

In regards to the topics on today's agenda it is apparent there is an overriding theme that the WHO has evidence based presumptions that diseases should be managed by the WHO making compliance to IHR mandatory to all nations and it appears by reading the WHO documents there is a plan to cure all disease through vaccines and treatments they approve.

The immunization 2030 agenda is based on false presumptions that vaccines save lives, which is true. However, the problem, which requires major reform within the WHO and revision of ALL documents on today's agenda, is these presumptions are based more in private sector financing interests rather than the interest in evidence. Steve Kirsh, Dr. Yeadon and other experts have clearly disproven the fallacy that mRNA or viral vector non vaccine gene therapy saves lives. More people die from the vaccines - it kills 2-5 people from all cause mortality just to save 1 person from covid.

The alleged vaccines promoted by the WHO as an infallible cure are editing the human genome which is the heritage to humanity, and there have been more deaths from these vaccines than all vaccines combined in history.

The WHO needs MAJOR reforms and their independent oversight is not truly independent, therefore we are making reports as THE LAW AND CIVICS TREATY MONITORING COMMITTEE.

More time needs to be given. It was literally impossible to prepare a true assessment of all agendas in the short time frame.

The IHR amendments proposed MUST be stopped for the reasons herein

Traditional medicine is medicine and the WHOP should be promoting traditional medicine far more than the vaccines. There appears to be a profit interest which is why there really needs to be reforms and independent oversight from our committee and others

You need to give more time for these meetings for people to prepare and participate. Also 2 hours is ridiculously short to speak of all these topics this is not a valid participatory process. Please read this entire package to explain all of these points

I see thousands of people have written you, telling you to stop the IHR amendments and why! We cordially ask you to withdraw the proposed IHR amendments at this time pending due process and other legal actions as well as the WHO's duty of substantiation!

Sincerely

IOJ Dustin Bryce

see>

To President Biden, Xavier Beccera, Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, The entire World Health Assembly, and all Delegates,

This is an URGENT demand for your duty of substantiation. The law requires your duty of substantiation and I have the right to invoke your duty of substantiation prior to any vote on IHR Amendments proposed by Mr. Xavier Beccera.

The list of delegates I have does not include their emails, which are inconvenient to find. I cannot find a single email for the World Health Assembly members, and since they are the decision making body of the WHO I will presume that Mr. Piercy and Mr. Ghebreyesus, being the Head Attorney and Director-General of the WHO, will present this petition to each member of the World Health Assembly in order to help facilitate a fair and participatory process for myself and all stakeholders, because there is apparently no other way to contact the decision makers directly. The law of Agency law is concerned with any "principal"- "agent" relationship; a relationship in which one person has legal authority to act for another. I invoke the law of agency. Notice to agent is notice to principle. Notice to principle is notice to agent.

I would like to warmly introduce myself as a member of a civil society organization Interest of Justice, a law and civics institute that has a participatory research project called "If not us, then WHO!" Our mission is to work with the WHO and not against to create a mechanism for individual and group monitoring of WHO's overreach and human rights issues.

Our mission is to remind the government of their duty and create procedures for the protection of human rights where none exists. Interest of Justice spoke at the April 12, 2022 public hearing to discuss substantive elements in a new pandemic treaty which are still not addressed by the WHO. The WHO has determined that our organization is a "relevant" and "interested" stakeholder in pandemic preparedness and response. Under the umbrella of Interest of Justice is a large number of international and Costa Rican civil society groups, top attorneys, worlds top scientific experts, citizen journalists and concerned citizens of many countries, which are all interested stakeholders in pandemic preparedness and response.

Interest of Justice has sent the U.S. President, HHS secretary Xavier Becerra, a petition with many presumptions and questions, which I personally find critical to your duty of substantiation that the proposed IHR amendments are in conformity with the limits of necessity, proportionality and reasonableness.

UNTIL YOU ANSWER AND O

UR GROUP OF PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS HAS THE ABILITY TO RESPOND AND AGREE OR CONTEST YOUR ANSWER, BY SUPERIOR LAW ANY VOTE IS ILLEGAL, PREMATURE AND DENIES US ALL DUE PROCESS. I DEMAND THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE WHA SLOW DOWN AND SUSPEND THE VOTE PENDING LEGAL RESOLUTION OF YOUR DUTY OF SUBSTANTIATION OF NECESSITY, PROPORTIONALITY AND REASONABLENESS, WHICH MUST COME FIRST.

Below is what was previously sent by Interest of Justice to the WHO and U.S. head, that must be addressed with due process before any vote to amend the IHR, otherwise your process will be invalid for all the reasons stated below.

According to WHO's January 24, 2022 document, "Strengthening of the International Health Regulations (2005) through a process for revising the regulations through potential amendments - Draft decision proposed by Albania, Australia, Canada, Colombia, India, Japan, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Peru, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Member States of the European Union" the WHO says,___... (PP7) Bearing in mind the importance of ensuring coherence, complementarity and communication between different processes that will run in parallel, including the process for developing the new instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness and response and the ongoing work under resolution WHA74.7, and ensuring

coordination between those processes in order to avoid creating an excessive burden on Member States.” and “(OP1.1) To note that the WGPR will include, as part of its ongoing work, dedicated time to allow for discussions on strengthening of the IHR (2005), including through implementation, compliance and potential amendments. (OP1.2) To urge Member States to take all appropriate measures to consider potential amendments to the IHR (2005), with the understanding that this would not lead to reopening the entire instrument for renegotiation. Such amendments should be limited in scope and address specific and clearly identified issues, challenges, including equity, technological or other developments, or gaps that could not effectively be addressed otherwise but are critical to supporting effective implementation and compliance of the IHR (2005), and their universal application for the protection of all people of the world from the international spread of disease in an equitable manner.”

Please explain the above reason for the alleged necessity of the amendment.

Please be advised we absolutely challenge the WHA and all delegates jurisdiction and authority to vote yes on these proposed amendments at this time while your duty of motivation and substantiation is invoked.

WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND A REAL NECESSITY FOR THE AMENDMENTS, THEREFORE WE DENY ANY NECESSITY EXISTS IN REALITY TO AMEND THE IHR.

Interest of Justice invokes your duty of motivation and substantiation to explain in detail why the proposed amendments “should be limited in scope and address specific and clearly identified issues, challenges, including equity, technological or other developments, or gaps that could not effectively be addressed otherwise but are critical to supporting effective implementation and compliance of the IHR (2005), and their universal application for the protection of all people of the world from the international spread of disease in an equitable manner.”:

Below we will now proceed to attempt to dissect the loaded statement above that is the WHO’s alleged reason for the necessity of the IHR amendments:

First, the “limited scope” of these proposed amendments is highly debatable. The scope of these proposed amendments is so fundamental and drastic it is tantamount to usurping the sovereignty of nation states, and they are not what Interest of Justice would consider an amendment of mere “limited scope”

Second: Lets break the above sentence into pieces and discuss it:

The WHO: [The amendments]“will address specific and clearly identified issues, challenges”
IOJ:

1. What clearly identified issues or challenges?

2. Why wasn’t the public given the alleged list of “specific and clearly identified

issues, challenges” in order for us to participate in these decisions, so we can substantiate there is a real need for amendments or not?

3. We need the FULL LIST of clearly identified issues and challenges you seek to resolve by amending the IHR, so we can agree or challenge each and every item on the list of “specific and clearly identified issues, challenges” with time and due process.

4. Due process requires notice and the ability to respond PRIOR to your vote on May 22-28th, 2022 - otherwise your vote is in violation of Article 9 right to participatory government, duty of substantiation and motivation and more constitutional violations.

The WHO: "including equity"

IOJ:

5. what does "equity" mean in this context?

6. This part of the sentence is void for vagueness and we require a solid unchanging definition of "equity" and "equitable" to agree or challenge it to have due process.

The WHO: "technological or other developments,"

IOJ:

7. please explain who would be in charge of "technological or other developments", who gets control of the technological data?

8. What "other developments" are currently being discussed or addressed by this IHR amendment?)

9. Will this amendment prevent or support the fourth industrial revolution?

The WHO: "or gaps that could not effectively be addressed otherwise."

IOJ:

10. Which gaps could not effectively be addressed without the amendments?

11. We see regulatory gaps where the WHO's definitions supplant local legislation and state sovereignty - would you all finally address that gap or loophole in an amendment?

12. Aren't these alleged gaps much better resolved by local legislation and regulations?

13. Why is IHR the only or best solution - it does not make sense to us - please explain in detail?

The WHO: "but are critical to supporting effective implementation and compliance of the IHR (2005),"

IOJ:

14. Why would the amendments be critical to supporting effective implementation and compliance of the IHR (2005)?

15. It is our understanding that under the current legal system any effective implementation and compliance of the IHR is the states responsibility, mainly, because cultural and other legal differences between sovereignties require the ability to NOT uniformly apply IHR regulations, precisely to protect the cultural differences from nation to nation. You must refute this if we are in error.

16. It is worth mentioning that in the Siracusa Principles (international human rights law) it says that states shall give "due regard" to the IHR, which we take to mean the IHR is non binding when applied in a way that is challenged as violating Siracusa Principles.

17. Please define "due regard of IHR" in Siracusa Principles vs "effective compliance" in the new amendment.

18. Would the amendments affect the Siracusa Principles by negating "due regard" of IHR by an "iron clad enforceable IHR".

19. Who would enforce compliance?

20. If WHO wants enforcement power of IHR in the national territory, we presume that is usurpation of State sovereignty and treason if you sign that into law.

The WHO: and their universal application

IOJ:

21. Universal application sounds like application to all humans universally, please correct us if we are incorrect and define "universal application".

22. Universal application of any health policy is inherently antithetical to upholding peoples right to Freedom of choice, therefore, if you vote yes on this it will be akin to treason; acting in violation of the CR constitution.

23. Who would enforce this?

24. Who would decide what needs to be uniformly applied?

25. Would states or the WHO decide what is uniformly applied?

26. Is this a universal application globally or in each state that you are all wanting to vote on?

27. Can you assure us there would be a prohibition on invasive measures such as vaccination being uniformly applied?

notice: Under IHR "invasive" means the puncture or incision of the skin or insertion of an instrument or foreign material into the body or the examination of a body cavity. For the purposes of these Regulations, medical examination of

the ear, nose and mouth, temperature assessment using an ear, oral or cutaneous thermometer, or thermal imaging; medical inspection; auscultation; external palpation; retinoscopy; external collection of urine, faeces or saliva samples; external measurement of blood pressure; and electrocardiography shall be considered to be non-invasive;

28. Can you ensure us that this "uniform application" would not apply to personal data?

notice: NO one we know would ever agree to let you amend the IHR to start tracking and tracing them and their personal data.

29. Do you claim the right to vote yes on an amendment that would allow for the uniform application of WHO's system of QR code, green pass, vaccine passport type of personal data collection?

30. Whilst it is true that data collection is WHO's constitutional mission, it is equally true that right to privacy and freedom of choice is Costa Rica and U.S. constitutional mission. If you sign an amendment that violates privacy and freedom of choice rights through uniformly applied IHR rules you will both be held liable, possibly for treason, certainly for breach of duty.

"personal data" means any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person; The WHO: "for the protection of all people of the world"

IOJ:

31. "protection" is not defined - do you mean protection of our human rights from blanket WHO one size fits all health policy? Probably not.

notice: Please be advised that "protecting" us from WHO's overreach by giving firm procedures to enforce Siracusa Principles limitations would be the only thing we would approve of as far as "protection" in an IHR amendment.

32. Does the WHO mean "protection" by gene vaccines and WHO approved therapeutics and measures only? Please define "protection"

33. Why would uniform application of IHR be required for the protection of all the people of the world?

notice: In reality, governments err and misapply benign laws all the time in a way that causes harm, and the covid response under IHR and WHO's technical guidance resulted in many lawsuits for harm and violations of local regulatory provisions.

34. Can you assure us that the "uniform application" of IHR would be so beneficial it would actually protect - ALL people of the world - every single person on earth as WHO wildly purports? It just sounds so fantastical it defies logic.

The WHO: from the international spread of disease

IOJ:

35. It is not possible to prevent the international spread of disease, therefore this amendment would give unnecessary power to the WHO to attempt to prevent the unpreventable. Its a fools errand to attempt to play God and try to make highly contentious health policy for the "effective implementation and compliance of the IHR (2005), and their universal application for the protection of all people of the world from the international spread of disease".

notice: It's simply not possible to prevent the international spread of disease, therefore, the amendments defy the rules of necessity, proportionality and reasonableness and are void ab initio. According to IHR "disease" means an illness or medical condition, irrespective of origin or source, that presents or could present significant harm to humans. Disease is a normal part of life and the WHO can't fix that by amending the IHR or enforcing iron clad health policies.

notice: So far, the WHO issued a PHEIC over an alleged disease, covid-19, still not proved to be isolated by using Koch's Postulates and existing in reality, even after 2 years, therefore, it is unreasonable to entrust the WHO with unilaterally being able to declare a PHEIC, because they have a history of exaggerating the diagnosis, complicating the treatment, creating alarm situations in response to unproven diseases and spurious interests.

The WHO: in an equitable manner.

IOJ: This excessive use of the undefined word "equity" and "equitable" must be defined immediately to avoid being void for vagueness under the common law. please see #5 above.

Interest of Justice protests the following amendments in "SEVENTY-FIFTH WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

A75/18 Provisional agenda item 16.2 12 April 2022 Strengthening WHO preparedness for and response to health emergencies Proposal for amendments to the International Health Regulations (2005)" for the following reasons:

36. The necessity for the amendments is not yet substantiated and approved by the people of the 194 member states. Frankly, the necessity appears to be wholly illusory.

37. As far as the amendment to Article 5 we have no idea what "The Universal Health Periodic Review mechanism" is, or how we participate in this periodic review. Do us civil society stakeholders get to meaningfully participate in order to review and agree or contest the Director-Generals science in "the Universal Health Periodic Review mechanism"? We cannot even begin to imagine how a single review mechanism would be needed or wise. It seems like the WHO wants to make their own rules and then control a single review mechanism, which is a violation of common law to be their own judge in their own matter of "universal health".

Interest of Justice is Universally domiciled and we do not agree to allow this imbalance of power over the universal jurisdiction of the world.

38. As far as the amendment to Article 59 please be advised that 6 months for a state to disagree with an amendment to IHR is far too short because it places an undue burden upon member states. This short time frame to reject the amendment also unduly burdens us marginalized stakeholder's who will be unable to sue and resolve any contentious matters

within 6 months. 18 months is barely enough time. WHY would anyone want to make this amendment to shorten 18 months to 6 months to reject an amendment, which would unfairly entrap member states who were still in a state of due process? We filed a case in our Costa Rican contentious administrative court and it still has not even commenced. Our system is slow and Costa Rica requires the original agreed upon time frame of 18 months. This particular amendment (Article 59: Entry into force; period for rejection or reservations) is outrageous and unreasonable because it will cause undue burdens on civil society groups, protestors, member states and will absolutely result in a denial of due process by creating an excessive burden on Member States by NOT allowing the promise of dedicated time to allow for discussions on strengthening of the IHR (2005).

39. As far as Article 12: Determination of a public health emergency of international concern, public health emergency of regional concern, or intermediate health alert. Please be advised the Director-General is put on notice May 4th, 2022 to substantiate his science for covid-19 PHEIC. Its unreasonable to give one man who has not yet substantiated his previous actions are based in science so much power to unilaterally declare an emergency and its dangerous to remove the only checks and balances of "and the State Party are in agreement regarding this determination" to allow one man, the Director-General, a decision to declare a PHEIC which affects the world. By removing the reasonable clause, "and the State Party are in agreement regarding this determination" the amendment is antithetical to health and state sovereignty by creating an imbalance of power away from the sovereign states and toward the quasi sovereign WHO, an untenable and unreasonable situation doomed to failure.

40. We need to discuss a lot of legal problems with these proposed amendments.

41. Instead of write you a very long treatise about each problem with these proposed amendment's, under Article 9 of the constitution we invoke our right of meaningful participation in all health policies under Article 9 of the constitution, which requires the WHO and you delegates to include us in these discussions before you all make biased rushed decisions affecting existing legal and human right norms by amending the IHR.

To Xavier Beccara,

The amendments you sent the WHO are manifestly illegal to vote on May 22-28, 2022 because you announced them on April 12, 2022 with no real publicity to make people aware, and all people worldwide hav

e the right to participate in health policy creation and implementation as part of universal right to health. This is very problematic because you know, or should know that Federal law gives you 60 days to respond. People need time to learn of these amendments, draft their questions or protests, write you, receive a response and be able to protest or agree in order to give the public due process.

You did not give enough time for meaningful participation or due process, therefore any vote you make on May 22-28, 2022 in regards to your proposed amendments will obviously be absolutely null and void for violating human rights to health, to participate and due process. We presume you know this and are barreling forward recklessly and very quickly in order to evade public scrutiny, because if there were a real participatory process the people would reject these amendments.

We reject all proposed amendments at this time out of principle that we are excluded, and for good cause that they are not strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, among other issues of unconstitutionality and usurpation of national and individual sovereignty.

There is a historical cause for concern about treaty making and good cause to invoke your duty of accountability, probity, motivation and substantiation in regards to these proposed amendments:

"This Senate attitude hasn't been overlooked by crafty men who would stoop to any device to get their thoughts and ideas inflicted on the Nation and made the supreme law of the land. When men like Alger Hiss and other Communist and Socialist sympathizers wormed their way into positions of great influence in the State Department and took over the job of drafting up our treaties and agreements with international organizations some rather strange and dangerous clauses began to crop up in these documents. These clauses for the most part went unnoticed by Senators who seldom have either the time or the inclination to wade through voluminous treaty agreements prior to voting on them. But other people were perfectly aware of these clauses. They knew full well that treaties automatically become the supreme law of the land upon ratification and thus take precedence over the Federal Constitution and all our State laws." (Congressional Record, 1953, page A422) <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-CRECB-1953-pt9/pdf/GPO-CRECB-1953-pt9-1.pdf>

U.N.'s documented history of unbroken communism raises concerns, especially in context of Agenda 2030, with the WEF's threat of the abolition of privacy and property rights by 2030, a communist ideology inherent within U.N. & WHO that joined with WEF in 2017 according to Tedros.

"Now let us look at the record. According to Trygve Lie, longtime Secretary General of the United Nations, he stated flatly that there was a secret agreement between Alger Hiss and Molotov to the effect that the head of the United Nations military staff should always be a Communist. That agreement has never been broken, and we have had a succession of Communists filling that post, the present one being Mr. Arkadov. As a first consequence of this treasonous agreement, this country lost its first military engagement in Korea at a cost to this country of more than \$20 billion and 145,000 American casualties ...This was the first war in which we engaged not as the United States military force, but as a United Nations force. ...How convenient this was to the Communists to have one of their own men as head of the United Nations military staff, who reviewed all orders going from the Pentagon to General MacArthur and gave them to our enemy before General MacArthur received them."(Congressional Record, 1962, page 215) <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-CRECB-1962-pt1/pdf/GPO-CRECB-1962-pt1-3-2.pdf>

Last but not least, please be advised that the entire world is watching and we are very concerned that "The aim is to give - in the event of future pandemics - the WHO de facto governing power over the Member States."

We will leave you with the wise words of Christine Anderson, UK MP a real champion of the people.

"Dear fellow citizens,

In yesterday's video, I informed you about the current renegotiation of the WHO treaties. The aim is to give - in the event of future pandemics - the WHO de facto governing power over the Member States.

The official answer of the EU-Commission to my parliamentary question, to what extent it would take care that the principles of the people's rule would be respected, was:
NOT AT ALL !

Find out now in the 2nd part of my video, which possibility still exists, in order to prevent the hostile takeover of our democracies by the international background elites. It can still be achieved, but now requires the personal commitment to freedom and democracy of all our fellow citizens. The more people raise their voices now, the greater our chance of a last-minute victory.”

Document links:

My Request:

https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/P-9-2022-000921_EN.html

Reply of the EU-Commission:

https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/P-9-2022-000921-ASW_EN.html

Formal Notice and Demand:

To the WHA, Xavier Beccara and all delegates, we firmly DEMAND you RETRACT the proposed amendments and do not vote yes May 22-28, 2022 on any IHR amendments.

You do NOT have the right or authority under WHO's regulations, WHA procedure, U.S., Costa Rica's and all nations current legal system to vote on a long term health policy that will affect all nations and peoples, without the participation and agreement, with full informed consent of all stakeholders, especially us marginalized primary stakeholders.

We are a large body of relevant stakeholders, yet at this point, as you are about to vote, we don't even have basic words defined and agreed upon. At this point it is clear there is no proven necessity for the amendments agreed upon or topics agreed upon, which must come first. We have a very serious claim that you are conspiring with the WHO and UN to omit what is required for informed consent and participation in order to make an unnecessary amendment to the IHR for the benefit of the UN and WHO, in violation of our legal system and at the great detriment of Costa Rica and her peoples.

Furthermore, we hope we are mistaken, but on and for the record, we do presume the illegitimacy of the current WHO IHR amendment process. We conclude the process does not withstand strict scrutiny of necessity, and constitutional limits, because this is an unprecedented health policy deliberation which takes PHEIC discretion from the sovereign nations and gives sole discretion to the WHO, a private body, funded by a majority of private-public interests, which unilaterally claims sovereignty and supreme power of health policy decision making.

While the goal of the WHO may be noble in wanting to protect global health, our organization Interest of Justice alleges that these IHR amendments which enact “universal application to all peoples” and “universal compliance”, with enforcement power by WHO is a “violation of the legal principle” whereby “only through a formal law issued by the Legislature, according to the procedure established in the Constitution for the enactment of laws, is it possible to regulate and, if appropriate, restrict fundamental rights and freedoms.” This is very problematic and must be addressed by WHO, otherwise the WHO may proceed in ways that could incur prohibition, if not liability for usurpation of sovereignty, a problem raised by nations repeatedly over the WHO's history.

These IHR amendments will have the effect of overreaching law & policy that unconstitutionally suspends rights and affects the dignity of all peoples by limiting freedom of choice. Executive emergency power should be sparing and temporary to be constitutional, however, the concept of a globally binding treaty is overreaching. It is appropriate to mention that cumulatively and consecutively enacted every 90 days, the WHO's declaration of emergency is now established as long term policy. Any amendment would obviously be required to limit and not expand this overreach by WHO into the realm of policy making that regulates dignity and freedom,

among other ergo omnes human rights conspicuously left out of the IHR.

Based on the foregoing, Interest of Justice concludes that the WHO's attempt at amending the IHR is an attempt to regulate just about every aspect of the "right to life and dignity of the human being," and therefore "[t]he non-temporary regulation of these rights by the WHO acting as a global health policy regulatory private monopoly is wholly incompatible with Constitutional law of all nations!

We do not consent to your vote on IHR amendments until our questions are answered, our presumptions rebutted and your duty of motivation and substantiation is met for each question.

You must rebut every presumption herein according to law, otherwise all undisputed facts will be taken as true.

Sincerely,

Dustin Bryce

Head of Public Relations, Interest of Justice, Global Health Civil Society Participatory Research Project

An international civil servant who might deal in his/her official capacity with any matter involving a company, partnership, or other business in which he/she has an interest shall disclose the nature and measure of that interest to the Director-General. He/she should always refrain from any decision-making process or activity, which could represent a conflict of interest.

It is entirely improper for international civil servants to lobby or seek support from Government representatives or members of legislative organs to obtain advancement either for themselves or for others or to block or reverse unfavourable decisions regarding their status. By adhering to the Charter and the constitutions of the organizations of the United Nations system, Governments have undertaken to safeguard the independence of the international civil service; it is therefore understood that Government representatives and members of legislative bodies will neither accede to such requests nor intervene in such matters. The proper method for an international civil servant to address such matters is through administrative channels; each organization is responsible for providing these

Neutrality³³. It is the clear duty of all international civil servants to maintain the best possible relations with Governments and avoid any action that might impair this. They should not interfere in the policies or affairs of Governments. It is unacceptable for them, either individually or collectively, to criticize or try to discredit a Government. At the same time, it is understood that international civil servants may speak freely in support of their organizations'

policies. Any activity, direct or indirect, to undermine or overthrow a Government constitutes serious misconduct.

Violations of the law can range from serious criminal activities to trivial offences, and organizations may be called upon to exercise judgement depending on the nature and circumstances of individual cases. A conviction by a national court will usually, although not always, be persuasive evidence of the act for which an international civil servant was prosecuted; acts that are generally recognized as offences by national criminal laws will normally also be considered violations of the standards of conduct for the international civil service.

A staff member who owns a vehicle with a K or diplomatic number plate must observe the Highway Code, and in particular, parking regulations, when using the vehicle. If faced with fines for offences, the staff member has the obligation to pay them.

****REGULATIONS FOR STUDY AND SCIENTIFIC GROUPS, COLLABORATING INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER MECHANISMS OF COLLABORATION****1****

INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization requires expert advice for overall scientific and technical guidance, as well as for direct support of global, interregional and regional technical cooperation programmes for national health development.

Such advice and support must reflect high scientific and technical standards, the widest possible representation of different branches of knowledge, and local experience and trends of thought throughout the world, and must cover a broad range of disciplines related to health and social development.

h and social development.

Expert advice and support may be obtained from and provided by individuals, groups and institutions.

The present regulations do not cover:

1. (a) advice obtained from members of expert advisory panels acting individually or collaborating in expert committees;
2. (b) expert advice available informally;
3. (c) expertise provided at regional level on problems of a regional or subregional character;
4. (d) advice obtained through channels covered by other regulations (e.g. from non-governmental organizations); or
5. (e) scientific and technical meetings other than those of expert committees, study groups and scientific groups, and especially meetings concerned with and adapted to special programmes (e.g. the Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases, the Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction, the Diarrhoeal Diseases Control Programme, the International Programme on Chemical Safety).
6. Adherence to the principles underlying these regulations is essential, but practical application must be responsive to evolving demands on the Organization, and new ways and means of securing and using expertise may prove necessary.

