

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



Seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Johannesburg (South Africa), 24 September – 5 October 2016

Summary record of the sixth session of Committee I

28 September 2016: 09h30 - 12h00

Chair: K. Gaynor (Ireland)

Secretariat: T. De Meulenaer
D. Kachelriess

Rapporteurs: F. Davis
J. Gray
B. Price
C. Rutherford

Amendment of the Appendices

88. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II

The Chair drew the attention of the Committee to documents CoP17 Doc. 88.1 (Secretariat's assessment of the proposals to amend Appendices I and II), CoP17 Doc. 88.2 (Rev. 1) (Comments from Parties) and CoP17 Doc. 88.3 (Comments from statutory consultees) and their annexes. She invited any statutory consultee who wished to do so to take the floor.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) reminded the Committee that, as a service to Parties, IUCN and TRAFFIC had since 1987 been producing the *IUCN/TRAFFIC Analyses of the Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices* (document CoP17 Inf. 11). They drew attention to three areas where use of Resolution Conf. 9. 24 (Rev. CoP16) on *Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II* had proved problematic. These were: interpretation of the opening paragraph of Annex 4 on precautionary measures; the appropriate timescales over which to assess forward projections of declines; and the use of data of uncertain quality. They believed that elaboration of further guidance in these areas would be useful to Parties for applying the criteria contained in the Resolution, and stated that IUCN and TRAFFIC stood ready to assist in elaborating such guidance.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) drew attention to Annex 5 to document CoP17 Doc. 88.3, containing the report of the *Fifth FAO Expert Advisory Panel for the Assessment of Proposals to Amend Appendices I and II of CITES Concerning Commercially-exploited Fish Species*. They stressed that the Panel made strenuous efforts to provide fair and balanced reviews against specific terms of reference, based on inputs from a range of experts. The Panel's report was intended to be a key reference to assist Parties in judging amendment proposals, but did not make specific recommendations as to whether or not to accept proposals. They noted the limited time that the Parties had to make use of the Panel's findings, and asked the Committee to consider improved ways in which objective, transparent, scientific advice on the amendment proposals could be provided to the Parties before the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. They also proposed that they work with the Secretariat in order to suggest ways forward, within the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between CITES and FAO.

The Chair indicated that the full interventions by FAO and IUCN would be included as annexes to the summary record (see Annex 1).

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 1, to delete *Bison bison athabasca* from Appendix II, was introduced by Canada.

Brazil, Chile, China, Egypt, the European Union, Kenya, Norway, Qatar and the United States of America supported the proposal.

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 1 to delete *Bison bison athabasca* from Appendix II was accepted by consensus.

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 2, to include *Capra caucasica* in Appendix II, with a zero quota for wild-taken *Capra caucasica caucasica* exported for commercial purposes or as hunting trophies, was introduced by Georgia and the European Union. The co-proponents drew attention to document CoP17 Inf. 16 which contained additional information on the export for commercial purposes or as hunting trophies of the species.

India, Ukraine and Humane Society International (HSI) supported the proposal, with the annotation for a zero export quota. The Russian Federation opposed the proposal, emphasising that it was the largest range State for the species, that the Russian population was stable and that controlled hunting provided incentives for the conservation of the species and its habitat. They also questioned the accuracy of some of the information in the proposal's supporting statement.

Canada, supported by the United States of America, expressed concern regarding the annotation for a zero export quota, noting that it would result in measures stricter than those that would apply in an Appendix-I listing and querying whether it would provide any additional benefit, given that the subspecies was already protected at national level and that the threats it faced were domestic. South Africa believed that only *Capra caucasica caucasica* met the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II.

The European Union and Georgia proposed amending the proposal by removing reference to a zero quota for wild-taken *Capra caucasica caucasica*. Canada and Guyana supported this. The Russian Federation suggested that an Appendix-III listing for Georgia could be more appropriate, but agreed not to block consensus to support the amended proposal.

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 2 to include *Capra caucasica* in Appendix II, as amended so as to remove the zero quota annotation for wild-taken *Capra caucasica caucasica*, was accepted by consensus.

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 3, to amend annotations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the populations of *Vicugna vicugna* in Appendix II, was introduced by Peru, who noted that the current annotations were insufficiently clear. They reported that they had new relevant information and asked the Chair to delay the proposal's consideration until Parties had had time to review this information. Peru's request was supported by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador and the European Union. The Chair suspended discussion of proposal CoP17 Prop. 3 until Parties had had time to review the new text, once it had been made available.

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 5 to transfer *Puma concolor coryi* and *P. c. cougar* from Appendix I to Appendix II was introduced by Canada, who noted that the proposal resulted from the Periodic Review and was endorsed by the Animals Committee. The proposal included a recommendation that, should it be accepted, the Conference of the Parties adopt the standard taxonomic reference for mammals [Wilson and Reader (2005)] as the taxonomic reference for *Puma concolor*.

The United States of America explained that the proposal was essentially procedural and would have no effect on the conservation of *Puma concolor coryi* in the wild. However, they were aware that some countries with *Puma concolor* populations had raised concerns that the proposal, if adopted, might have an impact on domestic protection of those populations. They intended therefore to abstain if the proposal were to come to a vote.

Brazil, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Humane Society International and the Natural Resources Defense Council did not support the proposal, Costa Rica drawing attention to evidence of illegal trade in *Puma concolor*. Canada stressed that the proposal concerned only *Puma concolor coryi* and *P. c. cougar*, whose distribution was confined to Canada and the United States of America.

Chile, Colombia, the European Union and its member States, Mexico, Switzerland and the Documentation Centre for Species Protection supported the proposal.

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 5 to transfer *Puma concolor coryi* and *P. c. cougar* from Appendix I to Appendix II was accepted by consensus. The Committee agreed that the Annex to Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP16)

on *Standard nomenclature* be amended to reflect the fact that the taxonomic reference for *Puma concolor* would henceforth be Wilson and Reeder (2005).

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 6 to transfer *Equus zebra zebra* from Appendix I to Appendix II, was introduced by South Africa, who drew the Committee's attention to relevant supplementary information in documents CoP17 Inf. 38 and 39.

Burkina Faso, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, the European Union, Kenya, Senegal, the United Arab Emirates, the United States of America, Zimbabwe and the Safari Club International Foundation all supported the proposal.

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 6 to transfer *Equus zebra zebra* from Appendix I to Appendix II was accepted by consensus.

Consideration of **proposal CoP17 Prop. 7** regarding Swaziland's white rhinoceros was deferred.

Proposal CoP17 Prop. 8, to transfer *Manis crassicaudata* from Appendix II to Appendix I, was withdrawn by Bangladesh.

The Chair ruled that the following proposals for the transfer of Asian pangolin species from Appendix II to Appendix I be considered together: **CoP17 Prop. 9** relating to *Manis crassicaudata*, introduced by India; **CoP17 Prop. 10** relating to *M. culionensis*, introduced by the Philippines; and **CoP17 Prop. 11** relating to *M. javanica* and *M. pentadactyla*, introduced by Viet Nam.

The Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, the European Union and its member States, Israel, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Singapore, Sri Lanka and the United States of America supported the proposals. China noted the importance of joint efforts between producer, transit and consumer countries in tackling illegal trade in pangolins.

Proposals CoP17 Prop. 9 to transfer *Manis crassicaudata* from Appendix II to Appendix I and CoP17 Prop. 10 to transfer *M. culionensis* from Appendix II to Appendix I were accepted by consensus.

Regarding proposal CoP17 Prop. 11, Indonesia expressed the view that Appendix-I listings for *Manis javanica* and *M. pentadactyla* would not achieve conservation objectives. They believed that focussing on enforcement and engaging local communities would be more effective.

The Chair, realising there was no consensus, called for a vote. Proposal CoP17 Prop. 11 to transfer *Manis javanica* and *M. pentadactyla* from Appendix II to Appendix I was accepted, with 114 Parties voting in favour, one against and five abstaining (see Annex 2).

The session was adjourned at 12h00.

Intervention from IUCN and TRAFFIC on CITES Listing Criteria

Since 1987 IUCN and TRAFFIC have been pleased to provide their joint *Analyses of Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices*. Since the adoption of the CITES listing criteria in 1994 we have collected and critically analysed relevant information to assess the Proposals (not the Supporting Statements) against the criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (and its revisions). In response to feedback from Parties this time we undertook the analyses in 10 weeks rather than 12 in order to fit better with Parties' decision making processes.

In the *Analyses* we aim to provide an objective analysis of whether or not the proposals meet the listing criteria. They do not provide advice on whether or not the listing proposed should be adopted or would have positive or negative conservation benefits for the species or taxa being proposed. In cases where data are lacking we have noted that there are insufficient data to determine whether the taxon does or does not meet the criteria.

In Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP16), it is stated that "when considering proposals to amend Appendix I or II, the Parties shall, by virtue of the precautionary approach and in case of uncertainty ... act in the best interest of the conservation of the species concerned and adopt measures that are proportionate to the anticipated risks to the species". However, the Parties have never provided any clear guidance on how to implement a precautionary approach in the application of the CITES listing criteria; nor have they given guidance on how to handle information of uncertain quality. In contrast, IUCN's Red List guidelines provide extensive guidance on these aspects. In view of the lack of guidance from the CITES Parties, the IUCN TRAFFIC *Analyses of Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices* have always interpreted data and information objectively and have not attempted to apply a precautionary approach. In other words, in the absence of any clear guidance from the Parties on these aspects, IUCN and TRAFFIC do not consider it appropriate to apply our own views on risk tolerance or precaution when carrying out the *Analyses*.

A number of comments have been made to us regarding apparent discrepancies between the IUCN Red List assessments and the IUCN/TRAFFIC *Analyses*. Part of these differences relates to different information being used. Although the *Analyses* have drawn on the information in the Red List, we have used the most up-to-date available data, which is sometimes more recent than that included in the Red List.

Furthermore, although there are similarities between the two sets of criteria (Red List and CITES) there are also significant differences. Indeed the work in the 1990s to develop the CITES listing criteria initially drew on IUCN's parallel process to develop new criteria for the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, although the finalisation of the two sets of criteria was independent. Both the CITES Parties and IUCN adopted their new criteria in 1994.

In 2001, IUCN revised its own objective and quantitative criteria (with explicit thresholds), which increased the divergence from the CITES criteria. IUCN's criteria are applicable to a wide range of taxa so that all species can be classified using available information into one of a number of categories of extinction risk. Over 80,000 species have now been assessed by IUCN, and as a result of the learnings from this, extensive guidelines have been developed that are updated annually. The application of the guidelines has led to further divergence between the results that can be obtained by applying the two sets of criteria.

Whereas the IUCN Red List system requires that set numerical thresholds be met in order for a species to be listed in a particular Red List category, the CITES listing criteria only provide indicative, non-binding guidelines on numerical values in Annex 5 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16).

We would like to emphasise one particular issue. When considering possible future declines of species, the IUCN criteria (specifically criterion A3) seek to quantify a population size reduction projected or suspected to be met within the next 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer (up to a maximum of 100 years).

Although the CITES Listing criteria refer to projected (i.e., future) decreases and declines, unlike IUCN the Parties have provided no explicit guidance in the biological criteria for Appendix 1 on the time period over which future declines should be considered. The guidance on future declines given in Annex 5 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16) relates to Appendix 2, in Annex 2aA, not to Appendix 1 proposals.

In conclusion, and regardless of any differences between the CITES and IUCN criteria, IUCN and TRAFFIC suggests that the CITES Parties might want to consider doing work on the following aspects:

- Developing clear guidance on how to handle uncertainty in information on a species
- Likewise develop guidance on the application of the precautionary principle in listing
- And develop guidance on appropriate timescales for forward projections for species proposed for listing in Appendix I.

If requested, IUCN and TRAFFIC will be willing to provide further technical assistance to Parties on these aspects.

Intervention from FAO on the FAO Expert Advisory Panel

Parties implement fisheries and trade management measures, to get better outcomes for their people and environment. All management, represents a cost in resources and capacity, so the selection of a new management measure, should be based on the best available information, of its need, its suitability and a belief that its implementation will be successful.

One of the key pieces of information needed by Parties, when considering a new CITES listing, is an unbiased report of the species current biological status. This piece of information, informs the question of risk, to the species sustainable use for fishers today, and for generations to come.

This risk-based assessment is conducted by looking at species life history characteristics, plus its historical and current status against benchmarks or standards developed by CITES, FAO and others, which are the CITES criteria.

The FAO Expert Advisory Panel process has been put in place, to supply this very service.

FAO coordinates and hosts the FAO Expert Advisory Panel, for the Assessment of Proposals to Amend Appendices I and II of CITES, Concerning Commercially-exploited Aquatic Species. The Panels task is to provide a fair and balanced expert scientific peer review of CITES proposals. This requirement, responds to specific text in the CITES Convention which translates, through the FAO-CITES MoU (2006) to the Terms of Reference for the Expert Panel.

So how does this Panel work in practice?

As an example, the fifth Expert Panel held in June 2016, brought together 25 specialists on fisheries science, management and trade, plus specialists on individual species or species groupings, to review the information contained in the CITES listing proposals, provided in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16).

These woman and men from over fourteen countries across five continents were carefully selected through a formal process, required for such UN expert meetings, which follow UN modalities requiring FAO to approach Member States for clearance of Panel participants prior to invitations being sent out. Although Panel members participate in their personal capacity and not as representatives of a State or Organization, FAO ensures there is a balance of expertise and viewpoints available.

For example, in 2016 as well as a range of quantitative fisheries scientists and trade specialists, the Expert Panel also welcomed an illegal trade specialist from TRAFFIC, and both Co-chairs of the IUCN sharks specialist group were invited to attend as Expert Panel members. Lastly, two observers from the CITES Secretariat participated, to provide input on questions related to the CITES criteria and provisions of the Convention.

These scientists, specialists and observers bring current and direct knowledge of the questions under consideration. In many cases the Panel deliberate over datasets, where members had direct involvement in the original sourcing of the raw data presented in Proposals, or had peer reviewed scientific manuscripts containing that information. Therefore, there is usually a significant amount of first-hand knowledge of the material in question. FAO does however ensure that Expert Panel participants have no direct affiliation with the writing of the Proposals being assessed.

The critical biological, fishery and trade information assessed by the Panel, includes information on i) productivity of the species, ii) known declines (both the historical extent of decline and recent rate of decline), plus iii) information on the importance of the species in international trade, its current management and the likelihood that a listing of the species in CITES Appendices would improve its outlook for conservation.

The panel spends five days reviewing proposals against the CITES criteria:

- 1) Looking at the accuracy, relevance and suitability of any data and information used in each Proposal
- 2) The appropriateness of the methods of analysis used and whether or not they have been correctly applied
- 3) Modifying factors and the levels of uncertainty in the data and analyses, and whether these have been appropriately considered in the conclusions of the Proposals; and lastly
- 4) The validity of the results and conclusions, and hence the recommendations in each Proposal.

The FAO Expert Panel Report is the main output, and the FAO position on whether the Proposals, present information that supports a case for a species meeting the CITES criteria. The CITES Secretariat and Parties are then offered this information to help them decide if they believe a CITES listing is warranted.

It is important to note that FAO does not advise Parties on whether to list species, as that is the Sovereign responsibility of the Parties. What FAO is asked to do, is service the needs of the Parties, and the Secretariat, in regards collating the best available scientific and trade information to assist in the decision making process.

Historically, the Panels decisions have been well received by Parties, and the record shows, that the Panel has determined that species have met the Cites criteria, on more occasions, than Parties have decided to list them in the Appendices.

The process of receiving and reviewing Proposals, and preparing the Panel report prior for the COP is very time-limited. However, the FAO tries to ensure the CITES Secretariat and Parties are offered a clear view of the best available scientific and trade information, to allow them to make informed decisions.

Unlike many fisheries management bodies, there is little scope under the current CITES listing amendment process to resolve any conflicting views should the Panels evaluations be contested, and this puts at risk, Parties chances of receiving a coherent, balanced and unified scientific analysis, information they need to assist in their decision making.

Parties might be urged to consider ways to strengthen and improve the existing process for informing Parties of the scientific evaluation of Proposals, to ensure that decisions on amendments to the Appendices I and II are informed by objective and transparent evaluations, of the status of each population in relation to the CITES listing criteria and guidelines.

In conclusion, we now have three years to work intersessionally so that we are better placed to assist Parties in their decision making at the following Conference of Parties, CoP18, that will be held in 2019, and I welcome the opportunity to work with the Secretariat, under the existing provisions of the FAO – CITES MOU (paragraph 4) to further strengthen and improve the existing process. If the Chair feels this is useful, we could record this statement in the summary record of this meeting, for future reference.

Voting report sorted by nameConference Name **Com 1 Session 6**

9/28/2016

Customer field 1 AM

Subject Title

Prop 11

Long description

Short description

Chairman CHAIR
 Chairman Panel 01
 Chairman Panel 02
 Chairman Panel 03
 Chairman Panel 04
 Chairman Panel 05
 Chairman Panel 06

Total Vote Result

Voting start time 9/28/2016 12:01:30 PM
 Voting stop time 9/28/2016 12:02:01 PM
 Voting Configuration EU SUBSTANTIVE (2/3)
 Voting mode Open
 Vote Result Accepted

YES 114
 ABSTAIN 5
 NO 1

Group Voting Result

Group	Present	Absent	YES	ABSTAIN	NO	Not voted
Nations	126	11	114	5	1	33
Total Results	126	11	114	5	1	33

Individual Voting Result

Seat Number	Name	Present	YES	ABSTAIN	NO	Not voted	Time
615	Angola ()	X				X	
	Antigua and Barbuda ()						
617	Argentina ()	X	X				12:01:38 PM
619	Australia ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
620	Austria ()	X				X	
701	Bahrain ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
704	Belarus ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
705	Belgium ()	X				X	
706	Belize ()	X	X				12:01:38 PM
707	Benin ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
708	Bhutan ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
709	Bolivia ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
711	Botswana ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
712	Brazil ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
714	Bulgaria ()	X				X	
715	Burkina Faso ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
718	Cambodia ()	X	X				12:01:47 PM
719	Cameroon ()	X	X				12:01:35 PM
720	Canada ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
721	Central African Republic ()	X	X				12:01:40 PM
722	Chad ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
801	Chile ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM

Voting report sorted by name

Conference Name

Com 1 Session 6

9/28/2016

Seat Number	Name	Present	YES	ABSTAIN	NO	Not voted	Time
802	China ()	X		X			12:01:34 PM
803	Colombia ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
805	Congo ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
806	Costa Rica ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
807	Côte d'Ivoire ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
808	Croatia ()	X				X	
809	Cuba ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
810	Cyprus ()	X				X	
811	Czech Republic ()	X				X	
812	D R Congo ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
813	Denmark ()	X				X	
816	Dominican Republic ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
817	Ecuador ()	X	X				12:01:36 PM
818	Egypt ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
822	Estonia ()	X				X	
904	European Union ()	X	X [28]				12:01:37 PM
905	Fiji ()	X	X				12:01:36 PM
906	Finland ()	X				X	
907	France ()	X				X	
908	Gabon ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
909	Gambia ()	X	X				12:01:39 PM
910	Georgia ()	X	X				12:01:36 PM
911	Germany ()	X				X	
913	Greece ()	X				X	
915	Guatemala ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
916	Guinea ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
918	Guyana ()	X	X				12:01:38 PM
919	Honduras ()	X	X				12:01:37 PM
920	Hungary ()	X				X	
106	Iceland ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
107	India ()	X	X				12:01:36 PM
108	Indonesia ()	X			X		12:01:32 PM
109	Iran ()	X	X				12:01:41 PM
111	Ireland ()	X				X	
112	Israel ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
113	Italy ()	X				X	
114	Jamaica ()	X	X				12:01:35 PM
115	Japan ()	X		X			12:01:33 PM
116	Jordan ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
201	Kenya ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
202	Kuwait ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
204	Lao PDR ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
205	Latvia ()	X				X	
206	Lebanon ()	X	X				12:01:37 PM
	Libya ()						
	Liechtenstein ()						
211	Lithuania ()	X				X	
212	Luxembourg ()	X				X	
213	Madagascar ()	X		X			12:01:37 PM
214	Malawi ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
215	Malaysia ()	X				X	
216	Maldives ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
217	Mali ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
218	Malta ()	X				X	
	Mauritania ()						
220	Mauritius ()	X				X	
221	Mexico ()	X	X				12:01:35 PM
222	Monaco ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
	Montenegro ()						
303	Morocco ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
304	Mozambique ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM

Voting report sorted by name

Conference Name

Com 1 Session 6

9/28/2016

Seat Number	Name	Present	YES	ABSTAIN	NO	Not voted	Time
305	Myanmar ()	X	X				12:01:39 PM
306	Namibia ()	X		X			12:02:00 PM
307	Nepal ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
308	Netherlands ()	X				X	
309	New Zealand ()	X	X				12:01:36 PM
310	Nicaragua ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
311	Niger ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
312	Nigeria ()	X	X				12:01:40 PM
313	Norway ()	X	X				12:01:35 PM
314	Oman ()	X		X			12:01:46 PM
315	Pakistan ()	X	X				12:01:37 PM
317	Panama ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
320	Peru ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
321	Philippines ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
322	Poland ()	X				X	
401	Portugal ()	X				X	
403	Rep of Korea ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
	Republic of Moldova ()						
405	Romania ()	X				X	
406	Russian Federation ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
	Rwanda ()						
	Saint Kitts and Nevis ()						
	Saint Lucia ()						
	Samoa ()						
415	Senegal ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
	Sierra Leone ()						
419	Singapore ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
420	Slovakia ()	X				X	
421	Slovenia ()	X				X	
501	Somalia ()	X				X	
503	South Africa ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
504	Spain ()	X				X	
505	Sri Lanka ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
508	Swaziland ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
509	Sweden ()	X				X	
510	Switzerland ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
511	Syrian Arab Republic ()	X	X				12:01:55 PM
512	Tajikistan ()	X	X				12:01:41 PM
602	Tanzania ()	X	X				12:01:38 PM
513	Thailand ()	X	X				12:01:31 PM
515	Togo ()	X				X	
517	Trinidad and Tobago ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
518	Tunisia ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
519	Turkey ()	X	X				12:01:42 PM
522	UAE ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
520	Uganda ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
521	Ukraine ()	X	X				12:01:34 PM
601	United Kingdom ()	X				X	
604	Uruguay ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
603	USA ()	X	X				12:01:33 PM
607	Venezuela ()	X	X				12:01:32 PM
608	Vietnam ()	X	X				12:01:35 PM
610	Zambia ()	X	X				12:01:30 PM
611	Zimbabwe ()	X	X				12:01:35 PM