



Economic and Social Council

Provisional

22 September 2011

English

Original: French

Substantive session of 2011

Provisional summary record of the 43rd meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Monday, 25 July 2011, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Rosacha (Acting Vice-President)..... (Slovakia)

Contents

General segment (*continued*)

Non-governmental organizations

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Editing Section, room E 4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

11-44476X (E)



In the absence of the President, Mr. Rosacha (Slovakia), Acting Vice-President, took the chair

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

General segment (*continued*)

Non-governmental organizations (E/2011/32 (Part I) and E/2011/32 (Part II)) (agenda item 12)

General discussion

1. **Mr. Henczel** (Observer for Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Montenegro and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; as well as Ukraine and Georgia, expressed his condolences to the Norwegian people following the recent terrorist attacks and reaffirmed that the European Union condemned all acts of terrorism and recommended enhancing collaboration to combat that scourge.

2. The European Union considered the participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) essential to the work of the Economic and Social Council in that it led to greater diversity of the discussions and fostered the requisite open-mindedness. Nevertheless, recalling the objectives set out in resolution 1996/31, under which consultative status was to be granted primarily to organizations whose activities came within the purview of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, the Union had some concern over the manner in which the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations was currently discharging its mandate: despite its efforts to deal with the backlog of NGO applications, in recent years it had moved away from the guiding principles of resolution 1996/31. Indeed, some States objected to the granting of consultative status to organizations that criticized their human rights record or expressed views they did not like. The Committee had also kept a number of human rights NGOs waiting indefinitely for a decision regarding their application.

3. The Union was particularly concerned over the discrimination levelled, in May 2011, against organizations defending lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) rights, the handling of whose applications had been systematically postponed by means of various ploys. By adopting motions aimed at preventing any decision from being taken on the

application of two organizations and by refusing to make any recommendation to the Council, the Committee had violated its obligations. The Union reminded the meeting that it was not within the Committee's mandate to request information of a private nature from members of NGOs, nor to express any judgement concerning the views of an organization for the purpose of drawing out the procedure indefinitely. Recalling that the consultation procedures with NGOs had not been designed to cater to the interests of States, the European Union urged the Committee members to defend and ensure compliance with the guiding principles agreed by the Member States in resolution 1996/31.

4. **Mr. Lysak** (Slovakia) said that his delegation associated itself with the statement made by Poland on behalf of the European Union and recalled that on numerous occasions representatives of civil society had drawn the attention of the international community to situations requiring the adoption of emergency measures: civil society, an irreplaceable source of innovative ideas, enriched intergovernmental exchanges and communicated the concerns of persons in need directly to high-level political representatives. Civil society had become an indispensable partner of the United Nations system in all its fundamental activities: peace and security, human rights and development. The Slovak delegation expressed its concern over the Committee's persistent delays in considering NGO applications. Clarifications requested must not be used as a pretext for unjustifiably postponing the consideration of certain applications.

5. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that for several years the United States of America had noted, regrettably, that some members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had let political considerations take precedence over their obligation to respect the principles of resolution 1996/31. Notwithstanding the fact that in 2011 it had accredited more NGOs than previously, the Committee had not even taken note of the quadrennial reports of some highly reputed human rights organizations, including Human Rights Watch, and had refused to grant consultative status to two major NGOs, namely the International Foundation for Electoral Systems and the Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression. The Committee had also decided to close the consideration of the application of the International Lesbian and Gay Association. Such decisions showed

that the Committee had not acted in accordance with the Council's clear position during the previous ten years, i.e. that the mere fact that an association promoted LGBT rights could not constitute valid grounds for denying it accreditation. The United States delegation said it was confident that the Council would use its supervisory authority over the Committee to correct those errors, granting consultative status to the three NGOs in question, and ensure in future that the criteria set forth in resolution 1996/31 were respected.

6. **Mr. Khabbaz Hamoui** (Observer for the Syrian Arab Republic), after expressing his condolences to the families of the victims of the attacks in Norway, said that the decisions of United Nations organs could not be governed by double standards. If the Committee had decided to suspend its decision on the accreditation of several NGOs for six months to enable them to produce additional developments, that decision must be respected by all organs and not contested by some delegations. The members of the Council must avoid any selectivity in the handling of decisions and take care not to impart a political twist to the process.

7. **Ms. Guilarte Calles** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) paid tribute to the work done by NGOs that acted with full transparency and impartiality in accordance with Article 71 of the Charter of the United Nations and recalled that if the credibility of the system was to be preserved, it was essential to respect the principles set forth in resolution 1996/31, in particular those pertaining to respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter. The principles that must govern any decision regarding the granting of consultative status to an NGO were respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, the sovereign equality and political independence of all Member States and the prohibition against interference in affairs falling within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

8. The Venezuelan delegation noted with concern that during the current session of the Council, there were calls for granting status in cases where the consideration of the application had been deferred on procedural grounds. It urged the members of the Council to respect the need to complete the formalities before taking decisions regarding the grant of consultative status to such NGOs, for otherwise a dangerous precedent would be established. Once those formalities were completed, it would be favourable to the idea of acceding to the requests of the NGOs in question.

9. **Mr. Hassan Ibrahim** (Egypt), while recognizing the validity of the Committee's activities and the prerogatives of the Council permitting it to state its position on the recommendations made by the Committee, recalled that the Council was not supposed to bypass the Committee and attempt to grant differential treatment to certain NGOs, for that would jeopardize its proper functioning. The Egyptian delegation was not favourable to the idea of granting consultative status to the international NGOs International Foundation for Electoral Systems and Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression, inasmuch as the Committee was still awaiting further answers to the questions it had asked, which was the reason why it had deferred the consideration of the related file. Any Council decision in that regard would set a precedent that indicated how little importance it attributed to the Committee's recommendations.

10. **Ms. Unterman** (Observer for Israel) recalled that one of the *raison d'être* of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations was the granting of consultative status to NGOs that met the criteria laid down in resolution 1996/31, irrespective of whether or not their activities or aims were in accord with the national interests of Member States. The Israeli delegation expressed its concern over the procedural tricks employed by some Member States during recent meetings of the Committee in order to thwart the adoption of final decisions on the accreditation of certain NGOs. Following a thorough examination of the files of those NGOs, the Israeli delegation had concluded that their applications were thoroughly founded and met the criteria for the granting of consultative status. It therefore supported the request that such status should be granted to them.

11. **Mr. Warraich** (Pakistan), after expressing his full sympathy to the members of the Government of Norway following the recent terrorist attacks, reaffirmed Pakistan's commitment to the role of NGOs in the economic and social development of societies and recalled that consideration of NGO applications for accreditation was subject to respect for certain criteria, from which there should be no derogation. For that reason, his delegation did not support the selective practice of questioning the decisions of the Committee within the framework of the work of the Council.

The meeting was suspended at 3.45 p.m. and resumed at 4.15 p.m.

Decision of the Council to consider first of all draft decisions E/2011/L.36, E/2011/L.37 and E/2011/L.38

12. **The President** proposed that the Council first take action on the three draft decisions E/2011/L.36, E/2011/L.37 and E/2011/L.38, and subsequently on the draft decisions included in the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2011 regular session (E/2011/32 (Part I) and (Part II)), pointing out that in so doing the Council would be waiving article 67.1 of its rules of procedure.

13. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to proceed accordingly.

14. *It was so decided.*

15. **The President** invited the Council to consider draft resolutions E/2011/L.36, E/2011/L.37 and E/2011/L.38.

Draft decision E/2011/L.36: Application of the non-governmental organization International Lesbian and Gay Association for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council

16. **Mr. Brauwers** (Belgium) introduced the draft decision on the request for special consultative status made by the NGO International Lesbian and Gay Association, expressing the hope that it could be adopted by consensus.

17. **The President** invited the Council to take action on draft decision entitled "Application of the non-governmental organization International Lesbian and Gay Association for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council", contained in document E/2011/L.36.

18. **Mr. Hassan Ibrahim** (Egypt) pointed out that the application submitted by the organization in question had been rejected on the grounds of participation of some of its members in activities involving the sexual exploitation of children. Inasmuch as the NGO had not responded to the questionnaire addressed to it by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations following accusations of paedophilia, the Committee, in keeping with its rules of procedure and practice, according to which an organization must not be granted consultative status while requests and inquiries were outstanding, had decided to close consideration of the application and recommended that consultative status should not be granted. His delegation requested that

draft decision E/2011/L.36 be put to a vote and announced that it would vote against the draft.

19. **The President** noted that the draft decision contained no programme budget implications and asked whether any delegations wished to make a general statement.

20. **Mr. Bauer-Savage** (Germany) said that the International Lesbian and Gay Association application had been placed on hold several times, then rejected on grounds unrelated to the criteria set forth in resolution 1996/31. The NGO had responded appropriately to all the questions addressed to it within the framework of the consideration of its application and demonstrated that its objectives were in keeping with the spirit, principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. Moreover, it possessed the skills and capacities required to contribute to the work of United Nations bodies. The German delegation would vote in favour of the draft.

21. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) announced that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft and urged other countries to do likewise. The NGO combated discrimination based on sexual orientation and identity and sought to promote universal respect for and implementation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgender people. Its activities were in agreement with the criteria of resolution 1996/31. Quite obviously, despite the guidance repeatedly provided to the Committee by the Council, the Committee continued to reject the applications of NGOs such as the International Lesbian and Gay Association solely because they defended the rights of LGBT people.

22. *The vote was taken by roll-call.*

23. *India, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour:

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

Against:

Bangladesh, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Ghana, Iraq, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Zambia.

Abstaining:

Bahamas, Côte d'Ivoire, Guatemala, Philippines, Rwanda.

24. *Draft decision E/2011/L.36 was adopted by 29 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions.*

25. **Mr. Brauwers** (Belgium) thanked all the members of the Council who had supported the draft decision, thus granting the NGO International Lesbian and Gay Association consultative status with the Council. Belgium, which accorded the utmost importance to combating all forms of discrimination, noted that in more than 10 years no organization for the defence of LGBT rights had obtained that status. The Council's systematic undoing of the negative decisions taken by the Committee was not enough to dispel Belgium's concerns regarding the operation of that organ. The participation of civil society and NGOs was vital to the work of the United Nations in general and the Economic and Social Council in particular. Regardless of their nature, NGOs broadened the range of interaction. The Committee's discrimination against NGOs that defended LGBT rights signified a weakening, by the Committee itself, of the principles governing the granting of consultative status with the Council. The arrangements to permit consultations with NGOs had been designed to enable representatives of civil society to enrich the work of the United Nations by bringing in points of view different, in many cases, from those of States. The Belgian delegation urged the members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to defend and ensure compliance with all the principles agreed by the Member States in resolution 1996/31.

26. **Mr. Ahmed** (Bangladesh), while saluting the contribution of local and international NGOs to his country's social and economic development, said that it was virtually impossible for the members of the Economic and Social Council, considering their work loads, to study NGO files with the same attention as the Committee. Bangladesh had full confidence in the Committee with regard to its work, its competence and its decisions and considered that every decision taken by it was well-founded. Going against a Committee

decision challenged its authority and its competence and established an inappropriate precedent that might lead the questioning of its role. Furthermore, the selective reversal of a Committee decision was liable to introduce an element of subjectivity detrimental to both the Committee and the Council. Bangladesh had consequently voted against draft decision E/2011/L.36.

27. **Ms. Guilarte Calles** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision because her country was convinced that the active participation of the most vulnerable groups was a sine qua non for democratization. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela considered the activism of popular movements that combated discrimination on sexual grounds as vital, and had no objection, in the case in hand, to the NGO International Lesbian and Gay Association being given consultative status.

Draft decision E/2011/L.37: Application of the non-governmental organization International Foundation for Electoral Systems for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council

28. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) introduced the draft decision on the request for special consultative status made by the NGO International Foundation for Electoral Systems, expressing the hope that it could be adopted by consensus.

29. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the draft decision entitled "Application of the non-governmental organization International Foundation for Electoral Systems for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council", contained in document E/2011/L.37.

30. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that the organization International Foundation for Electoral Systems, whose application had been before the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations for over two years, had long since established close and constructive working relations with United Nations organs and numerous Governments throughout the world, managing electoral assistance programmes with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and collaborating with the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), the United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF), the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and United Nations missions such as the United Nations

Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA). A member of the Council had gone to considerable lengths to discredit the activities of that NGO, raising questions both about its relations with the countries in which it managed projects and about its respect for national sovereignty. The NGO clearly responded that its work consisted simply in strengthening the capacities of local organizations for organizing elections competently and with a view to equity. The American delegation therefore requested the members of the Council to support the draft decision.

31. **The President** pointed out that the draft decision contained no programme budget implications and said he took it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision E/2011/L.37.

32. *It was so decided.*

33. **Mr. Brauwers** (Belgium) said that in recent years, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had moved further and further, in considering applications, from the principles of resolution 1996/31. Belgium was consequently very pleased that the Council had been able to decide by consensus to grant the consultative status in question.

34. **Mr. Cruz Toruño** (Nicaragua) expressed regret that it had been necessary to take action on the draft decision, something that did not bode well for the work of the Council and its subsidiary bodies. Nicaragua had not joined the consensus on the decision.

35. **Ms. Madrigal Muñoz** (Observer for Cuba) stressed that the granting of consultative status to the NGO International Foundation for Electoral Systems reopened to question what was established by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and constituted a violation of the provisions of resolution 1996/31. Decisions of the Committee should be strictly respected, in so far as they rested on a detailed examination. The Council's decision constituted a negative precedent, challenging the legitimacy of the work of subsidiary bodies and affording countries the possibility to grant consultative status in a selective, politicized manner.

36. Cuba pointed out that in the case of the International Foundation for Electoral Systems, the Committee had decided to extend the consideration of the application due to the fact that the organization had not answered all the questions. The NGO had received 136,000 United States dollars in financing from the

United States Agency for International Development to contribute to the implementation of recommendations made in a report of the Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba that had been adopted by the Government of the United States of America and favoured a change of government in Cuba. Those facts led one to believe that the NGO engaged in subversive activities incompatible with resolution 1996/31 and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Cuba, in total disagreement with the Council decision, which impaired the serious work of other NGOs, intended to follow closely the activities of the NGO and take action accordingly.

37. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) welcomed the consensus on the draft decision and stated that the Cuban delegation's remarks were a repetition of allegations formulated against the NGO in the past and had no basis in fact.

38. **Mr. Espinosa-Salas** (Ecuador) said that his country, while recognizing the useful work of NGOs, wished that in future, NGOs whose activities gave rise to any doubt would provide more ample information, including on their finances resources.

39. **Ms. Guilarte Calles** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), expressing her country's profound commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and its desire to see the Council's debates lead to consensus serving the general interest, said that the adoption of the draft decision was regrettable because it accorded consultative status to an NGO suspected of taking part in activities aimed at destabilizing democratic States, of which Venezuela was one, at the behest of its principal donor. Inasmuch as the basic principles of self-determination of peoples, sovereign equality of all Member States and non-intervention in their internal affairs were not respected by the NGO, the Venezuelan delegation dissociated itself from the consensus.

Draft decision E/2011/L.38: Application of the non-governmental organization Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council

40. **Mr. Mattéi** (France) introduced draft decision E/2011/L.38, entitled "Application of the non-governmental organization Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council". He stated that NGO's aim was to promote a culture of respect for

freedom of opinion, expression and belief within Syrian society and that it sought to improve the training of journalists and other media professionals in the field of freedom of expression.

41. **The President** invited the Council to take action on draft decision entitled “Application of the non-governmental organization Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council”, contained in document E/2011/L.38.

42. **Mr. Mattéi** (France) pointed out that the NGO's objectives were in full agreement with the Charter of the United Nations. Since 2008, its application for accreditation had been postponed on several occasions on grounds unrelated to the criteria set out in resolution 1996/31. At the most recent meeting of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, at a time when repression was raging in Syria, the organization's application had once again been blocked by a no-action motion. Repeated recourse to such motions was unacceptable and constituted a violation of the Council's good practices. France called on all delegations to support the draft.

43. **The President** said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision E/2011/L.38 without a vote.

44. *The draft decision was adopted.*

45. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) welcomed the decision, whereby the Council had for the first time granted consultative status to a Syrian NGO.

46. **Mr. Jiang** (China) stressed that decisions of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to postpone or deny an application by certain organizations were taken following a detailed examination, which must be taken into account. The Chinese delegation, deploring the practice of reversing the Committee's decisions, had voted against draft decision E/2011/L.36 and dissociated itself from the consensus on draft decisions E/2011/L.37 and E/2011/L.38.

47. **Mr. Nebenzia** (Russian Federation), after offering his condolences to the Norwegian people, said that the Russian delegation had voted against draft decision E/2011/L.36 and dissociated itself from the consensus on draft decisions E/2011/L.37 and E/2011/L.38. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had recommended to the Council to

grant consultative status to twice as many NGOs as the previous year, but its task had not been facilitated, and while it did happen that the Committee took decisions rapidly, prolonged consideration of applications was due to persistent doubts. What the States favourable to the draft decisions just adopted praised as a triumph of common sense and democracy actually reflected a lack of recognition of the skills and work of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

48. **Mr. Brauwers** (Belgium), noting the tendency of some States to deny consultative status to NGOs critical of the human rights situation in their territory, reminded Member States that the provisions governing consultations with NGOs were not aimed at promoting State interests, but rather at enabling civil-society actors to take part in the work of the United Nations, even when their position did not serve the interests of the State. Belgium attached great importance to the contribution of NGOs and urged the members of the Committee to defend and preserve the guiding principles stated in resolution 1996/31.

49. **Ms. Mostafa Rizk** (Egypt) reaffirmed her country's position with respect to draft decisions E/2011/L.37 and E/2011/L.38 and emphasized that the Council's decisions must be founded on a clear recommendation by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. By adopting the said draft decisions, the Council was deciding questions under consideration by the Committee and thus undermining the Committee's authority.

50. **Ms. Haruki** (Japan), indicating that her delegation had voted in favour of draft decision E/2011/L.36 and associated itself with the consensus on draft decisions E/2011/L.37 and E/2011/L.38, said that decisions of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should rest solely on agreement of the NGO's objectives with the provisions of the Charter and the principles stated in resolution 1996/31. True, the Committee needed time to look into the activities of NGOs, yet it was regrettable that the applications of some NGOs had been pushed aside repeatedly despite the fact that all the Committee's questions had been answered. The fact that the Japanese delegation had supported the applications of the NGOs in question did not necessarily mean that the Japanese Government agreed with their policies or their beliefs.

51. **Ms. Guilarte Calles** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her country deplored the adoption

of draft decision E/2011/L.38, inasmuch as the NGO concerned had not responded to questions raised by a large number of members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, including Venezuela's request for the NGO to provide documents proving that it had obtained authorization from the Syrian Government to carry on activities in that country. The fact that the NGO had obtained consultative status despite the objections formulated by many members and the examination in progress within the Committee was alarming, and her delegation dissociated itself from the consensus on that draft.

52. **Mr. Mattéi** (France) welcomed the adoption of draft decision E/2011/L.38, whereby the Council recognized the compliance of the Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression as well as the diversity and vitality of Syrian civil society, an important message in the light of the current situation.

53. **Mr. Espinosa-Salas** (Ecuador) said that, for the reasons already stated, his delegation dissociated itself from the consensus relating to documents E/2011/L.37 and E/2011/L.38.

Decision on the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2010/32 (Part I))

54. **The President** invited the Council to turn to the recommendations in chapter I of the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2011 regular session, contained in document E/2011/32 (Part I). He invited the Council to take action on draft decision I, entitled "Applications for consultative status, requests for reclassification and change of name, quadrennial reports received from non-governmental organizations and applications closed without prejudice", and mentioned that in paragraph (a) of the draft decision, under the heading "General consultative status", "Hope International" should be replaced by "NGO Hope International". He asked whether any delegation wished to comment on that draft decision, as orally revised.

55. **Mr. Jaiswal** (India) said his delegation fully supported the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations but requested that the decision to grant consultative status to the NGO "Movement against atrocities and repression" be referred back to the Committee, for review.

56. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said his delegation wondered whether that was the appropriate procedure in the case in hand, since no one had been able to consult with his capital on the matter in order to obtain instructions in that regard. He suggested that India request the revocation or suspension of the NGO at the next session of the Committee, in January 2012.

57. **Mr. Jaiswal** (India) pointed out that his delegation was not requesting the immediate revocation of the status of that NGO, but wished to refer the decision concerning it back to the Committee.

58. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that the Council might look into the facts in greater detail and come back to the question later in the current session. He did not feel the Council could take an informed decision without being in possession of more precise information. He proposed that the Council should take note of India's concern and request the Committee to re-examine the issue at its next session, and asked for the opinions of the other delegations on the matter.

59. **Mr. Jaiswal** (India) asked whether the proposed solution would mean not granting the NGO consultative status and considering the application again at the Council's January 2012 session.

60. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) replied that, if his proposal was adopted, the NGO would continue to enjoy consultative status until January 2012.

61. **Mr. Morrill** (Canada) said that his delegation was also unprepared, since it had not been aware of India's concerns and arguments regarding the decision in question. He proposed giving India time to provide more extensive information and postponing the Council's decision on the matter to a meeting later in the current session.

62. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said he subscribed to the Canadian delegation's proposal. He took India's concerns seriously, but would like to have additional information on the matter.

63. **Mr. Jaiswal** (India) said he also supported Canada's proposal.

64. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said he would like the secretariat to confirm that in so doing, the Council was indeed respecting the procedures in force.

65. **The President** proposed that the Council take action on draft decision I as a whole, without taking any action on the NGO “Movement against atrocities and repression”, on which it would come to a decision in the coming days. Upon reaching a decision regarding the NGO, the Council could take note of the entire report and complete the consideration of the draft decisions contained in document E/2011/32 (Part I). He asked whether the Council was ready to adopt draft decision I, as orally revised.

66. *Draft decision I, as orally revised, was adopted.*

67. **Mr. Jaiswal** (India) pointed out that his delegation had requested the postponement of the decision on the “Movement against atrocities and repression” upon recently learning from a reliable source that members of that NGO had taken part in aircraft hijackings in 1981 and 1984. “Wanted” notices had thus been issued for some members of the NGO in order that they might be extradited to India and tried there.

Decision on the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2010/32 (Part II))

68. **The President** invited the Council to proceed to the consideration of the second part of the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2011 regular session, contained in document E/2011/32 (Part II). He invited the Council to take action on the seven draft decisions recommended by the Committee, contained in chapter I of the report.

Draft decision I: Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations

69. **The President** said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision I, due account being taken of the decision it had just adopted on draft decision E/2011/L.36.

70. *The draft decision was adopted.*

Draft decision II: Closure of applications for consultative status of non-governmental organizations that had failed to respond to queries over the course of two consecutive sessions

71. **The President** said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision II.

72. *The draft decision was adopted.*

Draft decision III: Suspension of consultative status of non-governmental organizations with outstanding quadrennial reports, pursuant to Council resolution 2008/4

73. **The President** said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision III.

74. *The draft decision was adopted.*

Draft decision IV: Reinstatement of consultative status of non-governmental organizations that submitted outstanding quadrennial reports, pursuant to Council resolution 2008/4

75. **The President** said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision IV.

76. *The draft decision was adopted.*

Draft decision V: Withdrawal of consultative status of non-governmental organizations in accordance with Council resolution 2008/4

77. **The President** said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision V.

78. *The draft decision was adopted.*

Draft decision VI: Dates of and provisional agenda for the 2012 session of the Committee on Non Governmental Organizations

79. **The President** said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision VI.

80. *The draft decision was adopted.*

Draft decision VII: Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2011 resumed session

81. **The President** said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision VII.

82. *The draft decision was adopted.*

Withdrawal of the amendment to draft decision I (E/2011/32 (Part II), chap. I), contained in document E/2011/L.44

83. **The President** said that, in the light of the adoption of draft decision I contained in document E/2011/32 (Part II), he took it that the amendment to draft decision I, as contained in document E/2011/L.44, was now withdrawn by its sponsor.

84. *It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.