

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



Eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Geneva (Switzerland), 17-28 August 2019

Summary record of the thirteenth session for Committee I

25 August 2019: 14h15 - 17h15

Chair: R. Hay (New Zealand)

Secretariat: T. De Meulenaer
K. Gaynor
J. C. Vasquez

Rapporteurs: A. Caromel
F. Davis
J. Vitale
E. Vovk

Proposals to amend the Appendices (cont.)

The European Union (EU) made a point of order as Japan had requested the Chair to confirm the participation of all EU Members before the EU's exercise of its rights as a Party had been challenged by Japan under discussion of proposal CoP18 Prop. 45. The European Union reiterated its statement given under agenda item 4 on Rules of Procedure in the opening Plenary, that it is understood that the EU Member States will attend each session of the CoP, and it is understood that no Party will challenge the EU's exercise of its right to vote at CoP18. It trusted that such a challenge would not repeat itself and that the compromise reached in the Rules of Procedure would be accepted. The United States of America aligned itself with the European Union's statement.

105. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II

Proposal CoP18 Prop. 6 to transfer *Aonyx cinereus* from Appendix II to Appendix I was introduced by the Philippines, which also requested the name in the proposal be made more precise to *Aonyx cinerea*.

Costa Rica and the European Union supported the proposal. Indonesia opposed the transfer to Appendix I and proposed a zero quota on wild-caught specimens and a new draft decision on the establishment of a working group on the conservation of small-clawed otters, which would report to the Animals Committee and Standing Committee.

The Chair suspended the discussion on the proposal, asking the co-proponents India, Nepal and the Philippines to discuss a way forward with Indonesia and report back at the next session of Committee I.

Proposal CoP18 Prop. 7 to transfer *Lutrogale perspicillata* from Appendix II to Appendix I was introduced by India.

Bangladesh, the European Union, Iraq, Nepal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, the United States of America and Viet Nam supported the proposal. Humane Society International (HSI), speaking also on behalf of Animal Welfare Institute, the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA), Born Free Foundation, Born Free USA, CATCA Environmental and Wildlife Society, Catholic Concern for Animals (CCA), Center for Biological Diversity, Conservation Analytics, Environmental Investigation Agency, Eurogroup for Animals, European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA), Fondation Brigitte Bardot, Four Paws, International Fund for Animal Welfare

(IFAW), Japan Tiger and Elephant Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, ProWildlife, Robin des Bois, San Diego Zoo Global, Sea Shepherd Legal, Species Survival Network, Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Wildlife Protection Society of India, Wildlife Trust of India and World Animal Protection expressed their support for the proposal.

Indonesia did not support the proposal, considering that the species did not meet the criteria for inclusion in Appendix I in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) on *Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II*. With a lack of consensus, the Chair called for a vote.

With 102 votes in favour, 15 against, and 11 abstentions, proposal CoP18 Prop. 7 to transfer *Lutrogale perspicillata* from Appendix II to Appendix I was accepted.

Proposal CoP18 Prop. 8 to remove the annotation on the Appendix-II listing of the population of *Ceratotherium simum simum* of Eswatini (currently referred to as population of Swaziland), thereby permitting the regulated legal trade in Eswatini white rhinos and their products, including horn and derivatives, was introduced by Eswatini. It indicated that the escalating cost of protecting rhinos was becoming overwhelming and was unsustainable in the long term, and that all legal and ethical options needed to be explored to raise funds, including generating resources through legal international trade. Eswatini noted the intense polarisation in conservation strategies between southern Africa and the members of the African Elephant Coalition of northern and western Africa. It affirmed that all white rhinos in the country had been DNA sequenced, that any traded horn would be traceable, and that harvesting would occur without the loss of any animals. It rejected the assertion that approving legal trade would provide opportunities for illegal trade, noting this had never been tested.

Nigeria, supported by Kenya, the European Union and Qatar, opposed the proposal, arguing that legalising rhino horn trade would stimulate consumer demand, create opportunities for laundering, and may negate or create challenges to the conservation efforts of other rhino range States. The European Union believed the criteria for safeguards in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) were not met by the proposal.

Nigeria, echoed by Kenya, wished to place on record its objections to the inferences drawn by Eswatini relating to decisions previously reached on proposals submitted on elephants, giraffes and big cats.

Zimbabwe, supported by Botswana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, South Africa and the United Republic of Tanzania, expressed support for the proposal, citing its potential to support the long-term conservation of the species. Zimbabwe noted that the range States were bearing the high costs of protecting rhino populations, adding that the CITES trade ban on rhino horn had not prevented declines in populations due to poaching and hunting. Japan believed the proposal was in line with Resolution Conf. 8.3 (Rev. CoP13) on the *Recognition of the benefits of trade in wildlife*.

Environmental Investigation Agency, speaking also on behalf of the Animal Welfare Institute, Born Free Foundation, Born Free USA, CCA, Center for Biological Diversity, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Eurogroup for Animals, HSI, Japan Tiger and Elephant Fund, NRDC, Outraged South African Citizens Against Rhino Poaching (OSCAP), Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, ProWildlife, Species Survival Network and World Animal Protection, opposed the proposal.

The Private Rhino Owners Association (PROA) spoke also on behalf of Conservation Force and IWMC-World Conservation Trust and other like-minded organizations supported the proposal, underscoring the high cost of rhino conservation and management being reliant solely on donor income, and urged Parties to consider the needs of rural communities.

Eswatini asked for a vote to be carried out as a secret ballot in accordance with Rule 27.2 of the Rules of Procedure, and received the support of more than ten Parties.

With a vote of 25 Parties in favour, 102 against, and seven abstentions, proposal CoP18 Prop. 8, concerning removal of the annotation on the Appendix-II listing of the population of *Ceratotherium simum simum* in Eswatini, was rejected.

The United States of America stated that it voted against the proposal.

Namibia introduced **Proposal CoP18 Prop. 9** to transfer the population of *Ceratotherium simum simum* of Namibia from Appendix I to Appendix II with the following annotation: "For the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in: a) live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations; and b) hunting trophies. All

other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly". It stated that the population in Namibia, the second largest in the world, no longer met the criteria for listing in Appendix I as outlined in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Noting that illegal killing and trade represented the greatest threat to the subspecies, it highlighted resources invested to conserve the subspecies and to reduce illegal wildlife trade, and the need to incentivize continued efforts.

Botswana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eswatini, Japan, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe, and IWMC-World Conservation Trust supported the proposal. They variously considered that the subspecies no longer met the biological criteria for listing in Appendix I; that there were effective management and enforcement measures in place; that Namibia's conservation efforts should be rewarded; and that the transfer to Appendix II would incentivize investment.

Benin, Kenya, and Born Free, also on behalf of the Species Survival Network's Rhinoceros Working Group with endorsement from Animal Welfare Institute, Born Free Foundation, Born Free USA, Catholic Concerns for Animals, Center for Biological Diversity, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Environmental Investigation Agency, Eurogroup for Animals, Humane Society International, Japan Tiger and Elephant Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council, OSCAP, Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, ProWildlife, Species Survival Network, and World Animal Protection, opposed the proposal.

Namibia asked for a vote to be carried out by secret ballot and received the support of more than ten Parties.

With 39 votes in favour, 82 against and 11 abstentions, proposal CoP18 Prop. 9 to transfer the population of *Ceratotherium simum simum* of Namibia from Appendix I to Appendix II with an annotation was rejected.

The United States of America stated that it had voted against the proposal.

Proposal CoP18 Prop. 13 to include *Mammuthus primigenius* in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(b) of the Convention, was introduced by Israel that stated that the intent of the proposal was to support efforts to address the illegal trade in elephant ivory by preventing laundering as mammoth ivory.

Ethiopia, also speaking on behalf of the African Elephant Coalition, and Gabon supported the proposal, agreeing that the species met the criteria for listing in Appendix II as outlined in Article II paragraph 2(b).

Canada, China, the European Union, Japan, the Russian Federation, South Africa, and the United States of America opposed the proposal. They variously considered that the proposal to list an extinct species fell outside of the scope of the Convention; that elephant and mammoth ivory were easily differentiated; and that there was insufficient evidence that mammoth ivory was being used to launder elephant ivory. Canada and the United States also believed that the proposed listing would create additional administrative and enforcement burdens for Parties.

South Africa requested clarification as to whether extinct species qualified for any consideration in the CITES process. The Secretariat responded that its assessment concluded that this proposal was beyond the scope of the Convention, and that the consideration for special cases, as detailed in Annex 3 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) applied only to extinct species already listed in the Appendices.

Noting that there was not a clear consensus, Israel, invoking Rule of Procedure 24.2, asked to amend the proposal with the following annotation: "Includes only mammoth ivory carvings. All other parts and derivatives are not subject to provisions of the Convention". The Secretariat clarified that the definition of "specimen" of animal species included in Appendix I and II, as defined in Article I paragraph (b) of the Convention, did not allow for the exclusion of "parts and derivatives" and that the proposed annotation was therefore not allowed under the Convention.

Israel stated that it would withdraw the proposal if the Committee would instead agree two draft decisions. The Chair asked Israel to consult with Canada, the Russian Federation, and other interested Parties regarding possible draft decisions and produce an in-session document for further consideration.

Proposals CoP18 Prop. 14, CoP18 Prop. 15, CoP18 Prop. 16, and CoP18 Prop. 17 to transfer, respectively, *Leopordillus conditor*, *Pseudomys fieldi praeconis*, *Xeromys myoides*, and *Zyzomys pedunculatus* from Appendix I to Appendix II were introduced simultaneously by Australia. Australia noted that its review of these species, carried out in accordance with Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP17) on *Periodic Review of the Appendices*, had been presented at 30th meeting of the Animals Committee, which had agreed with the recommendation to transfer these species to Appendix II. Australia also noted that the

current listing of *P. fieldi praeconis* was not consistent with currently accepted nomenclature and recommended amending the name to *P. fieldi*.

New Zealand supported the proposal, stating that although these species still met the biological criteria, they did not meet (and never had met) the trade criteria for inclusion in Appendix I.

Proposals CoP18 Prop. 14, CoP18 Prop. 15, CoP18 Prop. 16, and CoP18 Prop. 17 to transfer, respectively, *Leoporillus conditor*, *Pseudomys fieldi*, *Xeromys myoides*, and *Zyzomys pedunculatus* from Appendix I to Appendix II, were accepted by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at 17h13.



Motion Proposal 7 [25.08.2019 2:53:09 PM]

Quorum: Yes > 66.66%

EU-Vote: block

YES: 87.18%

1	Afghanistan	YES
2	Albania	Not Allowed
3	Algeria	Not Present
4	Angola	Not Present
5	Antigua and Barbuda	Present
6	Argentina	YES
7	Armenia	Not Present
8	Australia	YES
9	Austria	YES (eu)
10	Azerbaijan	Not Allowed
11	Bahamas	YES
12	Bahrain	Not Present
13	Bangladesh	YES
14	Barbados	YES
15	Belarus	Not Allowed
16	Belgium	YES (eu)
17	Belize	YES
18	Benin	YES
19	Bhutan	YES
20	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	YES
21	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Not Allowed
22	Botswana	YES
23	Brazil	ABST
24	Brunei Darussalam	Not Allowed
25	Bulgaria	YES (eu)
26	Burkina Faso	YES
27	Burundi	YES
28	Cabo Verde	Present
29	Cambodia	NO
30	Cameroon	YES
31	Canada	NO
32	Central African Republic	YES
33	Chad	YES
34	Chile	YES
35	China	NO
36	Colombia	ABST
37	Comoros	Not Present
38	Congo	Not Allowed
39	Costa Rica	YES
40	Côte d'Ivoire	YES
41	Croatia	YES (eu)
42	Cuba	YES
43	Cyprus	YES (eu)
44	Czech Republic	YES (eu)
45	Democratic Republic of the Congo	ABST
46	Denmark	YES (eu)
47	Djibouti	Not Allowed
48	Dominica	Not Allowed
49	Dominican Republic	YES



Motion Proposal 7 [25.08.2019 2:53:09 PM]

50	Ecuador	YES
51	Egypt	YES
52	El Salvador	Not Allowed
53	Equatorial Guinea	Not Allowed
54	Eritrea	YES
55	Estonia	YES (eu)
56	Eswatini	ABST
57	Ethiopia	YES
58	European Union	Voted
59	Fiji	YES
60	Finland	YES (eu)
61	France	YES (eu)
62	Gabon	YES
63	Gambia	Not Allowed
64	Georgia	Not Present
65	Germany	YES (eu)
66	Ghana	YES
67	Greece	YES (eu)
68	Grenada	Not Allowed
69	Guatemala	Present
70	Guinea	Not Present
71	Guinea-Bissau	Not Allowed
72	Guyana	NO
73	Honduras	YES
74	Hungary	YES (eu)
75	Iceland	NO
76	India	YES
77	Indonesia	NO
78	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Not Allowed
79	Iraq	Not Allowed
80	Ireland	YES (eu)
81	Israel	YES
82	Italy	YES (eu)
83	Jamaica	NO
84	Japan	NO
85	Jordan	YES
86	Kazakhstan	Not Allowed
87	Kenya	YES
88	Kuwait	Not Present
89	Kyrgyzstan	Not Present
90	Lao People's Democratic Republic	NO
91	Latvia	YES (eu)
92	Lebanon	YES
93	Lesotho	Not Present
94	Liberia	Not Allowed
95	Libya	Not Allowed
96	Liechtenstein	NO
97	Lithuania	YES (eu)
98	Luxembourg	YES (eu)
99	Madagascar	ABST
100	Malawi	YES
101	Malaysia	NO
102	Maldives	YES



Motion Proposal 7 [25.08.2019 2:53:09 PM]

103	Mali	YES
104	Malta	YES (eu)
105	Mauritania	Not Present
106	Mauritius	Not Allowed
107	Mexico	YES
108	Monaco	YES
109	Mongolia	Not Present
110	Montenegro	YES
111	Morocco	YES
112	Mozambique	ABST
113	Myanmar	YES
114	Namibia	YES
115	Nepal	YES
116	Netherlands	YES (eu)
117	New Zealand	YES
118	Nicaragua	ABST
119	Niger	YES
120	Nigeria	YES
121	North Macedonia	Not Allowed
122	Norway	NO
123	Oman	Not Present
124	Pakistan	Not Allowed
125	Palau	YES
126	Panama	Not Allowed
127	Papua New Guinea	YES
128	Paraguay	Not Allowed
129	Peru	YES
130	Philippines	YES
131	Poland	YES (eu)
132	Portugal	YES (eu)
133	Qatar	YES
134	Republic of Korea	YES
135	Republic of Moldova	YES
136	Romania	YES (eu)
137	Russian Federation	ABST
138	Rwanda	YES
139	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Not Present
140	Saint Lucia	Not Present
141	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Present
142	Samoa	ABST
143	San Marino	Not Allowed
144	Sao Tome and Principe	Not Allowed
145	Saudi Arabia	YES
146	Senegal	YES
147	Serbia	Not Allowed
148	Seychelles	YES
149	Sierra Leone	YES
150	Singapore	YES
151	Slovakia	YES (eu)
152	Slovenia	YES (eu)
153	Solomon Islands	Not Present
154	Somalia	Present
155	South Africa	NO



Motion Proposal 7 [25.08.2019 2:53:09 PM]

156	Spain	YES (eu)
157	Sri Lanka	YES
158	Sudan	YES
159	Suriname	YES
160	Sweden	YES (eu)
161	Switzerland	YES
162	Syrian Arab Republic	Not Allowed
163	Tajikistan	Present
164	Thailand	YES
165	Togo	YES
166	Tonga	NO
167	Trinidad and Tobago	Not Present
168	Tunisia	YES
169	Turkey	YES
170	Uganda	NO
171	Ukraine	Not Present
172	United Arab Emirates	YES
173	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	YES (eu)
174	United Republic of Tanzania	YES
175	United States of America	YES
176	Uruguay	YES
177	Uzbekistan	Not Allowed
178	Vanuatu	ABST
179	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	ABST
180	Viet Nam	YES
181	Yemen	Not Allowed
182	Zambia	Not Present
183	Zimbabwe	YES



Motion Proposal 8 [25.08.2019 3:48:55 PM]

Proposal 8

Quorum: Yes > 66.66%

EU-Vote: block

YES: 19.69%

1	Afghanistan	Not Present
2	Albania	Not Allowed
3	Algeria	Voted
4	Angola	Voted
5	Antigua and Barbuda	Voted
6	Argentina	Voted
7	Armenia	Not Present
8	Australia	Voted
9	Austria	Voted (eu)
10	Azerbaijan	Not Allowed
11	Bahamas	Voted
12	Bahrain	Not Present
13	Bangladesh	Voted
14	Barbados	Voted
15	Belarus	Not Allowed
16	Belgium	Voted (eu)
17	Belize	Voted
18	Benin	Voted
19	Bhutan	Voted
20	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Voted
21	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Not Allowed
22	Botswana	Voted
23	Brazil	Present
24	Brunei Darussalam	Not Allowed
25	Bulgaria	Voted (eu)
26	Burkina Faso	Voted
27	Burundi	Voted
28	Cabo Verde	Voted
29	Cambodia	Voted
30	Cameroon	Voted
31	Canada	Voted
32	Central African Republic	Voted
33	Chad	Voted
34	Chile	Voted
35	China	Voted
36	Colombia	Voted
37	Comoros	Not Present
38	Congo	Not Allowed
39	Costa Rica	Voted
40	Côte d'Ivoire	Voted
41	Croatia	Voted (eu)
42	Cuba	Voted
43	Cyprus	Voted (eu)
44	Czech Republic	Voted (eu)
45	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Voted
46	Denmark	Voted (eu)
47	Djibouti	Not Allowed
48	Dominica	Not Allowed
49	Dominican Republic	Voted



Motion Proposal 8 [25.08.2019 3:48:55 PM]

Proposal 8

50	Ecuador	Voted
51	Egypt	Voted
52	El Salvador	Not Allowed
53	Equatorial Guinea	Not Allowed
54	Eritrea	Voted
55	Estonia	Voted (eu)
56	Eswatini	Voted
57	Ethiopia	Voted
58	European Union	Voted
59	Fiji	Voted
60	Finland	Voted (eu)
61	France	Voted (eu)
62	Gabon	Voted
63	Gambia	Not Allowed
64	Georgia	Voted
65	Germany	Voted (eu)
66	Ghana	Voted
67	Greece	Voted (eu)
68	Grenada	Not Allowed
69	Guatemala	Voted
70	Guinea	Voted
71	Guinea-Bissau	Not Allowed
72	Guyana	Voted
73	Honduras	Voted
74	Hungary	Voted (eu)
75	Iceland	Voted
76	India	Voted
77	Indonesia	Voted
78	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Not Allowed
79	Iraq	Not Allowed
80	Ireland	Voted (eu)
81	Israel	Voted
82	Italy	Voted (eu)
83	Jamaica	Voted
84	Japan	Voted
85	Jordan	Voted
86	Kazakhstan	Not Allowed
87	Kenya	Voted
88	Kuwait	Not Present
89	Kyrgyzstan	Not Present
90	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Voted
91	Latvia	Voted (eu)
92	Lebanon	Voted
93	Lesotho	Voted
94	Liberia	Not Allowed
95	Libya	Not Allowed
96	Liechtenstein	Voted
97	Lithuania	Voted (eu)
98	Luxembourg	Voted (eu)
99	Madagascar	Voted
100	Malawi	Voted
101	Malaysia	Voted
102	Maldives	Voted



Motion Proposal 8 [25.08.2019 3:48:55 PM]

Proposal 8

103	Mali	Voted
104	Malta	Voted (eu)
105	Mauritania	Not Present
106	Mauritius	Not Allowed
107	Mexico	Voted
108	Monaco	Voted
109	Mongolia	Not Present
110	Montenegro	Voted
111	Morocco	Voted
112	Mozambique	Voted
113	Myanmar	Voted
114	Namibia	Voted
115	Nepal	Voted
116	Netherlands	Voted (eu)
117	New Zealand	Voted
118	Nicaragua	Voted
119	Niger	Voted
120	Nigeria	Voted
121	North Macedonia	Not Allowed
122	Norway	Voted
123	Oman	Not Present
124	Pakistan	Not Allowed
125	Palau	Not Present
126	Panama	Not Allowed
127	Papua New Guinea	Voted
128	Paraguay	Not Allowed
129	Peru	Voted
130	Philippines	Voted
131	Poland	Voted (eu)
132	Portugal	Voted (eu)
133	Qatar	Voted
134	Republic of Korea	Voted
135	Republic of Moldova	Voted
136	Romania	Voted (eu)
137	Russian Federation	Voted
138	Rwanda	Present
139	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Not Present
140	Saint Lucia	Voted
141	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Voted
142	Samoa	Voted
143	San Marino	Not Allowed
144	Sao Tome and Principe	Not Allowed
145	Saudi Arabia	Voted
146	Senegal	Voted
147	Serbia	Not Allowed
148	Seychelles	Voted
149	Sierra Leone	Voted
150	Singapore	Voted
151	Slovakia	Voted (eu)
152	Slovenia	Voted (eu)
153	Solomon Islands	Not Present
154	Somalia	Voted
155	South Africa	Voted



Motion Proposal 8 [25.08.2019 3:48:55 PM]

Proposal 8

156	Spain	Voted (eu)
157	Sri Lanka	Voted
158	Sudan	Voted
159	Suriname	Voted
160	Sweden	Voted (eu)
161	Switzerland	Voted
162	Syrian Arab Republic	Not Allowed
163	Tajikistan	Voted
164	Thailand	Voted
165	Togo	Voted
166	Tonga	Not Present
167	Trinidad and Tobago	Not Present
168	Tunisia	Voted
169	Turkey	Voted
170	Uganda	Voted
171	Ukraine	Not Present
172	United Arab Emirates	Voted
173	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Voted (eu)
174	United Republic of Tanzania	Voted
175	United States of America	Voted
176	Uruguay	Voted
177	Uzbekistan	Not Allowed
178	Vanuatu	Present
179	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Voted
180	Viet Nam	Voted
181	Yemen	Not Allowed
182	Zambia	Not Present
183	Zimbabwe	Voted



Motion Proposal 9 [25.08.2019 4:29:50 PM]

Proposal 9

Quorum: Yes > 66.66%

EU-Vote: block

YES: 32.23%

1	Afghanistan	Not Present
2	Albania	Not Allowed
3	Algeria	Voted
4	Angola	Not Present
5	Antigua and Barbuda	Voted
6	Argentina	Voted
7	Armenia	Not Present
8	Australia	Voted
9	Austria	Voted (eu)
10	Azerbaijan	Not Allowed
11	Bahamas	Voted
12	Bahrain	Voted
13	Bangladesh	Voted
14	Barbados	Voted
15	Belarus	Not Allowed
16	Belgium	Voted (eu)
17	Belize	Voted
18	Benin	Voted
19	Bhutan	Voted
20	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Not Present
21	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Not Allowed
22	Botswana	Voted
23	Brazil	Voted
24	Brunei Darussalam	Not Allowed
25	Bulgaria	Voted (eu)
26	Burkina Faso	Voted
27	Burundi	Voted
28	Cabo Verde	Present
29	Cambodia	Voted
30	Cameroon	Voted
31	Canada	Voted
32	Central African Republic	Voted
33	Chad	Voted
34	Chile	Voted
35	China	Voted
36	Colombia	Voted
37	Comoros	Not Present
38	Congo	Not Allowed
39	Costa Rica	Voted
40	Côte d'Ivoire	Voted
41	Croatia	Voted (eu)
42	Cuba	Voted
43	Cyprus	Voted (eu)
44	Czech Republic	Voted (eu)
45	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Voted
46	Denmark	Voted (eu)
47	Djibouti	Not Allowed
48	Dominica	Not Allowed
49	Dominican Republic	Voted



Motion Proposal 9 [25.08.2019 4:29:50 PM]

Proposal 9

50	Ecuador	Voted
51	Egypt	Voted
52	El Salvador	Not Allowed
53	Equatorial Guinea	Not Allowed
54	Eritrea	Voted
55	Estonia	Voted (eu)
56	Eswatini	Voted
57	Ethiopia	Voted
58	European Union	Voted
59	Fiji	Voted
60	Finland	Voted (eu)
61	France	Voted (eu)
62	Gabon	Voted
63	Gambia	Not Allowed
64	Georgia	Voted
65	Germany	Voted (eu)
66	Ghana	Voted
67	Greece	Voted (eu)
68	Grenada	Not Allowed
69	Guatemala	Present
70	Guinea	Voted
71	Guinea-Bissau	Not Allowed
72	Guyana	Voted
73	Honduras	Voted
74	Hungary	Voted (eu)
75	Iceland	Voted
76	India	Voted
77	Indonesia	Voted
78	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Not Allowed
79	Iraq	Not Allowed
80	Ireland	Voted (eu)
81	Israel	Voted
82	Italy	Voted (eu)
83	Jamaica	Voted
84	Japan	Voted
85	Jordan	Voted
86	Kazakhstan	Not Allowed
87	Kenya	Voted
88	Kuwait	Not Present
89	Kyrgyzstan	Not Present
90	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Voted
91	Latvia	Voted (eu)
92	Lebanon	Not Present
93	Lesotho	Voted
94	Liberia	Not Allowed
95	Libya	Not Allowed
96	Liechtenstein	Voted
97	Lithuania	Voted (eu)
98	Luxembourg	Voted (eu)
99	Madagascar	Voted
100	Malawi	Voted
101	Malaysia	Voted
102	Maldives	Voted



Motion Proposal 9 [25.08.2019 4:29:50 PM]

Proposal 9

103	Mali	Voted
104	Malta	Voted (eu)
105	Mauritania	Not Present
106	Mauritius	Not Allowed
107	Mexico	Voted
108	Monaco	Voted
109	Mongolia	Not Present
110	Montenegro	Voted
111	Morocco	Voted
112	Mozambique	Voted
113	Myanmar	Voted
114	Namibia	Voted
115	Nepal	Voted
116	Netherlands	Voted (eu)
117	New Zealand	Voted
118	Nicaragua	Voted
119	Niger	Voted
120	Nigeria	Voted
121	North Macedonia	Not Allowed
122	Norway	Voted
123	Oman	Not Present
124	Pakistan	Not Allowed
125	Palau	Not Present
126	Panama	Not Allowed
127	Papua New Guinea	Voted
128	Paraguay	Not Allowed
129	Peru	Voted
130	Philippines	Voted
131	Poland	Voted (eu)
132	Portugal	Voted (eu)
133	Qatar	Voted
134	Republic of Korea	Voted
135	Republic of Moldova	Voted
136	Romania	Voted (eu)
137	Russian Federation	Voted
138	Rwanda	Voted
139	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Not Present
140	Saint Lucia	Voted
141	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Voted
142	Samoa	Voted
143	San Marino	Not Allowed
144	Sao Tome and Principe	Not Allowed
145	Saudi Arabia	Voted
146	Senegal	Voted
147	Serbia	Not Allowed
148	Seychelles	Voted
149	Sierra Leone	Voted
150	Singapore	Voted
151	Slovakia	Voted (eu)
152	Slovenia	Voted (eu)
153	Solomon Islands	Not Present
154	Somalia	Voted
155	South Africa	Voted



Motion Proposal 9 [25.08.2019 4:29:50 PM]

Proposal 9

156	Spain	Voted (eu)
157	Sri Lanka	Voted
158	Sudan	Voted
159	Suriname	Voted
160	Sweden	Voted (eu)
161	Switzerland	Voted
162	Syrian Arab Republic	Not Allowed
163	Tajikistan	Not Present
164	Thailand	Voted
165	Togo	Voted
166	Tonga	Not Present
167	Trinidad and Tobago	Not Present
168	Tunisia	Voted
169	Turkey	Voted
170	Uganda	Voted
171	Ukraine	Not Present
172	United Arab Emirates	Voted
173	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Voted (eu)
174	United Republic of Tanzania	Voted
175	United States of America	Voted
176	Uruguay	Voted
177	Uzbekistan	Not Allowed
178	Vanuatu	Present
179	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Voted
180	Viet Nam	Voted
181	Yemen	Not Allowed
182	Zambia	Voted
183	Zimbabwe	Voted