

**Security Council**

Distr.: General
23 January 2017

Original: English

Letter dated 23 January 2017 from the Ombudsperson addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to submit herewith the thirteenth report of the Office of the Ombudsperson, pursuant to paragraph 20 (c) of annex II to Security Council resolution 2253 (2015), according to which the Ombudsperson shall submit biannual reports to the Council summarizing her activities. The report describes the activities of the Office during the period since the previous report was issued, covering the period from 1 August 2016 to 23 January 2017.

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

(Signed) Catherine **Marchi-Uhel**
Ombudsperson



Report of the Office of the Ombudsperson pursuant to Security Council resolution 2253 (2015)

I. Background

1. The present report provides an update on the activities undertaken by the Office of the Ombudsperson since the issuance of the twelfth report of the Office (S/2016/671) on 1 August 2016.

II. Activities related to delisting cases

General

2. The primary activities of the Office during the reporting period related to delisting requests submitted by individuals and entities.

Delisting cases

3. During the reporting period, eight new cases were submitted to the Office and accepted, including two repeat requests. The total number of delisting petitions submitted to the Office since its establishment was 78 as at 23 January 2017. Unless the petitioner requests otherwise, all names remain confidential while under consideration and in the case of denial or withdrawal of a petition.

4. In total, the Ombudsperson has submitted 68 comprehensive reports¹ to the Security Council Committee pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999), 1989 (2011) and 2253 (2015) concerning the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (Da'esh), Al-Qaida and associated individuals, groups, undertakings and entities since the Office was established. During the reporting period, she submitted 3 reports and appeared before the Committee on one occasion to present one case.

5. Since the issuance of the twelfth report, the name of one individual has been retained through the Ombudsperson process.

6. Cumulatively, since the Office was established, 66 cases involving requests made to the Ombudsperson by an individual, an entity or a combination of both have been resolved through the Ombudsperson process or through a separate decision of the Committee. In the 64 cases fully completed through the Ombudsperson process, 46 individuals and 28 entities have been delisted, 1 entity has been removed as an alias of a listed entity, and 13 delisting requests have been refused. In addition, 3 individuals were delisted by the Committee before the Ombudsperson process was completed and one petition was withdrawn following

¹ The total includes one case concluded in 2011, in which the delisting request was withdrawn by the petitioner after the Ombudsperson had submitted and presented her 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 her report to the Committee but before she had presented it to the same. The total does not include two additional cases concluded in 2013, in which the case of the Ombudsperson became moot following a decision by the Committee to delist the petitioners before the Ombudsperson had submitted her report.

the submission of the comprehensive report. A description of the status of all of the cases, as at 23 January 2017, is contained in the annex to the present report.

7. There are 8 cases pending before the Ombudsperson in the information gathering and dialogue phase and 3 cases pending before the Committee. The four requests submitted to the Office during the reporting period were presented by individuals. To date, in total, 70 of the 78 cases have been brought by individuals, 2 by an individual together with one or more entities and 6 by entities alone. In 38 of the 78 cases, the petitioner is or was assisted by legal counsel.

Gathering of information from States

8. In the eight new cases, 30 requests for information have been sent so far to 16 States. With respect to the three cases for which a comprehensive report was submitted to the Committee during the reporting period, there were four instances when a State from which information had been requested failed to respond. In addition to the responses received from States to which requests had been specifically directed, some Committee members provided information in response to the general circulation of petitions.

9. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson met on one occasion with officials in their capital to gather information directly on two specific cases. She also met with the authorities of three States in their respective capitals to discuss broader issues relating to the Ombudsperson process.

10. During the reporting period, on one occasion the Ombudsperson shortened the information-gathering period pursuant to paragraph 3 of annex II to resolution 2253 (2015), which provides the Ombudsperson the discretion to shorten the information-gathering period in cases where all the designating States consulted do not object to the petitioner's delisting.

Dialogue with the petitioner

11. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson and her Office interacted with all petitioners during the dialogue phase of pending cases, including through written exchanges, telephone discussions and face-to-face and videoconference interviews. The Ombudsperson also travelled to interview three petitioners in person.

Provision of comprehensive reports to interested States

12. Paragraph 13 of annex II to resolution 2253 (2015) stipulates that, if so requested, the Ombudsperson may provide a copy of the comprehensive report to an interested State (designating State or State of nationality, residence or incorporation) with the approval of the Committee, with any redactions needed to protect confidential material. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson received three requests for disclosure from States, all of which were approved by the Committee.

Access to classified or confidential information

13. A new arrangement for access to classified or confidential information was entered into with Canada during the reporting period. To date, there is one formal agreement with Austria and 17 arrangements, with Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa

Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, respectively. One arrangement concluded with the previous Ombudsperson contains language clearly indicating that the arrangement was between the State and the previous Ombudsperson personally. The Ombudsperson has engaged with that State, but has yet to obtain confirmation that the arrangement remains in force with her.

14. Efforts continued to expand the list of arrangements and agreements during the reporting period, and hopefully further progress will be made in the upcoming months. One State has confirmed that it is willing to enter into an information-sharing agreement, a draft of which is currently being finalized by the authorities of that State following engagement by the Ombudsperson with the Office of Legal Affairs and with the Permanent Mission of that State to the United Nations.

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

General

15. Activities to further develop and strengthen the Office of the Ombudsperson continued during the reporting period to the extent possible.

Outreach and publicizing of the Office

16. The Ombudsperson participated in outreach activities to the extent possible given the limitations on time and resources.

17. On 16 October 2016, the Ombudsperson participated as a commentator at the launching of a book on the power of due process, an event hosted by the Queen Mary University of London.² She specifically commented on procedural fairness in the Ombudsperson's process and how that process enhances the representation of the public interest. On 7 November, the Ombudsperson participated in an induction seminar for incoming Security Council members on the topics of sanctions and Security Council reporting, organized by the Security Council Affairs Division of the Department of Political Affairs. She presented the context in which the Office had been established and the role of the Ombudsperson. On 22 November, in an open briefing to Member States, the Ombudsperson provided an update on the status of cases in the Office and discussed the use of confidential information in her practice. During the briefing, she also stressed the lack of improvement of administrative arrangements for the Office and the resulting impact on its independence. She also addressed the recent setback in relation to reasons letters provided to petitioners and the resulting impact on the credibility of the Ombudsperson mechanism and expressed her hope for a prompt return to a better practice.

18. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson continued to engage with various institutions of the European Union. Notably, she discussed with

² Devika Hovell, *The Power of Process; the Value of Due Process in Security Council Sanctions Decision-Making*, (Oxford University Press, 2016).

representatives of the European Commission recent developments in the jurisprudence of the General Court of the European Union relevant to the practice of the Ombudsperson. She also met with a judge of the European Court of Justice,³ with whom she discussed various aspects of the practice of the Ombudsperson, including efforts to increase transparency and the issue of access to information. The discussion also covered fairness concerns arising from access to and reliance on confidential information that cannot be disclosed to the petitioner, an area of common interest to the Court and the Office of the Ombudsperson.⁴

Interaction with the Committee

19. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson appeared before the Committee on one occasion. On 8 August 2016, she presented her report in one case in which the petitioner was retained on the list.

20. As done previously, the Ombudsperson and staff supporting the Office have continued to engage regularly with the Coordinator and members of the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team. The Team has continued to provide relevant information in accordance with paragraph 4 of annex II to resolution 2253 (2015). During the reporting period, the Team assisted the Office in reviewing delisting requests and supporting materials that were in German or in Arabic. The Team also helped the Office with German- and Arabic-language communications with petitioners. Finally, the Team gave expert advice on issues relevant to particular delisting requests.

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

21. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson and staff supporting the Office continued to interact with States, in particular States of relevance to the pending delisting petitions. They had several bilateral meetings with States interested in the work of the Office in order to discuss general issues, including issues related to possible options for increasing the independence of the Office. The Ombudsperson continued discussions with a number of States concerning agreements or arrangements on access to confidential or classified information. She also maintained contacts with the informal Group of Like-Minded States on Targeted Sanctions,⁵ representatives of the European Union and representatives of the European Commission. The Ombudsperson also met with officials of several States in their respective capitals for general discussions and to obtain information regarding particular cases.

³ The meeting between the Ombudsperson and Judge Allan Rosas took place in New York on 1 November 2016.

⁴ Articles 105 and 190bis of the respective Rules of Procedure for the General Court and the European Court of Justice entered into force on 25 December 2016. These rules provide a framework for the procedural treatment of confidential information or material pertaining to the security of the European Union or of its member States or to the conduct of their international relations and the exceptions to the adversarial principle that may arise as a result.

⁵ Comprising Austria, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Germany, Finland, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

Working methods and research

22. As done previously, casework conducted during the reporting period involved open-source research to collect information relevant to delisting requests.

23. The Ombudsperson also continued to follow developments and collected information with regard to relevant national and regional legal cases, including the judgment issued by the General Court of the European Union in the case of *Mohammed Al-Ghabra v. European Commission*.⁶ Additional details on that judgment are provided below in the section on the relevance of the Office.

Website

24. The website of the Office (www.un.org/sc/suborg/en/ombudsperson) continues to be revised and updated.

IV. Observations and conclusions

Fairness and transparency of the process

Access to petitioners

25. The decision taken by the Committee on a delisting petition during the reporting period was premised solely on information gathered by the Ombudsperson and followed her recommendation.

26. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson was unable travel to interview two petitioners in person because their countries of residence did not deliver entry visas in time. The Ombudsperson is satisfied that, given the particular circumstances of their cases, the situation did not jeopardize fairness to those petitioners. In the first case, the Ombudsperson had planned to travel to meet the authorities and interview the petitioner in early January 2017. However, in November 2016, she was informed by the Secretariat that, as a result of the consultancy nature of her contract, it could not extend her contract in time to approve travel in early January. In order to avoid imposing undue delay on the petitioner, and with a view to saving on costs, the Ombudsperson decided to prepone her travel in that case and to combine it with other travel. When it became clear that the relevant authorities would be unable to issue an entry visa in time, the Ombudsperson arranged a video conference with the petitioner with the support of a United Nations entity. That was possible only because the petitioner did not require

⁶ Judgment of the General Court (Third Chamber), case T-248/13, *Mohammed Al-Ghabra v. European Commission*, (13 December 2016). Available from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:62013TJ0248&from=EN>. The case initially arose from the addition of Mohammed Al-Ghabra's ("the applicant") name to the sanctions list by the Committee on 12 December 2006 and its subsequent addition to the list of the European Union on 10 January 2007. The applicant launched two sets of proceedings before organs of the European Union: (1) a request for review by the European Commission of the addition of his name to the list of the European Union; and (2) an application, following the Committee's decision of 6 March 2013 to retain his name on the list, for annulment of (a) Commission Regulation (EC) No. 14/2007, in so far as it concerned him, and (b) Commission Decision Ares (2013) 188023 of 6 March 2013 confirming the inclusion of his name on the list of the European Union.

interpretation. The Ombudsperson has nonetheless requested to meet with the Ambassador of the relevant Permanent Mission to the United Nations to explore ways to avoid similar occurrences in the future, and hopes that that discussion will take place soon.

27. In the second case, the Ombudsperson informed the relevant Permanent Mission a month in advance of her plan to visit the authorities⁷ and to interview the petitioner in country. However, the Permanent Mission could not deliver a visa because it had not received a letter from its capital authorizing the visit. The Ombudsperson first postponed her visit by a week to give that State additional time to issue the visa, which would have allowed her to combine that visit with previously arranged travel. However, the limited amount of information that had been gathered in that case minimized the need for an in-person interview. In addition, the petitioner could not be interviewed through videoconferencing because he required interpretation. While not ideal, the Ombudsperson therefore ultimately opted for a written dialogue and considers that doing so did not affect the overall fairness of the process in that particular case. The Ombudsperson subsequently met with the Permanent Representative of the relevant State, who assured her that pertinent information in the case would be provided, if available. The Ombudsperson is satisfied that a suitable procedure is now in place to prevent similar situations from arising in the future.

Reasons letters

28. During the reporting period, the Committee discontinued altogether its previous positive practice of providing increasingly substantive reasons letters that included large excerpts from the Ombudsperson's written analysis.⁸ Given the importance of those letters to the transparency of the process and its overall fairness (and the perception thereof), it would have been useful for the Committee to maintain the previously established practice.

29. The Ombudsperson is aware that there are differences of views on the extent of the requirement to provide reasons for retention or for the termination of sanctions following the Committee's consideration of the Ombudsperson's recommendation.⁹ The opinion has been expressed that the requirement to provide reasons is satisfied by the mere reference to the fact that the Committee has followed the Ombudsperson's recommendation to consider delisting or to retain a name on the list. The Ombudsperson is of view that such an interpretation would defeat the very purpose of the requirement. Where the Committee follows the recommendation of the Ombudsperson, it does not provide its own reasons but rather a summary of the reasons contained in the comprehensive report, specifying that those reasons are not attributable to the Committee as a whole or to any individual Committee member. For such a summary to adequately reflect the reasons, it must at a minimum address the arguments of the petitioner and fully

⁷ The State of nationality and residence did not respond to the Ombudsperson's request for information and did not seek an extension of the time in which to do so.

⁸ This trend, with respect to both retention and delisting cases, is described in detail in the eleventh report (see para. 41) and the twelfth report (see para. 30) of the Office of the Ombudsperson.

⁹ This requirement is set forth in annex II to resolution 2253 (2015).

reflect the analysis contained in the Ombudsperson's comprehensive report. As indicated in the eleventh and twelfth reports, the practice of the Committee during the first year of the Ombudsperson's mandate showed that it is possible to do so.

30. The Ombudsperson firmly hopes that this positive trend will resume during the next reporting period. The Committee's consistency and reliability in transmitting extensive reasons to petitioners is a major step towards making the process more transparent and fair. In addition to jeopardizing fairness to the petitioner in specific cases, any setback in that respect would affect the general credibility of the Ombudsperson mechanism. It would also be ironic that such a setback would occur at a time when the perception that regional and domestic courts have of the mechanism is starting to improve. Finally, the practice of transmitting extensive reasons may be beneficial in encouraging and guiding the disassociation process undertaken by certain petitioners (see below).

31. A number of petitioners deny the accuracy of the information that initially led to their designation and that obtained by the Ombudsperson during the information-gathering phase. Others claim that the information does not show their association with the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (Da'esh) or Al-Qaida. Certain petitioners admit, however, that they have had such an association. Those petitioners seek to be delisted on the grounds that they have severed their links with and disassociated themselves from those entities.¹⁰ This is the category of petitioners for whom the human dimension embedded in the Ombudsperson mechanism is probably the most useful. This human aspect can complement the disassociation process undertaken by these petitioners. Disassociation is not an instant process. In a number of cases, the petitioners require support and guidance. Petitioners undeniably perceive the Ombudsperson as having a certain authority.¹¹ On the basis of that authority and the unique and privileged access she has to petitioners during the dialogue phase, the Ombudsperson is able to include in her analysis messages that acknowledge the efforts made by a petitioner as part of the disassociation process. If need be, she can also guide the petitioner with respect to any additional steps required to fully complete the process.

32. Such guidance is particularly important for petitioners listed by the Committee following or alongside a trial and conviction for conduct that was the same or similar to that which led to his or her listing. In a number of such cases, the disassociation process starts while the petitioner is serving his or her sentence. The Ombudsperson may draw inferences of disassociation from the passage of time since the impugned activities, especially where the period is not minimal. However, when the petitioner is incarcerated, his or her capacity for continued involvement in activities in support of listed entities is limited.¹² In those circumstances, the Ombudsperson searches for specific signs of disassociation during the period of the petitioner's detention or beyond if he or she has been released. Various signs of such

¹⁰ A petitioner can make such a claim in support of either an initial request for delisting or a repeat request for delisting. See section 4.1.1 of the Ombudsperson's approach to analysis, assessment and use of information. Available from www.un.org/sc/suborg/en/ombudsperson/assessment-information.

¹¹ The mandate of the Ombudsperson is set by the Security Council. The Ombudsperson is appointed by the Secretary-General and the Committee has, so far, followed her recommendations.

¹² See section 4.1.3 of the Ombudsperson's approach to analysis, assessment and use of information. Available from www.un.org/sc/suborg/en/ombudsperson/assessment-information.

disassociation may be observed, even while a petitioner is detained. Those include a genuine engagement in a deradicalization process; the making of efforts to avoid contact with radical elements and/or to discourage approaches made by such elements; and the accepting of responsibility for past conduct, even after having previously denied such responsibility at trial.

33. The Ombudsperson's comprehensive report may provide an acknowledgement of a petitioner's disassociation efforts and contain specific encouragement to pursue such efforts and/or provide guidance on how to do so. It is important that such elements not be omitted by the Committee when it communicates to the petitioner the reasons for the decision to delist or to retain his or her name on the sanctions list. Such elements can also be of use to detention authorities and probation officers who are responsible for the penal situation of certain petitioners.

Delay in notifying the petitioner in cases of retention

34. The Ombudsperson reiterates the suggestion included in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth reports that the situation resulting from the delay in notifying the petitioner in the event of retention on the list should be addressed.¹³ For the reasons provided in those reports, the Ombudsperson suggests that she should be allowed, in the event of retention on the list, to advise the petitioner of the decision to retain the listing immediately after it has been taken, with a note indicating that the reasons will be provided within the 60-day deadline.

Cooperation with States and State support to the Office

35. States that had been generally supportive of the Office continued to express and demonstrate such support during the reporting period. Given that several States failed to respond to requests for information during the same period, the Ombudsperson reiterated the importance of such responses as part of the delisting process during her interactions with those States and, more generally, during briefings provided to Member States. Such responses are important even when States are not in a position to share information relevant to a specific request.

Independence of the Office

36. The twelfth report described the various options developed and presented by the Security Council Affairs Division, pursuant to paragraph 59 of resolution 2253 (2015),¹⁴ at an informal meeting of the Committee on 17 June 2016. In the view of the Ombudsperson, those options provided a sound basis to remedy current deficiencies in the status of the Office and offered appropriate contractual arrangements to guarantee its independence.¹⁵ However, the Ombudsperson was informed during the reporting period that the Committee was unable to agree to take action on the basis of any of those options. This situation is not surprising given the consensus rule by which the Committee reaches decisions other than those with

¹³ See S/2015/533, para. 47, S/2016/96, para. 42, and S/2016/671, para. 31.

¹⁴ In paragraph 59 of resolution 2253 (2015), the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to continue to strengthen the capacity of the Office and to make the necessary arrangements to ensure its continued ability to carry out its mandate in an independent, effective and timely manner, and to provide the Committee an update on actions taken in six months.

¹⁵ See S/2016/671, paras. 35 to 36.

respect to the merit of delisting requests. It is nonetheless regrettable given the importance of those arrangements for the credibility of the Office. On 4 November, the Committee reminded the Secretariat of the point made by the Security Council Affairs Division at the above-mentioned informal meeting that the Secretariat may be able to explore certain informal arrangements to address some of the concerns regarding the Office. On 27 December, the Secretariat informed the Committee that the following four informal measures had been put in place:

(a) The views of the Ombudsperson will be taken into account in the performance appraisals of the staff supporting the Office;

(b) All recruitment processes for the staff supporting the Office will involve the Ombudsperson and her views will be taken into account;

(c) The Ombudsperson will have access to all material, including electronic drives, relevant to the work of the Office;

(d) The Ombudsperson will have full editorial control of the Office website.¹⁶

37. The Ombudsperson welcomes the adoption of these informal arrangements, which will reinforce the independence of the Office. Although the consultancy contract and conditions of service under which the Ombudsperson is recruited do not necessarily reflect the importance of the function, the arrangements appropriately address almost all of the consequences of the contractual status of the Ombudsperson that affect the independence of the Office.¹⁷ However, the lack of an independent Office with its own budget¹⁸ cannot be resolved by way of informal arrangements. Nevertheless, the Ombudsperson is hopeful that further progress can be made by the Secretariat in relation to addressing the requirement for certification of service embedded in consultancy contracts, which covers both performance and attendance and is considered to be fundamentally inconsistent with the independent role and functions of the Ombudsperson.¹⁹ The Ombudsperson is encouraged in this regard by the Secretariat's indication that it will continue to explore additional informal modalities with respect to some of the issues identified by the Secretariat and the Ombudsperson, where possible and in line with the rules and regulations of the Organization, and will keep the Committee apprised accordingly.²⁰

Relevance of the Office

38. As noted above, the judgment of the General Court of the European Union in the case of *Mohammed Al-Ghabra v. European Commission*⁶ contains an interesting pronouncement with respect to the existence of the Ombudsperson as a legal remedy that was available to the applicant in the case at hand. In particular, when determining the merit of his application for annulment, the General Court took into account the fact that the applicant had chosen not to pursue that remedy. Furthermore, the Court accepted that the Commission had applied the same review criteria as that used by the Ombudsperson. Responding to an argument raised by the

¹⁶ S/AC.37/2016/NOTE.214.

¹⁷ The arrangements generalize practices that had been applied unevenly during the terms of the previous and current Ombudspersons.

¹⁸ Currently its budget comes under the special political mission for the Monitoring Team.

¹⁹ See S/2015/533, para. 61.

²⁰ S/AC.37/2016/NOTE.214.

United Kingdom,²¹ the Court found that there was no rational reason for failing to submit a delisting request through the Ombudsperson, in particular since the applicant claimed to have arguments to support the removal of his name from the Committee's list. The Court also found that the applicant's conduct²² had done nothing to allay the reasonable suspicions that had fallen on him in the light of the information and evidence that had been considered. In response to an argument made by the petitioner relating to the source of information, the Court found that the Commission had correctly applied the same criterion as that used by the Ombudsperson, namely, to first of all seek to ascertain whether there was sufficient information to provide a reasonable and credible basis for the allegation of torture.²³

39. The failure of applicants to avail themselves of that remedy has no impact on the admissibility of their application to the General Court.²⁴ However, in the light of the possible adverse inference the Court may draw from the failure to do so, the judgment may motivate individuals and entities that wish to be delisted to first seek delisting through the Ombudsperson's process prior to applying to the Court for annulment, or at least to do so concurrently.

40. The judgment reflects a positive assessment of the added value of the Ombudsperson's mechanism. It follows another judgment from the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom²⁵ and a separate opinion of judges from the European Court of Human Rights,²⁶ both issued during the first half of 2016, which also

²¹ During the course of its review of the addition of this individual's name to the list of the European Union, the Commission had repeatedly informed the applicant that he had had the opportunity to submit a request to the United Nations Ombudsperson to be removed from the Committee's list.

²² The applicant's conduct refers both to his failure to request delisting through the Ombudsperson process and to the withdrawal of his claims to the Court.

²³ This finding was made in the context of the applicant's complaint that the Commission had failed to consider whether the allegations made against him by the Committee had been based on information obtained through torture. The General Court ruled that the Commission had correctly found that, in the circumstances of the case, it was reasonable to rely on a general presumption that the Committee did not base its findings on evidence obtained through torture.

²⁴ Even if successfully delisted by the Committee following the recommendation of the Ombudsperson, an individual or entity can still turn to the Courts of the European Union, which can determine whether they should have been listed in the first place.

²⁵ Judgment of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom, *Youssef v. Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs* (27 January 2016). In this case, the applicant, who had been retained on the sanctions list following the recommendation by the Ombudsperson, was challenging on appeal the domestic implementation of sanctions. In dismissing Mr. Youssef's appeal, the Supreme Court did not rely only on the updated narrative summary of reasons for the listing, which had been posted on the Committee's website after it had decided to retain Mr. Youssef's name on the list. The Supreme Court also referred to some of the information contained in the letter providing reasons and the analysis of the Ombudsperson.

²⁶ Concurring opinion of Judge Pinto de Albuquerque, joined by Judges Hayiyev, Pechal and Debov in the judgment issued by the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of *Al-Dulimi and Montana Management Inc. v. Switzerland*, Application No. 5809/08 (21 June 2016). In this case, the concurring judges considered that, as a matter of principle, nothing hindered the adoption of adequate substantive and procedural safeguards by the United Nations bodies, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, when they take binding decisions to impose sanctions on individuals and entities. The judges indicated that the Office was not an insignificant development, which showed that incremental changes in the system were possible, and noted that it could be further strengthened, if the political will were there.

demonstrated new interest in the review process of the Ombudsperson. Such views are encouraging and contrast with those expressed previously in several judgments issued by regional courts following the establishment of the Office. Those judgments barely acknowledged the establishment of the Office owing to it not offering guarantees of effective judicial protection.²⁷

Conclusion

41. The reporting period has been marked by an unfortunate setback in terms of the transparency of the Ombudsperson process and fairness to petitioners as far as the content of reasons letters is concerned. It would be valuable for the Committee to revert to its earlier practice in this respect. The informal arrangements developed by the Secretariat are not as comprehensive or satisfactory as the options it had presented to the Committee to establish an independent Office of the Ombudsperson and to guarantee such independence. However, they appropriately address most of the concerns raised by the Ombudsperson in that regard, absent consensus within the Committee for a more formal and comprehensive solution to those issues. Further progress in both areas is important for the credibility of the Ombudsperson mechanism and for compliance with the basic requirements of independence and fairness, including an acceptable level of transparency, to which the Security Council has expressed its commitment. Additional progress in these areas is even more important now that the perceptions that regional and domestic courts have of the Ombudsperson mechanism have started to improve.

²⁷ See, for example, the judgment of the Grand Chamber of the Court of Justice of the European Union, *Commission and Others v. Kadi* (Joined Cases C-584/10 P, C-593/10 P and C-595/10 P) (18 July 2013), in which the court stated that effective review by the courts of the European Union was all the more essential in the absence of guarantees of effective judicial protection at the level of the United Nations. See also the judgment of the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights, *Nada v. Switzerland*, Application No. 10593/08 (12 September 2012).

Annex

Status of cases

Case 1, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
28 July 2010	Transmission of case 1 to the Committee
28 February 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
10 May 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 June 2011	Committee decision
1 September 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 2, Safet Ekrem Durguti (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
30 September 2010	Transmission of case 2 to the Committee
26 April 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
31 May 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 June 2011	Committee decision to delist
12 August 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 3, one entity (Status: delisting request withdrawn by petitioner)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
3 November 2010	Transmission of case 3 to the Committee
14 June 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 July 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 August 2011	Withdrawal of petition

Case 4, Shafiq Ben Mohamed Ben Mohammed Al Ayadi (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
6 December 2010	Transmission of case 4 to the Committee
29 June 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 July 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
17 October 2011	Committee decision to delist
8 November 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 5, Tarek Ben Al-Bechir Ben Amara Al-Charaabi (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
30 December 2010	Transmission of case 5 to the Committee
26 April 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
31 May 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 June 2011	Committee decision to delist
12 August 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 6, Abdul Latif Saleh (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
14 January 2011	Transmission of case 6 to the Committee
17 June 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 July 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
19 August 2011	Committee decision to delist
8 November 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

**Case 7, Abu Sufian Al-Salamabi Muhammed Ahmed Abd Al-Razziq
(Status: delisted)**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
28 January 2011	Transmission of case 7 to the Committee
29 August 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
15 November 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 November 2011	Committee decision to delist
13 February 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 8, Ahmed Ali Nur Jim'ale and 23 entities^a (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
17 March 2011	Transmission of case 8 to the Committee
23 September 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 December 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
27 December 2011	Committee decision to delist six entities
21 February 2012	Committee decision to delist one individual and 17 entities
8 June 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

^a Barakaat North America, Inc., Barakat Computer Consulting, Barakat Consulting Group, Barakat Global Telephone Company, Barakat Post Express, Barakat Refreshment Company, Al Baraka Exchange, LLC, Barakaat Telecommunications Co. Somalia, Ltd., Barakaat Bank of Somalia, Barako Trading Company, LLC, Al-Barakaat, Al-Barakaat Bank, Al-Barakaat Bank of Somalia, Al-Barakat Finance Group, Al-Barakat Financial Holding Co., Al-Barakat Global Telecommunications, Al-Barakat Group of Companies Somalia Limited, Al-Barakat International, Al-Barakat Investments, Barakaat Group of Companies, Barakaat Red Sea Telecommunications, Barakat International Companies and Barakat Telecommunications Company Limited.

Case 9, Saad Rashed Mohammed Al-Faqih and Movement for Reform in Arabia (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
19 April 2011	Transmission of case 9 to the Committee
21 February 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
1 July 2012	Committee decision to delist
13 November 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 10, Ibrahim Abdul Salam Mohamed Boyasseer (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
6 May 2011	Transmission of case 10 to the Committee
9 January 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 March 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
8 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 11, Mondher ben Mohsen ben Ali al-Baazaoui (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
1 June 2011	Transmission of case 11 to the Committee
19 January 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 March 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 March 2012	Committee decision to delist
10 July 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 12, Kamal ben Mohamed ben Ahmed Darraji (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
30 June 2011	Transmission of case 12 to the Committee
28 February 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
4 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 13, Fondation Secours Mondial (Status: amended^b)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
7 July 2011	Transmission of case 13 to the Committee
14 December 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 January 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
17 February 2012	Committee decision to amend
9 July 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

^b Amended to be removed as an alias of Global Relief Foundation (QE.G.91.02.).

Case 14, Sa'd Abdullah Hussein al-Sharif (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
20 July 2011	Transmission of case 14 to the Committee
29 February 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
27 April 2012	Committee decision to delist
5 June 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 15, Fethi ben al-Rebei Absha Mnasri (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
4 August 2011	Transmission of case 15 to the Committee
9 March 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 16, Mounir Ben Habib Ben al-Taher Jarraya (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
15 August 2011	Transmission of case 16 to the Committee
9 March 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 17, Rachid Fettar (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
26 September 2011	Transmission of case 17 to the Committee
27 April 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
5 June 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 June 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 18, Ali Mohamed El Heit (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
5 October 2011	Transmission of case 18 to the Committee
2 May 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 July 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
19 July 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 19, Yassin Abdullah Kadi (listed as Yasin Abdullah Ezzedine Qadi) (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
16 November 2011	Transmission of case 19 to the Committee
11 July 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
10 September 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
5 October 2012	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 20, Chabaane ben Mohamed ben Mohamed al-Trabelsi (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
21 November 2011	Transmission of case 20 to the Committee
23 April 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
5 June 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 June 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 21, Adel Abdul Jalil Ibrahim Batterjee (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
3 January 2012	Transmission of case 21 to the Committee
30 August 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
6 November 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 January 2013	Committee decision to delist
5 September 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 22, Ibrahim ben Hedhili ben Mohamed al-Hamami (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
6 February 2012	Transmission of case 22 to the Committee
25 September 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
6 November 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
21 November 2012	Committee decision to delist
7 February 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

**Case 23, Suliman Hamd Suleiman Al-Buthe (Status: delisted)
(Repeated request)**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
23 February 2012	Transmission of case 23 to the Committee
9 October 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
27 November 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
10 February 2013	Committee decision to delist
30 August 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 24, Mamoun Darkazanli (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
28 February 2012	Transmission of case 24 to the Committee
12 November 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
8 January 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
11 March 2013	Committee decision to delist
30 August 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 25, Abdullahi Hussein Kahie (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
28 February 2012	Transmission of case 25 to the Committee
26 July 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
10 September 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
26 September 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

**Case 26, Usama Muhammed Awad Bin Laden (Status: delisted)
Ombudsperson case became moot following the Committee's decision of
21 February 2013**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
23 April 2012	Transmission of case 26 to the Committee
15 February 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
21 February 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 27, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
7 May 2012	Transmission of case 27 to the Committee
11 February 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
7 May 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
7 May 2013	Committee decision to retain listing
12 June 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 28, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
7 June 2012	Transmission of case 28 to the Committee
20 November 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
8 January 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
8 January 2013	Committee decision to retain listing
29 January 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 29, Muhammad ‘Abdallah Salih Sughayr (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
25 July 2012	Transmission of case 29 to the Committee
9 April 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
21 May 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 July 2013	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 30, Lajnat Al Daawa Al Islamiya (LDI) (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
25 July 2012	Transmission of case 30 to the Committee
15 April 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
2 July 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 September 2013	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 31, Abd al Hamid Sulaiman Muhammed al-Mujil (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
1 August 2012	Transmission of case 31 to the Committee
13 March 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
30 April 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 June 2013	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 32, Mohamed ben Mohamed ben Khalifa Abdelhedi (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
19 September 2012	Transmission of case 32 to the Committee
5 March 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
16 April 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
1 May 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 33, Mohammed Daki (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
12 October 2012	Transmission of case 33 to the Committee
28 May 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
30 July 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
16 August 2013	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 34, Abdelghani Mzoudi (Status: delisted)
Ombudsperson case became moot following the Committee's decision of 18 March 2013

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
8 November 2012	Transmission of case 34 to the Committee
18 March 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 35, International Islamic Relief Organization, Philippines, Branch Offices (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
13 December 2012	Transmission of case 35 to the Committee
5 September 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 January 2014	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

**Case 36, International Islamic Relief Organization, Indonesia, Branch Offices
(Status: delisted)**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
13 December 2012	Transmission of case 36 to the Committee
5 September 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 January 2014	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 37, Jaber Abdullah Jaber Ahmed Al-Jalahmah (Status: delisted)^c

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
4 February 2013	Transmission of case 37 to the Committee
5 September 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 January 2014	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

^c Jaber Abdullah Jaber Ahmed Al-Jalahmah was relisted on the same date by a separate Committee decision.

Case 38, Moustafa Abbas (listed as Moustafa Abbas) (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
13 February 2013	Transmission of case 38 to the Committee
12 August 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 September 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 September 2013	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 39, Atilla Selek (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
13 February 2013	Transmission of case 39 to the Committee
2 October 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 December 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
31 December 2013	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 40, Youssef ben Abdul Baki Ben Youcef Abdaoui (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
4 March 2013	Transmission of case 40 to the Committee
14 November 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
11 February 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 April 2014	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 41, L'hadi Bendebka (listed as Abdelhadi Ben Debka) (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
12 March 2013	Transmission of case 41 to the Committee
14 October 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 December 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
18 December 2013	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 42, Youcef Abbas (listed as Youcef Abbes) (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
4 March 2013	Transmission of case 42 to the Committee
2 October 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
15 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 December 2013	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 43, Said Yousef AbouAziz (listed as Said Youssef Ali Abu Aziza)**(Status: delisted)****Ombudsperson case became moot following the Committee's decision of 26 August 2013**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
27 March 2013	Transmission of case 43 to the Committee
26 August 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 44, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
2 May 2013	Transmission of case 44 to the Committee
4 February 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
21 April 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
21 April 2014	Committee decision to retain listing
30 July 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 45, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
6 May 2013	Transmission of case 45 to the Committee
9 December 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
11 February 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
11 February 2014	Committee decision to retain listing
17 March 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 46, Yacine Ahmed Nacer (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
10 May 2013	Transmission of case 46 to the Committee
30 December 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
25 February 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
13 March 2014	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 47, Nabil Benatia (listed as Nabil ben Mohamed ben Ali ben Attia) (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
3 June 2013	Transmission of case 47 to the Committee
12 November 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 December 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
31 December 2013	Committee decision to delist
25 August 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

**Case 48, Wael Hamzah Jelaidan (listed as Wa'el Hamza Abd al-Fatah Julaidan)
(Status: delisted)**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
17 June 2013	Transmission of case 48 to the Committee
19 March 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 June 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
25 August 2014	Committee decision to delist
29 October 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 49, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
24 June 2013	Transmission of case 49 to the Committee
4 April 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 June 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
24 June 2014	Committee decision to retain listing
10 September 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 50, Al-Haramain Foundation (USA) (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
5 September 2013	Transmission of case 50 to the Committee
30 June 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 August 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
25 October 2014	Committee decision to delist
29 December 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 51, Aqeel Abdulaziz Aqeel Al-Aqeel (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
28 October 2013	Transmission of case 51 to the Committee
18 August 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
31 October 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 January 2015	Committee decision to delist
3 March 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 52, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
27 May 2014	Transmission of case 52 to the Committee
18 February 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
14 April 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 April 2015	Committee decision to retain listing
10 June 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 53, Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Jaffar 'Ali (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
13 June 2014	Transmission of case 53 to the Committee
9 December 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
29 January 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
31 March 2015	Committee decision to delist
12 May 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 54, Abdul Rahim Hammad Ahmad al-Talhi (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
19 June 2014	Transmission of case 54 to the Committee
29 January 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 March 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
17 May 2015	Committee decision to delist
22 July 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 55, Ismail Mohamed Ismail Abu Shaweesh (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
23 June 2014	Transmission of case 55 to the Committee
10 November 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
16 December 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 January 2015	Committee decision to delist
17 February 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 56, one individual (Status: denied) (Repeated request)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
5 September 2014	Transmission of case 56 to the Committee
21 April 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
19 June 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
19 June 2015	Committee decision to retain listing
10 July 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 57, one individual (Status: denied) (Repeated request)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
9 September 2014	Transmission of case 57 to the Committee
8 June 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
27 July 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
27 July 2015	Committee decision to retain listing
20 August 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 58, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
30 August 2014	Transmission of case 58 to the Committee
29 June 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 August 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
24 August 2015	Committee decision to retain listing
30 October 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 59, Al Sayyid Ahmed Fathi Hussein Eliwah (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
30 September 2014	Transmission of case 59 to the Committee
12 May 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
19 June 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
18 August 2015	Committee decision to delist
2 September 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 60, Mohammed Ahmed Shawki al Islambolly (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
10 November 2014	Transmission of case 60 to the Committee
13 July 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 August 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
26 October 2015	Committee decision to delist
27 October 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 61, Yasser Mohamed Ismail Abu Shaweesh (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
19 January 2015	Transmission of case 61 to the Committee
7 July 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 August 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
9 September 2015	Committee decision to delist
6 November 2015	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 62, Abd al Wahab Abd al Hafiz (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
11 March 2015	Transmission of case 62 to the Committee
9 November 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
23 December 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
11 January 2016	Committee decision to delist
22 January 2016	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 63, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
12 March 2015	Transmission of case 63 to the Committee
10 November 2015	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
23 December 2015	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
23 December 2015	Committee decision to retain listing
12 January 2016	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 64, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
29 May 2015	Transmission of case 64 to the Committee
25 February 2016	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
20 April 2016	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 April 2016	Committee decision to retain listing
9 June 2016	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 65, Farid Aider (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
27 August 2015	Transmission of case 65 to the Committee
26 February 2016	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
20 April 2016	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 June 2016	Committee decision to delist
20 June 2016	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 66, one individual (Status: denied)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
15 October 2015	Transmission of case 66 to the Committee
15 June 2016	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
8 August 2016	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
8 August 2016	Committee decision to retain listing
23 September 2016	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 67, Daniel Martin Schneider (Status: delisted)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
3 February 2016	Transmission of case 67 to the Committee
29 April 2016	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 June 2016	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
5 July 2016	Committee decision to delist
22 August 2016	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 68, one individual (Status: Committee phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
22 March 2016	Transmission of case 68 to the Committee
23 November 2016	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee

Case 69, one individual (Status: Committee phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
8 June 2016	Transmission of case 69 to the Committee
30 December 2016	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee

Case 70, one individual (Status: Committee phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
12 July 2016	Transmission of case 70 to the Committee
16 January 2017	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee

Case 71, one individual (Status: Dialogue phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
3 August 2016	Transmission of case 71 to the Committee
6 February 2017	Deadline for completion of the Dialogue phase

Case 72, one individual (Status: Dialogue phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
9 September 2016	Transmission of case 72 to the Committee
9 March 2017	Deadline for completion of the Dialogue phase

Case 73, one individual (Status: Dialogue phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
23 September 2016	Transmission of case 73 to the Committee
23 March 2017	Deadline for completion of the Dialogue phase

Case 74, one individual (Status: Information-gathering phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
17 October 2016	Transmission of case 74 to the Committee
17 February 2017	Deadline for completion of the Information-gathering phase

Case 75, one individual (Status: Information-gathering phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
17 November 2016	Transmission of case 75 to the Committee
17 March 2017	Deadline for completion of the Information-gathering phase

Case 76, one individual (Status: Information-gathering phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
22 November 2016	Transmission of case 76 to the Committee
22 March 2017	Deadline for completion of the Information-gathering phase

Case 77, one individual (Status: Information-gathering phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
28 November 2016	Transmission of case 77 to the Committee
28 March 2017	Deadline for completion of the Information-gathering phase

Case 78, one individual (Status: Information-gathering phase)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
7 December 2016	Transmission of case 78 to the Committee
7 April 2017	Deadline for completion of the Information-gathering phase
