THE JOHN H. JACKSON MOOT COURT COMPETITION



The European Law Students' Association

FINAL REPORT

OF THE 23RD EDITION OF THE JOHN H. JACKSON MOOT COURT COMPETITION

johnhjacksonmoot.elsa.org

FOREWORD

It was a great pleasure to prepare the case for 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, Alabasta - Certain Measures Affecting Electronic Goods and Digital Services. Now that the competition has come to a close, we wish to extend our heartfelt congratulations to all the teams that participated this year. Your dedication, creativity, and hard work exemplified the very spirit of international legal scholarship and advocacy that this competition seeks to foster.

Drafting this year's case was a particularly rewarding process for us. The case stands at the forefront of current developments in international economic regulation, exploring how WTO law interacts with some of the most pressing and contested issues in today's global economy: the governance of digital services, the regulation of electronic goods, and the tensions between trade, competition, and industrial policy. This edition's subject matter, ranging from digital services and data localization to competition law, mirrors the multifaceted pressures and demands placed upon the multilateral trading system in the 21st century.

With services like video streaming and e-commerce platforms now forming the backbone of global trade, the regulatory landscape is evolving in unprecedented ways. Governments around the world are grappling with how best to balance market openness with concerns over data protection, cultural preservation, and fair competition. These tensions are no longer theoretical; they play out daily in parliaments, courtrooms, regulatory bodies, and international dispute settlement fora.

From content quotas to data localization rules, and from strategic anti-trust enforcement to digital trade barriers, the lines between domestic regulation and international trade commitments have become ever more complex. This case was designed to invite critical engagement with these themes and to explore whether, and to what extent, the WTO framework can still respond to the demands of a digitally transformed global economy.

We were delighted to witness students from all around the world engage with these complex questions with such skill and insight. The range and sophistication of arguments presented throughout the competition were a testament not only to the intellectual calibre of the participants, but also to the continued relevance of the multilateral system. Despite ongoing challenges facing the WTO and the global trading order, the passion and trust demonstrated by the participants show that belief in a rules-based system remains strong.

To all the students, coaches, organizers, and panellists—thank you. You made this competition a truly global dialogue on the future of trade law. It has been an honour to contribute to this effort, and we are grateful to ELSA International and the Academic Board for their support during the preparation of the case.

We hope that the questions raised by the Alabasta dispute continue to provoke thoughtful discussion well beyond this year's competition. Congratulations once again to all teams for your hard work and accomplishments. The future of international economic law is in capable hands.

Written by the Case Authors of the 23rd JHJMCC, Dr. Panagiotis A. Kyriakou, Associate, Archipel (Geneva), and Marios Tokas, PhD Candidate, Geneva Graduate Institute

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.A.A.

. A.

ABOUT THE JOHN H. JACKSON MOOT COURT COMPETITION	7
ABOUT THE 23RD EDITION	8
Case & the Authors	8
Clarification Questions	8
Stages of the Competition	8
Written Round	8
Regional Rounds	9
Final Oral Round	9
Timeline of the 23rd Edition	10
SUPPORTERS OF THE 23RD EDITION	11
Technical Supporter	11
World Trade Organization (WTO)	11
Technical Supporter of the Final Oral Round	12
Geneva Graduate Institute	12
Platinum Sponsor	13
Van Bael & Bellis	13
Gold Sponsor	15
Baker McKenzie	15
Silver Sponsor	16
Sidley	16
Bronze Sponsor	17
Lee&Ko	17
Main Academic Supporter	18
Georgetown University Law Centre	18
Academic Supporter	19
World Trade Institute (WTI)	19
General Supporters	20
Jus Mundi	20
Advisory Centre on WTO Law (ACWL)	21
Supporters of the African Regional Round	22
United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA)	22
Society of International Economic Law (SIEL)	23
Individual Donours	24
Become a Sponsor	24
SCORING SYSTEM OF CALCULATION SCORES	25
WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORING	27
ORAL PLEADING SCORING	28

WRITTEN ROUND	29
1st Round of Written Submissions' Scoring	30
2nd Round of Written Submissions' Scoring - Finalist Teams	33
REGIONAL ROUNDS	34
East Asia & Oceania Regional Round	35
About the Regional Round	35
An Organisers' Perspective	36
Results	38
WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES	38
TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	39
TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	39
TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL	40
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	41
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	43
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL	44
Summary of Awards - East Asia & Oceania	44
West & South Asia Regional Round	45
About the Regional Round	45
An Organisers' Perspective	46
Results	49
WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES	49
TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	50
TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	51
TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL	51
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	52
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	55
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL	56
Summary of Awards - West & South Asia	56
All-American Regional Round	57
About the Regional Round	57
An Organisers' Perspective	58
Results	60
WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES	60
TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	61
TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	61
TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL	62
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	63
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	64

- Andredy

- F. S.

ТНЕ JOHN H. JACKSON MOOT COURT COMPETITION

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL	65
Summary of Awards - Americas	65
African Regional Round	66
About the Regional Round	66
An Organisers' Perspective	67
Results	70
WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES	70
TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	71
TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	71
TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL	72
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	73
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	75
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL	76
Summary of Awards - Africa	76
1st European Regional Round - Amsterdam	77
About the Regional Round	77
An Organisers' Perspective	78
Results	80
WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES	80
TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	81
TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	81
TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL	82
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	83
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	85
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL	86
Summary of Awards - Europe	86
2nd European Regional Round - Geneva	87
About the Regional Round	87
An Organisers' Perspective	88
Results	90
WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES	90
TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	91
TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	91
TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL	92
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS	93
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS	94
INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL	95
Summary of Awards - Europe	95

- Andredy

- F. S.

ТНЕ JOHN H. JACKSON MOOT COURT COMPETITION

Special Prize	96
QUALIFYING TEAMS	97
FINAL ORAL ROUND	100
RESULTS	109
Written Submission Scores	109
Team Scores	111
Preliminary Rounds	111
Quarter-Finals	112
Semi-Finals	113
Grand Final	114
Individual Scores	116
Preliminary Rounds	116
Quarter-Finals	119
Semi-Finals	121
Grand Final	123
Summary of the Awards	124
TESTIMONIALS	125
Winner's Perspective	125
Runner-Up's Perspective	128
Best Orator's Perspective	129
Coach's Perspective	131
THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE 23RD EDITION	133
World Trade Organization	133
Sponsors & Supporters	134
The Case Authors	135
The Academic Board	135
ELSA International Team	136
Organising Committee of the Final Oral Round	137
CONCLUDING REMARKS BY THE HEAD OF THE ORGANISING COMMITTEE	139

- Andredy

- F. S.

ABOUT THE JOHN H. JACKSON MOOT COURT COMPETITION

The John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition ("JHJMCC", "Competition"), previously known as "ELSA Moot Court Competition" ("EMC2") was founded in 2002 by the European Law Students' Association (ELSA) with the help of the World Trade Organization. This Competition focuses on the simulated hearing of the World Trade Organization dispute settlement system.

The Competition consists of three phases. In the first stage - Written Submissions - Teams draft legal documents on behalf of both sides of the dispute (Complainant and Respondent) based on the issued case. Secondly, the Teams participate in one of six Regional Rounds organised all over the world and plead as the Complainant and Respondent in front of the Panel of international trade law practitioners and academics. Lastly, the 24 best teams from all the Regional Rounds qualify for the Final Oral Round, held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition provides great opportunities for law students to develop their oral pleading skills as well as prepare them for an international career within the field of International Trade Law. The Competition challenges students to strengthen their skills, including legal analysis and oral presentations. In line of ELSA's its vision and purpose, the JHJMCC continues to contribute to further education of aspiring lawyers and to creating the network of the next generation of trade law experts.

Each year, the JHJMCC unites students, young lawyers, academics, and professionals in the field of International Trade Law, creating an environment to raise awareness and educate participants about the WTO and its dispute settlement system. Offering invaluable learning and networking opportunities, participation in the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition has become a crucial first step toward a career in international trade and within the World Trade Organization.



ABOUT THE 23RD EDITION

Case & the Authors

During the academic year 2024/2025, ELSA organised the 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition. It was a remarkable and inspiring journey that brought together students, young lawyers, academics, and professionals from around the world.

This year's Competition was launched on the 16th of September 2024; in total, we received **92 registrations** for the 23rd edition. On the same day, the Case "<u>Alabasta - Certain Measures</u> <u>Affecting Electronic Goods and Digital Services</u>" (written by Case Authors Marios Tokas and Panagiotis Kyriakou) was published.



Alabasta – Certain measures affecting electronic goods and digital services

Marios Tokas & Panagiotis Kyriakou

Clarification Questions

After registering, each team can submit Clarification Questions (CQs) to the Case Author about the Case. This year we received 162 questions, however, after sifting through the repeating ones, the Case Authors answered 74 of them. The first task for the teams is to submit their Written Submissions (WSs), once they have all the necessary information, including the <u>Answers to the Clarification Questions</u>.

Stages of the Competition

Written Round

Having acquired all outstanding clarifications and answers, the Teams participated in the first stage of the Competition - the Written Round - during which they had to prepare their Written Submissions (WS) until the 12th of January 2025. Each team had to prepare two submissions: one on behalf of the Complainant and one on behalf of the Respondent. *(more on the Written Round in the latter part of this Report)*

Regional Rounds

In the second stage of the Competition, Teams participated in one of six Regional Rounds held across the globe. Together with the Hosts of the Regional Rounds, we welcomed the Teams in Cambodia, India, Ecuador, Kenya, the Netherlands and Switzerland. During the Regional Rounds, the Teams participated in the Oral Pleadings representing both the Complainant and Respondent. The top four Teams advanced to the Semi-Finals, and the two best teams from the Semi-Finals competed in the Final. Each Regional Round concluded with the announcement of a regional Winner and Runner-up, and both Teams automatically qualified for the Final Oral Round. *(more on the <u>Regional Rounds</u> in the latter part of this Report)*

and and and and



Final Oral Round

The Regional Rounds culminated in a highly competitive Final Oral Round held in Geneva, Switzerland, bringing together the best 24 Teams from all around the globe. During the Final Oral Round the participants were hosted by the Geneva Graduate Institute and the World Trade Organization. The Grand Final Round was held in Room W at the World Trade Organization, followed by an aperitif and the Awards Ceremony. In the evening, Teams, Coaches, Partners, and Organisers convened for a Closing Dinner to celebrate their achievements and recognise the outstanding Team and individual performances of the week.

The past edition not only offered invaluable learning experiences but also fostered a global network of future leaders in the field. The 23rd edition saw outstanding performances, with Teams demonstrating profound legal acumen and oratory skills, further solidifying the JHJMCC's reputation as a cornerstone for those aspiring to build a career in international trade law. *(more on the Final Oral Round in the latter part of this Report)*

Timeline of the 23rd Edition



SUPPORTERS OF THE 23RD EDITION

We would like to begin by expressing our deepest gratitude to all the Sponsors and Supporters of the 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition. Their unwavering support throughout all stages of the Competition was instrumental in successfully organising the 23rd edition and especially, the Final Oral Round.

Technical Supporter

World Trade Organization (WTO)

WTO is the only international organization dealing with the global rules of trade between nations. The goal of the WTO is to improve the welfare of the people of the Member Countries by ensuring that trade flows as smoothly, predictably and freely as possible. The WTO currently consists of 161 Member Nations. As the WTO was born out of negotiations amongst the former GATT Contracting Parties, everything the WTO Members do is a result of negotiations. Therefore, the WTO, as an intergovernmental institution, is a place where Member governments seek to negotiate trade problems. The John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, therefore, supports the WTO's enforcement of the international trade rules via the Dispute Settlement Understanding system.



THE John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition

Technical Supporter of the Final Oral Round

Geneva Graduate Institute

The Geneva Graduate Institute is a higher education institution and a pioneer in the exploration of global issues. Through our core missions – academic research, teaching, expertise and forum activities - we produce and share knowledge on international relations, development issues, global challenges and governance.

Located in the heart of International Geneva, a centre of global governance, we build on scientific excellence and transdisciplinary to foster critical and creative thinking on the major challenges of our time. By engaging with international organisations, NGOs, governments and private sector actors, we participate in global discussions on the future of multilateralism and prepare a generation of engaged and responsible decision-makers for leadership in a radically uncertain world.



THE John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition

Platinum Sponsor

Van Bael & Bellis

Van Bael & Bellis (VBB) is proud to be a longstanding supporter of the John H Jackson Moot Court Competition and to play a part in helping the international trade lawyers of the future hone their skills.

VBB is a leading independent law firm headquartered in Brussels. WTO-related matters form a significant part of our wider international trade practice. We are a committed advocate of the multilateral trading system and its ability to contribute to increased prosperity and welfare across the world and have acted on WTO matters, including dispute settlement resolution, for the past 30+ years. During that time our teams have worked on a huge number of different issues, from negotiations to WTO compliance of domestic regulation and offensive and defensive dispute resolution. We have advised in relation to virtually all WTO agreements in numerous subject areas and have led on landmark disputes.





Philippe De Baere Partner



Joanna Redelbach Counsel



Jason Houston-McMillan Associate

<u>Van Bael & Bellis</u> (VBB) has one of Europe's leading international trade law practices. We have been active in Geneva on WTO-related matters since the late 1990s and are recognised for our expertise in the field.

An independent international firm, VBB is multicultural, comprising 90+ lawyers from 20+ countries and operating from Brussels, London and Geneva to serve leading corporates and governments from all over the world.

Our trade team – the largest specialist team in the Brussels market – advises on all aspects of EU and international trade law: trade defence, customs, sanctions and export controls, trade policy and regulation, trade agreements and WTO-related matters, including international dispute prevention and resolution. The team has handled more trade defence cases and WTO disputes than any other Brussels-based law firm, with an unparalleled success rate for challenging trade defence measures before the EU Courts.

Our WTO expertise is extensive. It includes:

- advising on negotiations to accede to the WTO as well as negotiations of new multi- and plurilateral agreements within the WTO framework;
- advising on the implementation of WTO Agreements, ensuring that domestic legislation and administrative procedures comply with WTO obligations;
- handling WTO dispute settlement proceedings.

In the area of dispute settlement, we have represented governments, as complainant, respondent or third party, in disputes in relation to virtually all WTO agreements and at all stages of proceedings (consultations, panel stage, Appellate Body stage, ad hoc Article 25 appeal arbitration, implementation).

Our experience spans a huge range of issues, including accession protocols, trade-related investment measures, intellectual property rights, subsidies, technical barriers to trade, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, and customs valuation and classification. We have been involved in many of the seminal WTO disputes, including the first WTO dispute relating to the national security exception in the GATT 1994 (acting for Ukraine), the first challenge of the WTO compatibility of the EU's climate policy measures (representing Indonesia) and the first appeal arbitration under Article 25 DSU (representing Turkey).

VBB also has highly regarded competition and transactional practices. Together, we pride ourselves on helping clients resolve their business-critical issues by applying best-in-class legal advice and outstanding client service.

Gold Sponsor

Baker McKenzie

Baker McKenzie has been voted the World's strongest law firm brand for 10 consecutive years and has more than 70 offices in over 40 countries. As an original global law firm founded in 1949, their fluency in working across borders, issues and practices allows them to simplify legal complexity, foresee risks others may overlook and identify commercial opportunities that many miss. This makes their advisers of choice to some of the world's leading multinational corporations. Market disruption is an accepted reality for business, as new competition and technologies drive the pace of change faster than ever before. Baker McKenzie brings the right talent to every client issue, regardless of where the client is. We partner with our clients to deliver solutions in the world's largest economies as well as newly opening markets. They are global citizens, industry savvy, diverse and have a thirst for innovation. Their strength is their ability to adopt a new type of thinking and use cutting-edge legal technologies to help clients overcome the challenges of competing in today's new world economic order.



THE John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition

Silver Sponsor

Sidley

Sidley Austin LLP is a premier law firm with a practice highly attuned to the ever-changing international landscape. The firm has built a reputation for being an adviser for global business, with more than 2,000 lawyers in 20 offices worldwide. Sidley is committed to providing quality legal services wherever they are needed, including litigation, transactional and regulatory matters spanning virtually every area of law. The firm's lawyers have diverse legal backgrounds and are dedicated to teamwork, collaboration and superior client service. From our offices throughout North America, Europe and Asia, Sidley Austin LLP assists companies, governments and trade associations worldwide on transactional, regulatory, dispute settlement and policy matters. Success in today's global marketplace requires an understanding of the rules that govern every aspect of the international economy - from capital movements to trade in goods and services, to intellectual property and product standards. Our team of seasoned negotiators, deal-makers, litigators and policy advisers draws on extensive private sector and government experience to help companies and governments shape these rules and resolve disputes arising under them. Because the United States and the European Union are the world's most important actors in international trade, we have teams in Washington, D.C. and Brussels. Since the World Trade Organization (WTO) is the focal point for trade rules, we have an office at the WTO headquarters in Geneva dedicated to ensuring that our clients are represented in international negotiations and WTO disputes. Our Washington, Brussels and Geneva offices work closely with colleagues in our Beijing, Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Singapore offices to provide comprehensive and practical guidance to clients on international trade matters.

SIDLEY

Bronze Sponsor

Lee&Ko

Following its establishment in 1977, Lee & Ko has steadily grown to become one of Korea's leading full-service law firms. This has been frequently confirmed by various foreign and Korean media institutions and law firm ranking institutions, which consistently place Lee & Ko at the highest level among law firms in all significant areas of measurement, including everything from professional legal capabilities to client satisfaction.

Lee & Ko's excellent reputation for trustworthiness and reliability has been built on a foundation of judiciously maintaining time-proven practices and giving priority to substance over appearance. While valuing innovation that brings genuine improvement, the firm continues to eschew attention getting gimmicks and novelty. We pledge to continue on this path, based on a proud "Lee & Ko tradition" that emphasizes the essentials of an excellent law firm practice: specialization, professionalism and full consideration for each client's needs. We are committed to doing our utmost to at all times conduct ourselves in the role of Korea's leading law firm in a socially responsible and positive way.



THE John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition

Main Academic Supporter

Georgetown University Law Centre

Georgetown University Law Center is a global leader in legal education and the preeminent U.S. law school based in the nation's capital. A world-class faculty of celebrated theorists and leading legal practitioners offers students an unmatched breadth and depth of academic opportunities. Second to none in experiential education, the Law Center's numerous clinics are deeply woven into the Washington, D.C., landscape. More than 20 centres and institutes forge cutting-edge research and policy resources across fields including health, the environment, human rights, technology, national security and international economics. Georgetown Law equips students to succeed in a rapidly evolving legal environment and to make a profound difference in the world, guided by the school's motto, "Law is but the means, justice is the end."



GEORGETOWN LAW

Academic Supporter

World Trade Institute (WTI)

The World Trade Institute (WTI) is a leading academic institution dedicated to teaching and research focused on international trade and investment regulation and economic globalisation and sustainability. Its aim is to shape public policy so that international economic governance yields tangible benefits for society. As a centre of excellence at the University of Bern with an international, interdisciplinary focus, the WTI explores the interconnections between the fields of law, economics and political science. Since 1999, its Master of International Economic Law (MILE) programme has been one of the world's leading programmes of advanced studies in the field of international trade regulation. In 2017, the WTI successfully launched a combined LL.M. and DAS programme, the TRAIL+. It targets students and professionals with a legal background who are interested in specialising in international economic law with cross-disciplinary study of the global economy and trade and investment agreements. The WTI's Winter and Summer Academies, as well as CAS and DAS programmes offer working professionals the opportunity to broaden their knowledge of issues related to international law and economics, without the long-term time commitment of traditional study programmes. Alumni of the WTI's various programmes work for international organisations, government ministries, academic institutions, global companies and internationally operating law firms.



General Supporters

Jus Mundi

The Jus Mundi platform offers a comprehensive, multilingual, and user-friendly search engine for advanced academic research in international law. Jus Mundi covers over 3800 international treaties (BITs, FTAs, multilateral agreements) and over 30,000 international law, investor-state and commercial arbitration documents issued by ICSID, UNCITRAL, IUSCT, WTO, ICC, SCC, ICDR, ICJ, PCIJ, PCA, ITLOS, Mixed Claims Commissions and other institutions. Jus Mundi offers several advanced linguistic features and more than a dozen filters to narrow down search criteria based on open or specific search strings, legal concepts relevant to the search, case type, decision type, type of legal document, decision-makers, dates, and more.





Advisory Centre on WTO Law (ACWL)

Based in Geneva, near the headquarters of the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Advisory Centre on WTO Law (ACWL) advises its developing country Members and least-developed countries (LDCs) on all issues relating to WTO law.

The ACWL gives free legal advice and training on WTO law and provides support in WTO dispute settlement proceedings at discounted rates. These services are available to the developing country Members of the ACWL (39 at present) and to LDCs that are Members of the WTO or are in the process of acceding to the WTO (43 at present).

The ACWL enables these countries to obtain a full understanding of their rights and obligations under WTO law and to have an equal opportunity to defend their interests in WTO dispute settlement proceedings.



Advisory Centre on WTO Law Centre Consultatif sur la Législation de l'OMC Centro de Asesoría Legal en Asuntos de la OMC

Supporters of the African Regional Round

United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA)

The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) promotes the economic and social development of its member states and fosters intra-regional integration and international cooperation for Africa's development. One of its key thematic area is Regional Integration and Trade. The African Trade Policy Centre (ATPC) is a specialized unit within ECA and is the leading Africa-based centre of excellence and is a continental hub that provides and coordinates technical support for the development of trade policies in Africa, in particular the negotiation and implementation of a continental free trade area (CFTA) agreement and the Boosting Intra-African Trade initiative. ATPC works with stakeholders at all levels to enhance the implementation of sound national, regional and international trade strategies, policies and programmes. The Centre also conducts research to generate and disseminate knowledge on trade and provides policy advice, training and capacity-building based on the needs identified by its partners.



THE John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition

Society of International Economic Law (SIEL)

The Society of International Economic Law (SIEL) is a membership organization aimed at academics and academically-minded practitioners and officials in the field of IEL, in all parts of the world. SIEL acts as an umbrella organization, fostering coordination, collaboration and debate between IEL scholars and practitioners and national or regional IEL organizations around the world. It will be academically focussed, genuinely global in its reach, and highly inclusive – not only in its membership but also in terms of the expertise and interests of participants. It will focus, at least in the short term, on making links between IEL academics from all parts of the globe, disseminating IEL research, and building an online library of publicly accessible material to facilitate the teaching and learning of IEL worldwide. SIEL aims to involve as many people as we can, particularly younger scholars and those from the developing world. Membership rates have been tailored to be accessible to all, regardless of their location and position.



Society of International Economic Law

Individual Donours

ELSA wishes to acknowledge the contributions from individuals that made this Competition possible. We would also like to take the opportunity to thank all of our individual donors who helped ensure the quality of the organisation of the African Regional Round and the European Regional Round - Pascal Lamy, former Director-General of the WTO and Patron of the Competition, and Marisa Goldstein, counsellor at the WTO. To our other contributors, we express our heartfelt gratitude for your support.

Become a Sponsor

Becoming a Sponsor of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition provides a unique opportunity to engage with the world's largest association of law students and young lawyers. It allows you to support dedicated students who are investing time and effort to enhance their skills and deepen their understanding of the globally interconnected legal industry. Additionally, it offers an exceptional chance to strengthen your brand by being associated with the largest Moot Court Competition in the field of WTO Law. For more information, please contact us at johnhjackson@elsa.org.

SCORING SYSTEM OF CALCULATION SCORES

The **Written Submission Score for Regional Rounds** shall be calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$(WSC - PC) + (WSR - PR) = WSS(RR)$$

The **Oral Pleading Score** during all stages of the JHJMCC shall be the average of the Complainant's and Respondent's Team Scores calculated by adding the scores assigned by all Panellists present during the Panel and dividing them by the number of Panellists scoring the pleading (3/5/7/9 depending on the stage of the Competition).

The **Team Score for Regional Rounds** shall be calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$WSS \times 0, 4 + OPS \times 0, 6 = TS(RR)$$

The **Qualification Score of the Semi-Finalists in the Regional Rounds** shall be calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$WSS \times 0,4 + \frac{(PRS(RR) + SFS(RR))}{2} \times 0,6 = QS(SFRR)$$

The **Qualification Score of Teams (non-Semi-Finalists) in the Regional Rounds** shall be calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$WSS \times 0,4 + PRS(RR) \times 0,6 = QS(PRRR)$$

The **Written Submission Score for the Final Oral Round** shall be calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$\frac{(WSC1+WSC2-PC)}{2} + \frac{(WSR1+WSR2-PR)}{2} = WSS(FOR)^*$$

*The Written Submission Score for the Final Oral Round is the average of points assigned during the first and second rounds of WS scoring. The second round of WS scoring is conducted before the Final Oral Round.

The **Team Score for the Preliminary Rounds of the Final Oral Round** shall be calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$WSS(FOR) \times 0.4 + OPS \times 0.6 = PRS(FOR)$$

In the **further stages** of the **Team Score for the Final Oral Round** (Quarter-Finals, Semi-Finals and the Grand Final) the Team score shall be the following:

$$OPS = TS(FOR)$$

Explanation of the abbreviations:

- WSC Written Submission Score Complainant
- WSR Written Submission Score Respondent
- WSS (RR) Written Submission Score (average of both sides) for the Written Stage and Regional Rounds
- PC Penalty Score Complainant
- PR Penalty Score Respondent
- TS (RR) Team Score for Regional Rounds
- PRS (RR) Preliminary Rounds Score for Regional Rounds
- SFS (RR) Semi-Final Score for Regional Rounds
- QS (SF RR) Qualification Score of Semi-Finalists from Regional Rounds to the Final Oral Round
- QS (PR RR) Qualification Score of Preliminary Rounds from the Regional Rounds to the Final Oral Round
- WSS (FOR) Written Submission Score (average of both scoring periods and of both sides) for the Final Oral Round
- PRS (FOR) Preliminary Round Score (during the Final Oral Round)
- OPS (FOR) Oral Pleading Score (during the Final Oral Round)
- OPS (RR) Oral Pleading Score (calculated the same way for the entire duration of the Regional Round)
- TS (FOR) Team Score for the Quarter-Finals, Semi-Finals and the Grand Final of the Final Oral Round

WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORING

Submitting Written Submissions is the first out of three stages of the Competition. In order to be eligible to compete in the further stages – Regional Rounds and the Final Oral Round – registered teams need to draft two Written Submissions each, one on behalf of the Complainant and one on behalf of the Respondent. For the 23rd edition, 77 Teams submitted their Written Submissions.

The Written Submissions were scored on the following criteria:

Analysis of Legal Issues (30 points):

- Article XVII of the GATS (10)
- Article XIV(a) of the GATS (3)
- Chapeau of Article XIV of the GATS (1)
- Article II of the GATS (2.5)
- Article XIV(c) of the GATS (2.5)
- Chapeau of Article XIV of the GATS (2)
- Unwritten and overarching measure (4.5)
- Article XI:1 of the GATT 1994 (1)
- Article XX(d) of the GATT 1994 (2.5)
- Chapeau of Article XX of the GATT 1994 (1)

Argumentation & Writing Style (20 points):

- Structure, organisation, and weighing of arguments (6 points)
- Creativity of argumentation (6 points)
- Clarity and tone of written expression (4 points)
- Correct use of legal terminology, grammar, spelling, and citation (4 points)

Each team could receive a maximum of 50 points for each Written Submission. After receiving the scores of both Written Submissions, these were averaged and used in all stages of the Regional Rounds and in the Preliminary Rounds of the Final Oral Round.

ORAL PLEADING SCORING

The Oral Submissions are scored based on the following criteria:

the start in

1. **Legal Analysis (Command of Issues)** - testing Team's understanding of legal and factual issues raised by the case; knowledge of applicable law, including relevant WTO agreements; command of relevant WTO jurisprudence: and logic and strength of legal reasoning.

Weighing 60% of the overall score - 30 points

The range of scores is:

- Poor (0-6)
- Fair (7-12)
- Good (13-19)
- Very Good (20-24)
- Excellent (25-30)
- 2. Argumentation and Style: testing Team's organisation and weighing of arguments; clarity and tone of oral presentation; responsiveness to questioning and adaptability in rebuttal/surrebuttal, and teamwork and time management.

Weighing 40% of the overall score - 20 points

See the range of scores below:

- Poor (0-4)
- Fair (5-8)
- Good (9-12)
- Very Good (13-16)
- Excellent (17-20)

The Written Submission scores comprise 40% of the overall Team score and the Oral Pleading score comprises 60% of the overall Team score.

For each criterion, the possible scores ranged between 0 (the lowest) and 30 or 20, respectively (the highest). The Complainant/Respondent score of each Judge was calculated by adding up the points for each criterion and dividing them by 2.

The scores have been calculated in accordance with the scoring system outlined in the <u>Calculation</u> <u>Of Scores</u> section of this report.

WRITTEN ROUND

Each Written Submission was assessed by an independent trade law practitioner or academic. We would like to take the opportunity to thank the 54 Panellists - people who dedicated their time and expertise to read and grade this year's submissions: Adrian Vazquez, Akawat Laowonsiri, Alejandro Jaramillo, Aman Sadiwala, Anastasiia Koltunova, Angelique Saw, Antonia Carzaniga, Ayushi Singh, Chibole Wakoli, Daniel Baker, Daniela Gomez Altamirano, Deena Bajrai, Dmytro Galagan, Gertrude Nimako-Boateng, Gerard Penalosa, Gracia Marin-Duran, Harsh (Hiroo) Gursahani, Jere Kahaki, Jenya Grigorova, Lijun Zhao, Marisa Goldstein, Mariia Shulha, Marios Tokas, Maria Pereyra, Mariya-Khrystyna Koziy, Markus Wagner, Mary Elizabeth Chelliah, Miguel Villamizar, Minn Naing Oo, Muhammad Ahsan Ali, Nataliia Kozachuk, Neada Mullalli, Olesia Kryvetska, Oleksandra Sandul, Ozlem Canbeldek, Pamela Apaza, Panagiotis Kyriakou, Pallavi Bajaj, Qiu Xu Liao, Ridhish Rajvanshi, Rishabha Meena, Ruosi Zhang, Sergei Tymma, Shashank Kumar, Slava Opeida, Sybilla Fries, Tatia Nikvashvili, Thomas WK Wong, Urvi Tembey, Wan Mohd Asnur bin Wan Jantan, Xiaolu Zhu, and Yannick Trudel.

Thank you to each and every one of you for taking some time out of your busy schedules to help by reading and scoring the submissions of the teams. I hope that the reading was both interesting and entertaining.

1st Round of Written Submissions' Scoring

And d

Toom No.	C	Complainan	t	I	Total		
Team No.	Scores	Penalties	Total	Scores Penalties		Total	Score
1	29.00	2.50	26.500	41.00	0.50	40.500	67.000
2	30.00	0.50	29.500	27.00	0.75	26.250	55.750
3	17.50	3.00	14.500	7.50	3.00	4.500	19.000
4	34.50	1.00	33.500	42.75	1.00	41.750	75.250
5	44.00	1.00	43.000	34.40	1.50	32.900	75.900
6	37.00	0.50	36.500	40.75	0.50	40.250	76.750
7	36.50	5.00	31.500	34.60	4.00	30.600	62.100
9	41.80	2.75	39.050	37.50	2.25	35.250	74.300
10	40.00	0.00	40.000	28.00	0.00	28.000	68.000
11	20.00	0.00	20.000	20.50	0.00	20.500	40.500
12	39.00	3.00	36.000	36.00	5.50	30.500	66.500
13	44.00	1.00	43.000	39.50	0.50	39.000	82.000
14	43.00	0.50	42.500	46.00	0.50	45.500	88.000
15	32.50	0.00	32.500	31.50	0.50	31.000	63.500
18	45.00	0.00	45.000	40.50	0.00	40.500	85.500
19	39.00	2.00	37.000	34.00	1.00	33.000	70.000
20	31.00	1.50	29.500	33.50	2.00	31.500	61.000
21	43.50	0.75	42.750	35.00	0.75	34.250	77.000
22	43.00	0.00	43.000	45.00	0.00	45.000	88.000
23	40.00	2.50	37.500	33.00	2.25	30.750	68.250
24	27.50	1.50	26.000	26.50	2.50	24.000	50.000
25	34.40	1.75	32.650	30.50	1.25	29.250	61.900
26	40.50	5.50	35.000	41.40	5.50	35.900	70.900
27	21.25	1.25	20.000	24.50	0.50	24.000	44.000
28	32.00	1.00	31.000	23.50	2.75	20.750	51.750
29	43.00	1.75	41.250	48.00	1.50	46.500	87.750
30	34.00	1.25	32.750	36.50	1.25	35.250	68.000
31	44.50	0.00	44.500	37.00	0.00	37.000	81.500
33	32.55	0.50	32.050	40.75	0.50	40.250	72.300

34	38.20	0.50	37.700	35.00	0.50	34.500	72.200
35	30.00	1.00	29.000	29.00	4.00	25.000	54.000
36	43.00	2.50	40.500	43.50	1.00	42.500	83.000
37	34.00	0.50	33.500	42.00	0.50	41.500	75.000
38	49.50	0.00	49.500	35.00	0.00	35.000	84.500
39	38.00	1.00	37.000	46.00	1.00	45.000	82.000
40	22.00	1.50	20.500	32.25	0.00	32.250	52.750
41	41.00	0.00	41.000	33.50	1.00	32.500	73.500
42	18.00	0.00	18.000	25.00	0.00	25.000	43.000
43	35.50	0.00	35.500	36.20	0.00	36.200	71.700
44	16.50	1.50	15.000	20.50	1.00	19.500	34.500
45	26.00	0.50	25.500	31.40	0.00	31.400	56.900
48	22.50	1.50	21.000	32.70	1.50	31.200	52.200
49	22.30	1.50	20.800	16.00	1.50	14.500	35.300
50	41.00	3.00	38.000	35.00	1.00	34.000	72.000
51	21.75	0.00	21.750	29.00	0.00	29.000	50.750
52	45.00	0.00	45.000	43.00	0.00	43.000	88.000
53	38.50	1.00	37.500	42.00	1.00	41.000	78.500
55	41.00	2.75	38.250	37.00	2.50	34.500	72.750
56	25.00	0.00	25.000	41.00	0.00	41.000	66.000
57	23.00	1.00	22.000	29.00	1.00	28.000	50.000
60	43.50	0.50	43.000	39.00	1.00	38.000	81.000
61	40.25	3.00	37.250	27.00	3.50	23.500	60.750
62	40.00	0.00	40.000	31.10	0.00	31.100	71.100
63	18.75	1.00	17.750	43.50	1.00	42.500	60.250
64	34.50	3.50	31.000	7.50	2.50	5.000	36.000
66	9.00	7.50	1.500	16.50	7.50	9.000	10.500
67	22.25	2.75	19.500	29.50	2.75	26.750	46.250
68	15.00	1.00	14.000	18.25	2.25	16.000	30.000
69	30.30	0.25	30.050	24.00	0.00	24.000	54.050
70	41.10	0.50	40.600	44.75	1.00	43.750	84.350
71	37.50	1.00	36.500	33.10	1.00	32.100	68.600
74	26.00	5.75	20.250	31.50	6.25	25.250	45.500

and a

AL.A.

75	40.50	0.25	40.250	44.70	0.25	44.450	84.700
76	43.00	4.00	39.000	30.00	1.50	28.500	67.500
77	30.00	5.25	24.750	28.20	3.25	24.950	49.700
78	21.70	2.00	19.700	10.25	2.00	8.250	27.950
79	33.20	1.50	31.700	27.00	1.00	26.000	57.700
81	23.00	2.75	20.250	27.00	2.00	25.000	45.250
83	30.75	1.00	29.750	14.50	1.50	13.000	42.750
84	36.50	1.00	35.500	43.00	1.00	42.000	77.500
85	28.75	2.50	26.250	40.50	2.50	38.000	64.250
87	44.50	1.00	43.500	16.00	1.00	15.000	58.500
88	23.50	1.50	22.000	35.50	1.50	34.000	56.000
89	41.00	1.50	39.500	40.00	1.50	38.500	78.000
90	36.00	3.00	33.000	38.00	5.75	32.250	65.250
91	30.00	0.75	29.250	42.00	0.25	41.750	71.000
92	30.00	0.00	30.000	18.50	1.50	17.000	47.000

- F- 8.

4.4.4

Team	Complainant				Respondent				Total
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Penalties	Total	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Penalties	Total	Score
6	37.00	39.00	0.50	37.750	40.75	29.25	0.50	34.750	72.500
9	41.80	39.80	2.75	39.425	37.50	31.20	2.25	33.225	72.650
13	44.00	35.50	1.00	39.250	39.50	32.00	0.50	35.500	74.750
14	43.00	31.00	0.50	36.750	46.00	34.50	0.50	40.000	76.750
18	45.00	35.00	0.00	40.000	40.50	48.00	0.00	44.250	84.250
22	43.00	35.80	0.00	39.400	45.00	42.20	0.00	43.600	83.000
29	43.00	43.00	1.75	42.125	48.00	42.00	1.50	44.250	86.375
31	44.50	45.90	0.00	45.200	37.00	42.50	0.00	39.750	84.950
33	32.55	42.50	0.50	37.275	40.75	42.30	0.50	41.275	78.550
34	38.20	44.45	0.50	41.075	35.00	29.50	0.50	32.000	73.075
36	43.00	45.65	2.50	43.075	43.50	35.00	1.00	38.750	81.825
37	34.00	38.50	0.50	36.000	42.00	37.50	0.50	39.500	75.500
39	38.00	36.50	1.00	36.750	46.00	46.00	1.00	45.500	82.250
41	41.00	46.00	0.00	43.500	33.50	39.00	1.00	35.750	79.250
43	35.50	21.50	0.00	28.500	36.20	34.00	0.00	35.100	63.600
52	45.00	44.00	0.00	44.500	43.00	43.00	0.00	43.000	87.500
53	38.50	33.00	1.00	35.250	42.00	40.50	1.00	40.750	76.000
60	43.50	44.00	0.50	43.500	39.00	35.00	1.00	36.500	80.000
62	40.00	43.00	0.00	41.500	31.10	31.50	0.00	31.300	72.800
70	41.10	41.60	0.50	41.100	44.75	44.00	1.00	43.875	84.975
71	37.50	40.50	1.00	38.500	33.10	38.00	1.00	35.050	73.550
75	40.50	38.50	0.25	39.375	44.70	33.50	0.25	38.975	78.350
84	36.50	39.10	1.00	37.300	43.00	33.50	1.00	37.750	75.050
90	36.00	31.50	3.00	32.250	38.00	40.00	5.75	36.125	68.375

2nd Round of Written Submissions' Scoring - Finalist Teams

And A

REGIONAL ROUNDS

Participation in the Regional Rounds is the second stage of the Competition following the Written Submissions. This year, we had the privilege of welcoming the participants to Regional Rounds in a physical format.

Out of the 77 teams that submitted their Written Submissions, **65 Teams participated in one of six Regional Rounds**. The Regional Rounds were hosted by the following hosts at the mentioned locations:

- East Asia and Oceania Regional Round: Phnom Penh, Cambodia, hosted by National University of Management;
- West and South Asia Regional Round: Jodhpur, India, hosted by National Law University Jodhpur;
- All-American Regional Round: Quito, Ecuador, hosted by Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar;
- African Regional Round: Nairobi, Kenya, hosted by Strathmore University;
- 1st European Regional Round: Amsterdam, the Netherlands, hosted by ELSA the Netherlands;
- 2nd European Regional Round: Geneva, Switzerland, hosted by ELSA International. This Regional Round was initially supposed to be organised in Istanbul, Türkiye, by ELSA Türkiye, however, due to the severe protests going on mid-April, when the Round was scheduled, ELSA and the organisers took the decision to relocate the event. We remain grateful to the organisers of ELSA Türkiye for all their efforts and hope that they will get the opportunity of hosting a Regional Round in the future.

The Regional Rounds consisted of Preliminary Rounds, Semi-Finals, the Grand Final, and of course social elements such as Sponsors' events and ceremonies. We would like to take this opportunity to thank all of our Regional Round Organisers and hosts for taking on the challenge of hosting a Regional Round and for doing so successfully.

East Asia & Oceania Regional Round

About the Regional Round

The first Regional Round of the 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition was organised by the National University of Management in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, from the 28th of February to the 3rd of March 2025. A special thanks goes to the Host for the organisation of the Regional Round. From 9 countries, a total of 12 teams from the following universities participated in this Regional Round:

- **Team 1** Singapore Management University (Singapore)
- Team 4 Soochow University, Faculty of Law (Taiwan)
- Team 6 National Taiwan University, Faculty of Law (Taiwan)
- Team 14 Peking University School of Transnational Law (China)
- Team 15 Universitas Airlangga, Faculty Of Law (Indonesia)
- Team 21 School of Law, Huazhong University of Science and Technology (China)
- Team 33 University of International Business and Economics (China)
- Team 51 Shanghai University of International Business and Economics (China)
- Team 55 National University of Management (Cambodia)
- Team 61 Diplomatic Academy of Viet Nam Faculty of International Law (Vietnam)
- Team 75 Ateneo De Manila University School of Law (Philippines)
- Team 85 Yonsei University (Republic of Korea)

The East Asia & Oceania Regional Rouns was supported by 22 Panellists and we wish to thank them for their time and contributions to the Regional Round. They are: Neysa Almandine Vulkania, Dany Channraksmeychhoukroth, Sivhoang Chea, Anthony Cheah Nicholls, Tianxin Fu Yuka Fukunaga, Xia Han, Ngov Huotchhay, Noury Kamel, Sin Kim Sean, Sae Kobayashi, Chhak Limchheang, Sithyka Jessica Meach, So Mosseny, Te Muykim, Rethda Navinth, Norn Panha, Kong Phallack, Rasul Rabia, Run Saray, Sin Soromnear, Chibole Wakoli.
An Organisers' Perspective

The National University of Management (NUM) was truly honoured to host the 23rd Edition of the East Asia and Oceania Regional Round of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition (JHJMCC). This marked our second consecutive year as host, and once again reaffirmed our commitment to legal education through the transformative power of international mooting.

At NUM, we strongly believe in the philosophy of "learning by doing." Moot court competitions, particularly the JHJMCC, offer a powerful platform for students to apply theoretical knowledge in practice, refine their legal reasoning, and engage with peers and experts from across the region. Our journey in international moots began in 2016, and by 2024, we had participated in over 80 international competitions. The JHJMCC has become a cornerstone of that journey.

This year, we welcomed 12 universities from across East Asia and Oceania. We were proud to see the regional round expand to include more teams than in previous years. It was particularly inspiring to witness the exceptional level of preparation, professionalism, and passion displayed by the students throughout the competition. Organising the Regional Round was made possible through the collaborative efforts of the NUM iLaw Program, our dedicated volunteers, faculty members, and generous partners.

We are particularly thankful to the European Law Students' Association (ELSA), especially Ms. Aliena Trefny and the Competitions Team, for once again entrusting Cambodia and NUM with this responsibility. Their professionalism and coordination made the entire experience smooth and enriching for everyone involved.

In every sense, this year's competition exemplified the values we hold dear—excellence, inclusivity, and international cooperation. While only one team advances to the Final Oral Round, we believe all participants are winners for having embarked on this rigorous and rewarding journey. We hope the memories, connections, and skills forged in Phnom Penh will accompany the students as they move forward in their legal careers.

We look forward to continuing our support of this meaningful initiative and to welcoming the international mooting community back to Cambodia in the years to come.

Written by the Organising Committee of the East Asia & Oceania Regional Round in Phnom Penh, Cambodia



The Organising Committee of the East Asia & Oceania Regional Round with the representatives of the WTO and ELSA

Results

Team No.	C	Complainan	it	I	Responden	t	Total
Teann no.	Scores	Penalties	Total	Scores	Penalties	Total	Score
1	29.00	2.50	26.500	41.00	0.50	40.500	67.000
4	34.50	1.00	33.500	42.75	1.00	41.750	75.250
6	37.00	0.50	36.500	40.75	0.50	40.250	76.750
14	43.00	0.50	42.500	46.00	0.50	45.500	88.000
15	32.50	0.00	32.500	31.50	0.50	31.000	63.500
21	43.50	0.75	42.750	35.00	0.75	34.250	77.000
33	32.55	0.50	32.050	40.75	0.50	40.250	72.300
51	21.75	0.00	21.750	29.00	0.00	29.000	50.750
55	41.00	2.75	38.250	37.00	2.50	34.500	72.750
61	40.25	3.00	37.250	27.00	3.50	23.500	60.750
75	40.50	0.25	40.250	44.70	0.25	44.450	84.700
85	28.75	2.50	26.250	40.50	2.50	38.000	64.250

WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES

Based on the scores, Team 21 from School of Law, Huazhong University of Science and Technology (China) was awarded the prize for *Best Complainant Written Submission (the Gabrielle Marceau Award)* of the East Asia & Oceania Regional Round, whereas Team 14 from the Peking University School of Transnational Law (China) was awarded the prize for *Best Respondent Written Submission (the Valerie Hughes Award)* and the prize for the *Best Overall Written Submission* of the East Asia & Oceania Regional Round.

TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

The Teams got to plead twice, once on behalf of the Complainant and once for the Respondent. Their score from the Oral Pleadings (60%) are then combined with their Written Submission score (40%) to give them an overall average score. The teams qualifying for the Semi-Finals are marked in green in the table below.

	Taam	(Compl	ainant	:		Respo	ondent			WS	WS	OP	PR
Rank	Team No.	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Total	Score	Score (*0.4)	Score (*0.6)	Score
1	14	39.00	45.00	37.00	40.33	28.00	39.00	43.00	36.67	77.00	88.00	35.20	46.20	81.40
2	75	32.00	39.00	48.00	39.67	33.00	46.00	38.00	39.00	78.67	84.70	33.88	47.20	81.08
3	33	36.00	35.00	43.00	38.00	45.00	44.00	48.00	45.67	83.67	72.30	28.92	50.20	79.12
4	6	41.00	40.00	43.00	41.33	32.00	42.00	43.00	39.00	80.33	76.75	30.70	48.20	78.90
5	4	39.00	40.00	46.00	41.67	38.00	35.00	46.00	39.67	81.33	75.25	30.10	48.80	78.90
6	1	48.00	41.00	39.00	42.67	42.00	45.00	n/a	43.50	86.17	67.00	26.80	51.70	78.50
7	55	38.00	40.00	45.00	41.00	42.00	41.00	39.00	40.67	81.67	72.75	29.10	49.00	78.10
8	61	39.00	39.00	43.00	40.33	44.60	37.00	33.00	38.20	78.53	60.75	24.30	47.12	71.42
9	21	33.00	24.00	n/a	28.50	32.00	36.00	48.00	38.67	67.17	77.00	30.80	40.30	71.10
10	85	24.00	41.50	26.00	30.50	43.00	37.00	44.00	41.33	71.83	64.25	25.70	43.10	68.80
11	15	43.00	35.00	43.00	40.33	31.00	26.00	20.00	25.67	66.00	63.50	25.40	39.60	65.00
12	51	40.50	40.50	31.00	37.33	13.00	39.50	20.00	24.17	61.50	50.75	20.30	36.90	57.20

TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Team		Cor	nplain	ant			Res	pond	ent		Total	ws	WS Score	OP	SF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	TOLAI	Score	(*0.4)		Score
						Sen	ni Fina	l Rou	nd 1						
14	39.00	37.00	46.00	43.00	33.00						39.60	88.00	35.20	23.76	58.96
6						43.00	45.00	48.00	45.00	45.00	45.20	76.75	30.70	27.12	57.82
						Sen	ni Fina	l Rou	nd 2						
33	44.00	42.00	43.00	33.00	45.00						41.40	72.30	28.92	24.84	53.76
75						40.00	34.00	36.00	40.00	36.00	37.20	84.70	33.88	22.32	56.20

Teams qualifying for the Grand Final of the East Asia & Oceania Regional Round are marked in green in the table above.

TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Team			Co	mplain	ant			Total	WS	WS	OP Score	GF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	IOLAI	Score		(*0.6)	Score
75	42.00	39.00	42.00	39.00	46.00	44.00	45.00	42.43	84.70	33.88	25.46	59.34

Team			Re	sponde	ent			Total	WS	WS	OP Score	GF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	IOLAI	Score	(*0.4) (*0.6		Score
14	34.00	46.00	32.00	32.00	41.00	34.00	24.00	34.71	88.00	35.20	20.83	56.03

Based on the scores, **Team 75** from **Ateneo De Manila University School of Law (Philippines)** was declared the **Winner** of the East Asia & Oceania Regional Round and Team 14 from the **Peking University School of Transnational Law (China)** was declared the **Runner-Up** of the East Asia & Oceania Regional Round.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

In order to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds award, the orator had to plead for both Complainant and Respondent. The following table gives an overview of the individual scores awarded to each of the orators of the Preliminary Rounds. Fulfilling the aforementioned criteria, 26 orators were eligible to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds Award.

Team			Comp	lainant			Respo	ondent		Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Orator
	Yeo Shan Lyn	48.00	42.00	36.00	42.00	43.00	46.00	n/a	44.50	86.50
1	Goh E Hsuen	48.00	40.00	40.00	42.67	42.00	43.00	n/a	42.50	85.17
	Nicole Yeo Gek Bin	48.00	43.00	42.00	44.33	42.00	42.00	n/a	28.00	72.33
	Marcus Kuek Wei Xuan				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Cin Yi Syuan	38.00	30.00	39.00	35.67	42.00	40.00	48.00	43.33	79.00
4	Jing Xuan Huang	33.00	44.00	42.00	39.67	38.00	37.00	46.00	40.33	80.00
4	Hsin I Wu				0.00	34.00	28.00	43.00	35.00	n/a
	Chang Chien Yi	35.00	47.00	46.00	42.67				0.00	n/a
	Yen-Yu Lin				0.00	17.00	45.00	36.00	32.67	n/a
(Wei-Heng Chang	39.00	39.00	38.00	38.67				0.00	n/a
6	Chia-Wei Lin	46.00	41.00	41.00	42.67	39.00	40.00	46.00	41.67	84.33
	Bo-Yuan Yang	43.00	43.00	42.00	42.67	34.00	43.00	43.00	40.00	82.67
	Wang Shiyu	40.00	40.00	38.00	39.33	30.00	40.00	45.00	38.33	77.67
14	Chen Zehao	40.00	42.00	37.00	39.67	24.00	36.00	41.00	33.67	73.33
	Yan Yudie	39.00	35.00	37.00	37.00	27.00	41.00	44.00	37.33	74.33
	Elsa Octaria Geraryn	42.00	32.00	43.00	39.00				0.00	n/a
15	Andragista Tandju				0.00	30.00	21.00	18.00	23.00	n/a
15	Mohammad Gunawan	42.00	38.00	43.00	41.00	30.00	28.00	21.00	26.33	67.33
	Alfi Mirzan	42.00	38.00	40.00	40.00	28.00	23.00	18.00	23.00	63.00
	Ying Liu	33.00	34.00	n/a	33.50	32.00	35.00	48.00	38.33	71.83
21	Die Han	33.00	25.00	n/a	29.00	31.00	35.00	48.00	38.00	67.00
21	Lei Xiang	32.00	24.00	n/a	28.00	28.00	35.00	48.00	37.00	65.00
	Yanning Wu				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Tianzi Chang	36.00	35.00	43.00	38.00	45.00	45.00	48.00	46.00	84.00
22	Hao Yuan	36.00	34.00	40.00	36.67	45.00	38.00	47.00	43.33	80.00
33	Jia Guo	36.00	33.00	39.00	36.00	40.00	42.00	47.00	43.00	79.00
	Yule Pan				0.00				0.00	n/a

	Sen Lyu	42.00	40.00	32.00	38.00				0.00	n/a
51	Lingxiao Xu				0.00	14.00	38.00	17.00	23.00	n/a
51	Li Xue				0.00	15.00	37.00	18.00	23.33	n/a
	Zehui He	39.00	41.00	30.00	36.67				0.00	n/a
	Kimly Bun	38.00	40.00	44.00	40.67	43.00	37.00	35.00	38.33	79.00
55	Sopanha Sin	35.00	44.00	47.00	42.00	46.00	43.00	40.00	43.00	85.00
))	Rosa Kon				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Bunnun Nak				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Hieu Minh Tran	37.00	38.00	40.00	38.33	44.00	40.00	32.00	38.67	77.00
61	Hoang Yen Nguyen	43.00	44.00	43.00	43.33	48.00	35.00	40.00	41.00	84.33
01	Thai Quynh Do Vu	35.00	34.00	33.00	34.00	42.00	37.00	30.00	36.33	70.33
	Huyen Trang Nghiem									n/a
	Byron Steven S. Siy	30.00	38.00	48.00	38.67				0.00	n/a
75	Melanie de Guzman				0.00	27.00	46.00	35.00	36.00	n/a
	Raisa Pandapatan	39.00	41.00	49.00	43.00	28.00	45.00	41.00	38.00	81.00
85	Sungmin Oh	32.00	43.00	31.00	35.33	43.00	40.00	45.00	42.67	78.00
	Jinseok Chang	26.00	40.00	23.00	29.6 7	39.00	32.00	42.00	37.67	67.33

- And

Based on the scores, **Yeo Shan Lyn** from **Team 1** from the **Singapore Management University** (Singapore) was awarded the prize for *Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Semi-Finals only let teams plead on behalf of one party (Complainant or Respondent). Therefore, all of the 9 Team members pleading during the Semi-Finals were eligible for the Best Orator of the Semi-Finals award.

Team				Compl	ainant			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Wang Shiyu	37.00	42.00	46.00	47.00	33.00	41.00	41.00
14	Chen Zehao	36.00	35.00	46.00	47.00	33.00	39.40	39.40
	Yan Yudie	37.00	36.00	45.00	39.00	30.00	n/a	n/a
	Tianzi Chang	44.00	41.00	43.00	35.00	47.00	42.00	42.00
33	Hao Yuan	41.00	38.00	43.00	32.00	38.00	38.40	38.40
55	Yule Pan						n/a	n/a
	Jia Guo	41.00	41.00	39.00	32.00	39.00	38.40	38.40

Team	T 14 1			Respo	ondent			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Yen-Yu Lin	39	32	46	42	40	39.80	39.80
6	Wei-Heng Chang						n/a	n/a
0	Chia-Wei Lin	43.00	48.00	48.00	45.00	45.00	45.80	45.80
	Bo-Yuan Yang	43.00	47.00	48.00	48.00	46.00	46.40	46.40
	Byron Steven S. Siy						n/a	n/a
75	Melanie de Guzman	41.00	31.00	32.00	39.00	34.00	35.40	35.40
	Raisa Pandapatan	43.00	35.00	42.00	41.00	38.00	39.80	39.80

Based on the scores, Bo-Yuan Yang from **Team 6** from **National Taiwan University (Taiwan)** was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Semi-Finals*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Similar to the Semi-Finals, all 5 of the Team members pleading during the Grand Final were eligible for the Best Orator of the Grand Final award.

	Team	Team				Compl	ainant				Best
	No.	Members	Panelli st 1.	Panelli st 2.	Panelli st 3.	Panelli st 4.	Panelli st 5.	Panelli st 6.	Panelli st 7.	Total	Orator
I		Byron Steven Siy	43.00	42.00	43.00	36.00	45.00	46.00	45.00	42.86	42.86
	75	Raisa Pandapatan	42.00	38.00	43.00	39.00	43.00	45.00	46.00	42.29	42.29
Į		Melanie de Guzman								n/a	n/a

	Team	Team				Respo	ndent				Best
	No.	Members	Panelli st 1.	Panelli st 2.	Panelli st 3.	Panelli st 4.	Panelli st 5.	Panelli st 6.	Panelli st 7.	Total	Orator
I		Wang Shiyu	30.00	47.00	29.00	32.00	40.00	30.00	23.00	33.00	33.00
I	14	Chen Zehao	35.00	43.00	31.00	34.00	42.00	34.00	24.00	34.71	34.71
		Yan Yudie	31.00	42.00	33.00	30.00	41.00	34.00	24.00	33.57	33.57

Based on the scores, Byron Steven S. Siy from **Team 75** from **Ateneo De Manila University School of Law (Philippines)** was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Grand Final*.

Summary of Awards - East Asia & Oceania

- Winner: Team 75 Ateneo De Manila University School of Law (Philippines);
- Runner-Up: Team 14 Peking University School of Transnational Law (China);
- Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds: Yeo Shan Lyn, Team 1 Singapore Management University (Singapore);
- Best Orator of the Semi-Finals: Bo-Yuan Yang, Team 6 National Taiwan University (Taiwan);
- Best Orator of the Grand Final: Byron Steven S. Siy, Team 75 Ateneo De Manila University School of Law (Philippines);
- Best Complainant's Written Submission: Team 21 School of Law, Huazhong University of Science and Technology (China);
- Best Respondent's Written Submission: Team 14 Peking University School of Transnational Law (China);
- Best Orator Written Submission: Team 14 Peking University School of Transnational Law (China).

West & South Asia Regional Round

About the Regional Round

The second Regional Round of the 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition was organised by the National Law University Jodhpur in Jodhpur, India, from the 7th to the 10th of March 2025. A special thanks goes to the Host for the organisation of the Regional Round. From 3 countries, a total of 19 teams from the following universities participated in this Regional Round:

- Team 11 Government Law College, Mumbai (India);
- Team 24 Gujarat National Law University (India);
- Team 30 OP Jindal Global University (India);
- Team 31 National Law School of India University (India);
- Team 34 Hidayatullah National Law University (India);
- Team 36 The West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences (India);
- Team 42 Institute of Law, Nirma University (India);
- Team 43 National Law Institute University, Bhopal (India);
- Team 49 School of Law, Christ, Bengaluru (India);
- Team 56 Maharashtra National Law University Nagpur (India);
- Team 57 National Law University Odisha (India);
- Team 62 University of Colombo, and University of Jaffna (Sri Lankan National Team);
- Team 63 Symbiosis Law School (India);
- Team 68 University of World Economy and Diplomacy (Uzbekistan);
- Team 71 National Law University, Jodhpur (India);
- Team 77 Tashkent State University of Law (Uzbekistan);
- Team 79 Symbiosis Law School Hyderabad (India);
- Team 89 Sri Lanka Law College (Sri Lanka);
- Team 91 Nalsar University of Law, Hyderabad (India).

The West & South Asia Regional Rounds was supported by 36 Panellists and we wish to thank them for their time and contributions to the Regional Round. They are: Shantanu Singh, Udita Sharma, Preetkiran Kaur, Claude Chase, Vishakha Srivastava, Debashish Lahiri, Rishabha Meena, Tanvi Parveen, Anushka Aggarwal, Ayushi Singh, Vishisth Malhotra, Yashovardhan Singh, Mahima Ahuja, Ritvik Ranjan Rao, Ashutosh Kashyap, Samarth Nayar, Vartul Srivastava, Sparsha, Harsha Srinivas Kanu, Aayush Rastogi, Shrinkhla Gupta, Amit Ranadev, Sanath Wijesinghe, Kiran Manokaran, Kruti Parashar, Jamshed Ahmed Siddiqui, Krishna Bhattacharya, Kailas Surendran, Hridayanand Ojha, Tathagatha, Shashank Kumar, Anand Nandakumar, Ambassador Ujal Singh Bhatia, Sneha Singh, Shiny Pradeep, Atul Sharma, and Devindra Bagia.

An Organisers' Perspective

The Research and Advisory Centre for International Economic Law (RACIEL) had the privilege to host the 23rd West & South Asia Regional Round of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition at National Law University, Jodhpur (NLUJ). The four days of the event and the four months preceding the event gave the organising committee members an unmatched professional experience. This fulfilling experience brought together NLUJ's core values of academic rigour, institutional pride, and global engagement in international trade law. As one of the few universities in the region offering a specialised Trade and Investment Law Honours programme and housing Trade, Law and Development (TL&D), a globally respected journal, the relevance of this moot to our institutional ethos was beyond compare.

- Andre 1

Our initiative to apply to host the round was driven by a strong alignment with the Competition's values—its global reputation, the substantive depth of WTO law, and the spirit of keen competition that it fosters. It was not only an academic endeavour but a celebration of the vibrant trade law community we are proud to be part of.

We were fortunate to receive enthusiastic support from across the board — our dedicated faculty, student volunteers, and most significantly, the panellists, who brought immense value to the competition. We welcomed esteemed panellists such as Ambassador Ujal Singh Bhatia, Shashank Kumar, an alumnus of NLUJ and current Legal Affairs Officer at the WTO, Claude Chase, Anand Nandkumar from World Trade Institute, Krishna Bhattacharya from Centre for Trade and Investment Law (CTIL), and Vartul Srivastava from Centre for WTO Studies(CWS). Their generosity with time and feedback made the rounds intellectually rich and rewarding. We were equally supported at every step by Aliena and Gia, representatives of the ELSA International team, whose warmth and guidance ensured that the event was aligned with the global standards of the competition.

ELSA International also presented numerous qualities to learn from. There was a systematic and generous support structure provided by the JHJMCC team. Aliena Trefny and Gia provided us unimaginably efficient inputs in the flexible yet regular update meetings which fuelled the event. From an organisational standpoint, the flexibility of the Hosting Agreement allowed us to tailor aspects of the event to our institutional needs, without compromising the quality or spirit of the Competition. We found the framework both supportive and adaptable, and do not propose any changes to the agreement or the quality standards.

We were able to raise approximately INR 24, 00, 000, through consistent communication with the premiere legal organisation and law firms in India and abroad dealing with the discipline of international trade law. This included INR 12, 00, 000 of sponsorship money alone raised from

CTIL, CWS, Sarvada Legal, Lakshmikumaran & Shridharan Attorneys (LKS). We were especially honoured to have the support of luminaries like Dr. Pritam Banerjee (CWS), Dr. James Nedumpara (CTIL), Mr. Atul Sharma(Sarvada Legal) and Ms. Charanya Lakshmikumaran (LKS). Our expenditure of approximately INR 23, 00, 000 reflected our commitment to ensuring a world-class experience for all involved. This covered accommodation and transport both for judges and participants, meals across all days, a cultural evening and networking session, and a city tour, all aimed at creating a holistic and memorable experience. We personally inspected and ensured that the funds raised for the event delivered the best quality food, accommodation, stationery, facilities and atmosphere.

- Andal

Much of our effort was focused on thoughtful communication — both with teams and with judges. For teams, we ensured clarity through consistent and centralised channels, timely updates, and an early release of schedules and logistics. We addressed every query and issue of the participants personally. For our panellists, we went a step further. Each judge was assigned a dedicated point of contact (POC), provided with hard copies of all documents, and assisted with their commute, accommodation, and on-ground coordination. The POCs streamlined onboarding, and informal interactions allowed space for deep, enriching conversations on international trade law and the evolving WTO framework. A formal feedback mechanism also helped us gather invaluable insights for future editions.

The true highlights of this event were the unprecedented challenges which yielded the convergence of excellence, in advocacy, in organisation, and in the spirit of global legal dialogue. The campus came alive with the energy of passionate law students, the mentorship of experienced panellists, and the shared belief in upholding the values of fairness, multilateralism, and academic integrity.

Our Vice Chancellor, Prof. (Dr.) Harpreet Kaur, with her administrative excellence and strategic suggestions, was our guiding light throughout this event. We were supported by a determined team of administrative and support staff at NLUJ. To everyone who made this possible, from the student volunteers to our faculty director, Dr. Bipin Kumar, Director of RACIEL, whose personal efforts, vision, and mentorship anchored the event, we express our deepest gratitude. For us, the West and South Asia Regional Round of the John H. Jackson moot court competition was beyond a moot - a testament to our collective commitment to the future of international trade law.

We look forward to continuing our engagement with the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition and remain deeply honoured to have contributed to its legacy.

Written by the Organising Committee of the West & South Asia Regional Round in Jodhpur, India



The organisers of the West 완 South Asian Regional Round during the Opening Ceremony

Results

WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES

Transla	C	Complainan	t		Responden	t	Total
Team No.	Scores	Penalties	Total	Scores	Penalties	Total	Score
11	20.00	0.00	20.000	20.50	0.00	20.500	40.500
24	27.50	1.50	26.000	26.50	2.50	24.000	50.000
30	34.00	1.25	32.750	36.50	1.25	35.250	68.000
31	44.50	0.00	44.500	37.00	0.00	37.000	81.500
34	38.20	0.50	37.700	35.00	0.50	34.500	72.200
36	43.00	2.50	40.500	43.50	1.00	42.500	83.000
42	18.00	0.00	18.000	25.00	0.00	25.000	43.000
43	35.50	0.00	35.500	36.20	0.00	36.200	71.700
49	22.30	1.50	20.800	16.00	1.50	14.500	35.300
56	25.00	0.00	25.000	41.00	0.00	41.000	66.000
57	23.00	1.00	22.000	29.00	1.00	28.000	50.000
62	40.00	0.00	40.000	31.10	0.00	31.100	71.100
63	18.75	1.00	17.750	43.50	1.00	42.500	60.250
68	15.00	1.00	14.000	18.25	2.25	16.000	30.000
71	37.50	1.00	36.500	33.10	1.00	32.100	68.600
77	30.00	5.25	24.750	28.20	3.25	24.950	49.700
79	33.20	1.50	31.700	27.00	1.00	26.000	57.700
89	41.00	1.50	39.500	40.00	1.50	38.500	78.000
91	30.00	0.75	29.250	42.00	0.25	41.750	71.000

Based on the scores, Team 31 from the National Law School of India University (India) was awarded the prize for *Best Complainant Written Submission (the Gabrielle Marceau Award).* For the award of the *the Best Respondent Written Submission (the Valerie Hughes Award),* there was a tie between Teams 36 and 62 from the West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences (India) and the Symbiosis Law School (India) respectively. The award of the *Best Overall Written Submission* of the West & South Asia Regional Round went to Team 36 from the West Bengal University of Juridical Sciences (India).

TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

The Teams got to plead twice, once on behalf of the Complainant and once for the Respondent. Their score from the Oral Pleadings (60%) are then combined with their Written Submission score (40%) to give them an overall average score. The teams qualifying for the Semi-Finals are marked in green in the table below.

	Team	(Compl	ainant	:		Respo	ondent			WS	WS	OP	PR
Rank	No.	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Total	Score	Score (*0.4)	Score (*0.6)	Scor e
1	31	40.00	40.00	42.50	40.83	45.00	44.00	43.00	44.00	84.83	81.50	32.60	50.90	83.50
2	34	46.00	47.00	44.00	45.67	38.00	38.00	36.00	37.33	83.00	75.37	30.15	49.80	79.95
3	71	34.00	45.00	38.00	39.00	47.00	45.00	47.00	46.33	85.33	68.60	27.44	51.20	78.64
4	36	41.00	40.50	32.00	37.83	35.00	38.00	40.00	37.67	75.50	83.00	33.20	45.30	78.50
5	62	44.00	41.00	45.00	43.33	35.00	37.00	40.00	37.33	80.67	71.10	28.44	48.40	76.84
6	43	42.00	45.00	39.00	42.00	35.00	40.00	37.00	37.33	79.33	71.70	28.68	47.60	76.28
7	30	40.00	27.00	35.00	34.00	34.00	44.00	40.00	39.33	73.33	69.25	27.70	44.00	71.70
8	56	30.00	35.00	34.00	33.00	42.00	37.00	42.50	40.50	73.50	66.00	26.40	44.10	70.50
9	91	28.00	28.00	27.00	27.67	21.30	31.00	35.00	29.10	56. 77	71.00	28.40	34.06	62.46
10	63	30.00	40.00	36.00	35.33	21.00	19.00	27.00	22.33	57.6 7	60.25	24.10	34.60	58.70
11	89	20.00	24.00	20.00	21.33	24.00	25.00	23.00	24.00	45.33	78.00	31.20	27.20	58.40
12	24	36.00	35.00	32.00	34.33	22.00	29.00	30.00	27.00	61.33	50.00	20.00	36.80	56.80
13	42	24.00	21.00	22.00	22.33	39.00	45.00	33.00	39.00	61.33	43.00	17.20	36.80	54.00
14	77	19.00	18.00	16.00	17.67	34.00	34.50	31.00	33.17	50.83	49.70	19.88	30.50	50.38
15	49	25.00	30.00	31.00	28.67	33.00	37.00	23.00	31.00	59.6 7	35.30	14.12	35.80	49.92
16	79	20.00	26.00	22.00	22.67	21.00	12.00	20.00	17.67	40.33	57.70	23.08	24.20	47.28
17	57	13.00	16.00	17.00	15.33	26.00	21.00	26.00	24.33	39.67	50.00	20.00	23.80	43.80
18	11	13.00	17.00	27.00	19.00	18.00	25.00	24.00	22.33	41.33	40.50	16.20	24.80	41.00
19	68	24.00	28.00	22.00	24.67	16.50	12.00	17.00	15.17	39.83	30.00	12.00	23.90	35.90

TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Team		Con	nplain	ant		Respondent					Total	ws	WS	OP	SF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Score	Score (*0.4)		Score
						Sen	ni Fina	ıl Rou	nd 1						
36	35.00	40.00	38.00	38.50	34.00						37.10	83.00	33.20	22.26	55.46
31						40.00	40.00	35.00	46.00	38.00	39.80	81.50	32.60	23.88	56.48
						Sen	ni Fina	ıl Rou	nd 2						
34	45.00	44.00	46.50	41.00	40.00						43.30	75.37	30.15	25.98	56.13
71						38.00 38.00 34.00 33.00 45.0					37.60	68.60	27.44	22.56	50.00

Teams qualifying for the Grand Final of the West & South Asia Regional Round are marked in green in the table above.

TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Team			Co	mplain	ant			Total	ws	WS	OP Score	GF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	TOtal	Score	(*0.4)	(*0.6)	Score
31	45.00	40.00	35.00	40.00	42.00	45.00	38.00	40.71	81.50	32.60	24.43	57.03

Team			Re	sponde	ent			Total	WS	WS	OP Score	GF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	IOtal	Score	(*0.4)	(*0.6)	Score
34	37.00	40.00	39.00	31.00	34.00	40.00	38.00	37.00	75.37	30.15	22.20	52.35

Based on the scores, Team 31 from National Law School of India University (India) was declared the Winner of the West & South Asia Regional Round and Team 34 from the Hidayatullah National Law University (India) was declared the Runner-Up of the West & South Asia Regional Round.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

In order to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds award, the orator had to plead for both Complainant and Respondent. The following table gives an overview of the individual scores awarded to each of the orators of the Preliminary Rounds. Fulfilling the aforementioned criteria, 48 orators were eligible to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds Award.

Team			Compl	lainant			Respo	ondent		Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Orator
	Shriganesh Jagdale	14.00	18.00	39.00	23.67	16.00	21.00	27.00	21.33	45.00
11	Gaurav Pawar				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Anushka Devkhedkar	12.00	16.00	31.00	19.67	14.00	20.00	20.00	18.00	37.67
	Mrunmayee Murudkar	12.00	16.00	36.00	21.33	14.00	20.00	24.00	19.33	40.67
	Rishabh Sharma	38.00	34.00	36.00	36.00	19.00	25.00	14.00	19.33	55.33
24	Maahi Shah	44.00	39.00	42.00	41.67	31.00	33.00	24.00	29.33	71.00
24	Khushi Patel				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Aditya Belsare				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Amani Ahuja	36.00	30.00	35.00	33.67	33.00	41.00	40.00	38.00	71.67
30	Meher Shah				0.00				0.00	n/a
50	Aarav Goel	40.00	27.00	35.00	34.00	37.00	45.00	43.00	41.67	75.67
	Bhuvana Katakam	38.00	25.00	26.00	29.67	37.00	43.00	44.00	41.33	71.00
	Anshu Varahagiri	37.50	39.00	32.00	36.17	47.00	45.00	44.00	45.33	81.50
31	Arushi Singh	40.00	38.00	39.00	39.00	39.00	38.00	38.00	38.33	77.33
	Harshvardhan Ray	43.50	43.00	38.00	41.50	43.00	42.00	42.00	42.33	83.83
	Sanjana Ramnath	42.00	49.00	44.00	45.00	32.00	42.00	40.00	38.00	83.00
2/	Ishwaryah Manikandan	41.00	43.00	46.00	43.33	25.00	26.00	30.00	27.00	70.33
34	Vriddhi Galada				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Kruthika Kumar	37.00	47.50	46.00	43.50	39.00	38.00	36.00	37.67	81.17
	Nupur Gupta	45.00	43.00	42.00	43.33	38.00	37.00	41.00	38.67	82.00
36	Pragya Mittal	40.00	38.00	33.00	37.00	34.00	35.00	40.00	36.33	73.33
30	Rohini Mehta				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Piyush Mohapatra								0.00	n/a
	Dhyey Jani	22.00	19.00	14.00	18.33	37.00	46.00	35.00	39.33	57.67
42	Zarana Acharya	26.00	19.00	18.00	21.00	32.00	42.00	33.00	35.67	56.67
	Dhaani Gautam	26.00	22.00	22.00	23.33	26.00	30.00	24.00	26.67	n/a

	Anushka Singh				0.00				0.00	n/a
43	Urja Bhardwaj	25.00	26.00	40.00	30.33	29.00	38.00	31.00	32.67	63.00
43	Anamika Singh	34.00	45.00	47.00	42.00	35.00	42.00	37.00	38.00	80.00
	Tarun Chittupalli	42.00	36.00	34.00	37.33	29.00	39.00	33.00	33.67	71.00
	Parth Verma	26.00	40.00	38.00	34.6 7	23.00	36.00	36.00	31.67	66.33
49	Blessen Tom Cyriac	21.00	22.00	22.00	21.67	23.00	37.00	28.00	29.33	51.00
49	Justin George Alex				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Aafreen Mohammed	28.00	32.00	34.00	31.33	23.00	36.00	34.00	31.00	62.33
	Argha Maitra				0.00				0.00	n/a
56	Arpita Upadhyay	29.00	35.00	33.00	32.33	41.50	42.00	38.00	40.50	72.83
50	Tanishka Jain	26.00	30.00	30.00	28.67	42.50	41.00	40.00	41.17	69.83
	Disha Bias	27.00	37.00	29.00	31.00	40.00	22.00	41.00	34.33	65.33
	Anoushka Bahadur	17.00	20.00	20.00	19.00	27.00	32.00	23.00	27.33	46.33
57	Eshal Zahur	8.00	16.00	15.00	13.00	27.00	28.00	17.00	24.00	37.00
	Samar Pratap Singh				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Dulandi Gunasekera	46.00	40.00	45.00	43.67				0.00	n/a
62	Ranudi Premasinghe	45.00	46.00	47.00	46.00	36.00	33.00	31.00	33.33	79.33
62	Udumbara Abeytunga				0.00	29.00	33.00	25.00	29.00	n/a
	Buthmini Mohotty	42.00	42.00	46.00	43.33	40.00	37.00	39.00	38.67	82.00
	Ojas Jain	29.00	32.00	26.00	29.00	20.00	22.00	18.00	20.00	49.00
63	Aarnav Alva	35.00	44.00	35.00	38.00	22.00	24.00	21.00	22.33	60.33
65	Aarshia Mukherjee				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Abhay Karan Chug				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Bokhodir Dadaev	23.00	26.00	28.00	25.67				0.00	n/a
68	Kamola Usmonova				0.00				0.00	n/a
60	Eldorbek Elmurodov	17.00	24.00	18.00	19.67	18.00	10.00	15.00	14.33	34.00
	Sarvinoz Abdunazarova	19.00	27.00	21.00	22.33	15.00	18.00	19.00	17.33	39.6 7
	Charuvi	23.00	43.00	33.00	33.00	46.00	45.00	45.00	45.33	78.33
71	Kashish Saxena	28.00	46.50	38.00	37.50	47.00	46.00	47.00	46.67	84.1 7
	Manvi Goyal				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Shreshth Jindal	25.00	44.50	36.00	35.17	48.00	45.00	48.00	47.00	82.17
	Asliddin Ochilov	16.00	17.00	20.00	17.67	33.00	35.00	36.00	34.67	52.33
77	Raykhona Kamolidinova	12.00	16.00	12.00	13.33	28.00	28.00	30.00	28.67	42.00

- Andred

- F. S.

	Srijan Bisht				0.00				0.00	n/a
79	Raashi Saxena	18.00	24.00	20.00	20.67	19.00	11.00	18.00	16.00	36.67
	Kaviya Swaminathan	21.00	26.00	22.00	23.00	20.00	17.00	27.00	21.33	44.33
	Oshi Yadav				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Hameed Reshman	20.00	25.00	21.00	22.00	25.00	27.00	26.00	26.00	48.00
89	Binuri Gunawardena	24.00	27.00	23.00	24.67	23.00	22.00	23.00	22.67	47.33
07	Javana Rohanadeera	16.00	21.00	12.00	16.33	22.00	20.00	22.00	21.33	37.67
	Rathnasekara Arachchige				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Aarushi Gulechha	28.00	23.00	25.00	25.33	20.00	31.00	35.00	28.67	54.00
91	Ishita Sen				0.00				0.00	n/a
91	Saloni Maheshwari	28.00	27.00	24.00	26.33	19.00	35.00	30.00	28.00	54.33
	Tamanna Yadav	29.00	21.00	30.00	26.67	25.00	29.00	42.00	32.00	58.6 7

Based on the scores, Kashish Saxena from Team 71 from the National Law University, Jodhpur (India) was awarded the prize for *Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Semi-Finals only let teams plead on behalf of one party (Complainant or Respondent). Therefore, all of the 9 Team members pleading during the Semi-Finals were eligible for the Best Orator of the Semi-Finals award.

Team				Compl	ainant			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Sanjana Ramnath	42.00	45.00	40.00	41.00	42.00	42.00	42.00
34	Ishwaryah Manikandan	35.00	41.00	33.50	35.00	32.00	35.30	35.30
54	Kruthika Senthil Kumar	45.00	44.00	43.00	41.00	40.00	42.60	42.60
	Vriddhi Galada						n/a	n/a
	Nupur Gupta	31.00	39.00	39.00	42.00	33.00	36.80	36.80
36	Pragya Mittal	34.00	38.00	35.00	36.00	32.00	35.00	35.00
50	Rohini Mehta						n/a	n/a
	Piyush Mohapatra						n/a	n/a

Team				Respo	ndent			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Anshu Varahagiri	38.00	45.00	35.00	40.00	37.00	39.00	39.00
31	Arushi Singh	34.00	43.00	32.00	39.00	37.00	37.00	37.00
	Harshvardhan Ray	36.00	43.00	37.00	35.00	34.00	37.00	37.00
	Charuvi	35.00	35.00	31.50	35.00	30.00	33.30	33.30
71	Kashish Saxena	38.00	39.00	32.50	37.00	35.00	36.30	36.30
/1	Shreshth Jindal	42.00	41.00	37.00	42.00	40.00	40.40	40.40
	Manvi Goyal						n/a	n/a

Based on the scores, Kruthika Kumar from **Team 34** from **Hidayatullah National Law University (India)** was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Semi-Finals*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Similar to the Semi-Finals, all 6 of the Team members pleading during the Grand Final were eligible for the Best Orator of the Grand Final award.

I	Team	Team	Complainant								Best
	No.	Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator
I		Anshu Varahagiri	37.00	45.00	44.00	43.00	42.00	42.00	46.00	42.71	42.71
I	31	Arushi Singh	31.00	35.00	33.00	35.00	24.00	34.00	42.00	33.43	33.43
l		Harshvardhan Ray	35.00	42.00	42.00	37.00	37.00	40.00	43.00	39.43	39.43

Team	Team				Respo	ondent				Best
No.	Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator
	Sanjana Ramnath	34.00	39.00	30.00	22.00	33.00	38.00	33.00	32.71	32.71
34	Ishwaryah Manikandan	41.00	45.00	40.00	35.00	44.00	42.00	35.00	40.29	40.29
54	Kruthika Senthil Kumar	36.00	42.00	36.00	36.00	41.00	38.00	36.00	37.86	37.86
	Vriddhi Galada								n/a	n/a

Based on the scores, Anshu Varahagiri from Team 31 from National Law School of India University (India) was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Grand Final*.

Summary of Awards - West & South Asia

- Winner: Team 31 National Law School of India University (India);
- Runner-Up: Team 34 Hidayatullah National Law University (India);
- Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds: Kashish Saxena, Team 71 National Law University Jodhpur (India);
- Best Orator of the Semi-Finals: Kruthika Senthil Kumar, Team 34 -Hidayatullah National Law University (India);
- Best Orator of the Grand Final: Anshu Varahagiri, Team 31 National Law School of India University (India);
- Best Complainant's Written Submission: Team 31 National Law School of India University (India);
- Best Respondent's Written Submission: Team 36 and 63 The West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences and Symbiosis Law School (India);
- Best Orator Written Submission: Team 36 The West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences (India).

All-American Regional Round

About the Regional Round

The third Regional Round of the 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition was organised by the Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar in Quito, Ecuador, from the 18th to the 21st of March 2025. A special thanks goes to the Host for the organisation of the Regional Round. From 4 countries, a total of 8 teams from the following universities participated in this Regional Round:

- Team 12 Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (Mexico);
- Team 13 Georgetown University Law Center (United States);
- Team 18 University of Ottawa (Canada);
- Team 35 Universidad de Guadalajara (Mexico);
- Team 45 Queen's University (Canada);
- Team 50 Pontificia Universidad Javeriana (Colombia);
- Team 60 Universidad de Los Andes (Colombia);
- Team 84 American University Washington (United States).

The All-American Regional Round was supported by 11 Panellists and we wish to thank them for their time and contributions to the Regional Round. They are: Esteban Santos, Gustavo Garcia Brito, Maria Elena Jara Vasquez, Gustavo Guerra, Yannick Trudel, Getrude Nimako-Boateng, Hugo Romero Martinez, Carlos Arboleda, Simón Hernandez, Daniel Ari Baker, and Yovana Reyes Tagle.

> THE John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition

An Organisers' Perspective

Hosting the Regional Round of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition 2025 was an honour and a deeply enriching experience for the entire team at the Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar Sede Ecuador, in the city of Quito.

- And And

As an institution committed to international law, regional integration, and academic excellence in the Andean region, hosting this prestigious competition not only represented recognition of our ongoing work, but also a unique opportunity to actively contribute to the global community of young international commercial law professionals.

From the moment we applied, our organising committee enthusiastically took on the challenge of making this edition an unforgettable experience. Our goal was clear: to offer an event that not only maintained the high academic standards of the competition, but also reflected the cultural richness and hospitality of Ecuador and the Andean region.

The competition took place on our university's historic campus, located in the heart of Quito. During the event, we welcomed teams from different countries across the continent, providing them with a welcoming, respectful and stimulating environment for high-level performance.

We are also proud to have offered cultural activities that celebrated the diverse identity of our country, including a guided tour of the Historic Centre of Quito, a UNESCO World Heritage Site. These experiences allowed our visitors to connect beyond the academic realm and learn about our history and culture first-hand.

The social agenda that accompanied the event was also important, designed to foster links between teams, promote intercultural exchange and strengthen the sense of community. We firmly believe that the spirit of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition lies as much in legal excellence as in the human connections that are forged along the way.

None of this would have been possible without the tireless work of our organising team, made up of Professor Michel Levi, head of the WTO Chair in Ecuador, Adrian Juárez, assistant to the WTO Chair in Ecuador, in charge of the All Americas Round, Sophia Moya, assistant at the Andean Centre for International Studies, as well as the support of academic authorities, especially our Rector Professor César Montaño Galarza, and the support of institutions such as the European Law Students Association (ELSA), the World Trade Organisation (WTO), through the Chairs Programme, and our local partners. To all of them, our sincere thanks.

At the Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar Sede Ecuador we are deeply proud to have hosted this edition of the Regional Round of the Americas. Furthermore, we are very pleased to be an active



part of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition community, a global network of institutions, professionals and students committed to international law, cooperation and the training of future generations.

Written by the Organising Committee of the All-American Regional Round in Quito, Ecuador

Results

Team No.	C	Complainan	ıt	I	t	Total	
Teann no.	Scores	Penalties	Total	Scores	Penalties	Total	Score
12	39.00	3.00	36.000	36.00	5.50	30.500	66.500
13	44.00	1.00	43.000	39.50	0.50	39.000	82.000
18	45.00	0.00	45.000	40.50	0.00	40.500	85.500
35	30.00	1.00	29.000	29.00	4.00	25.000	54.000
45	26.00	0.50	25.500	31.40	0.00	31.400	56.900
50	41.00	3.00	38.000	35.00	1.00	34.000	72.000
60	43.50	0.50	43.000	39.00	1.00	38.000	81.000
84	36.50	1.00	35.500	43.00	1.00	42.000	77.500

WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES

Based on the scores, **Team 18** from **the University of Ottawa (Canada)** was awarded the prize for *Best Complainant Written Submission (the Gabrielle Marceau Award)* and the *Best Overall Written Submission* of the All-American Regional Round, whereas **Team 84** from the **American University Washington (United States)** was awarded the prize for *Best Respondent Written Submission (the Valerie Hughes Award)*.

TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

The Teams got to plead twice, once on behalf of the Complainant and once for the Respondent. Their score from the Oral Pleadings (60%) are then combined with their Written Submission score (40%) to give them an overall average score. The teams qualifying for the Semi-Finals are marked in green in the table below.

	Team	(Compl	ainant	:		Respo	ndent			WS	WS	OP	PR
Rank	No.	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Total	Score		Score (*0.6)	Score
1	18	41.00	44.00	45.00	43.33	40.00	41.00	40.00	40.33	83.67	85.50	34.20	50.20	84.40
2	13	40.00	38.00	37.00	38.33	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	78.33	82.00	32.80	47.00	7 9.80
3	60	46.00	48.00	46.00	46.67	25.00	28.00	20.00	24.33	71.00	81.00	32.40	42.60	75.00
4	84	29.00	30.00	30.00	29.67	40.00	40.00	43.00	41.00	70.67	77.50	31.00	42.40	73.40
5	12	42.00	40.00	30.00	37.33	37.00	35.00	31.00	34.33	71.67	66.50	26.60	43.00	69.60
6	50	41.00	33.00	33.00	35.67	30.00	30.00	34.00	31.33	67.00	72.00	28.80	40.20	69.00
7	45	33.00	33.00	33.00	33.00	42.00	43.00	44.00	43.00	76.00	56.90	22.76	45.60	68.36
8	35	19.00	19.00	14.00	17.33	53.00	35.00	35.00	41.00	58.33	54.00	21.60	35.00	56.60

TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Team		Cor	nplain	ant			Res	spond	ent		Total	ws	WS	OP Score	SF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	TOLAI	Score	(*0.4)		Score
	_					Sen	ni Fina	ıl Rou	nd 1						
18	46.00	42.00	49.00	47.00	n/a						46.00	85.50	34.20	27.60	61.80
84						48.00	49.00	47.00	49.00	n/a	48.25	77.50	31.00	28.95	59.95
						Sen	ni Fina	l Rou	nd 2						
60	24.00	31.00	32.00	34.00	30.00						30.20	81.00	32.40	18.12	50.52
13						40.00	41.00	35.00	34.00	35.00	37.00	82.00	32.80	22.20	55.00

Teams qualifying for the Grand Final of the All-American Regional Round are marked in green in the table above.

TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Team			Co	mplain	ant			Total	WS	WS	OP Score	GF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	IOLAI	Score	Score (*0.4)	(*0.6)	Score
18	50.00	50.00	50.00	37.00	43.00	49.00	49.00	46.86	85.50	34.20	28.11	62.31
Team			Re	sponde	ent			Total	ws	WS	OP	GF
Team No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Re Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	ent Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	WS Score	Score	OP Score (*0.6)	GF Score

Based on the scores, **Team 18** from **University of Ottawa (Canada)** was declared the **Winner** of the All-American Regional Round and **Team 13** from the **Georgetown University Law Centre (United States)** was declared the **Runner-Up** of the All-American Regional Round.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

In order to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds award, the orator had to plead for both Complainant and Respondent. The following table gives an overview of the individual scores awarded to each of the orators of the Preliminary Rounds. Fulfilling the aforementioned criteria, 22 orators were eligible to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds Award.

Team			Compl	ainant			Respo	ondent		Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Orator
	Laura Castro	47.00	36.00	26.00	36.33	34.00	32.00	34.00	33.33	69.6 7
12	Mildred Chávez	49.00	45.00	36.00	43.33	41.00	40.00	33.00	38.00	81.33
	Valeria Gonzalez	45.00	38.00	32.00	38.33	36.00	30.00	34.00	33.33	71.67
	Dexter Woods	38.00	38.00	34.00	36.67	38.00	39.00	38.00	38.33	75.00
13	Jack Yang	38.00	37.00	38.00	37.67	40.00	39.00	40.00	39.67	77.33
	Arian Zand	37.00	33.00	33.00	34.33	38.00	38.00	38.00	38.00	72.33
	Aidan Reesor	41.00	45.00	46.00	44.00	35.00	35.00	36.00	35.33	79.33
18	James Lapthorne	38.00	43.00	44.00	41.67	40.00	38.00	37.00	38.33	80.00
	Michelle Hennessey	46.00	45.00	50.00	47.00	38.00	39.00	38.00	38.33	85.33
	Alfredo Isaac Delgado	15.00	26.00	15.00	18.67	44.00	39.00	43.00	42.00	60.67
35	Angela González	16.00	26.00	14.50	18.83	45.00	36.00	36.00	39.00	57.83
	Abril Hernández	18.00	27.00	16.00	20.33	42.00	34.00	33.00	36.33	56.67
	Alanna Ault	35.00	36.00	35.00	35.33	35.00	36.00	40.00	37.00	72.33
45	Noah Karpiak	33.00	33.00	33.00	33.00	38.00	45.00	42.00	41.67	74.67
	Dilraj Singh	36.00	36.00	36.00	36.00	43.00	39.00	46.00	42.67	78.67
	Lina María Torres	35.00	39.00	38.00	37.33				0.00	n/a
50	Maria Gomez Reina				0.00	27.00	31.00	36.00	31.33	n/a
50	Santiago Castro	33.00	37.00	33.00	51.50	28.00	28.00	35.00	30.33	81.83
	Simón Vergara	36.00	39.00	35.00	36.67	28.00	28.00	35.00	30.33	67.00
	Laura Calderón	45.00	45.00	46.00	45.33	27.00	26.00	23.00	25.33	70.67
60	Tatiana Suaza Varela	48.00	50.00	46.00	48.00	23.00	24.00	20.00	22.33	70.33
	Leonardo Vásquez	47.00	47.00	46.00	46.67	27.00	29.00	20.00	25.33	72.00
Q /	Colin McGinness	30.00	30.00	31.00	30.33	40.00	40.00	42.00	40.67	71.00
84	Lauren Ross	27.00	28.00	29.00	28.00	38.00	38.00	39.00	38.33	66.33

Based on the scores, Michelle Hennessey from Team 18 from the University of Ottawa (Canada) was awarded the prize for *Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Semi-Finals only let teams plead on behalf of one party (Complainant or Respondent). Therefore, all of the 11 Team members pleading during the Semi-Finals were eligible for the Best Orator of the Semi-Finals award.

Team				Best				
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Aidan Reesor	46.00	45.00	48.00	46.00	n/a	46.25	46.25
18	James Lapthorne	45.00	43.00	48.00	44.00	n/a	45.00	45.00
	Michelle Hennessey	47.00	46.00	47.00	49.00	n/a	47.25	47.25
	Laura Calderón	29.00	30.00	32.00	33.00	29.00	38.25	38.25
60	Tatiana Suaza Varela	29.00	30.00	32.00	29.00	25.00	36.25	36.25
	Leonardo Vásquez	31.00	30.00	31.00	37.00	30.00	39.75	39.75

Team				Respo	ndent			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Dexter Woods	43.00	43.00	31.00	46.00	40.00	40.60	40.60
13	Jack Yang	35.00	37.00	41.00	33.00	35.00	36.20	36.20
	Arian Zand	37.00	38.00	34.00	33.00	34.00	35.20	35.20
84	Colin McGinness	50.00	50.00	47.00	49.00	n/a	49.00	49.00
04	Lauren Ross	44.00	46.00	45.00	46.00	n/a	45.25	45.25

Based on the scores, **Colin McGinness** from **Team 84** from **American University Washington** (United States) was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Semi-Finals*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Similar to the Semi-Finals, all 5 of the Team members pleading during the Grand Final were eligible for the Best Orator of the Grand Final award.

	Team					Compl	ainant				Best
	No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator
ſ		Aidan Reesor	43.00	43.00	48.00	36.00	40.00	45.00	43.00	42.57	42.5 7
I	18	James Lapthorne	45.00	49.00	48.00	36.00	39.00	45.00	43.00	43.57	43.57
		Michelle Hennessey	48.00	50.00	50.00	39.00	42.00	49.00	44.00	46.00	46.00

I	Team					Respo	ndent				Best
	No.	Team Members	Panelli st 1.	Panelli st 2.	Panelli st 3.	Panelli st 4.	Panelli st 5.	Panelli st 6.	Panelli st 7.	Total	Orator
İ		Dexter Woods	50.00	48.00	50.00	36.00	44.00	47.00	50.00	46.43	46.43
I	13	Jack Yang	36.00	37.00	50.00	27.00	34.00	37.00	42.00	37.57	37.57
		Arian Zand	43.00	42.00	45.00	30.00	37.00	43.00	43.00	40.43	40.43

Based on the scores, **Dexter Woods** from **Team 13** from **Georgetown University Law Centre (United States)** was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Grand Final*.

Summary of Awards - Americas

- Winner: Team 18 University of Ottawa (Canada);
- Runner-Up: Team 13 Georgetown University Law Centre (United States);
- Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds: Michelle Hennessey, Team 18 University of Ottawa (Canada);
- Best Orator of the Semi-Finals: Colin McGinness, Team 84 American University Washington (United States);
- Best Orator of the Grand Final: Dexter Woods, Team 13 Georgetown University Law Centre (United States);
- Best Complainant's Written Submission: Team 18 University of Ottawa (Canada);
- Best Respondent's Written Submission: Team 84 American University Washington (United States);
- Best Orator Written Submission: Team 18 University of Ottawa (Canada).

African Regional Round

About the Regional Round

The fourth Regional Round of the 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition was organised by Strathmore University in Nairobi, Kenya, from the 23rd to the 26th of April 2025. A special thanks goes to the Host for the organisation of the Regional Round. From 7 countries, a total of 11 teams from the following universities participated in this Regional Round:

- **Team** 7 Faculty of legal political and social sciences of Tunis, University of Carthage (Tunisia);
- **Team 9** Strathmore University (Kenya);
- Team 20 Makerere University (Uganda);
- Team 27 Debre Tabor University (Ethiopia);
- Team 41 Kenyatta University (Kenya);
- Team 69 University of Nairobi (Kenya);
- Team 70 Kabarak University (Kenya),
- Team 78 University of Zimbabwe (Zimbabwe);
- Team 88 University of Lagos (Nigeria);
- Team 90 University of Witwatersrand (South Africa);
- Team 92 Uganda Christian University (Uganda).

The African Regional Rounds was supported by 13 Panellists and we wish to thank them for their time and contributions to the Regional Round. They are: Anthony Moses Odhiambo, Brenda Wagura, Faith Chelangat, Immanuel Barasa, Jenya Grigorova, Joanna Kahumbu, Maleehah Khandwalla, Meghan Kathure, Mishael Waumba, Pauline Mcharo, Sonia Sigilai, Tomasz Milej, and Vitaliy Pogoretskyy.

An Organisers' Perspective

Hosted in the vibrant heart of Nairobi, Kenya, the 12th Africa Regional Rounds of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition unfolded as a spectacular convergence of intellect and innovation. Strathmore University Law School had the distinct honor of hosting this prestigious event from the 23rd to the 26th of April, 2025, welcoming 11 exceptional teams from 9 different African nations.

This year's competition was unlike any other—a true milestone that not only challenged budding legal minds but also deepened the dialogue on the ever-evolving global digital economy. Centered around the theme of digital services trade, participants were pushed to the edge of legal imagination, analyzing complex cross-border issues and proposing forward-thinking solutions at the intersection of services trade, international law, and technology.

Adding a transformative layer to this edition, and for the first time ever, the competition ran concurrently with a high-level Digital Services Trade Conference, co-funded by GIZ. This landmark event brought together leading policymakers, private sector experts, government officials, and academics to address the intricate web of legal, regulatory, and infrastructural challenges facing digital trade today. Discussions integrated global instruments such as the AfCFTA Digital Trade Protocol (DTP), WTO's Joint Statement Initiative (JSI) on e-Commerce, and emerging frameworks like DEAs and CPTPP, positioning Kenya as a continental leader in digital trade governance.

The competition officially commenced on April 23rd with a vibrant opening ceremony that set the tone for the days ahead—days filled with compelling legal arguments, strategic advocacy, and unmatched camaraderie. The fictional nations of Wanu and Alabasta came alive in the courtroom through the passion and preparation of young lawyers.

After two riveting days of oral rounds, the semifinals featured four powerhouses: Kabarak Law School, Kenyatta University Law School, Strathmore Law School (all from Kenya), and the University of the Witwatersrand (South Africa).

The grand finale saw a thrilling face-off between Kabarak Law School and Kenyatta University Law School, with Kabarak ultimately taking the crown as the regional champions.



- Andrew ide

Their excellence also earned them accolades for Best Respondent Memorials and Best Overall Memorial Score. Kenyatta University Law School, the runners-up, also secured an award for the Best Complainant Memorials.



Individual brilliance was equally celebrated. Celine Maina (Kenyatta University) dazzled as Best Orator in both the preliminaries and finals, while Brian Naimodu (also from Kenyatta University) earned Best Orator in the semifinals.



The regional round experience culminated in a Gala Dinner - a kaleidoscope of culture and celebration. Attendees adorned in colorful African attire basked in the glow of a job well done, sharing stories, and recalling their own individual journeys. It was more than a conclusion; it was a celebration of unity, diversity, and the boundless potential of Africa's bright future in the field of international trade law.

The resounding success of the 12th Edition of the African Regional Rounds was made possible by the unwavering support and vision of the following partners: Anjarwalla & Khanna, GIZ, European Law Students Association (ELSA), the World Trade Organization, and the incredible Strathmore University Law School Organizing Committee.

In every sense, this year's competition was not just an academic exercise - it was a glimpse into the future of global trade, and a powerful affirmation of Africa's rising voice in international law.

Written by the Organising Committee of the African Regional Round in Nairobi, Kenya

Results

Teem No.	C	Complainan	it	I	t	Total	
Team No.	Scores	Penalties	Total	Scores	Penalties	Total	Score
7	36.50	5.00	31.500	34.60	4.00	30.600	62.100
9	41.80	2.75	39.050	37.50	2.25	35.250	74.300
20	31.00	1.50	29.500	33.50	2.00	31.500	61.000
27	21.25	1.25	20.000	24.50	0.50	24.000	44.000
41	41.00	0.00	41.000	33.50	1.00	32.500	73.500
69	30.30	0.25	30.050	24.00	0.00	24.000	54.050
70	41.10	0.50	40.600	44.75	1.00	43.750	84.350
78	21.70	2.00	19.700	10.25	2.00	8.250	27.950
88	23.50	1.50	22.000	35.50	1.50	34.000	56.000
90	36.00	3.00	33.000	38.00	5.75	32.250	65.250
92	30.00	0.00	30.000	18.50	1.50	17.000	47.000

WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES

Based on the scores, Team 41 from Kenyatta University (Kenya) was awarded the prize for Best Complainant Written Submission (the Gabrielle Marceau Award). The awards of the Best Respondent Written Submission (the Valerie Hughes Award), and the Best Overall Written Submission of the African Regional Round went to Team 70 from Kabarak University (Kenya).

TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

The Teams got to plead twice, once on behalf of the Complainant and once for the Respondent. Their score from the Oral Pleadings (60%) are then combined with their Written Submission score (40%) to give them an overall average score. The teams qualifying for the Semi-Finals are marked in green in the table below.

	Team	(Compl	ainant	:		Respo	ndent			WS	WS	OP	PR
Rank	No.	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Total	Score		Score (*0.6)	Scor e
1	70	40.00	39.00	n/a	39.50	39.00	42.00	40.00	40.33	79.83	84.35	33.74	47.90	81.64
2	41	44.00	44.00	44.00	44.00	45.00	32.00	39.00	38.67	82.67	73.50	29.40	49.60	79.00
3	9	36.00	31.00	39.00	35.33	40.00	36.00	37.00	37.67	73.00	74.30	29.72	43.80	73.52
4	90	40.00	39.00	n/a	39.50	36.00	21.00	38.00	31.67	71.17	65.25	26.10	42.70	68.80
5	20	24.75	38.00	28.00	30.25	37.50	34.00	40.00	37.17	67.42	61.00	24.40	40.45	64.85
6	92	32.00	45.00	43.00	40.00	39.00	27.00	30.00	32.00	72.00	47.00	18.80	43.20	62.00
7	7	25.00	23.00	n/a	24.00	32.00	29.00	n/a	30.50	54.50	62.10	24.84	32.70	57.54
8	69	15.00	31.00	n/a	23.00	40.00	31.00	n/a	35.50	58.50	54.05	21.62	35.10	56.72
9	88	31.00	25.00	24.00	26.67	29.00	29.00	21.00	26.33	53.00	56.00	22.40	31.80	54.20
10	27	26.00	25.00	28.50	26.50	21.00	23.00	n/a	22.00	48.50	44.00	17.60	29.10	46.70
11	78	33.00	30.00	28.50	30.50	25.00	24.00	n/a	24.50	55.00	27.95	11.18	33.00	44.18

TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Team		Cor	nplain	ant			Res	spond	ent		Total	ws	WS	OP	SF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Score	Score (*0.4)	(*0.6)	Score
						Sen	ni Fina	l Rou	nd 1						
90	46.00	44.00	46.00	47.00	44.00						45.40	65.25	26.10	27.24	53.34
70						35.00	36.00	37.00	39.50	36.00	36.70	84.35	33.74	22.02	55.76
						Sen	ni Fina	l Rou	nd 2						
9	44.00	50.00	45.00	45.00	44.00						45.60	74.30	29.72	27.36	57.08
41						44.00	50.00	45.00	45.00	47.00	46.20	73.50	29.40	27.72	57.12

Teams qualifying for the Grand Final of the African Regional Round are marked in green in the table above.
TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Team			Co	mplain	ant			Total	WS	WS	OP Score	GF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	IOLAI	Score			Score
70	38.00	40.00	38.00	40.00	41.00	38.00	36.00	38.71	84.35	33.74	23.23	56.97
Team			Re	sponde	ent			Total	WS	WS Score	OP	GF
Team No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Re Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	ent Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	WS Score	Score	Score	GF Score

Based on the scores, **Team 70** from **Kabarak University (Kenya)** was declared the **Winner** of the African Regional Round and **Team 41** from **Kenyatta University (Kenya)** was declared the **Runner-Up** of the African Regional Round.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

In order to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds award, the orator had to plead for both Complainant and Respondent. The following table gives an overview of the individual scores awarded to each of the orators of the Preliminary Rounds. Fulfilling the aforementioned criteria, 31 orators were eligible to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds Award.

Team			Comp	ainant			Respo	ondent		Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Orator
	Malek Nbiba	25.00	24.00	n/a	24.50	30.00	29.00	n/a	29.50	54.00
7	Nada Fatma Nouisser				0.00	33.00	26.00	n/a	29.50	n/a
/	Hiba Ben Mbarek	22.00	23.00	n/a	22.50	35.00	27.00	n/a	31.00	53.50
	Haifa Douzi	25.00	26.00	n/a	25.50				0.00	n/a
	Anthony Mburu	43.00	32.00	41.00	38.67	36.00	40.00	40.00	38.67	77.33
9	Clare Kaira	33.00	24.00	36.00	31.00	44.00	44.00	45.00	44.33	75.33
	Javier Mario	27.00	30.00	28.00	28.33	34.00	36.00	38.00	36.00	64.33
	Angelo Asinguza				0.00				0.00	n/a
20	Arnold Longole	34.00	38.00	25.00	32.33	37.00	32.00	41.00	36.67	69.00
20	Danielle Damulira	30.00	40.00	36.00	35.33	32.00	33.00	35.00	33.33	68.6 7
	Opini Cleopas	35.00	38.00	30.00	34.33	37.00	35.00	39.00	37.00	71.33
	Ayichew Sisay	36.00	30.00	42.00	36.00	30.00	27.00	n/a	28.50	64.50
27	Fekade Solomon	23.00	18.00	23.00	21.33	28.00	22.00	n/a	25.00	46.33
	Debre Molla	23.00	17.00	25.00	21.67	26.00	23.00	n/a	24.50	46.1 7
	Celine Maina	46.00	43.00	44.00	44.33	50.00	45.00	39.00	44.6 7	89.00
41	Brian Naimodu	39.00	36.00	40.00	38.33	45.00	43.00	37.00	41.67	80.00
41	Ryan Muriithi				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Vincent Kyalo	41.00	42.00	42.00	41.67	43.00	40.00	37.00	40.00	81.67
(0)	Teddy Muya	30.00	31.00	n/a	30.50	33.00	26.00	n/a	29.50	60.00
69	Florence Kimiri	32.00	33.00	n/a	32.50	45.00	42.00	n/a	43.50	76.00
	Jabez Oyaro	40.00	43.00	n/a	41.50	35.00	37.00	39.00	37.00	78.50
70	Rita Butitt	36.00	34.00	n/a	35.00	42.00	38.00	38.00	39.33	74.33
70	Joseph Thiongo	40.00	37.00	n/a	38.50	41.00	43.00	41.00	41.67	80.17
	Liberty Mshindi				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Tadiwanashe Hamandishe	30.00	30.00	31.00	30.33	25.00	26.00	n/a	25.50	55.83
78	Natasha Dhliwayo	33.00	34.00	33.00	33.33	22.00	23.00	n/a	22.50	55.83
	Rhoda N Moyo	33.00	30.00	30.00	31.00	27.00	23.00	n/a	25.00	56.00

	Michael Adeday	33.00	34.00	33.00	33.33	31.00	38.00	26.00	31.67	65.00
88	Ayotunde Abiodun	30.00	26.00	27.00	27.67	28.00	30.00	30.00	29.33	57.00
	David Nwaigwe	30.00	22.00	25.00	25.67	27.00	30.00	28.00	28.33	54.00
	Amahle Lutseke				0.00				0.00	n/a
90	Mninawe Mayekiso	32.00	33.00	n/a	32.50	34.00	14.00	29.00	25.67	58.17
90	Tejal Hansrajh	40.00	44.00	n/a	42.00	40.00	21.00	38.00	33.00	75.00
	Shruthya Siyakumar	35.00	40.00	n/a	37.50	50.00	32.00	45.00	42.33	79.83
	Namugerwa Sylvia	35.00	47.00	44.00	42.00	33.00	35.00	36.00	34.67	76.67
92	Namagembe Janet	34.00	46.00	39.00	39.67	36.00	22.00	22.00	26.67	66.33
	Joseph Tenywa	22.00	44.00	44.00	36.67	42.00	34.00	32.00	36.00	72.67

Based on the scores, **Celine Maina** from **Team 41** from the **Kenyatta University (Kenya)** was awarded the prize for *Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Semi-Finals only let teams plead on behalf of one party (Complainant or Respondent). Therefore, all of the 11 Team members pleading during the Semi-Finals were eligible for the Best Orator of the Semi-Finals award.

Team				Compl	ainant			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Anthony Mburu	41.00	50.00	45.00	44.00	42.00	44.40	44.40
9	Clare Kaira	43.00	50.00	45.00	44.00	44.00	45.20	45.20
	Javier Mario	40.00	50.00	45.00	43.00	44.00	44.40	44.40
	Tejal Hansrajh	44.00	46.00	45.00	44.00	43.00	44.40	44.40
90	Shruthya Siyakumar	45.00	48.00	44.00	44.00	47.00	45.60	45.60
,0	Amahle Lutseke							n/a
	Mninawe Mayekiso							n/a

Team				Respo	ndent			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Celine Maina	50.00	46.00	45.00	46.00	44.00	46.20	46.20
41	Brian Naimodu	50.00	46.00	45.00	46.00	44.00	46.20	46.20
41	Vincent Kyalo	50.00	46.00	45.00	45.00	42.00	45.60	45.60
	Ryan Muriithi						0.00	n/a
	Rita Butitt	40.00	37.00	39.00	35.00	35.00	37.20	37.20
70	Jabez Oyaro	37.00	33.00	31.00	33.00	32.00	33.20	33.20
/0	Joseph Thiongo	41.00	33.00	37.00	40.00	37.00	37.60	37.60
	Liberty Mshindi						n/a	n/a

Based on the scores, Celine Maina and Brian Naimodu from **Team 41** from **Kenyatta University** (Kenya) was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Semi-Finals*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Similar to the Semi-Finals, all 6 of the Team members pleading during the Grand Final were eligible for the Best Orator of the Grand Final award.

Tear	n				Compl	ainant				Best
No	Team Members	Panelli st 1.	Panelli st 2.	Panelli st 3.	Panelli st 4.	Panelli st 5.	Panelli st 6.	Panelli st 7.	Total	Orator
	Rita Butitt	36.00	41.00	42.00	37.00	39.00	39.00	34.00	38.29	38.29
70	Jabez Oyaro	34.00	41.00	39.00	38.00	39.00	37.00	35.00	37.57	37.57
	Joseph Thiongo	44.00	42.00	41.00	44.00	42.00	43.00	40.00	42.29	42.29
	Liberty Mshindi									n/a

I	Team		Respondent								
	No.	Team Members	Panelli st 1.	Panelli st 2.	Panelli st 3.	Panelli st 4.	Panelli st 5.	Panelli st 6.	Panelli st 7.	Total	Best Orator
ſ		Celine Maina	45.00	45.00	45.00	45.00	46.00	45.00	47.00	45.43	45.43
I	41	Brian Naimodu	42.00	43.00	40.00	43.00	42.00	41.00	46.00	42.43	42.43
I	41	Vincent Kyalo	41.00	40.00	43.00	40.00	42.00	40.00	46.00	41.71	41.71
		Ryan Muriithi								0.00	n/a

Based on the scores, **Celina Maina** from **Team 41** from **Kenyatta University (Kenya)** was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Grand Final*.

Summary of Awards - Africa

- Winner: Team 70 Kabarak University (Kenya);
- Runner-Up: Team 41 Kenyatta University (Kenya);
- Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds: Celina Maina, Team 41 Kenyatta University (Kenya);
- Best Orator of the Semi-Finals: Celina Maina and Brian Naimodu, Team 41 Kenyatta University (Kenya);
- Best Orator of the Grand Final: Celina Maina, Team 41 Kenyatta University (Kenya);
- Best Complainant's Written Submission: Team 41 Kenyatta University (Kenya);
- Best Respondent's Written Submission: Team 70 Kabarak University (Kenya);
- Best Orator Written Submission: Team 70 Kabarak University (Kenya).

1st European Regional Round - Amsterdam

About the Regional Round

The fifth Regional Round of the 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition was organised by ELSA the Netherlands in Amsterdam, the Netherland, from the 28th of April to the 2nd of May 2025. A special thanks goes to the Host for the organisation of the Regional Round. From 9 countries, a total of 10 teams from the following universities participated in this Regional Round:

- **Team 5** University of Zurich (Switzerland);
- Team 23 Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne (France);
- Team 25 Faculty of Social Sciences, Ukrainian Catholic University (Ukraine);
- Team 26 University of Amsterdam (the Netherlands);
- Team 28 Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary (Hungary);
- Team 37 Tilburg University (the Netherlands);
- Team 39 University of Münster (Germany);
- Team 53 University of Law (United Kingdom);
- Team 59 University of Bucharest (Romanian);
- Team 76 National & Kapodistrian University of Athens (Greece);
- Team 81 Moldova State University (Republic of Moldova).

The first European Regional Round was supported by 17 Panellists and we wish to thank them for their time and contributions to the Regional Round. They are: Achyunth Anil, Christian Lau, Gertrude Nimako-Boateng, Hugo Ramirez Martinez, Kholofelo Kugler, Marie Terlinden, Marisa Goldstein, Maryam AlDoseri, Marios Tokas, Oleksandra Sandul, Panagiotis Kyriakou, Panos Delimatsis, Pinar Artiran, Qiu Xu Liao, Shubhanyu Aujla, Tetiana Tanchyn, and Werner Zdouc.

An Organisers' Perspective

From April 28 April until May 2, 2025, ELSA the Netherlands had the honour of organising a Regional Round of the 23rd Edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition. The event took place in Amsterdam and welcomed teams and panellists from across Europe for an unforgettable week of advocacy, learning, and cultural exchange.

As one of the most prestigious moot court competitions in the field of international trade law, the John H. Jackson Moot Court holds a special place in the hearts of many within the ELSA Network. Hosting a Regional Round was therefore a moment of immense pride for our ELSA the Netherlands. The event provided us with the opportunity to showcase our beautiful capital city, allowing us to offer a professional and intellectually enriching platform for participants to deepen their understanding of WTO law.

Over the course of five days, we witnessed exceptional legal argumentation, thought-provoking pleadings, and a true spirit of friendly competition. The oral rounds were judged by a distinguished panel of academics, practitioners, and WTO experts, whose dedication and expertise elevated the entire experience. The quality of the teams and the level of debate reaffirmed the importance of this Competition as a training ground for future international lawyers.

Beyond the courtroom, we placed great emphasis on fostering meaningful connections. The social and networking events, from the opening drinks to a sunny boat tour on the canals to the closing cocktail hour in our primary partner's offices, celebrated ELSA's values of cultural exchange, collaboration, and mutual respect. The Regional Round would not have been possible without the support of our dedicated Organising Committee, volunteers, partners, and sponsors, whose enthusiasm and commitment brought our Regional Round to life.

We are grateful to the International Board of ELSA and the JHJMCC Team for entrusting us with this responsibility and for their continuous support. It was a privilege to contribute to the legacy of the Competition and to strengthen the ELSA spirit within the framework of international trade law. Hosting this Regional Round was not just an event – it was a celebration of everything ELSA stands for.

Written by the Organising Committee of the First European Regional Round in Amsterdam, the Netherlands



The Organising Committee of the 1st European Regional Round

Results

Team No.	C	Complainan	it	I	Responden	t	Total
Teann no.	Scores	Penalties	Total	Scores	Penalties	Total	Score
5	44.00	1.00	43.000	34.40	1.50	32.900	75.900
23	40.00	2.50	37.500	33.00	2.25	30.750	68.250
25	34.40	1.75	32.650	30.50	1.25	29.250	61.900
26	40.50	5.50	35.000	41.40	5.50	35.900	70.900
28	32.00	1.00	31.000	23.50	2.75	20.750	51.750
37	34.00	0.50	33.500	42.00	0.50	41.500	75.000
39	38.00	1.00	37.000	46.00	1.00	45.000	82.000
53	38.50	1.00	37.500	42.00	1.00	41.000	78.500
76	43.00	4.00	39.000	30.00	1.50	28.500	67.500
81	23.00	2.75	20.250	27.00	2.00	25.000	45.250

WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES

Based on the scores, **Team 5** from **the University of Zurich (Switzerland)** was awarded the prize for *Best Complainant Written Submission (the Gabrielle Marceau Award)* of the first European Regional Round, whereas **Team 39** from the **University of Münster (Germany)** was awarded the prize for *Best Respondent Written Submission (the Valerie Hughes Award)* and the *Best Overall Written Submission*.

TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

The Teams got to plead twice, once on behalf of the Complainant and once for the Respondent. Their score from the Oral Pleadings (60%) are then combined with their Written Submission score (40%) to give them an overall average score. The teams qualifying for the Semi-Finals are marked in green in the table below.

	Rank ^{Team} No.	Complainant					Respo	ondent		Total WS	\W/S	WS	OP	PR
Rank		Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Total	Score		Score (*0.6)	Score
1	39	36.50	44.00	41.00	40.50	44.00	44.00	n/a	44.00	84.50	82.00	32.80	50.70	83.50
2	37	40.00	46.00	38.00	41.33	48.00	45.00	43.00	45.33	86.67	75.00	30.00	52.00	82.00
3	23	39.00	43.00	35.00	39.00	50.00	44.00	41.00	45.00	84.00	68.25	27.30	50.40	77.70
4	53	27.00	25.00	n/a	26.00	42.00	42.00	44.00	42.67	68.6 7	78.50	31.40	41.20	72.60
5	26	35.00	39.00	40.00	38.00	27.00	29.00	n/a	28.00	66.00	70.90	28.36	39.60	67.96
6	5	31.00	25.00	25.00	27.00	32.00	34.00	n/a	33.00	60.00	75.90	30.36	36.00	66.36
7	25	29.00	30.00	n/a	29.50	40.00	42.00	34.00	38.67	68.17	61.90	24.76	40.90	65.66
8	76	30.00	30.00	n/a	30.00	26.00	31.00	29.00	28.67	58.67	67.50	27.00	35.20	62.20
9	81	28.00	23.00	n/a	25.50	30.00	30.00	27.00	29.00	54.50	45.25	18.10	32.70	50.80
10	28	11.00	11.00	17.00	13.00	19.00	17.00	n/a	18.00	31.00	51.75	20.70	18.60	39.30

TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Team		Cor	nplain	ant			Res	spond	ent		Total	ws	WS Score	OP	SF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.						Score	(*0.4)		Score
						Sen	ni Fina	ıl Rou	nd 1						
39	39.00	39.00	40.00	36.00	36.00						38.00	82.00	32.80	22.80	55.60
53						38.00	37.00	35.00	34.00	40.00	36.80	78.50	31.40	22.08	53.48
						Sen	ni Fina	l Rou	nd 2						
23	35.00	36.00	28.00	33.00	38.00						34.00	68.25	27.30	20.40	47.70
37						43.00	43.00	43.00	43.00	40.00	42.40	75.00	30.00	25.44	55.44

Teams qualifying for the Grand Final of the first European Regional Round are marked in green in the table above.

TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Team			Co	mplain	ant			Total	WS	WS	OP Score	GF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	TOLAT	Score	(*0.4)	(*0.6)	Score
37	45.00	46.00	46.00	42.00	46.00	38.00	43.00	43.71	75.00	30.00	26.23	56.23
Team			Re	sponde	ent			Total	WS	WS Score	OP	GF
Team No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Re Panellist 3.	e sponde Panellist 4.	ent Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	WS Score	Score	OP Score (*0.6)	GF Score

Based on the scores, **Team 39** from **the University of Münster (Germany)** was declared the **Winner** of the first European Regional Round and **Team 37** from **Tilburg University (the Netherlands)** was declared the **Runner-Up** of the first European Regional Round.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

In order to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds award, the orator had to plead for both Complainant and Respondent. The following table gives an overview of the individual scores awarded to each of the orators of the Preliminary Rounds. Fulfilling the aforementioned criteria, 24 orators were eligible to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds Award.

Team			Comp	ainant			Respo	ondent		Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Orator
	Tobias Müller	35.00	25.00	25.00	28.33				0.00	n/a
5	Wiktoria Gaedig				0.00	30.00	33.00	n/a	31.50	n/a
,	Aurelia Büchel	22.00	23.00	20.00	21.67	25.00	30.00	n/a	27.50	49.1 7
	Nataliia Rudenko	43.00	43.00	42.00	42.67	40.00	37.00	n/a	38.50	81.17
	Alexa Buathier-Phillips				0.00				0.00	n/a
23	Abigail Campbell	39.00	40.00	36.00	38.33	44.00	50.00	43.00	45.67	84.00
23	Calysta Kvasnevski	37.00	41.00	33.00	37.00	40.00	48.00	40.00	42.67	79.67
	Grâce N'Guessan	39.00	43.00	35.00	39.00	42.00	46.00	41.00	43.00	82.00
	Dariia Zinchenko	40.00	36.00	n/a	38.00	41.00	41.00	33.00	38.33	76.33
25	Marharyta Zavolokau	23.00	25.00	n/a	24.00	39.00	43.00	38.00	40.00	64.00
23	Illia Chakii				0.00	37.00	40.00	31.00	36.00	n/a
	Danylo Zaverukha	28.00	29.00	n/a	28.50				0.00	n/a
	Eva de Bont	37.00	36.00	44.00	39.00	29.00	32.00	n/a	30.50	69.50
26	Chantal Brunotte	30.00	32.00	33.00	31.67	27.00	32.00	n/a	29.50	61.17
	Carl von Mansberg	38.00	39.00	47.00	41.33	24.00	25.00	n/a	24.50	65.83
	Rebeka Honti-Kiss				0.00	31.00	25.00	n/a	28.00	n/a
28	Adrienn Hugyecz	13.00	12.00	20.00	15.00	12.00	20.00	n/a	16.00	31.00
20	Zsombor Trenka	8.00	10.00	14.00	10.67				0.00	n/a
	Bálint Zalay	10.00	9.00	14.00	11.00	13.00	8.00	n/a	10.50	21.50
37	Iveta Ivanova	36.00	43.00	36.00	38.33	45.00	42.00	40.00	42.33	80.67
5/	Alyssa Brum Alice	40.00	48.00	41.00	43.00	48.00	47.00	45.00	46.67	89.67
	Khanh Ly Tran	39.00	46.00	46.00	43.67	36.00	37.00	n/a	36.50	80.17
39	Marie Christin Zurwellen	34.00	43.00	35.00	37.33	45.00	45.00	n/a	45.00	82.33
57	Natalie Julia Hüsing	35.00	42.00	38.00	38.33	41.00	41.00	n/a	41.00	79.33
	Anastasia Carabulea				0.00				0.00	n/a

	Oshoste Idaewor	32.00	25.00	n/a	28.50	43.00	44.00	44.00	43.67	72.17
53	Louisa Lindsley	34.00	22.00	n/a	28.00	42.00	42.00	44.00	42.67	70.67
	Alexander Mash	30.00	24.00	n/a	27.00	41.00	37.00	40.00	39.33	66.33
	Eleni Yiagou	32.00	40.00	n/a	36.00	31.00	46.00	30.00	35.67	71.67
76	Anna Kouta	30.00	38.00	n/a	34.00				0.00	n/a
/0	Maria Valera				0.00	22.00	32.00	15.00	23.00	n/a
	Emmanouil Kanterakis	25.00	32.00	n/a	28.50	28.00	34.00	23.00	28.33	56.83
	Valeria Butorina				0.00	28.00	24.00	22.00	24.67	n/a
81	Gabriel Vescu	30.00	22.00	n/a	26.00	30.00	32.00	27.00	29.67	55.67
01	Mihai Lavrov	31.00	26.00	n/a	28.50				0.00	n/a
	Oxona Bardian	22.00	21.00	n/a	21.50	32.00	34.00	28.00	31.33	52.83

- And a particular

Based on the scores, Alyssa Brum Alice from Team 37 from Tilburg University (the Netherlands) was awarded the prize for *Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Semi-Finals only let teams plead on behalf of one party (Complainant or Respondent). Therefore, all of the 11 Team members pleading during the Semi-Finals were eligible for the Best Orator of the Semi-Finals award.

Team				Compl	ainant			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Alexa Buathier-Phillips							n/a
23	Abigail Campbell	37.00	30.00	32.00	33.00	38.00	34.00	34.00
23	Calysta Kvasnevski	32.00	26.00	23.00	29.00	37.00	29.40	29.40
	Grâce N'Guessan	36.00	29.00	28.00	38.00	39.00	34.00	34.00
	Khanh Ly Tran	40.00	39.00	44.00	27.00	38.00	37.60	37.60
39	Marie Christin Zurwellen	38.00	38.00	41.00	30.00	40.00	37.40	37.40
39	Natalie Julia Hüsing	34.00	37.00	39.00	39.00	33.00	36.40	36.40
	Anastasia Carabulea							n/a

Team				Respo	ndent			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
37	Iveta Ivanova	42.00	42.00	42.00	43.00	40.00	41.80	41.80
3/	Alyssa Brum Alice	45.00	46.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	44.20	44.20
	Oshoste Idaewor	40.00	37.00	34.00	38.00	33.00	36.40	36.40
53	Louisa Lindsley	46.00	41.00	38.00	40.00	40.00	41.00	41.00
	Alexander Mash	39.00	36.00	31.00	38.00	33.00	35.40	35.40

Based on the scores, Alyssa Brum Alice from Team 37 from Tilburg University (the Netherlands) was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Semi-Finals*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Similar to the Semi-Finals, all 5 of the Team members pleading during the Grand Final were eligible for the Best Orator of the Grand Final award.

Т	eam					Compl	ainant				Best
	No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator
	37	Iveta Ivanova	45.00	47.00	46.00	48.00	44.00	36.00	44.00	44.29	44.29
	3/	Alyssa Brum Alice	44.00	45.00	42.00	50.00	47.00	34.00	43.00	43.57	43.57

	Team						ondent				Best
	No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator
I		Khanh Ly Tran	40.00	32.00	41.00	43.00	38.00	40.00	39.00	39.00	39.00
	20	Marie Christin Zurwellen	43.00	34.00	40.00	40.00	33.00	42.00	40.00	38.86	38.86
	39	Natalie Julia Hüsing	44.00	36.00	40.00	48.00	35.00	38.00	41.00	40.29	40.29
		Anastasia Carabulea									n/a

Based on the scores, **Iveta Ivanova** from **Team 37** from **Tilburg University (the Netherlands)** was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Grand Final*.

Summary of Awards - Europe

- Winner: Team 39 University of Münster (Germany);
- Runner-Up: Team 37 Tilburg University (the Netherlands);
- Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds: Alyssa Brum Alice, Team 37 Tilburg University (the Netherlands);
- Best Orator of the Semi-Finals: Alyssa Brum Alice, Team 37 Tilburg University (the Netherlands);
- Best Orator of the Grand Final: Iveta Ivanova, Team 37 Tilburg University (the Netherlands);
- Best Complainant's Written Submission: Team 5 University of Zurich (Switzerland);
- Best Respondent's Written Submission: Team 39 University of Münster (Germany);
- Best Orator Written Submission: Team 39 University of Münster (Germany).

2nd European Regional Round - Geneva

About the Regional Round

The sixth Regional Round of the 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition was organised by ELSA International in Geneva, Switzerland, from the 5th to the 8th of May 2025. From 7 countries, a total of 8 teams from the following universities participated in this Regional Round:

- **Team 2** Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine);
- Team 10 Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg (Germany);
- Team 22 KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Team 29 Geneva Graduate Institute (Switzerland);
- Team 38 University of Southern Denmark (Denmark);
- Team 48 Democritus University of Thrace (Greece);
- Team 52 Maastricht University (the Netherlands);
- Teams 87 Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Greece).

The second European Regional Round was supported by 19 Panellists and we wish to thank them for their time and contributions to the Regional Round. They are: Alejandro Sanchez, Beichen Ding, Claude Chase, Clotilde du Parc, Gertrude Nimako-Boateng, Jason Houston-McMillan, Jenya Grigorova, Katherine Connolly, Marios Tokas, Marisa Goldstein, Miguel Villamizar, Olga Falgueras, Panagiotis Kyriakou, Rukiya Ibrahim, Smrithi Bhaskar, Sybilla Fries, Tatiana Yanguas, Valentina Botello, and Wafaa Saadeh.

An Organisers' Perspective

The organisation of the Regional Round in Geneva came somewhat as a surprise to us. Initially, this round was supposed to be the first Europen Regional Round, organised by ELSA Türkiye in Istanbul from the 15th to the 18th of April 2025. Due to the protests that broke out in Istanbul and all over the country in late March, ELSA took the decision to relocate the Regional Round to Geneva from the 5th to the 8th of May, upon consultation with ELSA Türkiye and the WTO. We want to thank and congratulate ELSA Türkiye for all their efforts and dedication throughout the months to organise the Regional Round in Istanbul and hope that they will get another opportunity to host participants in a Regional Round of the JHJMCC!

This new situation required ELSA to act quickly, as it left us with about one month to organise the round. We reached out to the partners and supporters of the 23rd JHJMCC, Panellists, potential venues, as well as caterers. At this point, ELSA would like to sincerely thank the ACWL, our General Supporter, for providing us with the pleading venues on the second and third day of the round, Sidley, our Silver Sponsor, for hosting the Grand Final on the fourth day, as well as the WTI, our Academic Supporter, for their contribution to the Closing Dinner. Our gratitude also goes to all the Panellists for their readiness to support this rather last-minute Regional Round.

On the first day of the Regional Round, we had the pleasure of welcoming the 8 Teams from all over Europe in the Maison Internationale des Associations, where the Opening Ceremony took place. We had the pleasure of also being welcomed by Ms Marisa Goldstein, representing the WTO, and Mr Jason Houston-McMillan, representing Van Bael & Bellis, our Platinum Sponsor, who both talked about career opportunities at their respective institutions. Following some logistical information and the Drawing Ceremony, the participants enjoyed an apéritif.

The next two days were dedicated to the Preliminary Rounds at the office of the ACWL, where we also served lunch. The timekeepers ensured the smooth-sailing of the pleadings, and we thank all of them for their time and efforts throughout the week. On the third day, the 7th of May, we also heard a presentation from the ACWL, represented by Ms Olga Falgueras, before the announcement of the four Semi-Finalists. We closed the day with a social programme at Le Scandale.

On the fourth and last day of the Regional Round, we started with the Semi-Finals, held in the Maison Internationale des Associations. After lunch, we moved to the Auditorium of Sidley, where the Grand Final of the Regional Round in Geneva took place. The Grand Final was chaired by Mr Marios Tokas, together with the Panel consisting of Mr Panagiotis Kyriakou, Ms Marisa Goldstein, Ms Jenya Grigorova, Mr Jason Houston-McMillan, Ms Gertrude Nimako-Boateng, and Ms Wafaa Saadeh.

The Closing Dinner and Award Ceremony took place in the Buvette of the Bains de Paquis. The Teams and Panellists were able to enjoy cheese fondue, one of the most traditional Swiss dishes and celebrated the conclusion of the Regional Round, especially the Award Winners, all together. At this point, ELSA also wants to thank all participants and congratulate them on their hard work and all their accomplishments.

All the challenges aside, we enjoyed this experience of organising a Regional Round immensely. Without the support of our partners and Panellists and the dedication of the Organising Committee, this Regional Round would not have been possible. A huge thank you to Nathalie, Mie, Nikola, Inês, Gabriel, Alec, Mira, and Maria for your readiness to jump on any tasklike to thank the Organising Committee for having entrusted us with the responsibility of hosting teams and Judges from all over Europe and for their support throughout this journey. ELSA Switzerland is honoured to have dedicated several months leading up to the Competition to ensure the best experience possible for everyone involved and it was incredibly fulfilling to listen to the participants' arguments, see them shine in the pleadings and witness new friendships being formed.

Written by Aliena Trefny, Head of the Organising Committee of the Regional Round Geneva



Members of the Organising Committee of the Regional Round Geneva

Results

Team No.	C	Complainan	ıt	I	Responden	t	Total
Teann no.	Scores	Penalties	Total	Scores	Penalties	Total	Score
2	30.00	0.50	29.500	27.00	0.75	26.250	55.750
10	40.00	0.00	40.000	28.00	0.00	28.000	68.000
22	43.00	0.00	43.000	45.00	0.00	45.000	88.000
29	43.00	1.75	41.250	48.00	1.50	46.500	87.750
38	49.50	0.00	49.500	35.00	0.00	35.000	84.500
48	22.50	1.50	21.000	32.70	1.50	31.200	52.200
52	45.00	0.00	45.000	43.00	0.00	43.000	88.000
87	44.50	1.00	43.500	16.00	1.00	15.000	58.500

WRITTEN SUBMISSION SCORES

Based on the scores, Team 38 from the University of Southern Denmark (Denmark) was awarded the prize for *Best Complainant Written Submission (the Gabrielle Marceau Award)* of the second European Regional Round, whereas Team 29 from the the Geneva Graduate Institute (Switzerland) was awarded the prize for *Best Respondent Written Submission (the Valerie Hughes Award)*. The Award for the *Best Overall Written Submission* went to Teams 22 and 52 from KU Leuven (Belgium) and Maastricht University (the Netherlands) respectively.

TEAM SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

The Teams got to plead twice, once on behalf of the Complainant and once for the Respondent. Their score from the Oral Pleadings (60%) are then combined with their Written Submission score (40%) to give them an overall average score. The teams qualifying for the Semi-Finals are marked in green in the table below.

	Team	(Compl	ainant	:		Respo	ndent			ws	WS	OP	PR
Rank	No.	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Total	Score		Score (*0.6)	Score
1	22	38.00	43.00	39.00	40.00	45.00	40.00	42.00	42.33	82.33	88.00	35.20	49.40	84.60
2	52	40.00	40.00	38.00	39.33	35.00	41.00	37.00	37.67	77.00	88.00	35.20	46.20	81.40
3	29	40.00	38.00	41.00	39.67	38.00	36.00	37.00	37.00	76.67	87.75	35.10	46.00	81.10
4	10	43.00	44.00	42.00	43.00	43.00	29.00	35.00	35.67	78.67	68.00	27.20	47.20	74.40
5	2	38.00	38.00	42.00	39.33	39.00	38.00	39.00	38.67	78.00	55.75	22.30	46.80	69.10
6	38	37.00	29.00	25.00	30.33	30.00	24.00	25.00	26.33	56.67	84.50	33.80	34.00	67.80
7	87	25.00	20.00	20.00	21.67	20.00	20.00	32.00	24.00	45.67	58.50	23.40	27.40	50.80
8	48	19.00	25.00	24.00	22.67	29.00	22.00	23.00	24.67	47.33	52.20	20.88	28.40	49.28

TEAM SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Team		Cor	nplain	ant			Res	spond	ent		Total	ws	WS	OP	SF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Score	Score (*0.4)		Score
						Se	emi Fina	al Roun	d 1						
22	42.00	45.00	43.00	44.00	42.00						43.20	88.00	35.20	25.92	61.12
10						39.00	40.00	39.00	40.00	40.00	39.60	68.00	27.20	23.76	50.96
						Se	emi Fina	al Roun	d 2						
29	42.00	42.00	42.00	43.00	42.00						42.20	87.75	35.10	25.32	60.42
52						45.00	46.00	46.00	44.00	43.00	44.80	88.00	35.20	26.88	62.08

Teams qualifying for the Grand Final of the first European Regional Round are marked in green in the table above.

TEAM SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Team			Co	mplain	ant			Total	WS	WS	OP Score	GF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	IOLAI	Score	(*0.4)	(*0.6)	Score
52	42.00	45.00	43.00	42.00	41.00	44.00	41.00	42.57	88.00	35.20	25.54	60. 74
	Respondent											
Team			Re	sponde	ent			Total	WS	WS Scoro	OP	GF
Team No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Re Panellist 3.	sponde Panellist 4.	ent Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	WS Score	Score	OP Score (*0.6)	GF Score

Based on the scores, **Team 22** from **KU Leuven** was declared the **Winner** of the second European Regional Round and **Team 52** from **Maastricht University (Belgium)** was declared the **Runner-Up** of the second European Regional Round.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

In order to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds award, the orator had to plead for both Complainant and Respondent. The following table gives an overview of the individual scores awarded to each of the orators of the Preliminary Rounds. Fulfilling the aforementioned criteria, 19 orators were eligible to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds Award.

Team			Compl	ainant			Respo	ondent		Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Orator
	Yelyzaveta Gorai	38.00	35.00	39.00	37.33	38.00	38.00	39.00	38.33	75.67
2	Kateryna Shchuruk	37.00	34.00	35.00	35.33	40.00	38.00	40.00	39.33	74.67
	Vladyslava Zaichko				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Felix Müller	45.00	48.00	44.00	45.67	46.00	37.00	40.00	41.00	86.67
10	Lynn Fichte	43.00	44.00	42.00	43.00	32.00	26.00	31.00	29.67	72.67
	Vinzenz Brinkschulte	35.00	39.00	39.00	37.67	38.00	26.00	32.00	32.00	69.6 7
	Nick Schamp	43.00	45.00	43.00	43.67	42.00	43.00	43.00	42.67	86.33
22	Senna Deriks	36.00	43.00	40.00	39.67				0.00	n/a
22	Lawrence Verbrugge	36.00	40.00	34.00	36.67	43.00	41.00	42.00	42.00	78.67
	Matthias Verschoren				0.00	41.00	33.00	39.00	37.67	n/a
	Yuhui Song	41.00	42.00	43.00	42.00				0.00	n/a
29	Adhira Rajesh Menon				0.00	42.00	38.00	42.00	61.00	n/a
2)	Weitong Shan				0.00	35.00	32.00	34.00	33.67	n/a
	Raquel Garcia Lago	38.00	36.00	38.00	37.33				0.00	n/a
	Ida Ellen Petersen	35.00	27.00	24.00	28.67	28.00	17.00	22.00	22.33	51.00
38	Izzah Bilal Ahmad	35.00	28.00	24.00	29.00	29.00	22.00	25.00	25.33	54.33
	Gustav Kirk Uggerhøj	35.00	29.00	27.00	30.33	30.00	26.00	27.00	27.67	58.00
	Athina Koulousiou	17.00	25.00	24.00	22.00	29.00	28.00	28.00	42.50	64.50
48	Evangelina Anastopoulou	24.00	38.00	26.00	29.33	23.00	20.00	21.00	32.00	61.33
	Georgios Fotopoulos	13.00	24.00	21.00	19.33	19.00	14.00	18.00	17.00	36.33
	Dominik Peters	40.00	39.00	37.00	38.67	38.00	42.00	41.00	40.33	79.00
52	Matthias Moens	40.00	40.00	41.00	40.33	41.00	44.00	43.00	42.67	83.00
	Charlotte Lassance	36.00	36.00	34.00	35.33	23.00	33.00	29.00	28.33	63.67
	Stefanos Papanikolaou	24.00	19.00	17.00	20.00	20.00	19.00	23.00	20.67	40.67
87	Nina Polychronidou	25.00	16.00	19.00	20.00	20.00	19.00	21.00	20.00	40.00
	Caroline Atuhaire	26.00	22.00	20.00	22.67	20.00	22.00	20.00	20.67	43.33

Based on the scores, Felix Müller from Team 10 from Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg (Germany) was awarded the prize for *Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds*.

Team				Compl	ainant			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Nick Schamp	45.00	49.00	43.00	46.00	46.00	45.80	45.80
22	Senna Deriks	40.00	45.00	41.00	40.00	40.00	41.20	41.20
22	Lawrence Verbrugge	38.00	38.00	39.00	40.00	40.00	39.00	39.00
	Matthias Verschoren							n/a
	Yuhui Song	40.00	41.00	42.00	42.00	42.00	41.40	41.40
29	Raquel Garcia Lago	43.00	42.00	41.00	44.00	42.00	42.40	42.40
29	Weitong Shan							n/a
	Adhira Rajesh Menon							n/a

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - SEMI-FINALS

Team				Respo	ndent			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Felix Müller	45.00	44.00	42.00	41.00	45.00	43.40	43.40
10	Lynn Fichte	36.00	37.00	39.00	35.00	32.00	35.80	35.80
	Vinzenz Brinkschulte	35.00	37.00	35.00	34.00	37.00	35.60	35.60
	Dominik Peters	44.00	42.00	45.00	46.00	42.00	43.80	43.80
52	Matthias Moens	47.00	45.00	46.00	46.00	45.00	45.80	45.80
	Charlotte Lassance	40.00	39.00	37.00	39.00	39.00	38.80	38.80

Based on the scores, Nick Schamp and Matthias Moens from Teams 22 and 52 from KU Leuven (Belgium) and Maastricht University (the Netherlands) respectively were awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Semi-Finals*.

INDIVIDUAL SCORES - GRAND FINAL

Similar to the Semi-Finals, all 5 of the Team members pleading during the Grand Final were eligible for the Best Orator of the Grand Final award.

	Team No.	Team Members	Complainant								Best
			Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator
	52	Dominik Peters	43.00	43.00	44.00	41.00	44.00	42.00	40.00	42.43	42.43
		Matthias Moens	46.00	49.00	46.00	45.00	42.00	47.00	46.00	45.86	45.86
		Charlotte Lassance	36.00	40.00	40.00	38.00	39.00	38.00	38.00	38.43	38.43

Team	Team Members	Respondent								Best
No.		Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator
	Nick Schamp	46.00	42.00	43.00	44.00	47.00	43.00	43.00	44.00	44.00
22	Matthias Verschoren	46.00	41.00	43.00	42.00	44.00	41.00	44.00	43.00	43.00
22	Lawrence Verbrugge	45.00	40.00	44.00	43.00	44.00	38.00	42.00	42.29	42.29
	Senna Deriks								0.00	n/a

Based on the scores, **Matthias Moens** from **Team 52** from **Maastricht (Belgium)** was awarded the prize for the *Best Orator of the Grand Final*.

Summary of Awards - Europe

- Winner: Team 22 KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Runner-Up: Team 52 Maastricht University (the Netherlands);
- Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds: Felix Müller, Team 10 Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg (Germany);
- Best Orator of the Semi-Finals: Nick Schamp & Matthias Moens, Teams 22 & 52 KU Leuven (Belgium) & Maastricht University (the Netherlands);
- Best Orator of the Grand Final: Matthias Moens, Team 52 Maastricht University (the Netherlands);
- Best Complainant's Written Submission: 38 University of Southern Denmark (Denmark);
- Best Respondent's Written Submission: Team 29 Geneva Graduate Institute (Switzerland);
- Best Orator Written Submission: Teams 22 & 52 KU Leuven (Belgium) & Maastricht University (the Netherlands).

Special Prize

For the first time in the history of the Competition, ELSA partnered with the Legal Service of the European Commission for a traineeship opportunity. The Best Orator of the Grand Finals of both European Regional Rounds of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition is invited to intern for six to eight weeks at the Commission in Brussels.



To determine the winner of this prize, ELSA took into consideration the two Best Orators of the Grand Final of both European Regional Rounds. However, the individual scores from all stages of the Regional Rounds were taken into consideration: Preliminary Rounds, Semi-Finals and Grand Final. The two eligible students were Iveta Ivanova (1st European Regional Round) and Matthias Moens (2nd European Regional Round). The formula used to determine the winner of the traineeship is as follows:

$$\frac{PRCS(I) + PRRS(I) + SFS(I) + GFS(I)}{4} = OS(I)$$

- PRCS (I) = Individual Preliminary Round Score on behalf of Complainant
- PRRS (I) = Individual Preliminary Round Score on behalf of Respondent
- SFS (I) = Individual Semi-Final Score
- GFS (I) = Individual Grand Final Score
- OS (I) = Individual Overall Score

Out of the two Best Orators of the European Regional Rounds, Matthias Moens (Team 52) from Maastricht University scored the highest:

Team No.	Orator	PRCS (I)	PRRS (I)	SFS (I)	GFS (I)	OS (I)
37	Iveta Ivanova	38.33	42.33	41.80	44.29	41.69
52	Matthias Moens	40.33	42.67	45.80	45.86	43.67

QUALIFYING TEAMS

24 teams qualify for the Final Oral Round and according to the Rules of the JHJMCC, the International Board of ELSA shall determine the number of teams qualifying from each round.

However, at least the 2 best teams from each Regional Round qualify for the Final Oral Round. The International Board of ELSA took a number of different factors into consideration, for example diversity from the Regional Rounds, Team scores between the Regional Rounds as well as the number of teams competing in each Regional Round.

This year, the breakdown of qualifying Teams from each Regional Round looks as follows:

- East Asia and Oceania Regional Round (Phnom Penh, Cambodia): 4
- West and South Asia Regional Round (Jodhpur, India): 6
- All-American Regional Round (Quito, Ecuador): 4
- African Regional Round (Nairobi, Kenya): 4
- 1st European Regional Round (Amsterdam, the Netherlands): 3
- 2nd European Regional Round (Geneva, Switzerland): 3



Qualifying Teams by Regional Round

The participating universities in the Final Oral Round were as follows:

- Team 6 National Taiwan University (Taiwan);
- Team 9 Strathmore University (Kenya);
- Team 13 Georgetown University (United States);
- Team 14 Peking University School of Transnational Law (China);
- Team 18 University of Ottawa (Canada);
- Team 22 KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Team 29 Geneva Graduate Institute (IHEID) (Switzerland);
- Team 31 National Law School of India University (India);
- Team 33 University of International Business and Economics (China);
- Team 34 Hidayatullah National Law University (India);
- Team 36 The West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences (India);
- **Team 37** Tilburg University (The Netherlands);
- Team 39 University of Münster (Germany);
- Team 41 Kenyatta University School of Law (Kenya);
- Team 43 National Law Institute University, Bhopal (India);
- Team 52 Maastricht University (The Netherlands);
- Team 53 The University of Law (United Kingdom);
- Team 60 Universidad de los Andes (Colombia);
- Team 62 University of Colombo and University of Jaffna, Sri Lankan National Team;
- Team 70 Kabarak University (Kenya);
- Team 71 National Law University, Jodhpur (India);
- Team 75 Ateneo de Manila University (Philippines);
- Team 84 American University Washington College of Law (United States);
- **Team 90** University of the Witwatersrand (South Africa).

THE JOHN H. JACKSON MOOT COURT COMPETITION

Qualifying countries





FINAL ORAL ROUND

The Final Oral Round of the 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition took place in Geneva between the 10th to the 14th of June 2025. The best 24 teams from the Regional Rounds qualified to compete in this final stage of the Competition.

- the particular

On the first day, the 10th of June, ELSA welcomed the participants to the World Trade Organization for the Academic Conference, the Opening Ceremony and the Welcome Reception.

The Academic Conference was moderated by Martin Roy, Counsellor in the Trade in Services and Investment Division of the WTO. The Panellists of the conference were:

- Panagiotis Kyriakou, Associate at Archipel & Case Author of the 23rd JHJMCC;
- Leonila Guglya, Digital / Services Policy and Regulatory Affairs Officer at the International Trade Centre;
- Henry Gao, Professor of Law, Singapore Management University & Member of the Academic Board.



Academic Conference with Henry Gao (on screen), Leonila Guglya, Martin Roy, and Panagiotis Kyriakou (from left to right)

The Opening Ceremony was opened by Ms Angela Ellard, Deputy Director-General of the World Trade Organization. Next, Mr Juan Pablo Moya Hoyos and Ms Marisa Goldstein introduced the testimonial project "*Profiles & Success Stories - 12 Years of African Regional Rounds 2012-2025*", a joint initiative between the WTO and ELSA. The project is a publication and serves as a structured effort to look back and track the academic and professional development of our alumni. The stories of these 15 former participants are stories of perseverance, of doors opened, of skills learned and dreams pursued. It aims to inspire the next generation of students to become part of this community. And second, it is a heartfelt message to the donors and institutions who make the African Round possible.





Juan Pablo Moya Hoyos and Marisa Goldstein

Following an opening speech, ELSA International proceeded with the explanation of the logistics of the event as well as the drawing of order of the pleadings for the Preliminary Rounds. The first day finished with a Welcome Reception in the Atrium of the WTO with an aperitif and drinks.



Monica Buțerchi, Welfare Officer



Aliena Trefny, Head of Organising Committee

During the second and third day (11th and 12th of June) the teams competed in the Preliminary Rounds of the Competition, pleading on behalf of the Complainant and Respondent. The pleadings were hosted at the Geneva Graduate Institute, with various rooms and the library being made available for the teams to practise. There, the teams also enjoyed their lunch and coffee breaks provided by IHEID Events. We are immensely grateful to both parties for hosting us and providing state of the art facilities for the pleadings.

A dansa d



Preliminary Rounds at the Geneva Graduate Institute

Additionally, on the third day (12th of June), having obtained both the scores from the Written Submissions and the teams' scores from the Preliminary Rounds, the 8 teams qualifying for the Quarter-Finalists were announced at the Geneva Graduate Institute.



Announcement of the Quarter-Finalists

The following day - the 13th of June - was filled with pleadings and side events. The morning started with a welcome address by the Director General of the WTO, Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala.



Address by the Director General of the WTO, Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala

The next point on the agenda was the Quarter-Finals.



Quarter-Finals

The Sponsors' Fair took place at noon at the Gallery of the WTO, and was combined with lunch. Here, the students got the chance to meet with the Sponsors and Supporters of the Competition and talk about future academic and professional career paths available to them. We would like to thank our supporters for joining us and for providing this opportunity for our participants: Joanna Redelbach representing Van Bael and Bellis, Pablo Bentes representing Baker & McKenzie, Katherine Connolly representing Sidley, Jessica Brum and Juan Pablo Moya Hoyos representing Georgetown University, Samantha Suarez representing the World Trade Institute, Leah Buencamina representing the Advisory Centre on WTO Law, and Marisa Goldstein representing the WTO.

And a start



Sponsors' Fair, lunch & announcement of the Semi-Finalists

After the conclusion of the Sponsors' Fair the 4 teams qualifying for the Semi-Finals were announced. The afternoon continued with the Semi-Finals and was concluded with the announcement of the Grand Finalists who were to compete the next day.



Semi-Finals

After the Announcement of the Grand Final, the Participants, Partners and Panellists were invited to the Alumni Get-together, which presented a chance to network in a more informal setting.



The 5th and final day of the Final Oral Round, started with the Grand Final in Room W.

- Andrew Charles

Grand Final, with the Finalists: Team 36 (top right) and Team 9 (bottom right)

We welcomed a highly esteemed Panel led by the Chairperson Gabrielle Marceau, a former counsellor in the Legal Affairs Division of the WTO Secretariat. With her on the Panel were: Gracia Marin-Duran, Professor of International Economic Law, Vice Dean (International), UCL Faculty of Laws, University College London -, Christian Lau - Partner at Dentons and Academic Board Member of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition -, Joanna Redelbach - Counsel at Van Bael & Bellis -, Geraldo Vidigal - Coordinator, LL.M. International Trade and Investment Law, University of Amsterdam -, Krista Nadakavukaren - Co-Head of Legal Services, Swiss Institute of Comparative Law, and Senior Fellow, World Trade Institute -, and Marco Molina - Minister Counsellor and Deputy Permanent Representative of Guatemala to the WTO.



Grand Final Panel (from left to right): Krista Nadakavukaren,Geraldo Vidigal, Gracia Marin-Duran, Gabrielle Marceau, Christian Lau, Joanna Redelbach & Marco Molina

During deliberation, the teams and spectators could enjoy a drink and aperitif on the terrace of the WTO. After the conclusion of the Panel deliberation and calculation of the scores the finalist teams, the Panel, and spectators were called back to Room W, where the Panel gave final feedback to both finalists teams. After the informal feedback we proceeded to the announcement of the Master of Ceremonies - Marisa Goldstein - and handing over the certificates of participation. All the awards were then presented, with the Winner and Runner-Up being announced by Ambassador Clare Kelly, New Zealand's Permanent Representative to the World Trade Organisation.

mark de al



Marisa Goldstein. Master of Ceremonies



Ambassador Calre Kelly, announcing the awards

After closing addresses from Inês Ribeiro, the Head of Organising Committee of the 24th JHJMCC, Nathalie Labar, President of ELSA, and Aliena Trefny, Head of Organising Committee of the current edition, the 23rd JHJMCC was officially closed.



Inês Ribeiro

Nathalie Labar

Aliena Trefny

THE John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition
In the evening, the Final Oral Round of the 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition concluded with the Closing Dinner where all participants and invitees could enjoy a dinner at Halles de l'Île.



Closing Dinner at Halles de l'Île

RESULTS

Written Submission Scores

Team		Compl	ainant			Respo	ndent		Total
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Penalties	Total	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Penalties	Total	Score
6	37.00	39.00	0.50	37.750	40.75	29.25	0.50	34.750	72.500
9	41.80	39.80	2.75	39.425	37.50	31.20	2.25	33.225	72.650
13	44.00	35.50	1.00	39.250	39.50	32.00	0.50	35.500	74.750
14	43.00	31.00	0.50	36.750	46.00	34.50	0.50	40.000	76.750
18	45.00	35.00	0.00	40.000	40.50	48.00	0.00	44.250	84.250
22	43.00	35.80	0.00	39.400	45.00	42.20	0.00	43.600	83.000
29	43.00	43.00	1.75	42.125	48.00	42.00	1.50	44.250	86.375
31	44.50	45.90	0.00	45.200	37.00	42.50	0.00	39.750	84.950
33	32.55	42.50	0.50	37.275	40.75	42.30	0.50	41.275	78.550
34	38.20	44.45	0.50	41.075	35.00	29.50	0.50	32.000	73.075
36	43.00	45.65	2.50	43.075	43.50	35.00	1.00	38.750	81.825
37	34.00	38.50	0.50	36.000	42.00	37.50	0.50	39.500	75.500
39	38.00	36.50	1.00	36.750	46.00	46.00	1.00	45.500	82.250
41	41.00	46.00	0.00	43.500	33.50	39.00	1.00	35.750	79.250
43	35.50	21.50	0.00	28.500	36.20	34.00	0.00	35.100	63.600
52	45.00	44.00	0.00	44.500	43.00	43.00	0.00	43.000	87.500
53	38.50	33.00	1.00	35.250	42.00	40.50	1.00	40.750	76.000
60	43.50	44.00	0.50	43.500	39.00	35.00	1.00	36.500	80.000
62	40.00	43.00	0.00	41.500	31.10	31.50	0.00	31.300	72.800
70	41.10	41.60	0.50	41.100	44.75	44.00	1.00	43.875	84.975
71	37.50	40.50	1.00	38.500	33.10	38.00	1.00	35.050	73.550
75	40.50	38.50	0.25	39.375	44.70	33.50	0.25	38.975	78.350
84	36.50	39.10	1.00	37.300	43.00	33.50	1.00	37.750	75.050
90	36.00	31.50	3.00	32.250	38.00	40.00	5.75	36.125	68.375

Based on the scores, Team 31 from National Law School of India University (India) was awarded the prize for the <u>Best Complainant Written Submission</u> (the Gabrielle Marceau Award), whereas Team 39 from the University of Münster (Germany) was awarded the prize

for the <u>Best Respondent Written Submission</u> (the Valerie Hughes Award). The prize for the <u>Best Overall Written Submission</u> was awarded to Team 52 from Maastricht University (the Netherlands).

man Andrea Andrea Andrea



Team 39 (University of Münster), Winner of the Best Respondents' Written Submission Award



Team 52 (Maastricht University), Winner of the Best Overall Written Submission Award

Team Scores

Preliminary Rounds

	Team	(Compl	ainant	:		Respo	ndent			WS	WS	OP	PR
Rank	No.	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Total	Score	Score (*0.4)	Score (*0.6)	Score
1	18	41.00	42.00	39.00	40.67	47.00	47.00	46.00	46.67	87.33	84.25	33.70	52.40	86.10
2	31	39.00	44.00	40.00	41.00	46.00	42.00	46.00	44.67	85.67	84.95	33.98	51.40	85.38
3	52	35.00	40.00	40.00	38.33	47.00	45.00	36.00	42.67	81.00	87.50	35.00	48.60	83.60
4	33	40.40	44.00	45.00	43.13	45.00	43.00	42.00	43.33	86.47	78.56	31.42	51.88	83.30
5	13	42.00	44.00	41.00	42.33	47.00	45.00	46.00	46.00	88.33	74.75	29.90	53.00	82.90
6	41	36.00	41.00	40.00	39.00	42.00	47.00	45.00	44.67	83.67	79.25	31.70	50.20	81.90
7	9	39.00	42.00	41.00	40.67	47.00	47.00	47.00	47.00	87.67	72.66	29.06	52.60	81.66
8	36	41.00	40.00	38.00	39.67	40.50	42.00	42.00	41.50	81.17	81.83	32.73	48.70	81.43
9	22	45.00	41.00	45.00	43.67	37.00	36.00	37.00	36.67	80.33	83.00	33.20	48.20	81.40
10	29	35.00	35.00	36.00	35.33	43.00	41.00	41.00	41.67	77.00	86.38	34.55	46.20	80.75
11	34	42.00	41.00	40.00	41.00	42.00	42.00	43.00	42.33	83.33	73.08	29.23	50.00	79.23
12	70	38.00	39.00	37.00	38.00	34.00	39.00	33.00	35.33	73.33	84.98	33.99	44.00	77.99
13	75	36.00	35.00	33.00	34.67	41.00	45.00	43.00	43.00	77.67	78.36	31.34	46.60	77.94
14	6	37.00	41.00	40.00	39.33	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	79.33	72.50	29.00	47.60	76.60
15	71	39.00	36.00	40.00	38.33	38.00	44.00	38.00	40.00	78.33	73.55	29.42	47.00	76.42
16	39	41.00	40.00	43.00	41.33	28.00	25.00	31.00	28.00	69.33	82.25	32.90	41.60	74.50
17	60	38.00	40.00	40.00	39.33	29.00	30.00	30.00	29.67	69.00	80.00	32.00	41.40	73.40
18	53	37.00	38.00	35.00	36.67	37.00	33.00	35.00	35.00	71.67	76.00	30.40	43.00	73.40
19	43	45.00	40.00	44.00	43.00	35.00	35.00	38.00	36.00	79.00	63.60	25.44	47.40	72.84
20	84	37.00	30.00	37.00	34.67	34.00	31.00	35.00	33.33	68.00	75.05	30.02	40.80	70.82
21	90	42.00	43.00	43.00	42.67	26.00	30.00	30.00	28.67	71.33	68.38	27.35	42.80	70.15
22	14	37.00	21.00	39.00	32.33	28.00	34.00	25.00	29.00	61.33	76.75	30.70	36.80	67.50
23	62	20.00	14.00	15.00	16.33	36.00	40.00	39.00	38.33	54.67	72.80	29.12	32.80	61.92
24	37	37.00	41.00	35.00	37.67	18.00	12.00	12.00	14.00	51.67	75.50	30.20	31.00	61.20

The 8 Teams qualifying for the Quarter-Finals are marked in green in the table above. Additionally, below, you can find information on the Quarter-Final match-ups and the sides on which the Teams pleaded the next day.

Quarter-Finals

	uarter-Fi ⁄latch-Up			Outcom	e of the C	oin Toss
Rank	Team No.	QF No.		QF No.	С	R
1	18	QF 1.	For the coin toss, the best 4 Teams of	QF 1.	18	36
2	31	QF 2.	the Preliminary Rounds got to state	QI'I.	10	50
3	52	QF 3.	their preference regarding the side on which they would like to plead in the	QF 2.	9	31
4	33	QF 4.	Quarter-Finals.	QI 2.		51
5	13	QF 4.		QF 3.	52	41
6	41	QF 3.		Q1 <i>3</i> .	52	41
7	9	QF 2.		QF 4.	13	33
8	36	QF 1.		۲. ۲. VI	15	33

Below you can find the Team scores from Quarter-Finals of the Final Oral Round of the 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, each judged by 5 international trade law practitioners and academics:

Team		Co	mplaina	ant			Re	esponde	nt		QF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Score
					Quarte	r-Final I	i				
18	44.00	46.00	43.00	46.00	47.00						45.20
36						45.00	45.00	44.00	48.00	48.00	46.00
					Quarte	r-Final 2	2				
9	46.00	48.00	46.00	48.00	46.00						46.80
31						43.00	43.00	41.00	43.00	42.00	42.40
			_		Quarte	r-Final 3	3				
52	38.00	35.00	36.00	36.00	36.00						36.20
41						43.00	40.00	40.00	42.00	40.00	41.00
	Quarter-Final 4										
13	45.00	42.00	43.00	39.00	45.00						42.80
33						45.00	44.00	47.00	45.00	48.00	45.80

The 4 Teams qualifying for the Semi-Finals are marked in green in the table above. Additionally, below, you can find information on the Semi-Final match-ups and the sides on which the Teams pleaded the next day.

Semi-Finals

Semi-F	inal Mat	ch-Ups		Outcom	e of the C	oin Toss
Rank	Team No.	SF No.	For the coin toss, the best 4 Teams of the Quarter-Finals got to state their	SF No.	С	R
1	9	SF 1.	preference regarding the side on which	SF 1.	9	41
2	36	SF 2.	they would like to plead in the	51 1.	9	41
3	33	SF 2.	Quarter-Finals.	SF 2.	36	33
4	41	SF 1.		31 ° 2.	50	55

Below you can find the Team scores from Semi-Finals of the Final Oral Round of the 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, each judged by 7 international trade law practitioners and academics:

Team										Res	spond	ent			SF
No.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Score
	Semi-Final 1														
9	46.00 45.00 46.00 48.00 40.00 45.00 47.00										45.29				
41								42.00	42.00	43.00	43.00	43.00	46.00	38.00	42.43
	-						Semi-	Final 2			-	-			
36	36 42.00 44.00 44.00 44.00 43.00 42.00 48.00 43.00 42.00 48.00										43.86				
33 38.00 40.00 40.00 45.0										45.00	43.00	40.00	45.00	41.57	

The 2 Teams qualifying for the Semi-Finals are marked in green in the table above. Additionally, below, you can find information on the Grand Final match-up and the sides on which the Teams pleaded the next day.

Grand Final

Semi-Final	Match-Ups	For the coin toss, the best Team of	Outcome of t	he Coin Toss
Rank	Team No.	the Semi-Finals got to state its preference regarding the side on	Complainant	Respondent
1	9	which they would like to plead in	0	36
2	36	the Grand Final.	9	30

Below you can find the Team scores from the Grand Final of the Final Oral Round of the 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, judged by 7 international trade law practitioners and academics:

Team			С	omplainai	nt			GF Score					
No.	Panellist	anellist Panellist Panellist Panellist Panellist Panellist Panellist											
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.						
9	45.00	45.00 46.00 48.00 48.00 48.00 48.00 46.0											

Team			R	Responden	ıt			GF Score					
No.	Panellist	nellist Panellist Panellist Panellist Panellist Panellist Panellis											
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.						
36	33.00	33.00 39.00 39.00 35.00 35.00 38.00 38.00											

Upon deliberation and calculation of scores, **Team 9** from **Strathmore University (Kenya)** was declared *Winner*, while **Team 36** from the **West Bengal University of Juridical Sciences** (**India**) was declared the *Runner-Up* of the 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition.

Congratulations to the Grand Finalists and all the Teams participating in the Competition!



- A. A. A. A.

Team 9 (Strathmore University), Winner of the 23rd JHJMCC



Team 36 (National University of Judirical Sciences), Runner-Up of the 23rd JHJMCC



Individual Scores

Preliminary Rounds

Each orator received individual scores based on the same scoring criteria as used for the Team Score. In order to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds award, the orator had to plead for both Complainant and Respondent and the following table gives an overview of the individual scores awarded to each of the orators of the Preliminary Rounds. Fulfilling the aforementioned criteria, 58 orators were eligible to compete for the Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds Award.

Team			Compl	ainant			Respo	ondent		Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Panellist 1.	Panllist 2.	Panellist 3.	Total	Orator
	Yen-Yu Lin				0.00	31.00	30.00	27.00	29.33	n/a
6	Wei-Heng Chang	40.00	38.00	38.00	38.67				0.00	n/a
0	Chia-Wei Lin	42.00	41.00	43.00	42.00	43.00	48.00	47.00	46.00	88.00
	Bo-Yuan Yang	40.00	36.00	36.00	37.33	41.00	38.00	35.00	38.00	75.33
	Anthony Mburu	40.00	37.00	38.00	38.33	45.00	41.00	44.00	43.33	81.67
9	Clare Kaira	45.00	40.00	42.00	42.33	47.00	48.00	48.00	47.67	90.00
	Javier Delmar	40.00	40.00	41.00	40.33	47.00	47.00	47.00	47.00	87.33
	Dexter Woods	45.00	44.00	45.00	44.6 7	43.00	47.00	46.00	45.33	90.00
13	Arian Zand	43.00	43.00	40.00	42.00	45.00	45.00	44.00	44.67	86.67
	Jack Yang	39.00	44.00	42.00	41.67	46.00	48.00	46.00	46.67	88.33
	Wang Shiyu	39.00	21.00	33.00	31.00	36.00	30.00	29.00	31.67	62.67
14	Chen Zehao	40.00	23.00	35.00	32.67	23.00	24.00	22.00	23.00	55.67
	Yan Yudie	30.00	21.00	35.00	28.67	33.00	25.00	25.00	27.67	56.33
	Aidan Reesor	41.00	46.00	41.00	42.67	49.00	47.00	47.00	47.67	90.33
18	James Lapthorne	37.00	37.00	34.00	36.00	45.00	43.00	44.00	44.00	80.00
	Michelle Hennessey	41.00	45.00	41.00	42.33	50.00	48.00	48.00	48.67	91.00
	Nick Schamp	44.00	44.00	42.00	43.33	42.00	40.00	40.00	40.67	84.00
22	Lawrence Verbrugge	46.00	46.00	47.00	46.33	32.00	34.00	34.00	33.33	79.67
22	Matthias Verschoren				0.00	33.00	32.00	32.00	32.33	n/a
	Senna Deriks	44.00	45.00	45.00	44.6 7				0.00	n/a
	Yuhui Song	31.00	31.00	33.00	31.67				0.00	n/a
29	Adhira Menon				0.00	46.00	43.00	41.00	43.33	n/a
29	Weitong Shan				0.00	41.00	40.00	44.00	41.67	n/a
	Raquel Garcia Lago	39.00	40.00	36.00	38.33				0.00	n/a

	Harshvardhan Ray	36.00	44.00	38.00	39.33	45.00	42.00	47.00	44.6 7	84.00
31	Arushi Singh	40.00	50.00	41.00	43.67	47.00	45.00	49.00	47.00	90.67
	Anshu Varahagiri	34.00	44.00	39.00	39.00	45.00	42.00	47.00	44.6 7	83.67
	Tianzi Chang	47.00	44.00	45.00	45.33	42.00	43.00	45.00	43.33	88.67
33	Hao Yuan	43.00	42.00	41.00	42.00	40.00	41.00	43.00	41.33	83.33
	Jia Guo	42.00	40.00	35.00	39.00	44.00	40.00	45.00	43.00	82.00
	Sanjana Ramanth	43.00	41.00	42.00	42.00	36.00	41.00	42.00	39.6 7	81.67
34	Ishwaryah Manikandan	36.00	38.00	35.00	36.33	42.00	43.00	43.00	42.67	79.00
54	Kruthika Senthil Kumar	43.00	38.00	38.00	39.6 7	40.00	42.00	41.00	41.00	80.67
	Vriddhi Galada				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Pragya Mittal	37.00	38.00	34.00	36.33	43.00	41.00	42.00	42.00	78.33
36	Nupur Gupta	41.00	41.00	38.00	40.00	41.00	40.00	41.00	40.67	80.67
50	Rohini Mehta				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Piyush Mohapatra				0.00				0.00	n/a
37	Iveta Ivanova	40.00	38.00	33.00	37.00	16.00	12.00	12.00	13.33	50.33
37	Alyssa Brum Alice	43.00	38.00	37.00	39.33	18.00	13.00	11.00	14.00	53.33
	Natalie Hüsing	39.00	40.00	42.00	40.33	28.00	37.00	33.00	32.67	73.00
39	Marie Christin Zurwellen	40.00	42.00	43.00	41.67	25.00	30.00	31.00	28.67	70.33
37	Khanh Ly Tran	39.00	38.00	42.00	39.67	23.00	27.00	20.00	23.33	63.00
	Anastasia Carabulea				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Celine Maina	40.00	43.00	38.00	40.33	40.00	46.00	44.00	43.33	83.67
41	Brian Naimodu	32.00	33.00	22.00	29.00	38.00	47.00	46.00	43.67	72.67
71	Vincent Kyalo	39.00	36.00	40.00	38.33	45.00	48.00	45.00	46.00	n/a
	Ryan Muriithi				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Anushka Singh				0.00				0.00	n/a
43	Anamika Singh	41.00	42.00	43.00	42.00	40.00	34.00	38.00	37.33	79.33
-15	Tarun Chittupalli	41.00	44.00	44.00	43.00	39.00	34.00	33.00	35.33	78.33
	Urja Bhardwaj	40.00	44.00	44.00	42.67	35.00	30.00	32.00	32.33	75.00
	Matthias Moens	35.00	40.00	42.00	39.00	36.00	47.00	42.00	41.6 7	80.67
52	Charlotte Lassance	31.00	35.00	40.00	35.33	22.00	31.00	22.00	25.00	60.33
	Dominik Peters	39.00	43.00	46.00	42.67	48.00	46.00	44.00	46.00	88.67
	Louisa Lindsley	34.00	36.00	34.00	34.67	32.00	25.00	24.00	27.00	61.67
53	Alexander Mash	41.00	37.00	36.00	38.00	42.00	35.00	41.00	39.33	77.33
	Oshotse Idaewor	36.00	38.00	35.00	36.33	34.00	30.00	31.00	31.67	68.00

- Andredy

- F. S.

	Leonardo Vásquez	38.00	38.00	37.00	37.67	20.00	26.00	20.00	22.00	59.67
60	Laura Calderón	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	27.00	41.00	30.00	32.67	n/a
	Tatiana Suaza	39.00	40.00	38.00	39.00	23.00	32.00	27.00	27.33	n/a
	Dulandi Gunasekera	20.00	12.00	15.00	15.67	32.00	37.00	37.00	35.33	51.00
62	Ranudi Premasinghe	20.00	12.00	15.00	15.67	36.00	40.00	39.00	38.33	54.00
02	Buthmini Mohotty	20.00	14.00	15.00	16.33	40.00	43.00	42.00	41.67	58.00
	Udumbara Abeytunge				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Jabez Oyaro	30.00	31.00	31.00	30.67	34.00	26.00	39.00	33.00	63.67
70	Rita Buttit	40.00	41.00	40.00	40.33	36.00	31.00	40.00	35.67	76.00
70	Joseph Mungai	39.00	39.00	39.00	39.00	40.00	37.00	41.00	39.33	78.33
	Liberty Mshindi				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Charuvi	35.00	33.00	38.00	35.33	43.00	37.00	38.00	39.33	74.67
71	Kashish Saxena	39.00	35.00	39.00	37.67	43.00	40.00	36.00	39.6 7	77.33
/1	Shreshth Jindal	40.00	38.00	41.00	39.6 7	44.00	39.00	38.00	40.33	80.00
	Manvi Goyal				0.00				0.00	n/a
	Raisa Pandapatan	33.00	33.00	22.00	29.33	45.00	41.00	43.00	43.00	72.33
75	Melanie de Guzman				0.00	45.00	39.00	42.00	42.00	n/a
	Byron Steven Sy	37.00	36.00	33.00	35.33				0.00	n/a
84	Collin McGinness	34.00	40.00	38.00	37.33	34.00	33.00	38.00	35.00	72.33
04	Lauren Ross	30.00	32.00	34.00	32.00	32.00	31.00	33.00	32.00	64.00
	Tejal Hansrajh	41.00	41.00	41.00	41.00	27.00	22.00	25.00	24.67	65.67
90	Shruthya Sivakumar	44.00	45.00	45.00	44.67	31.00	31.00	24.00	28.67	73.33
	Mninawe Mayekiso				0.00	30.00	24.00	26.00	26.67	n/a

Based on the scores from the Preliminary Rounds, Michelle Hennessey (Team 18) from the University of Ottawa (Canada) was awarded the *Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds Award*.



Michelle Hennessey (University of Ottawa), Best Orator of the Preliminary Rounds

Quarter-Finals

Each orator received individual scores based on the same scoring criteria as used for the Team Score. The following table gives an overview of the individual scores of each orator of the Quarter-Finals. In the Quarter-Finals, 22 orators competed for the Best Orator of the Quarter-Finals Award.

Team				Compl	ainant			Best
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Orator
	Anthony Mburu	48.00	43.00	49.00	43.00	46.00	45.80	45.80
9	Clare Kaira	50.00	47.00	50.00	48.00	46.00	48.20	48.20
	Javier Delmar Mario	48.00	42.00	49.00	45.00	44.00	45.60	45.60
	Dexter Woods	49.00	44.00	47.00	50.00	50.00	48.00	48.00
13	Arian Zand	39.00	41.00	41.00	40.00	42.00	40.60	40.60
	Jack Yang	40.00	41.00	40.00	35.00	42.00	39.60	39.60
	Aidan Reesor	47.00	43.00	44.00	44.00	46.00	44.80	44.80
18	James Lapthorne	40.00	40.00	42.00	43.00	40.00	41.00	41.00
	Michelle Hennessey	49.00	47.00	46.00	46.00	48.00	47.20	47.20
	Matthias Moens	34.00	32.00	40.00	40.00	39.00	37.00	37.00
52	Charlotte Lassance	27.00	30.00	30.00	34.00	27.00	29.60	29.60
	Dominik Peters	39.00	38.00	40.00	43.00	38.00	39.60	39.60

Team			Respondent							
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Total	Best Orator		
	Harshvardhan Ray	43.00	44.00	45.00	46.00	42.00	44.00	44.00		
31	Arushi Singh	41.00	43.00	45.00	46.00	42.00	43.40	43.40		
	Anshu Varahagiri	41.00	43.00	46.00	42.00	42.00	42.80	42.80		
	Tianzi Chang	48.00	45.00	50.00	48.00	50.00	48.20	48.20		
33	Hao Yuan	43.00	43.00	45.00	44.00	47.00	44.40	44.40		
	Jia Guo	41.00	43.00	35.00	42.00	40.00	40.20	40.20		
	Pragya Mittal	44.00	43.00	42.00	48.00	45.00	44.40	44.40		
36	Nupur Gupta	45.00	46.00	46.00	50.00	47.00	46.80	46.80		
56	Rohini Mehta							n/a		
	Piyush Mohapatra							n/a		
	Celine Maina	45.00	43.00	46.00	42.00	44.00	44.00	44.00		
41	Brian Naimodu	40.00	42.00	42.00	41.00	40.00	41.00	41.00		
41	Vincent Kyalo	35.00	38.00	39.00	36.00	36.00	36.80	36.80		
	Ryan Muriithi									

A dont

Based on the scores from the Quarter-Finals, Clare Kaira & Tianzi Chang (Teams 9 & 33) from Strathmore University (Kenya) & University of International Business and Economics (China) respectively were awarded the prize of *Best Orator of the Quarter-Finals Award*.



Clare Kaira (Strathmore University) & Tianzi Chang (University of International Business and Economics), Best Orators of the Quarter-Finals

Semi-Finals

Each orator received individual scores based on the same scoring criteria as used for the Team Score. The following table gives an overview of the individual scores awarded to each of the orators of the Semi-Finals. In the Semi-Finals, 11 orators competed for the Best Orator of the Semi-Finals Award.

Team No.		Complainant							Best	
	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator
	Anthony Mburu	47.00	46.00	46.00	45.00	40.00	43.00	47.00	44.86	44.86
9	Clare Kaira	48.00	45.00	48.00	47.00	39.00	42.00	48.00	45.29	45.29
	Javier Delmar	43.00	43.00	45.00	44.00	37.00	41.00	46.00	42.71	42.71
	Pragya Mittal	42.00	44.00	45.00	44.00	42.00	44.00	47.00	44.00	44.00
36	Nupur Gupta	44.00	43.00	47.00	42.00	45.00	40.00	47.00	44.00	44.00
50	Rohini Mehta									n/a
	Piyush Mohapatra									n/a

Team			Respondent							Best	
No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator	
	Tianzi Chang	45.00	42.00	45.00	45.00	37.00	40.00	37.00	41.57	41.5 7	
33	Hao Yuan	46.00	42.00	48.00	39.00	41.00	39.00	37.00	41.71	41.71	
	Jia Guo	46.00	42.00	45.00	38.00	40.00	37.00	36.00	40.5 7	40.5 7	
	Celine Maina	48.00	45.00	47.00	46.00	46.00	47.00	44.00	46.14	46.14	
41	Brian Naimodu	46.00	42.00	35.00	42.00	43.00	43.00	42.00	41.86	41.86	
41	Vincent Kyalo	46.00	40.00	34.00	42.00	42.00	40.00	50.00	42.00	42.00	
	Ryan Muriithi									n/a	

Based on the scores from the Semi-Finals, **Celine Maina** from **Kenyatta University (Kenya)** was awarded the prize of *Best Orator of the Semi-Finals Award*.



Celina Maina (Kenyatta University), Best Orator of the Semi-Finals

Grand Final

Each orator received individual scores based on the same scoring criteria as used for the Team Score. The following table gives an overview of the individual scores awarded to each of the orators of the Grand Final. In the Grand Final, 5 orators competed for the Best Orator of the Grand Final Award.

Team	Team					Compl	ainant				Best
	No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator
I		Anthony Mburu	45.00	43.00	43.00	47.00	46.00	44.00	49.00	45.29	45.29
I	9	Clare Kaira	46.00	47.00	49.00	49.00	49.00	50.00	49.00	48.43	48.43
		Javier Delmar	45.00	42.00	45.00	47.00	47.00	49.00	47.00	46.00	46.00

Те	eam						ondent				Best	
	No.	Team Members	Panellist 1.	Panellist 2.	Panellist 3.	Panellist 4.	Panellist 5.	Panellist 6.	Panellist 7.	Total	Orator	
		Pragya Mittal	39.00	37.00	36.00	34.00	39.00	39.00	32.00	36.57	36.57	
		Nupur Gupta	37.00	40.00	33.00	33.00	39.00	39.00	33.00	36.29	36.29	
	36	Rohini Mehta									n/a	
		Piyush Mohapatra									n/a	

Based on the scores from the Grand Final, Clare Kaira (Team 9) from **Strathmore University** (Kenya) was awarded the prize of *Best Orator of the Grand Final Award*.



Clare Kaira (Strathmore University), Best Orator of the Grand Final

Summary of the Awards

- Winner: Team 9 Strathmore University (Kenya);
- Runner-Up: Team 36 West Bengal University of Juridical Sciences (India);
- Best Orator in Preliminary Rounds: Michelle Hennessey, Team 18 University of Ottawa (Canada);
- Best Orator in Quarter-Finals: Clare Kaira & Tianzi Chang, Teams 9 & 33 Strathmore University (Kenya) & University of International Business and Economics (China);
- Best Orator in Semi-Finals: Celine Maina, Team 41 Kenyatta University (Kenya);
- Best Orator in Grand Final: Clare Kaira, Team 9 Strathmore University (Kenya);
- Best Written Submission for Complainant: Team 31 from National Law School of India University (India);
- Best Written Submission for Respondent: Team 39 from the University of Münster (Germany);
- Best Overall Written Submission: Team 52 from Maastricht University (the Netherlands).

TESTIMONIALS

Winner's Perspective

Our experience in the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition has been nothing short of transformative.

When we became part of the Strathmore Law School Trade Law community, our lecturer and coach, Janet Macharia, assured us that, regardless of the outcome, the experience would leave a lasting impact. The sentiment was echoed by past participants, Mark, Alex, and Wayne, who constantly warned us that we were stepping into one of the most demanding experiences of our academic journey. Therefore, in those early moments, we were somewhere between anticipation, unease, and the lingering thought that we might be in over our heads. It quickly became clear that the warnings we had been given were not only accurate, but understated. As complete rookies in international trade law, we entered an intensive learning process, learning and understanding unfamiliar concepts under considerable time pressure. In addition to this intense learning, we also needed to analyse the case, engage with extremely complex concepts such as single overarching measures and trade in services, and continuously refine our oral presentation skills. At no point did the pressure get any better, not even when seated in the WTO for the Grand Final. Actually, one may argue that the pressure was at its highest there. What helped us consistently find our footing were the daily meetings with our coaches, Amelia Midwa, Glory Abbie, Mark Gitau and Janet. While they were brutal, critical and often frustrating, these sessions brought structure to our preparation, held us accountable, and challenged us to improve, both in substance and delivery. This was crucial for us in our progress and development over the 9 months in which we participated in this competition.

Despite the many challenges, we can confidently say that the experience has had a lasting and positive impact on each of us. It taught us how to work effectively as a team, even when our approaches or opinions differed. We learned to accommodate differing perspectives without being afraid to defend our own when necessary. We came to understand that the success of the team depended on the progress of each member. Above all, the experience instilled in us a strong sense of resilience and a deep appreciation for the value of hard work. There were many moments when we questioned whether all the effort was worth it. The hours grew consistently longer and the expectations constantly higher. It often felt as though no amount of preparation was enough. Yet, in pushing through those moments, we grew, in discipline, in determination, and in belief in our own ability to persevere. Perhaps most meaningfully, the experience gave us the opportunity to form a genuine bond, both with each other and with our coaches, who, as first-time coaches, were just as invested and often just as frustrated as we were.

In addition to our personal development, the moot provided an opportunity to explore highly dynamic aspects of international trade law that continue to grow in importance amid the increasing volumes and legal uncertainties surrounding digital services trade, and the constantly ongoing debates on data protection and competition law. It placed us in a position to engage with experts in the field and seek their insights on the key issues underlying our moot problem, in seeking to bridge our knowledge gaps and deepen our understanding. Further, it also afforded us the unique privilege of travelling to Geneva, walking the halls of the World Trade Organization, and presenting our arguments in the very rooms where trade agreements are negotiated. The privilege of participating in the Grand Final was an intimidating, but also exciting, experience, and one which we hope we can recreate in future. Most importantly, we come away from this experience with not only a better understanding of international trade law and the dispute settlement system, but also with a renewed sense of curiosity and respect for its place in today's trade-driven world. It has broadened our opportunities and played a key role in our potential academic and professional trajectories.

We are deeply grateful to our coaches, Amelia and Glory, whose commitment and guidance made all the difference. Our special thanks go to Janet Macharia for building and nurturing the trade law community at Strathmore Law School, and for giving us the opportunity to be part of it. To Mark, Alex, Wayne and Vicky, we are sincerely thankful for the advice, encouragement, and generous support throughout our preparation. We are grateful to our friends, families, the legal professionals who graciously shared their time and expertise, and the entire SLS family for the continued support and confidence in us throughout this journey. Our deepest appreciation goes to the organisers at ELSA, whose commitment to facilitating such a significant and enriching experience made this entire journey possible. We are also deeply grateful to all the panellists for the three days of the Final Oral Rounds, for being such amazing panellists and for challenging the participants on their ideas and arguments, and in this way helping us all to improve and grow massively. We extend our hearty congratulations to all the teams who took part in the 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition. It was truly a privilege to learn alongside so many committed and talented individuals. Finally, we are grateful to God for the strength and clarity that sustained us throughout this journey. Participating in this competition has been an honour, and we deeply appreciate the opportunity.

Au revoir, Genève!

Sincerely,

Anthony, Clare and Mario, Team 9 - Strathmore Law School.



dan play jak

Winner Team from Strathmore University

Best Orator's Perspective

Describing the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition in one phrase feels impossible, but if I had to, I would call it life-changing. When I was selected as part of the team to represent Strathmore University at the 23rd edition of the Competition, I was told that the experience would transform me, regardless of the outcome. At the time, I do not think I fully appreciated just how profound that transformation would be.

This has been, without question, the most demanding and formative experience of my time in law school. For months, alongside my teammates and coaches, I worked relentlessly; long nights, early mornings, and countless weekends spent refining arguments, learning new areas of law, and challenging my own reasoning. There were moments of doubt, frustration, and fatigue so deep I wondered if I could keep going. But somehow, I always found the strength to take the next step. And thank God I did.

One of the most rewarding parts of this journey was the chance to explore areas of law I would have otherwise known little about. Digital services regulation, data privacy, and the complexities of trade in services were all completely new to me. Engaging with these topics broadened my understanding of how the law shapes the modern world in ways I had never considered.

Equally important, the moot forced me to grow as a speaker. For the longest time, I struggled with speaking too quickly and not annunciating my words clearly, problems that were far less than ideal for an oral moot competition. Even so,I am so thankful this moot gave me the chance to address them head-on. From countless practice rounds with Team 9's very able coaches, Glory and Amelia, to watching videos on communication and delivery, I developed skills I am sure will serve me well long after this experience.

Preparing for the moot demanded more than intellectual effort. It required real introspection, vulnerability, and growth. I had to confront parts of myself I often preferred to ignore: the tendency to search for perfect answers instead of trusting my judgment, the fear of speaking up when I was not certain, and the hesitation to step forward when the way was unclear. Slowly, and sometimes uncomfortably, I learned to push through those barriers and share my perspective, to lean into uncertainty, and to trust that growth often comes in the middle of the struggle.

Alongside the challenges came so many moments of joy: the quiet sense of camaraderie after a long day, the relief when an argument finally clicked, and the laughter that helped balance the stress. I will never forget the twelve-hour Saturday meetings, the evenings I left practice feeling completely spent, or the jokes I made about how badly some sessions went. Nor will I forget the more serious

moments - when I felt I had given everything I could, only to be reminded there was still more to do. Looking back, I am deeply grateful that none of it was in vain.

It all amounted to something rare and meaningful, a sense of growth and purpose I will carry with me for the rest of my life. This journey taught me discipline, resilience, and the quiet power of showing up, even when I felt like giving up.

I am endlessly grateful to God because without His grace and strength, none of this would have been possible. This experience is an answered prayer, not only mine but those of so many friends and loved ones who prayed alongside me. There were countless moments when I whispered desperate prayers for clarity and peace, and God showed up for me time and time again, often in quiet ways that made all the difference.

I am especially thankful to Glory and Amelia, who coached us with such dedication, patience, and heart that you would never guess it was their first time. To Mark, Alex, and Wayne, thank you for sharing your wisdom, your encouragement, and your time - you were incredibly generous. My thanks also go to Janet Macharia for building this trade law community and for giving me the chance to be part of it. To my friends, family, and the entire SLS family, thank you for believing in me, for cheering me on, and for reminding me who I was when I started to forget.

Finally, I am grateful to the organisers at ELSA for the tremendous work you put into running such a complex and impactful competition. You created a platform that challenged me, inspired me, and helped me grow in ways I will never forget.

This win is ours.



Clare Kaira, Best Orator of the Grand Final

Coach's Perspective

Much has been said about a student's journey through the JHJMCC. However, very little is known about the other side of the story; that of a coach's journey through the competition. It is a journey of equal trials, tribulations and triumph but even more, a journey of patience, trust and belief in your students.

- Andre 1

I have walked this journey nine times over the past six years, and in what was my final dance, I was honoured to come back and coach in the 23rd edition of the JHJMCC, the very competition that gave me my career as a Trade Policy Advisor. Accompanying me was my co-coach Michelle Kakai and the phenomenal Kenyatta University School of Law team consisting of Celine Maina (Best orator in the semi-finals of the Global Rounds and the finals of the African Rounds), Ryan Muriithi, Vincent Kyalo and Brian Naimodu (Best orator in the African Rounds Semi-finals).

Reflecting on the nine months we spent preparing for the competition, I would describe our journey to the Global Rounds Semi-Finals in two ways: "The Tree Experiment" and "The Family Unit". Under the Tree Experiment, Michelle and I saw our role as coaches as nurturing seedlings into trees - providing just enough support to let them take root, grow resilient, and bear fruit independently when the time came. This meant long nights, countless hours of rehearsals, mountains of reading, and yes, even a few tears. As coaches, we had to embody patience as the students evolved from having no background in trade law to becoming adept in the intricacies of GATS and GATT 1994. We equally had to trust that they would put in the work even when we weren't looking. With five Best Orator awards (four in the regional rounds and one at the globals) and a Best Complainant Memorial (Regionals), I dare say the experiment worked.

The second component and perhaps the most important one was "The family unit". Here, our preparation was never about "me", "my part" or "my argument", it was about "us", "our parts" and "our arguments". As a family, we fought together, cried together and laughed together. There was no hierarchy in the team, no notion of a coach or team captain, we were all one. If a student couldn't figure out something, we were all more than happy to sit with them through the night until they felt confident enough. In doing so, we forged something greater than a team, we built a bond that outlived the competition. And of course, a few socials and a drink here and there played a huge role (It is never that serious. Sometimes, laughter and cheap wine are all that stand between you and a nervous breakdown).

As I bow out of the competition, I am filled with gratitude. This competition gave me and so many others an opportunity that changed our lives. When I first arrived in Geneva as a participant, I had only 20 Swiss Francs in my pocket and a head full of international trade law. A week later, I left with an LLM scholarship to AIELPO. A year later, I was interning at the WTO; and now I work as

THE John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition a trade policy advisor for the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development. Truth be told, I owe my whole life to the JHJMCC and a big thank you to ELSA for championing this competition.

To those who came before us, I thank you for showing us what's possible, and to those who come after us, know that the responsibility is now yours to inspire and empower others.

Coaching is a gift, share it, and you might just change a life.

Written by John Muchina, Coach of Team 41 from Kenyatta University



THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE 23RD EDITION

and the stand

ELSA extends its deepest gratitude to thank the Sponsors and Supporters of the 23rd edition for their contributions.

World Trade Organization

We are immensely grateful for the financial and technical support of the World Trade Organization. Thanks to its support, we were able to create another successful edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition.



We extend our personal gratitude to Ms Marisa Goldstein, Mr Juan Pablo Moya Hoyos and Mr Quentin Baird from the WTO for all the support throughout the Competition and especially during the preparations leading up to the Final Oral Round.



(from left to right) Quentin Baird, Juan Pablo Moya Hoyos, Marisa Goldstein and Aliena Trefny

THE John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition

Sponsors & Supporters

ELSA thanks the Sponsors and Supporters of the Competition for all their support - their financial contributions, delegating experts to judge the pleadings, and all the pieces of advice.

- Andrew all



Supporters of the African Regional Round





United Nations Economic Commission for Africa



The Case Authors

ELSA extends its utmost gratitude to Mr Marios Tokas and Mr Panagiotis Kyriakou for all their work and dedication throughout the 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition as the Case Authors. Thank you for allowing ELSA to provide opportunities like this Moot Court and contribution to spreading the knowledge on international trade. The Competition would not have been the same without your involvement.



Panagiotis Kyriakou (left) & Marios Tokas (right), Case Authors of the 23rd JHJMCC

The Academic Board

ELSA would like to express its deepest gratitude to the Academic Board of the Competition for their invaluable support and guidance throughout this year. Your expert advice and unwavering commitment have been instrumental in our achievements, and we feel truly fortunate to have your support. Your contributions have greatly enriched our Competition. We look forward to continuing this fruitful collaboration and are immensely thankful for the time and effort you have dedicated to our shared mission.

We want to thank: Ms Marisa Goldstein, Prof. Markus Wagner, Dr. Dylan Geraets, Prof. Padideh Alai'i, Prof. Henry Gao, Dr. Jan-Yves Remy, Dr. Rodrigo Polanco, Mr Marcus Gustafsson, Dr. Weiwei Zhang, Ms Altagracia Cuevas-Arthur, Dr. Maria Anna Corvaglia, Ms Kholofelo Kugler, Ambassador Santiago Wills, Dr. James J. Nedumpara, Mr Victor Crochet, Ms Gracia Marin-Duran, Ms Iryna Polovets, Mr Quentin Baird, and Mr Christian Lau.

ELSA International Team

The John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition is not only made possible due to the incredible contributions by the Participants, Coaches, Panellists, Academic Board Members, and Regional Round Organisers, but in large because of the ELSA International Team Members who dedicate so much time, energy, and knowledge to this Competition.

From corresponding with Panellists and Teams, to checking internal and external documents, to always being there whenever something is needed: we know that this edition would not have been such a success without them. Therefore, we would like to take the opportunity to thank the amazingly dedicated, competent, and lovely ELSA International Team members that have worked so hard to ensure the success of this year's edition:

- Director for the JHJMCC: Patricia-Georgiana Dărăștean;
- Assistant for Teams of the JHJMCC: Ama Kuruppuarachchi;
- Assistant for Panellists of the JHJMCC: Cătălin Panțiru;
- Assistant for the European Regional Rounds of the JHJMCC: Beyza Çakır;
- Assistant for the Regional Rounds of the JHJMCC outside Europe: Monica Buterchi.



The ELSA International Team (from left to right): Cătălin Panțiru, Patricia-Georgiana Dărăștean, Aliena Trefny, Ama Kuruppuarachchi and Monica Buțerchi

Organising Committee of the Final Oral Round

March March 1

Additionally, for the Final Oral Round, the ELSA International Team and I needed reinforcement to ensure the smooth organisation of the week in Geneva. This is why I had the honour of having several members of the International Board of ELSA, my colleagues, come and support the team this week as well as some great ELSA members who also decided to help. We also had the great pleasure of having some ELSA International Board members of the Board 2025/2026 who were present to learn in preparation for next year, including my own successor Inês. I want to take the opportunity to express my gratitude to all of them.

The International Organising Committee:

- Nathalie Labar, President of the International Board of ELSA 2024/2025; Head of Partner Relations of the 23rd FOR;
- Nikola Grochowska, Vice President in charge of Marketing of the International Board of ELSA 2024/2025, Head of Marketing of the 23rd FOR;
- Niko Anzulović Mirošević, Vice President in charge of Academic Activities of the International Board of ELSA 2024/2025;
- Paula Bačić, Vice President in charge of Seminars and Conferences of the International Board of ELSA 2024/2025;
- Patricia-Georgiana Dărăștean, Director for the JHJMCC, Head of Pleadings of the 23rd FOR;
- Ama Kuruppuarachchi, Assistant for Teams of the JHJMCC, Head of Teams of the 23rd FOR;
- Cătălin Panțiru, Assistant for Panellists of the JHJMCC, Head of Panellists of the 23rd FOR;
- Monica Buțerchi, Assistant for the Regional Rounds of the JHJMCC outside Europe, Welfare Officer of the 23rd FOR;
- Inês Ribeiro, Vice President in charge of Competitions of ELSA Portugal 2024/2025 and member of the ELSA International Team, Head of Scoring of the 23rd FOR;
- Gabriel Marti, President of ELSA Switzerland 2024/2025;
- Rodrigo Prelhaz, Vice President in charge of Seminars & Conferences of ELSA Portugal 2024/2025;
- Nicola Stalder, Director for ROLE Swiss German Region of ELSA Switzerland 2024/2025;
- Lilia Hessabi, Vice President in charge of Moot Court Competitions of ELSA France 2024/2025.



Thank you all for joining us on this adventure.

The International Organising Committee: (back row from left to right) Patricia-Georgiana Dărăștean, Gabriel Marti, Nicola Stalder, Niko Anzulović Mirošević, Cătălin Panțiru, Rodrigo Prelhaz, (front row from left to right) Nikola Grochowska, Paula Bačić, Nathalie Labar, Inês Ribeiro, Aliena Trefny, Ama Kuruppuarachchi, Lilia Hessabi, and Monica Buțerchi

CONCLUDING REMARKS BY THE HEAD OF THE ORGANISING COMMITTEE

As we bring the 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition to a close, I find myself reflecting on the an intense, inspiring, and rewarding journey that all of us started together nearly a year ago - organisers, participants, judges, partners, and supporters alike. As the Head of the Organising Committee, it has been a great privilege to lead the preparations for this edition and to witness, from behind the scenes, the incredible amount of work, passion, and dedication that so many individuals have poured into making this Competition what it is.

What began over two decades ago as a vision to bring the WTO dispute settlement procedures to life for law students has once again culminated in a week filled with dedication, eloquence, and purpose. The John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition was born out of the idea of bringing international trade law closer to students in a practical, meaningful way - and since 2002, it has grown into one of ELSA's most important projects. This year has been no exception. From the publication of the case in September, through the Regional Rounds from March to May, and the Final Oral Round in Geneva this June, the journey has once again been defined by excellence, hard work, and an unwavering commitment to the principles at the heart of the World Trade Organization.

The case topics tackled, the creative arguments raised, and the invaluable feedback shared by our esteemed Panellists - all of these demonstrate the enduring relevance of this Competition in today's legal landscape, in a shared commitment to the fundamental principles of national treatment, the most favourite nation, transparency, liberalisation, and fair competition.

To our participants: it has been inspiring to witness your efforts over the past months. Whether or not you received an award at the end, you leave with something greater - confidence, knowledge, and lasting memories and friends. I hope that you carry these forward into your future careers.

To the Academic all the Panellists, coaches, and legal professionals who volunteered their time and expertise: thank you for nurturing the next generation of trade law experts. Your support ensures that the spirit of the WTO is not only preserved but continuously developed through education and practice.

To our partners, thank you for your unwavering commitment to this initiative. Your belief in the importance of the Competition transforms this project from a moot court into a bridge between academic learning and professional practice.

To my team - Patricia-Georgiana, Ama, Cătălin, and Monica, as well as my successor Inês, and all the members of the International Organising Committee and the International Board of ELSA: thank you for your tireless effort, dedication, and the heart you've put into every detail. Working alongside you has been both an honour and a joy. A last thank you also goes to Maciej Łodziński, my predecessor - your constant support and belief in me is invaluable!

A day A d

As I step away from my role as Head of the Organising Committee, I do so with immense pride and a full heart. Organising this Competition has been one of the most impactful and fulfilling experiences of my life. I hope that each of you carries forward the lessons and experiences of this Competition with you, continuing to advocate for a just world in which there is respect for human dignity and cultural diversity. Thank you to everyone for being part of this unforgettable journey!

With that, it is with a great sense of accomplishment that I officially close the 23rd edition of the John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition, and cannot wait to see the development of the project in the coming editions.

With best regards,

Alienalrefn

Aliena Trefny

Head of the Organising Committee 23rd John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition Vice President in charge of Competitions International Board of ELSA 2024/2025



THE JOHN H. JACKSON MOOT COURT COMPETITION

johnhjacksonmoot.elsa.org