# PROPOSED DRAFT DISCIPLINES ON DOMESTIC REGULATION

## *ESF COMMENTARY*

*In this commentary, the ESF's comments appear in red italics, and the text of the proposed draft disciplines is reproduced (in black type) from the WPDR Chairman's text dated 18 April 2007.*

*Two tables (of Developing Countries and LDCs) are attached to this commentary.*

*General*

*Although the WPDR Chairman's text may genuinely represent the extent of common ground between members of the WPDR, it is a generally weak document. In particular, it does little more than elaborate generally on GATS Article VI.2-3, without including material specifying in greater specificity the obligations on WTO members under GATS Article VI.4. This is disappointing. As to transparency, it carefully goes no further than a "best endeavours" provision on making draft legislation available for comment before implementation. It represents a small advance on present obligations, but too little to be any useful basis for a binding commitment to prior consultation on changes in domestic regulation.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. Having regard to Article VI:4 of the GATS, Members have agreed to the following disciplines on domestic regulation.

2. The purpose of these disciplines is to facilitate trade in services by ensuring that measures relating to licensing requirements and procedures, qualification requirements and procedures, and technical standards are based on objective and transparent criteria, such as competence and the ability to supply the service, and do not constitute disguised restrictions on trade in services.

3. Members recognize the right to regulate, and to introduce new regulations, on the supply of services within their territories in order to meet national policy objectives and, given asymmetries existing with respect to the degree of development of services regulations in different countries, the particular need of developing countries to exercise this right.

4. Members recognize the difficulties which may be faced by individual developing countries in implementing disciplines on domestic regulation, particularly difficulties relating to level of development, size of the economy, and regulatory and institutional capacity. Members also note the difficulties which may be faced by service suppliers of developing countries in complying with measures relating to licensing requirements and procedures, qualification requirements and procedures, and technical standards of other Members.

*Commentary*

*Part I (above) is essentially declaratory rather than substantive. It recalls and repeats many provisions of the GATS which are in any case binding on WTO members. In the ESF's view, Part I should be strengthened by a general provision on the following lines:*

*"In exercising domestic regulatory requirements, each member shall endeavour to accord to service providers of other contracting parties and to investors of such members, no less favourable treatment than it accords to its own service providers and investors in like circumstances unless otherwise notified to other contracting parties as an exception to the general principle" .*

## II. DEFINITIONS

5. "Licensing requirements" are substantive requirements, other than qualification requirements, with which a natural or a juridical person is required to comply in order to obtain, amend or renew authorization to supply a service.

6. "Licensing procedures" are administrative or procedural rules that a natural or a juridical person, seeking authorization to supply a service, including the amendment or renewal of a licence, must adhere to in order to demonstrate compliance with licensing requirements.

7. "Qualification requirements" are substantive requirements relating to the competence of a natural person to supply a service, and which are required to be demonstrated for the purpose of obtaining authorization to supply a service.

8. "Qualification procedures" are administrative or procedural rules that a natural person must adhere to in order to demonstrate compliance with qualification requirements, for the purpose of obtaining authorization to supply a service.

9. "Technical standards" are measures that lay down the characteristics of a service or the manner in which it is supplied. Technical standards also include the procedures relating to the enforcement of such standards.

*Commentary*

*Many of the above definitions are expressed in very general terms, adding little to the content of the GATS. It is a matter of concern that "procedures" are defined as administrative or procedural rules with which an applicant for authorisation must comply: there is no mention of the authorising body having to comply with authorisation procedures.*

## III. GENERAL PROVISIONS

10. These disciplines apply to measures by Members relating to licensing requirements and procedures, qualification requirements and procedures, and technical standards affecting trade in services in sectors where specific commitments are undertaken. They do not apply to measures which constitute limitations subject to scheduling under Article XVI or XVII.

11. Measures relating to licensing requirements and procedures, qualification requirements and procedures, and technical standards shall be pre-established, based on objective criteria and relevant to the supply of the services to which they apply.

12. Nothing in these disciplines prevents Members from exercising the right to introduce or maintain regulations in order to ensure provision of universal service, in a manner consistent with their obligations and commitments under the GATS.

*Commentary*

*The above General Provisions are noteworthy in taking a very restricted view of the ambit of the proposed disciplines. The question of how widely GATS Disciplines should apply is one on which ESF members are divided. The issue can best be analysed in terms of transparency disciplines, on the one hand, and other disciplines (legitimacy, necessity, proportionality and sectoral disciplines) on the other:*

*Transparency: all members of the ESF accept the general principle that transparency disciplines should apply to all services sectors, irrespective of whether a WTO Member has undertaken commitments. In taking this view, they are consciously adopting a 'trade-friendly' approach for transparency measures falling under Articles III and VI. The logic for this approach is that, even if no commitments have yet been entered into by a WTO Member, they may be in the future. In such*

*circumstances, if transparency disciplines already applied, service suppliers would immediately have greater legal certainty than might otherwise be the case. Given that the EU belongs to the 31 WTO Members that have committed in more that 100 sectors, and that about half of the WTO Members' commitments cover 40 sectors or fewer, the EU would be among the Members that would most benefit from this approach.*

*Other Disciplines (Legitimacy, Necessity, Proportionality and Sectoral Disciplines): some ESF members (those with 'offensive' interests in the expansion of internationally traded services) would support the application of the same 'trade-friendly' approach to the application of all GATS disciplines in the interests of liberalising trade in services and furthering the expansion of regulatory regimes based on internationally agreed standards (the financial services and the sound recording industry sectors, for instance, would favour this approach). But certain other service activities or entities, also represented on the ESF, have reservations with respect to legally binding horizontal disciplines regarding legitimacy, necessity and proportionality, as regards activities that are based on non-economic public policy principles (such as the maintenance of cultural diversity, or the public provision of an essential service). In such cases there may be priorities that are different from those commercial businesses in internationally traded services sectors interested in trade liberalisation for the expansion of their markets. Indeed, in some cases such service activities or entities have non-commercial priorities requiring a degree of protection from full market openness if their public policy objectives are to be achieved.*

*There is no doubt that, in terms of their importance for the EU economy as a whole, the internationally traded sectors favouring universal application of GATS disciplines outweigh, in terms of export earnings, worldwide investment, growth potential and other economic measures, those favouring a more restrictive approach. However, in the view of the ESF, this cannot – and should not – be the deciding factor in choosing an approach to be applied to all sectors. A distinction needs to be made to allow for the attainment of legitimate public policy objectives which are quite separate from those relevant to the expansion of international commerce in traded services.*

*In addition, there is certainly a case for the disciplines to apply to measures which constitute limitations subject to scheduling under Article XVI or XVII, and also to additional commitments under GATS Article XVIII.*

## IV. TRANSPARENCY

13. Each Member shall ensure that measures of general application relating to licensing requirements and procedures, qualification requirements and procedures, and technical standards are promptly published through printed or electronic means. Where publication is not practicable, these measures shall be made publicly available in a manner that enables any interested persons to become acquainted with them.

14. In fulfilling its obligations under paragraph 13, each Member shall ensure that detailed information regarding the measures concerned is also published through printed or electronic means, or otherwise made publicly available in a manner that enables any interested persons to become acquainted with them.

15. Each Member shall maintain or establish appropriate mechanisms for responding to enquiries from any interested persons regarding any measures relating to licensing requirements and procedures, qualification requirements and procedures, and technical standards. Such enquiries may be addressed through the enquiry and contact points established under Articles III and IV of the GATS or any other mechanisms as appropriate.

16. Each Member shall endeavour to ensure that any measures of general application it proposes to adopt in relation to matters falling within the scope of these disciplines are published in advance. Each Member should endeavour to provide reasonable opportunities for interested persons, including those of other Members, to comment on such proposed measures. Each Member should also endeavour to address

collectively in writing substantive issues raised in comments received from interested persons with respect to the proposed measures.

*Commentary*

*The above provisions are simple and straightforward, but go little further than GATS Articles III and IV. It is regrettable that paragraph 16 is expressed in "best endeavours" terms, and is limited (in the case of written responses to representations) to "collective" responses covering substantive representations. There is an obvious risk that action under this "best endeavours" provision, even when it is adhered to, will do little to open effective dialogue in response to representations.*

## V. LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

17. Where residency requirements for licensing not subject to scheduling under Article XVII of the GATS exist, each Member shall consider whether alternative less trade restrictive means could be employed to achieve the purposes for which these requirements were established.

*Commentary*

*The above provision is disappointingly open-ended. ESF would like a provision eschewing residency requirements except in cases of demonstrable necessity, or, failing that, at least a commitment to use best endeavours to find an alternative to a residency requirement. After all, a residency requirement ought only to be introduced where it can be shown, in the terms of GATS Article VI.4(b), to meet the necessity test of being "no more burdensome than necessary to ensure the quality of the service". The proposed commitment, going no further than to "consider whether alternative less trade restrictive means could be employed", is very weak indeed.*

*As well as residency requirements, the ESF would like to see a provision on nationality requirements, on the following lines:*

*"Members shall not require a service provider of another party to engage individuals of any particular nationality as directors, senior management or other essential staff".*

## VI. LICENSING PROCEDURES

18. Each Member shall ensure that licensing procedures, including application procedures, and, where applicable, renewal procedures, are as simple as possible and do not in themselves constitute a restriction on the supply of services. Applicants shall be allowed a reasonable period for the submission of licence applications and, in principle, not be required to approach more than one competent authority in connection with an application for a licence.

19. Each Member shall ensure that the decisions of, and the procedures used by, the competent authority are impartial with respect to all market participants. To this end, a competent authority should be separate from and not accountable to any supplier of the services for which a licence is required.

20. An applicant should be permitted to submit an application at any time. The competent authority shall initiate the processing of an application without undue delay. Wherever possible, applications should be accepted in electronic format under the same conditions of authenticity as paper submissions.

21. The competent authority shall, after receipt of an application, inform the applicant whether the application is considered complete. In the case of an incomplete application, the competent authority shall identify the additional information required to complete the application and provide the opportunity to correct deficiencies within a reasonable timeframe. Upon request, the competent authority shall notify the applicant without undue delay of the status of the application.

22. Authenticated copies should be accepted, wherever possible, in place of original documents.

23. If a licence application is rejected by the competent authority, the applicant shall be informed in writing and without undue delay. In principle, the applicant shall, upon request, also be informed of the reasons for rejection of the application and of the timeframe for an appeal against the decision. An applicant should be permitted, within reasonable time limits, to resubmit an application.

24. Each Member shall ensure that the processing of a licensing application, including reaching a final decision, is completed within a reasonable timeframe from the submission of a complete application. Each Member shall endeavour to establish and to publish the normal timeframe for processing of an application.

25. A licence, once granted, enters into effect without undue delay.

26. Each Member shall ensure that any licensing fees are commensurate with the costs incurred by the competent authorities and do not in themselves restrict the supply of the service.

*Commentary*

*The above provisions are commendably strong and simple. They would be improved by the deletion of "in principle" (inexact and ultimately meaningless) in paragraph 18. It is not clear whether the use of "should" (as against "shall") at various points is intended to convey a weaker degree of obligation than "shall". For the avoidance of doubt, "shall" should be used throughout.*

## VII. QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

27. In verifying and assessing qualifications, the competent authority shall give positive consideration to relevant professional experience of the applicant as a complement to educational qualifications. Where membership in a relevant professional association in the territory of another Member is indicative of the level of competence or extent of experience of the applicant, such membership shall also be given positive consideration.

28. Residency requirements, other than those subject to scheduling under Article XVII of the GATS, shall not be a pre-requisite for assessing and verifying the competence of a service supplier of another Member.

29. Once qualification requirements and any applicable licensing requirements have been fulfilled, each Member shall ensure that a service supplier is allowed to supply the service without undue delay.

*Commentary*

*These provisions are of mixed quality. Paragraph 27 is a weak and uncertain provision: what is meant by "positive" consideration? If "favourable consideration" is meant, it would be an improvement to use this term. As regards membership of a professional association, it would be helpful to include a commitment to use best endeavours towards either mutual recognition of qualifications or unilateral recognition of qualifications meeting a sufficiently similar standard to those of the host state. Paragraphs 28 and 29 do not suffer from these weaknesses. But, as well as residency requirements, the ESF would like to see a provision on nationality requirements, on the following lines:*

*"Members shall not require a service provider of another party to engage individuals of any particular nationality as directors, senior management or other essential staff".*

## VIII. QUALIFICATION PROCEDURES

30. Each Member shall ensure that qualification procedures are as simple as possible and do not in themselves constitute a restriction on the supply of services. Applicants shall, in principle, not be required to approach more than one competent authority for qualification procedures.

31. Each Member shall ensure that adequate procedures exist for the verification and assessment of qualifications held by service suppliers of other Members.

32. Provided an applicant has presented supporting evidence of qualifications, the competent authority, in verifying and assessing qualifications, shall identify any deficiency and advise the applicant of requirements to meet the deficiency. Such requirements may include course work, examinations, training, and work experience. Each Member shall provide the opportunity to applicants to fulfil such requirements in the home, host or any third jurisdiction, wherever possible.

33. Each Member shall ensure that examinations, if required, are scheduled at reasonably frequent intervals. Applicants for examinations shall be allowed a reasonable period for the submission of applications.

34. An applicant should be permitted to submit an application at any time. The competent authority shall initiate the processing of an application without undue delay.

35. The competent authority shall, after receipt of an application, inform the applicant whether the application is considered complete. In the case of an incomplete application, the competent authority shall identify the additional information required to complete the application and provide the opportunity to correct deficiencies within a reasonable timeframe. Upon request, the competent authority shall notify the applicant without undue delay of the status of the application.

36. Authenticated copies should be accepted, wherever possible, in place of original documents.

37. If an application for verification and assessment of qualification is rejected by the competent authority, the applicant shall be informed in writing and without undue delay. In principle, the applicant shall, upon request, also be informed of the reasons for rejection of the application and of the timeframe for an appeal against the decision. An applicant should be permitted, within reasonable time limits, to resubmit an application.

38. Each Member shall ensure that the processing of an application, including verification and assessment of a qualification, is completed within a reasonable timeframe from the submission of a complete application. Each Member shall endeavour to establish and to publish the normal timeframe for processing of an application.

39. Each Member shall ensure that any fees relating to qualification procedures are commensurate with the costs incurred by the competent authorities and do not in themselves restrict the supply of the service.

*Commentary*

*As in the case of paragraphs 18-26, the above provisions are commendably strong and simple. They would be improved by the deletion of "in principle" (inexact and ultimately meaningless) in paragraph 30. It is not clear whether the use of "should" (as against "shall") at various points is intended to convey a weaker degree of obligation than "shall". For the avoidance of doubt, "shall" should be used throughout.*

*Paragraph 39 should make clear that the relationship between fees and costs relates to costs directly arising from the qualification process, and does not relate to indirect costs (wider official overheads, etc) that could be allocated in fixing fees.*

## IX. TECHNICAL STANDARDS

40. Members are encouraged to ensure maximum transparency of relevant processes relating to the development and application of domestic and international standards by non-governmental bodies.

41. Where technical standards are required and relevant international standards exist or their completion is imminent, Members should take them or the relevant parts of them into account in formulating their

technical standards, except when such international standards or relevant parts would be an ineffective or inappropriate means for the fulfilment of national policy objectives.

*Commentary*

*The above provisions need to be considered by reference to other WTO provisions on technical standards, with which they need to be consistent.*

## X. DEVELOPMENT

42. A developing country Member shall not be required to apply these disciplines for a period of [X] years from their date of entry into force. Before the end of this transitional time period, upon request by a developing country Member, the Council for Trade in Services may extend the time period to implement these disciplines, based on that Member's level of development, size of the economy, and regulatory and institutional capacity.

43. A Member may accord reduced administrative fees to service suppliers from developing country Members.

44. Where circumstances allow for the phased introduction of new licensing requirements and procedures, qualification requirements and procedures, and technical standards, Members shall consider longer phase-in periods for such measures in service sectors and modes of supply of export interest to developing country Members.

45. Developed country Members, and to the extent possible other Members, shall provide technical assistance to developing country Members and in particular least-developed country Members (LDCs), upon their request and on mutually agreed terms and conditions. Technical assistance shall be aimed, inter alia at:

a) developing and strengthening institutional and regulatory capacities to regulate the supply of services and to implement these disciplines;
b) assisting developing country and in particular LDC service suppliers to meet the relevant requirements and procedures in export markets;
c) facilitating the establishment of technical standards and participation of developing country Members and in particular LDCs facing resource constraints in the relevant international organizations;
d) assisting, through public or private bodies and relevant international organizations, service suppliers of developing country Members in building their supply capacity and in complying with domestic regulation in their markets. Such assistance may also be provided directly to the respective service suppliers.

46. LDCs shall not be required to apply these disciplines. LDCs are nonetheless encouraged to apply these disciplines, to the extent compatible with their special economic situation and their development, trade and financial needs.

*Commentary*

*The above provisions are very disappointing, and threaten to negate the limited value of the text as a whole. As matters currently stand, developing countries (like all WTO members) are bound to adhere to a simplified version of domestic regulation disciplines (GATS Article VI): the proposed disciplines should not weaken (or seem to weaken) existing GATS provisions. It is important for all countries to adhere to GATS Article VI, which – for all its insufficiencies – binds all WTO members to certain minimum standards of "due process" in licensing procedures.*

*Given that the proposed disciplines (to the extent that they genuinely build on existing GATS provisions), are frequently expressed in "best endeavours" terms, it was at least to be expected that they would be binding on all WTO members. Instead, the effect of the "Development" provisions is that some two-thirds of WTO members would be exempted from them, either for a transitional period or altogether.*

*There is a further effect of the non-binding nature of these provisions: uncertainty is created, because there is no agreed list of countries that are to be regarded as "developing". In the case of Least Developed Countries there is at least a UN list of some 50 LDCs (attached) as established after the 2006 UN Triennial Review. But, in the case of "developing" countries, "developing" status is a matter of self-selection, with no clear concept of "graduation", and covers countries in widely different stages of development. The attached list of current beneficiaries (some 200 countries and territories) of the EC's scheme under the Generalised System of Preferences indicates the full range of countries to be considered as LDCs or "developing": in the ESF's view, up to 50 of these could be classed as developing country markets which might reasonably be expected to be in a position to comply with the proposed disciplines.*

*ESF takes the view that is in developing and least developed countries' own interest to apply the disciplines and been seen to do so. At the same time, ESF recognises that their may be genuine capacity difficulties in assuming a binding commitment to do so. ESF suggests that the solution to this problem is not the combination of transitional periods and/or total exemption proposed in the current text. Instead, the WPDR should consider a model on the lines of the implementation provisions in the draft texts of a Trade Facilitation Agreement being considered in the WTO Negotiating Group on Trade Facilitation. This envisages an initial "best endeavours" regime binding on all developing countries and LDCs, plus a needs assessment and capacity building programme to ensure that all WTO members will take on binding commitments, once they have the capacity to do so. This approach, balancing staged capacity-building matched to the assumption of commitments, is far preferable to the partial or total exemption regime contemplated in the above provisions.*

*These provisions also take no account of the fact that 'conditions' and 'levels of development' differ enormously between sectors in developing countries, giving raise to questions and anomalies in applying the same disciplines (and "best endeavours" or exemption provisions) in all cases. For instance, shipping in China is a highly developed sector with global reach. Some way should be found of giving due weight to the level of development and commercial strength of individual sectors.*

## XI. INSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

47. The Council for Trade in Services shall establish a Committee on Domestic Regulation to oversee the implementation of these disciplines and the operation of Article VI of the GATS including any further work under Article VI:4 of the GATS.

48. The Council for Trade in Services shall, upon request from any Member, review the operation of these disciplines and make recommendations as appropriate.

*Commentary*

*The above provisions appear unobjectionable.*

* * *

***Contact:*** ***ESF Rapporteur: John Cooke (cooke.ja@virgin.net)***
***European Services Forum***
***July 2007***

European Services Forum

# List of ESF Members Supporting the ESF COMMENTARY ON DOMESTIC REGULATION DRAFT DISCIPLINES

1. Accenture
2. AIG Europe S.A.
3. Architects' Council of Europe – ACE
4. ARD
5. Association of Commercial Televisions – ACT
6. Barclays PLC
7. British Telecommunications plc - BT
8. Budesverband des Freien Berufe – BFB
9. Bureau International des Producteurs et Intermédiaires d'Assurances – BIPAR
10. BUSINESSEUROPE
11. BUSINESSEUROPE WTO Working Group
12. Confederation of Bristish Industry - CBI
13. Comité Européen des Assurances - C.E.A.
14. European Council of the Liberal Professions – CEPLIS
15. Conffédération Fiscale Européenne - CFE
16. Clifford Chance
17. Comité de Liaison des Géomètres Européens – CLGE
18. Commerzbank AG
19. Deutsche Bank AG
20. Deutsche Telekom AG
21. DHL Worldwide Network SA
22. EDS Europe, Middle East & Africa
23. EK - Confederation of Finnish Industries
24. Ernst & Young
25. Eurelectric - Union of the Electricity Industry
26. EuroCommerce
27. European Association of Cooperative Banks – EACB
28. European Banking Federation – FBE
29. European Broadcasting Union - EBU
30. European Community Shipowners' Associations – ECSA
31. European Express Association – EEA
32. European Federation of Engineering and Consultancy Association – EFCA
33. European Film GATS Steering Group
34. European International Contractors - EIC
35. European Public Telecom Network – ETNO
36. European Retail Round Table – ERRT
37. European Savings Banks Group – ESBG
38. European Satellite Operators Association - ESOA
39. Federation of European Consultancies Associations – FEACO
40. Fédération des Experts Comptables Européens – FEE
41. Fédération de l'Industrie Européenne de la Construction – FIEC
42. France Telecom
43. Free and Fair Post Initiative -FFPI
44. Goldman Sachs International
45. IBM Europe, Middle East & Africa
46. International Federation of the Phonographic Industry – IFPI
47. International Financial Services, London - IFSL
48. KPMG
49. La Poste
50. Law Society of England & Wales
51. Lloyd's of London
52. Oracle Europe, Middle East & Africa
53. PricewaterhouseCoopers
54. Prudential
55. Royal Ahold NV
56. Royal Bank of Scotland – RBS
57. Siemens AG.
58. Standard Chartered Bank
59. Svenskt Näringsliv (Confederation of Swedish Enterprise)
60. Telecom Italia
61. Telefónica SA
62. Telenor Group
63. TNT
64. TUI A.G.
65. Universal Music International
66. UNIQA Versicherungen AG
67. Veolia Environnement
68. Zenit

ESF • Avenue de Cortenbergh, 168 • B – 1000 - Brussels • Belgium • TVA BE 863.418.279
Email: esf@esf.be • Tel : +32-2-230 75 14 • Fax : +32-2-230 61 68 • www.esf.be

**Annex I**

**UN list of LDCs after the 2006 Triennial Review**

| | |
|---|---|
| Afghanistan | Madagascar |
| Angola | Malawi |
| Bangladesh | Maldives |
| Benin | Mali |
| Bhutan | Mauritania |
| Burkina Faso | Mozambique |
| Burundi | Myanmar |
| Cambodia | Nepal |
| Cape Verde | Niger |
| Central African Republic | Rwanda |
| Chad | Samoa |
| Comoros | Sao Tome and Principe |
| Congo (Democratic Republic of the) | Senegal |
| Djibouti | Sierra Leone |
| Equatorial Guinea | Solomon Islands |
| Eritrea | Somalia |
| Ethiopia | Sudan |
| Gambia | Tanzania (United Rep. of) |
| Guinea | Timor-Leste |
| Guinea-Bissau | Togo |
| Haiti | Tuvalu |
| Kiribati | Uganda |
| Lao People's Democratic Rep. | Vanuatu |
| Lesotho | Yemen |
| Liberia | Zambia |

Total: 50 Countries

**Annex II**

**Developing Countries and LDCs (as shown by EU GSP Beneficiaries)**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| AE United Arab Emirates | EC Ecuador | LR Liberia | SH Santa Helena |
| AF Afghanistan | EG Egypt | LS Lesotho | SL Sierra Leone |
| AG Antigua and Barbuda | ER Eritrea | LY Libyan Arab | SN Senegal |
| AI Anguilla | ET Ethiopia | Jamahiriya | SO Somalia |
| AM Armenia | FJ Fiji | MA Morocco | SR Suriname |
| AN Netherlands Antilles | FK Falklands Islands | MD Moldova, Republic of | ST São Tomé and Príncipe |
| AO Angola | FM Micronesia, | MG Madagascar | SV El Salvador |
| AQ Antarctica | Federated States of | MH Marshall Islands | SY Syrian Arab Republic |
| AR Argentina | GA Gabon | ML Mali | SZ Swaziland |
| AS American Samoa | GD Grenada | MM Myanmar | TC Turks and Caicos |
| AW Aruba | GE Georgia | MN Mongolia | Islands |
| AZ Azerbaijan | GH Ghana | MO Macao | TD Chad |
| BB Barbados | GI Gibraltar | MP Northern Mariana | TF French Southern |
| BD Bangladesh | GL Greenland | Islands | territories |
| BF Burkina Faso | GM Gambia | MR Mauritania | TG Togo |
| BH Bahrain | GN Guinea | MS Montserrat | TH Thailand |
| BI Burundi | GQ Equatorial Guinea | MU Mauritius | TJ Tajikistan |
| BJ Benin | GS South Georgia & | MV Maldives | TK Tokelau |
| BM Bermuda | South Sandwich Islands | MW Malawi | TL Timor-Leste |
| BN Brunei Darussalam | GT Guatemala | MX Mexico | TM Turkmenistan |
| BO Bolivia | GU Guam | MY Malaysia | TN Tunisia |
| BR Brazil | GW Guinea-Bissau | MZ Mozambique | TO Tonga |
| BS Bahamas | GY Guyana | NA Namibia | TT Trinidad and Tobago |
| BT Bhutan | HM Heard Island and | NC New Caledonia | TV Tuvalu |
| BV Bouvet Island | McDonald Islands | NE Niger | TZ Tanzania (United |
| BW Botswana | HN Honduras | NF Norfolk Island | Republic of) |
| BY Belarus | HT Haiti | NG Nigeria | UA Ukraine |
| BZ Belize | ID Indonesia | NI Nicaragua | UG Uganda |
| CC Cocos Islands | IN India | NP Nepal | UM United States Minor |
| (or Keeling Islands) | IO British Indian Ocean | NR Nauru | outlying islands |
| CD Congo, Democratic | Territory | NU Niue Island | UY Uruguay |
| Republic of | IQ Iraq | OM Oman | UZ Uzbekistan |
| CF Central African | IR Iran, Islamic Republic | PA Panama | VC St Vincent & the |
| Republic | of | PE Peru | Grenadines |
| CG Congo | JM Jamaica | PF French Polynesia | VE Venezuela |
| CI Côte d'Ivoire | JO Jordan | PG Papua New Guinea | VG Virgin Islands |
| CK Cook Islands | KE Kenya | PH Philippines | (British) |
| CL Chile | KG Kyrgyzstan | PK Pakistan | VI Virgin Islands (USA) |
| CM Cameroon | KH Cambodia | PM St Pierre and | VN Vietnam |
| CN China, People's | KI Kiribati | Miquelon | VU Vanuatu |
| Republic of | KM Comoros | PN Pitcairn | WF Wallis and Futuna |
| CO Colombia | KN St Kitts and Nevis | PW Palau | WS Samoa |
| CR Costa Rica | KW Kuwait | PY Paraguay | YE Yemen |
| CU Cuba | KY Cayman Islands | QA Qatar | YT Mayotte |
| CV Cape Verde | KZ Kazakhstan | RU Russian Federation | ZA South Africa |
| CX Christmas Islands | LA Lao People's | RW Rwanda | ZM Zambia |
| DJ Djibouti | Democratic Republic | SA Saudi Arabia | ZW Zimbabwe |
| DM Dominica | LB Lebanon | SB Solomon Islands | |
| DO Dominican Republic | LC St Lucia | SC Seychelles | |
| DZ Algeria | LK Sri Lanka | SD Sudan | |