
CLARIFICATIONS

1. **Is Danizia a developing or developed country and what is the criteria of classifying the same?**

Danizia considers itself a developing country.

2. **The Harmonized Tariff Schedule is a legislation of the USA. Is it the same legislation for the moot or is there any other specific legislation?**

Valeria's Harmonized Tariff Schedule is modelled after the World Customs Organization's (WCO) Harmonized System.

3. **In Paragraph 4.11 of the Moot Problem, it is stated that the Panel directed the parties to advance written and oral arguments on the issue of whether the Isle of Nysa's request, as provided under Paragraph 4.10 could be accepted by the Panel in light of the fact that the Isle of Nysa had not exercised its right to participate as a third party. However, in Paragraph 4.5 of the Moot Problem, Danizia has put forth three claims to be decided by the Panel. Whether the participants are required to advance written and oral arguments solely on the issue as directed by the Panel or on the three claims made by Danizia or on all the four issues in total?**

In addition to the claims mentioned in paragraph 4.5, parties are also required to advance written and oral arguments on the Isle of Nysa's request to file an *amicus curiae* brief.

4. **What is the Cosmetic Accreditation Authority?**

No clarification necessary.

5. **Does the Cosmetic Accreditation Authority belong to Valeria?**

No clarification necessary.

6. **Whether the argument by Valeria that the recommendation by Danizia is improper under Article 19.1 of DSU has been accepted by the Panel, or will it be a part of submissions?**

The parties are required to advance written and oral arguments on whether the panel should exercise its discretion under Article 19.1 of the DSU with respect to Danizia's request for a recommendation.

7. **Whether Valeria has considered equivalency arrangements?**

Under Section 8 of the Ethical Cosmetics Act, 2021, Valeria has accredited multiple certification agencies in countries with similarly progressive animal testing legislations. Therefore, it did not consider it necessary to conclude any equivalency arrangements in this respect.

8. **President Olän, through Executive Decree No. 1510/2021, set up the SCPI Collective Action Fund under which grants would be awarded "to encourage cutting-edge research into alternatives to animal testing". The SCPI Collective Action Fund will be awarded for research in Valeria only, overseas and not Valeria or both in Valeria and overseas?**

No clarification necessary.

9. **Danizia cited research suggesting that there is not sufficient evidence of disease in cephalopods and their sensitivity to pain. What is that research?**

No clarification necessary.

10. **The statement "*Danizia cited research suggesting that there is not sufficient evidence of disease in cephalopods and their sensitivity to pain.*" is a fact or a mere argument?**

No clarification necessary.

11. “Catan Region” given in Paragraph 1.1 of the Moot Problem, is it meant to be real-world equivalent to certain demography or topography? If yes, then which area does it correspond to?

No clarification necessary.

12. What is the definition of “megadiverse” as stated in Paragraph 1.1 of the Moot Problem?

No clarification necessary.

13. Paragraph 1.2 of the Moot Problem speaks of a ‘Biodiversity Protection Act 1984 (BP Act)’. What is the real-world equivalent of said Act since it has not been given in the Annexures?

No clarification necessary.

14. Under which authority was the Regulatory Scrutiny Board (Paragraph 2.4 of the Moot Problem) formed?

The Regulatory Scrutiny Board was constituted by the Valarian Parliament under the Sustainable Taxation Act with the objective of undertaking an independent and impartial review of the implementation of the Act.

15. Since the Member States of WTO that have expressed their comments to the TBT are fictitious, what is to be equated as their foreign policy with respect to Trade with Valaria?

No clarification necessary.

16. In Paragraph 2.3 of the Moot Problem, the sentence states “carbon costs equivalent to those borne by local producers to importers with a view to prevent carbon leakage.” Are the ‘carbon costs’ to be borne by local producers and importers or just local producers or just importers? And to whom are the carbon costs borne being paid to?

No clarification necessary.

17. Paragraph 4.16 of the Moot Problem states “model it, inter alia, on the Saturnalian approach”. The draft Ethical Cosmetics Act 2021 was modelled on the Saturnalian model. Is it to be considered as established fact or mere puffery on part of Saturnalia?

No clarification necessary.

18. What does the use of word “importation” imply in proviso to Section 5 of the Sustainable Taxation Act, 2021?

The term “importation” in the proviso to Section 5(1) of the Sustainable Taxation (Amendment) Act, 2021 refers to importation of Valarian products into a foreign country.

19. In Paragraph 2.8 of the Moot Problem, whether the usage of “now” is a typographical error in the proposition and “not” was to be used?

Paragraph 2.8 should read as follows:

“When asked to identify the scope of future policies on biodiversity conservation and animal welfare concerns, respondents of this survey answered that these should include higher standards for treatment of farm animals, curbs on animal testing, and prohibition of blood sports and hunting. Nevertheless, a large number of respondents were unaware of the conditions farm animals were kept in, and around 30% of respondents indicated that they did **not** know whether the ingredients or products currently available in Valaria were tested on animals.”

20. Who were the participants of the follow up survey commissioned in Paragraph 2.7 of the Moot Problem?

The follow-up survey conducted in May-June 2020 saw participation from industries, consumers, and civil society organisations, similar to the survey held in February-March 2020. However, the participation in the follow-up survey was lower.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO TEAMS

1. Clause 2 of Annexure B to the Ethical Cosmetics Act, 2021 should read as follows:
The “cruelty-free” label as set out in Section 6(1) of the Act **shall** consist of the expressions “CRUELTY-FREE PRODUCT” and “NOT TESTED ON ANIMALS”, accompanied by the following logo and design on the principal display panel: ...
2. In the meeting of the TBT Committee held on 3-4 July 2021, Saturnalia also shared information concerning the implementation and effectiveness of its 2018 Industrial Chemical Regulation, which introduced mandatory “eco-labelling” for industrial chemicals. The Saturnalian regulation required that products labelled as eco-friendly could not be tested in any manner harmful for the environment. Saturnalia noted that the consumption of eco-friendly household products had increased twofold in a span of three years after the introduction of eco-labelling. It attributed this increase in significant part to the design and color of the labels, which attracted consumer attention. However, Saturnalia further stated that several consumers “remain concerned that restrictions on testing methods compromise the safety of household products”.