I. Background
The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations. At its heart are the WTO agreements, negotiated and signed by the bulk of the world’s trading nations and ratified in their parliaments. The goal is to help producers of goods and services, exporters, and importers conduct their business. The WTO is a rules-based, member-driven organization — all decisions are made by the member governments, and the rules are the outcome of negotiations among members. Currently there are 164 country members.

The WTO’s procedure for resolving trade quarrels under the Dispute Settlement System is vital for enforcing the rules and therefore for ensuring that trade flows smoothly. A dispute arises when a member government believes another member government is violating an agreement or a commitment that it has made in the WTO. The authors of these agreements are the member governments themselves — the agreements are the outcome of negotiations among members. Thus, the ultimate responsibility for settling disputes also lies with member governments, through the Dispute Settlement Body.

II. Your assignment:
You will be placed into one of 4 groups; each group is assigned to a case filed before the WTO Dispute Settlement System. Within each group, members will take different sides of the dispute, and your group will be responsible for generating a series of position papers which 1. Describe your assigned position on the dispute and 2. Support the position using positive economic analysis. Each group member writes their own paper. Then as a group, you will use the papers to develop a group presentation describing and justifying your position. Each person is required to present a portion of the presentation.

Your 6-8 page position paper should include (Check list to be handed in with your paper!!):

_____ Use the following Headings in your paper

Section 1: Introduction:
1. _____ A clear introduction to the specific trade dispute on which you will be writing your position.
   • Include a clear definition/explanation of the trade policy that is under dispute.
   • You may use the WTO documentation about the dispute as a source, or you may also find substantive information from news/media articles. Be sure to cite your sources!
2. _____ A clear, normative statement of your country’s position on the specific trade issue being disputed in your opening paragraph(s). (note: this is not what you personally believe should be the position on the dispute)
   • Ex: Write a sentence like, “We, the representatives of Brazil believe Ecuador has violated current WTO rules regarding…” Or, “We, the representatives of Ecuador have been conducting trade with Brazil according to current WTO rules regarding…”
   • The source of information about your country’s opinion can come from WTO documentation or news articles – be sure to cite the source of your information!
   • Your paper is written in 1st person, using statements like “We, the Government of Ecuador, believe…”

---

1 More than one group member will be taking the same side on the case. You are encouraged to work together to understand the issue, find background information and data, derive your economic analysis. However, any evidence of copied work constitutes academic dishonesty and zero points will be awarded for the paper.
• Once you have stated your position, the remainder of your paper is dedicated to using positive statements, research, facts, data and importantly economic analysis to convince your reader (the other WTO country members) that your country’s stated position is correct.

Section 2: Background
3. ____ A well written paper will also include a discussion of:
   • More details/background about the trade dispute that goes beyond your basic introduction. Briefly explain both sides of the issue.
   • Put this dispute into context. Why is it so important to your country? Provide some basic intuition and background of why your country’s position on the trade issue is correct.
4. ____ Include a discussion of data that helps quantify the economic impact of the trade dispute for your country. In order to convince the WTO Dispute Settlement Body that they should accept your position, you need to convince the audience that the commodity is important to your country’s economy.
   • ______ You must carefully explain the important points that your tables/charts show in the main text of your paper. Do not assume your reader will do this for you.
   • Ideas for relevant tables/charts of data: What is the volume/value of trade in this product between the two countries? What is the volume/value of trade in this product in relation to all products traded? What is the impact of this product’s trade in terms of increase/loss of jobs? What data can you find that can be used to support your arguments? What data can you use to explain how important this trade issue is to your country?

Section 3: Economic Analysis
5. ____ Provide economic analysis that supports your country’s position. This is the critical part of your paper and should make up the largest section of your written paper! You are required to use international trade theory to support your country’s position. For some policies and some countries this will be quite easy – for others it may be more difficult. Please seek help if you need it!
   • _____ Graphical analysis of the trade policies and models discussed in class and your text. You must hand draw your graph(s) and may not scan or cut and paste it from the internet and/or text. You must completely label your graph(s).
   • _____ Better papers will include more than one graph and a relevant welfare analysis.
   • _____ You must carefully and thoroughly explain your graph within the main text of your paper. Use the graph to explain to your reader how trade policies affect the flow of trade and the resulting: prices, volume of trade and income distribution.
   • _____ You must use the results of your analysis to carefully justify your country’s position that you described in your introduction. Do not assume your reader will do this for you.
   • _____ Better papers will make use of academic literature (Economic Journal Articles) to support your position.

Section 4: Conclusion
6. ____ This is where you tie carefully and thoughtfully tie your position statement and your economic analysis together. Be sure to put in a final, compassionate pitch!

Final Points
7. ____ Your paper must be written in APA format (including all in-text citations and reference list): http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/1/.
8. _____ Before you hand in your paper in: carefully consider whether you have avoided plagiarism. See the Avoiding Plagiarism link on the course website.

Your name: __________________________, Signature: __________________________
The WTO Dispute Settlement Simulation (Dec. 10th and 12th)

- At the WTO in-class simulation, both sides of a dispute will present on the same day.
- While your papers are individually written, you should formulate a group presentation of your country’s position on the dispute.
- After each side is presented, questions/challenges will be taken from the class (Acting as the WTO Dispute Settlement Board).
- The audience is expected to ask questions of clarification and challenge positions.
- Your final grade for this project will directly reflect your active participation in this aspect of the simulation.
- After the debate is complete – the WTO Dispute Settlement Board will settle the dispute by voting for the winner.

Due Dates (please work head):

- Draft of your introduction and background are due Monday November 5th (electronically delivered by 12:15 p.m. or bring a hard copy to class)
- Draft of your technical economic analysis is due Wednesday November 21st (electronically delivered by 12:15 p.m. or bring a hard copy to class. If you graph is drawn by hand, bring it to class)
- Final paper is due Monday December 10th (hard copy only!)
- Simulation will be held Dec. 10th and 12th

III. Position paper topics:

1. **DS511: China — Domestic Support for Agricultural Producers**

Summary of the dispute to date

- The summary below was up-to-date at 13 February 2017

Complaint by the United States

- On 13 September 2016, the United States requested consultations with China regarding certain measures through which China appears to provide domestic support in favour of agricultural producers, in particular, to those producing wheat, India rice, Japonica rice and corn.
- The United States claimed that the measures appear to be inconsistent with:
  - Articles 3.2, 6.3 and 7.2(b) of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- On 29 September 2016, the European Union requested to join the consultations. On 30 September 2016, Australia, Canada and Thailand requested to join the consultations. On 5 October 2016, the Philippines requested to join the consultations. Subsequently, China informed the DSB that it had accepted the requests of Australia, Canada, the European Union and Thailand to join the consultations.
- On 5 December 2016, the United States requested the establishment of a panel. At its meeting on 16 December 2016, the DSB deferred the establishment of a panel.

Panel and Appellate Body proceedings

- At its meeting on 25 January 2017, the DSB established a panel. Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, the European Union, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine and Viet Nam reserved their third-party rights.
- Following agreement of the parties, the panel was composed on 24 June 2017.
- On 22 February 2018, the Chair of the panel informed the DSB that the panel expected to issue its final report to the parties no earlier than the third-quarter of 2018, in accordance with the timetable adopted after consultation with the parties. In its communication, the Chair also informed the DSB
that the report would be available to the public once it was circulated to the Members in all three official languages, and that the date of circulation depended on completion of translation.

Resources:
- WTO web page on the dispute: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds511_e.htm
- Financial Times: https://www.ft.com/content/8f791bfe-79c6-11e6-97ae-647294649b28?mhq5j=e3
- International Center for Trade and Sustainable Development:
- The Observatory of Economic Complexity:
- Worldstopexports.com:

Heart of the Issue:
- In September of 2016, the U.S. filed a complaint against China regarding producer subsidies for various grains including corn, rice and wheat. The U.S. argues that these domestic support payments limit the American farmer the ability to compete for exports into China.
- Keep in mind that the events of this trade dispute happened well before China imposed retaliatory tariffs on $34 billion worth of American agricultural products in July of 2018. Do not confuse these two disputes. See the following news article for a briefing on these tariffs: https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-06-15/china-targets-u-s-farm-imports-with-tariffs-on-soybeans-corn

2. **Export Duties on Certain Raw Materials**: There are two separate disputes (DS508 and DS509), one by the EU and one by the US. The group will choose which of the two to study for this assignment.

**China — Duties and other Measures concerning the Exportation of Certain Raw Materials (DS509)**

Complaint by the European Union
- On 19 July 2016, the European Union requested consultations with China regarding China’s duties and other alleged restrictions on the export of various forms of antimony, chromium, cobalt, copper, graphite, indium, lead, magnesia, talc, tantalum and tin.
• The European Union claims that the measures appear to be inconsistent with:
  • Paragraphs 2(A)(2), 5.1, 5.2 and 11.3 of Part I of China's Accession Protocol, as well as paragraph 1.2 of the Accession Protocol (to the extent that it incorporates paragraphs 83, 84, 162 and 165 of the Report of the Working Party on the Accession of China); and Articles X:3(a) and XI:1 of the GATT 1994.
  • The European Union also considers that the measures also appear to nullify or impair the benefits accruing to the European Union directly or indirectly under the cited agreements.
  • On 25 July 2016, Mexico and the European Union requested to join the consultations.
  • On 26 July 2016, Canada requested to join the consultations. On 27 July 2016, the United States requested to join the consultations. On 29 July 2016, Mexico requested to join the consultations. Subsequently, China informed the DSB that it had accepted the requests of Canada, Mexico and the United States to join the consultations.
  • On 26 October 2016, the European Union requested the establishment of a panel. At its meeting on 8 November 2016, the DSB deferred the establishment of a panel.

Panel and Appellate Body proceedings
• At its meeting on 23 November 2016, the DSB established a panel. Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea, Mexico, Norway, Oman, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, the United States and Viet Nam reserved their third-party rights.

China — Export Duties on Certain Raw Materials (DS508)
Complaint by the United States
• On 13 July 2016, the United States requested consultations with China regarding China's export duties on various forms of antimony, cobalt, copper, graphite, lead, magnesia, talc, tantalum, and tin.
  • The United States claims that the measures appear to be inconsistent with:
    o Paragraph 11.3 of Part I of China's Accession Protocol.
  • The United States also considers that the measures appear to nullify or impair the benefits accruing to the United States directly or indirectly under China's Accession Protocol.
  • On 19 July 2016, the United States requested supplementary consultations concerning alleged restrictions on the export of various forms of antimony, chromium, indium, magnesia, talc, and tin. The United States claims that the alleged restrictions appear to be inconsistent with Paragraphs 2(A)(2), 5.1, 11.3 of Part I of China's Accession Protocol, as well as paragraph 1.2 of the Accession Protocol (to the extent that it incorporates paragraphs 83, 84, 162 and 165 of the Report of the Working Party on the Accession of China), and Articles X:3(a) and XI:1 of the GATT 1994. The United States also considered that the alleged restrictions appear to nullify or impair the benefits accruing to the United States directly or indirectly under the cited agreements.
  • On 25 July 2016, Mexico and the European Union requested to join the consultations. On 26 July 2016, Canada requested to join the consultations. Subsequently, China informed the DSB that it had accepted the requests of Mexico, Canada and the European Union to join the consultations.
  • On 13 October 2016, the United States requested the establishment of a panel. At its meeting on 26 October 2016, the DSB deferred the establishment of a panel.

Panel and Appellate Body proceedings
• At its meeting on 8 November 2016, the DSB established a panel. Brazil, Canada, the European Union, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea, Mexico, Norway, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Chinese Taipei and Viet Nam reserved their third-party rights.

Heart of the Issue:
• In July of 2016, both the U.S. and E.U. separately filed a complaint against China regarding export taxes on certain raw materials used as inputs for manufacturing in the U.S and E.U.
• Do not confuse this case with DS431, DS432, DS 433 on China’s export taxes of rare earths. The trade policy that China is using is the same, but the goods in question are different.

Resources:
• WTO web page on the dispute: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds508_e.htm
• WTO web page on the dispute: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds509_e.htm
• WTO News: https://www.wto.org/english/news/news16_e/dsb_08nov16_e.htm
• Reuters: https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-china-trade/u-s-challenges-china-raw-material-export-duties-in-trade-enforcement-push-idUSKCN0ZT1LT
• Eurostat (Select EU trade since 1988 by SITC, choose imports, chose partner China, choose SITC 682(copper) 687(tin) 685(lead)): http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/international-trade/data/database
• UN Comtrade Database (easiest to compare US/EU imports from China – Select SITC Rev. 4, Reporters: EU and US, Partners: China, SITC Rev. 4: 682, 687, 685): http://comtrade.un.org/data/
• United States Geological Services Commodity statistics and information (select the individual commodity, select Mineral Commodity Summary for a 2 page summary with info on trends including information on China): https://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/commodity/

3. DS545: United States — Safeguard measure on imports of crystalline silicon photovoltaic products

Complaint by South Korea
• On 14 May 2018, Korea requested consultations with the United States concerning definitive safeguard measures imposed by the United States on imports of certain crystalline silicon photovoltaic products.
• Korea claimed that the measures appear to be inconsistent with:
  o Articles 1, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 7.1, 7.4, 8.1, 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3 of the Agreement on Safeguards; and
  o Article X:3, XIII and XIX:1(a) of the GATT 1994.
• On 24 May 2018, China requested to join the consultations. On 25 May 2018, the European Union, Malaysia, Thailand and the Russian Federation requested to join the consultations. Subsequently, the United States informed the DSB that it had accepted the requests of China, the European Union, Malaysia and Thailand to join the consultations.
• June 25, 2018, United States - Safeguard Measure on Imports of Crystalline Silicon Photovoltaic Products - Acceptance by the United States of the requests to join consultations see: WT/DS545/6 2

Resources
• WTO Web page on the dispute: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds545_e.htm
• WTO news: https://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news18_e/ds539rfc_20feb18_e.htm
4. **Heart of the Issue:**

- **Financial Times:** https://www.ft.com/content/8b7916f0-c9af-11e7-ab18-7a9fb7d6163e
- **Financial Times:** https://www.ft.com/content/1c1927ae-01eb-11e8-9650-9c0ad2d7c5b5
- **NYT:** https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/03/business/energy-environment/solar-industry-tariffs.html
- **USTR:** https://ustr.gov/countries-regions/japan-korea-apec/korea
- **US Energy Information Administration:** https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=34952
- **Solar Energy Industries Association:** https://www.seia.org/solar-industry-research-data
- **The Observatory of Economic Complexity:**
- **United Nations UN Comtrade Database:** https://comtrade.un.org/data/
  - Select: year(s), USA, Rep. South Korea, Imports, Exports, HS commodity code: 85414011, 854140 and 8541

**Data note:** It is a bit of a trick to find trade data on solar panels/cells. The technical name is crystalline silicon photovoltaic products. Under HS codes it is classified under HS8541 DIODES, TRANSISTORS AND SIMILAR SEMIDONDUCTOR DEVICES; PHOTOSENSITIVE SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICES, INCLUDING PHOTOVOLTAIC CELLS WHETHER OR NOT ASSEMBLED IN MODULES OR MADE UP INTO PANELS; LIGHT EMITTING DIODES; MOUNTED PIEZOELECTRIC CRYSTALS.

**Heart of the Issue:**

- In May of 2018, Korea filed a complaint against the United States concerning safeguard measures on certain crystalline silicone photovoltaic products (solar panels). A WTO member may take a “safeguard” action (i.e., impose a tariff) to protect a specific domestic industry from an increase in imports of any product which is causing, or which is threatening to cause, serious injury to the industry. The U.S. argued that the U.S. solar panel industry was threatened by these imports and should be allowed to safeguard the industry by imposing these tariffs. South Korea disagrees with the United States does not believe these tariffs should be imposed.

4. **Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminum Products:** There are several separate disputes (DS544 China, DS547 India, DS548 EU, DS 550 Canada, DS551 Mexico, DS552 Norway, DS554 Russia and DS556 Switzerland). Listed below are the Canada and Mexico cases for examples. The group needs to choose which case to study for this assignment (see Canada case below). To reduce the workload, I also recommend choosing steel or aluminum.

**DS551: United States — Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products**

**Complaint by Mexico** (See also DS544, DS547, DS548, DS550, DS552, DS554 and DS556)
• On 5 June 2018, Mexico requested consultations with the United States concerning certain measures imposed by the United States to allegedly adjust imports of steel and aluminium into the United States.
• Mexico claimed that the measures appear to be inconsistent with:
  • Articles 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 7, 9, 11.1(a), 11.1(b), 12.1, 12.2, 12.3 and 12.5 of the Agreement on Safeguards;
    o Articles I:1, II:1(a), II:1(b), X:3(a), XI:1, XIX:1 and XIX:2 of the GATT 1994; and
    o Article XVI:4 of the WTO Agreement.
• On 8 June 2018, Japan requested to join the consultations. On 13 Jun 2018, China requested to join the consultations. On 14 June 2018, Thailand requested to join the consultations. On 15 June 2018, Canada, the European Union, India, Norway and the Russian Federation requested to join the consultations.
• On 15 June 2018, the United States requested the Chair of the DSB to circulate to Members a communication where it indicated that the United States was willing to enter into consultations with Mexico, without prejudice to the US view that the measures imposed by the United States concern issues of national security not susceptible to review or capable of resolution by WTO dispute settlement and that the consultations provisions in the Agreement on Safeguards are not applicable. In its communication, the United States also referred to Mexico's Decree of 5 June 2018, in which Mexico raised duties on certain imports from the United States.

**DS551: United States — Certain Measures on Steel and Aluminium Products Complaint by Canada** (See also DS544, DS547, DS548, DS551, DS552, DS554 and DS556)

• On 1 June 2018, Canada requested consultations with the United States concerning certain measures imposed by the United States to allegedly adjust imports of steel and aluminium into the United States.
• Canada claimed that the measures appear to be inconsistent with:
  • Articles 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 7, 8.1, 11.1(a), 11.1(b), 12.1, 12.2, 12.3 and 12.5 of the Agreement on Safeguards;
  • Articles I:1, II:1(a), II:1(b), X:3(a), XI:1, XIX:1 and XIX:2 of the GATT 1994; and
  • Article XVI:4 of the WTO Agreement.
• On 8 June 2018, Japan requested to join the consultations. On 13 Jun 2018, China requested to join the consultations. On 14 June 2018, Thailand requested to join the consultations. On 15 June 2018, the European Union, India, Mexico, Norway and the Russian Federation requested to join the consultations.
• On 11 June 2018, the United States requested the Chair of the DSB to circulate to Members a communication where it indicated that the United States was willing to enter into consultations with Canada, without prejudice to the US view that the measures imposed by the United States concern issues of national security not susceptible to review or capable of resolution by WTO dispute settlement and that the consultations provisions in the Agreement on Safeguards are not applicable. In its communication, the United States also referred to Canada's notice of intent to impose countermeasures of 31 May 2018.

Resources:
• WTO web page on the US Canada dispute: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds551_e.htm
• WTO web page on the US Mexico dispute: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds550_e.htm
• Reuters: https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trade-mexico/mexico-to-start-wto-dispute-settlement-over-u-s-tariffs-idUSKCN1J022L
• ICTSD news: https://www.ictsd.org/bridges-news/bridges/news/officials-steel-industry-groups-react-to-us-agency%E2%80%99s-tariff
• U.S. Department of Commerce:  

  o This site has Global Steel Monitor (import and export) reports for many countries.

• Worldstopexports.com:  
  o http://www.worldstopexports.com/top-aluminum-exporters-by-country/

• The Observatory of Economic Complexity:  
  o https://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/profile/hs92/7225/  
  o https://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/visualize/tree_map/hs92/export/show/all/7601/2016/  

• United Nations UN Comtrade Database:  https://comtrade.un.org/data/  
  o Select: year(s), USA, Other country (like Canada or Mexico), Imports, Exports, HS commodity code: 72 (iron and steel) and 76 (Aluminium and articles thereof)

• Data note: There are multiple names for steel and aluminium when looking up trade statistics. Be sure your group is on the same page when reporting steel and aluminum trade data so you are not comparing apples to oranges.

Heart of the Issue:

• Beginning in April of 2018 several countries filed a complaint against the United States concerning tariffs that the United States has imposed on imports of steel and aluminum products. The United States argues that the tariffs are necessary to reduce imports of steel and aluminum that impair the national security of the United States. The US further argues that since issues of national security are a political matter the tariffs are not capable of a resolution under the WTO Dispute Settlement system. Regardless, the United States has agreed to enter into consultations with the countries that have filed a complaint.
V. Research Hints and Additional resources

- **Hint 1:** Read your case early, so you have time to sift through the legal jargon and discuss your case in “plain English”.
- **Hint 2:** Look for more current news articles about your case.
- **Hint 3:** Think carefully (and early) about what model you need to support your case and what data you need to support your case.
- **Hint 4:** Ask for help early!
- **Hint 5:** Read the papers written by your group members early!
- **Hint 6:** As with any resource, read with caution any source that tends to use a lot of normative statements.

Other international organizations and resources

- WTO Dispute Settlement Page
- Overview Videos (1) and (2)
- WTO Organizational Chart
- WTO Member countries
- WTO Definitions
- WTO News
- WTO Statistics Database (trade profiles, tariff profiles, time series selection – by country by year)
- WTO Statistics Gateway Other statistics links provided by the WTO

- United States Trade Representative (USTR), Dispute Settlement Page
- US Census Statistics on Trade
- International Center for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) - Publishes a weekly and monthly newsletter with current WTO negotiations.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
- The World Bank
- World Development Indicators
VI. Evaluation

Paper

1. **Effective use of economic and international trade tools/theory to justify your country’s position.** Did you properly use the theory? Did you get the analysis correct, or did you have some mistakes?
   - Failure to include a graphical analysis
   - Failure to completely label your graph(s)
   - Failure to *thoroughly* describe and explain your graph within the text of your paper – left explanation in an appendix or did not explain at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Sophistication and depth of economic analysis.** Did you make *more sophisticated* use of economic theory and graphical analysis? Is there more substance in the analysis? Did you apply concepts of welfare analysis and/or use more than one graph? Did you make use of any (significant) *academic literature* to support your position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Background** on the trade dispute. Did you make *effective* use of data, tables and charts to place your position paper into context? Did you *carefully explain* the important points that your tables/charts show in the main text of your paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Clarity** of writing and organization of writing. Is your paper well written and well organized? Is there a lot of redundancy?
   - Failure to write a clear introduction and conclusion.
   - Failure to make a clear statement of your country’s position on the trade dispute.
   - Failure to tie your economic analysis to your position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Presentation.** Did you make strong efforts to proofread your paper or did you have grammatical and spelling mistakes?
   - Failure to use APA format for in-text citations and reference list results in zero points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Extra Credit:** Visit the **Center for Writing** to obtain assistance on your writing. To receive extra credit you **must**:
   - Make an appointment and visit the Center for Writing at least one day prior to the paper’s due date.
   - Attach a hard copy of the follow-up email you received after your appointment; verify apt. duration was over 10 minutes.
   - Attach a one paragraph reflection of: 1. What you did at the Center and 2. What you learned at the Center
   - Only attend if you are serious about getting help – don’t waste their time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Required Drafts:** 4 pt deduction for each late draft
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WTO simulation:

1. Quality of group presentation – was it a cohesive effort to present your position on the trade dispute. Did your group support your country’s position using economic theory and/or arguments for protection?

   F  D  C  B  A
   3.5 4.55 5.25 5.95 7

2. Quality of your component of the group presentation. Was your presentation clear and well-articulated? Were you able to effectively respond to questions from the other groups when asked?

   2.5 3.25 3.75 4.25 5

3. Quality of participation in Q&A/Debate/Discussion following the presentation of other groups. Did you engage in the discussion and ask at least one question? Did you ask additional questions?

   4 5.2 6 6.8 8

Total: _____, Grade: _____

Note – even with the extra credit, the maximum total score is 100%