World Intellectual Property Organization

Artificial Intelligence & Intellectual Property Rights

GLOBAL CLASSROOMS DC
SPRING 2024 MODEL UN CONFERENCE

CONTENT TABLE

INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMITTEE: World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations that seeks to "promote the protection of intellectual property" through state cooperation and administer the various international agreements on intellectual property.[1] As a result of this mandate, the work of WIPO started long before the organization was established. First, in 1883, the **Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property** established the first protections for inventors after many refused to attend the International Exhibition of Inventions in Vienna, Austria in 1873 out of fear that their inventions might be stolen.[2] Then, in 1886, the **Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works** established similar protection but for artistic works. Specifically, it lists the specific rights of authors as copyright holders including the right to reproduce, broadcast, and translate.[3] Finally, in 1891, the **Madrid Agreement** established the first international intellectual property filing system that would eventually become the WIPO. In 1893, the administration of the treaties became placed under the jurisdiction of the **United International Bureaux for the Protection of Intellectual Property** (BIRPI) which would then become WIPO in 1970.[4] In 1974, WIPO was incorporated into the United Nations system. It now enforces 26 different treaties (including the Berne Convention and the Paris Convention)and coordinates with other United Nations organizations such as the World Trade Organization, the International Labor Organization, and The International Monetary Fund.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

The term **Artificial intelligence** or "AI" was originally coined in 1956. Since then, AI technology has developed rapidly.[5] From 1960 to 2018, over 1.6 million scientific papers have been published on the subject and 340,000 patents have been issued.[6] However, in recent years, AI development has accelerated significantly with 53% of all patents issued after 2013 which encompasses a 6.5 times increase from 2011-2017.[7] As a result of this rapid development in this emerging technology, AI has posed significant problems for international copyright standards and patent protection.

In this case, artificial intelligence refers to "AI systems …as learning systems; that is, machines that can become better at a task typically performed by humans with limited or no human intervention."[8] The technology currently available does not allow for the development of Artificial Intelligence that can conduct certain activities by the human brain or even surpass it **(superintelligence).** Generally, there are three types of AI patents. First, **AI techniques**, including machine learning, perform tasks typically done by humans. Secondly, **AI functional applications** use techniques to do a function such as speech or computer vision (which means identification technology). Finally, **AI application fields** are the various sectors in which specific AI technology is used.[9]

---

[1] "Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization (as amended on September 28, 1979." https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/283854
[2] WIPO, "A Brief History." https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/history.html
[3] WIPO, "Summary of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (1886)." https://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/berne/summary_berne.html
[4] WIPO, "A Brief History. https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/history.html
[5] WIPO, "WIPO Technology Trends 2019." https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_1055.pdf
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.

The current protections do not explicitly cover certain aspects of such a new technology. **Patent protection and copyright law** give certain rights to creators, so others cannot steal or plagiarize their work. According to the WIPO Charter, the law protects **intellectual property** which includes: literary, artistic, and scientific works; performances and broadcasts; inventions; scientific discoveries; industrial designs; and trademarks.[10]

No established international standards regulate the relationship between AI and intellectual property protection. Firstly, there is no internationally recognized definition for Artificial intelligence or a measure to distinguish between works purely generated by AI and those with a certain degree of human intervention. These issues have created complications for the authorship of works generated by Artificial Intelligence and whether patent protections can extend to inventions created by Artificial Intelligence. Secondly, since AI uses large amounts of data, questions have emerged about whether that use of data can be considered an infringement of copyright and how to regulate such data use. Finally, creating an international framework to regulate AI and intellectual property is difficult because of the concerns that it protects copyright holders but still needs to be inclusive for those further behind in AI development.

DEFINING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE:

One of the main debates surrounding artificial intelligence involves how to define it for regulation. Currently, there is no internationally recognized definition of Artificial Intelligence, but states and supranational bodies take two main approaches. Many states use "human-based" language while others use more technical language when defining AI.

The United States Department of State defines AI as "the ability of machines to perform tasks that normally require human intelligence." [11] A human-based approach, this definition has the advantage of considering the rapid advance of technological development.[12] The research community uses similarly vague definitions to maintain a broad and diverse body of work.[13] If states decide to take this more ambiguous approach, regulators need to understand how AI functions in social contexts, not merely what it does or how it technically functions.[14]

Nevertheless, there are certain complexities concerning using a broad definition for IP protection. Broad definitions of AI make it difficult to define the specific type and function of the artificial intelligence that one is seeking to copyright.[15] Furthermore, what is considered "human intelligence" is complex and not agreed upon.[16]
In the EU Policy draft, the definition of AI "explicitly includes systems that generate 'content,' in addition to 'predictions, recommendations, or decisions.'" A definition using more technical language, this type of more legally exact definition helps foster an environment where creators feel safe to innovate with laws that are more targeted

---

[10] "Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization (as amended on September 28, 1979." https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/283854
[11] O'Shaughnessy, "One of the Biggest Problems in Regulating AI Is Agreeing on a Definition."
https://carnegieendowment.org/2022/10/06/one-of-biggest-problems-in-regulating-ai-is-agreeing-on-definition-pub-88100
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.
[15] "WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence Third Session," November 4th 2020.
https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20_inf_5.pdf
[16] Ibid.

and effective at protecting their IP.[17] Regardless, definitions like these can become outdated quickly with the rapidly advancing field. The OECD definition, previously used by the EU, only included "predictions, recommendations, or decisions," neglecting content generation entirely.[18] With the development of machine learning which has allowed for the generation of art and artificial media, this older definition arguably ignores an extremely important part of the current debates surrounding artificial intelligence and intellectual property. Moreover, these techniques, like machine learning, have no agreed-upon definition by themself which makes it difficult to incorporate them into a definition of AI writ large.[19]

Besides these three approaches, The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has released a document that does not include a specific definition of AI. Instead, this document focuses on AI's impacts, allowing it to be more adaptable to future changes. This approach means that policymakers must make legislation that targets more specific issues and that outlines the goals of said regulations.[20]

AUTHORSHIP OF WORKS GENERATED BY AI:

With machine learning technology, artificial intelligence now can generate anything from artistic works to inventions. In courts of law around the world, there is a large discrepancy between whether these works can be copyrighted and/or to whom the copyright can be attributed.

Some jurisdictions do not allow works generated by AI to be protected under intellectual property law without sufficient human contribution. For example, The United States falls into this category because patent law requires a significant degree of involvement from a human author.[21] Proponents of this type of law argue that providing copyright protections to AI-generated work, could "raise the bar" for what is considered originality and change what is considered a good artist which could make it more difficult for individuals to attain copyrights.[22] Regardless, this kind of jurisdiction brings up the question of the line between **AI-Generated** and **AI-Assisted** works. There is no international consensus on what is considered AI-Generated versus AI-Assisted. One United States court distinguished between a work generated by AI that reproduces the original ideas of the author (AI-Assisted) and one that generates work independently of human originality (AI-Generated).[23] A Chinese court did the same, ruling that a work with a sufficient amount of human contribution is AI-assisted.[24] Nevertheless, many argue that this binary is insufficient, and courts should instead focus more on the degree of human intervention.[25] For example, many argue for a certain threshold of human intervention to receive copyright while others argue for additional categories like "AI-Supported" to fill in these gaps.[26]

[17]O'Shaughnessy, "One of the Biggest Problems in Regulating AI Is Agreeing on a Definition."
https://carnegieendowment.org/2022/10/06/one-of-biggest-problems-in-regulating-ai-is-agreeing-on-definition-pub-88100
[18] Ibid.
[19] "WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence Third Session," November 4th 2020.
https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20_inf_5.pdf
[20]O'Shaughnessy, "One of the Biggest Problems in Regulating AI Is Agreeing on a Definition."
https://carnegieendowment.org/2022/10/06/one-of-biggest-problems-in-regulating-ai-is-agreeing-on-definition-pub-88100
[21] Walsh, "How to Think About AI." https://hls.harvard.edu/today/how-to-think-about-ai/
[22] Khoury, "AI System as an Inventor: "DABUS" Case." https://www.hg.org/legal-articles/ai-system-as-an-inventor-dabus-case-61426
[23] NYU Library, Copyright, Authorship, and Governance. https://guides.nyu.edu/data/ai-governance
[24] Ibid.
[25] "WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence Third Session," November 4th 2020.
https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20_inf_5.pdf

[26] Ibid.

Other jurisdictions allow AI-Generated work to be copyrighted to the author of the AI's code. Courts in jurisdictions like the UK, the European Patent Office (EPO), and Germany have ruled in accordance with this interpretation of their laws.[27] Proponents of this view argue that without copyright, works generated by AI could be used freely despite the labor and monetary cost involved in creating the AI used to generate said work.[28] Therefore, by attributing the copyright to the author of the AI's code, courts can recognize the originality and effort needed to create an AI that generates artistic or scientific work and AI as a "legitimate tool of artistic expression." [29]

One jurisdiction has made a ruling different from any others. A South African court ruled that two inventions entirely created by artificial intelligence can be patented under the authorship of artificial intelligence itself. Dr. Stephen Thaler invented an artificial intelligence called **"DABUS"** which, with only machine learning and no human intervention, invented a "beverage container based on fractal geometry" and a "flickering light device to attract attention during search and rescue operations."[30] Although it could be challenged in the future because the South African system only checks for basic requirements and can be revoked later, South Africa allowed these inventions to be attributed to the artificial intelligence, not Dr. Thaler.[31] In other jurisdictions, courts have ruled similarly to how one might expect: the EPO ruled that Dr. Thaler needed to refile the application under his name and the United States rejected the application entirely.[32] Opponents of this system argue that with the complex methods used to generate AI inventions, it may be difficult to "disclose accurately the invention" which means that "an AI invention may never become part of the public domain" even though the purpose of copyright law is to temporarily allow inventors to make profit from an invention in exchange for public disclosure of how it works for eventual use in the **public domain**.[33] Moreover, IP protections are intended to encourage innovation, but AI does not need an incentive to innovate.[34] Proponents argue that copyrights owned by corporations already encourage inventors employed by said companies, so AI inventions should be no different.[35] Others offer a third alternative where patents no longer need to require an author at all or could name a human author but "require an explanation of any AI involvement."[36]

DATA USED TO TRAIN AI:

Another unresolved issue for artificial intelligence and intellectual property protection is whether the use of data to train AI that generates artistic work is a violation of copyright protection. AI requires mountains of data to train, and sometimes, the data used to teach AI may be copyrighted in its own right. In short, there is a question of whether works produced by an AI that was trained with protected data is infringing on creators' protections.[37]

[27] Egbuonu, "The latest news on the DABUS patent case." https://www.ipstars.com/NewsAndAnalysis/The-latest-news-on-the-DABUS-patent-case/Index/7366; NYU Library, Copyright, Authorship, and Governance.

[28] Guadamuz, "Artificial Intelligence and Copyright." https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2017/05/article_0003.html

[29] Guadamuz, "Artificial Intelligence and Copyright." https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2017/05/article_0003.html; Walsh, "How to Think About AI." https://hls.harvard.edu/today/how-to-think-about-ai/

[30] Khoury, "AI System as an Inventor: "DABUS" Case." https://www.hg.org/legal-articles/ai-system-as-an-inventor-dabus-case-61426

[31] Egbuonu, "The latest news on the DABUS patent case." https://www.ipstars.com/NewsAndAnalysis/The-latest-news-on-the-DABUS-patent-case/Index/7366

[32] Ibid.

[33] "WIPO Conversation and Frontier Technologies Sixth Session," September 21st, 2022. https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_conv_ge_2_22/wipo_ip_conv_ge_2_22_3.pdf

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Gleave and Powell, "AI and art: how recent court cases are stretching copyright principles." https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/03/28/ai-and-art-how-recent-court-cases-are-stretching-copyright-principles

Some argue that this would not be a violation of copyright protection. The Berne Convention outlines three criteria for exceptions to the right of reproduction: '(i) only in certain special cases; (ii) only if there is no conflict with the normal exploitation of works; and (iii) only if there is no unreasonable prejudice to the legitimate interests of the author. The United States maintains the doctrine of **fair use** which allows the use of copyrighted work for "transformative" purposes such as commentary, criticism, or parody.[38] With these exceptions in mind, AI-generated works using copyrighted data may be protected as long as they do not provide an "alternative version of the copyrighted … work to the public, but only snippets of it."[39] Moreover, some argue that increasing copyright protections could discourage innovation by leading researchers to conceal their data, thus reducing transparency and prompting them to take fewer risks due to fears of copyright infringement.[40] Others simply say that using AI to train data is just like artists using other art to learn, and as long as the output is not "substantially similar" to the original, it is not a violation of copyright.[41]

Still, others emphasize the need to protect the creators whose data and works are used to train AI. In recent years, there has been a rise in cases related to possible infringement in the public sphere. In one case, Getty Images sued **Stability AI** for copyright infringement with damages of over two trillion dollars in both the United Kingdom and the United States. Getty argues that Stability AI simply copied Getty images to train their AI without any license.[42] Moreover, Getty argued that Stability AI went as far as removing watermarks and altering metadata to either 'conceal' or 'facilitate' the infringement, pointing out that specific images generated by Stable Diffusion (Stability's AI) retained modified versions of the original watermarks.[43] Whether this case falls under fair use will most likely be determined based on whether these images are substantially copying the original images or taking actual parts of them.[44] In another case, comedian Sarah Silverman sued **Open AI**, the creators of **Chat GPT**, for using portions of her book for training purposes.[45] She argues that Chat GPT was trained using unauthorized versions of her book, and now reproduces texts "derivative" of the original.[46]

PROTECTING INNOVATION AND DEVELOPING NATIONS:
An important consideration of international AI protection is the discrepancy between developed and less developed countries when it comes to AI development. Out of the top 20 companies to apply for AI patents, twelve are Japanese, the two largest are from the United States, two are from the Republic of Korea, and two are from Germany.[47] Out of the top 500 research institutions to apply for patents over one-hundred come from China, twenty come from the United States, and others come from the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, Europe, and Japan. Thus, there is a large technology gap between a select few countries and the rest of the world.[48]

---

[38] Stim, "What is Fair Use?" https://fairuse.stanford.edu/overview/fair-use/what-is-fair-use/
[39] "WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence Third Session," November 4th 2020.
https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20_inf_5.pdf
[40] Ibid.
[41] Walsh, "How to Think About AI." https://hls.harvard.edu/today/how-to-think-about-ai/
[42] Gleave and Powell, "AI and art: how recent court cases are stretching copyright principles."
https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/03/28/ai-and-art-how-recent-court-cases-are-stretching-copyright-principles
[43] Loving, "Current Copyright Cases Part 1." https://copyrightalliance.org/current-ai-copyright-cases-part-1/
[44] Gleave and Powell, "AI and art: how recent court cases are stretching copyright principles."
https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/03/28/ai-and-art-how-recent-court-cases-are-stretching-copyright-principles
[45] Vera, "Sarah Silverman Sues Maker Of ChatGPT For Copyright Infringement."
https://www.huffpost.com/entry/sarah-silverman-copyright-suit-chatgpt_n_64ab2ce5e4b02fb0e6f94a1b
[46] Ibid.
[47] WIPO, "WIPO Technology Trends 2019." https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_1055.pdf
[48] "WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence Third Session," November 4th 2020.
https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20_inf_5.pdf

Less developed countries do not have the expensive infrastructure, the knowledge, or data holding capacity to maintain AI systems.[49] Concerning Intellectual property specifically, many less developed countries do not have updated copyright laws for evolving technology or the manpower to even enforce said laws.[50] As a result of these issues, less developed countries need to cooperate with more developed countries if they want to increase their capacity. Many argue that strict intellectual property protection on data or AI technology will hinder cooperation because less developed countries need access to databases to train their AI and information on how to develop AI in the first place.[51] Though IP policy is important for mitigating this gap between developed and less developed nations while balancing protections for copyright holders, it is not the only consideration. This issue "intersects" with "education, labor, and human resources," so a variety of fields are needed to build capacity in less developed countries to catch up on AI development.[52]

PREVIOUS ACTION BY UN & UN Member States:

There has been little United Nations action on this issue due to the recent rapid changes. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) issues recommendations regarding the ethics of artificial intelligence. With 193 signatories, the document primarily focuses on protecting individual rights regarding surveillance and personal data while also addressing other human rights concerns, diversity, and limiting potential harm from AI.[53] There is a single paragraph that advises states to research the intersection between AI and IP and to "assess how AI technologies are affecting the rights or interests of IP owners…"[54] Nevertheless, no international resolution or consensus addresses this intersection, and this document primarily provides recommendations to member states. The WIPO does host sessions called The WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence that bring together stakeholders from government officials to law experts, to AI researchers to other members of the private and public sectors who discuss emerging issues in the field of artificial intelligence.[55]

Member states, in their capacity, are engaging with artificial intelligence more so than the United Nations at large. The United Arab Emirates (UAE) is at the forefront of this development, even establishing its own Ministry of Artificial Intelligence.[56] The UAE hopes to integrate artificial intelligence into services and infrastructure. [57] Furthermore, the UAE is even starting to use artificial intelligence to administrate intellectual property protection. For example, AI can determine if a work is original enough for patent protection.[58] Minister Al Olama, the Minister of State for Artificial Intelligence of the UAE, at the third session of The WIPO Conversation on Intellectual

[49] Chatterjee and Dethlefs, "Developing Countries are being left behind in the AI Race."
https://theconversation.com/developing-countries-are-being-left-behind-in-the-ai-race-and-thats-a-problem-for-all-of-us-180218; "WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence Third Session," November 4th 2020. https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20_inf_5.pdf
[50] "WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence Third Session," November 4th 2020.
https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20_inf_5.pdf
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid.
[53] UN News, "193 countries adopt first-ever global agreement on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/11/1106612; "Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence," 26.
https://unesdoc.unesco.org/in/documentViewer.xhtml?v=2.1.196&id=p::usmarcdef_0000381137&file=/in/rest/annotationSVC/DownloadWatermarkedAttachment/attach_import_e86c4b5d-5af9-4e15-be60-82f1a09956fd%3F_%3D381137eng.pdf&locale=en&multi=true&ark=/ark:/48223/pf0000381137/PDF/381137eng.pdf#1517_21_EN_SHS_int.indd%3A.8934%3A8
[54] Ibid.
[55] "The WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence." https://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/artificial_intelligence/conversation.html
[56] "UAE to Use AI to tackle Intellectual Property Cases: A Bold Step for a Better Future. https://jcatrademarkuae.com/uae-use-ai-tackle-intellectual-property-cases/
[57] Ibid.
[58] "WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence Third Session," November 4th 2020.
https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_3_ge_20_inf_5.pdf

Property and Artificial Intelligence, mentioned that the "fundamental needs" for the relationship between IP and AI are: the protection of AI algorithms as to not affect current software protection, the protection of author's rights to AI algorithms, and the use of AI in administration of IP protection and registration.[59]

GLOBAL CLASSROOMS DC POSITION PAPER OVERVIEW AND REQUIREMENTS

What is a Position Paper?
A position paper is a short document that outlines a country's opinion on an issue. The paper includes a short summary of what the issue or problem is, explains why the country is interested in the issue, and communicates the country's stance on what should be done to address the issue. A position paper is written as if you were the actual representative of the country stating its position. Your personal opinions on the issue should not be included. A position paper is not a summary of your country's GDP, government, economy, languages, etc. unless directly relevant to the issue. Only one position paper is written per country, per grade school committee; if there are 2 or 3 delegates representing the same country on a committee, they should write the paper together.

Why write a Position Paper?
Writing a position paper will help you organize why an issue matters to your country and what your country wants done on the issue. The first thing you will likely do in committee is present an opening speech about your country's position. You should be able to pull portions of a well written position paper into an introductory speech on your country's perspective. Also, your delegation is not eligible to win best / outstanding delegation without the submission of a position paper. There are separate awards given for best position paper.

How to Write a Position Paper
(1) Research the Issue. The questions you want to answer are:
  ○ How does this issue affect your country?
  ○ How does this issue affect your country's neighbors or allies?
  ○ Is this a global problem that impacts everyone?
  ○ What would your country like to see done on this issue?
  ○ Are there countries or groups of people who will be particularly sensitive to addressing this issue?
  ○ Are there any conventions or resolutions on the topics that your country has signed or ratified?
  ○ What are UN actions on the issue? Has your country supported or opposed these actions?
  ○ Keep in Mind: What a country says, and what it actually believes should be done may be different. Also, some countries may believe that no action should be taken on an issue. They may disagree with how others feel or may not want international involvement. It is okay if your position is that the international community should do nothing, but you will need to explain why.
(2) Brainstorm Specific Actions. Come up with 3-4 specific things that can be done to reach the outcome your country desires. For example: "The United States believes we should send a peacekeeping mission to monitor human rights abuses in Syria and encourage talks between both sides." You will present these ideas in committee as possible solutions to the problem and attempt to pass a resolution which includes these actions.
(3) Outline Your Paper. Make an outline of what points you want to cover in your paper and the order in which you would like to address them. Remember a good paper should briefly explain the problem, explain why your country cares about the issue, and inform others what your country should like to see done. If you know other countries favor a solution that you will disagree with, make sure to include why your country disagrees.

---

[59] Ibid.

(4) Write your Paper. Position papers should be no more than one page long and be written from the perspective of the country you are representing. Rather than being a report on the topic, a position paper should explain what your country wants to see done to address the issue. Start by giving a brief summary of the issue and how it impacts your country. Then explain the specific actions you would like to see taken. Close by summarizing your country's overall position. Proper grammar and spelling are a must.

Award Criteria and Eligibility

- Each Committee is giving out the following awards – Honorable Mention, Outstanding Position Paper, and Best Position Paper.
- The ideal position paper will have a clearly defined and summarized topic with your country's position clearly outlined. Points are also awarded for organization, style and correct grammar.
- GCDC Staff will be fact checking position papers, so be sure to include the most up to date information and a bibliography (if using in text citations, a Works Cited page MUST be included)
  - o   Proper source citation: if an idea or quote came from another source, you must provide a footnote / citation.
- Papers will be disqualified if the conference staff has discovered that students did not write their own papers or that content has been plagiarized.
- Make sure your position paper must have the required header below! Do not create any additional title pages - points will be deducted for improper format.
- Formatting Requirements: 500 words minimum, 1,500 words maximum. Times New Roman font, 12-point size
- **POSITION PAPERS MUST BE SENT IN AS A PDF ATTACHMENT TO gcdc@unanca.org by APRIL 22nd, 2024 AT 11:59 PM EST (extensions may be granted on a case by case basis, and must be requested beforehand).**

REQUIRED POSITION PAPER HEADER

Committee:
Country:
Topic
School:
Delegate Name(s