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Part two

II. Applications for consultative status received from non-governmental organizations

2. The Committee considered item 3 of its agenda at its 716th-732nd and 734th meetings, from 17 to 28 January 2000.

3. It had before it a memorandum by the Secretary-General containing new applications for consultative status received from non-governmental organizations (E/C.2/1999/R.2 and Add.15-28), as well as two compilations of applications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions (E/C.2/1999/CRP.2 and CRP.3).

A. Applications for consultative status deferred from the 1998 session

International Committee of Peace and Human Rights

4. The Economic and Social Council, at its substantive session of 1995, decided to refer the application of the International Committee of Peace and Human Rights to the Committee for further consideration (see Council decision 1995/305). Subsequently, at its 1996 session, the Committee took note of a letter from the organization requesting that the Committee suspend consideration of its application, without prejudice, for one year (see E/1996/102, para. 5). At its 1997 session, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the application of the organization to its 1998 session, and requested that the organization submit the information it had offered to provide at the Committee’s 1996 session. At the 1998 session of the Committee, consideration of this application was deferred to the 1999 session and thereafter to the 1999 resumed session.

5. At its 772nd meeting, on 20 January 2000, in the absence of further communication from the organization, the Committee decided to close its consideration of the application of the International Committee for Peace and Human Rights for consultative status.

Assyrian National Congress

6. At its 1997 session, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the application of the Assyrian National Congress to its 1998 session, where further consideration was deferred to the 1999 regular session and thereafter to the 1999 resumed session.

7. At its 729th meeting, on 26 January 2000, the Committee reviewed the application of the Assyrian National Congress. Several delegations noted that this application had been before the Committee at previous sessions and that its responses to questions put to it were inadequate, particularly with regard to its aims and objectives and its definition of the terms “minority” and “indigenous” people. Some delegations found activities of the organization to be divisive and contrary to the principle of Council resolution 1996/31 and the United Nations Charter. These delegations referred in particular to the most recent correspondence from the Assyrian National Congress, in which the organization indicated that as its responses continued to fail to satisfy the Committee, its only option would be to appeal to the Economic and Social Council itself or some other such higher United Nations organ. Many delegations expressed their disapproval of both the failure to provide acceptable clarifications and the lack of respect for the Committee expressed by the organization, maintaining that neither frustration over a delayed decision nor ignorance of the Committee’s rules and procedures excused such a response.

8. It was decided by a roll call vote of 11 in favour to one against with six abstentions not to recommend the organization for consultative status. The voting was as follows:

_In favour:_
- Algeria, China, Cuba, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia and Turkey.

_Against:_
- United States of America.

_Abstaining:_
- Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, France, Ireland, Romania.

9. The Bolivian delegation made the following statement before the vote:
“My country recognizes the right of minorities in a constitutional framework, but, in view of the lack of sufficient evidence concerning the work of the non-governmental organization ‘Assyrian National Congress’, my delegation is not in a position to reject or accept this application and will accordingly abstain in the vote.”

Israel Women’s Network

10. At its 1998 session, the Committee decided to defer the application of the Israel Women’s Network to the 1999 session. At its 1999 session, the Committee had before it a letter from the Israel Women’s Network requesting deferral to its resumed 1999 session. At its 729th meeting, on 26 January 2000, the Committee had before it a letter from the Israel Women’s Network requesting a further deferral of its application to the 2000 session. The organization’s request was granted; however, the Committee made it clear that when a deferral is requested by an NGO, it is the prerogative of the Committee to determine on the basis of the reasons given and to decide whether or not to grant the request.

Local Government International Bureau

11. At its 1998 session, the Committee decided to defer the applications of the Local Government International Bureau and the Council for the Defence of Human Rights and Freedoms to its next regular session, in 1999.

12. At its 724th meeting, on 21 January 2000, the Committee discussed its earlier question concerning the eligibility of the Local Government International Bureau to be considered a non-governmental organization under the criteria contained in Council resolution 1996/31 in the light of its close association with local government associations. Concern was also expressed that the majority of this organization’s funding came from government.

13. Subsequently, it was decided to defer both applications to the 2000 session pending clarification of questions posed by the Committee.

B. Applications for consultative status deferred from the 1999 session

Human Rights International Alliance

14. At its 1999 session, the Committee considered the application of Human Rights International Alliance and decided to defer the application to its resumed session pending the receipt of further information from the organization.

15. At its 727th meeting, on 25 January, the Committee members discussed the activities of Human Rights International Alliance. Noting that one of the organization’s main objectives was to campaign for the release of “prisoners of conscience”, the Committee requested clarification on the exact meaning of the term and asked how it was accomplished. Other questions focused on whether or not the organization conducted its activities in cooperation with national Governments and whether or not those activities were conducted in both developed and developing countries. Attention was drawn to the fact that the organization had erroneously referred to Tibet as a separate State whereas the United Nations system recognized Tibet as a part of China. The organization was commended on its achievements in the light of its relatively small budget. In response to the Committee’s comments and questions, the representative of the Human Rights International Alliance made clear that his organization cooperated closely with national Governments in its various activities, such as the provision of free legal counselling. With regard to the identification of “prisoners of conscience”, the organization operated at all times within the boundaries of the United Nations Charter. It also apologized for the incorrect reference to Tibet, and assured the Committee that his organization respected China’s sovereignty and that a correction to reflect the United Nations nomenclature had been made in its application.

16. At the same meeting, the Committee decided to defer its decision on the application of the Human Rights International Alliance to its 2000 session, pending further clarifications.

17. Due to the lack of time and its busy agenda, the Committee was unable to consider the applications of the following organizations:
Africa for Christ International
Ahmedabad Women’s Action Group
Annai Educational Society
Association pour la Fondation Mohsen Hachtroudi
Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustin Pro Juarez
Christian Solidarity Worldwide
Global Eco Village Network
Global Environment Center Foundation
Institute for Security Studies
International Prostitutes Collective
Kashmiri American Council
Korea International Volunteer Organization
National Association of Women’s Organizations in Uganda
North American Taiwanese Women’s Association
Voluntary Action Network

**African Community Resource Centre**

18. At its 1999 session, the Committee considered the application of the African Community Resource Centre. Certain members expressed concern that the organization had overstated the scope and nature of its work regarding activities in Ethiopia, which could not be substantiated, including participation in the building of universities and medical centres in Africa. The representative of the organization informed the Committee that hers was primarily a networking organization and that the work in Ethiopia was carried out through a local organization. The representative further described her organization’s work in the United States, which focused on the provision of social services to empower, educate and mobilize the immigrant and refugee community, particularly its women. Regarding the claims in the organization’s application, the representative assured the Committee that supporting documentation could be provided as proof of their veracity. In the light of a number of outstanding questions concerning the organization, the Committee decided to defer the application pending the receipt of further information from the organization.

19. At its 720th meeting, on 19 January, the Committee reviewed the application of the African Community Resource Centre and decided to defer the application to its 2000 session pending further clarifications.

**Human Rights Guard**

20. At its 1999 session, the Committee considered the application of Human Rights Guard and decided to defer further review of the application to its resumed session.

21. At its 727th meeting, on 25 January, the Committee reviewed the application of Human Rights Guard. A statement by the observer from Yemen brought the Committee’s attention to the fact that the organization in question was in fact the political arm of a party associated with an ongoing war of secession in his country, and that the stated objectives of Human Rights Guard were both misleading and contradictory. In this regard, the Committee noted that it had found certain inconsistencies between the original application and the organization’s responses to its earlier questions, indicating that amendments had been made to its name, constitution and stated objectives. The Committee decided by consensus not to recommend Human Rights Guard for consultative status.

22. The representative of Cuba made the following statement after the decision on Human Rights Guard:

“My delegation is very pleased with the fact that the Committee has taken the decision by consensus to reject the application for consultative status of the Human Rights Guard, an organization which has a demonstrably politically motivated orientation.

“We consider it unfortunate that we are unable to do this in all such cases. It is apt to send out the wrong message when the decision not to recommend NGOs that are demonstrably politically motivated against certain very specific countries cannot be adopted by consensus, but are, on occasion, moved to a vote by political interest within the Committee. My delegation urges that the Committee continue to work in the future in the manner it has dealt with the case of Human Rights Guard.”
Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad
Frederich Hayek

23. At its 1999 session, the Committee deferred the application of the Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Frederich Hayek to its 1999 resumed session pending the response to several questions posed by Committee members. At its 725th meeting, on 24 January, the Committee had before it the application of the organization and the response to the questions posed by the Committee.

24. In the light of its need for further clarification and information about the organization it was decided to request that a representative be present to respond to questions raised by the Committee. The Committee had twice invited a representative to appear before it to answer questions and had even extended the deadline. The organization responded by requesting an extension of 30 days for its application to be reviewed since no representation would be possible before the deadline. A number of delegations drew attention to the second paragraph of the faxed response, which read as follows: “We do understand, however, that there might exist parties interested in downgrading the high standards, morals and goals of our institution based on freedom education (sic) and respect for human rights. We also understand that these rumours might arise from interested parties associated with countries listed as international terrorists by the State Department of the United States, namely the Republic of Cuba.”

25. The delegate from Cuba made the following statement, which she requested be recorded in the report:

“We have before us once again the application for consultative status of the organization called ‘Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Frederich Hayek’. As everyone knows, this application was submitted to the Committee at its previous session in June 1999. On that occasion my delegation set forth conclusive arguments demonstrating that this organization does not meet the requirements for receiving consultative status with the Economic and Social Council as laid down in resolution 1996/31. Nevertheless, my delegation and other Committee members put questions to this organization. Bearing in mind that no representative of this organization appeared, in spite of having been invited, my delegation, showing flexibility, agreed to defer consideration of the case until this resumed session, in the hope of acquiring further information and giving the organization a fresh opportunity to appear before the Committee.

“In accordance with this decision, the secretariat of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section, as it reported yesterday, sent a new invitation to the organization, informing it that its case would be considered by this Committee during the week from 17 to 21 January 2000. We should like to recall that, when consideration of deferred applications began at this session, my delegation asked whether any representative was present and agreed, again showing flexibility, that the organization should be contacted once again and the invitation to appear before the Committee reiterated with the time limit for it to appear being extended until Monday, 24 January at 10 a.m.

“Furthermore, the replies to the two rounds of questions put by members of the Committee last June are evasive and ambiguous and only seek to disguise the true nature of this organization.

“The ‘Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Frederich Hayek’ is a centre established and supported by the Cuban American National Foundation, a terrorist organization with headquarters in Miami. The ‘Universidad Latinoamericana’ is also closely linked with other well-known terrorist organizations and groups, such as Hermanos al Rescate and Alfa 66, inter alia. All these organizations have for years devoted themselves to organizing, conducting and carrying out activities designed to overthrow the legitimate and constitutionally established Government of Cuba, using all possible ways and means to that end, including the most violent, such as terrorist acts, assassinations, sabotage, etc.

“While the substance of the replies of this organization fails to answer the questions put by the Committee, the official paper on which this organization submitted its replies constitutes a
clear proof of the links of ‘Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad’ not only with the above-mentioned terrorist organizations but also with various United States congressmen of Cuban origin who lead a strong lobby within the United States political system and elsewhere in the world, favouring the most aggressive policies against the Government and people of Cuba, including the adoption of genocidal laws such as those reinforcing the criminal and illegal blockade against Cuba, which is continually and overwhelmingly rejected by the international community in the General Assembly. The primary objective of this anti-Cuban lobby, moreover, is the overthrow of the Government of my country.

“Furthermore, on the official letterhead of this organization, there is a mention of the existence of a chapter operating inside Cuba. My delegation can confirm that this chapter devotes itself to carrying out illegal activities aimed at the destabilization of the internal order.

“Who are some of the ‘honorary members’ or ‘Consulting Officers’ of this Committee, as demonstrated by the ‘Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Frederich Hayek’’s own official letterhead?

“Jorge Mas Canosa

“Cuban American National Foundation

“The Cuban American Foundation (CANF): it was created in 1981 as an instrument of the policy of the United States Government against Cuba. This organization has organized and financed violent and subvertive actions, among them numerous terrorist activities, such as the bombing of hotels and other resorts in Cuba in 1997, as well as the financing and organization of the attempted murder of Cuban President Fidel Castro at Isla Margarita, Venezuela, when he attended the Seventh Iberoamerican Summit. Documentary proof of the links between CANF and its President Jorge Mas Canosa with terrorist acts and with very well-known terrorists operating with impunity in United States territory and some Latin American countries is available.

“On the other hand, the lobby group of CANF, the so-called ‘Free Cuba Political Action Committee’, has financed campaigns to more than 70 representatives to the United States Congress in Congressional elections in the United States in order to get the influence to guarantee Congressional support to CANF’s hostile and aggressive actions against the Cuban Government. In this regard, CANF has lobbied to promote genocidal legislation against the people of Cuba, including for the adoption of the Torricelli and Helms-Burton legislation and many amendments to kill the Cuban people through starvation and sickness, as part of a political and economic warfare against the Government and people of Cuba.

“Jorge Mas Canosa: President and founder of the Cuban American National Foundation CANF (see details of the activities of this organization above) until his death in 1997, an organization created in 1981 to develop all kind of actions, including terrorist acts, to overthrow the Cuban Government. Mas Canosa has been personally involved in this actions. Details of this links and activities are clearly explained by the perpetrators themselves of terrorist acts in some well-known newspapers (see The New York Times, 12 and 13 July 1998, and also the Prosecutor’s closing argument of the trial for terrorism held under cause No. 1 of 1999, published in Granma. See also ‘A Miami trial for 7 accused in Castro Plot’, in The New York Times, 13 January 1999).

“Jose Basulto y Hermanos al Rescate: a veteran of the 1961 United States-sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion to overthrow the Cuban Government. President of ‘Hermanos al Rescate’, an organization based in Miami that has been continuously developing actions violating Cuban airspace, inciting public disorder and calling on people to fight against the constitutional order. On 14 February 1996, José Basulto personally headed an illegal flight to Cuba, originating a crisis between Cuba and the United States that put in serious danger international security and peace. This case was considered by the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations. The Government of the United States has publicly recognized that this person has been violating United States legislation, flying illegally from United States territory to Cuba, and on several occasions has had his license to fly
withdrawn. More recently, Basulto has honoured publicly a pilot of Vietnamese origin who flew illegally over Cuban airspace on 1 January 2000, in his own words to ‘energize the Cuban people to rise up and overthrow’ (the Government), encouraging illegal, dangerous and politically motivated activities (see press releases published by the United States Federal Aviation Administration on José Basulto’s background, published in The Miami Herald, and related stories in The New York Times).

“Marta Beatriz Roque: the organization recognizes her as a member of the so-called ‘chapter operating in Cuba’, but there is proof of her open activities against the constitutional order in Cuba, developing activities to stimulate investors to break off relations with Cuba, following instructions received by the United States Interests Section at Havana, and calling on the Cuban people to carry out actions against the Government, being paid and serving a foreign Government, that of the United States (see editorial in Granma, 4 March 1999, including testimony and proof of all these activities).

“Lleana Ros-Letinen, Lincoln Diaz Balart and Robert Menéndez: for many years, these persons have strongly supported and even have participated in the writing of legislation directly antagonistic to Cuba, many of which have an extraterritorial scope that intend to and in fact hurt the sovereignty and independence of United Nations Member States, such as the so called Torricelli and Helms-Burton Laws, which strengthen the United States economic, financial and commercial embargo against Cuba, so overwhelmingly rejected by the General Assembly.

“So far we have mentioned only a few elements. Nevertheless, we could not conclude without referring to one of the most recent actions spearheaded by these organizations, which lay bare the absence of scruples of these organizations, in their zeal to attack the Government of Cuba: such is the case of the abduction of the Cuban child, Elián González, whose tragedy has been the subject of brutal political manipulation, as well as constituting a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles laid down in the Convention on the Rights of the Child. There is abundant information currently in the United States press on this case, and it is possible that Committee members have seen the child Elián González wearing a CANF T-shirt or accompanied by the current President of the Cuban American National Foundation, Jorge Mas Santos and the above-mentioned congressmen of Cuban origin.

“The Cuban delegation has demonstrated with the above evidence that the organization called ‘Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Frederich Hayek’ does not fulfil the requirements laid down by resolution 1996/31, in view of its politically motivated conduct and the development of activities that clearly contravene the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, for which reason my delegation proposes that this Committee reject this organization’s application for consultative status.”

26. The representative of the United States noted that the comments by the Cuban delegate were cause for great concern, but the organization should be given additional time to address the Committee. He was not in favour of rejecting the organization, particularly since its application had just been submitted in June 1999. While some delegations were in favour of giving the organization more time to respond, others felt that in such complex and sensitive cases organizations should feel an obligation to appear before the Committee and at the very least provide reasons for requesting an extension of the deadline for its appearance.

27. While several delegations argued against taking a decision on the organization until all the requested information had been provided, others expressed the opinion that the organization had been given a reasonable opportunity to accede to the Committee’s requests.

28. The Cuban delegate proposed rejecting recommendation of the application because the organization did not comply with the purposes of the United Nations nor with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31. Upon the request of the representative of the United States, the Committee voted on the Cuban delegate’s proposal not to recommend the Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Frederich Hayek. It was adopted by a roll call
vote of 13 to 1, with 5 abstentions. The voting was as follows:

**In favour:**
- Algeria, Bolivia, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sudan, Tunisia and Turkey.

**Against:**
- United States of America.

**Abstaining:**
- Chile, France, Ireland, Romania and Senegal.

The following statements were made before the vote:

29. The delegate from the United States of America made the following statement:

“The United States will vote against rejecting the application of the NGO ‘Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Frederich Hayek’, since we do not believe that there is sufficient evidence to reject it. The questions which were posed in writing to the organization were answered satisfactorily, and the United States Government believes that it is a legitimate organization which is qualified to receive consultative status.”

30. The Bolivian delegate made the following statement:

“My delegation will vote against the application submitted by the non-governmental organization ‘Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Frederich Hayek’, inasmuch as it did not show sufficient interest in having its proposal considered by this Committee.

“Furthermore, it wishes to register its concern regarding the non-existence of an international legal instrument to regulate the conduct of NGOs and the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations in their procedure for evaluating and assessing application submitted by NGOs for consideration by the Committee.”

31. In their statements before the vote, Senegal and Romania stated that they would abstain and that they regretted the absence of a representative from the NGO.

**C. New applications for consultative status**

**Global Policy Forum**

32. At its 721st meeting, on 20 January, the Committee had before it the application of the Global Policy Forum and the written replies to earlier questions put to the organization. During the course of its review, some delegations expressed concern regarding a note to the Secretary-General in which the organization had expressed its opinion that the Committee had become politicized, and firmly repudiated the observation. Other delegations, noting the substantial contribution already made by the organization to the work of the United Nation, welcomed the organization’s criticism and comments, noting that dissent was healthy for growth. One delegate referred to the organization’s stated aim to promote more openness and accountability in the Security Council and wondered whether working with the Security Council might be of more interest to it than a relationship with the Economic and Social Council.

33. In his response, the representative of the Global Policy Forum asserted that any comment on the Committee had been made not to discredit it but to lead to further improvement of its functioning. This type of constructive criticism, he maintained, was the responsibility of civil society. Regarding its work on the Security Council, the representative indicated that while it was one of the organization’s most visible projects, the Global Policy Forum was active in a number of other important areas, such as, financing for development and the social and economic aspects of security crises.

34. At its 726th meeting on 24 January, the Committee decided to recommend the Global Policy Forum for special consultative status (see part I, sect. I, draft decision I).

**Vishva Hindu Parishad**

35. At its 1999 regular session, the Committee considered the application of Vishva Hindu Parishad. One Committee member raised questions which the representative of the organization answered. Further questions by the same member were to be sent to the organization in writing.
36. At its 721st meeting, on 20 January, the Committee reconsidered the application of Vishva Hindu Parishad. One Committee member expressed serious concern regarding that NGO’s philosophy and ideology, in particular its affiliation with certain organizations which were closely linked with the concept of “cultural Hinduism”, one which he equated with nazism and fascism. In addition, reference was made to reports that Vishva Hindu Parishad participated and supported violence against women, including the rape of missionary nuns. The representative of Vishva Hindu Parishad denied any relationship with the radical organizations in question and with adherence to the concept of forced “cultural Hinduism”. He attributed the reports of violence to misrepresentation of the press. Another Committee member objected to the attempt to denigrate Hinduism. Further consideration of this application was deferred pending receipt of additional written information and clarification of the issues raised by the Committee.

Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights

37. At its 1998 substantive session, the Committee had decided to defer the application of Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights to a later date and requested the organization to submit a revised application, using the correct terminology and nomenclature as recognized by the United Nations. At the subsequent 1999 session, the Committee considered the application of Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights on the basis of a new application, and decided to defer further consideration of the application to its resumed 1999 session pending the issuance of official documentation.

38. At its 724th meeting, on 21 January, after a review of the new documentation provided by Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights, questions were raised regarding the scope of activity, which appeared to be restricted to one geographic area although the organization claimed to be international. Questions were raised as to the exact nature and focus of its human rights activities, its position on displaced persons and refugees in the Jammu and Kashmir region as well as its relationship with a known political body in Kashmir. The representative of the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights asserted his organization’s concern for the plight of refugees and displaced persons and denied any relationship with the political body in question. He described his organization as a charitable organization providing human rights services and assisting in conflict resolution, and he further informed the Committee of activities in South Asia and East Timor. In the light of the questions raised during its discussion, the Committee decided to defer further consideration of this application pending the receipt of a response from the organization to the additional concerns expressed.

Le Foyer musulman — Association internationale pour les droits de l’homme

39. At its 716th meeting, on 17 January 2000, the Committee decided to defer the application of Le Foyer musulman — Association internationale pour les droits de l’homme to its 2000 substantive session since this organization had not yet been in existence for the mandatory two years to qualify for consideration.

Hadassah Women’s Zionist Organization of America

40. At its 717th and 723rd meetings, on 17 and 21 January, the Committee reviewed the application of Hadassah Women’s Zionist Organization of America. Delegates sought clarification from the representative of the organization on its definition of the term “pragmatic or practical Zionism” and its stated objective to promote United States foreign policy. It was also stated by a number of delegations that Zionism was equivalent to racism. Questions were asked regarding the various locations of Hadassah’s activities in the Middle East and its relationship with the World Zionist Organization, the World Jewish Agency and the Palestinian Authority, and the national make-up of its board and members.

41. In response to the Committee’s questions, the representative of Hadassah affirmed that her organization was not non-political but rather humanitarian in nature, focused on promoting mutual understanding and peace. Her group expressed a special form of Zionism, focusing on bringing service to the peoples of the world and dedicated to ideals of Judaism, democracy, health, education and human rights. The organization had a close relationship with the Palestinian Authority as well as being a member organization of the World Zionist Organization, and was represented on the World Jewish Agency. Hadassah’s medical outreach programme was active in eight countries in East and West Africa and in Cuba.
The Hadassah International Medical Relief Association was also involved in distributing donations of pharmaceuticals.

42. At its 730th meeting, on 26 January, the Committee decided to defer a decision on Hadassah Women’s Zionist Organization of America, pending receipt of a response to questions raised during the session.

43. At its 731st meeting, on 27 January, the Committee reviewed the application of the Islamic Centre (England). In the discussion, questions were raised concerning the organization’s finances and fund-raising activities, particularly with regard to funds channelled to programmes in Chechnya and Afghanistan. In response to these questions, the representative of the Centre informed the Committee that the organization was funded mainly through donations from individuals, and that it responded to requests for and from all over the world with no consideration of political boundaries. The Committee decided to defer the application for further review.

44. At its 716th, 717th, 726th, 729th and 731st meetings, on 17, 24, 26 and 27 January, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the following applications to the 2000 session, pending receipt of further information:

- Enchanté repertoire de la tranquilité
- Grameena Vikas Samithi
- Institute for Environment and Development Studies
- Islamic Center (England)
- Kazem Rajavi International Association for the Defense of Human Rights
- Relief International
- National Center for Missing and Exploited Children
- National Opinion Research Centre
- Management Sciences for Health
- Minbyun-Lawyers for a Democratic Society
- Olabisi Olaleye Foundation
- Peaceways
- Union of Kuwaiti Women Associations
- Zimbabwe Association for Crime Prevention and Rehabilitation of the Offender

**Independence from government Influence**

45. In the course of the Committee’s review of new applications, it encountered several instances of small and large organizations, predominantly from the South, that had significant ties to government. After serious discussion during which several delegations expressed concern regarding the ability of such organizations to retain their independence from undue influence and freedom of expression, it was recognized that at times such organizations required government assistance in order to function, particularly in such matters as the sharing of expertise in the areas of technology and project management.

**D. Requests for reclassification of consultative status**

46. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee decided to recommend six organizations for reclassification from special to general consultative status and five organizations for reclassification from the Roster to special consultative status (see part one, sect. I, draft decision I).

**World Society for the Protection of Animals**

47. At its 718th meeting, on 18 January 2000, the Committee decided to recommend maintaining the special consultative status for the World Society for the Protection of Animals. It was generally conceded that although the organization had expanded the geographical sphere of its work and it could be argued that the protection of animals had a definite ecological impact on human sustainability, the scope of the organization’s activities still did not meet the criterion under Council resolution 1996/31 that mandated that organizations in the general category should be active in nearly all areas of concern to the Economic and Social Council. The Committee took the opportunity to commend the Society on its work.

**International Peace Bureau**

48. At its 719th and 720th meetings, on 19 January, the Committee considered the reclassification request of the International Peace Bureau. Some members had
expressed support for reclassifying this organization to the general category in the light of its substantive contributions to the work of the United Nations. Questions were raised regarding the organization’s finances, particularly with regard to its high administration expenditures and its receipt of government funding. Mention was also made of a discrepancy between information provided to the Committee and material on the organization’s web site.

49. At its 734th meeting, on 28 January 2000, a decision on the request was deferred pending receipt of further clarification to questions posed by the Committee.

E. Requests for reclassification deferred from the 1998 session

International Council of Environmental Law

50. At its 687th meeting, on 18 December 1998, the Committee considered a request by the International Council of Environmental Law for reclassification from special to general consultative status and decided to defer the requests to its 1999 session pending the receipt of clarification of points raised by the Committee on the application.

51. At its 723rd meeting, on 21 January 2000, the Committee decided to recommend reclassification to general consultative status for this organization (see part I, sect. I, draft decision I).

World Alliance of Reformed Churches

52. Also in 1998, the Committee reviewed a request for reclassification from the Roster to special consultative status submitted by the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and decided that it, too, should be deferred to the Committee’s 1999 session pending the receipt of further information from the organization.

53. At its 734th meeting, on 28 January 2000, the Committee decided to recommend reclassification to special status for this organization (see part I, sect. I, draft decision I).

International P.E.N.

54. At its 1998 session, the Committee considered a request for reclassification to special consultative status from International P.E.N., an organization on the Roster, and decided to defer further consideration of this organization’s request to the second part of its session in June 1998, following the request of a delegation for additional time to study the information provided by the organization. At its June 1998 session, 1998 resumed session and 1999 regular session, the Committee deferred consideration of this request because it was not yet in the position to make a decision on this application.

55. At its 734th meeting, on 28 January, the Committee once again took up the request of International P.E.N. The representative of Cuba referred to reports indicating that the organization was actively interfering in the internal affairs of her Government and that it had relationships with individuals or groups engaged in illegal activities in Cuba. The Committee decided to defer consideration of International P.E.N. pending the receipt of its response to further questions from the Committee. The Chairman cautioned the Committee, however, that while it could ask an NGO to identify affiliated groups by name, it could not require an organization to identify specific individuals within those groups.

F. Withdrawal of status

International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

56. At the same meeting, on 28 January, the Committee agreed to the request of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources to withdraw its special consultative status since it had been granted observer status by the General Assembly.

III. Review of quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Council

57. The Committee considered agenda item 4 at its 733rd and 734th meetings, on 27 and 28 January. It had before it quadrennial reports for the period 1994 to 1997 and also 1995 to 1998 on the activities of 52 organizations in general and special consultative status with the Council (E/C.2/1999/2/Add.18-22 and E/C.2/1999/CRP.4).
58. The Committee took note of the reports of the following 43 non-governmental organizations:

- African Association of Education for Development
- All Pakistan Women’s Association
- Asia Crime Prevention Foundation
- Association of Medical Doctors of Asia
- Center for International Health and Cooperation
- Dominican Union of Journalists for Peace
- European Forum for Victim Services
- European Insurance Committee
- European League for Economic Cooperation
- Federation of Associations of Former International Civil Servants
- Federation of National Representations of the Experiment in International Living
- Foundation for the Rights of the Family
- General Conference of the Seventh-Day Adventists*
- Global 2000
- Global Fund for Women
- Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation**
- Human Rights Internet
- Inclusion International
- International Alliance of Women
- International Association for the Defence of Religious Liberty
- International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development
- International Council of Environmental Law
- International Federation of Human Rights
- International Federation of Non-Governmental Organizations for the Prevention of Drug and Substance Abuse
- International Federation of Persons with Physical Disability
- International Hotel and Restaurant Association
- International Multiracial Shared Cultural Organization
- International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association
- International Union of Technical Associations and Organizations
- Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development
- Lawyers Committee for Human Rights
- Liberal International (World Liberal Union)
- Pan American-Pan African Association
- Regional Network of Local Authorities for the Management of Human Settlements
- Women’s World Summit Foundation
- World Assembly of Youth
- World Coal Institute
- World Federalist Movement
- World Federation of United Nations Associations
- World Information Transfer
- World Organization of Building Officials
- World Young Women’s Christian Association
- Worldview International Foundation

** World Federation of Trade Unions

59. At its 734th meeting, on 28 January 2000, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the quadrennial report of the World Federation of Trade Unions pending the submission of further information on the organization’s affiliates in Pakistan.

* The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations requested the General Conference of the Seventh-Day Adventists to take note and use the correct United Nations appellation for the French Overseas Territories.

** The Committee decided to take note, with reservation, of the quadrennial report of the Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation.
A. Review of quadrennial reports deferred from the 1998 session

International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations

60. At its resumed 1997 session, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the quadrennial report of the International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations.

61. Subsequently, at its resumed 1998 session, the Committee again decided to defer the report of this organization to its 1999 session since the requested clarifications had not yet been provided by the organization. At its 1999 session, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the report of the International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations until after its discussion of the issue of accreditation.

62. At its 733rd meeting, on 27 January, the Committee reviewed the information provided by the organization, after which some concern was expressed that the organization had strayed from its original objectives to become somewhat politicized. The Committee also noted that a change in headquarters location accompanied each change of Secretary-General, which was in contravention of the provision of Council resolution 1996/31 regarding the requirement that organizations in status maintain an established headquarters. One delegation drew attention to the fact that elections were held less frequently, suggesting a deterioration of democratic procedures.

63. At the same meeting, on 27 January, the Committee considered a letter from the organization dated 9 January 2000 stating that it had decided to cease the practice of cross-participation at United Nations meetings; in the light of the qualifications expressed by some members, the Committee decided to take note of the report with reservations.

B. Review of quadrennial reports deferred from the 1999 session

Robert F. Kennedy Memorial

64. Some delegations expressed their continuing concern over the accreditation practices of the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial, particularly in respect of one organization the group had enabled to participate in the Commission on Human Rights, as well as the seeming lack of transparency in the organization’s actions demonstrated by its presentation of a human rights award to an anonymous recipient in the Sudan. A representative of the organization acknowledged that although certain organizations with a long and credible relationship with the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial were permitted to speak on its behalf, the organization never lost sight of its obligations to the relationship with the Economic and Social Council, which it took very seriously. With regard to the anonymous human rights awardee, the representative explained that her organization had followed the guidelines concerning human rights defenders under General Assembly resolution 53/144. While some delegations accepted that transparency had been maintained with regard to the work done by the unnamed recipient, other members of the Committee requested further information from the organization.

65. At its 732nd meeting, on 27 January 2000, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the report pending the organization’s reply in writing to the questions raised by the Committee.

66. At its 732nd and 733rd meetings, on 27 and 28 January 2000, the Committee decided to take note of the quadrennial reports of the following five organizations:

- All Pakistan Women’s Association
- Foundation for the Rights of the Family
- General Conference of the Seventh-Day Adventists
- International Alliance of Women
- International Federation of Human Rights

67. At the same meetings, the Committee left pending its decision on the quadrennial reports of the following organizations pending receipt of further information on their activities:

- Afro-Asian Peoples’ Solidarity Organization
- Christian Democratic International
- Hadassah Women’s International Zionist Organization
- Society for Threatened Peoples
- World Muslim Congress
IV. Implementation of Council resolution 1996/302

68. The Committee considered item 5 of its agenda at its 734th and 735th meetings, on 28 January 2000. It had before it a memorandum by the Secretary-General containing applications from non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development to expand their participation in other fields of the Economic and Social Council (E/C.2/1999/CRP.7).

69. At the same meeting, the Committee decided to recommend that the Council approve the requests of the non-governmental organizations contained in document E/C.2/1999/CRP.7 (see part I, sect. I, draft decision II).

70. The Committee also agreed to the proposal of one member that non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development wishing to expand their participation in other fields of the Council should be required in future to submit a formal request through the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

V. Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304

A. Consideration of special reports

71. At its 727th meeting, on 25 January, the Committee considered agenda sub-item 6 (a) based on document E/C.2/1999/3/Add.1. The Committee took note of the special reports of the World Confederation of Labour, the Pan African Islamic Society for Agro-Cultural Development and the International Federation of Human Rights.

World Confederation of Labour

72. At its 1998 resumed session, the Committee had before it the special report of the World Confederation of Labour, which had been requested in response to a complaint by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran regarding its accreditation of unacceptable representatives to the fifty-fourth session of the Commission on Human Rights. The observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran was not satisfied with the report of the organization and requested additional information and the presence of a representative of the organization at the 1999 session. At the 1999 session, the requested report was submitted to the Committee and the representative of the organization, who proposed a dialogue with the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Office of the United Nations at Geneva, was present to answer the Committee’s questions. The observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran welcomed the proposal; however, he found the report inadequate and asked the Committee to request a new special report from the organization for its next session to answer the questions raised.

73. At its 727th meeting, on 25 January, the Committee reviewed the new special report of the World Confederation of Labour, in which the organization stated that in the event that it was provided with verifiable evidence that members of the organizations it had accredited were terrorists, as alleged, the organization should be expelled immediately. Furthermore, the representative of the World Confederation of Labour recommended that further participation of the members of the organization in question would be frozen pending further investigation. He added that his organization was engaged in intensive discussion on the matter with International Labour Organization representatives at Geneva. Several members of the Committee noted with approval that the World Confederation of Labour appeared to be making a genuine effort to bring the issue to closure. However, they cautioned that an organization of its stature should be more meticulous in its affiliations.

74. At the same meeting, on 25 January, the Committee decided to defer its decision to its 2000 session.

Pan African Islamic Society for Agro-Cultural Development

75. At its 1998 substantive session, the Committee decided to request the Pan-African Society for Agro-Cultural Development (PAIS), a non-governmental organization on the Roster, to submit a special report to
the Committee at its 1999 session. At its 1999 session, the Committee had before it the quadrennial report for 1994-1997 of PAIS as well as a letter responding to allegations by the Permanent Mission of the United States of America regarding solicitation of business ventures. Information on this matter was circulated to the Committee by the delegation of the United States of America. The United States delegation requested that the Committee authorize the forwarding of this information to the organization in question as well as to request comments from the NGO since they believed that PAIS was unaware of the solicitation of funds being carried out by persons representing themselves as members of PAIS. The Committee agreed to this request and asked the Secretariat to forward the information to PAIS along with the request for comments.

76. At its 735th meeting, on 28 January, the Committee reviewed the report of the organization in which it was informed that PAIS had undertaken to suspend all accreditation of its representatives in the year 2000. At that meeting, the Committee took note of the special report submitted by the organization.

**International Federation of Human Rights**

77. At its 1999 session, the delegation of Algeria asked the Committee to review documents which it had regarding an incident which took place at the fifty-fourth session of the Commission on Human Rights regarding the International Federation of Human Rights. The Committee had already deferred this quadrennial report to its resumed session due to outstanding questions about its accreditation procedures. The delegation of Algeria agreed to circulate to members of the Committee documentation on the incident, which took place on 15 April 1998 on the premises of the Palais des Nations. The Ambassador of Algeria was approached by three individuals who accosted him in a violent manner. One of the three individuals was accredited by the International Federation of Human Rights. The Committee agreed to request the NGO to submit a report on the incident to its resumed session.

78. At its 735th meeting, on 28 January, the Committee took note of the report of the organization. The Algerian delegation made the following declaration:

“My delegation takes note of the report, submitted on 22 June 1999 to the Non-Governmental Organizations Section, by the International Federation of Human Rights (IFHR) following the incident that took place on 15 April 1998 on the premises of the Palais des Nations in Geneva in the course of which the Ambassador of Algeria was accosted by individuals one of whom was accredited by IFHR. It takes note in particular of the excuses and apologies submitted by IFHR concerning this incident.

“While not commenting on the substance of the report, my delegation draws the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that Mr. Kebaili’s letter of apology was not transmitted until a year after the incident, on 17 June 1999, or three days after the Committee had taken a decision on the quadrennial report of IFHR at the request of Algeria.

“The Algerian delegation, which greatly appreciates the important role of NGOs and their significant contribution to the work of the United Nations, as well as their efforts to uphold and promote the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, believes that major NGOs such as IFHR have a particular responsibility to respect the rules and procedures governing relations between NGOs and the United Nations. It requests that in the future, if such situations reoccur, the Committee will take the appropriate measures.”

**B. Strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Secretariat**

79. At its 735th meeting, on 28 January 2000, the Committee considered agenda sub-item 6 (b) relating to the strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the United Nations Secretariat. The question of the strengthening of the Section was recognized as being of great concern, since the efficient functioning of the Committee was dependent upon the work of the Section. The Committee was concerned at the negative impact an inadequately equipped secretariat could have upon its functioning now and in the future, and it was suggested
that the item on strengthening of the Section remain on the agenda.

80. At its 1999 resumed session, the Chairman of the Committee, Wahid Ben Amor (Tunisia), underlined in his opening statement that the Section was facing an increasing workload, due to the greater number of organizations in consultative status with the Council. He added that the General Assembly recently requested information on the resources needed to enable the Section to work effectively, and decided to raise the level of the post of the Chief of the Section from P-5 to D-1.

81. The Committee reaffirmed its support to the ongoing process of strengthening the Section and noted that this issue would be taken up by the General Assembly at its resumed fifty-fourth session.

C. Methods of work of the Committee

82. At its 732nd meeting, on 27 January 2000, the Committee reconsidered its working methods with a view to their further enhancement. It was noted that several of the mechanisms put into place do not function as smoothly as originally anticipated. The working methods adopted in Council resolution 1997/103 are costly in both time and human resources. The Committee received a summary paper which identified several important issues, including national clearances, timing of invitations, complaints, substantive review of the quadrennial reports, time limits for deferrals, NGOs on the Roster from the specialized agencies, and applications of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31 (grey area).

83. The Committee decided to focus on two issues at its 1999 resumed session — the question of deferred applications and the procedures for inviting NGOs to attend Committee sessions, on the understanding that the other areas of concern would be reviewed at its 2000 session. The Committee recorded its firm intention to devote a substantial amount of time to its working methods at its 2000 session and at future sessions until the points of concern are addressed. Several sessions of the Committee will be needed to refine its working methods.

84. Concerning deferred applications, the Committee felt that a distinction should be made between several different situations: applications that are deferred owing to unanswered Committee questions, indicating an obvious lack of interest by the organization, applications in which respondents are not providing answers to the full satisfaction of the Committee and applications of such a sensitive nature that extensive deliberation is required in order to respond to Committee questions. In the first case, most members of the Committee felt that a two-year limit should be imposed in which three reminders would be sent. If reminders are ignored, the Committee should not pursue the review of these applications. One delegation stressed that when a representative of an organization with a deferred application is present, the Committee should allow the representative to answer all the questions and avoid as much as possible sending additional written questions to the organization while its representative is still available to respond. This would limit the number of deferred cases.

85. It was noted that there is a problem in the current procedure for issuing invitations to attend Committee sessions to organizations being considered for consultative status. Since the programme of work can provide only an approximate date for an application being considered, given the timing and availability of documentation and the difficulty of predicting the amount of time the Committee will need for consideration of a particular submission. It was decided that the Committee would give serious consideration to hearing NGO representatives with the longest travel times at the beginning of each session. Due consideration would also be given to the fact that not all NGO representatives can afford the financial expenses of an extended stay in New York.

86. One delegation drew attention to the issue of NGOs gaining Roster status through their affiliation with the specialized agencies and cited the example of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). At the informal meeting of the resumed session, the Committee heard Michael Millward, who was invited by the Secretariat to share with the Committee the UNESCO experience. This invitation was a first step towards coordination with the specialized agencies to examine the principles and practices relating to their consultative status with NGOs in order to promote harmonization of practice within the system, as mentioned in the report of the Secretary-General (see A/54/520, para. 23).
87. As former Chief of the UNESCO Non-Governmental Organizations External Relations Bureau and current Special Assistant of the Director General of UNESCO, Mr. Millward explained to the Committee that UNESCO had two types of relationship with NGOs. Organizations in the formal category could be called upon for advice and consultation on policy-related issues, even being permitted to address the plenary of the General Council, while those in the operational category were concerned primarily with the implementation of UNESCO operational activities in the field. Because the advice of organizations in the formal category was expected to be representative of an identifiable geo-cultural population, breadth of geographical consideration was a major consideration of eligibility for this type of relationship, as well as the representativeness of membership and governing bodies.

88. In response to the Committee’s expressed concern that the relationship in the formal category would be restricted to large international organizations predominantly from the North, the representative from UNESCO described other mechanisms which grouped national NGOs which usually fell into the operational category to enable them to provide policy input under a collective consultation arrangement. Noting that the UNESCO secretariat evidently exercised more autonomy in the selection of applications to be presented for the granting of a relationship with UNESCO, he added that the quality and regularity of interaction with the organization was a primary criterion. With regard to establishing a more systematic interaction with the Committee, Mr. Millward suggested that it might be possible to exchange information on organizations where there was a clear overlap of orientation and activity, citing the example of two organizations under discussion by the Committee, both of which were well known in UNESCO. He also indicated that the Committee might wish to explore the possibility of distinguishing between the various types of relationship defined by other organizations and agencies and retaining on the Council Roster only organizations with similar consultative or policy advisory functions.

89. Another delegation suggested that the Committee could benefit from further consultations with the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations (CONGO) and other NGOs on the methods of work, while two other delegations felt that the Committee should concentrate on ensuring that the Secretariat has the support and human resources it needs to cope with work being generated by the Committee.

D. Process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations

90. The Committee considered sub-item 6 (c) of its agenda at its 732nd, 733rd and 735th meetings, from 26 to 28 January. While underlining its full support for the continued participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of the United Nations and after an in-depth discussion on the accreditation of non-governmental organizations and their participation in United Nations meetings, the Committee welcomed the proposal of the President of CONGO to undertake wide-ranging consultations with all concerned parties to address those concerns. In both his opening and closing statements of the session, the Chairman of the Committee made mention of the relationship between non-governmental organizations and the United Nations, drawing the attention of the Committee to two important documents on the practical arrangements for the interaction of NGOs in the activities of the United Nations system; noting the need to find ways to improve the participation of NGOs suffering financial and logistic constraint; and finally observing that relations with NGOs had never been so good and expressing his sincere hope that with the support of the Committees, NGOs would continue to play an important role in economic and social development worldwide.

91. Afaf Mafouz, President of CONGO, addressed the Committee on the issue of NGO accreditation and representation at meetings.

92. In her statement, the President of CONGO summarized the recommendations compiled by the CONGO over three consultative sessions held on 1 October, 3 November and 1 December 1999. These sessions were attended by NGO representatives, member States’ delegates and Secretariat staff, and were undertaken in order to address issues relating to NGO participation in United Nations meetings and suggest avenues for the resolution of points of difficulty that are of concern to both the NGOs and member States.
93. With the perceived increase in the number of NGO representatives at United Nations headquarters, difficulties have arisen regarding accommodation, issues of security and misconduct on the part of a few NGO representatives. The two most important issues discussed concern NGO access to and effective participation in the meetings of the Council’s commissions and committees. It was noted that there is often a significant discrepancy between the number of NGO representatives who register to attend meetings and those who actually attend, with far fewer attendees. Moreover, financial and logistical constraints often preclude the participation of groups from the South, while those from the North are more able to attend meetings. It was suggested that tracking the actual number of NGO representatives at the United Nations as well as those attending specific meetings of the Council’s commissions would make it possible to discern a pattern of usage of United Nations facilities by NGO representatives. On this issue, the President of CONGO asserted that her organization was committed to facilitating greater participation of NGOs from countries with developing economies in United Nations meetings at Headquarters. With regard to regulating the number of representatives, CONGO was of the opinion that this should be resolved on a case-by-case basis, depending on the parameters set by the meeting in question. It was also suggested that methods of coordinating requests to speak and effective time management need to be explored so as to allow NGO representatives to share views with government delegates on a collaborative basis so that they can be more easily taken up by the Secretariat. Finally, regarding issues of proper conduct at meetings, it was agreed that establishing written guidelines and orientation sessions for NGO representatives attending United Nations meetings would ensure that NGO representatives do not mistakenly overstep United Nations rules and procedure. The President of CONGO pointed out that since Council resolution 1996/31 provides adequate guidance, there appears to be no reason for additional structures or the development of a formal code of conduct.

94. The President of CONGO ended her statement by inviting a response to her organization’s proposal to create several small working groups to finalize the report on accreditation issues and to enable CONGO to provide a more comprehensive report to the Committee before its next meeting.

95. Further to the issues concerning the principles governing the nature of the consultative relationship between NGOs and the Council, the Committee Chairman, Wahid Ben Amor (Tunisia), reminded the members of the Committee of his opening statement and the decision of the Council to withdraw the status of Christian Solidarity International, an organization which was recognized by the Committee not to have fully adhered to these principles. This decision of the Council, he noted, supported the credibility of the Committee and its procedures.

96. Concerning accreditation, the delegation of Turkey made the following statement:

“I have taken the floor in order to address one specific issue, namely accreditation of representatives by NGOs to United Nations meetings and the responsibility of NGOs for the conduct of these representatives.

“My delegation, like many others, values the important work that is carried out by NGOs; and as a member of the NGO Committee, Turkey encourages a wider representation of views of the NGO community within the United Nations system. NGOs have a great deal of knowledge and expertise that we can all benefit from.

“However, in recent years we have noticed with regret that the number of cases where an NGO provides an umbrella representation to certain terrorist or politically motivated organization or persons against United Nations Member States is on the increase. This trend, which has already been underlined by other delegations during previous sessions of the Committee, is a cause for serious concern for my delegation.

“It is our strong conviction that NGOs have a direct and full responsibility for the conduct and behaviour of the representatives they accredit to United Nations meetings. In the light of the increasing number of recent incidents, it is important to underline the significance of this issue once again. We reiterate our full support for the continued participation of NGOs in the work of the United Nations, but at the same time my delegation believes that providing a banner representation to those individuals or organizations which pursue politically motivated work against Member States or have connections
with terrorist groups is a clear breach of status granted to NGOs by the United Nations.

“In this connection, I would like to make a brief reference to Council resolution 1996/31, which lays out the basic principles regarding the consultative relationship between the United Nations and NGOs. Article 55 of part VIII of the resolution states that non-governmental organizations granted consultative status by the Council and those on the Roster shall conform at all times to the principles governing the establishment and nature of their consultative relations with the Council. The same part of the resolution also establishes the rules and methods to be followed in suspending and withdrawing consultative status of NGOs.

“In the light of the above, my delegation deems it necessary to emphasize that as a member of the NGO Committee, Turkey will continue to closely monitor the activities of NGOs with a view to determining to what extent they comply with the principles governing consultative status and contribute to the work of the United Nations. Bearing in mind certain incidents, my delegation will pay particular attention to NGOs which have already once abused their status in order to ascertain whether their behaviour constitutes a pattern of acts under paragraph 57 (a) of Council resolution 1996/31.

“In conclusion, I would like to reiterate Turkey’s continued support for the invaluable work carried out by NGOs and request that my statement be fully reflected in the official records of this session.”

97. The following delegations also took the floor: Algeria, Cuba, Pakistan, Chile, Lebanon and China.

E. Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31

98. The Committee considered sub-item 6 (d) of its agenda at its 735th meeting, on 28 January 2000, on the issue of NGOs whose defining characteristics are considered by some Committee members not to be in strict conformity with Council resolution 1996/31, namely commercial/industrial, professional, religious, research/educational or government-funded organizations. Several members of the Committee noted that the Committee had already set a precedent by granting status to such organizations in the past. One member of the Committee, however, suggested that the granting of consultative status to industrial or commerce-oriented NGOs might cause a further imbalance between the numbers of northern and southern NGOs granted consultative status since industrial/commercial NGOs are not only well financed but based primarily in the North. A debate ensued on the definition of an NGO as set out within the parameters of Council resolution 1996/31, with some members of the Committee suggesting that any organization without government ties could be considered a non-governmental organization. Others objected to this broad definition. It was agreed that this topic should continue to be considered in the course of future consultations.

99. At its 1999 session, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations deferred consideration of the following organizations, which were previously deferred from the 1998 resumed session, since it had not yet come to a conclusion on whether or not manifestly professional and religious bodies or industrial or commercially oriented organizations qualify as NGOs under the criteria set out in Council resolution 1996/31: International Group of P and I Clubs, International Federation of Inspection Agencies and the European Fertilizer Manufacturers Association. For the same reason, the Committee also deferred the Confederation of German Forest Owners Associations.

100. Consideration of the following four organizations was also deferred because some members felt they had characteristics that marked them as professional or religious bodies: Association internationale des traducteurs de conférence, the Southern State Police Benevolent Association, Working Party “Brussels 1952” and the Syrian Orthodox Church in America.

101. The Committee also deferred a decision on the German Advisory Council on Global Change on the basis of questions raised regarding its extensive government funding.

102. Consideration of the Women’s Exchange Programme (E-Quality) had previously been deferred from the 1998 resumed session owing to questions concerning its government funding. At its 735th
meeting, on 28 January 2000, the Committee considered the application of this organization, and after hearing the representative of this organization, the only representative of an organization in the category of the “grey area” present at the session, decided to defer a decision it pending receipt of an updated financial statement from the organization.

103. Further consideration of all the organizations noted above was deferred by the Committee to its 2000 session.

VI. Implementation of Council resolution 1995/32

104. At the resumed 1999 session of the Committee, there were no applications from organizations of indigenous people seeking consultative status with the Economic and Social Council in accordance with Council resolution 1995/32.

VII. Organization of the session

A. Opening and duration of the session

105. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations held its resumed 1999 session from 17 to 28 January 2000. The Committee held 20 meetings (716th to 735th meetings).

B. Attendance

106. Representatives of all the States members of the Committee attended the session: Algeria, Bolivia, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, France, India, Ireland, Lebanon, Pakistan, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America.

107. The following States Members of the United Nations were represented by observers: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Cyprus, Egypt, Germany, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam, Yemen.

108. The Holy See, a non-member State, was also represented by an observer.


C. Agenda

110. At the 716th meeting, on 17 January 2000, the Committee had before it an informal paper containing the draft organization of work of the Committee.

D. Documentation

111. The list of documents before the resumed 1999 session is contained in the annex.

VIII. Provisional agenda for the 2000 session of the Committee

112. The Committee considered item 8 of its agenda at its 735th meeting, on 28 January 2000. It had before it the draft provisional agenda for its 2000 session (E/C.2/1999/L.3).

113. At the same meeting, after statements by the representatives of Chile, Pakistan, Algeria, Ireland, Turkey and Cuba, the Committee approved the provisional agenda for its 2000 session, as orally amended during the discussion, for submission to the Economic and Social Council (see part I, sect. I, draft decision III).

IX. Adoption of the report

114. At its 735th meeting, on 28 January 2000, after statements by the representatives of Pakistan, the United States, India and Cuba, the Committee adopted the draft report contained in E/C.2/1999/L.2, as well as an informal paper, and authorized the Rapporteur to finalize it in consultation with the members of the Committee, as appropriate.
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<td>6 (a)</td>
<td>Note by the Secretary-General on special reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/1999/R.2/Add.15, 16 and 18-28</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>Memorandum by the Secretary-General on new applications for consultative status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/1999/R.3</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>Memorandum by the Secretary-General on requests for reclassification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/1999/CRP.2, 3 and 6</td>
<td>3 (a)</td>
<td>Memorandum by the Secretary-General transmitting deferred applications for consultative status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/1999/CRP.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Memorandum by the Secretary-General transmitting a compilation of deferred quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/1999/CRP.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Memorandum by the Secretary General transmitting a compilation of non-governmental organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/1999/CRP.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>New methods of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/1999/L.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/1999/L.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provisional agenda for the session of the Committee to be held in the year 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>