

## Solutions

---

**2.1** Ten participants; eight places.

**2.2** Twelve places, enough for the proposed ten people; confirmed availability until 17:00.

**2.3** Everybody likes the library; it is already booked; there is no need to consider Mei's capacity concern. The first two lack supporting records; the last ignores a relevant constraint.

**2.4** Lin identifies quietness as relevant to study. Mei supplies the capacity mismatch and a feasible alternative. Ask the group, including Dan, whether they agree; no agreement is recorded yet.

**3.1** Award correction B1 and reason B1 per record. Check explicit agreement: no reply is not a confirmed consensus. Retain Lin's experience as one person's evidence: no whole-group preference was collected. Check the exact start and supervisor's booking process: availability and a recommendation are not completed permission/booking.

**3.2** Local analytic rubric,  $8 \times B1$ : acknowledges Lin's quiet-study reason; responds to Mei's ten/eight mismatch; twelve-place classroom option; confirmed 17:00 limit; recommendation/booking distinction; start and booking checks; invites a speaker and checks actual agreement; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: "Lin, I agree that a quiet room would help us study, and your experience is useful. However, Mei's capacity point matters: ten participants cannot fit the library room's eight places. I suggest classroom 204 because it holds twelve and is available until 17:00. That is a proposed recommendation, not a completed booking. We still need to confirm our exact start and the supervisor's booking process. Dan, would you support this option, or is there a concern we have missed? Before recording agreement, we should hear your response and explain why the smaller library room was not selected."