



THE 2026 MANFRED LACHS SPACE LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE
RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION
Inkaton
v.
Accadia

1. Which State authorized the operation of the Earth Orbit Station 1?

See Agreed Statement of Facts ¶ 1

2. Can you please provide the pronunciations for the countries and entity names in the problem (Inkaton, Accadia, Quipu, Sargon), and any other pertinent actors.

Inkaton "IN-kuh-ton"

Accadia "Ah-KAY-dee-ah"

Quipu "KEE-poo"

Sargon "SAAR-gun"

3. Paragraph 17, Line 1: The text states that Accadia requested diplomatic consultations and sought to have the Sabaku judgment declared null and void. Is this a typographical error, or did Accadia in fact seek to invalidate the Sabaku judgment, notwithstanding that it was in favour of the Accadian corporation, Sargon?

This is not a typographical error

4. Following the loss of navigation, propulsion, and command functions of Observer-1, what was its intended legal status under the factual matrix:



THE 2026 MANFRED LACHS SPACE LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

- a a temporarily non-responsive space object;
- b. non-functional space debris;
- c. a deleterious space object; or
- d. an abiotic space resource under Sargon's extraction licence?

Further, if Observer-1 was intended to be treated as temporarily non-responsive, was there any reasonable prospect of regaining control at the time Sargon removed it.

Clarification declined

5. Paragraph 3 states that "Prior to extracting any space object which constitutes an abiotic space resource under its extraction license, Sargon first requests permission from the owner, if known." We would be grateful for clarification on whether the phrase "which constitutes an abiotic space resource under its extraction license" is intended to qualify the space object itself, such that the license determines whether a given object is classified as an abiotic space resource, or whether it is intended to refer to the procedural requirements set out in the license, governing how extraction is to be carried out.

See Agreed Statement of Facts ¶¶ 3, 6, and 7; further clarification is declined

6. Were the components or materials extracted from the Dragnet wreckage subsequently used for research, study, modification/engineering by Quipu, or were they merely salvaged and retained without any further use?

Clarification declined

7. In Submission B, why is the Applicant's position framed as "not liable", while the Respondent's position is framed as "liable and responsible"? Is this a drafting



THE 2026 MANFRED LACHS SPACE LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

error, or is the Applicant meant to address only liability while the Respondent must address both liability and responsibility?

Submission ¶ 21(b) should be read to include both liability and responsibility

8. What exactly is meant by "Dragnet wreckage" for the purposes of this dispute?

Does it include:

- all component parts and subsystems,
- proprietary technologies, and
- any associated or subsequently designed space objects (such as the spacecraft later registered as Transat) that were carried aboard, derived from, or previously integrated with Dragnet?

Clarification declined

9. What is the precise material, functional, and spatial scope of Quilla's abiotic space resource extraction licence? In particular, does it authorise the removal, salvage, or appropriation of:

- non-regolith space objects,
- component parts, or
- proprietary technologies originating from foreign spacecraft that have crash-landed on the lunar surface within or near Quilla's safety zone?

Clarification declined

10. Is Inkaton the State of Registry of Observer-1?

Yes



THE 2026 MANFRED LACHS SPACE LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

11. Was the loss of navigation and control over Observer-1 intended to be complete and permanent, or was any intermittent or partial restoration of control foreseen or possible?

Clarification declined

12. For the purposes of the case, what is the intended time interval between the Dragnet wreckage event and the forced landing of Dragonfly to survey and inspect the Dragnet wreckage?

Clarification declined

13. In paragraph 7, line 4, the text refers to "Dragon". Should this be understood as a reference to "Dragnet"?

Paragraph 7 line 4 does not mention or use the word "Dragon," however the reference to "Dragon" in ¶ 14 should be "Dragnet"

14. In paragraph 4, line 3, the case refers to "four solar days which is a fraction of one lunar day". Does "solar day" here refer to:

- an Earth solar day, or
- a solar day defined with respect to the Moon?

Earth solar day

15. Can Quipu's stealth technology described in paragraph 6 be characterised as dual-use technology, i.e. usable for both civilian and military purposes?

Clarification declined

16. Had Dragnet's technology and/or abiotic space resources already been removed by Quilla's personnel, and if so, by what means?

Clarification declined