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Opening of the Session

1. The Special Session of the Executive Committee of the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) was held via teleconference on 11 January 2007. The virtual session was attended by representatives of the following eight Members of the Executive Committee: Antigua and Barbuda, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Trinidad and Tobago, United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

2. Ms. Rosicar Mata León (Venezuela, President of the Executive Committee) opened the session and welcomed the participants.

3. Dr. Mirta Roses (Director, Pan American Sanitary Bureau) also extended a welcome to the participants. She pointed out that the virtual session represented a historic moment since participants were fully employing a technology that allows for increasing participation and providing the Governing Bodies more time to reflect and exchange ideas. This is the result of a nearly three-year experience in which Governing Body working groups have been using this technology to exchange ideas in order to prepare important recommendations for the Organization. She added that this was the first time the Executive Committee has held a deferred session to conclude matters unresolved at the Committee’s previous session. The Director mentioned that other organizations are quite interested and eager to discover how the Member States have learned to navigate this technology, which has truly enabled the Organization’s activities to move ahead in a very democratic, participatory, and transparent fashion by cutting costs and not allowing a lack of resources to hinder full participation of Member States.

Procedural Matters

Officers

4. The following Members elected to serve as officers for the 139th Session of the Executive Committee continued in their respective roles at the Special Session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>(Ms. Rosicar Mata León)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>(Mr. John Maginley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapporteur</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>(Mr. Mark Abdoo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The Director served as Secretary ex officio, and Dr. Richard Van West Charles, interim Deputy Director of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau (PASB), served as Technical Secretary.
Adoption of the Agenda (Document CESS/1, Rev. 1)

6. Pursuant to Rule 9 of its Rules of Procedure, the Executive Committee adopted the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat.

Governing Body Matters

Revision of the Principles Governing Relations between the Pan American Health Organization and Nongovernmental Organizations (Document CESS/3)

7. The Delegate of Canada said that his Government supported the resolution contained in Document CESS/3; however, he believed, in fact, that the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration, at its March meeting, will be empowered to examine requests submitted for consideration and make an appropriate recommendation to the Executive Committee at its June session. He proposed amending paragraph 2, page 6, to read as follows: “During the March meeting of the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration ...”

8. One Member expressed his concern regarding the definition of a nongovernmental organization as being extremely broad, since it encompassed almost all aspects of participation in any activity within the community. He pointed out that perhaps the intent was not to exclude anyone, and that if it were to read “any group of technical associations or federation of professionals,” it would cover everyone, without mentioning that its focus can be health and human development, assistance, relief, protection, and welfare.

9. Members requested clarification as to what the exceptional circumstances for establishing relations with national nongovernmental organizations would be, in addition to the meaning of “whether or not affiliated,” and the discretion granted to the Director of PAHO to determine eligibility of a national NGO.

10. Chile, in reference to Item 5.1 on national nongovernmental organizations, proposed considering as a requirement consultation with the relevant State regarding the nationality of the NGO.

11. Dr. Philippe Lamy (Area Manager, Governance, Policy, and Partnerships) reminded participants that the definition of a nongovernmental organization is the same as the one appearing in the previous version of the Principles, and that should they wish to change the definition at this time, they should agree to alternative wording. Regarding national nongovernmental organizations, he mentioned that this matter is addressed under Item 4.2, which states that in exceptional cases a national NGO may be considered
eligible after a process of consultation between the Director and the Member State; in other words, it is not a decision, but a mere proposal dependent on the Director’s opinion in consultation with the Member State. In order to familiarize Committee members with the changes incorporated into the text under consideration, he explained that (1) the term “Standing Committee” was replaced by a reference to the new Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration; (2) the Protocol for reviewing collaboration with nongovernmental organizations was inserted under Items 5.1 and 5.2 of the Principles; (3) based on previous discussions of the Executive Committee and the former Subcommittee on Programming and Planning regarding the need to reinforce assessment mechanisms for admitting NGOs, an addition was made under Item 4.3 requiring that NGOs submit financial statements; and (4) in response to the requirement to improve monitoring and assessment of the work of these organizations, a reference was included in the last paragraph of Item 4.3 regarding the use of indicators.

12. One Member indicated that the most difficult aspect to address, which would consequently spark more debate, was the issue of nonofficial relations—something quite new. He suggested that in order to establish nonofficial relations, an NGO should submit a request to the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration, which would then examine the request in which the NGO should explain why it is seeking to establish relations with PAHO. Then, the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration would submit the proposal to the Executive Committee, which, in turn, would render a decision. He also added that it was very important for inter-American and national NGOs to be backed by their respective governments when requesting nonofficial or official relations with PAHO.

13. Dr. Heidi Jimenez (Legal Counsel) responded to the remarks of the Delegate from Cuba by emphasizing that the Principles submitted for consideration, in fact, do set forth a mechanism allowing national NGOs to establish nonofficial relations. Nevertheless, PAHO has many ongoing relations with national organizations, but the difference lies in these relations are currently carried out bilaterally.

14. In response to the question concerning exceptional cases of relations with national NGOs, the Director mentioned the Organization’s relations with the American Red Cross as an example of a national organization whose activities and impact are important, and which is also a member of both international and inter-American networks. She said that there are not many national organizations; this is why they are considered exceptional cases, thus allowing for the possibility while also establishing a specific mechanism. This feature already existed in the Organization’s previous version of the document. It is important to conserve the language providing for formal consultation regarding the establishment of official relations with an NGO. Likewise, for operative purposes it would be important to retain the need for consultation to be carried out with the Member State in which the NGO has its headquarters, because, in any case, a request to establish
official relations must be presented to the Subcommittee and, therefore, the Member States, through this Governing Body, will have the opportunity to either endorse the request or not.

15. Finally, regarding eligibility criteria, all other criteria listed for international NGOs will undoubtedly apply to them; the reason for having a specific paragraph addressing the eligibility of NGOs is precisely because it is an exceptional case. By incorporating the protocol under paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the *Principles* and by establishing stricter criteria for reviewing the nature of an NGO and its recognition to some extent, these criteria reduce the ambiguity of the definition of an NGO by requiring a review of the legal, administrative, and financial aspects. All Member States have a legal framework that defines for them a recognized NGO, and that same legal framework provides a narrower definition of an NGO than that of PAHO, which PAHO must adhere to and respect, and this is one of the requirements that must be met by an NGO upon submitting its application. She underscored that, although the definition of an NGO appearing on the first page of the *Principles* is quite broad, by establishing eligibility criteria, the definition is actually restricted since each country’s definition must be respected.

16. The Committee adopted the Resolution as amended.¹

**Program Policy Matters**

*Division of Labor among UN Agencies Regarding the Recommendations of the Global Task Team for Improving HIV/AIDS Coordination in Response to Resolution WHA59.12* (Documents CESS/4 and Add.1)

17. The Delegate of Canada proposed a general amendment to the Decision in Document CESS/4, as follows: “… Decides that the PAHO Secretariat should: (a) be flexible when interpreting and implementing the assignments of the Global Task Team, taking into account the local and subregional specificities of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, together with the comparative strengths of the various United Nations agencies in various geographic locations, and (b) present a report on the results to the Pan American Sanitary Conference.”

18. The Delegate of the United States indicated that his Government believes the recommendations of the Global Task Team are far-reaching and allow leeway for regional and country specificities and, as a result, his country does not see the need for the Executive Committee to take action to allow the Secretariat to continue its work as currently carried out. He proposed not adopting the draft decision.

¹ See Resolution CESS.R1 in Annex A.
19. The Delegate of Venezuela endorsed the draft decision presented, which would allow PAHO to adapt the division of labor scenario.

20. The Delegate of Uruguay supported Canada’s proposal and mentioned that his country had a very positive experience regarding use of the Regional Revolving Fund for Strategic Public Health Supplies. He pointed out the experience of MERCOSUR countries in their negotiations, which enabled them to reduce the price of antiretrovirals and make joint purchases. It is important to spread news of this type of experience through the Organization, along with the understanding that necessary funds can be used to make this vital medication available to the population.

21. The Delegate of Canada, bearing in mind the remarks of the Delegate of the United States, said that, at first, it was Canada’s view that this was a matter the Secretariat should negotiate and discuss with WHO. Perhaps the fact that the Organization has a unique role to perform was not taken into consideration when making the decision; therefore, the key word in the amendments proposed by Canada is “flexibility” and that the Organization continue to discuss its role and present to the Pan American Sanitary Conference a report and conclusions on what was actually discussed with WHO and other agencies. He said that PAHO has a unique role to perform in the Region of the Americas, and he acknowledged the hard work carried out and the success achieved by way of the Organization’s capacity to provide the most needed medication, particularly antiretrovirals, to the countries of the Region of the Americas through the Strategic Fund and other mechanisms.

22. The Delegate of the United States agreed with the wording put forth by Canada; however, he recommended deleting subparagraph (b) present a report to the 27th Pan American Sanitary Conference. Given that the wording recommended by Canada requests that PAHO be flexible and carry on its work, it will not be necessary to present a special report to the Conference.

23. Although Canada supported the amendment proposed by the United States, the Member thought that perhaps it would be beneficial for the Secretariat and Member States to present to the Executive Committee at its June meeting a brief progress report on the status of its deliberations with WHO regarding this matter, so that Member States may determine whether or not there is a particular problem with these deliberations, and to reassure the countries of how well the Organization is managing antiretrovirals, the Regional Revolving Fund for Strategic Public Health Supplies, and other mechanisms.

24. In response to the concern voiced by the Delegate of Venezuela regarding the ambiguity of the phrase “be flexible,” the United States suggested replacing paragraph a) with “take advantage of the flexibility of the Global Task Team technical-support division of labor . . . .”
25. Dr. Patricio Rojas (Acting Unit Chief, HIV/AIDS, PAHO), added to the discussion by mentioning that the tenor of the dialogue reflects a consensus among the different opinions. Accordingly, from a technical perspective, the Secretariat is pleased and willing to continue moving forward with its efforts to ensure that the Organization’s comparative advantage may be fully realized.

26. Because meetings are held periodically with the group of UNAIDS agencies in the Region of the Americas, the next of which will take place at the end of February, and also with the individuals heading up the new team that has joined WHO, the Director said she prefers to retain the reference on updating the Executive Committee on the status of the role of the Organization in this matter. It was also important for the Organization’s other partners and allies, and she mentioned that Member States need to remain aware of what transpires with regard to the role played by the Organization, particularly in reference to the Strategic Fund, which is an innovative mechanism used by the countries of the Americas to reap many benefits. The outpouring of Pan American solidarity has also made it possible to increase access; in fact, it is one of the components mentioned in the assessment of the 3 x 5 initiative, whose goal was almost met only in this Region, given the commitment and solidarity among the countries. The Secretariat believed that periodically reporting to the Executive Committee constitutes a strength and an indication that the Members States are monitoring the issue. She would therefore prefer to conserve the periodic reporting, without clearly stating that it be this June, but that the Secretariat periodically presents a status report on the situation to the Executive Committee.

27. The Delegate of Uruguay remarked that the international system has been taking action on this pandemic for quite awhile, and he believes that it is time they begin to see an assessment of its impact. He proposed incorporating this complementary concept.

28. Responding to the request of Uruguay and attempting to reflect what he expressed, the Director suggested replacing “… as well as the comparative strengths of the respective UN agencies” in subparagraph a) with “… the successes achieved with the action taken to contain it, together with the strengths.”

29. The Delegate of Uruguay thanked the Director and accepted her suggestions.

30. The Committee approved the decision as amended.²

² See Decision CESS(D1) in Annex B.
31. The Director thanked the Members for their participation. She also expressed her satisfaction for having fully met the objective for which the Committee was convened and for being able to take advantage of the new technology that furthers the possibility of participation.

32. The President declared the Special Session of the Executive Committee closed.

Annexes
RESOLUTION

CESS.R1: Revision of the Principles Governing Relations between the Pan American Health Organization and Nongovernmental Organizations

THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

Taking into account Resolution CE138.R12 that establishes the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration, which includes among its functions the responsibility for the process of admittance and assessment of nongovernmental organizations in official relations with PAHO, undertaken annually;

Mindful of the provisions of the “Principles Governing Relations between the Pan American Health Organization and Nongovernmental Organizations” (1995, and revised in 2000) and of the “Protocol for Reviewing Collaboration with Nongovernmental Organizations in Official Relations with PAHO” (2003); and

Considering that the changes proposed to the Principles, incorporating the Protocol, are rational and would facilitate their application,

RESOLVES:

To approve the revised version of the “Principles Governing Relations between the Pan American Health Organization and Nongovernmental Organizations”, as annexed.

(Single meeting, 11 January 2007)

Annex
1. Introduction

Article 71 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization stipulates that WHO may "make suitable arrangements for consultation and co-operation with non-governmental international organizations and, with the consent of the Government concerned, with national organizations, governmental or non-governmental."

Articles 2 and 3 of the Agreement between the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) respectively provide that the Pan American Sanitary Conference (1) "through the Directing Council of the Pan American Health Organization . . . shall serve . . . as the Regional Committee . . . of the World Health Organization for the Western Hemisphere" and (2) "may adopt and promote health and sanitary conventions and programs in the Western Hemisphere, provided that such conventions and programs are compatible with the policy and programs of the World Health Organization."

The Pan American Health Organization, within the regional context of the Western Hemisphere, therefore acts in conformity with the relevant policies and programs of WHO in its cooperation with nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

The objectives of this cooperation are to promote the policies, strategies, and programs derived from decisions of the Governing Bodies; to collaborate with regard to various PAHO programs in jointly agreed activities to implement these strategies; and to play an appropriate role in ensuring the harmonization of intersectoral interests among the various sectoral bodies concerned in a country or regional setting.

An NGO can be a technical association or a federation of professionals, educational faculties, or enterprises. Its focus can be: health and human development; assistance, relief, protection, and welfare; provision of service; research and investigation; community development, basic human needs, and appropriate technology; partnership with communities and institutional and organizational strengthening at the local level; or communication and information.

* Principles adopted by Resolution CESS.R1 (2007)
An international NGO is understood to be an organization that has relations with WHO and therefore, by definition, has official working relations with PAHO, as WHO regional office. Upon its own initiative or by invitation, and in close consultation with the particular Member State, an inter-American or national NGO affiliated with an international NGO in official relations with WHO may elaborate and execute a program of collaboration with PAHO (as described in sections 3.3 and 4) to ensure implementation of health strategies at the country level.

An inter-American NGO is headquartered in one country of the Western Hemisphere (Americas Region) and carries out operations in more than one country of the Region.

A national NGO operates in an individual country of the Region.

2. Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration

The Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration will review applications received and submit a recommendation for action by the Executive Committee. It will also periodically review collaboration with NGOs and make recommendations to the Executive Committee concerning renewal of such collaboration.

3. Types of Relations at the Inter-American and National Levels

3.1 Informal Working Relations

In order that PAHO may promote and support collaboration with NGOs in various fields, the Headquarters technical program or country office concerned may establish informal working relations with an inter-American or national NGO, subject to consultation between the Director of PAHO and the Member State. Such working relations shall be based on a program of activities developed and implemented as described in sections 3.3 and 4.

3.2 Official Working Relations

PAHO recognizes only one category of formal relations, known as official working relations, with those NGOs which meet the criteria described in these Principles.

3.3 Development of Informal and Official Working Relations

The establishment of relations with an NGO shall be an evolving process proceeding through a number of separate stages, as follows:
First, informal contacts between PAHO and an NGO occur in the form of exchanges of information and/or reciprocal participation in technical meetings. These exchanges are designed to heighten mutual understanding of each institution’s mission, purpose, and comparative interests and strengths. This type of informal contact may continue on an ad hoc basis, without time limit and without written agreement. However, the definition of the broad objectives of collaboration and the possibility of enlarging its scope to include specific joint activities in line with the particular expertise of the NGO are also explored at this stage.

When a number of specific joint activities have been identified, collaboration may be taken a stage further by proceeding to the definition of informal working relations entered into by a legally binding agreement. Such an agreement sets out the basis for the collaboration, indicating details of the activities to be undertaken during the period, providing an estimate of the resources to be supplied by PAHO and the NGO, and designating focal points in the NGO and technical officers in PAHO.

Collaborative activities are jointly monitored every two years, thus allowing for necessary adjustments to the original work plan. At the end of the period of informal working relations, a joint assessment of the outcome of the collaboration is undertaken by the parties concerned, including consideration of the future relationship. This may result in:

- the continuation of the existing informal working relations for a further period;
- an application for admission into official working relations with PAHO for examination by the Executive Committee, should there be a number of activities which might form the basis of a long-term and closer relationship;
- a decision that there is no scope for further contacts in the foreseeable future.

4. Admittance of Inter-American and National NGOs into Official Working Relations with PAHO

In order to be eligible for admittance into official working relations with PAHO, the main area of competence of the NGO shall fall within the purview of PAHO. Its aims and activities shall be in conformity with the spirit, purposes, and principles of the Constitution of PAHO, shall center on health or health-related fields, and shall be free from concerns which are primarily of a commercial or profit-making nature. The major part of its activities shall be relevant to and have a bearing on the implementation of the major policy orientations of PAHO.

An NGO shall be eligible for admission based upon the following criteria:
the NGO shall have successfully completed at least two years of informal working relations (as described in section 3.3) prior to an application for admission into official working relations;

- the NGO has a well-defined mission and there has been continuity in its basic commitments over the years;

- a major part of the NGO’s activities and resources is directed towards health and health-related work;

- the NGO has a dependable source of funding for recurrent and fixed administrative costs;

- the NGO has adequate resources to support project and administrative staff, its facilities, and program development;

- the NGO has alternative sources of administrative support, such as income-generating activities and/or consulting;

- the NGO has the internal structures to guarantee adequate reporting, financial accounting, and budgeting;

- the NGO utilizes efficient information-gathering techniques to ensure that information is used by its staff and is fed back to the community, national and local government agencies, and other partners.

4.1 Eligibility of Inter-American NGOs

An inter-American NGO, in its structure and/or scope, shall represent a substantial proportion of the persons regionally organized for the purpose of participating in the particular field of interest in which it operates. When there are several inter-American NGOs with similar areas of interest, they may form a joint committee or other body authorized to act for the group as a whole.

Thus, inter-American NGOs eligible for admission into official working relations with PAHO include various types of organizations with a federated structure (made up of
national or regional groups or having individual members from different countries), foundations that raise resources for health development activities in the Region, and similar bodies promoting health.

4.2 **Eligibility of National NGOs**

In exceptional cases, a national NGO, whether or not affiliated with an inter-American NGO, may be considered eligible for admission into official working relations after formal consultation between the director of PASB and the Member State, the results of which shall accompany the request, as indicated in item 5.1.

4.3 **Procedure for Admittance of Inter-American or National NGOs into Official Working Relations with PAHO**

Applications from NGOs, made voluntarily or by invitation, should reach PAHO headquarters not later than the end of January in order to be considered by the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration in March and approved by the Executive Committee in June of the same year.

Each application will include the following supporting documentation:

- a certified copy of the NGO's charter and by-laws;

- wherever applicable, certified copies of the charters and by-laws of its affiliates in the Hemisphere;

- an authenticated copy of the proceedings in which the directors were elected and of the authorization of the assembly to establish relations with PAHO;

- a copy of the most recent periodic report on its activities;

- financial statements for the previous fiscal year, including reference to public and private sources of financing;

- a general four-year program for collaborative activities which have been agreed upon by the NGO and PAHO headquarters and/or the respective PAHO/WHO Representative (PWR) Office, accompanied by a more specific biennial work plan that follows these guidelines:

  - a brief review of the health situation in the region, subregion, and/or country where the NGO functions;
  - reference to the specific areas in which PAHO and the NGO may collaborate;
• a description of how the projects will assist in PAHO's delivery of programs and activities;

• reference to the expected results of each project;

• an outline of the indicators for each of the expected results;

• a list of the activities to be carried out to achieve the expected results;

• reference to the various types of resources allocated by PAHO and the NGO for each activity;

• names of the focal points in the NGO and the designated technical officers at PAHO headquarters and/or in the PWR office.

During the March session, the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration will consider applications submitted by NGOs and will make recommendations thereon to the Executive Committee. It may invite a representative of the NGO to speak before it in connection with the NGO’s application. Should the applicant NGO be considered not to meet the established criteria, and bearing in mind the desirability of ensuring a valuable continuing partnership based on defined objectives and evidenced by a record of successful past collaboration and a framework for future collaborative activities, the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration may recommend postponement of consideration or rejection of an application.

The Executive Committee, after considering the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Program Budget, and Administration, shall decide whether an NGO is to be admitted into official working relations with PAHO. A reapplication from an NGO shall not be considered until two years have elapsed since the Executive Committee’s decision on the original application. The Director of PAHO shall inform each NGO of the Executive Committee’s decision on its application.

The four-year work plan based on mutually agreed objectives, and the outline of specific activities for each two-year period (as described in section 4) shall form the basis of official working relations between PAHO and the NGO. This plan shall also be transmitted to the PWR offices, as appropriate, to encourage closer formal collaboration at the country level.

The more specific two-year collaborative plan of action should include indicators that are specific, measurable, achievable and attributable, relevant and realistic, as well as time bound, traceable, and targeted (S.M.A.R.T.).
5. **Review of Collaboration with Inter-American and National NGOs**

The Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration will normally review collaboration with each NGO with which PAHO has official working relations every four years and, based on the results of the biennial work plans and activities undertaken during the period under review and on the proposed work plan for the next four-year period, shall make a recommendation to the Executive Committee on the desirability of maintaining these relations.

The Executive Committee may discontinue official working relations if it considers that such relations are no longer appropriate or necessary in light of changing programs or other circumstances. Similarly, the Executive Committee may suspend or discontinue official working relations if an NGO no longer meets the criteria that applied at the time of the establishment of such relations, or fails to fulfill its obligations under the agreed-upon program of collaboration.

Official relations may be terminated by either party through a written communication to the other party and with the approval of the Executive Committee, through the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration.

### 5.1 In order for the members of the Subcommittee to make their recommendation, the Director of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau (PASB) provides a background document to the Subcommittee that includes the following:

- Results of the formal consultation presented by the Member State in the case of a national NGO;
- Brief background on the NGO in question;
- Report by the NGO on activities undertaken during the period in question (normally four years, but in some cases this may be only one or two years) with reference to indicators (see last paragraph of section 4.3.);
- A proposed program of work for the forthcoming four-year period; and
- A critical commentary on the above-mentioned brief background and report by the NGO by the appropriate technical unit of the PASB.

### 5.2 Application of Criteria

5.2.1 The Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration should consider the following three criteria when reviewing the background document prepared by the PASB: (a) Has the NGO in question and the relevant technical unit or country
office in PAHO agreed upon a general four-year program for collaborative activities, with a more specific two-year work plan for the period under review? (b) Has the NGO submitted a report on activities which specifically refers to indicators of the previous two-year work plan? (c) Has the technical unit found the performance of the NGO to be satisfactory, according to the S.M.A.R.T. indicators agreed upon in the two year work plan?

5.2.2 If all of the three questions are answered in the affirmative, then the members of the Subcommittee on Program, Budget, and Administration will be in the position to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee on its findings based on the review of the past work plan, the future work plan, as well as the recommendation of the technical unit of PAHO.

5.2.3 In reviewing the background document regarding an NGO, the Subcommittee should rate the activities of the NGO on a high-to-low basis according to the following criteria:

- Public health significance of the NGO’s activities,
- Utility and sustainability,
- Practicality,
- Cost/time (in this case “low” would be the preferred score).

Should the response to any one of the three criteria questions in section 5.2.1. be negative, then the Subcommittee will not be in a position to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee.

6. Privileges Conferred on NGOs by their Relationship with PAHO

The privileges conferred by an official working relationship include:

- the right to appoint a representative to participate, without the right to vote, in PAHO meetings or those convened under its authority to which the NGO is invited. Whenever the Pan American Sanitary Conference, Directing Council, or a committee or conference convened under PAHO’s aegis discusses an item in which a related NGO is particularly interested, that NGO, at the invitation of the president of the body or at the request of the NGO, may make a statement of an expository nature and, with the consent of the president of the session, it may be invited to make an additional statement for purposes of clarification, in the course of the discussion of the item before the session;
- access to nonconfidential documentation and such other documentation as the Director of PAHO may see fit to make available through such channels as PAHO may establish;

- the right to submit a memorandum to the Director of PAHO, who shall determine the nature and scope of its circulation. In the event of a memorandum being submitted which the Director considers might be placed on the agenda of the Pan American Sanitary Conference or Directing Council, such memorandum shall be placed before the Executive Committee for possible inclusion in the agenda of the Pan American Sanitary Conference or Directing Council.

A national NGO which is affiliated with an inter-American NGO covering the same subject on a regional basis shall present its views through that NGO, unless other arrangements are made in view of its particular relationship with PAHO.

7. **Responsibilities of NGOs in Their Relationship with PAHO**

   NGOs shall be responsible for implementing the mutually agreed-upon program of collaboration and shall inform PAHO as soon as possible if for any reason they are unable to fulfill their obligations under the agreement.

   NGOs shall utilize the opportunities available to them through their normal work to disseminate information on PAHO policies and programs.

   NGOs shall collaborate individually or collectively in PAHO programs to further their regional and national health goals and to promote the implementation of the major policy documents of PAHO adopted by the Governing Bodies of the Organization.

8. **Amendment of the Principles**

   These Principles may be amended by a resolution of the Executive Committee.
DECISION

CESS(D1)

THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

Having considered Document CE139/6 on the Division of Labor among UN Agencies Regarding the Recommendations of the Global Task Team for Improving HIV/AIDS Coordination in Response to Resolution WHA59.12,

DECIDES that the PAHO Secretariat should: (a) take advantage of the flexibility of the Global Task Team technical-support division of labor, taking into account the local and subregional specificities of the HIV/AIDS pandemic and the successes achieved with the action taken to contain it, together with the strengths of the various United Nations agencies, and (b) report periodically to the Executive Committee.
PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Opening of the Session

2. Procedural Matters

   2.1 Adoption of the Agenda

3. Governing Body Matters

   3.1 Revision of the Principles Governing Relations between the Pan American Health Organization and Nongovernmental Organizations: draft resolution

4. Program Policy Matters

   4.1 Division of Labor among UN Agencies Regarding the Recommendations of the Global Task Team for Improving HIV/AIDS Coordination in Response to Resolution WHA59.12: draft decision
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