



The Rule of Moot Shanghai 2026

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Moot Shanghai (the “MSH”) is an annual competition of teams representing law schools from mainland China and other jurisdictions.
- 1.2 The Organizing Committee (the “OC”) is the management team of MSH 2026, which is responsible for the organization work, logistics and other arrangements for MSH 2026. The OC can be reached at mootshanghai@163.com.
- 1.3 MSH is a pro-bono event. The OC does not receive monetary compensation. The staff receive nominal compensation and reimbursement of their reasonable expenses. Professionals who participate in MSH as organizers, judges, speakers do not receive monetary compensation. Contractors like caterers, drivers, third-party venues, photographers, etc., are paid at market price.
- 1.4 MSH is an educational program designed to be a forum for different legal education methods, practices and traditions of different jurisdictions, especially those between China and foreign jurisdictions, and to forge understanding, and friendship. The rules and procedures in MSH should be interpreted in the light of this goal.
- 1.5 The oral hearings will be held IN PERSON from March 9 to March 12, 2026.
- 1.6 MSH will be conducted in English.

2 Registration

- 2.1 Online registration opens from January 13, 2026 via [Online Form](#).
- 2.2 MSH hosts limited teams and a waiting list is maintained. Waitlisted teams will move up if any participating team decides to withdraw from MSH.
- 2.3 MSH caps the percentage of teams representing schools in mainland China at 50%. Teams from mainland China who register beyond the cap will be waitlisted. The number of participating teams is limited to 24.
- 2.4 Teams that are not registered in either the 33rd Willem C. Vis International

Commercial Arbitration Moot (the Vis Moot) OR the 23rd Vis East Moot will be waitlisted directly.

- 2.5 The pairings in the general rounds will evade pairings of teams that are scheduled to meet in the Vis Moot or the Vis East Moot. Teams shall provide information of their potential pairs in the Vis Moot or the Vis East Moot when such information is available.
- 2.6 Teams should complete registration by January 23, 2026. Teams may decide to withdraw without prejudice by January 25, 2026, and a formal notification is required. Any withdrawal or no-show after this date will be considered misconduct and may affect the school's registration in future MSH.
- 2.7 MSH reserves the right to refuse or remove the registration of any team, and such refusal or removal is at the absolute discretion of the OC. When exercising this discretion, the OC will have regard to, but not limited to, the past conduct of teams from that institution (e.g., any unjustified no-show, any past violation of any rules of MSH).
- 2.8 MSH will announce the List of Participating Teams for MSH 2026 by January 26, 2026.

3 The Problem

- 3.1 MSH, as a pre-moot event of the Vis Moot, adopts and distributes the Moot Problem and related case materials of the Vis Moot in their original form.
- 3.2 Identical to the Vis Moot, the Problem will consist of the statements of claim and defense and the additional request with their exhibits, any order of the arbitral tribunal issued prior to the date on which the Problem is distributed, and the clarifications issued by the Vis Moot Directors.
- 3.3 The facts in the dispute that is the subject matter of MSH are given in the Problem. Facts alleged in the statements of claim and statement of defense including the exhibits to those statements, as well as in the clarifications, are taken to be correct unless there is a contradiction between them. No additional facts may be introduced into MSH unless they are logical and necessary extensions of the given facts or are publicly available true facts, and may be introduced in the Vis Moot under its rules.

4 Teams

- 4.1 Teams may come from either a law school or another higher educational institution that includes law as part of its program of study. A team is composed of at least two students registered at that school or institution. Students may be registered either for a first degree or an advanced degree and are not necessary from the country in which the institution is located.
- 4.2 No student who has been licensed to practice law is eligible to participate except with permission of the OC.
- 4.3 Each participating law school or other institution may enter one team. The OC may at his/her absolute discretion approve more than one team representing one school or institution for the narrow purpose of paring.
- 4.4 Each team shall bear their own travel expenses or other related costs, and there is no financial support available in MSH 2026.

5 Oral Hearings

- 5.1 The oral hearings of MSH 2026 will be held IN PERSON. The published schedules of oral hearings will be following Beijing time (GMT+8).
- 5.2 Each team will argue four times in the general rounds, twice as claimant and twice as respondent.
- 5.3 The oral presentation of each team is, in principle, 30 minutes. The team should allocate equitably the time available to the two individual advocates. However, the arbitral tribunal may exceed the time limits stated as long as neither team is allowed more than 45 minutes to present its argument, including the time necessary to answer the questions of the tribunal. It will be the responsibility of the tribunal to ensure that the teams are treated fairly.
- 5.4 In case a team fails to appear for a scheduled oral hearing, the arbitral tribunal after notifying the OC and waiting for 15 minutes will conduct the oral hearing *ex parte*. The attending team may present its arguments and will be scored as if the absent team were present. The team that fails to appear at the scheduled oral hearing forfeits all points for the round. It is not allowed that only one oralist from a team appears for the oral hearing. Each attending team must have two oralists to present their submissions. One oralist is responsible for procedural issues and

the other is for merit issues.

- 5.5 Failure to participate in the oral hearings without a valid reason (as determined by the Directors) may result in the exclusion of the institution from the competition.
- 5.6 The arbitrators are requested to act during the oral hearings the way they would in a real arbitration taking into account that this is an educational exercise. There are significant differences in style dependent both on individual personalities and on perceptions of the role of an arbitrator (or judge) in oral argument. Some arbitrators or arbitral tribunals, may interrupt a presentation with persistent or even aggressive questioning. Other arbitrators or arbitral tribunals, may listen to an entire argument without asking any questions. Therefore, teams should be prepared for both styles of oral presentation.
- 5.7 Some arbitrators or arbitral tribunals will ask one team to present its argument on all of the issues before the other team is permitted to present its argument. Other arbitrators or arbitral tribunals will ask both teams to argue one issue first before they both argue in respect of a second issue. Normally the party who has raised the issue will argue first. Therefore, normally the claimant would argue first, if it is to present its arguments on all of the issues before the respondent is permitted to argue. However, if the respondent has raised an objection to the jurisdiction of the Arbitral Tribunal or other such defense, the tribunal would normally ask it to present its arguments on that issue before the claimant responds to it.
- 5.8 The arbitrators or arbitral tribunals will decide whether rebuttal arguments will be permitted. Whether or not rebuttal will be allowed can be expected to change from one argument to the next.
- 5.9 Devices. Teams are permitted to have electronic and digital devices with them during the oral hearings for the sole purpose of looking up and accessing materials. If a team intends to use any device that is capable of sending or receiving communication, the team must at the beginning of the oral hearing confirm and assure the Tribunal that the device will not be used for communication during the hearing and that the rules on scouting and AI are understood. Team members may use devices to look up and access material during the hearing, whether that material is stored on the device or obtained via an internet connection. Team members are explicitly prohibited from employing the device for any other purpose during the oral hearing that includes the usage of an AI-enhanced tool or chat bot for, inter alia, translation, consultation or

coaching. Teams are expressly prohibited from using a device to record any part of MSH except in accordance with Rule 5.10 (Recording of hearings). All devices must be set to silent at the commencement of the hearing.

5.10 Recording of hearings. Recording (audio or video) of hearings is permitted only with the prior agreement of the opposing team and the arbitral tribunal. Recording must be done in such a way as not to disturb the hearing. The tribunal may at any time require that recording cease. Unauthorized recording is a violation of these Rules.

5.11 Scouting. One purpose of MSH is to develop the art of advocacy. Observance of the performance of other participants is encouraged. However, no team member, coach, advisor, friend, or relative is permitted to attend an oral hearing of a team against which their own team is scheduled to argue at a later time in the general rounds. This rule also applies to watching practice rounds or pre-moot arguments once the official schedule is published. Violation of this rule may result in disqualification from the elimination rounds.

5.12 No exhibits may be used during oral arguments that do not come directly from the Problem. Exhibits that are designed to clarify time sequences or other such matters may be used, but only if the arbitrators and the opposing team are in agreement. Where a team believes the opposing team is using an exhibit not complying with the previous sentence, it must raise an objection with the tribunal. The tribunal is empowered to determine whether the exhibit complies with the requirements of this paragraph. Objections must be raised during the course of the actual hearing, thereafter a team cannot raise any such objections.

6 Scoring

6.1 Each arbitrator will score each of the oralists on a scale of 50 to 100. The scores of the two oralists will be added to constitute the team score for that argument. Therefore, each team could score a maximum of 200 points per arbitrator per argument, or a theoretical maximum of 2,400 points for the four arguments. Arbitrators will score the oral arguments without knowledge of the results of earlier arguments.

6.2 The individual score given to an oralist by an arbitrator is entirely within the discretion of that arbitrator. There is no requirement that the arbitral tribunal agree scores. However, the arbitral tribunals may, and are strongly encouraged

to, discuss scoring at the end of a hearing and prior to submitting the scores to the OC.

- 6.3 As part of the OC's measures to ensure consistency of scoring, any significant differences in the score of any individual member of the arbitral panel will be drawn to the attention of that arbitrator and the presiding arbitrator. The presiding arbitrator will be asked to advise whether the panel has conferred with each other as referred to in the paragraph above. The arbitrator whose score varies significantly will be invited to confirm or amend the score given. The score will always remain at the discretion of the individual arbitrator. A significant difference is defined as a variance of 15 points.
- 6.4 The eight teams that have obtained the highest composite scores will meet in the elimination rounds. If there is a tie for eighth place, the decision as to which team will enter the elimination rounds will be determined by lot.
- 6.5 The pairings in the elimination rounds shall be determined by use of "power-seeding", i.e. the highest-ranked Team shall compete against the lowest-ranked-Team; the second-highest-ranked Team shall compete against the second-lowest-ranked Team, etc. If teams to be paired in any elimination rounds have been paired and on identical sides in earlier rounds, changes may be made at the discretion of the director.

7 Use of Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity

- 7.1 Allowed use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Acknowledging the widespread prevalence and practical significance of AI, MSH adopts a principles-based approach to its regulation. AI can be used in Moot activities to support, but not substitute, a student's own reasoning, ensuring that critical thinking remains the primary basis for demonstrating knowledge, judgment, advocacy and creativity. It follows that there are contexts and purposes for which AI can be used within the Moot, inter alia, the following:
 - a) Using AI-enhanced tools for team-internal administrative tasks,
 - b) Using AI-enhanced research tools to find relevant sources (for example search engines, library catalogues),
 - c) Using AI-enhanced translation tools, to translate and understand legal sources,

- d) Using AI-enhanced translation tools to aid an English translation of text within the submitted memorandum (it should be noted that whilst not prohibited the use of English translation tools is strongly discouraged for education purposes),
- e) Using AI-enhanced tools as a tutor,
- f) Using AI to generate high-level briefings on relevant factual and legal topics which are not submitted as part of the memorandum but solely used for the team's own understanding,
- g) Using AI-enhanced proof-reading tools.

7.2 Prohibited use of AI. Applying MSH's principles-based approach, there are contexts and purposes of using AI that substitute a student's own critical thinking. It follows that the following are expressly prohibited and would be acts in contravention of these rules:

- a) Use of AI-enhanced tools to synthesize or summarize sources,
- b) Use of AI tools to reformulate or rewrite text that is submitted in a memorandum,
- c) Submit text in the memorandum that has been generated by an AI-tool other than as contemplated in paragraph 7.1(d) above – even if the AI-generated text has been altered, corrected and amended by the team members.
- d) To submit any documents issued by the Vis Moot Association or MSH Organizing Committee to an AI-tool, or to employ an AI-tool that has been intentionally trained on the Vis Moot Problem in order to write and submit a memorandum.

7.3 AI Disclosure. Every team is required to submit the completed "Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence Disclosure Statement" ("AI Statement", attached to these Rules as Appendix 1) via the method specified by the OC. All statements on the use of AI must be made truthfully. Failure to comply with this rule may result in disqualification of the team. Untruthful statements may result in disqualification.

8 Awards given:

The Champion Team

The Runner-up Team
Two Semi-finalist Teams
Four Quarter-finalist Teams
The Champion Individual Oralist
The Runner-up Oralist
The Second Runner-up Oralist
Honorable Mention Oralists

*The Awards listed are subject to changes.

*Honorable Mention Oralists shall be selected based on the following:

- a) the oralist is ranked among the top 10% of all oralists;
- b) the ranking is determined by the total individual scores awarded in the General Rounds; and
- c) the oralist has appeared for both the Claimant and the Respondent in the General Rounds.

9 Interpretation

9.1 For interpretation of these rules, requests may be addressed to the OC. All interpretations, as well as any waivers, consents, or other decisions are at the discretion of the OC.

9.2 The OC reserves the right of final interpretation

APPENDIX 1

Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence Disclosure Statement

UNIVERSITY:

COUNTRY:

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY	YES	UNSURE	NO
We confirm that this memorandum does not include text from any source, whether the source was in hard copy or online available, which has not been properly distinguished by quotation marks or citation.			

USE OF AI			
We have used AI-enhanced tools for team-internal administrative tasks.			
We have used AI-enhanced search engines or library catalogues for researching sources and (factual or legal) information on the Moot Problem.			
We have used AI enhanced translation tools to translate sources relevant for our work on the Moot Problem.			
We have used AI enhanced translation tools to translate parts of the text submitted in this Memorandum into English from any other language.			
We have used AI to generate high-level briefings on relevant factual and legal topics which are not submitted as part of the memorandum but have been solely used to advance our own understanding.			
We have used AI-enhanced tools as a tutor to guide and support our preparation and learning.			
We have used AI-enhanced proof-reading tools.			
We have used AI-enhanced tools to synthesize or summarize sources.			
We have used AI-enhanced tools to reformulate or rewrite text that is submitted.			
We have used AI tools to generate statements that are now included in the memo. Please tick yes even if you have altered or amended the text generated by AI before submission.			

We have submitted documents issued by the Vis Moot Association to an AI-tool.			
We have used an AI tool that has been trained on Vis Moot documents to generate text that is part of our Memorandum			
Other (please specify):			