

2026 PHILIP C. JESSUP INTERNATIONAL LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO THE SPECIAL AGREEMENT

The following corrections and clarifications to the Statement of Agreed Facts have been stipulated to by the Parties, and the Statement of Agreed Facts jointly communicated to the Court on 15 September 2025 should be considered amended accordingly. The Registrar of the Court reminds all participants of the following:

- a. The wording of the Statement of Agreed Facts has been carefully chosen and is the result of extensive negotiation. The Parties decline to “clarify” matters about which they are unlikely to agree. The Parties will not stipulate as to which legal principles are relevant, or which arguments are acceptable or unacceptable.
- b. Any request for correction or clarification not addressed in the following paragraphs has been considered by the Parties to be redundant, inappropriate, or immaterial, or the Parties were unable to reach a mutually acceptable answer.
- c. Except to the extent that corrections and clarifications are set out below, participants are to assume that the Statement of Agreed Facts is accurate and complete in all respects. In particular, the Parties stipulate as to the authenticity of all documents and of the signatures on all documents referenced in the Statement.
- d. With respect to the pronunciation of the various proper names used in the Statement of Agreed Facts, the Parties and the Court have agreed that they will not take formal or informal offense at any reasonable effort to pronounce proper names correctly.

CORRECTIONS

1. In paragraph 11, the phrase “In both countries” is corrected to read “In Alekostria and Restovia”.
2. In paragraph 20, the phrase “Just over three months later” is corrected to read “Two months later”.
3. In paragraph 50, the phrase “Section 1688” is corrected to read “Section 1668”.
4. In paragraph 55, the phrase “including those rights enshrined in our own treaty with Alekostria” is corrected to read “including those rights enshrined in our own treaty with Restovia”.
5. In subparagraph (a) of paragraph 60, the phrase “permitted intervene” is corrected to read “permitted to intervene”.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. The 1965 Extradition Treaty, the ARPA, and the SRPA were each duly registered with the United Nations Secretariat in conformity with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.
2. In 1981, Sollania deposited a Declaration with the Secretary-General of the United Nations under Article 36(2) of the ICJ Statute accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court without limitation or reservation.
3. The Restovian Ministry of Natural Resources posted the three DPRs to its website and invited the Elders to the online forums on the same day it announced the names of the three finalists. The Ministry ensured full linguistic accessibility by providing translations of the DPRs into the Pilemon language, and simultaneous interpretation during the forums. In addition, the toll-free hotline was staffed by technical advisors proficient in the Pilemon language, ensuring that all inquiries could be addressed accurately and inclusively.

4. The judgment of the Alekostrian Court of Appeal described in paragraph 43 constitutes a final judgment, dismissing the case. There is no further opportunity for appeal or review of that judgment in Alekostria.
5. On 19 July 2024, following the award of the contract to Hyperion and before the company had commenced operations, Hyperion and the government of Restovia agreed that they would postpone all work in the Plateau until any issues concerning its legality were conclusively resolved. In September 2025, they clarified that the postponement would continue “until the International Court of Justice issues a final judgment in the case between Alekostria and Restovia.”
6. At no point, including during the surveying of the Gorge and in the aftermath of the SARV incident, was access of the Pilemon people to the Torngat Plateau affected in a manner that would engage or implicate Article 17 of ARPA or SRPA.
7. Sollania’s application to intervene complied with the relevant Rules of Court, and in particular set out all information required by paragraph 5 of Article 81 of those Rules. The application specified that Sollania sought to intervene only with respect to the issues set out in paragraphs 59(b) and 60(b) of the Statement of Agreed Facts.