

The 2011 Official Rules of the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition were approved by ILSA's Board of Directors on August 9, 2010. Since the Board approved several significant changes, teams are advised to read the 2011 Official Rules completely and carefully. Please do not rely merely on knowledge of last year's Rules or the Summary of Rule Changes below.

1. **Schools must obtain special permission from ILSA to use the *Compromis* for all purposes except exclusive use by the school's Jessup team. (Rule 2.1(e)).** Institutions that participate in the Jessup Competition must obtain special permission from the ILSA Executive Office to use the current year's *Compromis* and other competition materials for any purpose other than participating in the Jessup Competition, including, but not limited to, teaching a Jessup class that includes students who are not team members, conducting Jessup team try-outs, and conducting an internal moot court competition.
2. **Posting Team Memorials online is an express form of prohibited outside assistance. (Rule 2.4.4).** Last year, a Jessup team posted its memorials online to assist participants in its school's internal moot court competition, which was modeled after the Jessup. While this posting was consistent with the school's internal moot court competition rules, it had the unintended effect of allowing other Jessup teams to access its memorials online. Posting team memorials online such that a person who is not a team member or Team Advisor can access them is now specified as a prohibited form of outside assistance under Rule 2.4.4.
3. **Practice round judges may not have obtained access to the Bench Memorandum. (Rule 2.4.7(c)(iii)).** Rule 2.5, which pertains to the confidentiality of the Bench Memorandum, precludes those who have accessed the Bench Memorandum from judging practice rounds. The Rules now clarify this restriction also under Rule 2.4.7(c)(iii), which lists the eligibility requirements for practice round judges.
4. **At the International Rounds, ILSA will identify and discard each oralist's lowest Preliminary Round score for the purpose of determining individual oralist rankings. (Rule 10.6).** To reduce the impact of low "outlier" scores, each oralist's lowest score will be dropped when individual oralist rankings are calculated. The Rules Committee determined that this procedure would not have negatively impacted the highest-scoring oralists in recent competitions (the top ten oralists would have earned the exact same rankings), since consistently high scores are necessary to earn a best oralist award. Rather, this procedure will preserve the more appropriate rankings of otherwise consistently-scored oralists by insulating them from low outlier scores. This procedure will not affect team match wins; the scores received from each judge will continue to be measured directly against the scores given by that same judge to the opposing team when determining which team earns that judge's oral round points.

5. **At the International Rounds, four-judge panels will evaluate each memorial, and only the three scores closest to the mean will be utilized. (Rules 6.9-6.10, 10.2.2.1, 12.2).** Four judges will be assigned to grade each Applicant and Respondent memorial. Of the four scores received for each memorial, ILSA will discard the score that is furthest from the mean, whether high or low. The three remaining scores will be used throughout the International Rounds, including to determine team match wins as well as team memorial rankings (Rule 6.9, 10.2.2.1). National and Regional Administrators have the express option of incorporating this policy at the national or regional level by adopting it in an Official Rules Supplement. (Rule 6.10, 10.2.2.1). The ILSA Executive Office has the express option of using this process for the Hardy C. Dillard best memorial competition. (Rule 12.2).
6. **At the International Rounds, the top 32-ranked teams of the Preliminary Rounds will compete in the Run-Off Advanced Rounds. (Rules 9.3 – 9.3.5.3(e)).**
 - a. In recent years, only the top 24-ranked teams of the Preliminary Rounds have advanced. The increase from 24 to 32 advancing teams reflects the higher number of total teams that have consistently competed at the International Rounds in recent years (Rule 9.3).
 - b. The team pairings example under the power-seeding rule has been modified to explain the pairings of the top 32 (as opposed to 24) teams in the Run-Off Rounds. In the past, the top 8 teams received a “bye” at the Run-Off level, and therefore did not compete in the advanced rounds until the Octafinals. With 32 teams now advancing, the new seeding structure eliminates this “bye”; all 32 advancing teams will compete in the Run-Off Rounds. The highest-ranked teams will retain the advantage of competing against the lowest-ranked teams (e.g. 1 v. 32, 2 v. 31, etc.) (Rule 9.3.5.1).
 - c. The National Representation Limit of teams from the same country that may advance has been increased from 6 to 8 teams. This change naturally follows the increase from 24 to 32 total advancing teams, as the National Representation Limit is traditionally $\frac{1}{4}$ of the total number of advancing teams (Rule 9.3.3).
7. **All Microsoft Word formats are acceptable for memorial submission. Memorials in PDF format and memorials that use a .dat file extension are expressly prohibited. (Rule 6.2.1).**
 - a. Teams may use both older and newer versions of Microsoft Word, including the forthcoming 2010 version.
 - b. Many teams mistakenly believe that memorials may be submitted in PDF format by interpreting the Rule prescribing the use of Microsoft Word as impliedly accepting “better” document formats such as PDF. However, ILSA must format certain aspects of memorials and remove metadata, actions that are most easily done in Word format. Memorials in PDF format are therefore expressly unacceptable.
 - c. Teams using Macintosh word processing programs often mistakenly believe that the format used is Word compatible; however, a .dat file extension indicates that a document is not in Microsoft Word format. Memorials with a .dat file extension are therefore expressly unacceptable.

8. **The National & Regional Rounds Advanced Rounds scoring rule now *requires* judges to “take into account” both Memorials and oral arguments as part of each Team's performance. (Rule 10.5.1).** As before, judges are not required to give a fixed weight to memorials or oral pleadings when determining the outcome of advanced rounds in national and regional competitions. However, judges are now *required* to take both “Memorials and oral argument into account as part of each team’s performance,” consistent with the pre-existing requirement that they “make an independent review” of these two components.
9. **Penalties.**
- a. **Section headings and footnotes are expressly included in the word count limits prescribed for the Summary of Pleadings, Statement of Facts, and Pleadings sections of the memorial. (Rule 6.4).** For uniformity and consistency, the Committee voted to clarify these particulars so that teams and Administrators are on notice of exactly what textual parts of each Memorial section are included in that section’s word count.
 - b. **Extract “Discretionary Penalties” from the Oral Round Penalties section of the Rules and move them to their own section. (Rule 11.3).** The relocation of the “Discretionary Penalties” is designed to emphasize that discretionary penalties may be applied at all stages of the Competition, not just during the oral rounds.
 - c. **Substantive argument is permitted in the footnotes of the Pleadings section. (Rule 6.5).** While substantive pleadings are still only permitted in the Pleadings section of the Memorial (Rule 6.3.6), consistent with actual ICJ practice, teams may now include substantive legal argument in the footnotes of the Pleadings section, as well as the body text of the Pleadings section.
 - d. **The penalty for including substantive legal argument in prohibited parts of the Memorial has been eliminated. (Rule 11.1(e)).** “Substantive, affirmative legal argument or legal interpretation of the facts” is still only permitted in the Pleadings section of the Memorial (Rule 6.3.6). The Rules Committee has decided that whether language constitutes “substantive, affirmative legal argument or legal interpretation of facts” is a determination that Memorials judges should make rather than competition Administrators. Although the administrative penalty for violating Rule 6.3.6 will no longer be assessed, the Memorial Judging Guidelines have been revised to instruct judges to consider Rule 6.3.6 in the course of their evaluations.