



Security Council

Distr.: General
27 September 2024

Original: English

Letter dated 27 September 2024 from the Ombudsperson addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit herewith the twenty-seventh report of the Office of the Ombudsperson to the Security Council Committee pursuant to resolutions [1267 \(1999\)](#), [1989 \(2011\)](#) and [2253 \(2015\)](#) concerning Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (Da'esh), Al-Qaida and associated individuals, groups, undertakings and entities, submitted pursuant to paragraph 20 (c) of annex II to Security Council resolution [2734 \(2024\)](#), according to which the Ombudsperson shall submit biannual reports to the Council summarizing the activities of the Ombudsperson. The report provides a description of the activities since the previous report was issued, covering the period from 29 March to 26 September 2024.

I would appreciate it if the present letter, the report and its annex* were brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council and issued as a document of the Council.

(Signed) Richard **Malanjum**

Ombudsperson to the Security Council Committee pursuant to resolutions [1267 \(1999\)](#), [1989 \(2011\)](#) and [2253 \(2015\)](#) concerning Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (Da'esh), Al-Qaida and associated individuals, groups, undertakings and entities

* Circulated in the language of submission only.



Report of the Office of the Ombudsperson submitted pursuant to Security Council resolution 2734 (2024)

I. Background

1. The present report provides an update on the activities undertaken by the Office of the Ombudsperson since the issuance of the twenty-sixth report of the Office to the Security Council on 28 March 2024 ([S/2024/274](#)).

II. Activities related to delisting requests

A. General

2. The primary activities of the Office of the Ombudsperson during the reporting period, from 29 March to 26 September 2024, related to delisting requests submitted by individuals.

3. During this period, the Ombudsperson also communicated with Member States about his views on improving the work and methods of the Office and enhancing its independence. The importance of independence is discussed in more detail in section V below (paras. 59 and 60).

B. Delisting requests

4. In the context of his casework, the Ombudsperson communicated with the members of the Committee as well as with other relevant Member States, undertook independent research, conducted interviews with petitioners and their legal representatives, and communicated with other interlocutors on matters related to the cases.

5. Since the issuance of the previous report, the Ombudsperson has not received any new petitions. As at 26 September 2024, a total of 111 delisting petitions had been accepted by the Office since its establishment. Unless a petitioner requests otherwise, all names remain confidential while a petition is under consideration. Through the Committee's press releases, the names of delisted petitioners are published, after which the Office of the Ombudsperson publishes the same information on its website.¹ In cases in which the petitioner's name is retained on the sanctions list, or in the case of the withdrawal of a petition, the petitioner's name is not revealed at any stage of the process.

6. There are currently four cases pending before the Ombudsperson. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson submitted two comprehensive reports to the Committee for its consideration. He also presented two other reports to the members of the Committee. One report remains under the Committee's consideration at the time of writing.

7. During the reporting period, following the Ombudsperson's review and recommendation, one individual was retained on the Committee's sanctions list and one individual was delisted.

¹ See www.un.org/securitycouncil/sc/ombudsperson/status-of-cases.

8. Since its establishment, the Office has completed a total of 108 cases, of which 105 involved the submission of comprehensive reports to the Committee,² pursuant to paragraph 8 of annex II to Security Council resolution 2734 (2024) and the equivalent paragraph of previous resolutions. A total of 102 cases were fully processed through the Ombudsperson process, resulting in a decision by the Committee.

9. Cumulatively, of the 102 cases completed entirely through the Ombudsperson process, 71 delisting requests were granted and 31 were denied. As a result of the 71 petitions granted, 66 individuals and 28 entities have been delisted, and 1 entity has been removed as an alias of a listed entity. In addition, four individuals were delisted by the Committee before the Ombudsperson process was completed, and one petition was withdrawn following the submission of the comprehensive report. A description of the status of all cases is available on the website of the Office of the Ombudsperson.³ The status of the most recent cases is contained in the annex to the present report.

10. The four pending cases were each filed by an individual. To date, 102 of the 111 cases have been brought by individuals alone. Two cases were brought by an individual together with one or more entities, and six by entities alone. In 64 of the 111 cases, the petitioner was assisted by legal counsel.

11. During the reporting period, the Office was in contact with the legal representative of one designated individual who had expressed an interest in filing a petition for delisting but has not yet done so.

C. Gathering information from Member States

12. For each petition received, the Ombudsperson invites relevant Member States to submit substantive information, accompanied by underlying evidentiary documentation wherever possible.

13. Of the four pending cases, three are in the dialogue phase, and in one case the comprehensive report is pending consideration by the Committee.

14. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson sent five requests for substantive information to Member States in three cases during varying phases of their respective procedures.

15. The Ombudsperson met in New York with representatives of Member States to discuss the pending cases, the requests for information and follow up questions that had arisen during the information-gathering process. He also discussed the relevance of receiving substantive information and underlying evidentiary documentation directly from State authorities during his visit to the petitioner's State of residence, in preparation for the interview that he conducts with the petitioner.

16. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson received 17 submissions from Member States that included information in response to his requests for information. Some States submitted more than one response in which they shared information.

² This number includes one case concluded in 2011, in which the petitioner withdrew the delisting request after the Ombudsperson had submitted and presented the comprehensive report to the Committee. It also includes one case concluded in 2013, in which the Committee decided to delist the petitioner after the Ombudsperson had submitted the comprehensive report to the Committee but before the Ombudsperson had presented it to the same. Finally, this number does not include three additional cases in which the Ombudsperson case became moot following a decision by the Committee to delist the petitioners before the Ombudsperson had submitted the comprehensive report.

³ See www.un.org/securitycouncil/sc/ombudsperson/status-of-cases.

Five States expressed a view on the delisting request. Four Member States responded to the Ombudsperson that they had no information to share. In the two cases completed during the reporting period, seven States did not respond to the Office at all. In the pending cases, one Member State is yet to respond to the Ombudsperson's request for information, even though the dialogue phase has already started.

17. During the same period, four designating States responded to the Ombudsperson's request to submit relevant information. The responses varied from sharing only a position to submitting detailed relevant substantive information. In four cases, four designating States submitted relevant information and one designating State informed the Office that it had no information to share.

18. In response to the request by the Ombudsperson to designating States to indicate whether or not they supported the delisting request, one of the three designating States in two cases stated its opposition to the respective pending delisting request that was still in the information-gathering period during the reporting period. As a consequence, the opportunity did not arise for the Ombudsperson to shorten the information-gathering period in those pending cases pursuant to paragraph 3 of annex II to resolution 2610 (2021), which was still applicable to the pending cases at the time.

19. During the dialogue phase in two cases, the Ombudsperson travelled to the State of nationality and residence of the petitioner and met with the authorities to obtain information.

D. Dialogue with petitioners

20. The Ombudsperson and the Office interacted with petitioners and their legal representatives, including through written exchanges, videoconferences and in-person meetings.

21. During the dialogue period in two cases, the Ombudsperson travelled to the petitioners' States of nationality and residence to conduct an extensive interview with, in one case, the lawyer of a petitioner, and, in the other case, the petitioner personally. The Ombudsperson also met with other relevant interlocutors to gather and verify information in one of the cases.

E. Access to classified or confidential information

22. To date, the Office of the Ombudsperson has entered into 22 agreements or arrangements for access to classified information⁴ and one arrangement on an ad hoc basis.

23. The Ombudsperson continued to bring the importance of streamlining the information-sharing process to the attention of Member States, especially non-members of the Committee involved in cases and States of nationality and residence of listed individuals. A signed arrangement solidifies the basis for the sharing of classified, declassified or confidential information with the Ombudsperson. The conditions under which information can be shared, and how this information can or cannot be reflected in the comprehensive report, can be determined prior to being engaged in an actual case that is subject to very strict timelines, leaving less opportunity to seal the cooperation in an information-sharing arrangement in a timely manner.

⁴ More information is available on the relevant web page on the website of the Office of the Ombudsperson (see www.un.org/securitycouncil/ombudsperson/classified_information).

III. Summary of activities relating to the development of the Office of the Ombudsperson

A. General

24. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson discussed, *inter alia*, the renewal of the Ombudsperson's mandate and changes to the resolution during bilateral meetings with members of the Committee, non-members of the Committee and other stakeholders.

25. On 18 April, the Ombudsperson participated in a discussion with students and academics of Columbia University in New York on conflict resolution, in which he shared his personal experiences on conflict resolution in relation to fairness and due process in the context of international sanctions.

26. On 15 April, the Ombudsperson presented his views on his mandate, the challenges that he encounters and the minimal requirements to establish a due process mechanism in the context of sanctions regimes during a discussion at the European Union-United Nations seminar on targeted sanctions in New York.

27. On 25 April, the Ombudsperson participated virtually in a discussion with delegates of the European Union working party on restrictive measures to combat terrorism on how his mandate enhances the legitimacy of the Da'esh and Al-Qaida sanctions regime.

28. On 22 May, in the context of the upcoming renewal of the mandate, the Office gave a briefing to the Group of Like-Minded States on Targeted Sanctions during a meeting on current issues and ways forward in relation to due process in Security Council sanctions regimes, in which he described the mandate of the Office, current challenges and proposals for mandate renewal, including the independence of the Office.

29. On 30 May, the Ombudsperson gave a briefing to the States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council on the relevance of the mandate of the Office of the Ombudsperson in the context of counter-terrorism and United Nations sanctions and discussed how cooperation with Member States could be enhanced.

30. On 30 May, the Ombudsperson had a meeting with the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Saul. Ideas were exchanged on how their respective mandates could promote the protection of human rights and the challenges ahead.

31. On 23 July, the Ombudsperson gave a virtual presentation during a training session on designations and delisting processes and mechanisms at the sixth international training course on United Nations sanctions at the Graduate Institute in Geneva.

32. In the context of increasing awareness of the existence of the Office and its mission, the Ombudsperson met with several stakeholders and participated in several events in Malaysia as outlined below.

33. On 31 July, the Ombudsperson was a guest speaker at the seventh World Conference on Islamic Thought and Civilization at the Universiti Sultan Azlan Shah in Perak, at which he delivered a paper entitled "The rule of law: national and international perspectives with special reference to Malaysia".

34. The Ombudsperson spoke about the rule of law, terrorism and due process at an International Day of Indigenous Peoples event in Kuching from 7 to 9 August.

35. On 17 August, the Ombudsperson delivered a paper to legal practitioners, professors, lecturers and law students at the Law Faculty of the Universiti Teknologi MARA in Shah Alam, entitled “Advocacy at the appellate courts and United Nations pro bono legal advocacy: a guide for aspiring lawyers”.

36. On 20 August, the Ombudsperson had a meeting in Putrajaya at the Attorney General’s Chambers to discuss existing legislation in Malaysia on the prevention of terrorism, the rule of law and due process and to deliver his paper on Security Council sanctions and their impact.

37. On 23 August, the Ombudsperson delivered a paper entitled “Human rights and the rule of law in the context of international terrorism: the Malaysian perspective” at a Human Rights Commission of Malaysia seminar on the rule of law, human rights and terrorism prevention legislation in Malaysia, held in Kuala Lumpur.

38. On 5 September, the Ombudsperson engaged with Member States about his mandate and the work of the Office during an open briefing in New York. His statement was published on the Office’s website.

B. Interaction with the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team

39. The Ombudsperson and Office staff met with individual members of the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team to discuss pending delisting requests. As the Ombudsperson noted previously, including during a general meeting in 2023 with the Monitoring Team, the quantity and quality of submissions by the Team varied by case. In the four cases currently under review, the information provided by the Monitoring Team was not extensive.

40. The Ombudsperson reiterates the recommendation in his twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth reports ([S/2023/662](#) and [S/2024/274](#)) to consider updating the narrative summary of the reasons for listing based on his comprehensive reports. According to paragraph 16 of annex II to Security Council resolution [2734 \(2024\)](#), the Committee should approve an updated narrative summary of reasons for listing, where appropriate. The Ombudsperson emphasizes that the Ombudsperson’s comprehensive reports are based on a thorough analysis of the case, including an assessment of the narrative summary of the reasons for listing in each procedure. This assessment should be used to consider updating the narrative summary in cases in which the name of a petitioner is retained, bearing in mind paragraph 60 of resolution [2734 \(2024\)](#). Such an approach is crucial from a fairness perspective, in particular for petitioners who submit repeat requests for delisting. The Ombudsperson would welcome a discussion with the Monitoring Team on this matter.

C. Liaison with States, intergovernmental organizations, United Nations bodies and non-governmental organizations

41. During the reporting period, the Office continued to interact with Member States, in particular members of the Committee and Member States of relevance to pending delisting petitions. The Ombudsperson continued his discussions with Committee members on cooperation between the Member States and his Office. The Office reached out to the five new non-permanent members of the Security Council to arrange bilateral meetings prior to the start of their Council membership to discuss the Office’s functions and responsibilities as they relate to the Committee.

42. The Office interacted with agencies and bodies of the United Nations system (including the Department of Safety and Security, resident coordinators and their

offices, the Department of Global Communications and Special Rapporteurs) and with independent experts, representatives of law enforcement agencies, legal practitioners, counter-terrorism experts, international jurists, academics and international and human rights law professionals.

D. Working methods and research

43. As was done previously, casework during the reporting period involved extensive open-source research and liaison with various interlocutors and experts, from Member States and otherwise, to collect and analyse information relevant to delisting requests.

44. Pursuant to paragraph 13 of annex II to resolution [2734 \(2024\)](#), in one case, directly after circulation of the comprehensive report to the Committee, the Office of the Ombudsperson shared the report with the State of nationality and residence of the petitioner and with a Member State that participated in the pending case by providing substantive information to the Ombudsperson.

E. Website

45. The Office continued to revise and update its website during the reporting period.⁵

IV. Other activities

Outreach

46. In the period since the Ombudsperson's twenty-sixth report, the Office increased its outreach efforts, including through meetings with stakeholders, both online and in person, in several regions. Discussions took place in countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, especially Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore, as well as with the European Union and the Gulf Cooperation Council.

47. Another effort was the publication of an informational booklet on the work and mandate of the Office, which was made available on the Office's website and distributed widely, both digitally and in hard copy. It was first published in April 2024 and updated in July 2024 after the adoption of Security Council resolution [2734 \(2024\)](#) and the renewal of the Office's mandate in June 2024. At the time of writing, it is being translated for dissemination in all official languages of the United Nations online and to delegates of the permanent missions of Member States to the United Nations in New York, as well as intergovernmental organizations, lawyers, human rights and international law professionals, academics and other relevant stakeholders.

48. These outreach efforts are aimed at increasing awareness among listed individuals and entities about the process, which the Ombudsperson has found to be lacking and which could be a reason for the relatively low number of applications for delisting. Another reason for increased outreach is to explain the mandate and relevant procedures to a wider audience, in particular in regions that were not targeted during previous outreach efforts. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson made an effort to share information about the Committee's list and the Office of the Ombudsperson's function, specifically in South-East Asia.

⁵ See www.un.org/securitycouncil/ombudsperson.

49. Workshops and talks were organized with the cooperation of local non-governmental organizations such as human rights bodies and the legal fraternity in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations region to create awareness of the importance of due process and the existence of the Office.

50. In addition, the Ombudsperson increased outreach to lawyers who might wish to serve as pro bono legal representation for petitioners. While submitting petitions does not require strict compliance with rules, having legal representation helps to ensure that the reasons relied upon by the petitioner are clearly expressed and not contradictory. The Office is preparing an online workshop for pro bono lawyers to explain the Office's mandate, the value of pro bono legal assistance and the expectations of the Office for pro bono lawyers.

V. Observations and conclusions

A. Renewed mandate: resolution 2734 (2024)

51. The mandate of the Office was renewed in June 2024 by the Security Council in resolution 2734 (2024), in which it extended the mandate for 36 months. The Ombudsperson notes that the language of the resolution incorporated several proposals made in his twenty-sixth report. These include improvements to the Ombudsperson process – some reflecting existing practices.

52. For example, in paragraph 16 of annex II to the resolution, the Security Council provides for the provision of a redacted comprehensive report, rather than a summary of information, to the petitioner in both delisting and retention cases. This means that the petitioner receives a nearly complete overview of the information, including the reasons for making the recommendation, a sine qua non of due process, as it was submitted to the Committee, with redactions of information only addressing security concerns.

53. Furthermore, in paragraph 13 of annex II to the resolution, the Security Council provides that, upon submission of the comprehensive report to the Committee, the Office now also shares it immediately with the Member States that provided substantive information to the Ombudsperson during the review process, as well as with the designating State and the State of nationality and residence if they are not members of the Committee. This ensures that those States are kept abreast of how the information that they shared has been utilized. The change also rectifies the previous inconsistency between paragraphs 13 and 14 of resolution 2610 (2021), which the Ombudsperson had raised in several previous reports (see S/2022/608, S/2023/133, S/2023/663 and S/2024/274).

54. Both developments constitute improvements to the transparency of the Ombudsperson procedure.

55. However, the Ombudsperson notes that regrettably several other proposals made in his previous report were not incorporated into the new resolution.

B. Scope of the Ombudsperson's review

56. As this question has arisen in recent cases, there is a need to clarify the approach of the Ombudsperson in analysing information gathered, including the information underlying the narrative summary that may be based on domestic court judgments. The results of court proceedings can be relevant but are not determinative, given that the ultimate question for the Ombudsperson to consider may be different from that considered by the relevant court, and the standards for assessment are quite distinct.

The Ombudsperson is not bound by the inferences drawn by a national court or its findings on factual or legal issues. In keeping with past practice, in such situations, the Ombudsperson considers the information underlying the court judgments, juxtaposed with other information gathered, including the additional details and explanations provided by the petitioner, in determining whether there is a sufficient basis for continued listing presently.

57. Such an approach and assessment may therefore result in a determination that the underlying information alone, considered holistically and in the light of the information provided by the petitioner, is not sufficient to demonstrate to the required standard that there was a link between the petitioner and Al-Qaida or Da'esh *ab initio*. This is to be expected given that at the time of the listing there is no information provided by the petitioner. In other words, he has not been accorded due process at the time of his listing. During the delisting review process, once the petitioner provides information and arguments as to why he should be delisted, it is incumbent on designating States and other relevant States to provide information to counter the information of the petitioner and also to defend the listing. Such States should provide information that goes beyond the narrative summary, or at least state why the narrative summary still contains valid reasons to continue the listing of the petitioner, should their position be that the listing should remain.

58. However, the Ombudsperson's analysis in his comprehensive report is premised solely on the basis of the information gathered during the delisting process, viewed presently, and the Ombudsperson makes no assumptions as to the information that may have been before the Committee at the time of the listing. As such, this does not constitute a review of the initial decision to list the petitioner.

C. Independence

Administration of the Office of the Ombudsperson

59. In paragraph 71 of resolution [2734 \(2024\)](#), the Security Council called for the Secretariat to “further” strengthen the capacity of the Office of the Ombudsperson by providing necessary resources, including for translation services, as appropriate, and to make the necessary arrangements to ensure its continued ability to carry out its mandate in an independent, impartial, effective and timely manner.⁶ Accordingly, the Ombudsperson will engage with the Secretariat on steps that could be taken to further strengthen the capacity and independence of the Office. However, while recognizing the measures that have been put in place by the Secretariat thus far, the observations made in previous reports and during a briefing to the Committee in November 2023 that these measures do not truly resolve the underlying structural problems that have led to long-standing concerns about the lack of institutional autonomy – and the perception of independence – of the Office remain valid.

60. While the Ombudsperson appreciates that the Secretariat has been increasingly supportive in allowing him to manage the staff in the Office independently, full autonomy has not been achieved. Furthermore, safeguarding the independence of staff during the absence of an Ombudsperson due to unforeseen circumstances or during a transition period, and in the absence of a deputy Ombudsperson, remains a concern.

⁶ Previous resolutions contained the phrase “continue to strengthen”. See, for example, resolutions [2610 \(2021\)](#), para. 68, and [2368 \(2017\)](#), para. 65.

Requirement for independence and impartiality and consideration of States' opinions

61. The Ombudsperson gives serious consideration to the opinions of Member States. However, while the Office encourages Member States to share information in relation to delisting requests under review by the Ombudsperson and, in that context, welcomes discussions in relation to these cases, the Ombudsperson is not in a position to provide information about the direction of his reasoning in a pending case to any Member State prior to the submission of his comprehensive report for circulation to the Committee. Nor should Member States attempt to influence or coax the Ombudsperson towards any particular outcome. In that context, the Ombudsperson recalls that, in paragraph 66 of resolution 2734 (2024), as in past resolutions, the Security Council affirmed that the Ombudsperson should continue to receive and review requests from individuals, groups, undertakings or entities seeking to be removed from the Da'esh and Al-Qaida sanctions list in an independent and impartial manner and should neither seek nor receive instructions from any Government.

62. The Ombudsperson would be appreciative if Member States that have questions after reading his comprehensive report and before its presentation to the Committee reach out to him so that he can consider these questions and provide clarifications. Should questions or issues remain, the Ombudsperson can address them with members of the Committee during his presentation of the comprehensive report. Informing the Ombudsperson of issues at an early stage would enhance a substantive discussion at the Committee meeting. Furthermore, it would be preferable for members of the Committee to provide any questions in writing in advance of the meeting.

63. In addition, while Member States have a key role to play during the Ombudsperson's review process in providing information, delisting applications to the Ombudsperson are premised on individual capacity and are not a Member State-assisted process. Therefore, the petitioners, not their State authorities, must take the necessary steps towards submitting the petition, and any relevant information, to the Office of the Ombudsperson.

D. Further measures to increase transparency

64. One further measure that might be taken to improve the transparency of the process, to both the public and non-Member States, would be to make the comprehensive reports publicly available in cases in which the petitioner has been delisted. In such cases, the Committee has made the decision that there is no longer a reasonable and credible basis for the listing of the individual, and thus that the individual no longer poses a threat to international peace and security. During the open briefing on the work of the Committee on 5 September, a Member State made a similar suggestion. Making the comprehensive report public would ensure transparency about the Ombudsperson's reasoning in those cases. However, at the same time, the Ombudsperson is cognizant that Member States may be reluctant to provide information to the Office, in particular given national security concerns, if they are aware that such information will be made public should the Committee decide to delist the petitioner. Moreover, certain personal information relating to the petitioner and other interlocutors may need to be protected. Therefore, it would be advisable that only a redacted version of the report be made publicly available. The Ombudsperson will engage with the Chair of the Committee on this issue.

65. Furthermore, the Office continues to receive repeat requests from petitioners. For such repeat requests, previous comprehensive reports related to the same petitioner may be relevant to Member States in determining which information to

provide during the information-gathering phase. While permanent members of the Committee have access to previous comprehensive reports, other members of the Committee, States of nationality and residence, designating States and other relevant States do not necessarily have access. Accordingly, the Committee should consider authorizing the Ombudsperson to make those previous comprehensive reports available to such Member States during the information-gathering period. The previous comprehensive reports should also be annexed to and form an integral part of the new comprehensive report.

E. Administrative issues

66. In order to facilitate the work of the Ombudsperson, Member States should consider providing their information in relation to specific cases in an official language of the United Nations. In the light of the Organization's current liquidity situation and its impact on translation capacity, which has led to delays in processing translation requests, especially longer texts, it is recommended that Member States submit translations of official documents, preferably in English.

67. The current liquidity situation is affecting the organization of mandated activities of the Office that relate to meeting with government authorities and interviewing a petitioner in the State of nationality and residence. Due to the uncertainty regarding funding, the necessary arrangements with involved stakeholders and colleagues cannot be confirmed in a timely manner. Costs related to anticipated travel are also likely to increase unnecessarily due to the delays. The Ombudsperson reiterates the observation made in his previous report that in-person interviews are critical to assessing the petitioner's credibility and state of mind. Should travel need to be postponed, or should in-person interviews no longer be possible owing to budgetary restraints, this would have an impact on due process.

Annex

Status of recent cases¹

Case 111, one individual (Status: dialogue phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
12 February 2024	Transmission of case 111 to the Committee
12 August 2024	Information-gathering period completed
12 October 2024	Deadline for completion of the dialogue period

Case 110, one individual (Status: dialogue phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
8 February 2024	Transmission of case 110 to the Committee
8 August 2024	Information-gathering period completed
8 October 2024	Deadline for completion of the dialogue period

Case 109, one individual (Status: dialogue phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
28 December 2023	Transmission of case 109 to the Committee
28 June 2024	Information-gathering period completed
28 October 2024	Deadline for completion of the extended dialogue period

Case 108, one individual (Status: Committee consideration)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
21 September 2023	Transmission of case 108 to the Committee
21 March 2024	Information-gathering period completed
20 July 2024	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee

¹ The status of all cases since the establishment of the Office of the Ombudsperson can be accessed through the website of the Office: www.un.org/securitycouncil/sc/ombudsperson/status-of-cases.

Case 107, Yassine Chekkouri (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
23 June 2023	Transmission of case 107 to the Committee
23 December 2023	Information-gathering period completed
23 April 2024	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
21 June 2024	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
23 August 2024	Committee decision to delist
6 September 2024	Formal notification to the petitioner with redacted version of the comprehensive report

Case 106, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
26 May 2023	Transmission of case 106 to the Committee
26 November 2023	Information-gathering period completed
26 March 2024	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
5 July 2024	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
5 July 2024	Committee decision to retain the listing
18 July 2024	Formal notification to the petitioner with redacted version of the comprehensive report