



**MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT**  
FÜR AUSLÄNDISCHES ÖFFENTLICHES RECHT  
UND VÖLKERRECHT



 **UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE**

## **MAX PLANCK-CAMBRIDGE PRIZE FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW**

### **GUIDELINES FOR THE SELECTION PROCEDURE**

#### **SECTION I – GENERAL PROVISIONS**

##### **Article 1 – Aim of the Prize**

1. The Max Planck-Cambridge Prize for International Law (hereinafter: MaxCamPIL) is a European research prize which highlights the relevance of fundamental research in the field of international law in an era of reconfiguration of the international order.
2. The MaxCamPIL is awarded jointly by the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law of Heidelberg and the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law at the University of Cambridge (LCIL). The denomination “Max Planck – Cambridge Prize for International Law” mentions both awarding institutions and the discipline.
3. The aim of the MaxCamPIL is to identify an outstanding mid-career international legal scholar whose seminal contributions to the study of international law have enriched the field and are likely to continue in the future. The aim is also to highlight her/his scholarship, support her/his future work, and to provide a model for academic excellence for younger scholars.
4. The MaxCamPIL also seeks to promote the cross-border cooperation of leading research institutes across political boundaries.

##### **Article 2 – Awarding Ceremony**

1. The prize shall be awarded every two years.
2. The awarding ceremony shall take place alternately in Heidelberg and Cambridge. It shall commence with a *laudatio* by a representative of the non-hosting institution and a testimonial lecture of the laureate which shall be published in a scholarly journal of international law, acknowledging the prize.
3. The Supporting Members of the Max Planck Society will be invited to the awarding ceremony and be informed about the activities within the framework of the project.

### **Article 3 – Follow-Up**

1. Within two years after the awarding ceremony, the laureate of the MaxCampIL shall visit either the MPIL or the LCIL for a paid stay of one month, and shall also visit the other institution for a paid stay of at least five days and hold a guest lecture or seminar.

## **SECTION II – AWARD SELECTION PROCEDURE**

### **Article 4 – Selection Procedure**

1. The selection procedure for the MaxCampIL is governed by these Guidelines and shall be carried out by the Selecting Committee indicated in article 5.
2. The working language of the selection procedure will be English.
3. The selection procedure shall consist of three stages: pre-nomination procedure (article 6), nomination procedure (article 7) and final decision (article 8).

### **Article 5 – Composition and Chair of the Selecting Committee**

1. The Selection Committee has eight members and is composed of one Director of each of the two institutions and three Younger Researchers from each institution (after Ph.D.). The selection committee of each edition of the MaxCampIL will be chaired alternately by a director of the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law and the director of the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law.
2. The Chair has the general supervision of the selection procedure.
3. In case of impediment of the Chair, his or her institution shall replace him or her with another Director.

### **Article 6 – Pre-Nomination Procedure**

1. The Younger Researchers shall nominate the candidates for the prize.
2. In order to take a decision as widely shared as possible, a pre-nomination procedure shall take place among the Younger Researchers.
3. Based on the criteria provided in articles 10 to 13 of these Guidelines, each Younger Researcher shall submit a list of four candidates (pre-nomination lists). As a consequence, there shall be six pre-nomination lists of four candidates each, comprising a total number of candidates which in the abstract may range from a minimum of four to a maximum of twenty-four.
4. Each Younger Researcher shall provide written comments and explanations for each of the candidates of her/his own list, based on a template which will be provided by the secretariat of the Chair.

5. Each Younger Researcher shall disclose any current or past link or collaboration, either academic or personal, to the candidates indicated in her/his own list.
6. Before submitting their pre-nomination lists, the Younger Researchers may informally set one or more early discussion meetings to exchange views and comments. However, the Younger Researchers shall not communicate the content of their own pre-nomination lists before the deadline indicated in paragraph 8 of this article.
7. Each Younger Researcher shall submit her/his pre-nomination list between 28 March and 31 March to the secretariat of the Chair. Lists submitted before 28 March or after 31 March will not be taken into consideration by the Selecting Committee. Likewise, subsequent changes will not be taken into consideration. The secretariat of the Chair shall archive the pre-nomination lists and the accompanying comments/explanations for at least ten years.
8. The secretariat of the Chair shall simultaneously distribute the six pre-nomination lists to all the Younger Researchers on 1 April, without disclosing any information about their content to anyone before that date. The Younger Researchers shall not communicate the content of their own pre-nomination lists to other members of the Selecting Committee before the secretariat of the Chair distributes them.

#### **Article 7 – Nomination Procedure, Collective Discussion Meetings and Final Shortlist**

1. Once the pre-nomination lists under article 6 are distributed by the secretariat of the Chair, the Younger Researchers shall participate in one or more collective discussion meetings between 2 April and 20 May, concerning their evaluations. During these meetings, the Younger Researchers shall openly discuss all nominated candidates in alphabetical order, also referring to the written comments under article 6 paragraph 4) of other Younger Researchers. The exact number and dates of these meetings shall be informally determined by the Younger Researchers themselves.
2. Based on the exchanges during the discussion meetings, the Younger Researchers shall indicate by consensus a final shortlist of three candidates to be nominated to the attention of the whole Selecting Committee for the final decision.
3. If no consensus is reached, each Younger Researcher shall indicate five preferences for five different candidates which are not included in her/his own list. If a candidate indicated by a Younger Researcher in her/his own list is also included in one or more other pre-nomination lists, he/she can express one of her/his five preferences for that candidate.
4. The five preferences shall be succinctly motivated in a written form, based on the criteria provided in articles 10 to 13 of these Guidelines. A template for these written motivations shall be provided by the secretariat of the Chair.
5. Each Younger Researcher shall submit to the secretariat of the Chair and to all the Younger Researchers her/his five preferences with the accompanying motivations by 31 May. Different, oral or subsequent preferences will not be taken into consideration or counted.
6. The secretariat of the Chair shall archive the preferences and the accompanying motivations for at least ten years.
7. The final shortlist of candidates to be nominated for the attention of the whole Selecting Committee for the final decision shall comprise the three candidates which received the highest number of preferences expressed by the Younger Researchers. More than three candidates may be nominated to the attention of the whole Selecting Committee for the final decision only in case of a tie.

8. The Younger Researchers shall provide a written report of the collective discussion meetings under paragraph 2 of this article to both Directors, and forward it to the secretariat of the Chair, who shall archive it for at least ten years.

### **Article 8 – Final Decision**

1. The final decision about the awarding of the MaxCamPIL shall be taken by the whole Selecting Committee on a date to be informally determined, under the coordination of the Chair, but not later than 30 June. The secretariat of the Chair shall keep the minutes of the final decision meeting.
2. The final decision meeting may take place through teleconference.
3. During the final decision meeting, each member of the Selecting Committee shall address the Selecting Committee with her/his views and comments on the shortlisted candidates. The final address shall be made by the Chair. The final decision shall be based on the criteria provided in articles 10 to 13 of these Guidelines.
4. The final decision shall be taken by consensus or, in the alternative, by secret vote. In this latter case, each Younger Researcher shall cast one vote and each Director shall cast three votes. The votes shall be collected, counted and recorded by the secretariat of the Chair. In case of a tie, the Chair shall cast the decisive vote.
5. A written motivation for the winner of the MaxCamPIL shall accompany the final decision. The motivation shall be written by a member of the Selecting Committee to be informally individuated, attributed to the Selecting Committee collectively, and signed by the two Directors.
6. The secretariat of the Chair shall archive the minutes, any votes cast, and the written motivations for at least ten years.

## **SECTION III – AWARD SELECTION CRITERIA**

### **Article 9 – Selection Criteria**

1. In submitting the pre-nomination lists under article 6, in nominating the candidates under article 7 and in taking the final decision under article 8, the members of the Selecting Committee shall consider the criteria provided in the following articles (10 to 12) of these Guidelines.
2. In submitting their written comments, explanations and motivations at the different stages of the selection procedure, the members of the Selecting Committee shall explicitly refer to the above mentioned criteria. They shall also indicate why and how the specific features of their candidates fit into the selection criteria provided by these Guidelines.

### **Article 10 – Personal Criteria**

1. In submitting their pre-nomination lists under article 6, the Younger Researchers shall take into consideration only mid-career international legal scholars.
2. 'Mid-career' refers both to biological and academic age. To this purpose, the candidates to be considered in the pre-nomination lists under article 6 must not be older than fifty years old. Prospectively, candidates would be expected to still pursue a significant part of their career in the future. Such limitations may be overcome through a specific and detailed explanation provided by the Younger Researcher submitting the list.
3. 'International' does not refer to the fact that the candidates must be scholars specialized in international law, but to the fact that the potential laureate has a well-established standing in the context of global scholarship. To this purpose, the global reach of the candidate's study and research experiences (academic degrees, research stays and visiting scholarship/professorships), the variety and the level of international journals and publishing houses where the works of the candidate were published, as well as the number of languages and translations of the candidate's works shall be considered.
4. The candidates must be scholars with works and careers having a significant impact on the study of international law.
5. The Younger Researchers shall strive to ensure that their pre-nomination lists reflect gender balance and that they adequately comprise candidates coming from different cultural-legal backgrounds across the world.

#### **Article 11 – Criteria related to the Career as a Whole**

1. In submitting their pre-nomination lists under article 6, the Younger Researchers shall consider the careers of the candidates as a whole, as well as their potential for future research.
2. To this purpose, the quantity, quality and overall impact of published works and research projects, as well as of the academic lectures and courses given, and the potential of each candidate to continue and develop further shall be considered.

#### **Article 12 – Quantitative Criteria**

1. In submitting their pre-nomination lists under article 6, the Younger Researchers shall take into consideration a reasonable amount of works for each candidate, taking also into account the specific features of each field of research. Although not mandatorily requested, the publication of a monograph will be considered as an asset by the Selecting Committee.
2. In submitting their pre-nomination lists under article 6, the Younger Researchers shall only consider candidates whose works have been published into at least two different languages, one of which must be English. Exceptions may only be made for English-speaking candidates.

#### **Article 13 - Qualitative Criteria**

1. In submitting their pre-nomination lists under article 6, each Younger Researcher shall explain why and how the works and the other activities of each candidate have significantly

impacted international law scholarship and should be considered seminal and/or original. Each Younger Researcher shall explain the reasons why the overall production of each candidate satisfies selection criteria provided by these Guidelines.

2. The Younger Researchers shall generally explain whether and why the topics investigated by the candidates in their pre-nomination lists are original and/or seminal. They may also refer to the innovativeness and/or the thoroughness of the methodology applied by them.
3. The Younger Researchers shall ensure that the works and the research of the four candidates included in their pre-nomination lists cover a sufficiently diverse range of fields, such as international human rights law, international humanitarian law, international environmental law, international economic law, international institutional law, international legal theory, and international legal history. This means that, while the Younger Researchers may indicate outstanding candidates specialized in one field only, they will also strive to ensure that the other candidates are specialized in different fields.
4. The Younger Researchers shall specifically explain for each of the candidates why they constitute a model of academic excellence for future generations of scholars and researchers, and why their works are likely to continue to develop further along the same path in the next decade at least.
5. The Younger Researchers may also refer to the actual or potential influence of their candidates' works and research on the practice of international judicial and quasi-judicial bodies, especially in cases of significant political relevance, as well as on the international law-making processes.
6. In complying with the qualitative criteria listed in this article, the Younger Researchers shall also consider where appropriate: a) impact on scholarship; b) originality of the topics investigated; c) diversity of the topics investigated; d) methodology; e) perspective developments; f) impact on international law practice and lawmaking.

## **SECTION IV – FINAL PROVISIONS**

### **Article 14 – Interpretation and Clarification of the Guidelines**

1. When uncertainty or conflict over the meaning or the scope of these Guidelines arises, one or more members of the Selecting Committee may request the Chair to provide interpretation or clarification in a written form. The request shall be forwarded to the secretariat of the Chair.
2. The Chair, after consultation with the other Director, shall provide interpretation or clarification on the meaning or the scope of the provisions of these Guidelines. Such interpretation or clarification shall be provided in a written form within five days of the request being made, circulated to all the members of the Selecting Committee and forwarded to the secretariat of the Chair.
3. The secretariat of the Chair shall archive and keep both the request and the interpretation/clarification for at least ten years.
4. The Chair, after consultation with the other Director, may also provide *motu proprio* interpretation, clarification or integration to these Guidelines, which shall be circulated to all the members of the Selecting Committee

### **Article 15 – Revision of the Guidelines**

1. The Guidelines for the Selection Procedure shall be periodically revised and modified by the Selecting Committees of each edition of the MaxCamPIL, according to a revision process to be determined by the acting Selecting Committee, after informal consultation with the Directors of the Selecting Committees of the previous editions.

February 2019