

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



Fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
The Hague (Netherlands), 3-15 June 2007

Summary record of the 10th session of Committee II

11 June 2007: 14h10-17h30

Chairman: C.S. Cheung (China)

Secretariat: J. Barzdo
J. Sellar
M. Silva
M. Yeater

Rapporteurs: J. Gray
J. Hepp
W. Jackson
C. McLardy

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Trade control and marking issues

34. Trade in Appendix-I species

Re-opening discussion of document CoP14 Doc. 34, the Chairman reminded the Committee that there had not been consensual support for the draft decisions directed to the Standing Committee and to the Secretariat contained in document CoP14 Inf. 7. With reference to these decisions, the Secretariat noted that, if it was expected to carry out investigations of anomalous records beyond what it already did in this regard, this would have resource implications and that, if it had to report to every meeting of the Standing Committee, this should be the subject of a resolution, rather than a decision. The Chairman called for a vote on the two draft decisions taken together, with the result that 16 votes were in favour and 47 against, with 8 abstentions (vote 1). They were therefore rejected. Document CoP14 Doc. 34 was noted.

Strategic matters

13. Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity

Germany announced that they had liaised with other Parties who had intervened in discussion of this item in the second session of the Committee. However, there had been no consensus on a proposal to amend Resolution Conf. 13.2, instead of Resolution Conf. 10.4 as recommended by the Secretariat in document CoP14 Doc. 13. Therefore, Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, supported by China and Norway, proposed voting on the proposal contained in the comments of the Secretariat to amend Resolution Conf. 10.4. The United States of America, supported by Australia, proposed that instead a number of amendments be adopted to Resolution Conf. 13.2. on Sustainable use of biodiversity: Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, as follows:

- at the end of the first preambular paragraph, delete the words in parentheses and insert the words: a summary of which is contained in Annex 1;
- in the fifth preambular paragraph, replace "164 of the 166 CITES Parties" with the vast majority of CITES Parties; the Secretariat also proposed that "13th meeting" be replaced by 14th meeting.
- in paragraph a) of the operative part, after "national circumstances" insert as well as the recommendations of the Animals and Plants Committees (see Annex 2); and
- attach, as Annex 2 to the Resolution, the whole of the Annex of document CoP14 Doc. 13.

A vote followed on this set of proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 13.2. With 52 votes in favour, 13 against and 12 abstentions, these amendments were accepted (vote 2). Australia, supported by the United States, stated that this rendered consideration of the European Community's proposal regarding amendment of Resolution Conf. 10.4 redundant. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, withdrew their proposal.

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Trade control and marking issues

40. Electronic permitting

40.1 Report of the Secretariat

and

40.2 Report of the Standing Committee's Working Group

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 40.1 (Rev. 1), suggesting that current permit systems should be parallel to electronic permitting systems in order to maximize the potential for cooperation and information exchange between Parties, reduce the possibility of a digital divide and ensure flexibility in terms of linking with other global initiatives.

Italy, as Chairman of the Working Group of the Standing Committee on Information Technology and Electronic Systems, introduced document CoP14 Doc. 40.2, noting that, on the basis of results from a questionnaire, the Working Group did not recommend compulsory use of electronic systems, but sought to support Parties wanting these and to explore the possibility of trial projects. They noted that Brazil, Canada, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and the United Arab Emirates had been invited to join the Working Group, in order to improve representation.

Argentina voiced concern about promoting electronic systems, citing funding difficulties and potential disparity between Parties. Regarding the draft decisions, they rejected the idea of a computer-based system, but supported the development of standards and protocols. This comment was supported by Ecuador and the United States, who, with Senegal, also pointed out that implementation problems could result from parallel permitting systems. Informing delegates that it had been a victim of fake paper permits, the Philippines expressed interest in upgrading its systems and using barcodes, and suggested that these systems could initially be voluntary. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela proposed that the Standing Committee issue recommendations at CoP15 regarding the implementation of electronic systems.

Mauritius felt that electronic permitting would facilitate the implementation of CITES. Switzerland noted that their electronic permitting system facilitated control and exchange of information regarding permits, allowing more permits to be issued with fewer resources. The Bahamas supported advancements in electronic permitting, but warned of potential misuse. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, supported the draft decisions in document CoP14 Doc. 40.1 (Rev. 1) in general, but believed further work was

necessary in order to encourage support for electronic systems and called for text to be inserted in the draft decision to the Secretariat to request further work by UNEP-WCMC towards development and dissemination of Internet-based software tools. They also proposed merging the draft decision to the Standing Committee in document CoP14 Doc. 40.1 (Rev. 1) with the draft decision in document CoP14 Doc. 40.2.

Brazil suggested modifying paragraph l) in Annex 1 of Resolution Conf. 12.3 by inserting or an electronic equivalent signature certified and recognized by the CITES Secretariat after "his/her handwritten signature". Noting that its own permitting system was nearly entirely electronic, the United Arab Emirates supported Brazil. Argentina, Ecuador, Senegal and the United States opposed Brazil amendment, pointing out implementation difficulties. The United States added that a review of the application of electronic signatures might be premature.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, supported the decisions outlined in document CoP14 Doc. 40.2. Switzerland also supported the document, and Cameroon, the United Arab Emirates and the United Nations University said they would be happy to work with the Working Group should its mandate be continued.

In response to comments on both documents, the Secretariat noted that the use of electronic signatures was a complicated issue and that it did not have the capacity to certify electronic signatures. Regarding Brazil's proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 12.3, it added that this would necessitate review of the entire Resolution. Responding to Argentina's concern over the 'digital divide', the Secretariat said that it was impossible to stop the development of electronic systems, but that countries with these systems had offered to help countries who wanted to establish them. Regarding Germany's proposal for assistance from UNEP-WCMC in the development of electronic systems, it approved of this idea, but observed that this would require work in terms of both establishment and maintenance. The United Nations University offered assistance with any pilot projects, especially in developing countries.

The Secretariat then suggested wording to effect a combination of the decisions directed to the Standing Committee from both documents. In response, Argentina asked for a clean version of the text to be distributed before discussion. The Chairman agreed to this and the item was deferred.

36. Management of annual export quotas

Cameroon, as Chairman of the Export Quota Working Group (EQWG), introduced document CoP14 Doc. 36. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, referred to the two issues on which agreement within the EQWG had not been reached. They supported the use of the words "Parties should" in Annex 3, section A, paragraph b). They also proposed that, in the draft resolution in Annex 1, the words and reviewed annually be inserted at the end of paragraph 2 c) of the Annex. They added that non-compliance with CITES Resolutions should be a cause for seeking clarification, alongside those listed in paragraph 3 d) of the same Annex. They called for the Secretariat's role in screening export quotas for any problems before they were published to be strengthened, adding that text should be inserted at the end of paragraph 3 d) to state that, where discussion between the Secretariat and a Party had failed to resolve any problems with a quota, the former should publish an annotation that indicated its concerns and that it would be taken up further via one of the existing procedures.

Argentina believed the Secretariat's role in relation to export quotas was not supervisory in nature and suggested the deletion of paragraph 3 d). Brazil, Ecuador and the IWMC concurred with Argentina. They also noted their preference for the inclusion of the phrase Parties may in paragraph b) of Section A of Annex 3 of the document. China stressed that the role of the Secretariat was part of a voluntary process of declaring quotas. Safari Club International noted the Secretariat's current role in reviewing export quotas was sufficient.

Jamaica and the United States supported the maintenance of the phrase Parties should in the aforementioned paragraph b). The United States supported the inclusion of quota information on

export permits as well as the role of the Secretariat in reviewing export quotas as detailed in paragraph 3 d), of the Annex in Annex 1 of the document. TRAFFIC noted their support for the Secretariat's recommendations and encouraged Parties to submit quotas based on scientifically sound non-detriment findings.

The Secretariat explained that its role in relation to publishing export quotas was to facilitate communication and that it attempted to clarify any unclear information regarding quotas before publishing them. It also sometimes had reasons to raise questions with Parties about their quotas if the information conflicted with other information it had received. It outlined two opposing viewpoints regarding how to move forward with publishing quotas in the rare case of a disagreement regarding an export quota and noted their preference to publish the quota with an annotation to indicate its concerns and then take up the issue through one of the existing CITES procedures. It also noted its suggestion to retain the words Parties should language in Annex 3.

The Chairman called a vote to decide whether to accept the words "Parties may" shown in square brackets in Annex 3. With 30 votes in favour, 49 against, and two abstentions, the amendment was rejected (vote 3).

A vote was held to on a proposal to insert the following sentence at the end of paragraph 3. d) of the Annex to Annex 1: When the case is not resolved, the Secretariat shall publish the quota with an annotation to indicate its concerns and the issue will be taken up through one of the existing CITES procedures. With 67 votes in favour, eight against, and six abstentions, the sentence was accepted (vote 4).

A vote was held on the proposal to insert at the end of paragraph 2. c) of the Annex to Annex 1 the words and reviewed annually. There being 56 votes in favour, 22 against and six abstentions, the amendment was accepted (vote 5).

The Chairman then called on the Committee to approve the proposals in Annexes 1, 2 and 3 of the document as amended. There being no consensus, he called for a vote. With 63 votes in favour, 19 against and seven abstentions, these proposals were accepted (vote 6).

42. Physical inspection of timber shipments

Italy at the request of Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, introduced document CoP14 Doc. 42. Brazil and Italy wished to amend the draft decisions in the Annex to the document. Argentina, Colombia and Peru, as well as the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), supported Brazil's suggested amendments. ITTO also offered to collaborate with the Standing Committee in developing guidelines. The United States provided their support for the original proposal and requested a written copy of the amended draft decisions, as did Mexico. Australia welcomed the proposal and proposed an amendment to suggest that the Secretariat collate relevant case studies from Parties during this process.

Brazil indicated their preference for a drafting group to collaborate on the suggested amendments. The Chairman requested that Italy convene the group and report back with an amended version of the draft decisions. Further discussion was deferred.

43. Effectiveness of the CITES universal crocodylian tagging system

The United States introduced document CoP14 Doc. 43 regarding a proposed review of the implementation and effectiveness of the tagging system recommended in Resolution Conf. 11.12 and recommended adoption of the draft decisions in Annex 1. The Secretariat suggested that Parties consider broadening the mandate of the proposed review to include other marking and tagging issues.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, offered their support for the document and noted that financial resources to undertake the review could be sought from the industry. Species Management Specialists and TRAFFIC also supported the review, the latter endorsing the Secretariat's suggestion to broaden the scope.

Colombia, with support from Honduras and Peru, indicated their preference to consider the document concurrently with document CoP14 Doc. 46 because of related subject matter. They supported the proposal but suggested that a working group be formed to analyse issues related to the budget and methodology for the review. Peru also suggested that the review include capacity-building elements.

Argentina and the Philippines noted concerns in regards to the hiring of a consultant and suggested the establishment of a working group to pinpoint problems with the tagging system. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela remarked they did not see the need to review the tagging system.

The Chairman suggested that interested Parties give their proposed amendments to the United States, to coordinate the production of a revised text. Further discussion on the document was deferred.

44. Identification Manual

The Secretariat introduced CoP14 Doc. 44, drawing attention to paragraph 7 of the report. It was noted that because of technical difficulties, Identification Manual sheets could not yet be accessed through the CITES website, but it was expected that these would be available shortly. The Secretariat noted it was seeking ways to improve the usability of Identification Manual sheets, through for example, links to the species database operated by UNEP-WCMC. The report was noted.

Exemptions and special trade provisions

46. Trade in some crocodylian specimens

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, and France, introduced document CoP14 Doc. 46.

Colombia, with support from Peru, recommended that the document be considered in conjunction with document CoP14 Doc. 43. Considered separately, Colombia noted their opposition to the draft decisions, recognizing that the exemption of small crocodylian leather goods from the CITES provisions could give rise to perverse incentives for whole skins and boost illegal trade. India considered that such an exemption would create enforcement problems and that it would not be possible to link products in trade back to legal exports. Japan concurred with the Secretariat's recommendation to reject the draft decisions.

Mexico did not support an approach that would negate the need for CITES permits and supported the creation of a working group.

Switzerland noted they had issued 87,000 permits for small crocodylian leather products in 2006, and felt the corresponding administrative burden to be a waste of limited resources without any significant conservation benefits. With support from the IWMC, they considered that small crocodylian leather goods could not be identified to species level or easily distinguished from artificial products within trade, and should therefore be exempt from the provisions of Article I of the Convention. Switzerland and IWMC supported the formation of a working group.

Taking on board the concerns of the Committee, Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, undertook to amend the draft decisions. Further discussion on this agenda item was deferred.

48. Relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation: report of the Standing Committee

Ireland introduced document CoP14 Doc. 48 (Rev.1) highlighting Decision 13.78 and discussion in the Standing Committee. They drew attention to the draft terms of reference for an independent study on the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation contained in the Annex. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, noted that there were many successful breeders of CITES species within the European Community. They supported the terms of reference, and use of resources from the Trust Fund to undertake the study, and urged

the focus to remain on the key issue of achieving maximum benefits whilst minimizing risks for CITES species. China also expressed support for the study.

Colombia acknowledged the close relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation, but considered the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) a more appropriate forum to explore the issue, whilst recognizing important synergies between CBD and CITES. They, along with India and Brazil, did not support the study.

Peru felt that issues linked to benefit sharing should not form part of the proposed study and were not supportive overall. Jordan expressed concern that the existence of large scale *ex situ* operations might undermine enforcement efforts and believed the study would drain resources from the Trust Fund and therefore did not support it. The Wildlife Conservation Society on behalf of the International Tiger Coalition, highlighted the risks to wild tigers should the trade in captive-bred animals be opened up, and did not see any benefit to the proposed study.

The Chairman requested Parties to vote on the proposal to conduct a study, as a matter of principle, before considering terms of reference. With 48 votes in favour, 31 against and five abstentions, the proposed to conduct a study was rejected (vote 7). Consequently no further discussion was necessary.

49. Reservations regarding species transferred from one Appendix to another

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 49 and drew attention to possible different interpretations regarding the validity of existing reservations when a species is transferred from one Appendix to another. The preferred interpretation of the Secretariat was outlined in the proposed amendment to Resolution Conf 4.25 contained in Annex 2.

Norway requested clarification that the amendment, if adopted, would not be applied retroactively. They also proposed the inclusion of a paragraph at the end of the Resolution to read:

Instructs the Secretariat to remind concerned Parties explicitly of the reservations that will be rendered invalid, in time for the Parties to renew their reservations if they so desire.

The United States proposed replacing “concerned” with “affected”. The Secretariat confirmed that the amendment would apply only to reservations for species that are transferred within the Appendices after CoP14. In response to a query from Mexico, the Secretariat confirmed that the current Appendices remain in effect until 90 days after the end of a meeting of the Conference of Parties, at which time the amendments adopted come into effect. Senegal offered their support for this document.

The proposed amended text of Resolution Conf. 4.25 as contained in Annex was accepted by consensus, together with the amendments proposed by Norway and the United States.

The Chairman closed the session at 17h30.

Results of the votes

Key: 0 = did not vote, 1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = abstain

Party	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7
Afghanistan AF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Albania AL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Algeria DZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Antigua and Barbuda AG	2	1	2	1	1	1	2
Argentina AR	2	1	1	2	2	2	1
Australia AU	2	1	2	1	1	1	2
Austria AT	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Azerbaijan AZ	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
Bahamas BS	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Bangladesh BD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barbados BB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belarus BY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgium BE	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Belize BZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benin BJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bhutan BT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bolivia BO	0	0	2	1	2	2	2
Botswana BW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil BR	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
Brunei Darussalam BN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bulgaria BG	0	1	2	1	1	1	1
Burkina Faso BF	0	3	2	1	1	1	0
Burundi BI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cambodia KH	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Cameroon CM	3	3	2	1	2	2	3
Canada CA	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Cape Verde CV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central African Republic CF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chad TD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chile CL	2	1	2	1	1	1	2
China CN	2	3	1	1	2	1	1
Colombia CO	0	0	2	1	2	2	2
Comoros KM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Congo CG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Costa Rica CR	0	0	2	1	1	2	2
Côte d'Ivoire CI	0	0	1	1	2	1	2
Croatia HR	0	1	2	1	1	1	1
Cuba CU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cyprus CY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Czech Republic CZ	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Democratic Republic of the Congo CD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denmark DK	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Djibouti DJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dominica DM	0	0	1	0	2	2	0
Dominican Republic DO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ecuador EC	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
Egypt EG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Party	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7
El Salvador SV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equatorial Guinea GQ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eritrea ER	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Estonia EE	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Ethiopia ET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fiji FJ	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Finland FI	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
France FR	0	1	2	1	1	1	1
Gabon GA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gambia GM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia GE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany DE	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Ghana GH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greece GR	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Grenada GD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guatemala GT	3	1	0	0	3	2	3
Guinea GN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guinea-Bissau GW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guyana GY	2	1	1	1	2	1	3
Honduras HN	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
Hungary HU	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Iceland IS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
India IN	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Indonesia ID	0	0	1	2	2	2	2
Iran (Islamic Republic of) IR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ireland IE	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Israel IL	1	1	2	0	0	1	2
Italy IT	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Jamaica JM	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Japan JP	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
Jordan JO	0	3	1	1	2	1	2
Kazakhstan KZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kenya KE	1	3	2	1	1	1	2
Kuwait KW	3	1	0	3	1	3	1
Lao People's Democratic Republic LA	2	1	2	1	1	1	0
Latvia LV	2	1	2	1	1	1	0
Lesotho LS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liberia LR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya LY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liechtenstein LI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lithuania LT	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Luxembourg LU	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Madagascar MG	2	3	2	1	1	1	2
Malawi MW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malaysia MY	2	0	1	2	2	2	2
Mali ML	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malta MT	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Mauritania MR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauritius MU	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Mexico MX	1	0	2	0	0	0	1
Monaco MC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mongolia MN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montenegro ME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Party	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7
Morocco MA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mozambique MZ	2	0	1	2	2	2	0
Myanmar MM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Namibia NA	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Nepal NP	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands NL	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
New Zealand NZ	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Nicaragua NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Niger NE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nigeria NG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norway NO	3	1	2	2	3	3	2
Pakistan PK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palau PW	0	3	3	3	3	3	2
Panama PA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Papua New Guinea PG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paraguay PY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peru PE	0	0	0	0	2	2	1
Philippines PH	2	3	1	1	1	1	2
Poland PL	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Portugal PT	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Qatar QA	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Republic of Korea KR	0	2	0	1	1	1	0
Republic of Moldova MD	1	2	0	1	1	1	1
Romania RO	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Russian Federation RU	3	3	2	1	1	1	2
Rwanda RW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Kitts and Nevis KN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Lucia LC	0	1	1	3	3	3	0
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines VC	0	0	1	3	3	3	1
Samoa WS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Marino SM	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Sao Tome and Principe ST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saudi Arabia SA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senegal SN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Serbia RS	3	1	1	3	3	3	3
Seychelles SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sierra Leone SL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Singapore SG	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Slovakia SK	2	1	0	0	1	1	1
Slovenia SI	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Solomon Islands SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somalia SO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Africa ZA	2	2	0	0	0	0	1
Spain ES	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
Sri Lanka LK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sudan SD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Suriname SR	0	2	1	1	0	2	0
Swaziland SZ	1	2	1	1	2	2	1
Sweden SE	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Switzerland CH	2	1	1	1	1	1	3
Syrian Arab Republic SY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thailand TH	2	2	1	1	2	1	2
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia MK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Party	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7
Togo TG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago TT	2	1	2	1	1	2	2
Tunisia TN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey TR	2	1	2	1	0	1	1
Uganda UG	3	0	0	1	2	1	2
Ukraine UA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Arab Emirates AE	1	1	3	3	2	2	2
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland GB	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
United Republic of Tanzania TZ	0	0	1	1	2	1	2
United States of America US	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Uruguay UY	3	3	1	1	2	2	2
Uzbekistan UZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vanuatu VU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) VE	2	3	1	0	2	2	2
Viet Nam VN	0	0	1	1	1	1	2
Yemen YE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zambia ZM	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Zimbabwe ZW	0	0	0	0	2	2	1