

49th EDITION

TELDERS INTERNATIONAL LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION



LEGAL CONSEQUENCES ARISING FROM THE CONDUCT AND POLICIES OF GRAVENWALD

3-6 June 2026, The Hague



Grotius Centre
for International
Legal Studies



*Telders International Law
Moot Court Competition*

Table of Contents, Supervisory Board & TOO

Table of Contents

- Preface
- Prof. Mr. B.M. Telders
- Case concerning Legal Consequences Arising from the Conduct and Policies of Gravenwald (Advisory Opinion, AIGO v. Gravenwald)
- Participating Teams
- Team Sponsors
- Acknowledgements
- International Board of Review
- Judges Semi-Finals
- Programme of Events

Supervisory Board of the Telders International Law Moot Court Foundation

H.E. Judge Hilary Charlesworth, International Court of Justice

H.E. Judge Georg Nolte, International Court of Justice

H.E. Judge Dire Tladi, International Court of Justice

H.E. Judge Liesbeth Lijnzaad, International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea

Prof. Dr. Niels Blokker, Leiden University (emeritus)

Prof. Dr. Nico Schrijver, Leiden University (emeritus)

Ms. Hanna Thuránszky, Former Director Telders Organizing Office

Telders Organizing Office 2026

Ms. Mette Léons, Coordinator

Ms. Catie Huynh, Coordinator

Ms. Ana Tonžetić, Student Intern

Ms. Idil Tok, Student Intern

Preface

Dear Students,

For the past 49 years, the Telders International Law Moot Court Competition has brought together a diverse group of teams from over 20 different countries in an effort to stimulate students' interest and knowledge of international law and promote international cooperation and understanding. Not only does the Telders Moot Court Competition provide an exceptional platform for aspiring international lawyers to sharpen their advocacy skills and gain practical experience arguing various topics of international law in a close-to-reality court setting, it accords various opportunities for students to engage in thought-provoking legal debates with like-minded peers, build lasting connections and receive invaluable advice from legal professionals in the field of international law.

The 2026 Telders Case concerns the Legal consequences arising from the conduct and policies of Gravenwald in relation to visas and immigration and to international organisation immunities. This year's problem is the first time that the Telders problem involves Advisory Opinion proceedings before the ICJ. The problem tackles 'classic' public international law issues such as procedural issues with regard to rendering an advisory opinion, the immunities of international organizations from jurisdiction, and the inviolability of their premises. The written memorials which address these issues will lead to challenging and engaging exchange of views during the Oral Rounds at the Spui Campus The Hague on 4 and 5 June, and the Final Round in the Great Hall of Justice on 6 June.

The Supervisory Board and the Telders Organizing Office wish to express their gratitude to all Members of the International Board of Review, the Judges of the Oral Rounds and the Final Round for their involvement and support. We would also like to thank the organizers of the UNICUM International Friendly Rounds 2026, which took place at University of Belgrade in May. Finally, we are grateful for the financial contribution of the City of The Hague, the Leiden University Fund, Fonds Mr. S. J. Vissers, and the Embassies of Switzerland and Qatar in The Hague, that have made this competition possible. We look forward to welcoming you to The Hague for this 49th edition of the Telders International Law Moot Court Competition.

Good luck to all the Teams!

Prof. Mr. B.M. Telders

The Telders International Law Moot Court Competition is named after Professor Benjamin Marius Telders, who first became a professor of international law at Leiden University in 1931.

From a young age, Telders was extremely interested in why and how law operated, and displayed a remarkable aptitude for law which he pursued in his legal studies at Leiden University. He considered international law to be a unique study and challenge, since it was - and in many respects still is - undefined and interwoven with history and politics. Telders' passion for international law and human rights led him to become a prominent figure in the field, frequently having the honour to represent his country, The Netherlands, before the Permanent Court of International Justice.



His interests and activities were not, however, limited to international law, and his commitment to justice and human rights was also evident in his political career and personal life. Together with his colleague Cleveringa, Telders was involved in the events of October 1940, when all professors in the Netherlands were instructed to sign what was known as the Aryan Declaration, in which they had to state whether they were Jewish. If they did not, they would be dismissed. Telders led the resistance to this declaration, not only refusing to sign but writing to the President of the Supreme Court of the Netherlands, L.E. Visser: *'This far, but no further'*.

Prof. Mr. B.M. Telders

Telders was subsequently imprisoned for his resistance, but he did not allow it to break him morally or mentally, continuing to put moral guidance and leadership first and write about international law using a small pencil and match sticks during his incarceration. Professor Telders died of typhus in the concentration camp of Bergen-Belsen in April 1945, shortly before the end of the war.

Two years later, in 1947, former students of Professor Telders founded the Telders Students Society of International Law (Telders Dispuut) in commemoration of their Professor. The first Telders International Law Moot Court Competition was organised in 1977, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Telders Students Society for International Law.

Today, the Telders Moot Court Competition continues to be organized every year in commemoration of his legacy as a brilliant international legal scholar, a dedicated politician, and a fearless champion of human rights, and serves as a testament of his inspiring and lasting impact on the field of international law.



Dispute concerning Legal Consequences Arising from the Conduct and Policies of Gravenwald (AIGO v. Gravenwald)

1. Owing to the global concern about the rising use of artificial intelligence in many fields, on 4 January 2016, states adopted the International Artificial Intelligence Governance Treaty, the “AI Treaty” (Annex I). The AI Treaty provides for the creation of the Artificial Intelligence Governance Organization (“AIGO”) among other matters. The AIGO is mandated by its constitution to set global standards for the safe and ethical use of AI, ensure compliance with these standards, and facilitate cooperation on AI safety research (Annex II). The AIGO currently has 115 members consisting of states from all over the world.
2. On 17 February 2017, the AIGO and the United Nations entered into an agreement (“UN–AIGO Agreement”) pursuant to Articles 57 and 63 of the United Nations Charter, giving the AIGO the status of a UN Specialized Agency (Annex III).
3. The AIGO reached an agreement with one of its member states, the Republic of Gravenwald, to act as its host state and allow the AIGO to establish its headquarters in Graustadt, the capital of Gravenwald. To give effect to this, Gravenwald and AIGO entered into the AIGO Headquarters Agreement (“HQ Agreement”) on 13 March 2018 (Annex IV).
4. The Municipality of Graustadt offered the AIGO a building on the outskirts of the city, known as the Centre William Beauregard (“CWB”), to serve as its headquarters. The CWB, an abandoned municipal office building named after Graustadt’s first mayor, was leased to the AIGO under a long-term agreement. The AIGO officially began its operations at the CWB on 18 August 2018.

5. Gravenwald is an island nation surrounded by the Morvanta Sea, the Thalvian Ocean, and the Sundren Sea. Gravenwald has long been recognized as a global leader in the preservation and advancement of agricultural practices. More recently, since 2015, Gravenwald has rapidly risen to prominence in AI research and development, now housing multiple educational and private institutions dedicated to the advancement of AI.
6. Gravenwald is a party to the 1965 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) and the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). It is also a party to the UN Charter, the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the 1946 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations and the 1947 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. It was a party to these instruments at all relevant times.
7. On 20 December 2022, in the southern Gravenwald city of Dornheim, a commercial building housing the offices of AI4All, a startup dedicated to the development of generative AI programs, was attacked through the use of explosives. Responsibility for the attack was tied to the militant, anti-AI group, Humanity's Last Guard ("HLG"), which left its distinctive insignia spray-painted on the street outside the building bombed. The 20 December 2022 attack was the sixth HLG attack in Gravenwald.
8. HLG was formed in response to the rapid advancements in AI. Driven by a deep conviction that AI will erase human autonomy and dignity, the group sees itself as the final defenders of humanity's organic existence. The group rejects digital dependence and advocates for dismantling AI infrastructures through both cyber and physical attacks. HLG was formally designated as a terrorist organization under Gravenwald's Counter-Terrorism Act in 2021.

9. International intelligence reports have located HLG as based in the Kingdom of Norfeld. The population of Norfeld is called Norfeldians and they are composed of 78% Norfolk, the indigenous peoples of Norfeld. The Norfolk have distinct names, traditional facial markings and a unique language only spoken by the Norfolk. Norfeld is the nearest country to Gravenwald, separated only by the Sundren Sea.

10. Each year, thousands of Norfolk travel to Gravenwald to engage in a wide range of pursuits in the field of agriculture. Beyond formal studies at Gravenwald's renowned educational institutions for agriculture, the Norfolk regularly participate in conferences, workshops, and collaborative research projects with Norfolk and other international scientists based in Gravenwald's research institutes for agriculture.

11. On 22 December 2022, in the aftermath of the most recent HLG attack, the President of Gravenwald issued a proclamation:

"In light of the grave and exceptional threat posed by the terrorist organization Humanity's Last Guard, I hereby declare that a public emergency exists. The repeated attacks on Gravenwald constitute a clear danger to the stability of our nation and the safety of our citizens. In order to respond effectively, the Government will adopt certain measures, including heightened review of residence permits, automated visa screening, and security-based entry restrictions."

12. On 1 February 2023, the Gravenwald parliament enacted two laws related to visas and immigration. The first is the Search and Cancel Act and the second is the Automated Entry System Act. To implement these laws Gravenwald procured the AI program, Immigration Processing Intelligence System ("IPIS") to facilitate the review of immigration matters. The IPIS was commissioned by Gravenwald and it was developed and designed by Civitas Logic Solutions ("Civitas") as its first product.

13. The Search and Cancel Act authorizes the use of the IPIS to review the profiles of non-citizen residents in Gravenwald to detect support for and potential involvement in the activities of the HLG. The IPIS was given access to all public records in Gravenwald's possession and was given CCTV footage data to identify suspects through facial recognition. The IPIS is also capable of reviewing digital activity, such as social media. If the system deems that the non-citizen holder of a residence permit supports, aids, or abets the HLG or any of its members, or is part of the HLG, then the residence permit will be automatically revoked and the persons concerned will be deported immediately. Persons deported may appeal in Gravenwaldian courts.

14. The Automated Entry System Act authorizes the use of AI to review visa applications from non-Gravenwald citizens and imposes a visa bond requirement on applicants of certain nationalities. Upon the submission of a visa application for tourism, study or business, the IPIS will make a determination whether to grant or reject the visa application. The IPIS will make a determination based on all available information on the applicant such as public records and digital activity, including social media posts. The visa decisions under the Automated Entry System Act are not subject to appeal or review, however, a fresh application can be submitted.

15. Furthermore, the IPIS will designate certain nationalities as "high-risk". Applicants from these high-risk nationalities would have to pay a visa bond in amounts of €10,000 or €15,000, determined by the IPIS upon the approval of the visa and before its issuance. The full visa bond amount will be returned to the applicant upon leaving Gravenwald. Under the Automated Entry System Act, a nationality may be designated as "high-risk" for a period not exceeding twelve months unless renewed upon a finding of a continued threat.

16. The nationalist party in Gravenwald, the Gravenwald Unity Party, praised the Gravenwald government for enacting this legislation. On 15 May 2023, the Chair of the Gravenwald Unity Party posted on Twitter:

“Gravenwald cannot afford to ignore the risks. Arrivals from across the Sundren Sea have brought instability and disregard for our laws. The new visa standards are about protecting our people and ensuring only those who truly respect Gravenwald’s way of life are admitted.”

17. Six months after being enacted, on 20 August 2023, the two laws entered into force and have since been implemented.

18. Meanwhile, on 18 July 2023, the HLG committed another attack, this time on the Institute of AI, an advanced AI educational institution near the AIGO headquarters in Graustadt. Police reports stated that a suspect responsible for the bombings was seen fleeing the scene and then entering the AIGO headquarters.

19. Half an hour after the incident, the Municipality of Graustadt sent an email to the AIGO which states:

“We have strong evidence to believe that the suspect is hiding within the AIGO premises according to intelligence reports. Reports indicate that the suspect was carrying explosives and a detonator when it entered the CWB. Reports suggest that the suspect was let in the premises by a person from inside the AIGO and that the suspect might be preparing for another attack. As such, we urgently request the AIGO to cooperate and allow the Graustadt police entry in order to conduct a joint search. It is a matter of public safety and emergency. In addition, we remind the AIGO that its premises cannot be used as a refuge by fugitives or persons evading arrest.”

20. Almost instantly, the Office of the Director-General of the AIGO sent a reply via email stating: “we will revert upon instruction”.

21. After receiving no response from the AIGO for over two hours after the email, on the afternoon of 18 July 2023, the Graustadt police forcibly entered the CWB, breaking open the front gates after repeated refusals of entry from the AIGO security force stationed at the front gate. The police then proceeded to conduct thorough searches of the main building, breaking open any and all doors which were locked, in order to gain access to all rooms. Eventually, after three hours of searching, they arrested an individual who matched the profile of the suspected HLG member. The suspect was found hiding in a utility corridor adjacent to the main archives in the basement level. The suspect was taken to the Graustadt police station for further questioning.

22. The next day, the Office of the Director-General of the AIGO issued a Press Release stating:

“The AIGO condemns the forcible entry into its Headquarters by the Graustadt police. Under international law, our premises are inviolable. AIGO was preparing to grant conditional consent for a limited, supervised search, however, the police hastily and forcibly entered the CWB before such consent can be transmitted. The intrusion far exceeded any conceivable emergency action. The AIGO insists that allegations of harboring fugitives are unfounded.”

23. A week after the 18 July 2023 incident, the AIGO's internal investigations revealed that a staff member, Dr. Niccolo Drexler, had been involved in the incident. On 5 August 2023, the AIGO dismissed Dr. Drexler, for sheltering a member of a terrorist organization in the AIGO premises. Dr. Drexler joined the AIGO in 2018 and eventually became the Director of the Legal Compliance Division. According to the Internal Staff Tribunal for Ethical Conduct ("ISTEC"), Dr. Drexler allowed the suspected member of the HLG to enter the CWB in the aftermath of the 18 July 2023 attack in order to provide him refuge.
24. The ISTEC serves as the formal oversight and adjudication body within the AIGO for handling internal disputes and complaints involving staff behavior or misconduct. It is mandated to investigate formal complaints submitted by AIGO staff or the Office of the Director-General. It is composed of five senior AIGO staff members from different divisions in the organization, appointed by the Director-General for non-renewable three-year terms. The ISTEC can make reasoned recommendations to the AIGO Director-General for the dismissal of employees and its findings are normally accepted by the Director-General.
25. After his dismissal, Dr. Drexler filed a case against the AIGO at the Court of First Instance of Graustadt. Dr. Drexler argues that he was unjustly dismissed and that the ISTEC is not a fair, independent, and impartial tribunal.
26. Dr. Drexler's complaint alleges that a member of the ISTEC, who was next in line for promotion to the position of Director of the Legal Compliance Division, was in fact promoted to that role following Dr. Drexler's dismissal. The complaint further contends that another ISTEC member harbored prejudice against Dr. Drexler from his first day at the organization. In support of this claim, Dr. Drexler attached internal email printouts showing that this ISTEC member, who had been his initial supervisor, repeatedly berated him.

27. In addition, the complaint alleges that Dr. Drexler did not have access to an oral hearing and the evidence relied upon by ISTEK was not properly authenticated or tested. He highlights that the ISTEK has no explicit mechanism for recusal and that there is no independent procedure for removal other than on the Director-General's recommendation. Finally, he argues that he could not appeal the decision of the ISTEK, all of which violated his right of access to justice and the right to a fair trial.

28. The AIGO, for its part, argued that it has immunity from all legal processes and that accordingly, the Court of First Instance of Graustadt should declare that it is without jurisdiction.

29. The Court of First Instance ruled that it has jurisdiction over the case because Gravenwald has the duty to protect Dr. Drexler's right of access to justice. The ruling reads:

"The Court finds that AIGO's ISTEK was not a reasonable or appropriate forum for settling disputes as required under international law. Given credible evidence of conflicts of interest and bias within ISTEK, the Court determines that Dr. Drexler's right to a fair trial would be extinguished and there would be a denial of justice if immunity were recognized. Accordingly, the Court denies AIGO's plea of immunity and asserts jurisdiction over the case, which shall proceed on the merits."

30. Shortly after it learned of this ruling, the AIGO sent a Note Verbale to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Gravenwald to intervene in the proceedings:

“The AIGO contends that under the 1947 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies it enjoys immunity from “every form of legal process” and that this absolute protection is essential for its independent functioning. The organization has complied with its obligations under Section 31 of the same convention by establishing the ISTEAC. Allegations of bias or lack of fairness do not negate AIGO’s compliance with its treaty duty. In any event, compliance is not a condition to the grant of AIGO’s immunities.”

31. The AIGO received no response. The proceedings are currently ongoing.

32. On 23 September 2023, the AIGO and Gravenwald attempted to consult and negotiate on the matter of the entry of the Graustadt police in the CWB, the Dr. Drexler matter, and the potential implications on the immunities of the AIGO. The negotiations and consultations ended unsuccessfully. On 15 January 2024, the AIGO sent a Note Verbale to Gravenwald invoking Article 21 of the HQ Agreement which provides for arbitration in the event of a dispute regarding the agreement.

33. On 8 May 2024, the tribunal was constituted. In its first procedural order, the arbitral tribunal affirmed that its jurisdiction was limited to “disputes arising under the HQ Agreement between AIGO and Gravenwald”. Gravenwald objected to the jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal. It argued that the dispute revolved around the Specialized Agencies Convention as the ISTEAC proceedings confirmed the intelligence reports that personnel from the AIGO gave refuge to the suspect, an abuse of privileges and immunities as per Article 24 of the Convention. The tribunal has not yet issued a decision regarding its jurisdiction and the matter remains pending.

34. On 1 June 2025, a human rights NGO, the AI Justice Alliance, after almost two years of monitoring the operation of the IPIS, released a report stating that there is a high probability that the IPIS was not tested for fairness and bias based on nationality, race, gender, and religion citing the absence of publicly available fairness reports and transparency about the IPIS' training data.

35. For its report, the AI Justice Alliance partnered with an independent AI auditor to conduct a study on the IPIS and its use in implementing the Automated Entry System Act. The study annexed to the report revealed that IPIS disproportionately flagged travelers from Norfeld for additional screening while Norfolk were reportedly disproportionately denied visas. The auditors report that after proxy-testing and reverse engineering with a limited dataset (18% of all IPIS decisions), it is suggested that there are possible correlations between IPIS' risk indicators and Norfolk characteristics. Following its release, the report attracted widespread attention from civil society and was cited by several Norfeldian activist groups in calls for an urgent suspension of the use of IPIS pending review.

36. In response, the Directorate of Migration Control of Gravenwald ("DMC") issued a press statement:

"The DMC categorically rejects the conclusions of the report by the AI Justice Alliance. The alleged disproportionately higher rate of Norfeldian application rejections, assuming it is true, does not itself prove systemic bias. The figures reflected credible intelligence assessments and risk indicators, rather than discriminatory profiling. Furthermore, the visa bond requirement includes hardship and agricultural academic exemptions. In any event, the Automated Entry System Act is justified by the ongoing national security threats."

37. When asked by a news outlet for comment, Civitas stated that, prior to 20 August 2023, it had provided Gravenwald with two pre-deployment memoranda summarizing model validation and an assurance letter from an external cybersecurity firm regarding data privacy and security. The memoranda, however, did not disclose whether protected-attribute testing was conducted.
38. As of June 2025, only Norfeld has been listed as a country whose nationals are required to post a visa bond under the Automated Entry System Act. According to a survey conducted by the AI Justice Alliance on 15 July 2025, the average monthly salary of Norfeldians before taxes is €1,400 and that 79% of Norfeldians stated that they do not possess the means to pay for the visa bond required. According to the AI Justice Alliance, as of June 2025, only 15% of the total number of hardship and agricultural academic exemption applications have been granted.
39. On 23 July 2025, Norfeld filed an application instituting proceedings at the International Court of Justice against Gravenwald. Norfeld invoked Article 22 of the CERD as a basis for the Court's jurisdiction. Norfeld argues that the Automated Entry System Act and its implementation violate the CERD. According to Norfeld, Gravenwald's denial or restriction of cross-border access to the Norfolk amounts to discrimination under CERD.
40. That same day, Norfeld who was a member of the AIGO, filed a complaint with the AIGO Secretariat, stating that the IPIS as used in the Search and Cancel Act and the Automated Entry System Act do not meet international human rights standards as required by the AI Treaty. On 25 July 2025, the AIGO Governing Body constituted an Independent Compliance Review Panel ("ICRP") to assess the IPIS and its implementation.

41. The implementation of the Search and Cancel Act has also garnered criticism from the population. According to social media posts, there have been Norfolk students deported while conducting research on AI ethics and governance, despite subsequently being proven through judicial proceedings as not being affiliated with HLG. An independent news outlet in Gravenwald reported the following:

“In September 2023, the DMC deported a 25-year-old Norfeldian student, Lisa Thalvik, who had been conducting Ph.D. research on the ethical governance of AI. The expulsion order accused her of “dissemination” of HLG messaging, but no specific social media posts or dates were provided. Ms. Thalvik had no opportunity to contest the evidence and was placed on a Sundren Channel ferry within 48 hours. After a two-year-long legal battle in Gravenwaldian courts costing upwards of €7,000, her name was finally cleared and she was allowed to continue her Ph.D. in Dornheim.”

42. On 1 August 2025, the AI Justice Alliance released a report on the implementation of the Search and Cancel Act. According to the report, of the 15,507 deportations conducted under the Act between August 2023 and July 2025, approximately 48% involved Norfolk, even though Norfeldians comprised only 23% of Gravenwald’s resident non-citizen population. The report states that notices for deportation contain only generic references to supporting HLG activities. The report found that the DMC has invoked “national security” in 88% of expulsion cases since August 2023.

43. In response, the DMC released a report on 10 August 2025 finding that of the 6,978 individuals who appealed their deportation, only 41% were later cleared of affiliation with the HLG by domestic courts; the remainder had some level of contact with HLG networks. Where domestic courts subsequently cleared appellants, Gravenwald compensated for costs of wrongful deportation and expedited restoration of residence permits. In May 2024, Gravenwald had established a legal aid program for deportees to be able to seek representation to appeal in Gravenwaldian courts.

44. Since the implementation of the two laws, no HLG attack has been committed in Gravenwald. The Chair of the Gravenwald Unity Party praised the measures on X, stating:

“Since the new laws took effect, not a single HLG attack has struck Gravenwald. These measures work and they are a reasonable and objective response to the threat. They have exposed Norfeldians who aided and abetted HLG. Our people are safer, and Gravenwald stands united.”

45. On 29 August 2025, Gravenwald filed a preliminary objection in the case of Norfeld v. Gravenwald pending in the ICJ, arguing that the ICJ does not have jurisdiction over the dispute. In its letter sent to the ICJ and Norfeld, Gravenwald argues that the CERD does not apply extraterritorially. Gravenwald further argues that the laws are applied equally to all visa applicants and are motivated by threats from HLG rather than prejudice against the Norfolk people. On this basis, Gravenwald maintains that the ICJ is without jurisdiction.

46. On 11 October 2025, the ICRP issued its report on the IPIS, the implementation of the Search and Cancel Act and the Automated Entry System Act by Gravenwald. With a vote of three to two, it found that the measures in question were not compliant with the AI treaty and international human rights standards and recommended that the implementation of the measures be suspended and withdrawn. The members of the panel in the minority attached a substantive two-page dissent concluding that the IPIS met applicable international technical standards.
47. The report of the ICRP was communicated to Gravenwald. On 13 October 2025, Gravenwald appealed the report to the Governing Body. The report divided the membership of the Governing Body composed of all 115 members of the AIGO. In its special session on 20 October 2025, the AIGO Governing Body decided to refer the matter to the ICJ. It further agreed to refer the issue of the immunities of the AIGO in relation to Gravenwald to the ICJ. On that same day, the draft wording of the resolution to request for an advisory opinion was circulated to the members for review and comment.
48. Two days later, Gravenwald circulated a memorandum to AIGO member states arguing that, taken together, the arbitration initiated by AIGO pursuant to the HQ Agreement, and the contentious case brought by Norfeld against it in the ICJ cover the same subject-matter raised in the advisory opinion request. In Gravenwald's view, requesting an advisory opinion will risk prejudicing the ongoing proceedings. Gravenwald further argues that the request requires the Court to undertake factual investigations which cannot be pursued in advisory proceedings. Gravenwald argues that the draft request seeks to convert what is in actuality a contentious case into advisory proceedings, thereby circumventing Gravenwald's lack of consent. It urges the members to not proceed with the request.

49. On 1 November 2025, after hours of debate in the Governing Body session, the Body adopted a resolution, by a vote of 57 to 53, requesting the ICJ to give an advisory opinion on the matter. By a letter dated 3 November 2025 (Annex V) and received in the Registry on 5 November 2025, the Director-General of the AIGO officially communicated to the ICJ the decision taken by the Governing Body to submit these questions for an advisory opinion:

“Considering the rules and principles of international law, including the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies:

- a. What are the legal consequences of the conduct of the Republic of Gravenwald in relation to the inviolability of the premises of the Artificial Intelligence Governance Organization and to the immunities of the Organization from jurisdiction?*
- b. What are the legal consequences arising from the enactment and implementation of the Search and Cancel Act and the Automated Entry System Act?”*

50. On 6 November 2025, the Republic of Gravenwald sent a Note Verbale to AIGO stating that it considers that:

1. The Court should exercise its discretion to decline to give an advisory opinion;
or
2. The Republic of Gravenwald did not violate international law when its agents entered the premises of the Artificial Intelligence Governance Organization;
3. The Republic of Gravenwald assuming jurisdiction over the case filed by Dr. Niccolo Drexler did not violate international law;
4. The enactment and implementation of the Search and Cancel Act and the Automated Entry System Act are not in violation of international law.

51. In response, the AIGO sent a Note Verbale dated 8 November 2025 to Gravenwald stating that:

1. There are no compelling reasons which may lead the Court to refuse to give its opinion in response to the current request falling within its jurisdiction;
2. The Republic of Gravenwald violated international law when its agents entered the premises of the Artificial Intelligence Governance Organization;
3. The Republic of Gravenwald violated international law by assuming jurisdiction over the case filed by Dr. Niccolo Drexler;
4. The enactment and implementation of the Automated Entry System Act is inconsistent with the CERD, and the enactment and implementation of the Search and Cancel Act is inconsistent with Article 26 of the ICCPR.

52. By an Order dated 10 November 2025, the President of the Court decided that the AIGO and its member states were likely to be able to furnish information on the questions submitted to the Court for an advisory opinion, and fixed the time-limit within which written statements on the questions might be presented to it, in accordance with Article 66, paragraph 2, of the ICJ Statute.

53. The Court expects to receive the written statements of the Director-General of the AIGO and Gravenwald prior to the oral proceedings. The Court had also decided that the Director-General of the AIGO will first present its oral statements, followed by Gravenwald. Norfeld sent a letter stating that it will not participate in the proceedings to avoid prejudice to its case, *Norfeld v. Gravenwald*. No other participant is taking part in the advisory opinion proceedings.

Participating Teams

Armenia

Yerevan State University

Team coaches: Mr. Yeghishe Kirakosyan
Ms. Kristine Khanazadyan
Team members: Mr. Erik Manukyan
Ms. Lilit Paytyan
Ms. Svetlana Simonyan
Ms. Silva Vardazaryan

The University of Law

Team coaches: Mr. Owen Lawton
Mr. Joshua Gibbs
Team members: Ms. Vanessa Yu
Ms. Ismahan Mohamed
Mr. William Schlich
Mr. Diven Nair

Austria

University of Graz

Team coaches: Prof. Erika de Wet
Ms. Natascha Gojkovic
Team members: Ms. Mechthild Wochesländer
Ms. Charlotte Vereecken
Ms. Viktoria Schirnhofner
Ms. Jana Tsybrovskyy

Estonia

University of Tartu

Team coaches: Ms. Kertu-Liis Rannik
Ms. Liina Lumiste
Team members: Mr. Sten-Marten Pukka
Ms. Helen Haamer
Ms. Tuuli Loho
Mr. Heiti Talvik

Bulgaria

Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Team coaches: Ms. Maria Zhelyazkova
Ms. Sofia Donskaya
Team members: Mr. Kadir Kadir
Ms. Ivana Stoyanova
Ms. Maria Kostadinova

Finland

University of Helsinki

Team coach: Mr. Tero Kivinen
Team members: Ms. Emilia Mäenpää
Ms. Erika Forsman
Mr. Ryan Ashton
Ms. Maria Lindberg

Denmark

University of Southern Denmark

Team coaches: Dr. Ulrike Fleth-Barten
Ms. Emma Hadrovic
Team members: Ms. Maria Ambika Frandsen
Ms. Sally Svannah Mosleh
Ms. Thameera Gindendrarajah

France

Université Catholique de Lille

Team coaches: Mr. Matthew Roberts
Ms. Manon Lanselle
Team members: Ms. Diane Brasier de Thuy
Ms. Nihel Feroui
Ms. Emilie Fonteneau
Ms. Shanya Appala Sami

England

The Honourable Society of the Inner Temple

Team coach: Ms. Lanea Williams
Team members: Mr. Hamza Sheikh
Ms. Lara Canivari
Ms. Angel Obi
Ms. Nizanka Yoganathan

Georgia

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

Team coach: Ms. Tamar Mtchedlidze
Team members: Mr. Aleksandre Grdzeldidze
Ms. Naia Sisauri
Ms. Tamar Kalandia
Ms. Ana Gelashvili

Participating Teams

Germany

Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen

Team coaches: Mr. Rasim Mustafi
Mr. Paul Rehm

Team members: Ms. Sakshi Mishra
Ms. Greta Arnold
Ms. Dorothea Huber
Ms. Emilia Schramm

Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf

Team coaches: Mr. Timotheus Staab
Mr. Jasper Kurth

Team members: Ms. Anastasia Bassanets
Mr. Philipp Dietrich
Mr. Niklas Hammacher
Mr. Lucas Schiffer

Greece

Democritus University of Thrace

Team coach: Prof. Constantine
Antonopoulos

Team members: Mr. Georgios Chatzivalasis
Mr. Aristofanis Chourdakis
Ms. Maria Pagomenou
Chrysovalantou

Hungary

ELTE Law School

Team coaches: Mr. Gábor Bazsó
Mr. Kálmán Márk Varga

Team members: Ms. Lilla Kladuia Berenyi
Mr. Ádám Gábor Nagy
Ms. Zsófia Horváth

Ireland

Maynooth University

Team coach: Ms. Bríd Ní Ghráinne

Team members: Mr. James Birrell
Ms. Olivia Miley
Ms. Naomi Laloo
Ms. Ava Grimes

The Law Society of Ireland

Team coaches: Ms. Ruth Tracey
Ms. Claire O Mahony

Team members: Mr. Robert Hardiman
Mr. Tony McBrien
Ms. Katie Mallon
Ms. Nadine Fitzpatrick

Italy

Università degli Studi di Torino

Team coaches: Dr. Gustavo Minervini
Ms. Margherita Penna

Team members: Ms. Catia Cuscusa
Ms. Ludovica di Scianni
Ms. Nicoletta Sassi
Mr. Oskar Urbatis

Latvia

University of Latvia, Faculty of Law

Team coach: Mr. Māris Lejnīeks

Team members: Ms. Marta Rozenberga
Ms. Kristīne Prohorova
Ms. Mona Upeniece

The Netherlands

Leiden University

Team coaches: Dr. Letizia Lo Giacco
Mr. Arif Yasar

Team members: Ms. Leah Mathiesen
Ms. Janice Pole Sebagenzi
Mr. David Grandperrin-Luna
Mr. Mario Zirai

The Hague University of Applied Sciences

Team coaches: Dr. Friedemann Groth
Mr. Daniel Russell

Team members: Ms. Vlada Kolinko
Ms. Joanne Manipadam
Ms. Zdravka Shturkova
Mr. Oliver Svetlík

Participating Teams

Tilburg University

Team coach: Dr. Elke Helinx
Team members: Mr. Štěpán Bačinsky
Ms. Hristiana Teneva
Ms. Gaia Recinti
Mr. Theo Billetter

Romania

Babes-Bolyai University

Team coaches: Ms. Diana Botău
Ms. Gabriela Dănilă
Team members: Ms. Irins Daecu
Ms. Enia-Tiana Pașcalău
Ms. Maria Gabriela Avramescu
Ms. Sabina Nicoleta Toma

University of Bucharest

Team coaches: Mr. Carol-Mihail Țino
Dr. Ioana-Roxana Oltean
Team members: Ms. Goroneanu Rareș
Ms. Chirilă Bianca Georgiana
Ms. Mărcuș Iulia Maria
Ms. Marin Cristiana

Slovakia

Comenius University in Bratislava

Team coach: Mr. Nikolas Sabján
Team members: Ms. Dominika Blchová
Ms. Beata Filová
Ms. Svitlana Yelanska
Ms. Kornélia Šimšíková

University of Trnava

Team coaches: Mr. Ivan Novotny
Mr. Ivan Vu Nhu
Team members: Ms. Andrea Slaba
Mr. Filip Privoznik
Mr. David Petrik

Spain

Universidad Internacional de La Rioja

Team coaches: Ms. Paloma Pérez
Ms. Eva Getino
Team members: Ms. Alicia Van Peene
Ms. Sabela Martínez
Ms. Nerea García

Turkey

Koç University

Team coaches: Dr. Kerem Gülay
Ms. Özge Karsu
Team members: Ms. Eda Horuzoğlu
Ms. Selin Zehra Çetinkaya
Ms. Esma Ayça Tabur
Ms. Su Azra Dayioğlu

Ukraine

Kyiv School of Economics

Team coach: Mr. Erik Kucherenko
Team members: Ms. Mariia Kushnir
Ms. Anhelina Lazar
Ms. Diana Tychkova
Ms. Anastasiia Koretska

National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

Team coaches: Ms. Tetiana Avdieieva
Team members: Mr. Maksym Dvorovyi
Ms. Kateryna Tamakhina
Ms. Myroslava Biron

Team Sponsors

Austria

CMHF Infinitus

Bulgaria

Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Denmark

Dreyers Fond

England

The Honourable Society of Inner Temple,
Mooting Society

Finland

Finnish Bar Association
Suomalainen Lakimiesyhdistys
University of Helsinki

Germany

CMS Hasche Sigle
Thümmel, Schütze & Partner
GÖRG
W2K
Boven
DLA Piper
Freshfields
Clifford Chance
Freshfields
Freundeskreis der Düsseldorfer Juristischen
Fakultät e.V.
Gesellschaft von Freunden und Förderern der
Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf e.V.
Hausfeld Rechtsanwälte LLP
Heuking Kühn Lüer Wojtek Partnerschaft mit
beschränkter Berufshaftung von
Rechtsanwälten und Steuerberatern
Jones Day
Kapellmann und Partner Rechtsanwälte mbB
Kanzlei Staab im Hegehof
Manuel Busch - Notar in Köln
Stadtsparkasse Düsseldorf
VELTEN SONDERMANN Partnerschaft von
Rechtsanwälten

Georgia

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

Hungary

National Talent Programme
Frank Ignác Foundation
Eotvos Lorand University

Ireland

The Law Society of Ireland

Romania

BRD - Groupe Soci t  G n rale

Slovakia

A&O Shearman Sterling
Nedelka Kub   advok ti
 ECHOV  & PARTNERS; LEGATE

Ukraine

Kyiv School of Economics Charitable Foundation
AEQUO
Avellum

Team Sponsors

SOFIA UNIVERSITY
ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
FACULTY OF LAW



K WURSTER WEISS KUPFER
RECHTSANWÄLTE PARTNERSCHAFT MBB

thümmel
schütze

AUS GUTEN GRÜNDEN

NEDELKA KUBÁČ ADVOKÁTI



MANUEL BUSCH
— NOTAR IN KÖLN —



GESELLSCHAFT VON
FREUNDEN UND FÖRDERERN
DER HHU DÜSSELDORF

ČECHOVÁ & PARTNERS
advokáti attorneys

AEQUO

A&O SHEARMAN

S Stadtparkasse
Düsseldorf

FRESHFIELDS

Clifford Chance



Kanzlei Staab im Hegehof

Kapellmann
Rechtsanwälte

Team Sponsors

KSE
Foundation



Nemzeti Tehetség
Program



VELTEN SONDERMANN
RECHTSANWÄLTE



CMHF Infinitus

CMS
law·tax·future



GÖRG

 FRANK IGNÁC
ALAPÍTVÁNY

 DLA PIPER

BOVEN
KANZLEI UND MEDIATION

AVELLUM

 HEUKING

LEGATE

HAUSFELD

**JONES
DAY**

DREYERS
FOND



Acknowledgements



**Grotius Centre
for International
Legal Studies**



Den Haag



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra



Leids Universiteits Fonds
Fonds Mr. S. J. Vissers

سفارة دولة قطر في لاهاي
Embassy of The State of Qatar in The Hague

دولة قطر
State of Qatar



Hosts of the Friendly Round 2026:



Ashurst

INTERNATIONAL *Law* SETTLEMENT **& GMVI**



UNICUM

International Board of Review

The International Board of Review (IBOR) is composed of a panel of international experts trained in (international) law. The task of the IBOR is to assess the written memorials of the participating teams.

Prof. Dr. Iraida A. Giménez
Ms. Petra Adamová
Dr. Christiane Ahlborn
Mr. Dhawan Anmol
Dr. Aram Aramyan
Ms. Alma Vilma Arro
Mr. Gergo Barna Balazs
Mr. Florian Bayer
Ms. Barbara Bazanth
Ms. Bhavya
Ms. Beata Bolyova
Prof. Dr. iur. Manuel Brunner
Dr. Isabella Brunner
Ms. Fedelma C. Smith-Ruiz
Ms. Berfin Çelik
Dr. Mattia Colli Vignarelli
Ms. Nathalia Cortes Gomez
Prof. Dr. Henri de Waele
Prof. Dr. María del Angel Iglesias
Prof. James Devaney
Dr. Bhavana Dhoundiyal
Mr. José Javier Fernández Hernández
Associate Professor Alina Gentimir

Ms. Viktorija Gilberte
Ms. Tinatin Goletiani
Dr. Romana Gulášová
Mr. Muhammed Gürkan Gür
Dr. Anna Lena Hörzer
Mr. Hajro Husic
Ms. Victoria Oluwatobi
Ms. Isa Daniel
Dr. Danny Johansen
Mr. Saamir K. Nizam
Ms. Ruchira Kaur Bali
Dr. Sofia Kausar
Dr. Steven William Kayuni
Ms. Theresa Khriesh
Prof. Dr. Ketevan Khutsishvili
Mr. Dimitrios Kourtis
Ms. Eva-Triin Kubpart
Dr. Diana Madibekova
Ms. Tanya Marinova
Mr. John Mehaffy
Mr. Adrien Meyer
Ms. Simona Mokreva
Dr. Clíodhna Murphy

International Board of Review

Mr. Roshan Nepal
Mr. Umar Niaz Khan
Ms. Glory Ojesanmi
Senior Lecturer Sergiy Petukhov
Ms. Tina Pirnovar
Assistant Professor Beata Polok
Ms. H el ene Ramond
Mr. Jakob Reinecke
Dr. John Reynolds
Mr. David Robles Ramos
Ms. Ewa Romanowska
Ms. Sara Rostam Shirazi
Prof. Dr. Stefano Saluzzo
Mr. Diego Ernesto Sanchez Borjas
Ms. Alexandra Sarban

Dr. Christina Seewald
Dr. Artur Simonyan
Dr. Emily Sipiorski
Dr. Eka Siradze
Dr. Otto Spijkers
Dr. Oisin Suttle
Ms. Maarja Tambet
Dr. Tobias Thienel
Mr. Leki Tshering
Dr. G. Matteo Vaccaro-Incisa
Prof. Eulalia W. Petit de Gabriel
Dr. Simon Weise
Mr. Muhammad Yayha Ahmed Minhas
Ms. Tamta Zaalishvili
Assistant Professor Vasileios Zalidis



Judges Semi-Finals

Ms. Karin Arana Chacón, International Court of Justice
Ms. Jamilla Abdulle, African Foundation for International Law
Dr. Margaret Adzo Ninsin, Intellectual Property & Capital Institut of AFRICA
Prof. Dr. María del Angel Iglesias, UNIR, Universidad Internacional de La Rioja
Mr. José Manuel Aznar, Universitat Pompeu Fabra
Dr. Isabella Brunner, Leiden University
Mr. Frederik Barthel, Hoens & Souren Advocaten
Ms. Bhavya, Jindal Global Law School
Ms. Anja Blank, University of Helsinki
Ms. Axelle Cartier, Trainair Plus/Toulouse Capitole University
Mr. Varad Choudhary, Permanent Court of Arbitration
Mr. Máté Csernus, International Court of Justice
Ms. Camelia Daudelin, European Space Agency
Ms. Karen De Vos, KU Leuven
Mr. Anmol Dhawan, Leiden University
Dr. Vladislav Djanic, Independent Legal Consultant
Mr. Dimitrije Đukić, DN Law, Bar Association of Vojvodina
Mr. Stefan Dulić, Beljanski Law, Bar Association of Vojvodina
Mr. Ahmed Durak, Leiden University
Ms. Helena Eckhardt, University Münster
Dr. Craig Eggett, Maastricht University
Mr. Karim Eshragh, Legal Expert
Mr. Luca Erhart, Uría Menéndez Law Firm
Ms. Khrystyna Franchuk, Waterland Private Equity Investments B.V., Maastricht Univ.
Associate Professor Alina Gentimir, University Alexandru Ioan Cuza
Ms. Tinatin Goletiani, Ilia State University
Mr. Guillermo Juan Gómez, University of Zaragoza
Mr. Omer Hamed, Mynta Law
Dr. Andrea Isolia, Universitas Mercatorum
Ms. Marion Kappeyne van de Coppello, Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ms. Anna Kasperovich, Leiden University
Prof. Dr. Ketevan Khutsishvili, Tbilisi State University, Levan Alexidze Foundation
Dr. Diana Madibekova, Peace Recipes
Prof. Artemis Malliaropoulou, The Hague University of Applied Sciences

Judges Semi-Finals

Dr. Brian McGarry, Leiden University
Dr. Sofia Kausar, UPES
Ms. Theresa Khriesh, International Law Fellow
Dr. Martha Mejía-Kaiser, International Institute of Space Law
Prof. Dr. Pablo Mendes de Leon, Leiden University (emeritus)
Dr. Irene Miano, Tilburg University
Ms. Simona Mokreva, Trustmoore
Mr. Saamir K. Nizam, Lewis Companies LLC
Ms. Dari Nof, alumna Leiden University
Mr. Nemanja Novaković, DN Law, Bar Association of Vojvodina
Mr. Lesther Antonio Ortega Lemus, LexOceana
Ms. Bianca Isabella Ortiz, University of Oxford
Mr. Francisco Palacios-Larrea, Leiden University
Mr. Luca Paladini, University for Foreigners of Siena
Prof. Eulalia W. Petit de Gabriel, Universidad de Sevilla
Dr. Hossein Piran, Iran-United States Claims Tribunal
Mr. Maksym Popovych, ARTICLE 19
Ms. Vyashti Ramlakhan, alumna Leiden University
Dr. Vahid Rezadoost, International Court of Justice
Dr. Olivier Ribbelink, TMC Asser Inst (ret)
Mr. Diego Ernesto Sanchez Borjas, Universitat Pompeu Fabra
Dr. Eka Siradze, Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
Mr. Rajat Shandilya, Jindal Global Law School, O.P. Jindal Global University
Ms. Eliza Shyhapova, International Development Law Organization
Ms. Marjolijn Smith-Molenaar, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment
Ms. Fedelma C. Smith-Ruiz, Independent Practitioner
Ms. Veronica Soon, International Court of Justice
Dr. Otto Spijkers, Leiden University
Ms. Christina Stünzi, Member of the Cantonal Council of Zürich
Dr. Murat Sümer, IMO International Maritime Law Institute
Mr. Robbert Thierens, Università di Trento
Dr. G. Matteo Vaccaro-Incisa, GMVI Law
Prof. Dr. Henri de Waele, Radboud University Nijmegen & University of Antwerp
Mr. Anthony Wenton, British Institute of International and Comparative Law
Mr. Muhammad Yahya Ahmed Minhas, Ibn Azam Chambers and legal advisors (LLP)

Programme of Events

Wednesday 3rd June — Peace Palace, Refectorium

16:45

Registration for Teams

Carnegieplein 2, 2517 KJ Den Haag

17:00 - 19:00

Welcome Briefing & Dinner for students

Opening by Prof. Niels Blokker,
Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies

Thursday 4th June — Campus The Hague, Location Spui

(courtrooms are on the 3rd, 4th and 5th floor)

09:30 - 11:00

Session I

Courtrooms

11:45 - 13:15

Session II

Courtrooms

13:15 - 14:15

Lunch

Cafeteria Spui, 2nd floor

14:30 - 16:00

Session III

Courtrooms



Programme of Events

Friday 5th June — Campus The Hague, Location Spui
(courtrooms are on the 3rd, 4th and 5th floor)

9:30 - 11:00 **Session IV**
Courtrooms

11:45 - 13:15 **Session V**
Courtrooms

13:15 - 14:15 **Lunch**
Cafeteria Spui, 2nd floor

14:30 - 16:00 **Session VI**
Courtrooms

19:00 - 00:00 **Announcement of Finalist Teams & Closing Party**
[Beach Club WOW](#) Zwarte Pad 58, 2586 ZZ
Scheveningen, The Hague



Programme of Events

Saturday 6th June — Peace Palace, Great Hall of Justice

10:00 - 11:30

Final Round

Winning Team Applicant vs. Winning Team Respondent
President of the Court: H.E. Judge Georg Nolte,
H.E. Judge Beti Hohler, and H.E. Ambassador Greg French.

11:30 - 12:00

Deliberation of the Court

Group Photo
Peace Palace staircase

12:15 - 13:00

Award Ceremony

Master of ceremony: Prof. Niels Blokker
The following awards will be presented:

- Winner Final Round,
- Finalist Team,
- Max Huber Award for the Highest Overall Score,
- Best Oral Argument Applicant,
- Best Oral Argument Respondent,
- Best Memorial Applicant,
- Best Memorial Respondent,
- Best Oralist Award,
- Best Oralist Award Runner-up,
- Best Judge Award.

13:00 - 14:00

Farewell Drink Reception



Telders Organizing Office
Grocius Centre for International Legal Studies
Leiden Law School, Leiden University



TELDEERS INTERNATIONAL LAW
MOOT COURT COMPETITION

www.teldersmoot.com
TeldersMoot@law.leidenuniv.nl

 @TeldersMC