

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 12th session of Committee I

22 March 2010: 14h10 - 17h00

Chairman: J. Donaldson (South Africa)  
Secretariat: D. Morgan  
Rapporteurs: L. Garrett  
J. Gray  
T. Inskipp  
C. Lippai

68. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II (continuation)

Zambia introduced document CoP15 Prop. 5 to transfer their population of *Loxodonta africana* from Appendix I to Appendix II. They expressed their thanks to the Government of Norway for financial support over the past two decades for conservation of wild resources, but noted that they wished to exercise their sovereign rights to manage their resources to reduce their dependency on donors. They highlighted increasing Human-Elephant Conflict (HEC) and the engagement of the paramilitary wing of the Zambian police force to combat illegal killing of elephants. With regard to their community development programmes, Her Royal Highness Chiefteness Chiawa spoke on behalf of rural communities living alongside elephants and noted that HEC was threatening lives and destroying livelihoods. She mentioned that traditional leaders in Zambia were committed to wildlife conservation and had allocated considerable tracts of land to wildlife.

Noting the comments from the Panel of Experts, other Parties and the Secretariat, Zambia suggested amending the proposal in accordance with Rule 22.2 of the Rules of Procedure, so that, after "for the exclusive purposes of allowing:-", it would read: "a) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; b) trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations, as defined in Resolution Conf. 11.20; c) trade in raw hides. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly."

They took great exception to the rumours circulating that revenue from any ivory sales in Zambia would be used for political purposes and asked that other Parties and NGOs to share information constructively. They urged Parties to support their proposal.

Japan, Norway, South Africa, Uganda, the United States of America and Zimbabwe spoke in favour of the amended proposal. Norway, Uganda, South Africa and Zimbabwe cited the need for effective conservation to be rewarded through benefits accruing to local communities, in terms of support for infrastructure, including health care and education; food security; and reduction of HEC. Norway, South Africa, Uganda, the United States and Zimbabwe also believed Zambia had sufficient law enforcement and management capacity to regulate any trade that would be allowed by adoption of their proposal.

Norway, Uganda, the United States and Zimbabwe considered the biological criteria for Appendix-II listing had been met, while Norway also considered Zambia's proposal to be in line with precedent for transfer of elephant populations to Appendix II. Uganda noted that the moratorium on proposals to allow trade in elephant ivory agreed at CoP14 did not apply to Zambia's elephant population. They believed that Zambia was faced with the challenge of balancing increasing numbers of elephants with consequent environmental degradation, which had possible implications for climate change.

Acknowledging the Panel of Experts' report, Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, accepted that Zambia's increasing elephant populations met the biological criteria for Appendix II and that national management and conservation measures were adequate. They said they were aware of the growing public pressure to sell government-held stocks of ivory.

Ghana, Kenya, Mali and Rwanda, as members of the 23-member African Elephant Coalition, were against the amended proposal. Mali, Kenya and Rwanda believed that illegal ivory trade could be sourced to Zambia, citing peer reviewed reports, the Panel of Experts report and a newspaper report from 2009 in support of this view. They feared that acceptance of the proposal would encourage such illegal trade, to the detriment of elephant populations in countries neighbouring Zambia. They considered the proposal to be against the spirit of the moratorium agreed at CoP14 and, in the case of Kenya, against what had actually been agreed in terms of the moratorium. Kenya and Rwanda reminded the meeting that the moratorium had been instituted to allow implementation of the African elephant action plan and monitoring of the effects of the one-off sales. Moreover, Mali and Kenya objected that Zambia had not consulted African elephant range States before submitting their proposal, while Kenya and Rwanda were of the view that incidence of HEC was not in direct proportion to the size of elephant populations and that, even though the amended proposal did not apply to ivory, it would be a stepping stone to future ivory sales. Ghana was sceptical about whether benefits from trade in elephants would indeed accrue to communities living alongside elephants if the proposal were accepted. They suggested other community benefits were possible, without the transfer of Zambia's elephants to Appendix II.

Uganda and Zambia asked the Secretariat to explain the outcome of elephant discussions at CoP14 regarding the moratorium, as the issue continued to give rise to confusion. The Secretariat replied that the record of that meeting was quite clear and that the moratorium applied only to Parties whose elephant populations were listed in Appendix II at that time.

The Chair noted that the debate on the amended proposal was divided. Zambia requested a vote by secret ballot and received support from more than 10 Parties for the same. Burkina Faso, echoed by Gabon, made a point of order invoking Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure regarding Powers of Presiding Officer and the right to speak. However, the Chair opined that a balance of views had been heard and that the debate was closed. The result of the vote was 55 in favour, 36 against with 40 abstentions. Accordingly, the amended proposal was rejected.

Instead of introducing document CoP15 Prop. 6, Kenya suggested that, in light of debate regarding proposals. 4 and 5, a compromise on the original proposal could be met in a draft decision. This draft decision aimed to clarify and strengthen the provisions regarding the nine-year resting period following CoP14. In addition to promoting consensus on this issue, the draft decision proposed no further amendment proposals be accepted for African elephants for the duration of this resting period. They believed that the resting period would enable the understanding of the impact of the initial sale of stockpiled ivory on poaching, illegal trade and elephant conservation. Further, it would allow Parties to direct funding to other CITES issues and allow African nations to focus on implementation of the African Elephant Action Plan and development of the African Elephant Fund.

Kenya believed that allowing future proposals to transfer the African elephant from Appendix I to Appendix II would promote the idea that the ivory trade could resume in the future and it would compromise the monitoring of the impact of the initial trade sanctioned at CoP14. If Parties accepted their proposed draft decisions, Kenya stated that they were willing to withdraw proposal CoP15 Prop. 6.

The Minister for Forestry and Wildlife of Kenya (who was also the Co-Chair for the African Elephant Coalition (AEC)) stated that poaching levels in Kenya were now at their worst since the international ban on ivory trade in 1989. He shared similar concerns regarding the management of elephant conservation with those stated by the United Republic of Tanzania in proposal CoP15 Prop. 4, including the impact of Human-Elephant Conflict (HEC), increasing human population pressures, resource competition and poverty reduction strategies. However, he was disappointed that the CoP14 compromise had not promoted African unity or enabled the international community to focus on elephant conservation. In addition it restricted CITES' ability to look at the impacts of trade on other species, rather than the continued domination by elephant and ivory issues. He believed that the final wording regarding the nine-year resting period did not reflect the spirit in which it was intended, and hoped that the draft decisions proposed by Kenya would prevent further amendment proposals regarding the ivory trade within this period. He urged that the African elephant range States complete and adopt the African Elephant Action Plan.

Kenya proposed the following draft decision:

***Directed to the African elephant range State Parties***

Not to propose or adopt further proposals to amend the existing listings of African elephants on the CITES Appendices, including amendments to existing proposals during the period from CoP14 and ending nine years from the date of the single sale of ivory that took place in November 2008, in accordance with Annotation 5, paragraphs g) i), g) ii), g) iv) and g) vii) to the Appendices. Following this nine-year resting period, any further proposals concerning trade in African elephant in the CITES Appendices shall be dealt with in accordance with Decision 14.77 and 14.78.

Algeria, Burkina Faso, Liberia, Nigeria and Tunisia supported the proposed draft decision and believed that they clarified the CoP14 proceedings. They would also provide the best opportunity for the coordination of elephant issues in the future, whilst allowing Parties to concentrate fully on the implementation of the African Elephant Action Plan.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, and Uganda did not support the proposed draft decisions and did not want Appendix-I species to be subject to such limitations. Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, wished to encourage range States to fully apply the African Elephant Action Plan.

Botswana requested clarity regarding CITES Art. XV (giving Parties the right to propose amendments to the Appendices). The Secretariat confirmed this and noted that Parties could collectively agree not to use this right. However, in the absence of consensus on the use of Art. XV, Parties who did not agree would continue to have the right to propose the transfer of Appendix-I species to Appendix-II. China, Botswana and South Africa felt that, in light of this, the sovereign rights of Parties would be brought into question, which was against the spirit of CITES, therefore they did not support the proposed draft decision. This was echoed by the United Republic of Tanzania who, with China, also felt that successful management of elephant populations should be encouraged rather than punished, and weak enforcement by some African countries should not undermine those with strong enforcement records.

The Chair noted that there was no consensus on the proposed draft decision and asked Kenya how they wished to proceed. Kenya stated that the draft decision was not intended to contravene Parties' right to submit proposals to transfer Appendix-I species to Appendix II and that they were aware that Art. XV would allow for this submission, irrespective of any compromise. They reiterated that they hoped to clarify that the nine-year resting period would stand. They requested an adjournment, in accordance with Rule 18, to allow the 23 members of the AEC to consult on their position. They were concerned that if a vote on the draft decision was passed the proposal would have to be amended. The Chair put this to vote, with 53 Parties in support, 58 against and 20 abstaining (see Annex 1). The request for adjournment was denied.

Kenya requested that the draft decision should therefore be put to a vote and, following that, requested that a separate vote be made on the amended proposal. A vote on the draft decision was made, with 38 Parties in support, 76 against, and 21 abstaining (see Annex 2). The draft decision was therefore rejected.

In light of this, prior to the second vote, Kenya had stated that they felt that putting document CoP15 Prop. 6 to a vote would give the impression that the nine-year resting period had been defeated. Therefore, on behalf of the 23 countries of the AEC they wished to withdraw the proposal as they believed that, in light of the vote on the draft decisions, it would not be in the interest of elephant conservation. They strongly believed in maintaining the nine-year resting period and, requesting African unity on this issue, proposed to continue discussion of the issue outside of the CoP. Saudi Arabia made a point of order, requesting explanation from the Chair as to why Kenya had been allowed to interject after a vote had been declared when, in a previous session, Egypt had been denied the floor. The Chair reiterated that the two votes had been on separate issues and that he had not declared the second vote, and maintained that Kenya had the right to interject and withdraw their proposal.

63. Criteria for the inclusion of species in Appendices I and II

Canada presented document CoP15 Com. I. 13 produced by the working group on *Criteria for the inclusion of species in Appendices I and II* stating that consensus had been reached following constructive discussions. With regard to paragraph b), Canada clarified that, although the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations was likely to be able to undertake the work with its own existing funds, they believed that TRAFFIC and IUCN - International Union for Conservation of Nature would require

funding assistance. They stated that this funding was not likely to be significant given that the report required would be brief. Com. I. 13 was accepted.

57. Cedrela odorata, Dalbergia retusa, Dalbergia granadillo and Dalbergia stevensonii

The Secretariat reported that they had examined the issues raised by Peru, on behalf of the region of Central and South America and the Caribbean, regarding document CoP15 Com. I. 2 on *Cedrela odorata*, *Dalbergia retusa*, *Dalbergia granadillo* and *Dalbergia stevensonii*. Regarding paragraph 1.f), the word "all" was indeed a typographical error, and, whilst making no material difference to the sentence, the Secretariat stated that it would revise the document to remove this word from the final text of the Action Plan. Concerning the words "such as Appendix-II listing" in paragraph 3.d), these words were proposed for insertion by Norway during the debate of this matter by the Committee in its third session. It reiterated that this was clearly stated on page three of document CoP15 Com. I Rec. 3, and that insertion of these words was agreed by the Committee. It reminded Parties that CoP15 Com. I Rec. 3 itself was agreed, with some unrelated minor amendments, on Wednesday 17 March 2010 and therefore it did not believe there was reason to delete these words as suggested by Peru.

58. Bigleaf mahogany

The Chair of the Plants Committee introduced document CoP15 Com. I. 14, containing draft decisions from the working group on Bigleaf Mahogany and Other Neotropical Timber Species. She highlighted the new name of the working group stating that the available budget was USD 45,000. She requested that the Annex be amended as follows: in paragraph 2 d), in the Spanish version the names of cited organizations should be included in full, and Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO) should be added. In paragraph 2 f) the words within a period of one month after the entry into force of the decision should be added at the end of the first sentence.

This was agreed and the document was accepted as amended.

49. Tortoises and freshwater turtles

The United States introduced document CoP15 Com. I. 16, containing several draft decisions. They requested that "at its 61st meeting," should be deleted from the draft decision under Directed to the Standing Committee. This was agreed and the document was accepted as amended.

10. Cooperation with other organizations

10.1 Synergy with biodiversity-related international initiatives

Spain, as Chair of the working group on this issue, introduced document CoP15 Com. I.12, containing various draft decisions on this issue.

Mexico referred to inconsistencies between the Spanish and English versions and requested that, in the Spanish version, the word "platform" under Directed to the Animals and Plants Committees and the Secretariat should be replaced by "IPBES".

This was agreed and the document was accepted as amended.

35. Standard nomenclature

The Chair of the working group amending the draft decision directed to the Animals and Plants Committee in document CoP15 Com. I. 1 read out the following amended wording:

"The Animals and Plants Committee shall conduct an analysis to identify taxa listed in the Appendices that can be included under the name of a higher taxon without altering the scope of the listing, to be consistent with the section on "Higher taxa" in Annex 3 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), and where appropriate prepare proposals for submission to the Conference of the Parties by the Depositary Government."

This was agreed and the document was accepted as amended.

28. Ranching and trade in ranched specimens

The United States introduced document CoP15 Com. I. 17, containing a draft decision on the issue. The document was accepted by consensus.

29. Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species

The United States introduced document CoP15 Com. I. 17, containing two draft decisions, the second of which included two operative options. The Secretariat asked for clarification of the amount of external funds that were likely to be required in paragraph 2 a). Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported by Australia, indicated that they would prefer Option 2 in paragraph 3.

The document was accepted, with Option 2 as the selected option.

After this item had been closed, Mexico noted that both options might have implications for other Resolutions and that the choice should therefore be left open. The Chair noted that although the matter had already been decided by the Committee, Mexico's concerns would be included in the record of the present session.

### **Approval of summary records**

Summary record of the seventh session of Committee I (CoP15 Com. I Rec. 7)

Denmark requested two amendments: the first to insert the words "on behalf of Greenland" on page one, the last paragraph on the first line after the word "Denmark", and the second, to insert the following text on page two in the first paragraph before "However, Spain..."

"The Greenland Government drew attention to the fact that proposals to amend the CITES Appendices should be based on the conservation status of the species concerned. They felt that proposals should take account of the contribution that CITES controls can make towards improvement of the conservation status of a species, while acknowledging the efforts of those countries that have implemented effective conservation measures. Greenland reported that the annual quotas, established since 2006, are set in accordance with international agreements and on the basis of scientific advice. It also stated that the total catch of polar bears was significantly reduced and had been below the set quota since 2006, and that the regulation on CITES export permits had been in place since 1983, whilst the Home Rule order had been revised and strengthened in 2004.

Furthermore, the Greenland Government had decided on a voluntary export ban in April 2008 on all Greenland polar bear populations, and Canada had decided on a voluntary export ban for Kane Basin and Baffin Bay populations in 2009. They also reiterated that polar bears did not fulfil the biological criteria for inclusion in Appendix-I as there was no "marked on-going decline", projected future decline was not 50%, polar bear populations were greater than 5,000 individuals, and there were well established national and regional management measures in place."

With this amendment added to those noted at the Committee's 10th session, summary record CoP15 Com. I. Rec. 7 was adopted.

The session was adjourned at 17h05.

MOTION: In favour of adjournment Kenya Proposal CoP15 Prop. 6

VOTE TOTALS:

Yes : 53  
No : 58  
Abstain : 20

VOTE BREAKDOWN

	GROUP DETAILS		RESULTS OF VOTE			
	NAME	SIZE	Yes	No	Abstain	
	Africa	40	20	15	3	38
	Europe	39	12	14	9	35
	Asia	32	7	19	4	30
C/S America & Carib,		26	8	9	4	21
	Oceania	6	3	1	0	4
	N America,	3	3	0	0	3

THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS

MIC CARD	DELEGATE	INFORMATION	VOTE
1	1	AF Afghanistan	No
3	3	DZ Algeria	Abstain
4	4	AG Antigua and Barbuda,	No
5	5	AR Argentina	Abstain
6	6	AM Armenia	No
7	7	AU Australia	Yes
8	8	AT Austria	No
9	9	AZ Azerbaijan	Yes
10	10	BS Bahamas	Abstain
11	11	BD Bangladesh	No
14	14	BE Belgium	No
16	16	BJ Benin	Yes
17	17	BT Bhutan	Abstain
18	18	BO Bolivia (Plurinational State of),	Yes
20	20	BW Botswana	No
21	21	BR Brazil	Abstain
22	22	BN Brunei Darussalam,	Abstain
24	24	BF Burkina Faso,	Yes
25	25	BI Burundi	No
26	26	KH Cambodia	No
27	27	CM Cameroon	No
28	28	CA Canada	Yes
30	30	CF Central African Republic,	Yes
32	32	CL Chile	Yes
33	33	CN China	No
34	34	CO Colombia	Yes
36	36	CG Congo	Yes
37	37	CR Costa Rica,	Yes
39	39	HR Croatia	Yes
40	901	CU Cuba	No
41	41	CY Cyprus	Yes
42	42	CZ Czech Republic,	Yes
44	44	DK Denmark	
46	46	DM Dominica	No
47	47	DO Dominican Republic,	Abstain
48	48	EC Ecuador	Yes
49	49	EG Egypt	No

50	50	SV	El Salvador,	
51	902	GQ	Equatorial Guinea,	
52	52	ER	Eritrea	Yes
53	53	EE	Estonia	Yes
54	54	ET	Ethiopia	Yes
55	907	FJ	Fiji	Yes
56	56	FI	Finland	Yes
57	57	FR	France	
59	59	GM	Gambia	Abstain
60	60	GE	Georgia	
61	61	DE	Germany	Yes
62	62	GH	Ghana	Yes
63	63	GR	Greece	Abstain
64	64	GD	Grenada	No
65	65	GT	Guatemala	No
66	66	GN	Guinea	Yes
67	67	GW	Guinea-Bissau	Yes
68	68	GY	Guyana	
69	69	HN	Honduras	No
70	70	HU	Hungary	Yes
71	71	IS	Iceland	No
72	72	IN	India	Yes
73	73	ID	Indonesia	No
74	74	IR	Iran (Islamic Republic of),	No
75	75	IE	Ireland	No
76	76	IL	Israel	No
77	77	IT	Italy	Abstain
78	78	JM	Jamaica	Yes
79	79	JP	Japan	No
80	80	JO	Jordan	
82	82	KE	Kenya	Yes
83	83	KW	Kuwait	No
84	84	KG	Kyrgyzstan	No
85	85	LA	Lao People's Democratic Republic,	No
86	86	LV	Latvia	Abstain
88	88	LR	Liberia	Yes
89	89	LY	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,	No
90	90	LI	Liechtenstein	No
92	92	LU	Luxembourg	No
93	93	MG	Madagascar	Yes
94	94	MW	Malawi	No
95	95	MY	Malaysia	No
96	96	ML	Mali	Yes
97	97	MT	Malta	No
98	98	MR	Mauritania	Yes
99	99	MU	Mauritius	Abstain
100	100	MX	Mexico	Yes
101	101	MC	Monaco	Yes
102	102	MN	Mongolia	Yes
103	103	ME	Montenegro	
104	104	MA	Morocco	Yes
105	105	MZ	Mozambique	No
106	106	MM	Myanmar	Abstain
107	107	NA	Namibia	No
108	108	NP	Nepal	No
109	109	NL	Netherlands	Abstain
110	110	NZ	New Zealand,	Yes
111	111	NI	Nicaragua	
112	112	NE	Niger	Yes
113	113	NG	Nigeria	Yes
114	114	NO	Norway	No
115	115	OM	Oman	No
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	Yes
124	124	PT	Portugal	Abstain
125	125	QA	Qatar	No
126	126	KR	Republic of Korea,	No
127	127	MD	Republic of Moldova,	No
128	128	RO	Romania	Abstain
129	129	RU	Russian Federation,	No
131	131	KN	Saint Kitts and Nevis,	No
132	132	LC	Saint Lucia,	Yes
133	133	VC	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,	No
134	134	WS	Samoa	
137	137	SA	Saudi Arabia,	No
138	138	SN	Senegal	No
139	139	RS	Serbia	No
141	141	SL	Sierra Leone,	Yes
142	142	SG	Singapore	Abstain
143	143	SK	Slovakia	Yes
147	147	ZA	South Africa,	No
148	148	ES	Spain	Yes
149	149	LK	Sri Lanka,	Yes
150	150	SD	Sudan	No
151	151	SR	Suriname	Yes
152	152	SZ	Swaziland	Yes
153	153	SE	Sweden	Abstain
154	154	CH	Switzerland	No
155	155	SY	Syrian Arab Republic,	Yes
156	156	TH	Thailand	No
158	158	TG	Togo	
160	160	TN	Tunisia	Yes
161	161	TR	Turkey	No
162	162	UG	Uganda	No
163	163	UA	Ukraine	Abstain
164	164	AE	United Arab Emirates,	Yes
165	165	GB	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,	Abstain
166	166	TZ	United Republic of Tanzania,	No
167	167	US	United States of America,	Yes
168	168	UY	Uruguay	
170	170	VU	Vanuatu	No
172	172	VN	Viet Nam,	No
173	173	YE	Yemen	
174	906	ZM	Zambia	No
175	175	ZW	Zimbabwe	No



(English only / Únicamente en inglés / Seulement en anglais)

MOTION: COP15 DOC.68 Proposal.6 *Loxodonta africana*  
 Moratorium Kenya Draft decision

## VOTE TOTALS:

Yes : 38  
 No : 76  
 Abstain : 21

## VOTE BREAKDOWN

	GROUP DETAILS		RESULTS OF VOTE			
	NAME	SIZE	Yes	No	Abstain	
	Africa	40	19	17	2	38
	Europe	39	4	32	2	38
	Asia	32	9	11	10	30
C/S America & Carib,	26	4	12	6	22	
	Oceania	6	1	3	0	4
	N America,	3	1	1	1	3

## THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS

## MIC CARD DELEGATE INFORMATION

## VOTE

1	1	AF Afghanistan	Abstain
3	3	DZ Algeria	Abstain
4	4	AG Antigua and Barbuda,	No
5	5	AR Argentina	No
6	6	AM Armenia	No
7	7	AU Australia	Yes
8	8	AT Austria	No
9	9	AZ Azerbaijan	Yes
10	10	BS Bahamas	Abstain
11	11	BD Bangladesh	Yes
14	14	BE Belgium	No
16	16	BJ Benin	Yes
17	17	BT Bhutan	Abstain
18	18	BO Bolivia (Plurinational State of),	No
20	20	BW Botswana	No
21	21	BR Brazil	Abstain
22	22	BN Brunei Darussalam,	Abstain
24	24	BF Burkina Faso,	Yes
25	25	BI Burundi	No
26	26	KH Cambodia	Abstain
27	27	CM Cameroon	No
28	28	CA Canada	No
30	30	CF Central African Republic,	Yes
32	32	CL Chile	Yes
33	33	CN China	No
34	34	CO Colombia	Abstain
36	36	CG Congo	Yes
37	37	CR Costa Rica,	Abstain
39	39	HR Croatia	Yes
40	901	CU Cuba	No
41	41	CY Cyprus	No
42	42	CZ Czech Republic,	No
44	44	DK Denmark	No
46	46	DM Dominica	No
47	47	DO Dominican Republic,	Abstain
48	48	EC Ecuador	No

49	49	EG	Egypt	No
50	50	SV	El Salvador,	
51	902	GQ	Equatorial Guinea,	
52	52	ER	Eritrea	Yes
53	53	EE	Estonia	No
54	54	ET	Ethiopia	Yes
55	907	FJ	Fiji	No
56	56	FI	Finland	No
57	57	FR	France	No
59	59	GM	Gambia	Abstain
60	60	GE	Georgia	
61	61	DE	Germany	No
62	62	GH	Ghana	Yes
63	63	GR	Greece	No
64	64	GD	Grenada	No
65	65	GT	Guatemala	Abstain
66	66	GN	Guinea	Yes
67	67	GW	Guinea-Bissau	Yes
68	68	GY	Guyana	No
69	69	HN	Honduras	Yes
70	70	HU	Hungary	No
71	71	IS	Iceland	Abstain
72	72	IN	India	Yes
73	73	ID	Indonesia	Yes
74	74	IR	Iran (Islamic Republic of),	Abstain
75	75	IE	Ireland	No
76	76	IL	Israel	Yes
77	77	IT	Italy	No
78	78	JM	Jamaica	Yes
79	79	JP	Japan	No
80	80	JO	Jordan	Yes
82	82	KE	Kenya	Yes
83	83	KW	Kuwait	No
84	84	KG	Kyrgyzstan	No
85	85	LA	Lao People's Democratic Republic,	Abstain
86	86	LV	Latvia	No
88	88	LR	Liberia	Yes
89	89	LY	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,	No
90	90	LI	Liechtenstein	No
92	92	LU	Luxembourg	No
93	93	MG	Madagascar	Yes
94	94	MW	Malawi	No
95	95	MY	Malaysia	No
96	96	ML	Mali	Yes
97	97	MT	Malta	No
98	98	MR	Mauritania	Yes
99	99	MU	Mauritius	Yes
100	100	MX	Mexico	Abstain
101	101	MC	Monaco	Yes
102	102	MN	Mongolia	Abstain
103	103	ME	Montenegro	No
104	104	MA	Morocco	Yes
105	105	MZ	Mozambique	No
106	106	MM	Myanmar	Abstain
107	107	NA	Namibia	No
108	108	NP	Nepal	Yes
109	109	NL	Netherlands	No
110	110	NZ	New Zealand,	No
111	111	NI	Nicaragua	
112	112	NE	Niger	Yes
113	113	NG	Nigeria	Yes
114	114	NO	Norway	No
115	115	OM	Oman	Abstain
116	116	PK	Pakistan	No

117	117	PW	Palau	
118	118	PA	Panama	
121	121	PE	Peru	No
122	122	PH	Philippines	No
123	123	PL	Poland	No
124	124	PT	Portugal	No
125	125	QA	Qatar	No
126	126	KR	Republic of Korea,	Abstain
127	127	MD	Republic of Moldova,	No
128	128	RO	Romania	No
129	129	RU	Russian Federation,	No
131	131	KN	Saint Kitts and Nevis,	No
132	132	LC	Saint Lucia,	No
133	133	VC	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,	No
134	134	WS	Samoa	
137	137	SA	Saudi Arabia,	No
138	138	SN	Senegal	No
139	139	RS	Serbia	Yes
141	141	SL	Sierra Leone,	No
142	142	SG	Singapore	No
143	143	SK	Slovakia	No
147	147	ZA	South Africa,	No
148	148	ES	Spain	No
149	149	LK	Sri Lanka,	Yes
150	150	SD	Sudan	No
151	151	SR	Suriname	Yes
152	152	SZ	Swaziland	No
153	153	SE	Sweden	No
154	154	CH	Switzerland	No
155	155	SY	Syrian Arab Republic,	Yes
156	156	TH	Thailand	
158	158	TG	Togo	
160	160	TN	Tunisia	Yes
161	161	TR	Turkey	No
162	162	UG	Uganda	No
163	163	UA	Ukraine	Abstain
164	164	AE	United Arab Emirates,	Yes
165	165	GB	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,	No
166	166	TZ	United Republic of Tanzania,	No
167	167	US	United States of America,	Yes
168	168	UY	Uruguay	
170	170	VU	Vanuatu	No
172	172	VN	Viet Nam,	No
173	173	YE	Yemen	
174	906	ZM	Zambia	No
175	175	ZW	Zimbabwe	No