COMPETITION RULES

I.
V4 Commercial Arbitration Moot Prague 2026

1. study of international commercial law and the use of international commercial arbitration to resolve international disputes. The concept of the moot is intended to lead participants to interpret texts of international commercial law and to develop expertise in advocating a position before an arbitral panel.

II.
Rules

A. The Problem

2. The problem involves a controversy arising out of an international sale of goods subject to the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG).
3. The controversy is before an arbitral tribunal pursuant to the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (2021). Parties agreed that the seat of the arbitration is Ontario, New Kent. New Kent has enacted the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration with the 2021 amendments. Valdora, Montara and New Kent, the three states that may be involved are party to the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York Convention).
4. The facts in the dispute that is subject matter of the moot are given in the Problem. Facts alleged in the Notice of Arbitration, Response to the Notice of Arbitration including exhibits attached to these submissions as well as clarifications are to be taken as correct unless there is a contradiction between them. No additional facts may be introduced into the moot unless they are logical and necessary extension of the given facts or are publicly available true facts.
5. Statements of facts alleged by a team that do not qualify under paragraph 25 are not true. Therefore, basing an argument on any such alleged facts will be considered to be in breach of the rules of the moot and to be professionally unethical. Arbitrators will enforce these rules strictly in oral arguments and will evaluate team's efforts accordingly.
6. Requests for Clarifications of the Problem must be submitted via email prior to 23:59 hours CET on 12 October 2026. Requests for clarification should be limited to matters that would appear to have legal significance in the context of the Problem. A request for clarification must include a short explanation of the expected significance of the clarification. Any request that does not contain such an explanation may be ignored.

B. Teams

7. Each participating university is represented by one team consisting of four team members. Two members of the team are expected to focus on legal issues of the Problem. The remaining two members of the team are expected to focus on the issue of quantification of damages. Any changes to the composition of the team must be specifically communicated to the organizers of the moot.
8. Teams are expected to be able to present arguments for both Claimant and Respondent.
9. In each of the oral hearings two members of the team will present the arguments, one student for the legal issue and one student for quantification of damages. The remaining student focusing on the issue of quantification of damages will act as an expert of the respective party. Different members of the team may participate in the oral hearings.

C. Oral hearings

10. Each team will present their arguments in a preliminary round 1 and 2 on 26 November 2026 taking place at the Arbitration Court attached to the Czech Chamber of Commerce and Agricultural Chamber of the Czech Republic (Vladislavova 1390/17, Prague 1, Czechia). Each team will present arguments on behalf of claimant as well as respondent. Drawing of lots for party allocation in the first round shall take place on 25 November 2026. Each team will receive points for their respective pleading. The team's final score shall be calculated as an arithmetic average of their scores received in preliminary rounds. Team with first and second highest score from preliminary rounds will qualify for the final hearing.
11. The final hearing shall take place on 27 November 2026 (morning) at the premises of the Arbitration Court attached to the Czech Chamber of Commerce and Agricultural Chamber of the Czech Republic (Vladislavova 1390/17, Prague 1, Czechia).
12. Oral presentation of each team is, in principle, 30 minutes. The team should allocate equitably the time available to the two individual team members. The tribunal is entitled to grant time extension to the speakers provided that the opposing party is granted the same amount of time to present their case.
13. Cross-examination of experts of each party to the dispute is, in principle, 30 minutes. The tribunal is entitled to grant time extension to the speakers provided that the opposing party is granted the same amount of time to cross-examine opposing party's expert.
14. The order of presentation should be as follows: Claimant's counsel is to present arguments on applicability of the CISG and then arguments on quantification of damages (30 minutes). Then Respondent's counsel is to respond to Claimant's counsel arguments in the same order (30 minutes). Once the presentation of arguments is completed, Counsel for Claimant is to cross-examine Respondent's expert witness on quantification of damages (30 minutes), followed by Counsel for Respondent cross-examining Claimant's expert witness on quantification of damages.
15. No exhibits may be used during the oral arguments that do not come from the Problem. Parties are permitted to use demonstratives provided that these are shared with the moot organizers and approved 48 hours prior to the hearing in which the demonstratives are to be used.
16. Each arbitrator will score each of the orators on a scale of 50 to 100. In cross-examination part of the moot, each arbitrator will score both the expert witness and the cross-examining counsel on the scale of 50 to 100. The scores of the two orators and the cross-examination will be added to constitute the team score for the respective round.
17. Criteria to be regarded in evaluation of the oralists:
    a. Organization and preparation – introduction of counsel, cooperation between counsel, introduction of the issues, structured pleading.
    b. Knowledge of the facts and law – ability to relate the facts and law and answer questions correctly and precisely.
    c. Presentation – pace of presentation, free of mannerisms, eye contact, inflection, balanced arguments.
    d. Handling of questions – does counsel answer questions directly and use the opportunity to turn the question to its advantage?

Co-financed by the Governments of Czechia, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia through the International Visegrad Fund.
A project of Prague University of Economics and Business (host & coordinator) with Kozminski University, Bratislava University of Economics and Business, and University of Pécs.

Visegrad Fund