



INTLAW INVESTMENT ARBITRATION MOOT

Inaugural Edition • London

COMPETITION RULES

DIRECTORS

M. Belén Paoletta

Ivan Levy

Last updated: 20 August 2026

INTLAW INVESTMENT ARBITRATION MOOT

INAUGURAL EDITION RULES

Last revised: 20 August 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND GOALS	3
A. Origins	3
B. Purpose	3
II. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION.....	3
A. The IntLaw Moot Directorate.....	3
B. Venue.....	4
C. Language	4
D. Communications.....	4
D. IntLaw Moot Portal.....	5
III. PARTICIPATION AND ELIGIBILITY	8
A. Eligibility of Participants.....	8
B. Team Composition	8
C. Professional Restrictions.....	8
IV. REGISTRATION AND FEES	9
A. Registration Timeline	9
B. Registration and Participation.....	9
C. Tiered Fee Structure.....	10
D. Payment Terms.....	10
V. STRUCTURE	11
A. Structure of the IntLaw Moot	11
B. Procedural Development	11
VI. THE PROBLEM.....	11
A. Subject Matter	11
B. Factual Parameters	11
C. Distribution	12
D. Clarifications.....	12
E. The Procedural Development Stage	12
F. Copyright	13

VII. WRITTEN MEMORANDA.....	13
A. Memoranda.....	13
B. Formatting and Structure	14
C. Plagiarism	15
D. Submission of Memoranda.....	15
E. Scoring of Memoranda.....	15
F. Copyrights.....	16
VIII. ORAL ROUNDS	16
A. Venue.....	16
B. General Rounds	16
C. Pleading Format	16
D. Arguments and Integration of the Procedural Development Stage	17
E. Scoring and Evaluation.....	17
F. Significant Difference	18
G. Guidance for Arbitrators.....	18
H. Elimination Rounds	19
IX. CONDUCT AND INTEGRITY	20
A. Academic Integrity.....	20
B. Use of Artificial Intelligence	20
C. Restriction Prior to Oral Rounds.....	21
D. Scouting	22
E. Digital Devices	22
X. AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS.....	22
A. Team Awards	22
B. Individual Awards.....	23
C. Special Awards.....	23
D. Certificates of Participation	23
E. Letters of Recognition for Coaches.....	24
XI. FINAL PROVISIONS	24
A. Copyright and Data Privacy	24
B. Finality of Decisions	24
C. Interpretation of Rules	24

I. INTRODUCTION AND GOALS

A. Origins

The IntLaw Investment Arbitration Moot, also referred to as the ‘IntLaw Moot’ was established through the IntLaw Foundation by María Belén Paoletta and Ivan Levy, Partners at IntLaw LLP, as a direct expression of their longstanding commitment to legal education and to the development of future practitioners in public international law and international arbitration.

It was created in recognition of the fact that rigorous training opportunities in these fields remain unevenly geographically distributed, despite their growing relevance in legal practice and international dispute resolution.

B. Purpose

The IntLaw Moot was conceived with the purpose of making the study and practice of public international law and international arbitration more genuinely accessible, without compromising intellectual depth or professional standards. It seeks to open meaningful pathways for students who are drawn to public international law as the substantive framework governing the dispute, as well as for those interested in arbitration as the procedural mechanism through which such dispute is resolved.

In this respect, the IntLaw Moot rests on a simple but important premise: these fields should not remain effectively limited to a narrow set of institutions, jurisdictions, or professional circles. They should be made available, in a serious and demanding way, to students across diverse regions and backgrounds who are prepared to engage with them at a high level. The IntLaw Moot therefore aims not only to simulate dispute resolution, but also to broaden access to the knowledge and advocacy skills that encompass contemporary international legal practice.

At its core, the IntLaw Moot reflects the view that legal excellence and accessibility are not competing values. On the contrary, widening access to high-quality training strengthens the future of the profession by bringing new talent, broader perspectives, and deeper global participation into the development of public international law and international arbitration.

II. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. The IntLaw Moot Directorate

1. The IntLaw Moot is conducted under the authority of the IntLaw Moot Directorate (the “Directorate”), which is the body entrusted with the overall administration and supervision of the competition.

2. The IntLaw Moot Directors stand at the head of the Directorate and hold ultimate authority and responsibility for all matters relating to the competition, including its structure, administration, and overall conduct.
3. The Directorate may interpret these Rules, resolve any matter arising out of or in connection with the competition, and adopt such measures as may be necessary for its proper, fair, and efficient conduct.
4. The Directorate may establish or designate boards, panels, committees, advisors, arbitrators, officers, ambassadors and members of the administrative team as it considers necessary for the discharge of its functions.
5. In exercising its functions under these Rules, the Directorate acts in good faith and in a manner consistent with the educational mission, procedural fairness, and orderly administration of the IntLaw Moot.

B. Venue

The oral rounds will be held annually in London, United Kingdom.

The Directorate may designate different venues within London, including arbitral institutions, universities, law firm offices, or other suitable locations, where necessary for the efficient conduct of the oral rounds.

The official schedule and designated venues shall be communicated by the Directorate in advance. All references to time in these Rules are to London time, unless expressly stated otherwise.

C. Language

The IntLaw Moot is conducted entirely in English. Written submissions, communications, official competition materials and oral rounds shall be submitted and conducted in English unless the Directors expressly authorize otherwise.

D. Communications

1. All communications regarding the IntLaw Moot must be directed to the Directorate via e-mail (directorate@intlawnmoot.org) or, where appropriate, through the IntLaw Moot Portal.
2. No Team may seek direct communication with any Editorial Board Member or Case Panel Member.
3. Each team shall designate one individual as its “Contact Person,” who shall be responsible for all communications with the Directorate.

4. It is the Contact Person's responsibility to distribute all relevant material to the team. Teams are responsible for ensuring that the Contact Person's information contained in the team account is kept up to date.
5. All official competition-related communications from teams should clearly identify the team's registered institution.
6. Communications made outside the designated channels, or in breach of this rule, may be disregarded.

D. IntLaw Moot Portal

The IntLaw Moot Portal is the dedicated platform through which students, coaches, arbitrators and Ambassadors may manage most of their schedules, submissions, and interactions connected with the IntLaw Moot. Access to the IntLaw Moot Portal is granted by invitation once a team or arbitrator has completed the registration process.

Students and Coaches

Students and coaches have the same functional access and may use it to:

Competition Information

- access and download the Rules of the IntLaw Moot;
- consult a summary of the Rules;
- view news and announcements published by the Directorate; and
- consult the contact details of their university's designated Contact Person.

Written Phase

- submit the Memorandum for Claimant and the Memorandum for Respondent on behalf of their university;
- view and download the Memorandum for Claimant assigned to their university for the preparation of its Memorandum for Respondent;
- submit the requests for clarification on behalf of their university;

Oral Phase

- consult the hearings assigned to their university, together with each hearing's date, time, participating universities, party allocation, venue address, and additional venue details;

- indicate whether their university is willing to be considered as a Sparring Team in the event of a last-minute absence by another team;
- submit ratings for the panel arbitrators who arbitrated their university;
- submit, on behalf of the team, a first-choice and second-choice nomination from among the panel arbitrators who arbitrated the team, once all four of the team's oral hearings have taken place.

Social Agenda

- participate in the IntLaw Moot Collectors Album, including collecting official cards and downloading the completed album once available; and
- access and participate in any other social agenda activities made available by the Directorate through the IntLaw Moot Portal.

Certificates and Awards

- view certificates and awards issued to them by the Directorate; and
- open and download the relevant certificate or award files.

Arbitrators

Arbitrators may use the IntLaw Moot Portal to:

Competition Information

- access and download the Rules of the IntLaw Moot;
- consult a summary of the main provisions of the Rules; and
- view news and announcements published by the Directorate.

Conflicts of Interest

- review the participating universities;
- declare conflicts of interest with individual universities for memorial scoring assignments and the oral rounds;
- review conflicts automatically flagged by the IntLaw Moot Portal where the arbitrator is also registered as a coach of a participating university.

Oral-Round Availability

- review the hearing dates and predefined hearing slots established by the Directorate;
- mark the hearing slots during which they are available; and
- update their availability before assignments are made.

Oral-Hearing Assignments

- review hearings to which they have been assigned as a panel arbitrator or reserve arbitrator;
- view the participating universities, date, time, venue address, room details, and any ex parte or Sparring Team designation;
- confirm or decline attendance when assigned as a reserve arbitrator;
- amend a previously submitted reserve-attendance response;
- check in shortly before an assigned hearing;
- notify the Directorate if they become unable to sit in an assigned hearing and provide the reason and any relevant additional information; and
- review the status of completed and upcoming assignments.

Oral-Hearing Scoring

Panel arbitrators may:

- access the scoring form for an assigned hearing;
- submit an individual score between 50 and 100 for each pleading student; and
- submit scores for only the participating university where the other side is a Sparring Team or is absent from an ex parte hearing.

Written Memorial Assignments

- specify how many Claimant and Respondent memorials they are willing to score;
- review memorials assigned to them by the Directorate;
- view and download each assigned memorial;
- view the applicable scoring deadline;
- download the Directorate's rationale template;

- submit a score between 50 and 100 for each assigned memorial; and
- upload the mandatory accompanying rationale in PDF or Word format.

Certificates and Awards

- view certificates and awards issued to them by the Directorate; and
- open and download the relevant certificate or award files.

III. PARTICIPATION AND ELIGIBILITY

A. Eligibility of Participants

Participants must be enrolled in a law degree program (e.g., LLB, JD, LLM, PhD, diploma in professional practice or equivalent).

The eligibility requirement is satisfied if all team members are enrolled in such a program at the time of the team's registration. Any subsequent change in a participant's academic or enrolment status shall not affect eligibility.

B. Team Composition

1. Each participating law school or higher educational institution may enter only one team.
2. Each team, excluding coaches, assistants, and other non-student support personnel, shall consist of no fewer than two (2) and no more than eight (8) students, all of whom may act as speakers in the oral rounds.
3. The official list of team members must be completed and finalized by the date of submission of the Memorandum for Claimant.
4. Any change to the composition of a team after the deadline for submission of the Memorandum for Claimant requires the prior approval of the Directorate and may be made only until the deadline for submission of the Memorandum for Respondent.
5. Teams composed of students from different institutions may be permitted only with the prior approval of the Directors. Any such team must therefore consult the Directors before registering.

C. Professional Restrictions

1. No student who is licensed to practice law at the time of registration is eligible to participate except with express written permission of the Directors.

2. The Directors may request any additional information reasonably necessary to determine eligibility, and their determination shall be final.

IV. REGISTRATION AND FEES

A. Registration Timeline

1. Registration for the IntLaw Moot shall open on 1 June 2026 and close on 9 November 2026.
2. Teams must complete the registration process within this period through the IntLaw Moot's website (www.intlawmoot.org).
3. The Directorate reserves the right to extend registration deadlines or accept late registrations in exceptional circumstances.

B. Registration and Participation

1. Registration is a multi-step process consisting of: (a) submission of the "[Register a Team](#)" form by the Contact Person; (b) submission of the "[Team Composition](#)" form once all participating students and coaches have been selected; and (c) payment of the applicable registration fee.
2. A team's registration shall be considered complete only once both forms have been submitted, all requirements under these Rules have been satisfied, and payment of the applicable registration fee has been confirmed by the Directorate.
3. Upon completion of registration, the team shall be officially confirmed as a participating team in the competition, and all registered students and coaches shall receive an invitation to access the IntLaw Moot Portal.
4. Participation in the IntLaw Moot is open to all eligible teams, and no cap is placed on the number of registered teams.
5. All teams whose registration has been completed and confirmed in accordance with these Rules shall be entitled to participate directly in the oral rounds in London. The IntLaw Moot does not conduct any qualifying oral rounds for participation in London.
6. Pre-moots, friendly rounds, or other practice hearings may be organized by third-party institutions. Such activities are independent of the IntLaw Moot and shall under no circumstances constitute qualifying rounds or otherwise affect a team's eligibility to participate in the oral rounds.

7. The Directors reserve the right to refuse or cancel the registration of any team in exceptional circumstances, including serious prior violations of competition rules, unjustified withdrawal in a prior edition, or persistent failure to comply with administrative requirements.

C. Tiered Fee Structure

1. In furtherance of its commitment to meaningful global participation and accessibility, the IntLaw Moot adopts a differentiated registration fee structure based on the economic classification of participating teams' jurisdictions.
2. Registration fees are determined in accordance with the [World Bank Income Classification by Country](#). For the Inaugural Edition, the fees are set as follows:
 - (a) High-income and upper-middle-income countries: 700 GBP;
 - (b) Lower-middle-income, low-income and unclassified countries: 450 GBP.

D. Payment Terms

1. The registration fee must be paid by 9 November 2026 for the registration to be considered complete.
2. Payment details will be provided to each participating institution once it has completed the registration process. Teams must ensure that the name of the participating institution is clearly indicated in the payment reference to facilitate proper identification and allocation of the payment.
3. All transfer fees and bank charges shall be borne by the paying team. Any shortfall in the amount received shall remain due.
4. A team that withdraws before the deadline for submission of the Memorandum for Claimant may receive, at the discretion of the Directorate, a full refund, less bank charges and any related administrative expenses.
5. A team that withdraws before the deadline for submission of the Memorandum for Respondent may receive, at the discretion of the Directorate, a refund of fifty per cent of the registration fee, less bank charges and any related administrative expenses.
6. A team that withdraws after submission of the Memorandum for Respondent will ordinarily not be entitled to any refund.
7. Failure to pay the registration fee in full by the applicable deadline may result in suspension or cancellation of the team's participation.

V. STRUCTURE

A. Structure of the IntLaw Moot

The IntLaw Moot follows a two-phase structure consisting of: (a) a written phase, involving the submission of a Memorandum for Claimant and a Memorandum for Respondent; and (b) an oral phase, consisting of in-person hearings in London. Participation in both phases is required of all registered teams.

B. Procedural Development

As a distinctive component of the oral phase, a Procedural Development will be introduced ten (10) days before the commencement of the oral rounds. That development will form part of the Moot Problem for purposes of the oral rounds and will require teams to reassess some of their positions and adapt their oral arguments accordingly.

VI. THE PROBLEM

A. Subject Matter

1. The Moot Problem concerns a dispute between a foreign investor and a host State, arising under an investment agreement, treaty, or relevant domestic legislation providing for resolution before a tribunal in accordance with the applicable arbitration rules.
2. The dispute raises a range of procedural and substantive legal issues typical of contemporary investment arbitration, including questions relating to arbitral jurisdiction, procedure, and the regulation and protection of foreign investment, among others.
3. The dispute and all parties involved are fictitious. Any resemblance to real disputes, entities, or persons, whether living or dead, is purely coincidental.
4. The Moot Problem is self-contained. Teams must confine themselves to the legal and factual framework set out in the Moot Problem, the exhibits, official clarifications, and any further materials expressly incorporated into the record.

B. Factual Parameters

1. Facts alleged in the statements of claim and defense, including exhibits and official clarifications, are taken to be correct unless a contradiction exists between them. No additional facts may be introduced.
2. Where an official clarification or subsequent competition document modifies the record, that document shall prevail to the extent of any inconsistency.

3. Reliance on facts that do not comply with Rule VI(B) shall constitute a breach of these Rules and may be considered inconsistent with the standards of professional conduct expected in the IntLaw Moot. Arbitrators may take such conduct into account in their evaluation of the team.

C. Distribution

The Moot Problem will be published on 3 August 2026 through the IntLaw Moot website (www.intlawmoot.org).

The Moot Problem shall be deemed officially released once posted through the IntLaw Moot website, and teams are responsible for consulting the website regularly.

D. Clarifications

1. Requests for clarification of the Moot Problem must be submitted through the IntLaw Moot Portal prior to 23:59 hours (London time) on 14 September 2026.
2. Requests must be limited to matters of legal or factual significance. A request must include a short explanation of its expected significance; failure to do so may result in the request being ignored.
3. Clarifications issued by the Directorate become part of the Moot Problem.
4. The Directorate may, in its discretion, decline to answer requests that are argumentative, repetitive, purely strategic, insufficiently explained, or not of sufficient legal or factual significance.
5. Only official clarifications issued through the IntLaw Moot website shall be authoritative.

E. The Procedural Development Stage

As a distinctive feature of the IntLaw Moot, the competition includes a Procedural Development designed to simulate the evolving nature of arbitral proceedings. The Procedural Development is intended to test participants' ability to adapt their legal strategy and advocacy in response to changing circumstances, in line with real-world arbitral practice.

1. Ten (10) days before the commencement of the oral rounds in London, the Directorate will release "Procedural Order No. 3" (PO No. 3).
2. PO No. 3 will introduce a new procedural hurdle to the Moot Problem.
3. Teams are required to integrate the legal and factual implications of PO No. 3 into their oral arguments.

4. Written memoranda will not be revised after the official submission deadline to account for PO No. 3. Thus, PO No. 3 shall form part of the record for the oral phase only. Teams may not submit supplemental written pleadings in response to PO No. 3.
5. Any guidance notes, instructions, or explanatory directions issued together with PO No. 3 shall be binding for purposes of the oral rounds.

F. Copyright

All problems and materials created for the IntLaw Moot are copyrighted. Commercial use is prohibited. No problem materials, clarifications, or related official competition documents may be republished, adapted, or commercially exploited without the Directors' prior written authorization.

VII. WRITTEN MEMORANDA

A. Memoranda

1. Each team shall submit two written memoranda: one on behalf of the Claimant and one on behalf of the Respondent.
2. The version submitted at the deadline is final; no revisions are permitted for typographical errors, missing pages, or computer software issues. Submissions made after the deadline are not eligible for inclusion in the written stage.
3. Every Memorandum for Claimant will be made available to one other participating team as soon as possible after the submission date.
4. The Directorate will determine which team's Memorandum for Claimant is assigned to which other team.
5. Each team will prepare a Memorandum in support of the Respondent's position in response to the Memorandum in support of the Claimant's position that was made available to it.
6. The Memorandum for Respondent must be responsive to the arguments raised in the specific Memorandum for Claimant assigned to the team.
7. If the assigned Memorandum for Claimant has not made all the arguments that the Respondent believes should have been made, the Respondent must still address such issues. When addressing omitted issues, the Respondent should indicate that the argument was not explicitly raised. Teams must ensure they present a coherent argument for the Respondent rather than a series of possibly disjointed responses to the Claimant's specific brief.

8. The Memorandum for Respondent must remain a pleading on behalf of Respondent, not merely an annotation or commentary on Claimant's filing.

B. Formatting and Structure

1. The formatting provisions listed in this section are required to be followed. No memorandum that violates these provisions will be considered for an award.
2. Each memorandum shall include, at a minimum: (a) a cover page; (b) a table of contents; (c) a list of abbreviations; (d) a list of authorities; (e) a statement of facts; (f) a summary of arguments; (g) the legal arguments; (h) a conclusion.
3. Each memorandum must clearly identify the participating university or higher educational institution on the cover page.
4. Memoranda may be no longer than thirty (30) pages. The 30-page limit includes the statement of facts, arguments, and conclusions; cover pages, tables of contents, and lists of authorities are excluded from this count. Text must be no smaller than 12-point font and typed at 1½ line spacing. All margins must be at least one inch or 2.5 cm.
5. All paragraphs must be numbered consecutively to facilitate easy reference by the arbitrators. References within the memorandum, or in the case of the Respondent, the reference to the Memorandum for Claimant must be to paragraph number. The use of the term "passim" in place of specific paragraph numbers is not sufficient to meet the formatting requirements.
6. Citations in the memorandum should be limited to those that directly advance the specific argument being made. The memoranda are intended to be of practical use to the arbitrators in deciding the dispute. They are not intended to be scholarly dissertations on the relevant law.
7. Teams must utilize a formal English style appropriate for submission to a tribunal. This includes avoiding slang and contractions.
8. Excessively compressed formatting, inflated prose, unnecessary repetition, or citation dumping may be taken into account adversely by memorial judges.
9. Citations must be included directly in the text in a shortened form; footnotes and endnotes must not be used. The full citation should be given in a List of Authorities.

10. The List of Authorities should be in a form that is intelligible to all who will read the memorandum. That includes the members of the other teams and the arbitrators of the written phase of the competition.
11. The cover page shall contain only the information prescribed in these Rules and shall clearly indicate whether the submission is the Memorandum for Claimant or the Memorandum for Respondent.

C. Plagiarism

Any memorandum that includes text from any source must set out that text in quotation marks and provide a citation to the source.

Plagiarism, including disguised paraphrase, unattributed copying, or misrepresentation of authorship, is a serious violation of these Rules and may give rise to further sanctions, including disqualification.

D. Submission of Memoranda

1. The memoranda in support of the Claimant's position must be submitted by 9 November 2026.
2. The memoranda in support of the Respondent's position must be submitted by 30 November 2026.
3. Memoranda must be submitted in searchable PDF format as a single document through the IntLaw Moot Portal.
4. Teams are solely responsible for ensuring timely upload, proper formatting, completeness, and legibility of the submitted file. Technical or software problems do not excuse late or defective submission.

E. Scoring of Memoranda

1. Specialized arbitrators will evaluate the memoranda on a scale from 50 to 100, based on the quality of the legal analysis, persuasiveness of the arguments, thoroughness of research, and clarity of writing.
2. The evaluation shall take into account: (a) the quality and depth of legal analysis; (b) the clarity and persuasiveness of the arguments; (c) the use and understanding of legal authorities; (d) the organization and structure of the submission; and (e) compliance with the Rules.
3. When judging the Memorandum for Respondent, the arbitrators will specifically weigh whether it is directly responsive to the arguments raised in the assigned Memorandum for Claimant.

4. Arbitrators may also take into account professionalism of style, procedural discipline, economy of expression, and the practical utility of the submission for a tribunal.
5. The Directorate may establish internal arbitral guidance, rubrics, and moderation processes for the written phase.

F. Copyrights

All memoranda submitted become the sole property of the IntLaw Moot and may be copyrighted as such. The authors' moral rights shall be respected. The IntLaw Moot may reproduce, archive, anonymize, publish, or otherwise use submitted memoranda for educational, archival, or promotional purposes, subject to applicable law and any stated competition policy.

VIII. ORAL ROUNDS

A. Venue

The oral rounds are held annually in London. Rounds may be allocated across multiple hearing venues. Teams are responsible for arriving punctually at the correct venue and hearing room.

B. General Rounds

1. Each team will argue four (4) times in the general rounds: twice as Claimant and twice as Respondent.
2. The hearing schedule shall be communicated by the Directorate in advance.
3. Each hearing shall ordinarily be heard by a panel of three arbitrators.
4. In exceptional circumstances, the Directorate may permit a hearing to proceed before two arbitrators or, if strictly necessary, one arbitrator. In such cases, scores may be normalized by the Directorate for ranking purposes.

C. Pleading Format

1. Each team is allotted thirty (30) minutes to present its argument. Teams should divide their time equitably between the two advocates. Each advocate should plead for at least twelve (12) minutes.
2. The tribunal may extend the time limits, provided that neither team is allowed more than forty-five (45) minutes in total, including time for questions.
3. Rebuttal and sub-rebuttal arguments are permitted, usually limited to a maximum of two (2) minutes within the team's total time.

4. Arbitrators are encouraged to act as they would in a real investment arbitration. This may include persistent questioning or silent observation; teams must be prepared for both.
5. Participants shall refrain from any behavior that may disrupt or distract from the proper conduct of the hearing. Team members presenting oral arguments may exchange written notes and assist one another in locating relevant materials. No other form of communication with team members or third parties shall be permitted during the hearing.
6. Before the hearing begins, each team shall communicate to the tribunal its proposed allocation of time, including any time reserved for rebuttal or sub-rebuttal. In the absence of agreement or consistency between the teams' proposals, the presiding arbitrator shall determine the order and structure of the pleadings.
7. Only registered student team members may act as oral advocates. No more than two advocates may plead for a team in a single hearing.

D. Arguments and Integration of the Procedural Development Stage

1. Teams may rely on the arguments in their written memoranda but are not restricted to them. A team may refine, develop, or abandon positions taken in its written memoranda during the oral rounds, provided that it does so consistently, professionally, and in a manner capable of justification before the tribunal.
2. PO No. 3 is not a factual clarification. During their thirty (30) minute allotment, teams must reserve sufficient time to address the hurdle introduced by PO No. 3.
3. Teams must be prepared to answer questions from the tribunal regarding PO No. 3. Failure to address PO No. 3 will be reflected in the team's score.
4. The Directorate and the Moot Case Panel will define the specific scope of PO No. 3. Arguments must be strictly confined to the legal and factual parameters established within PO No. 3 text. To ensure consistency across all hearings, PO No. 3 will provide teams and arbitrators with the required conceptual approach, and the specific legal questions it intends to test.

E. Scoring and Evaluation

1. Each arbitrator shall award each oral advocate a score between 50 and 100 points per round.
2. The total team score for a hearing is the sum of the scores of the two oralists, creating a maximum of 200 points per arbitrator, and 600 points per round.

3. While arbitrators are encouraged to confer after a hearing to discuss performance, each arbitrator must arrive at an individual decision regarding the score.
4. Where a hearing is conducted before fewer than three arbitrators, the Directorate may normalize scores for purposes of team ranking and individual oralist ranking.
5. Scores submitted by arbitrators shall be final, subject only to administrative correction of obvious clerical error or review under Rule VIII(F).

F. Significant Difference

A variance of 10 points or more between any two arbitrators on the same panel is considered a “significant difference”. In such cases, the presiding arbitrator will be asked to confirm if the panel conferred, and the arbitrator whose score varies may be invited to amend their score, though the final decision remains in their discretion. The score shall always remain that arbitrator’s own decision.

G. Guidance for Arbitrators

Arbitrators should use the following scope to maintain global consistency:

- 91 – 100 Excellent
- 80 – 90 Very Good
- 70 – 79 Good
- 60 – 69 Satisfactory
- 50 – 59 Needs Improvement

Arbitrators will evaluate each advocate on the following four pillars:

1. Organization and Preparation

- Does counsel introduce themselves, their co-counsel, and their client clearly?
- Are the issues and facts presented in an effective, persuasive sequence?
- Is there a clear, generalized conclusion?
- Does counsel effectively manage the time to address PO No. 3 as a standalone issue?
- Is counsel clearly prepared and familiar with the authorities on which their arguments rely?
- Is rebuttal used effectively?
- Does counsel demonstrate the ability to pivot seamlessly from the main substantive dispute to the procedural hurdle introduced by PO No. 3?

2. Knowledge of Facts and Law

- Does counsel demonstrate thorough knowledge of the law?
- Is counsel able to relate complex facts to the law to build a tenable case?

3. Presentation

- Is the delivery appropriately paced, loud enough, and free of distracting mannerisms?
- Does counsel maintain eye contact and balance professional deference with a forceful argument?

4. Handling Questions

- Does counsel answer the tribunal's questions directly?
- Does counsel use questions as an opportunity to pivot back to their client's advantage?
- Is counsel poised and tactful under the pressure of rigorous interrogation, specifically regarding the PO No. 3 issue?

Arbitrators should assess advocacy not as a mere recital of memorized text. A strong advocate should demonstrate structure, responsiveness, legal judgment, and strategic control of the hearing. Arbitrators should also take into account that English may not be the first language of all participants, while maintaining equal expectations as to professionalism, preparation, and persuasiveness.

H. Elimination Rounds

1. Following the preliminary rounds, the highest-ranked teams shall advance to the elimination rounds.
2. The specific number of teams advancing and the format of the elimination rounds shall be determined by the Directorate, taking into account the number of participating teams.
3. Rankings for advancement will be determined based solely on the oral scores.
4. In elimination rounds, teams may be paired based on their ranking, with the highest-ranked team facing the lowest-ranked team, the second highest-ranked team facing the second lowest-ranked team, and so forth.
5. Where two teams competing in an elimination round have previously faced each other in the preliminary rounds, they shall argue for the opposite party from that which they represented in their prior encounter.

6. Where two teams have not previously faced each other: (a) if, in the immediately preceding round, one team argued as Claimant and the other as Respondent, they shall switch roles in the current round; (b) if both teams argued for the same party in the immediately preceding round, the allocation of roles shall be determined by lot.
7. If two or more teams are tied for advancement on aggregate oral score, the Directors may break the tie by reference to one or more of the following, in the order they deem appropriate for the edition concerned: the number of round wins or ballots, if such system is used; the highest single-round team score; the lowest dropped round score; or drawing of lots.
8. The Directorate may publish or communicate additional elimination-round procedures before the start of the oral rounds, provided that such procedures remain consistent with these Rules.

IX. CONDUCT AND INTEGRITY

A. Academic Integrity

All research, writing, and editing of the memoranda and the preparation of oral arguments must be the exclusive product of student team members. Plagiarism, misrepresentation of sources, and any form of academic dishonesty are strictly prohibited. For clarification on Plagiarism and its sanctions see [Rule VII\(C\)](#).

1. Teams may seek and receive outside assistance limited to general discussion of issues, suggestions as to research sources, general comments on argument structure and persuasiveness, and practice for the oral rounds. However, the final written and oral work product must remain that of the student team members alone.
2. At the time of each memorandum upload, each team must submit any academic integrity declaration required by the Directorate.
3. Teams must disclose, in the manner prescribed by the Directorate, any coach, advisor, or assistant attending the oral rounds who has materially assisted the team's preparation.

B. Use of Artificial Intelligence

The IntLaw Moot adopts a principles-based approach: AI may support, but must never substitute, a student's own critical reasoning, judgment, and advocacy.

Permitted Uses

- Research Assistance: Finding relevant sources, library catalogues, or general information.
- Translation: Understanding legal sources in other languages or aiding English comprehension (though discouraged for educational growth).
- Proof-reading: Using AI tools to check grammar and spelling.

Prohibited Uses

- Synthesis: Using AI to summarize or synthesize legal sources into arguments.
- Drafting and Reformulating: Using AI to write, rewrite, or reformulate any text submitted in a memorandum.
- Submission of AI Text: Including AI-generated text in a memorandum, even if subsequently altered or corrected by team members.
- Processing: Submitting the IntLaw Moot Problem or the PO No. 3 to an AI tool to generate arguments or strategic “pivots”.

Every team must submit a signed Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence Disclosure Statement at the time of each memorandum upload.

It is likewise prohibited to use AI tools to generate oral scripts, hearing outlines, answer banks, or live hearing prompts that substitute for the students’ own analysis.

It is prohibited to upload, submit, or use official competition materials for the purpose of training an AI model or system.

All disclosures concerning AI use must be truthful and complete. False, misleading, or incomplete disclosure may result in disqualification.

C. Restriction Prior to Oral Rounds

1. Once the schedule of oral rounds has been communicated, teams shall not: (a) conduct practice pleadings against a team they are scheduled to face; or (b) observe hearings involving such team prior to their scheduled match.
2. This restriction applies to all forms of observation, including pre-moots and practice rounds, where match schedules are known.
3. This restriction also extends to reviewing recordings or receiving detailed strategic reports of such hearings where this would undermine competitive fairness.

D. Scouting

1. Teams may attend hearings in which they are not participating, as a means of developing advocacy skills.
2. Notwithstanding the above, teams, as well as their coaches, affiliates, or accompanying persons, shall not attend hearings involving teams against which they are scheduled to compete in the preliminary rounds.
3. Any violation of this Rule may result in sanctions, including disqualification from the elimination rounds.
4. The prohibition in paragraph 2 applies equally to in-person attendance, live-stream observation, and indirect scouting through third parties.

E. Digital Devices

1. During the oral rounds, teams may have electronic and digital devices for the sole purpose of accessing research materials or timekeeping.
2. The use of any device to communicate with any person outside the counsel table is strictly prohibited once the hearing has commenced. Teams are also explicitly prohibited from using AI-enhanced tools or chatbots (e.g., for translation or “live” coaching) during the oral round.
3. Recording of arguments is not permitted.
4. Any breach of Rules of Section IX may result in one or more sanctions, including warning, deduction of points, exclusion from awards, loss of a round, exclusion from the elimination rounds, or disqualification, depending on the gravity of the violation. The determination of sanctions shall rest with the Directors.

X. AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

A. Team Awards

1. Written Advocacy Awards
 - **Best Written Memorandum for Claimant.** Awarded to the team whose Memorandum for Claimant is judged to be of the highest quality.
 - **Second Best Written Memorandum for Claimant.** Awarded to the team whose Memorandum for Claimant is judged to be of the second highest quality.
 - **Third Best Written Memorandum for Claimant.** Awarded to the team whose Memorandum for Claimant is judged to be of the third highest quality.
 - **Best Written Memorandum for Respondent.** Awarded to the team whose Memorandum for Respondent is judged to be of the highest quality.

- **Second Best Written Memorandum for Respondent.** Awarded to the team whose Memorandum for Respondent is judged to be of the second highest quality.
- **Third Best Written Memorandum for Respondent.** Awarded to the team whose Memorandum for Respondent is judged to be of the third highest quality.
- **Honorable Mentions.** In each category, the remaining top-performing teams may receive Honorable Mentions for their written work. Where the number of participating teams so warrants, Honorable Mentions may be awarded either to the next two (2) teams, so as to complete a top five (5), or to the next seven (7) teams, so as to complete a top ten (10), as determined by the Directorate.

2. Oral Competition Awards

- **IntLaw Moot Championship Award.** Awarded to the winning team in the final round of the oral rounds held in London.
- **Finalist Recognition.** The runner-up team in the final round will receive formal recognition for their achievement.

B. Individual Awards

- **Best Individual Oralist.** This award for the general rounds is granted to the individual student with the highest average score per argument. To be eligible, a participant must have presented oral arguments at least once on behalf of the Claimant and at least once on behalf of the Respondent.
- **Best Oralist of the Final Round.** This award is granted to the individual student selected by the final-round arbitral tribunal as having delivered the strongest oral advocacy performance in the final round.
- Honorable Mentions for Individual Oralists may also be awarded to other top-performing advocates, as determined by the Directorate.

C. Special Awards

The Directorate may establish additional special awards for teams and arbitrators from time to time, provided that their existence and, where appropriate, the applicable criteria are communicated before the commencement of the oral rounds.

D. Certificates of Participation

1. Certificates for all participating students will be generated based on the final team lists provided. Teams are solely responsible for ensuring the correct spelling and presentation of names; certificates will reflect the data exactly as submitted.
2. Certificates and achievement awards will be available for download in PDF format following the conclusion of the oral rounds.

3. No correction will be guaranteed after the certificate generation process has been completed.

E. Letters of Recognition for Coaches

Formal Letters of Recognition will be prepared for team coaches whose names are properly registered in the team account. These letters will display the names and titles of the coaches exactly as they were entered by the team. Teams bear sole responsibility for the accuracy of those entries.

XI. FINAL PROVISIONS

A. Copyright and Data Privacy

1. The IntLaw Moot reserves all rights to the audio and video recording of any oral round, or any part thereof, subject to the privacy rights of the participants.
2. By participating in the IntLaw Moot, team members and arbitrators consent to the use of their images and audio-video recordings for educational and promotional purposes.
3. The IntLaw Moot reserves the right to use such recordings for social media purposes, including but not limited to highlight reels, live-streaming, and promotional posts across official IntLaw Moot platforms.
4. The IntLaw Moot shall process personal data in accordance with applicable data protection law and any privacy notice issued for the competition.

B. Finality of Decisions

1. Any decision made by the Directors in connection with the IntLaw Moot is final and not subject to appeal.
2. Individual scores awarded by arbitrators are final and will not be revisited once submitted, except in cases of significant technical variance as described in [Rule VIII\(F\)](#).
3. The Directorate may correct purely clerical, computational, or administrative errors without reopening substantive decisions.

C. Interpretation of Rules

1. Any request for the interpretation of these Rules should be addressed to the IntLaw Moot Directors.
2. All interpretations, as well as any waivers, consent, or other decisions required for the conduct of the IntLaw Moot, are at the absolute discretion of the Directors.

3. The Rules are reviewed annually and are subject to change from year to year to reflect evolving practice in investment arbitration.
4. Reliance on prior editions, prior practice, or informal understandings shall not excuse non-compliance with the Rules applicable to the relevant edition.



INTLAW INVESTMENT ARBITRATION MOOT

Inaugural Edition • London

THANK YOU

DIRECTORS

M. Belén Paoletta

Ivan Levy

Last updated: 20 August 2026