

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA



Fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties  
Doha (Qatar), 13-25 March 2010

Summary record of the 11th session of Committee II

22 March 2010: 09h25 - 11h45

Chairman: W. Dovey (New Zealand)  
Secretariat: J. Barzdo  
L. Gauthier  
M. Silva  
Rapporteurs: J. Gray  
J. Jorgenson  
T. Inskipp  
A. Mathur

39. Using the taxonomic serial number (TSN) in international wildlife trade data: a role for CITES

Canada introduced document CoP15 Doc. 39 and stated that Taxonomic Serial Numbers (TSN) could assist Customs authorities in collecting and managing species data, as inconsistencies in the naming of species created problems in tracking, monitoring and enforcement. They pointed out that the unique number codes of TSN would complement the World Customs Organization (WCO) Harmonized System and that the Integrated Taxonomic Information System (ITIS) was not being proposed as a taxonomic authority. Taking into account the Secretariat's comments in the document they had decided not to propose the adoption of a draft resolution but instead to propose the following draft decisions:

**Regarding use of taxonomic serial numbers**

***Directed to the Parties***

The Parties are encouraged to consider the usefulness of incorporating taxonomic serial numbers in their domestic data systems and provide comments to the Secretariat.

***Directed to the Secretariat***

The Secretariat shall compile information voluntarily provided by Parties regarding the usefulness of incorporating taxonomic serial numbers in their domestic data systems and make this information available to other Parties.

***Directed to the Standing Committee***

The Standing Committee shall, at SC61, establish a working group in consultation with the nomenclature experts of the Animals and Plants Committees and the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre to:

- a) investigate the usefulness and feasibility of incorporating taxonomic serial numbers as an element of CITES data sets;
- b) report its findings to SC62; and
- c) if necessary, prepare a draft resolution for submission and consideration at CoP16.

Reiterating its acknowledgement of the possible benefits of TSN, the Secretariat commented that it was pleased that WCO was incorporating TSN within their system and hoped that external funding would be available to allow Parties to test the use of TSN with electronic permitting.

Switzerland, as chair of the Standing Committee's Working Group on the Use of Information Technologies and Electronic Systems, supported the draft decisions and expressed interest in participating in a working group, if formed in accordance with the draft decision. Australia, China, Israel, Nigeria and UNEP-WCMC also supported the draft decisions. Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, concurred, supporting the establishment of a working group, contingent on external funding. They supported the involvement of UNEP-WCMC in the review of the usefulness of TSN.

Malaysia commented that the application of TSN would require a lot of work on the part of Parties rich in biological diversity and they therefore supported the draft decisions with the exception of that directed to the Secretariat. Noting this, the Chair suggested the insertion in that draft decision of the words ",subject to external funding," before "compile information". With this, Malaysia withdrew its objection.

The draft decisions, so amended, were accepted.

#### 51. Humphead wrasse: additional management measures needed to combat IUU fishing

Document CoP15 Doc. 51 was presented by Indonesia, who drew attention to the main impediments to successful implementation of the Appendix-II listing of the humphead wrasse *Cheilinus undulatus*, including the erroneous records of exports (as opposed to re-exports) of the species from Singapore. They stated that, since 2007, they had allowed exports only by air. Malaysia favoured adoption of the draft resolution in the Annex to the document and, echoed by China, urged relevant Parties to establish suitable confiscation facilities for the fish. They announced that they had banned exports of the species from their country since January 2010, until such time as positive non-detriment findings were made. Australia was also in favour of the draft resolution.

China clarified its actions to improve controls of imports of the species, stating that it had benefited from stricter domestic measures within China since December 2006 and that most imports since March 2008 had been by air. They considered that bilateral efforts were the best way to tackle illegal and unsustainable trade in the species and concurred with the Secretariat that the draft resolution in the document was not necessary at present. Norway, and Spain on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, concurred with this view. The two latter Parties advised that further discussion were needed of issues surrounding conservation of this species, including of the outcomes of the workshop in June 2009 and of the Fisheries Circular planned for publication by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in 2010.

The United States of America supported Indonesia's efforts to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and asked them to provide additional information regarding the composition and mandate of the proposed CITES Humphead Wrasse Task Force.

The Wildlife Conservation Society commended range States' collaborative efforts to implement CITES for humphead wrasse and encouraged the endorsement of measures against IUU fishing at the present meeting. IUCN, intervening also on behalf of TRAFFIC and WWF, thought that shipments by sea to Hong Kong and from non-Parties constituted a challenge to resolving IUU fishing of humphead wrasse and identified the limiting of international trade to air transport and the establishment of bilateral agreements between trading countries as important actions, cautioning that there were many other potential exporting countries.

As there was no agreement on acceptance of the draft resolution, the Chair asked China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Norway and other interested parties to continue discussions on this subject and report back to the Committee the following day.

#### 61. Report of the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group

The Secretariat introduced document CoP15 Doc. 61, noting that, although called for by Decision 14.74, no report from the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group had been received. Nigeria urged the Secretariat to liaise more closely with the Secretariat of the CBD and to continue its interactions with that Convention and other relevant conventions. The Chair clarified that it had already been decided to retain Decisions 14.73 and 14.74.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, was critical of the lack of action on these Decisions. They thought that cooperation with the Great Ape Survival Project and the Gorilla Agreement of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals could precipitate action on the Decisions and supported the recommendations of the CBD Liaison Group on Bushmeat. They commended the work of TRAFFIC on bushmeat in Central Africa. Israel found the absence of a report from the Bushmeat Working Group unacceptable and asked that the Secretariat pursue a response on this issue with vigour.

TRAFFIC, speaking also on behalf of WWF and IUCN, drew attention to successes in the conservation of bushmeat species, for example the workshop on sustainable management of bushmeat convened by FAO in 2009 and, in the same year, the workshop to develop a national bushmeat strategy and action plan in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a process also under way for other countries in the region. They thought bushmeat should remain a CITES priority and suggested a broadening of geographic scope, for greater interaction with organizations such as the Commission des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale and the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).

The Chair noted that there was a mandate for continuation of the work of the Central African Bushmeat Working Group, along the lines specified in Decisions 14.73 and 14.74, and looked forward to a report on this at CoP16.

41. Applications to register operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes

The Chair noted that Annex 7 to document CoP15 Doc. 41.2 had been withdrawn.

41.1 Consideration of operations subject to an objection

and

41.2 Request from the Philippines regarding Birds International

Following the showing of a video of the Birds International facilities in the Philippines, the Secretariat introduced document CoP15 Doc. 41.1, relating to applications for facilities in the Philippines and the United States for there were still objections to the registration.

Regarding the application from the Philippines in document CoP15 Doc. 41.1 paragraph 2 a) and document CoP15 Doc. 41.2, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, speaking on behalf of 31 Latin American Parties, and supported by Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, noted that there were issues relating to the legality of the founder stock of the birds held by Birds International. The birds involved were claimed to be of pre-Convention origin but the documents provided in support of these claims were ambiguous and could not be authenticated by the range States, as required under the Convention. Some documents had no species names, referring only to 'parrots', and could have been issued to cover species other than those in the application. They considered that recovery and repatriation of birds of uncertain origin was more appropriate than legalizing them in the importing States. Furthermore, it was pointed out that there were no conservation programmes established with the range States, where conservation efforts should be directed as a priority.

For the same reasons, the United States opposed the application. However, they also had a more specific objection to the registration with regard to *Ara macao*, for which the founder stock originated in Suriname. At the time of import, the birds of this Appendix-I species could not have been legally imported into the Philippines for commercial breeding purposes. Israel spoke against the application, noting that there was no evidence that the breeding operation had contributed to improving the conservation status of the wild populations, as recommended in Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP14). ProWildlife also recommended rejection of the application, explaining that some birds, although cited as pre-Convention, had been imported after the species had been listed in Appendix I and when the Philippines was already a Party.

China spoke in favour of the application, and expressed support for initiatives such as this that had great potential for breeding in captivity a wide range of species. Indonesia noted that they would support the application as far as the *Cacatua* species were concerned. The Chair of the Animals Committee spoke in favour of the proposed registration, noting that it was very difficult to establish the

authenticity of founder stocks so many years after the event. He also thought that, once a facility had been registered, it was much easier for authorities in the Party concerned to control its operation.

The Philippines noted that they had tried, unsuccessfully, to communicate with some of the range States to resolve the issues, and that they hoped to be able to share the wealth of experience in captive-breeding techniques gained over the years.

There being no agreement, the registration of Birds International for the species listed in documents CoP15 Doc. 41.1, paragraph 2. a), and CoP15 Doc. 41.2 issue was put to a vote (see Annex 1). With 24 votes in favour, 20 against and 30 abstentions, the application was rejected.

With regard to document CoP15 Doc. 41.1, paragraph 2. b), the United States indicated that *Falco peregrinus*, *F. rusticolus* and hybrids of those species had been protected under domestic legislation for over 100 years. They added that the captive-breeding facilities met strict United States domestic requirements for breeding and trading in these species. The basis for the original objection by the Philippines had been that some of the documents submitted lacked official stamps. In response, the United States indicated that those documents were the applicants' own copies and therefore had not been affixed with the stamps and seals of the regional offices of the US Fish and Wildlife Service. These copies, nevertheless, were still valid under United States domestic regulations.

The Philippines reiterated that some of the documentation submitted by the United States was unacceptable because it had not been cancelled by the required domestic stamps and seals. They also indicated confusion about the origin of some specimens, and whether they were of wild origin, captive-bred or F2 specimens. Israel referred to Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP14) stating that, to be registered, a captive-breeding operation should make a continuing meaningful contribution to the conservation of the species concerned. In their view, this was lacking in the applications.

The United States, in response to the Philippines, indicated that all of these issues had been dealt with bilaterally during 2009 and that all relevant details had been provided to those officials, as well as to the Secretariat. Regarding the hybrid specimens, the United States indicated that the production of hybrid *Falco* specimens was widespread and that the Parties had approved the registration of several other captive-breeding facilities for these taxa. In response to Israel, the United States indicated that holders of falconry permits were required by regulation to comply with domestic legislation such as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Endangered Species Act. Under these acts, significant and ongoing actions were being implemented to enhance the conservation status of the taxa. These actions fulfilled the requirements of Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP14).

The Philippines maintained their objections to the proposal and, at the request of the United States, the Chair put the proposal to a vote (see Annex 2). With 46 votes in favour, 7 against, and 21 abstaining, the registration of the captive-breeding operations for specimens of *Falco peregrinus*, *F. rusticolus*, and hybrids of these species as identified in document CoP15 Doc. 41.1, paragraph 2. b), was accepted.

#### 41.3 Request from the United States of America regarding Richard W. Anderson

Document CoP15 Doc. 41.3 was introduced by the United States. Israel said that Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP14) recommended that a captive-breeding operation make a continuing meaningful contribution to the conservation needs of the species concerned. In their view, this was lacking in the application.

Noting no other objections from the Parties, the Chair determined that the proposal to register the operation was accepted.

#### 41.4 Request from the United States of America regarding Stephen C. Brown

Document CoP15 Doc. 41.4 was introduced by the United States. Israel stated that the application lacked information to show that the captive-breeding operation made a continuing meaningful contribution to the conservation needs of the species as recommended in Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP14).

Noting no other objections from the Parties, the Chair determined that the proposal to register the operation was accepted.

#### 41.5 Request from the United States of America regarding Frank Metallo

Document CoP15 Doc. 41.5 was introduced by the United States. Israel stated that the application lacked information to show that the captive-breeding operation made a continuing meaningful contribution to the conservation needs of the species as recommended in Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP14).

Saint Lucia noted that the Secretariat had stated in its *Comments from the Secretariat* that it had not had time to review the supporting documentation at the time of its assessment. The Secretariat reported that this information had been reviewed subsequently and that the application, as well as the applications in documents CoP15 Doc. 41.3 and CoP15 Doc. 41.4, met the criteria in Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP14).

The proposal to register the operation was accepted.

The Chair closed the session at 11h45.

MOTION: Acceptance of the registration of the applications in documents CoP15 Doc. 41.1, paragraph 2. a) and CoP15 Doc. 41.2

## VOTE TOTALS:

Yes : 24  
No : 20  
Abstain: 30

## VOTE BREAKDOWN

	GROUP DETAILS		RESULTS OF VOTE			
	NAME	SIZE	Yes	No	Abstain	
	Africa	39	2	1	7	10
	Europe	38	1	2	21	24
	Asia	32	16	2	1	19
C/S	America & Carib,	26	2	12	1	15
	Oceania	6	1	2	0	3
	N America,	3	2	1	0	3

## THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS

## MIC CARD DELEGATE INFORMATION

## VOTE

1	1	AF Afghanistan	
3	3	DZ Algeria	
4	4	AG Antigua and Barbuda,	Yes
5	5	AR Argentina	No
6	6	AM Armenia	
7	7	AU Australia	No
8	8	AT Austria	Abstain
9	9	AZ Azerbaijan	
10	10	BS Bahamas	No
11	11	BD Bangladesh	
14	14	BE Belgium	Abstain
16	16	BJ Benin	
17	17	BT Bhutan	
18	18	BO Bolivia (Plurinational State of),	No
20	20	BW Botswana	
21	21	BR Brazil	No
22	22	BN Brunei Darussalam,	Yes
24	24	BF Burkina Faso,	
25	25	BI Burundi	
26	26	KH Cambodia	Yes
27	27	CM Cameroon	Yes
28	28	CA Canada	Yes
30	30	CF Central African Republic,	
32	32	CL Chile	No
33	33	CN China	Yes
34	34	CO Colombia	No
36	36	CG Congo	
37	37	CR Costa Rica,	
39	39	HR Croatia	No
40	901	CU Cuba	
42	42	CZ Czech Republic,	Abstain
44	44	DK Denmark	Abstain
46	46	DM Dominica	
47	47	DO Dominican Republic,	
48	48	EC Ecuador	No

49	49	EG	Egypt	No
50	50	SV	El Salvador,	
52	52	ER	Eritrea	
53	53	EE	Estonia	
54	54	ET	Ethiopia	
55	907	FJ	Fiji	Yes
56	56	FI	Finland	Abstain
57	57	FR	France	Abstain
59	59	GM	Gambia	
60	60	GE	Georgia	
61	61	DE	Germany	Abstain
62	62	GH	Ghana	Abstain
63	63	GR	Greece	
64	64	GD	Grenada	Abstain
65	65	GT	Guatemala	No
66	66	GN	Guinea	
67	67	GW	Guinea-Bissau	
68	68	GY	Guyana	Yes
69	69	HN	Honduras	
70	70	HU	Hungary	Abstain
71	71	IS	Iceland	
72	72	IN	India	No
73	73	ID	Indonesia	Yes
74	74	IR	Iran (Islamic Republic of),	
75	75	IE	Ireland	Abstain
76	76	IL	Israel	No
77	77	IT	Italy	Abstain
78	78	JM	Jamaica	No
79	79	JP	Japan	Yes
80	80	JO	Jordan	
82	82	KE	Kenya	Abstain
83	83	KW	Kuwait	Yes
84	84	KG	Kyrgyzstan	
85	85	LA	Lao People's Democratic Republic,	Yes
86	86	LV	Latvia	
88	88	LR	Liberia	Abstain
89	89	LY	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,	
90	90	LI	Liechtenstein	
92	92	LU	Luxembourg	
93	93	MG	Madagascar	Yes
94	94	MW	Malawi	
95	95	MY	Malaysia	Yes
96	96	ML	Mali	
97	97	MT	Malta	Abstain
98	98	MR	Mauritania	
99	99	MU	Mauritius	
100	100	MX	Mexico	Yes
101	101	MC	Monaco	Abstain
102	102	MN	Mongolia	
103	103	ME	Montenegro	
104	104	MA	Morocco	
105	105	MZ	Mozambique	
106	106	MM	Myanmar	Yes
107	107	NA	Namibia	Abstain
108	108	NP	Nepal	Yes
109	109	NL	Netherlands	Abstain
110	110	NZ	New Zealand,	No
111	111	NI	Nicaragua	
112	112	NE	Niger	
113	113	NG	Nigeria	Abstain
114	114	NO	Norway	Abstain
115	115	OM	Oman	Yes
116	116	PK	Pakistan	Yes
117	117	PW	Palau	

118	118	PA Panama	
121	121	PE Peru	No
122	122	PH Philippines	Yes
123	123	PL Poland	Abstain
124	124	PT Portugal	Abstain
125	125	QA Qatar	Yes
126	126	KR Republic of Korea,	Yes
127	127	MD Republic of Moldova,	
128	128	RO Romania	Abstain
129	129	RU Russian Federation,	
131	131	KN Saint Kitts and Nevis,	
132	132	LC Saint Lucia,	No
133	133	VC Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,	
134	134	WS Samoa	
137	137	SA Saudi Arabia,	
138	138	SN Senegal	Abstain
139	139	RS Serbia	
141	141	SL Sierra Leone,	
142	142	SG Singapore	Yes
143	143	SK Slovakia	Abstain
147	147	ZA South Africa,	Abstain
148	148	ES Spain	Abstain
149	149	LK Sri Lanka,	
150	150	SD Sudan	
151	151	SR Suriname	
152	152	SZ Swaziland	
153	153	SE Sweden	Abstain
154	154	CH Switzerland	
155	155	SY Syrian Arab Republic,	
156	156	TH Thailand	Abstain
158	158	TG Togo	
160	160	TN Tunisia	
161	161	TR Turkey	No
162	162	UG Uganda	
163	163	UA Ukraine	Yes
164	164	AE United Arab Emirates,	
165	165	GB United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,	Abstain
166	166	TZ United Republic of Tanzania,	
167	167	US United States of America,	No
168	168	UY Uruguay	No
170	170	VU Vanuatu	
172	172	VN Viet Nam,	
173	173	YE Yemen	
174	906	ZM Zambia	
175	175	ZW Zimbabwe	



MOTION: Acceptance of the registration of the applications in document CoP15  
Doc. 41.1, paragraph 2. b)

## VOTE TOTALS:

Yes : 46  
No : 7  
Abstain: 21

## VOTE BREAKDOWN

	GROUP DETAILS		RESULTS OF VOTE			
	NAME	SIZE	Yes	No	Abstain	
	Africa	39	4	1	5	10
	Europe	38	21	0	5	26
	Asia	32	6	5	8	19
C/S	America & Carib,	26	10	0	3	13
	Oceania	6	2	1	0	3
	N America,	3	3	0	0	3

## THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS

## MIC CARD DELEGATE INFORMATION

## VOTE

1	1	AF Afghanistan	
3	3	DZ Algeria	
4	4	AG Antigua and Barbuda,	Abstain
5	5	AR Argentina	
6	6	AM Armenia	
7	7	AU Australia	Yes
8	8	AT Austria	Yes
9	9	AZ Azerbaijan	
10	10	BS Bahamas	Yes
11	11	BD Bangladesh	
14	14	BE Belgium	Yes
16	16	BJ Benin	
17	17	BT Bhutan	
18	18	BO Bolivia (Plurinational State of),	Yes
20	20	BW Botswana	
21	21	BR Brazil	Yes
22	22	BN Brunei Darussalam,	Abstain
24	24	BF Burkina Faso,	
25	25	BI Burundi	
26	26	KH Cambodia	Abstain
27	27	CM Cameroon	Abstain
28	28	CA Canada	Yes
30	30	CF Central African Republic,	
32	32	CL Chile	Yes
33	33	CN China	Yes
34	34	CO Colombia	Yes
36	36	CG Congo	
37	37	CR Costa Rica,	
39	39	HR Croatia	Abstain
40	901	CU Cuba	
42	42	CZ Czech Republic,	Yes
44	44	DK Denmark	Yes
46	46	DM Dominica	
47	47	DO Dominican Republic,	
48	48	EC Ecuador	Yes
49	49	EG Egypt	Abstain

50	50	SV	El Salvador,	
52	52	ER	Eritrea	
53	53	EE	Estonia	Yes
54	54	ET	Ethiopia	
55	907	FJ	Fiji	No
56	56	FI	Finland	Yes
57	57	FR	France	Yes
59	59	GM	Gambia	
60	60	GE	Georgia	
61	61	DE	Germany	Yes
62	62	GH	Ghana	Abstain
63	63	GR	Greece	
64	64	GD	Grenada	Yes
65	65	GT	Guatemala	Yes
66	66	GN	Guinea	
67	67	GW	Guinea-Bissau	
68	68	GY	Guyana	Yes
69	69	HN	Honduras	
70	70	HU	Hungary	Yes
71	71	IS	Iceland	
72	72	IN	India	Abstain
73	73	ID	Indonesia	Abstain
74	74	IR	Iran (Islamic Republic of),	
75	75	IE	Ireland	Yes
76	76	IL	Israel	No
77	77	IT	Italy	Yes
78	78	JM	Jamaica	Abstain
79	79	JP	Japan	Abstain
80	80	JO	Jordan	
82	82	KE	Kenya	
83	83	KW	Kuwait	Abstain
84	84	KG	Kyrgyzstan	
85	85	LA	Lao People's Democratic Republic,	No
86	86	LV	Latvia	Abstain
88	88	LR	Liberia	Abstain
89	89	LY	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,	
90	90	LI	Liechtenstein	
92	92	LU	Luxembourg	
93	93	MG	Madagascar	Yes
94	94	MW	Malawi	Yes
95	95	MY	Malaysia	Yes
96	96	ML	Mali	
97	97	MT	Malta	Yes
98	98	MR	Mauritania	
99	99	MU	Mauritius	
100	100	MX	Mexico	Yes
101	101	MC	Monaco	Abstain
102	102	MN	Mongolia	
103	103	ME	Montenegro	
104	104	MA	Morocco	
105	105	MZ	Mozambique	
106	106	MM	Myanmar	
107	107	NA	Namibia	No
108	108	NP	Nepal	No
109	109	NL	Netherlands	Yes
110	110	NZ	New Zealand,	Yes
111	111	NI	Nicaragua	
112	112	NE	Niger	
113	113	NG	Nigeria	Yes
114	114	NO	Norway	Yes
115	115	OM	Oman	Abstain
116	116	PK	Pakistan	Yes
117	117	PW	Palau	
118	118	PA	Panama	

121	121	PE	Peru	
122	122	PH	Philippines	No
123	123	PL	Poland	Yes
124	124	PT	Portugal	Yes
125	125	QA	Qatar	Yes
126	126	KR	Republic of Korea,	Yes
127	127	MD	Republic of Moldova,	
128	128	RO	Romania	Yes
129	129	RU	Russian Federation,	
131	131	KN	Saint Kitts and Nevis,	
132	132	LC	Saint Lucia,	Abstain
133	133	VC	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,	
134	134	WS	Samoa	
137	137	SA	Saudi Arabia,	
138	138	SN	Senegal	Abstain
139	139	RS	Serbia	
141	141	SL	Sierra Leone,	
142	142	SG	Singapore	Yes
143	143	SK	Slovakia	Yes
147	147	ZA	South Africa,	Yes
148	148	ES	Spain	Yes
149	149	LK	Sri Lanka,	
150	150	SD	Sudan	
151	151	SR	Suriname	
152	152	SZ	Swaziland	
153	153	SE	Sweden	Yes
154	154	CH	Switzerland	
155	155	SY	Syrian Arab Republic,	
156	156	TH	Thailand	Abstain
158	158	TG	Togo	
160	160	TN	Tunisia	
161	161	TR	Turkey	Abstain
162	162	UG	Uganda	
163	163	UA	Ukraine	Abstain
164	164	AE	United Arab Emirates,	
165	165	GB	United Kingdom of Great Britain and and Northern Ireland	Yes
166	166	TZ	United Republic of Tanzania,	
167	167	US	United States of America,	Yes
168	168	UY	Uruguay	Yes
170	170	VU	Vanuatu	
172	172	VN	Viet Nam,	No
173	173	YE	Yemen	
174	906	ZM	Zambia	
175	175	ZW	Zimbabwe	