- Team 059 - Howard University School of Law, USA

Best Respondent Written Submission - International Written Round:

- Team 028 - Duke University, USA

E) Concluding Remarks

A concern expressed by teams participating in the FOR via International Written Round selection is that they were disadvantaged by not attending an oral selection round prior to Geneva. The reason for such concern is that the Written Submissions are tendered in mid January with the FOR held in late April. Teams participating in oral selection rounds gain an advantage in that their legal pleadings are tested via panellist questions. Such questioning enables teams to refine their arguments before competing in Geneva.

As a consequence of the above mentioned concern as well as the ELSA International Council Decision (Budva, October 2003) the International Written Round will continue to be scaled down with new oral selection rounds being established in various regions. It is intended that in 2007 teams from the USA, Canada, Africa, the Middle East and other WTO Member and Observer States will be directed to new non-ELSA regional (oral) round competitions (details of the rounds will be released in September 2006 on ELSA's website). If such rounds do not eventuate then the fall-back position of the International Written Round will be utilised.

A special remark should also be made to the fact that in the 4th Edition of the EMC², every continent in the world was represented with participating teams. The team from Dire Dawa University in Ethiopia was the first African team to ever compete in the Final Oral Round of the EMC². ELSA International believes that the EMC² is now truly made a worldwide Moot Court Competition.

Sincerely,
Mr. Halvor Lekven
Vice President Academic Activities
ELSA International 2006/2007

3. PARTICIPANTS OF THE FINAL ORAL ROUND

The teams are presented in the order they ranked after the Preliminary Rounds (corresponding team codes issued to the teams at registration are placed in the brackets).

1. Team 042 - West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, India
2. Team 001 - University of Sydney, Faculty of Law, Australia
3. Team 024 - London School of Economics and Political Sciences, England
4. Team 012 - King's College London, England
5. Team 054 - National Taiwan University, Taiwan
6. Team 031 - Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Colombia
7. Team 028 - Duke University, USA
8. Team 060 - Hidayatullah National Law University, India
9. Team 016 - Martin Luther University, Faculty of Law, Germany
10. Team 045 - Helsinki University, Finland
11. Team 037 - New York University, USA
12. Team 006 - University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
13. Team 059 - Howard University School of Law, USA
14. Team 009 - St. Petersburg State University, Faculty of Law, Russia
15. Team 018 - University of Lund, Sweden
16. Team 002 - Georgetown University Law Center, USA
17. Team 067 - Padova University, Italy
18. Team 027 - Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia

4. AWARDS

Winner EMC² 2005/2006 – World Trade Institute Award

- *Team 001 – University of Sydney, Faculty of Law, Australia*

Runner-up EMC² 2005/2006 – Professor Claus-Dieter Ehlermann Award

- *Team 025 - London School of Economics and Political Sciences, England*

Other Semi-Finalists:

- *Team 042 - West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, India*
- *Team 012 - King's College London, England*

Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds – Cambridge University Press Award:

- *Mr Hamed Fathi-Nejad – Team 012 -King's College London, England*

Best Orator of the Elimination Rounds - O'Connor and Company Award:

- *Mr Hussein Haeri – Team 025 - London School of Economics and Political Sciences, England*

ELSA Award Overall Best Written Submissions of the International Written Round:

- *Team 028 -Duke University, USA*

ELSA Award Best Complainant Written Submission - International Written Round:

- *Team 059 - Howard University School of Law, USA*

ELSA Award for the Best Respondent Written Submission - International Written Round:

- *Team 028 -Duke University, USA*

WTO Award Overall Best Written Submissions - Final Oral Round:

- *Team 031 - Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Colombia*

Gabrielle Marceau Award for Best Complainant Written Submission - Final Oral Round:

- *Team 042 - West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, India*

Valerie Hughes Award for Best Respondent Written Submission - Final Oral Round:

- *Team 016 - Martin Luther University, Faculty of Law, Germany*

A. RANKING OF THE 18 PARTICIPATING TEAMS AFTER THE PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

Ranking	"Round of Origin"*	Team Code	WS Score**	WS Score Final (WS Score multiplied by 0,3)	Oral Score	Final Oral Score (Oral Score multiplied by 0,7)	Total Score
1	SWAS RR	042	169,000	50,700	182,660	127,862	178,562
2	SEA&PRR	001	154,500	46,350	168,000	117,600	163,950
3	NEE RR	025	138,875	41,663	170,000	119,000	160,663
4	NEE RR	012	123,000	36,900	176,670	123,669	160,569
5	ARR	054	167,250	50,175	157,000	109,900	160,075
6	LRR	031	172,880	51,864	151,670	106,169	158,033
7	IWR	028	138,125	41,438	162,400	113,400	154,838
8	SWAS RR	060	151,625	45,488	155,000	108,500	153,988
9	NEE RR	016	170,625	51,188	146,000	102,200	153,388
10	NEE RR	045	156,125	46,838	145,000	101,500	148,338
11	IWR	037	107,375	32,213	156,330	109,431	141,644
12	SEE RR	006	131,000	39,300	145,000	101,500	140,800
13	IWR	059	116,500	34,950	151,000	105,700	140,650
14	SEE RR	009	115,500	34,650	150,000	105,000	139,650
15	SEE RR	018	141,500	42,450	130,670	91,469	133,919
16	IWR	002	108,125	32,438	142,340	99,638	132,076
17	SEE RR	067	153,875	46,163	103,660	72,562	118,725
18	IWR	027	107,875	32,363	117,900	82,530	114,893

* Abbreviations indicating the ELSA and non-ELSA Regional Rounds:

NEE RR = Northern European ELSA Regional Round

SEE RR = Southern European ELSA Regional Round

SEA&PRR = South East Asia & Pacific Regional Round

ARR = Asian Regional Round

SWAS RR = South West Asian Sub-Continent Regional Round

LRR = Latin American Regional Round

IWR = International Written Round

**WS = Total Score of both the Complainant and Respondent Written Submissions submitted to ELSA International.

According to the Rules of the EMC², the four highest ranking Teams (marked in yellow) qualified for the Elimination Rounds (Semi-Finals).

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 and divided by 3. Therefore, the maximum score for each oral argument any Team presented was 100 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 200 points could have been received by one Team throughout the Preliminary Rounds.

B. DETAILED SCORES OF THE PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

Session #*	Team code		Total	
	Complainant	Respondent	Complainant	Respondent
1A	060	059	80,67	75,00
1B	027	018	61,33	62,67
1C	001	054	81,33	71,00
1D	037	031	75,33	77,67
1E	009	042	77,00	95,33
2A	002	012	63,67	82,67
2B	045	067	60,00	42,33
2C	028	025	78,67	85,67
2D	006	016	67,00	63,00
3A	012	045	94,00	85,00
3B	067	002	61,33	78,67
3C	025	006	84,33	78,00
3D	016	028	83,00	83,33
4A	059	001	76,00	86,67
4B	018	037	68,00	81,00
4C	054	009	86,00	73,00
4D	031	060	74,00	74,33
4E	042	027	87,33	56,67

* Sessions with four highest ranking teams are marked in yellow.

C. BEST ORATORS OF THE PRELIMINARY ROUNDS RANKING

Ranking	Name	Team Code	Points (out of 200)
1.	Hamed Fathi-Nejad	012	187,00
2.	Uday Joshi	042	186,67
3.	Neha Bhat	042	174,33
4.	Emmanuel Saurat	012	173,00
5.	Hussein Haeri	025	172,67
6.	Odette Murray	001	172,33
7.	Ben Mitchell	028	168,33
8.	Lucas Bastin	001	167,67
9.	Aniiruddha Rajput	025	166,00
10.	Justin Sommers	028	165,00
11.	Rebecca Mann	001	163,33
12.	Yueh-Ping Yang	054	162,33
13.	Chun-Ming, Cheng	054	160,67
14.	I-Sha Liu	054	160,33
15.	Steve Katevatis	012	160,00
16.	Debanshu Mukherjee	060	157,67
17.	Adarsh A. Vargese	060	157,33
18.	Sudhanshu Roy	060	155,67
19.	Felipe Serrano Pinilla	031	154,33
20.	Vladimir Talanov	009	154,00
21.	Olga Kudryavtseva	009	154,00
22.	Jeffrey Smith	002	150,33
23.	Rafael Jose Rincon Ordonez	031	149,67
24.	Scott Martin	006	148,33
25.	Jose Fernando Plata Puyana	031	148,00
26.	Karmen Turk	045	143,67
27.	Mark Vuaran	006	142,67
28.	Elin Sundberg	018	135,00
29.	Camilla Sourander	045	128,00
30.	Esteban Aguero Guier	002	127,67
31.	Binnsam Ahmed	027	127,67
32.	Caroline Nilsson	018	122,33
33.	Daniela Bastianic	067	119,00
34.	Amsale Getnet	027	118,33
35.	Mulugeta Getu	027	117,33
36.	Diana Michelazzo	067	106,00

*Please note: to qualify for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Round Awards, an orator had to plead twice during the Preliminary Rounds - once as Complainant and once as Respondent. The scores were drawn up as an average of 6 scores (3 judges per 2 Panels of the Preliminary Rounds).

A total of 36 out of 62 speakers pleaded twice throughout the Preliminary Rounds. Hence their ranking is presented above.

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.

D. RESULTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WRITTEN ROUND AND THE OVERALL BEST MEMORIAL RESULTS

Team Code	Penalties		Interim Memorial Score		Memorial Score
	Compl.	Resp.	Compl.	Resp.	Total
031 LRR	0	0	81,750	91,130	172,880
016 NEE	1	1	78,50	94,250	170,750
042 SWAS	0	0	84,250	84,750	169,000
045 NEE	0	0	78,625	77,500	156,125
054 ARR*					167,250
067 SEE	1	1	81,500	74,375	153,875
001 SEA&P	1	2	78,500	77,500	153,000
060 SWAS	1	1	76,625	77,000	151,625
018 SEE	2	2	72,250	73,250	141,500
025 NEE	0	0	69,500	69,375	138,875
028 IWR	0	0	62,625	75,500	138,125
006 SEE	1	1	73,375	59,625	131,000
012 NEE	0	0	59,000	64,000	123,000
059 IWR	1	1	68,625	49,875	116,500
009 SEE	1	1	54,250	63,250	115,500
002 IWR	1	1	82,000	28,125	108,125
027 IWR	1	1	31,875	78,000	107,875
037 IWR	0	0	42,000	62,735	107,375

* The IOC were only given the total score of team 054s Written Submissions.

Each Written Submission was reviewed by two judges individually and independently.

Each Written Submission judge could assign a maximum score of 20 points: 0-50 being poor, 51-64 being average, 65-84 being good, and 85-100 being excellent. Therefore, the maximum score for each Written Memorial could be 40 points, and for both Memorials – 80 points.

The judges were guided by factors such as: argumentation and correct legal analysis, clarity of argument, complete and correct recognition and weighting of issues, correct application of the relevant rules and legal principles, presentation and style, persuasiveness, structure, logic, thoroughness, eloquence, reasoning, grammar, spelling and style.

5. APPRECIATION

A. ADVISORY BOARD AND JUDGES' POOL OF THE ELSA MOOT COURT COMPETITION ON WTO LAW

In order to ensure the high quality of the event the following persons agreed to advise and support ELSA with the organisation of the ELSA Moot Court Competition (EMC²) on WTO Law.

Regardless of their past and present positions and status, these individuals are helping the EMC² to reach its full potential. They consult with the IOC, promote the Competition commissioning their own reputation, and overall supporting the EMC² however they can. ELSA and the IOC are extremely humbled by such devotion and attention to the Competition.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Involvement with the EMC²</i>
Ms. Kerry Allbeury WTO Legal Affairs Division (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Mr. Stefan Amarasinha Directorate-General for Trade, European Commission (Belgium)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2005 and 2006
Dr. Arthur Appleton White & Case, Geneva (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds and Semi Finals Panel of FOR 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006; Advisory and Case Review Board of 2004, 2005 and 2006;
Ms. Vassiliki Avgoustidi Gide Loyrette Nouel (Belgium)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Prof. Luiz Olavo Baptista WTO Appellate Body Member (2001 to present) (Brazil)	Advisor
Mr. Georg Berrisch Covington & Burling (Belgium)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003 and 2004
Dr. Jan Bohanes WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006
Prof. Peter. Van Den Bossche University of Maastricht (The Netherlands)	Advisor
Prof. Jacques Bourgeois Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld (Belgium)	Grand Final Panels of FOR 2003, 2004 and 2006 (Chairman)
Prof. Christine Breining-Kaufmann University of Zurich (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003, 2004 and 2005
Dr. Marco Bronckers Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering (Belgium)	Advisor
Mr. Matt Busheri University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Mr. Jorge Castro WTO Legal Affairs Division (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2004 and 2005
Prof. Thomas Cottier University of Berne, Baker & McKenzie (Switzerland)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2003, 2004, 2005 (Chairman) and 2006
Ms. Victoria Donaldson WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2004, 2005 and 2006; Advisory and Case Review Board 2006

Prof. Piet Eeckhout King's College London (the United Kingdom)	Advisor
Prof. Claus-Dieter Ehlerman Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering (Belgium) WTO Appellate Body Member (1995-2001)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2003 (Chairman) and 2004 (Chairman)
Mr. Lothar Ehring Directorate-General for Trade, European Commission (Belgium)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003, 2004 and 2005
Prof. Frank Emmert Indiana University School of Law (Indianapolis, USA)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2003; Case Drafter 2003; Advisor
Prof. John Erauw Private International Law Institute, University of Ghent (Belgium)	Advisor
Prof. Mary Footer Amsterdam Centre for International Law (The Netherlands)	Preliminary Rounds and Semi Finals Panels of FOR 2003, 2004 and 2005
Dr. David A. Gantz The University of Arizona, Rogers College of Law (USA)	Grand Final Panel 2006; Case Drafter EMC ² 2006
Ms. Pettina Gappah Advisory Centre on the WTO Law (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Mr. Folkert Graafsma Vermulst Waer & Verhaeghe (Belgium)	Advisor
Prof. Heinz Hauser University of St. Gallen (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003 and 2004
Prof. Robert Howse Michigan University (USA)	Semi Finals Panel of FOR 2003, Case Drafter 2005
Ms. Valerie Hughes Director of the WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (1999-2005)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2003 and 2005; Case Review Board 2004 to 2006
Ms. Hannah Irfan WTO Legal Affairs Division (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Mr. Alejandro Jara Deputy Director General of the WTO (Switzerland)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2006
Mr. Payman Jassim White & Case, Geneva (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Ms. Aegyyoung Jung WTO Legal Affairs Division (Switzerland)	Advisor
Prof. Margret Liang WTO Consultant to the Singapore Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Singapore)	Preliminary Rounds and Semi Final Panels of FOR 2006; Preliminary Rounds and Grand Final Panels ASIA RR 2006
Prof. Chang-Fa Lo Executive Director, Asian Centre for WTO & Health Law & Policy - National Taiwan University (Taiwan)	Joint Regional Round Administrator (ASIA RR); Advisor
Mr. David Luff Trade Com Facility for the ACP Countries (Belgium)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006; Semi Finals Panel FOR 2006
Dr. Gabrielle Marceau WTO Secretariat - Counselor for Director General's Division (Switzerland)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2005; Semi Finals Panels of FOR 2003, 2004 and 2005; Advisory and Case Review Board 2004 and 2005;
Mr. Philip Marsden The British Institute of International and Comparative Law (England)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003

Dr. James H. Mathis International Law Department of Amsterdam University (The Netherlands)	Grand Final of FOR 2004, Case Drafter 2004
Prof. Mitsuo Matsushita Tokyo University (Japan); WTO Appellate Body Member (1995-2000)	Joint Regional Round Administrator (ASIA RR); Preliminary Rounds and Grand Final Panels ASIA RR 2006; Advisor
Ms. Teisha Mattison WTO Secretariat Technical Cooperation Division (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Prof. Petros Mavroidis University of Neuchatel (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003
Ms. Natalie McNelis Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering (Belgium)	Advisor
Mr. Niall Meagher Senior Counsel at the Advisory Centre on WTO Law (Switzerland)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2005 and Semi Finals Panel of FOR 2006
Mr. Andrew Mitchell University of Melbourne (Australia)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2005; Preliminary, Semi-Finals Panels SEA&P RR 2006
Prof. Elisabetta Montaguti European Commission, Legal Service (Belgium)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2003 and 2004
Dr. Laura Nielsen University of Copenhagen (Denmark)	Academic Supervisor for Europe-Africa 2006; Preliminary Rounds Panel of FOR 2004, 2005 and 2006; Semi Finals Panel and Grand Final Panel of FOR 2006; Case Drafter EMC ² 2006
Mr. Hunter Nottage Advisory Centre on the WTO Law (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006
Mr. Bernard O'Connor O'Connor and Company - European Lawyers (Belgium)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2006
Ms. Barbara Oliveira WTO Secretariat Technical Cooperation Division (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Prof. Joost Pauwelyn Duke's University (USA)	Advisor
Mrs. Maria J. Pereyra-Friedrichsen WTO Legal Affairs Division (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2004 and 2005; Advisory and Case Review Board 2005 and 2006
Dr. Christian Pitschas WTI Advisors (Switzerland))	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2004, 2005 and 2006
Mrs. Letizia Raschella - Sergi Institute for International Business, Economics & Law - University of Adelaide (Australia)	Academic Supervisor for Asia-Pacific 2004, 2005 and 2006; Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006; Advisory and Case Review Board 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006
Dr. Roberto Rios-Herran Richardson Rios Olechowski International Lawyers (Poland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2005 and 2006; North European Regional Round 2006
Ms. Edna Ramirez Robles Visiting Scholar, Economic and Research Division of the WTO (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Prof. Giorgio Sacerdoti WTO Appellate Body Member (2001 to present) (Italy)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2004
Mr. Iain Sandford Minter Ellisons (Australia) WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (2003-2005)	Advisory and Case Review Board 2005 and 2006; Semi Final and Grand Final Panels SEA&P RR 2006
Mr. Hannes Schloemann Director of WTI Advisors (Switzerland)	Grand Final and Semi Final Panels of FOR 2005; Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003, 2004, 2005 and

	2006
Dr. Soren Schonberg Directorate-General for Trade, European Commission (Belgium)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2005
Ms. Julia S. Selivanova Baker & McKenzie, Geneva (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2005 and 2006
Mr Andrew Stoler Executive Director, Institute for International Business Economics & Law - University of Adelaide (Australia) WTO Deputy Director-General (1999-2001)	Regional Round Administrator (SEA&P RR) 2005 and 2006; Grand Final Panel SEA&P RR 2005 and 2006; Advisor
Prof. Christian Tietje University of Halle (Germany)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006
Mr. Raul Torres WTO Secretariat Rules Division (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2005 and 2006
Prof. Joel Trachtman Tufts University (USA)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2005; Advisor
Mr. Arun Venkataraman WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2004
Ms. Tania Voon University of Melbourne (Australia) WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (2004-2005)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2004 and 2005; Preliminary, Semi-Finals and Grand Final Panels SEA&P RR 2006
Prof. Rolf Weber Zurich University (Switzerland)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2005
Prof. Dr. Jan Wouters Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2005
Ms. Ruta Zarnauskaite DG Trade of the European Commission (Belgium)	Preliminary Rounds of FOR 2006
Mr. Werner Zdouc Director of the WTO Appellate Body Secretariat (Switzerland)	Grand Final Panel of FOR 2006

Many of the above EMC² judges served on the Panels of the International Written Round (2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006) and undertook the tedious work of assessing and grading the Written Submissions of the EMC² teams. Their vast contribution to the quality and day-to-day operations of the Competition is immensely appreciated by the IOC and surely, by the participants.

B. SPONSORS OF THE EMC² 2005/2006

EMC² Partner

World Trade Institute

The World Trade Institute (WTI) is a centre of advanced studies and a forum for interdisciplinary research and teaching in international trade law and economics, fostering interaction between students and professionals, and allowing researchers and practitioners to pool their expertise.

WTI has supported the EMC² 2005/2006 by giving a monetary contribution as well as providing WTI summer courses as prizes to the EMC² Winning team members.

EMC² Sponsors

O'Connor and Company - European Lawyers

O'Connor and Company - European Lawyers is one of the few independent law firms specialising in EC and International Trade Law in Brussels. The areas of practice of the firm are competition and trade with an important emphasis on regulatory law and litigation.

O'Connor and Company has supported the EMC² 2005/2006 by providing a monetary contribution.

University of Geneva

The University of Geneva has supported the EMC² 2005/2006 by providing venues for the preliminary pleadings, semi-finals, opening ceremony and conference of the competition, as well as providing catering for the opening ceremony.

EMC² Supporters

APCO Europe

APCO is a global communication consultancy firm with a specialized group focusing on global trade. APCO has supported the EMC² 2005/2006 by developing a media relations plan for the competition, giving ELSA staff training in media relations and providing on-ground assistance in Geneva.

Cambridge University Press

Cambridge University Press is the world's oldest printer and publisher. In addition it is one of the largest academic publishers globally who amongst other thing, publishes a large number of books on WTO Law. Cambridge University Press has supported the EMC² 2005/2006 by donating books as prizes for the participants of the competition.

Thomson

The Thomson Corporation is a leading global provider of integrated information-based solutions to business and professional customers. Thomson has supported the EMC² 2005/2006 by providing ELSA International with marketing material for the competition.

C. ACADEMIC SUPERVISORS FOR THE EMC² 2005/2006

We 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

D. MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANISING COMMITTEE

Last of all, a word of thanks should be given to all those ELSA Members who helped organise the event and turn the EMC² into a point of pride for the whole network:

Ms. Josefin Björklund (Finland)

Mr. Wouter-Jan Brookman (Netherlands)

Ms. Heidi Katrine Sæbø Platou (Norway)

Mr. Mircea Serban Moraru (Romania)

Ms. Katia Giroto (Italy)

Ms. Julianna Koppány (Hungary)

Ms. Paula Calatan (Romania)

Ms. Ieva Žebrytė (Lithuania)

Mr. Torgeir Willumsen (Norway)

Mr. Umut Kurman (Turkey)

Ms. Kristin Steinbring (Germany)

Mr. Pål Jakob Aasen (Norway)

Ms. Merle Eckhard (German)

Mr. Halvor Lekven (Norway)

Ms. Giedrė Tijusaitė (Lithuania)

Ms. Agnė Žebrytė (Lithuania)

Mr. Christopher Carlson (Sweden)

Ms. Tina Eszlari (Germany)