



19 September 2023

Minister of Foreign Affairs

For information by

6 October 2023

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

BRIEFING Overview Submission

PURPOSE To share feedback from public consultations on Aotearoa New Zealand's approach to negotiations towards a Pandemic Treaty

Tukunga tūtohua – Recommended referrals

Minister of Health

For information by

6 October 2023

Taipitopito whakapā – Contact details

NAME	ROLE	DIVISION	WORK PHONE
John Riley	Special Advisor	United Nations, Human Rights and Commonwealth Division	s9(2)(a)
Anthony Simpson	Principal Advisor	Multilateral & Legal Group	s9(2)(a)

Mā te Tari Minita e whakakī – Minister's Office to complete

<input type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input type="checkbox"/> Noted	<input type="checkbox"/> Referred
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs amendment	<input type="checkbox"/> Declined	<input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn
<input type="checkbox"/> Overtaken by events	<input type="checkbox"/> See Minister's notes	

Comments

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Pito matua – Key points

- WHO Member States have been making slow progress in negotiations towards a Pandemic Treaty, although the objective remains to conclude negotiations prior to the World Health Assembly in May 2024.
- This briefing shares the public feedback received to date on Aotearoa New Zealand's involvement in the negotiations so that you and other relevant Ministers can take it into account when making future decisions.



Anthony Simpson
for Secretary of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Tūtohu – Recommendations

It is recommended that you:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Note the public feedback received to date on Aotearoa New Zealand's objectives and priorities for negotiations towards a Pandemic Treaty; | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2 | Note that officials will continue to update Aotearoa whānui on the negotiations through the Ministry website and provide opportunities for people to have further input; and | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 3 | Note that this briefing will be prepared for public release through the Ministry website. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |



Hon Nanaia Mahuta
Minister of Foreign Affairs / Minita Take Aorere

Date: 05 / 10 / 2023

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Pūrongo – Report

Public feedback on global health negotiations

1. WHO Member States continue to make slow progress in negotiations on a Pandemic Treaty (also referred to as a 'Pandemic Accord' or 'Pandemic Instrument'). However, most remain committed to working to conclude negotiations prior to the World Health Assembly in Geneva in May 2024.
2. This briefing summarises the feedback received to date on Aotearoa New Zealand's objectives and priority for the negotiations. It does not cover feedback received from government agencies or the health sector.

Feedback received during the formal consultation period, July/August 2022

3. Between 12 July and 11 August 2022, the Ministry sought written feedback from New Zealanders on Aotearoa New Zealand's objectives for and approach to negotiations on a new Pandemic Treaty. These consultations were publicised on social media.
4. In July of this year, you and the Minister of Health submitted a Cabinet Paper which secured a negotiating mandate for two related processes: i) the Pandemic Treaty; and ii) negotiations under way in parallel to amend the International Health Regulations 2005. That Cabinet Paper included a summary of priorities identified in the public consultation, and was informed by it.
5. For the feedback received during the formal consultation period, we have included:
 - 5.1. A summary of the feedback, July-August 2022 (Annex 1)
 - 5.2. All collated feedback July-August 2022 in raw form (Annex 3)

Feedback received after the formal consultation period

6. The Ministry indicated through its website that feedback can continue to be submitted at any time during the negotiations. Since 11 August 2022, we have received 35 additional written submissions from members of the public.
7. For this feedback received after the formal consultation period, we have included:
 - 7.3. A summary of the feedback 12 August 2022-15 September 2023 (Annex 2); and
 - 7.4. All collated feedback 12 August 2022-15 September 2023 in raw form (Annex 4).

Further public consultation

8. As the negotiations evolve and more information becomes available, we will continue to provide updates through the Ministry website and allow for further input from Aotearoa whānui. s9(2)(f)(iv)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Annex 1

Summary of Feedback, July-August 2022

On 12 July 2022, public consultations regarding Aotearoa New Zealand's objectives and priorities for negotiations on a proposed World Health Organization (WHO) pandemic instrument opened through the Ministry's website. These consultations were promoted on the Ministry's social media accounts. Ten submissions were received in total, although two submissions, from different respondents, contained identical text. The initial round of public submissions closed on 11 August 2022.

Overall, the submissions reflected a range of views, both in favour of and opposing the proposed pandemic instrument and/or Aotearoa New Zealand's involvement in negotiations. All feedback has since been reviewed and considered by those participating in the negotiations.

There was no consensus amongst the submitters regarding the legal form of the agreement, with some preferring a legally binding option, and others against it being legally binding.

Some submissions supported the work of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Body (INB), and encouraged Aotearoa New Zealand to take "strong and ambitious action", including better information sharing between countries, improved rules and processes to identify a pandemic and act earlier, and strengthening of the WHO.

Other submissions provided detailed, constructive feedback on how Aotearoa New Zealand should engage in the negotiations. Issues that were raised included: promoting alignment with the International Health Regulations (IHRs); ensuring the new instrument wasn't overly shaped by COVID-19 experiences (to ensure it was not specific to any one disease); addressing the root causes of zoonotic diseases; ensuring clear linkages and coordination with other instruments; and incorporating a One Health perspective (including the intrinsic value of environmental and animal health).

A common theme throughout submissions was a concern that a new pandemic instrument would require Aotearoa New Zealand to relinquish control of our domestic decision making processes to the WHO during a public health emergency of international concern (PHEIC), or otherwise reduce autonomy at the individual or country level.

The content of the instrument has not been agreed, and will be subject to ongoing negotiations over the next two years. While no decisions have been made on the nature of obligations on States under the instrument, there are no indications in the current draft texts that these concerns are justified. Moreover, any decision by Aotearoa New Zealand to ratify the instrument will require agreement from Cabinet and proceed through the usual treaty making processes with opportunity for public consultation.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Some submissions noted concern that a pandemic instrument could undermine the obligations of the New Zealand Government to Māori under Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Treaty of Waitangi). As noted, the content of the instrument has not been agreed. Te Tiriti obligations will be considered, and engagement and consultation with Māori undertaken as the text takes shape, prior to any treaty action being taken by Aotearoa New Zealand.

Some submissions expressed concern that the pandemic instrument would introduce additional cost to the taxpayer. We note that negotiations on the pandemic instrument are being undertaken within the baseline resources of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Health. No additional funding for these negotiations has been sought nor provided. Where additional regulatory changes are needed to implement the proposed instrument domestically, any additional costs will be considered as part of the treaty making process.

Some submissions raised concerns about the effectiveness and accountability of the WHO, including criticisms of the Organization and its handling of the COVID-19 pandemic. Aotearoa New Zealand is actively engaged, alongside other governments in Geneva, in proactive efforts to reform pandemic prevention, preparedness and response mechanisms and broader global health architecture. This includes strengthening WHO governance and financing, to ensure it is positioned to effectively respond to pandemics.

Some submissions claimed consultation was needed on whether or not to engage in the negotiations at all, rather than our objectives and priorities for these negotiations. These submissions questioned the rationale behind Aotearoa New Zealand engaging in PPPR processes, calling for an “open debate” about whether the instrument is “in the best interests of New Zealanders”. Some submissions called for these decisions to be put to a public referendum. We note Ministers have already agreed to Aotearoa New Zealand’s participation and engagement in the INB process, in support of our broader global health objectives.

Some submissions were either based on or contained misunderstandings, misinformation, or factually incorrect information. This included information regarding the role and powers of the WHO during a PHEIC, accusations regarding the WHO’s handling of the COVID-19 pandemic, and statements that do not find basis in reality (such as “COVID-19 was not a pandemic”, and “vaccines are not safe and effective”). Other submitters noted frustration with the emergence of increasing misinformation in public discourse relating to these topics.

Finally, we received some feedback that was outside of the scope of the pandemic instrument negotiations. Examples included broader work being undertaken by the WHO, and claims relating to freedom of speech/censorship.

The feedback received in these consultations will be taken into account as Aotearoa New Zealand engages in subsequent rounds of negotiations on the pandemic instrument.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Annex 2

Summary of Feedback, 12 Aug 2022-15 Sept 2023

Following the initial formal consultation period, Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade has continued to receive feedback. Between 12 August 2022 and 15 September 2023, the Ministry received another 35 submissions, with 34 submissions coming through the PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz email address and one submission arriving by mail. One person sent two separate submissions for consideration.

The submissions received in this period were almost all strongly opposed to Aotearoa New Zealand being part of a Pandemic Treaty, with only one submission expressing support, provided the instrument enabled countries to retain their sovereignty, supported better collaboration between countries, and promoted more transparency and accountability in WHO processes. There were 24 submissions with the exact same subject header, “Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument”, suggesting that the consultation email address may have been shared as part of an online community with a common interest in global health matters.

There were around twenty main concerns or interests expressed about Aotearoa New Zealand’s involvement in a Pandemic Treaty as follows:

Concern expressed	# of submissions
New Zealand should retain sovereignty over it’s own health policy	23
The WHO is controlled by unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats	14
The WHO is subject to capture by corporate interests	13
Vaccines are ineffective, unsafe or insufficiently tested	10
Lockdowns will be made compulsory by WHO	6
Negotiating the treaty without referendum is undemocratic	5
Negotiations are shrouded in secrecy	4
WHO is corrupt	3
WHO is subject to capture by certain countries	3
Governments lied about the pandemic	3
Consultation on final document needed before making a decision	2
Opposed to globalist world view	2
Opposed to mask mandates	1
Invermectin should be accessible in NZ	1
WHO advice not based on science	1
The Pandemic Treaty could result in better sharing of pathogen info	1
WHO DG’s term is too long	1
Any treaty should create better transparency	1
It will be too easy for the WHO to declare a pandemic	1
More publicity needed	1

As with the earlier feedback received during the formal consultation period, this most recent feedback has been shared with negotiators in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade and the Ministry of Health who are involved in negotiations for the Pandemic Treaty, as well as negotiations to amend the International Health Regulations 2005.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Annex 3

All collated public feedback July-August 2022 in raw form

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Monday, 25 July 2022 11:25 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: International pandemic prevention, preparedness and response instrument - input

Good morning

This email responds to the request for input from NZ'ers on the proposed 'WHO convention, agreement or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness and response (PPPR)'.

I do not see anywhere in the 'Aotearoa New Zealand Submission to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Body April 2022' any reference to Aotearoa New Zealand MAINTAINING it's right to choose which components of the 'instrument' to implement or not implement.

Our country (people, flora, fauna, geography, economy, world view and culture – especially that of Maori) has elements of uniqueness that must be protected from unilateral decisions made by people from countries with different critical and motivating factors. Our country should not BLINDLY follow directions if they do not suit the local situation and are not in the best interests (short AND long term) of its people.

s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Thursday, 28 July 2022 11:17 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I oppose that that New Zealand government should become a party to the WHO pandemic treaty which will be legally binding on the citizens of New Zealand. If the New Zealand government become a party to this treaty they will have effectively handed over the governance of the New Zealand during a state of emergency to a panel of unelected decision makers. I also oppose this transference of power because will undermine the obligations of the sovereign to Māori under the Treaty of Waitangi.

s9(2)(a)

Nga mihi nui,

Kind regards

s9(2)(a) LLB

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

s9(2)(a)

This email is a confidential communication between s9(2)(a) and its intended recipient(s). If you have received it in error, please notify us by return email and delete this email.

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Thursday, 28 July 2022 2:37 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Under no circumstances should we engage in ANYTHING with WHO. They have proven to be totally unreliable in handling covid. Have not been honest, have contradicted themselves multiple times, have refused to look at facts, have not reported true stats or 'followed the science', are headed by global bullies and idiots, and have no place and no right to have a say in how OUR nation handles ANYTHING.

And the government has no right to give them that say, without a mandate from the people.

I believe the majority of NZers would say NO to this whole idea of WHO having any say in how we handle any crisis in our nation.

They are a major source of misinformation and are constantly having to correct themselves when proof comes out that they are wrong.

And now they say monkey pox is a world crisis. REALLY. A virus that is pretty much an STD, and is less of a threat than the common chicken pox.

Thank goodness for those nations that told them to get lost because of their mishandling of the covid situation. As a democracy, NZ needs to stand on it's own in these situations, and if the government even considers such a terrible idea as this, then there needs to be a binding referendum, so we, THE PEOPLE, can have our say.

Regards

s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Wednesday, 3 August 2022 11:54 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

To whom it may concern,

Nothing needs to be done as most people know this was not a pandemic!

Listening to qualified people with commonsense and also experience, is a must! Eg Guy Hatchard.

Regards

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

-----Original Message-----

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Wednesday, 3 August 2022 3:50 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

To whom this may concern,

COVID-19 has shown us that the world needs to be better prepared for the next pandemic. The lack of urgency or response to the latest Monkeypox outbreak underscores this. I support New Zealand taking strong and ambitious action at the INB negotiations to ensure this is the case.

To do this, I would like to see better information sharing between countries, rules and processes to enable us to identify and act on (emerging) pandemics earlier, and more resources, support, and money for the WHO itself.

I also think this should be legally binding (a treaty), so all states have to adhere to these new rules. I am frustrated by people who continue to deny the pandemic exists, or think that the WHO is trying to take away their rights. We have to work together on this.

Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration.

Sincerely,
s9(2)(a)

Sent from my iPhone

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Sunday, 7 August 2022 7:37 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Cc: s9(2)(a)

Subject: PPPR Feedback - s9(2)(a), s9(2)(ba)(i)

Dear MFAT Team,

Thanks for your important work in this area. For a PPPR to succeed, several massive failings at WHO need to change as we inevitably face another Pandemic, as we have already seen with MonkeyPox on a lesser scale.

s9(2)(a)

s9(2)(a), s9(2)(ba)(i) my conclusion is WHO needs concerted Member State-led Reform immediately. WHO are not ready to handle another Pandemic, as we saw with COVID-19. The response was slow, influenced, misleading, and negligent.

s9(2)(a)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

s9(2)(ba)(i)

s9(2)(ba)(i) So a PPPR can not be successful until the real structural issues in WHO are addressed, and the organization is reformed and held accountable.

s9(2)(a)

s9(2)(a)

I remain at your disposal for additional information needed to ensure WHO is a responsible agency, and a PPPR is successful tool for the future.

Yours sincerely,

s9(2)(a)

s9(2)(a)

7 August 2022

To Whom it May Concern,

RE: FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC RESPONSE INSTRUMENT

You have asked for feedback on how NZ should interact with the process for a legal instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness and response (PPPS).

I want to start by saying that you should be asking the question as to whether NZ should be engaging in the process in the first instance given that it could have far reaching ramifications for NZ's at a legislative, community and individual level.

In principle, having a coordinated approach to cross-border pathogen threats should be positive but there is a fundamental concern with the definition of a pandemic and how any legal instrument would interact with the autonomy of New Zealand to execute her own decisions around risk management should such an event occur.

In summary:

1. Any PPPS should be a guideline and have no legal authority within NZ. That if there comes a point where it would infringe on NZ's at a statutory level, a public referendum would be held.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

2. Any PPPS should ensure that the definition of pandemic is altered to reflect demonstrable death through total mortality rather than just being a broadly communicable disease that causes general illness.
3. Remove the use of the precautionary principle and pandemic modelling as key reasons to take action. Action should be taken on the basis of demonstrable increased total mortality within the general population and not just small sub-groups such as the old.
4. Informed consent is at the heart of any policy decision that acts on the individual as the individual is sovereign.
5. That any gain of function activities is disallowed by any Member.

The subject of NZ's involvement in this process should be reported on regularly and made public with funding allocated to communicate in a non-biased manner our involvement in this process.

I will lay out my comments to some of the specific requests as follows.

MORE INFORMATION REQUIRED.

1. I note that in the documents put up for review in response to this request for feedback had quite large areas that had been censored out. Given that this is of significant importance for feedback and the topic being commented on, it is hard to think that these are areas of national security. Please release the documents in their full without censorship.
2. How far is NZ already committed to this process and what, in plain English, are the legal instruments that could emerge from this process.
3. What are the possible range of outcomes on existing legal systems in NZ by pandemic?
4. What commitment to checking in with the public is the NZ Government making during this process?

PRIORITISATION

1. Engagement with NZ's as this is a matter of national significance rather than trying to slip this in under the radar. Get the authority of NZ's to engage in this process.
2. Understand the impact of any PPPS on NZ law and its ability to act independently.
3. Ensure any instrument is not legally binding.
4. Alter definition of pandemic (see below)
5. Include principles as highlighted below.
6. If no alteration of pandemic, then only engage at an information sharing level.

PRINCIPLES AND OTHER INFORMATION FOR INCLUSION/CLARIFICATION

1. Definition of a pandemic. For NZ to interact in a process, the definition of a pandemic would need to be revised to a narrower definition that has a demonstrable threat to life(death), measurable through statistically significant increase in total mortality across the general

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

population. Current definitions are too broad and allow the declaration of a pandemic without severe illness and loss of life.

2. The use of the precautionary principle should be deleted if the existing definition of a pandemic is used. Serious and plausible threats are not demonstrably real and not demonstrably deadly. They are also interpretations that are open to abuse through an extension of logic and modelling scenarios ad infinitum. If the stricter (see 1) definition of a pandemic is used and demonstrable death is within the test of a pandemic the use of the precautionary principle is not required. Demonstrable, not modelled, death is the hurdle within this definition.
3. Modelling of virus spread should be viewed as a low-level reason to take any action. The COVID experiences have shown that adoption of wildly inaccurate models ala Imperial College London has led to poor public policy decisions such as lockdowns that are likely to have caused severe damage in their own right.
4. The principles at the heart of the Nuremberg Code are not mentioned. Informed consent free of coercion should be at the heart of any PPPR as the plan will inevitably include responses that impinge on an individual.
5. An understanding that the individual is sovereign should be at the heart of any PPPR.
6. An understanding that the role of the innate immune system is recognized as a credible defense and can form part of a PPPR. There were too many debates during COVID that have tried to remove the role of the innate immune system in dealing with the treat of a virus. This is against knowledge that has been acquired since Greek times.
7. Gain of function testing when handling potential pathogens is outlawed and deviation from this will attract the full weight of international Law.
8. Censorship is absent from any part of the debate and freedom of speech facilitated. This will allow science to regain some of its credibility lost during the recent pandemic.

These matters 1-9 are missing from Principles and cannot be assumed.

9. Equity. Equity in health outcomes, is a non-sense as a general statement. This should be defined as broadly similar health outcomes for individuals of the same age/sex/starting weight/lifestyle etc. regardless of ethnicity/sexual orientation and the like. It is a given that inequity can develop between different groups as the natural course of things. Youth should not be sacrificed as a shield to protect older generations.

10. Rights of Assistance. Clarify meaning of no-one is safe until all are safe. This can create prolongation of responses.

HOW A NEW INSTRUMENT WILL HELP AGAINST FUTURE HEALTH EMERGENCIES

1. If the instrument is in the form of a guideline, sharing of best practice in its many guises will assist in achieving better outcomes.

We trust that you will be incorporating this feedback into your thinking prior to marching NZ on a potentially undemocratic path that will remove our ability to act autonomously in this area.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Yours Faithfully.
s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Tuesday, 9 August 2022 12:31 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: Pandemic Treaty Submission

9 August 2022

Pandemic Instrument Co-ordinator
Legal Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Private Bag 18-901
Wellington

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed international pandemic, prevention, preparedness and response instrument.

"Specifically, how do you think this new instrument will help prepare the world for future health emergencies and ensure a global health crisis of this nature does not occur again."

"What issues do you think need to be prioritised"

"Is there any information you would like to provide that would help to develop our position on a new instrument on PPPR"

Obligation to Prevent Harm

The World Health Organisation has thus far avoided answering multiple questions surrounding the Covid-19 Pandemic. It's origins, the "safe and effective" vaccine promise which has proven to be incorrect and the suppression of significantly high incidences of adverse events which have been silenced by mainstream media and our government. NZ has the second highest vaccination rate behind Israel and both countries have the highest rates of Covid in the world. So the WHO has clearly failed in it's handling of the pandemic. Why then, would you then give power to an organisation who has failed at it's job? **On this basis prioritisation needs to be given to communication to the New Zealand public on evaluation criteria, accountability and any legal immunity the WHO has secured or may acquire.**

The PPPR Instrument will further empower World Health Organisation, who serve the interests of lobbying organisations, primarily the pharmaceutical industry but also banking institutions, technology companies and mainstream media. There is a significant conflict of interest between profit driven organisations and the best health outcomes for New Zealanders. World Health Organisation committee members benefit from approving products they are accessing. As a result we have witnessed the deliberate suppression of efficacious generic viral medicines in favour of profitable patented products. **Therefore a transparent communication on the effect the PPPR instrument will have on New Zealand's sovereignty and the independence of our medical professionals to honour the Hippocratic Oath and determine the best treatment and outcomes for our culturally and age diverse population.**

The WHO have stated their current budget is unsustainable. **A clear and published cost benefit analysis is required, including any additional cost to the New Zealand taxpayer. Furthermore clarity on where additional funding will come from with any potential conflict of interest included.**

Lastly the submission invitation does not provide opportunity to comment if a "WHO convention, agreement or instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness and response, which is intended to be legally binding, is in fact in the best interests of New Zealanders. I consider open discussion and debate on this point fundamental to our democracy.

Yours faithfully
s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, 11 August 2022 12:08 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: Proposed International Pandemic Prevention and Response Instrument

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

To the Pandemic Instrument Co-ordinator

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed international pandemic, prevention, preparedness and response instrument.

Please find attached document for your review.

Yours faithfully
s9(2)(a)

ATTACHMENT:

8 August 2022

Pandemic Instrument Co-ordinator
Legal Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Private Bag 18-901
Wellington

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed international pandemic, prevention, preparedness and response instrument.

"Specifically, how do you think this new instrument will help prepare the world for future health emergencies and ensure a global health crisis of this nature does not occur again."

"What issues do you think need to be prioritised"

"Is there any information you would like to provide that would help to develop our position on a new instrument on PPPR"

Obligation to Prevent Harm

The World Health Organisation has thus far avoided answering multiple questions surrounding the Covid-19 Pandemic. It's origins, the "safe and effective" vaccine promise which has proven to be incorrect and the suppression of significantly high incidences of adverse events. **On this basis please provide clarity on evaluation criteria, accountability and any legal immunity the WHO has secured or may acquire.**

The PPPR Instrument will consolidate power to the World Health Organisation, who serve the interests of lobbying organisations, primarily the pharmaceutical industry but also banking institutions, technology companies and mainstream media. There is a significant conflict of interest between profit driven organisations and the best health outcomes for New Zealanders. There are clear cases where World Health Organisation committee members have directly benefited from the approval of products they are accessing. As a result, we have witnessed the deliberate suppression of efficacious generic viral medicines in favour of profitable patented products. **Therefore a transparent communication on the effect the PPPR instrument will have on New Zealand's sovereignty and the independence of our medical professionals to honour the Hippocratic oath and determine the best treatment and outcomes for our culturally and age diverse population.**

The WHO have stated their current budget is unsustainable. **A clear and published cost benefit analysis is required, including any additional cost to the New Zealand taxpayer.**

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Furthermore, clarity on where additional funding will come from with any potential conflict of interest detailed.

Lastly the submission invitation does not provide opportunity to comment if a "WHO convention, agreement or instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness and response, which is intended to be legally binding, is in fact in the best interests of New Zealanders. I consider open discussion and debate on this point fundamental to our democracy.

Yours faithfully
s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 31 August 2022 3:52 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Kia ora s9(2)(a)

Thanks for the opportunity of providing comments on the proposed pandemic treaty, somewhat beyond the anticipated date!

I am keen to be on some sort of list of people interested, and to be kept in the loop of developments and further consultation /participation opportunities.

Thanks

s9(2)(a)

ATTACHMENT:

Response to proposals for "*Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument*"

Prepared by s9(2)(a)
31 August 2022

Introduction

Who I am
s9(2)(a)

I appreciate the opportunity of responding to ideas on a new legal instrument to strengthen pandemic prevention, preparedness and response (CAII/PPPR

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

treaty). I would also be grateful if you could advise me of future developments on the treaty, and if and when further consultation/participation opportunities arise.

These comments are my own views, not those of s9(2)(a)

General comments

I strongly support the decision to develop a new international legal instrument, referred to informally as the 'pandemic treaty'. I endorse the work of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and the Ministry of Health, in developing the views of Aotearoa New Zealand regarding proposals for the new treaty, and in inviting public consultation on those views.

Terminology

For the purposes of this submission, I shall refer to the proposed international instrument as the CAII/PPPR, with the term PPPR used in the Aotearoa New Zealand submission to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Body April 2022 (the Aotearoa April Submission). I shall refer to the current INB draft proposals developed for the second meeting of the INB on July 2022 (A/INB/2/3) as "INB Working Draft July 2022".

Main points

My main focus on the proposals is the need to emphasise the critical importance of preventing future pandemics, and thus the need for concrete strategies in the CAII/PPPR treaty to achieve true prevention.

I certainly also support objectives and strategies related to the preparation and response phases of any new emergency, such as the equitable access to medical and risk reduction measures; effective mechanisms for development and distribution of vaccines and therapeutics; appropriate and multisector planning; workforce training and capacity; improved laboratory systems; work on global supply chains and logistic networks and so on. But this submission will not discuss any of these critical matters given the greater expertise of others in these areas.

I note here also a few extra points but won't elaborate on them:

1. The need to align proposals for the CAII/PPPR treaty with the existing and amended International Health Regulations: some but certainly not most of the current proposals for the treaty could perhaps be a better fit with an amended IHRs.
2. The need to keep front of mind the fact that the new treaty should not be over-shaped by our Covid-19 experience. The new treaty should be as general as possible in terms of diseases it should anticipate, at the same time as being as specific as possible in terms of addressing the range of up-stream factors which cause them.
3. To my mind it would have been preferable for the new Treaty to have been developed and then administered by the United Nations as a whole,

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

rather than the World Health Organization. At one stage that appears to have been a possibility but for some reason no longer.

The discussion that follows with my recommendations are set out under the following headings:

- Priority on prevention
- How a 'health' treaty would address pandemic causation and hence achieve pandemic prevention
- The need for an explicit ethical basis that goes beyond human interests, and One Health
- Summary of recommendations

Priority on prevention

In your invitation to comment, you ask how we can ensure a global health crisis of this nature does not occur again.

The only way we can aim to ensure that such emergencies do not recur is to address the root causes of increasing rates of new zoonotic diseases.

Increased rates of new zoonotic diseases

Communicable/infectious diseases, such as the various forms of avian influenza, ebola, SARS, H1N1, MERS and now Covid-19, are largely zoonotic in origin, that is, transmitted to human beings directly or indirectly, and evolving so as to become transmissible between humans. Estimates of the percentage of new or re-emerging infectious diseases over the last 50–60 years that are zoonotic vary between 65 per cent to nearly 75 per cent.¹ To put it another way, there are '...more than five new diseases emerging every year...'²

While many such diseases may not be particularly serious, clearly the overall increase of new zoonotic diseases has amplified the likelihood of new diseases with significant implications for human health and pandemic potential.

Drivers of new zoonotic diseases

The factors driving the increase in emergence of new zoonotic diseases are well-recognised and easily identified, given that there is now more contact between human beings and animals than ever before in our history.³

Transmission of biological material between species is needed in order to develop zoonotic disease, and thus some kind of contact, however minimal, is needed.

¹ KF Smith and others "Global rise in human infectious disease outbreaks" (2014) 11 Journal of the Royal Society Interface 20140950. Also see K E Jones and others "Global trends in emerging infectious diseases" (2008) 451(7181) Nature 990.

² Charlotte Milbank and Bhaskar Vira "Wildmeat consumption and zoonotic spillover: contextualising disease emergence and policy responses" (2022) 6(5) The Lancet Planetary Health e439, quoting from International Livestock Research Institute. Mapping of poverty and likely zoonoses hotspots. Zoonoses Project 4. Report to Department for International Development, UK. Jan 1, 2012. <https://assets.>

³ This summary is drawn from Louise Delany *Covid and the Law in Aotearoa* (Thomson Reuters) 2021

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Underlying factors relevant to the frequency of zoonotic disease outbreaks, and hence the Covid crisis, include human population increase (expected to reach around 9 billion by 2050), human food crises, human conflict, decreased habitat available to non-humans, climate change (influencing environmental conditions that affect the survival and distribution of pathogens), deforestation and forest degradation, environmental devastation impacting on both human and animal populations, biodiversity loss, accelerated pressures on animals of all kinds to be forced into human contact, the breeding of animals under artificial conditions, and the capture, trade and killing of animals for human consumption as well as for therapeutic purposes and as exotic pets.⁴ Many of these factors are underpinned by globalised trade, communication, criminal networks and consumerism. These causes are succinctly summarised as four systemic drivers: “ecosystem conversion, meat consumption, urban population concentration, and domestic/international connectivity”.⁵ Awareness of the interconnections between human health, animal health, and the environment is one reason for the interest in ‘One Health’ perspectives and strategies as developed over recent decades. Recognition of One Health in the *INB Working Draft July 2022* and the *MFAT/MoH Aotearoa New Zealand Submission to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Body April 2022* (‘Aotearoa submission April’) is therefore very much to be applauded.

Recommendations

- 1: that the CAII/PPPR prioritise objectives for prevention to the same extent as it does those objectives relevant to emergency preparation and response, with supporting provisions in the text that provide details on how such objectives may be achieved.
- 2: that the CAII/PPPR urge in the preamble the importance of facing up to the up-stream causes of pandemics, with explicit statements in the preamble that emphasise:
 - a. the increasing rates of zoonotic disease;
 - b. their potential for new pandemics;
 - c. the environmental, economic and social causes of increased emergence of new diseases

How a ‘health’ treaty would address pandemic causation and hence achieve pandemic prevention

4 Information on the environmental causes of Covid is drawn from a range of sources, particularly Paul Ekins, Joyeeta Gupta and Pierre Boileau (eds) *Global Environment Outlook: GEO-6 – Healthy Planet, Healthy People* (University Printing House, Cambridge, 2019); and United Nations Environment Programme *UNEP Frontiers: 2016 Report – Emerging Issues of Environmental Concern* (UNEP Division of Early Warning and Assessment, Nairobi, 2016); see also WA Karesh and others “Zoonoses 1: Ecology of zoonoses – natural and unnatural histories” (2012) 380 *Lancet* 1936.

5 Tong Wu “The socioeconomic and environmental drivers of the COVID-19 pandemic: A review” (2021) 50(4) *Ambio* 822.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

The environmental drivers, and social forces (such as globalisation) that are the basic causes of pandemics lie, to at least some extent, outside the traditional health realm. Environmental issues are addressed, partially, by a wide-ranging of international environmental agreements: including but of course not limited to the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES); the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The multiple environmental instruments are, however, very fragmented and uncoordinated. There is no overarching framework that makes sense of how the various agreements relate either to each other, or other international agreements such as those in the health area. The agreements are not always well enforced and there are significant gaps in the areas they cover.

For these and other reasons the international environmental agreements are only partially effective in achieving their objectives. This poses a real challenge for pandemic prevention, given that WHO does not itself have an explicit remit for addressing environmental issues; and there are no obvious models for how international legal instruments can be linked together in a comprehensive way.

Opportunities for linkages in the CAI/PPPR

The INB Working Draft provides a positive opportunity for addressing these issues, in that Article 2 'would define the relationship, complementarity and potential hierarchy between this WHO CAI and other agreements..'. But the ideas sketched out at this stage (in the present draft) are not substantial (they simply refer to the need for consistency and avoidance of duplication etc). The Aotearoa Submission adds little to what could be included in Article 2; and much more thought is required on how CAI/PPPR could define its relationship with other agreements for the purpose of pandemic prevention. Equally important is the need for further thought to how compliance with the CAI/PPPR should be incentivised and enforced.

Recommendations

3: that in-depth work be undertaken to develop ideas, objectives, strategies and measures for how CAI/PPPR could define its relationship with other agreements for the purpose of pandemic prevention. The CAI/PPPR could:

4: Identify the principal instruments of international law whose implementation would be necessary for tackling upstream forces for pandemic prevention;

5: Commit CAI/PPPR parties to an increased focus on implementing and enforcing relevant international legal frameworks (environmental and others) within their jurisdictions;

6: Commit CAI/PPPR parties to establishing appropriate governance/institutional arrangements between secretariats of all relevant international legal frameworks to ensure effective collaboration for the purpose of pandemic prevention;

7: Review gaps in the current international law regime with relevance to emerging pandemic potential, and in particular:

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

- a. Trade in endangered wildlife *within* countries (as well as between) with the aim of 'reducing the likelihood of potentially zoonotic pathogens ... transmitting from wildlife reservoirs to people or domestic animals..' ⁶
- b. Issues relevant to wet markets
- c. Trade in domestic animals farmed in substandard facilities (defined as failing to meet standards relating to animal health and welfare, as well as practices leading to increased antimicrobial resistance). New law should, in more general terms, reduce '...the likelihood of ...[pathogens] from domestic animal reservoirs to people, such as H1N1 Swine Flu and Avian Influenza' ⁷

8: that the CAII/PPPR frame appropriate incentives and compliance mechanisms to achieve effective implementation of international environmental instruments. Some examples could include:

- a. Committing parties to suspend all international trade in relation to states where trade of illegal wildlife occurs (where that trade does not comply with CITES)
- b. Committing parties to withdraw tax advantages from corporate entities within their jurisdictions whose activities have adverse effects on biological diversity, or which fail to promote the protection of ecosystems (Convention on Biological Diversity)
- c. Provide for levies on Parties which fail to meet targets to which they are committed under instruments agreed under the *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*, such levies to be channelled to developing-country parties (referred to in Part V, Article 4).

The need for an explicit ethical basis that goes beyond human interests, and One Health

The ethical foundations of new law to be based on more than human interests

The draft CAII/PPPR and the Aotearoa Submission both propose important principles as underlying values. These include, in the CAII/PPPR, the right to health, equity, transparency. Such values are critical to all emergency phases. As well, the precautionary principle of precaution set out in the Aotearoa Submission should be included in the CAII/PPPR list.

⁶ Michelle Lim and Tianbao Qin et al. Kirsten Davies "CHANS-Law: preventing the next pandemic through the integration of social and environmental law. International Environmental Agreements. DOI: 10.1007/s10784-022-09566-7" (2022) Int Environ Agreements (2022) 22:577-597.

⁷ As above.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

But these principles are entirely human-focused. An anthropocentric perspective is dominant in our culture and public health as it has developed over the last 200 years. But we now know that the existing symptoms of planetary ill-health, of which Covid-19 is only one, demonstrate that this perspective is disastrously short-sighted.

Is One Health the answer?

The CAII/PPPR and the Aotearoa April Submission both appropriately identify the importance of One Health. This may lead to an assumption that inclusion of some One Health concepts means that the proposed treaty is not solely centred on the interests of human beings. This is not the case. Simple inclusion of a One Health perspective does not in itself ensure a non-anthropocentric framework. While the development of the One health approach has been critical to a better understanding of the close interconnectedness of human, animal, and environmental health, it has generally assumed, perhaps implicitly, that human health takes precedence.⁸

There are different versions of One Health, the more traditional of which are confined to understanding the ecological causes of communicable disease, and implementing preventive measures accordingly, but generally designed solely to safeguard human health in a relatively short term sense. The different beginning points that are possible in the range of One Health viewpoints lead to very different solutions, for example as shown in strategies relevant to antimicrobial resistance.⁹

Beyond human interests and values

The failure of our law and systems to look beyond obvious human interest has led to our current predicament and will lead to future pandemic crises. If we care about real prevention then we need to affirm the intrinsic value of the planet itself, its systems and requirements for long term thriving and survival. We need to recognise the importance of all planetary citizens, including but not limited to human beings. This is both morally right and also pragmatic given its long-term implications.

References to the intrinsic value of the planet, its ecosystems, the factors on which planetary/ecohealth depends, and the interests of non-human entities and animals, could be included in the CAII/PPPR preamble, vision, and principles; as well as specific provisions in the body of the treaty on what One Health should mean in terms of non-anthropocentric assumptions and values. The CAII/PPPR should also be clear on what a One Health focus should require

⁸ Vittorio A. Sironi, Silvia Inglese and Andrea Lavazza "The "One Health" approach in the face of Covid-19: how radical should it be?" (2022) 17(1) Philosophy, Ethics, and Humanities in Medicine 3.

⁹ J. A. Cañada, S. Sariola and A. Butcher "In critique of anthropocentrism: a more-than-human ethical framework for antimicrobial resistance" (2022) Med Humanit.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

as strategies for long term planetary health (and survival) as well as effective pandemic prevention.

Recommendations

9: that the principle of precaution, referred to in Aotearoa submission, be included in the list of CAII/PPPR principles.

10: that an explicit ethical basis that goes beyond anthropocentrism is included in the CAII/PPPR preamble, vision, principles, and articles that set out what is involved in One Health. Outlines of the One Health approach should go beyond anthropocentrism. References to the intrinsic value of the planet, its ecosystems, the factors on which planetary/ecohealth depends, and the interests of non-human entities and animals, could be included in the CAII preamble, vision, and principles; as well as specific provisions on what One Health should mean and require.

Summary of Recommendations in this Submission

1: that the CAII/PPPR prioritise objectives for prevention to the same extent as it does those objectives relevant to emergency preparation and response, with supporting provisions in the text that provide details on how such objectives may be achieved.

2: that the CAII/PPPR urge in the preamble the importance of facing up to the up-stream causes of pandemics, with explicit statements in the preamble that emphasise:

- a. the increasing rates of zoonotic disease;
- b. their potential for new pandemics;
- c. the environmental, economic and social causes of increased emergence of new diseases

3: that in-depth work be undertaken to develop ideas, objectives, strategies and measures for how CAII/PPPR could define its relationship with other agreements for the purpose of pandemic prevention. The CAII/PPPR could:

4: identify the principal instruments of international law whose implementation would be necessary for tackling upstream forces for pandemic prevention;

5: commit CAII/PPPR parties to an increased focus on implementing and enforcing relevant international legal frameworks (environmental and others) within their jurisdictions;

6: commit CAII/PPPR parties to establishing appropriate governance/institutional arrangements between secretariats of all relevant international legal frameworks to ensure effective collaboration for the purpose of pandemic prevention;

7: review gaps in the current international law regime with relevance to emerging pandemic potential, and in particular:

- a. Trade in endangered wildlife *within* countries (as well as between) with the aim of 'reducing the likelihood of potentially zoonotic

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

pathogens ... transmitting from wildlife reservoirs to people or domestic animals..¹⁰

b. Issues relevant to wet markets

c. Trade in domestic animals farmed in substandard facilities (defined as failing to meet standards relating to animal health and welfare, as well as practices leading to increased antimicrobial resistance). New law should, in more general terms, reduce '...the likelihood of ...[pathogens] from domestic animal reservoirs to people, such as H1N1 Swine Flu and Avian Influenza'¹¹

8: that the CAI/PPPR frame appropriate incentives and compliance mechanisms to achieve effective implementation of international environmental instruments. Some examples could include:

- a. committing parties to suspend all international trade in relation to states where trade of illegal wildlife occurs (where that trade does not comply with CITES)
- b. committing parties to withdraw tax advantages from corporate entities within their jurisdictions whose activities have adverse effects on biological diversity or which fail to promote the protection of ecosystems (Convention on Biological Diversity)
- c. provide for levies on Parties which fail to meet targets to which they are committed under instruments agreed under the *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*, such levies to be channelled to developing-country parties (referred to in Part V, Article 4).

9: that the principle of precaution, referred to in Aotearoa submission, be included in the list of CAI/PPPR principles.

10: that an explicit ethical basis that goes beyond anthropocentrism is included in the CAI/PPPR preamble, vision, principles, and articles that set out what is involved in One Health. Outlines of the One Health approach should go beyond anthropocentrism. References to the intrinsic value of the planet, its ecosystems, the factors on which planetary/ecohealth depends, should also be set out in specific provisions on what One Health should mean and require.¹²

¹⁰ Michelle Lim and Tianbao Qin et al. Kirsten Davies "CHANS-Law: preventing the next pandemic through the integration of social and environmental law. International Environmental Agreements. DOI: 10.1007/s10784-022-09566-7" (2022) Int Environ Agreements (2022) 22.577-597.

¹¹ As above.

¹² Burke, A. 2022. Interspecies cosmopolitanism: Non-human power and the grounds of world order in the Anthropocene. Review of International Studies X: 1–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210522000171>

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Annex 4

All collated feedback 12 Aug 2022-15 Sept 2023 in raw form

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Tuesday, 21 March 2023 10:48 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Dear MP's,

I am really nervous about New Zealand politicians involving NZ in the W.H.O 's global "pandemic treaty."

The W.H.O is mainly funded by corporates, many with global agenda's and involved with the World Economic Forum. Their influence could clearly be seen throughout this pandemic. Could this explain the very slow actions and bad advice that was given out by the W.H.O during the pandemic.?

I think it is more than just a coincidence, that the ones that profited billions throughout this pandemic were the very ones funding and influencing the W.H.O..

For example Bill Gates openly reports about his investment in Phizer being one of his best. He influenced policies throughout the pandemic, made billions , and now that efficacy and safety issues are being seen with the mRNA vaccine he has dumped his stock, and after doing so publicly announces the vaccines failures. Of course, Bill Gates is allowed to openly discuss the vaccines failures, but why is it, that everyone else who has tried throughout the pandemic was silenced and accused of spreading misinformation.

I believe the pharmaceutical industries influence on health authorities and government policy created the mandating of a rushed, leaky, vaccine which does not stop transmission and lacks a safety profile. It is ludicrous to promote this very vaccine as a reason for vaccine passports when it does not stop transmission. Clearly these passports are about people control and not public health.

A lot of unnecessary and avoidable harm was done to people and society on a whole because the world took on bad advice, so why trust the W.H.O. ?

The W.H.O and Dr Fauci's shut down scientific debate even shutting out the then head of the CDC, Dr Redfeild, because he didn't agree with the narrow

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

narrative being promoted. Other leading scientists and doctors had solutions to this pandemic which would not have caused the harm that lockdowns and lack of treatment protocols caused. Why were they not and still not given a seat at the table?

The Great Barrington Declaration which had the backing of many scientists throughout the world was ignored, as was Dr J Bhattacharya, Dr Sunreta Gupta, Dr M Kulldorff, Dr Redfield, Dr Robert Malone, Dr Bryam Bridle, the doctors at the FLCCC and NZDSOS. This is just to name a few experts who all worked tirelessly throughout this pandemic to be heard and were deliberately suppressed by Health authorities, media and governments.

Why is there so much secrecy surrounding this "pandemic treaty", it should be open to broad scientific and public debate. There needs to be transparency if there is ever to be public trust. The public has lost trust because of the lies and secrecy told by governments throughout the pandemic and it can only be regained by truth and transparency. If NZ MP's sign NZ up to a treaty which erode's freedom, individual autonomy and business confidence I foresee public unrest.

NZ is in a unique position as an Island and while we should consider the W.H.O's advice in another pandemic situation, New Zealand needs to have the freedom to choose our own pathway to keep our population safe. Let it be a pathway that is broad and steers clear of the narrow agenda's of corporates and globalists.

Please do not sign NZ up to a "treaty" which will create laws that will make peaceful NZ citizens criminals because they don't want to take a vaccine or that stops individuals from choosing their own ways of staying safe, whether it be by self isolating or by accessing natural therapeutics which have been shown to improve outcomes when against Covid 19 and possibly other virus's or even better, access to Ivermectin.

The inaccessibility to Ivermectin has been one of the biggest crimes in this pandemic fuelled by greedy corporates protecting their profit margins. The doctors at the FLCCC who have used Ivermectin extensively over the last 3 years believe the pandemic could have been ended with its use and that it could have saved millions of lives. How can we ever take the W.H.O seriously again when it did not authorise the use of Ivermectin against Covid 19 ? It stinks of corporate influence. Is this bias going to change in a future pandemic?

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Our Government needs to be there to support people's measures to stay safe in another pandemic, not to cause harm. Our NZ Government representatives need to be savvy, strong advocates for the people and what they really need in a broader picture.

As our representatives, please do not allow yourselves to be bullied or bought by corporates and globalists with their unproven theories and narcissistic futuristic dreams that will only be realised if governments buy into their plans.

I believe the "pandemic treaty" is just another part of the globalist world view and New Zealand needs to opt out if it erodes the individual freedoms of New Zealanders.

As a New Zealand citizen I demand transparency, truth, freedom of expression and autonomy always.

Thanks for reading and please take my comments to heart.

Kind regards,
s9(2)(a)
Concerned citizen

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Tuesday, 4 April 2023 10:24 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: Pandemic Treaty

Hello

What gives the NZ govt the right to sign us up for international treaties like the WHO pandemic treaty without first asking the public of NZ if it is what they want?

This was not publicised and very few people have any idea this was happening while you continue to work away under the cover of darkness.

Another example of the NZ Govt walking all over our so called democracy

Disgusting

Regards
s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Monday, 24 April 2023 8:55 am

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Re: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Kia ora John Riley,

Thanks for the reply to my previous email. It was much appreciated but disappointing that you so easily dismissed my concerns "as reflective of mis-information". It seems that any narrative other than "safe and effective" is "misinformation" these days. This mind-set may serve to bury controversy, but it does not serve the public well and is also damaging to the vaccine injured, who have struggled to be recognised. I hope you will open your mind to the possibility that perhaps you and other members of our government are too trusting, and are being deceived by disinformation perpetrated by powerful forces with global agendas. I'm hoping like hell that this is the problem, as you and others in government can fix it by waking up, now please, for if not this, then I would have to conclude that there is an agenda inside our own government that has become so captured and corrupted that the best interests of NZ will never come first.

Dr Redfeild, former director of the CDC , when testifying to senate said, "When you have a group of people who decide there can only be one point of view, thats problematic, and it is anti theoretical to science" .

Governments universally have decreed as "misinformation", information that is clearly evident and have put their efforts and tax payer's money into dis-informing the public of any serious risks of the mRNA "vaccine" through media censorship and disinformation campaigns. Just one heart breaking story of the many vaccine injured, please watch as it will give you insight into the manipulation of data at the CDC. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9XGpe6MTaFg> .

Surely you can see why a Pandemic "instrument" with the World Health Organisation (W.H.O) is a danger to New Zealanders in such an environment.

Another example is the attempt by the FDA to suppress the Pfizer mRNA "vaccine" documents for 75 years and if it were not for a determined lawyer and a savvy judge we wouldn't know that Pfizer

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

knew in November 2020 that the vaccines did not stop transmission and that Pfizer knew in May of 2021 that the 'vaccine' could cause heart inflammation. It took the CDC 4 months to alert the young men of America that there was an alleviated risk of heart damage for them especially, instead they coerced young people through media, mandates and influencers to take the "vaccine", and this was a cohort whose risk of Covid complications was almost zero.

And many had reactions, this victim being a 14yr old Japanese girl who recently died due to inflammation caused by the "vaccine". <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1344622323000548#b0010>

There has now been a new pathology discovered, which will help to understand the causes of death due to vaccine injury. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00414-021-02706-9?utm_source=getftr&utm_medium=getftr&utm_campaign=getftr_pilot

And now further evidence that dangerous vaccine materials are not isolated but are found throughout the body. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36597886/>

The Swiss Government also has suspended all Covid vaccines and Uk is also slowly retreating.

The W.H.O is failing to keep up with scientific evidence and should be calling for a halt on mRNA technology.

The Pfizer documents can be found on the website Public Health and Medical Professionals for Transparency or click here. <https://phmpt.org> . A working groups of 3500 medical experts around the world volunteered their time to analyse and report on these documents and the harmful substance in these vaccines are now known. These are the experts that should be in charge of any pandemic "instrument", not the useless captured W.H.O.

Instead, the W.H.O was onboard with those who shut down meaningful scientific discourse with contrary experts, such as Dr Redfeild, Professor Clancy, Robert Malone, Dr J. Bhattacharya, and all the doctors within the FLCCC and NZDSOS, the World Council of Health <https://worldcouncilforhealth.org> , just some of the many

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

doctors speaking out and risking their jobs and reputations for doing so.

We now know the NZ government was also privy to the information found in the Pfizer documents and neglected to inform the NZ public of the "vaccine" risks prior to "rollout". Inadequate informed consent is an abuse of trust and going forward there must be laws to stop this ever happening again. The potential risks associated with taking a novel "vaccine" with an unknown safety profile has become even more obvious with the release of the Australian Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) report on Pfizer trial data. <https://www.tga.gov.au/sites/default/files/foi-2389-06.pdf> (and attached below) . This document was released to Health authorities in January 2021. Regardless of the red flags within, Medsafe approved the mRNA "vaccine" for use in NZ on the 3/02/2021, out right lying to the public by promoting the "vaccine" as just safe and effective whilst Med-safe's own clinical assessment concluded;

1. The duration of the vaccine protection has not been established beyond 2 months ;
2. At this stage, there is limited evidence of protection against severe disease;
3. There is no long term safety follow-up info;
4. Preventions of asymptomatic infection and disease transmission has not been established.

<https://cranmer.substack.com/p/pfizer-vaccine-approval-in-nz-under>

The TGA report is evidence that the NZ Government initiated vaccines mandates knowing that the "vaccine" had not been proven to stop transmission and continued to spread disinformation to the public.

Health authorities, globally, coined the saying "this is a pandemic of the unvaccinated" and "the pandemic stops with you" promoting through controlled media, the falsehood that the pandemic could only end if there was a vaccine in every arm. The NZDSOS is appealing the outcome of a Judicial Review on the legality of vaccine mandates in NZ, appeal date the 19/04/23.

I hope other court cases will follow, as the people of NZ need their Human Rights reestablished so never again can individual rights be

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

taken through mandates and threats of job loss or any other form of coercion made by a narrow minded government misled by faulty science. We need the "absolute" right to decline medical treatment reinstated and acknowledgement that this ruling by a NZ judge was in conflict with long established Human Rights, put in place for the very reason that this novel experimental "vaccine" created. This verdict is an attack on our freedom as was all legislation passed during the pandemic as it was based on distorted science from a corrupted health system. Until this decision is reversed every New Zealanders remains in danger of exploitation from powerful market forces and a pandemic "instrument" with the captured W.H.O just increases this danger.

Well known Australian Emeritus Professor Robert Clancy, (<https://www.newcastle.edu.au/profile/robert-clancy>) who has an international reputation in the study of infections of the airways, gut and vaccine development, discusses the red flags and consequences of the findings found in the TGA report, which was only released to the public due to requests under the Australian "freedom of information" Act. Even now some data contained within has been redacted. It is known that funding from the corporate health industry can be an influencing factor. <https://www.bmj.com/content/377/bmj.o1538>
I urge you to please watch this over view as Professor Clancy brings out important safety and efficacy points that have either been missed by Health authorities or maybe they are just not doing their job. Please take the time to view here. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pYkN7Gdpl8w>

The W.H.O can not be trusted to make good decisions or to promote truth. When so many scientists were alerting to the distinct possibility that the virus started in a lab, the W.H.O, with no evidence concluded it was of natural origin. A comprehensive report "Muddy Waters" has now officially denounced the W.H.O's stand, and reports the most likely origins is due to Gain of Function research in Wuhan.

The W.H.O also ignored the known efficacy of natural immunity and studies done were not openly discussed with the public, instead our government coerced and intimidated the N.Z people

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

into accepting this novel, experimental product, shot after shot regardless of whether they had had Covid or not. A meta analysis of the many studies on natural immunity done prior to September 2022, was only published in the Lancet February 2023, and it shows that natural immunity after infection from Covid is the same if not better than 2 shots of mRNA. [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(22\)02465-5/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(22)02465-5/fulltext)

But the W.H.O's biggest crime, was their failure to recognise early on, the importance of early treatment strategies, and the denying of Ivermectin as a treatment / prophylactic while demonising doctors who successfully saved lives administering it....another big reasons why this Pandemic "instrument" with the W.H.O should not go ahead.

<https://covid19criticalcare.com/ivermectin/>
<https://covid19criticalcare.com/senate-testimony/>

The commercial bias seen against repurposing 1st generation / off patent drugs and evidence of research designed with deliberate flaws to influence in favour of novel treatments, generating new profits for Pharma and creating conflicts of interest due to third party royalty's collected by Health Authorities are all issues needing to be addressed before any pandemic "instrument" can improve outcomes. The W.H.O should be calling out this bias and directing research funding where needed not where there is the greatest potential for profit.

<https://covid19criticalcare.com/ivermectin-and-the-need-to-establish-an-alternative-healthcare-system/>
<https://covid19criticalcare.com/dr-kory-and-dr-marik-to-speak-at-covid-litigation-conference-2023/>

Further issues are; the "new norms" created by the pandemic, the new "speed of science" for profit, which deviates from well-established pharmaceutical, regulatory and clinical development norms. A Pandemic "instrument" will encourage further speedy entries of novel products to meet every new definition of a health emergency, with a trigger happy W.H.O at the helm, influenced by the World Health Forum and the World Economic Forum who have a strategic partnership with the UN, all with vested interests in furthering a narrow global agenda.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

The W.H.O website clearly states that it receives only 20% of funding from member states, with its core funders being corporates or private funding. The website discloses W.H.O agreements with these corporates allowing them to direct their funding to the areas of health they choose, which of course is the development of new products with potential of future profits. This questionably philanthropic group of elite corporates have become involved in public health for tax relief and profit and their involvement has clearly become a problem for public health on multi levels. How can the best interests of the public be protected when governments and health authorities forge public /private partnerships with these corporates. <https://covid19criticalcare.com/ivermectin-and-the-need-to-establish-an-alternative-healthcare-system/>

We have already seen the harm that government overreach can do to society in the past 3 years, with many loosing their livelihoods, increased suicide, vaccine death and injuries with unknown possible side effects still to manifest, and the biggest transfer of wealth from the tax payer to the corporate ever seen, just to name a few.

https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/covid-vaccine-injury-deaths-economic-damage/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=stop_the_silence&utm_content=medsafe

It is estimated that the Covid 19 policy response caused more deaths than the illness itself by Dr. Jay Bhattacharya, Professor of Medicine and senior fellow at Stanford University, research associate at the National Bureau of Economics Research, holding Appointments as Professor in Economics and Health Research and Policy, who co authored the Great Barrington Declaration found here; <https://gbdeclaration.org>.

For further insight please

watch <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MpnbMIOvbjc>

As Professor Clancy points out, there is a lot riding on the safety of this mRNA technology as Big Pharma plan to use this technology in future vaccines, even though they still have not managed to provide satisfactory evidence to support the efficacy or safety of this gene therapy in its new role as a "vaccine" nor that it is any better than traditional antigen vaccines. American Senator Paul

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Rand and other scientists have also pointed out that historically the mRNA technology never made it over the line due to safety concerns, until the definition of "vaccines " was changed during the pandemic. This enabled its use under the Emergency Use Authorisation and now it has been propelled into mainstream medicines without the usual safety profiles. A example of this is in the farming industry where America is now vaccinating animals with this technology with no real knowledge of what harm it could do to the food chain and human consumption.

Why is so much trust put in Pfizer when they are the pharmaceutical company that in 2009 set a record for the largest health care fraud settlement and the largest criminal fine ever. <https://www.drugwatch.com/manufacturers/pfizer/>. But regardless, governments have given them indemnity against prosecution for the mRNA vaccine. Obviously this is a problem for the global vaccine injured with huge medical bills and a potential problem for the unassuming public being offered novel products. There are other claims by researchers of data manipulation by Pfizer and regulatory oversight. <https://www.bmj.com/content/375/bmj.n2635>

The American Senate is now openly debating the issue of censorship, disinformation and the influence of corporates on global policies and the politicising of health systems as American bureaucracy tries to get out of the way of truth. I hope the same thing can happen in NZ.

I hope you will do some fact checking, but obviously you won't find the information I have provided on any government health authority webpage and I urge you to check out my links, especially the work of the doctors at the FLCCC.

NZ does not need a "pandemic Instrument " giving unprecedented power to the captured W.H.O while further eroding our individual rights. Is a "One Health" global monopoly with a "one size fits all" ideology, really in the best interest of NZ public health or will it interfere with doctor/patient confidentiality, autonomy and destroy further the trust of New Zealanders .

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Kind Regards,
s9(2)(a) (Concerned citizen)

On 24/03/2023, at 3:24 PM, PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz> wrote:

[UNCLASSIFIED]

Kia ora Helen

Thank you for your email.

You have expressed a lot of concern which we will reflect when collating New Zealanders' feedback for Ministers' consideration.

There is a lot of misinformation on these topics and I fear some of it is reflected in your message. On that point, we would just encourage you to check the [New Zealand government advice on how to distinguish between misinformation and information from trusted sources](#).

For advice on effective treatments for COVID-19 we recommend that you talk to your doctor, nurse or pharmacist or follow [the advice of New Zealand health authorities](#).

For information on how the World Health Organisation is funded, we would encourage you to check the [information provided on the WHO website](#).

Thank you again for your feedback and I hope you have a good weekend.

Ngā mihi nui

John Riley ([he/him](#))

Special Adviser, Global Health, Multilateral and Legal Group
Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Monday, 24 April 2023 10:26 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I oppose that that New Zealand government should become a party to the WHO pandemic treaty which will be legally binding on the citizens of New Zealand. If the New Zealand government become a party to this treaty they will have effectively handed over the governance of the New Zealand during a state of emergency to a panel of unelected decision makers.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, 27 April 2023 10:10 am
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: NO participation in WHO pandemic programs.

Top down approaches do not work for people, they only serve corporate interests. New Zealand should NOT participate in WHO pandemic programs. Local solutions to local problems.

-----Original Message-----

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, 27 April 2023 10:04 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Please, this topic needs a referendum.

It involves the giving away of our sovereignty.

I deeply disagree with these instruments proposed to empower non elected and non accountable WHO members to make generalised risk assessment and control.

Please keep NZ people independently operated for health.

Kind regards

Sent from my iPhone

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, 28 April 2023 10:09 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

As a citizen of New Zealand I am incredibly worried at the over reach of this plan put out by the WHO.

It is our sovereign right to have self determination regarding our health in our own country. Rather than being dictated by a world body that is not elected and has diplomatic immunity. New Zealands approach to any pandemic or other health emergency should be researched and discussed with a holistic approach in an elected Government ministry. Information should be open and transparent and without bias. Not censored by the WHO.

I believe that this pandemic instrument is a power grab flying in the face of humanity.
s9(2)(a)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

-----Original Message-----

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, 28 April 2023 10:09 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I am a NZ citizen. I am appalled by the prospect of NZ health and wellbeing being determined by a non-elected, non-accountable body. The health of NZ and other sovereign nations must be locally- determined, not by a WHO which has private (ie Gates Foundation,etc) influence.

Best regards
s9(2)(a)MHealSci (distinction)

Sent from my iPhone

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Saturday, 29 April 2023 2:35 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: WHO treaty

I am writing this to have my say about the treaty.
I would not call it a treaty but a submission to tyrannical powers.
I do not and will not support or abide by this treaty.
It is from a corrupt organisation that does not have our goodwill at the top of priorities.
The treaty will encourage and mandate the depopulation of New Zealand.

--
s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Saturday, 29 April 2023 8:00 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: Pandemic Instrument

No Way! No Way!

This is a speech in the Uk parliament that says it all. Loss of freedoms, loss of democracy ,loss of human rights , controlled by people that say untrilled vaccines are fine with consequential huge loss of life and harm , obviously .I had read all the information available on what it is .It already is creating fear . All red flags

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

against normal intuition. No doubt it will cause even greater protest and disruption in NZ .

If you treasure peace and freedom, and what the Anzacs fought for and as people do, please avoid this one, please .Which side will you be on . Judgement will be the Lords. He puts people in power and He takes it away as He did Jacinda.

WHO new treaty

[WHO new treaty - YouTube](#)

Kind regards s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Monday, 1 May 2023 3:52 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Herein I submit my feedback on Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument .

We must disengage from all negotiation and support for the WHO, and in particular oppose any legal instrument of the WHO that can compel New Zealand citizens or any subset to undertake experimental medical interventions.

1. the WHO is in its vital organs corrupt. I consider this process the New Zealand Government is involved in to empower and further fund the WHO, to be part of an ingoing soft coup against public health. It is evident to me in observing the World Health Organisation, that it is compromised, funded in part and infiltrated by various conflicted interests, some of which developed and feed at root the issues the proposed international binding legal instrument purports to tackle in the future.

2. New Zealand due to its geographical situation is one of few special cases requiring its own policy and control of legal instruments in response to pandemics and health emergencies.

3. Advice, consulting institutions and veracity of data by NZ government and WHO have been incomplete, compromised and incompetent. Much data our government and the WHO created policy from has been questioned by independent experts, is arguable, or has proven to be wrong, and the light of evidence in many areas of health science leading to recommended actions (such as lockdowns, social distance rules, testing, masking, repurposed drug treatments, mandates) has been minimised or actively labelled mis or dis-information. Ridiculous blanket constructs such as "combatting vaccine hesitancy" have merged public relations with science in a compromising way. The consequences of following this bad advice has been devastating as viewed in terms of public health, economic indebtedness, the distress

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

and closure of many small businesses, public trust in pharmaceutical medicine, all cause excess death rate after vaccination and other adverse events that often escape the terms of reference and framing of our frankly bought and paid for regulatory health bodies.

4. Previous actions have eroded public trust in our Government and the NGO system of unaccountable public private partnership bodies associated with the United Nations including WHO. Despite appearances and spin during the Covid 19 responses, the New Zealand Government and WHO repeatedly pushed actions that now prove detrimental to consumer's interests.

5. The whole realm of health security, vaccine passes, tracking, censorship and surveillance for health is actually quite pseudoscientific, and has proved both massively divisive, and a huge blow to freedoms of movement and association. We can improve pandemic prevention, preparedness and response by removing any association and legal requirements from the World Health Organisation.

Do you think these are radically unusual viewpoints? No they are not are they. They are held by a growing, educated and increasingly noisy sector of the population.

I can send you a 60,000 word research piece regarding the mistakes and issues surrounding the Covid response with references that I edited to assist your understanding if you need further accurate information.

Let me know if you are interested in balanced independent research.

Regards,
s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Monday, 1 May 2023 10:20 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Pandemic instruments in nz law should not be made into a treaty

Hi

I have noticed the recent submissions for the below instruments and was hoping to submit my view that NZ should retain all its powers and not agree to this treaty.

I do not support the next steps to strengthen the support for the WHO and i do not support the current recommendations.

<https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/peace-rights-and-security/our-work-with-the-un/have-your-say-improving-pandemic-prevention-preparedness-and-response-with-a-legal-instrument/>

Cheers
s9(2)(a)
s9(2)(a)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

-----Original Message-----

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, 4 May 2023 6:04 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I as a New Zealand citizen do not agree at all with the government signing over legislative rights for our country to a corrupt and unelected by us, foreign entity. You have no right to give this body power over us as citizens without the use of a democratic referendum. Not happy with this process at all.

Regards,

s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 10 May 2023 4:28 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: New international pandemic prevention, preparedness and response instrument.

Regarding the Pandemic Preparedness Treaty whereby the WHO (World Health Organisation) is suggesting that they will determine what a pandemic is, what disinformation is and order all countries who have signed up to this treaty to follow what the WHO tells them to do. I DO NOT AGREE and have the following comments:

- I do not agree that unelected people will determine what each sovereign nation must do to protect its people
 - The WHO wants to say what is disinformation and can determine when the science is settled. The science is NEVER settled - it warrants continual debate
 - The WHO members are domiciled in Geneva and are exempt from tax. They and their families have diplomatic immunity, are unelected and are therefore unaccountable! Not what we want.
 - The original goal of the WHO was to respect each country's sovereignty, meaning each government gets to decide on what to do based on the will of its people - this new treaty will end this!
 - The WHO is not primarily funded by its member states – A significant amount of its funding comes from external sources (private e.g. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation) who's priorities will probably not align with the priorities of the majority of New Zealand citizens. An apt saying is "he who pays the piper, calls the tune"...
- <https://www.who.int/about/funding/contributors>
- We would end up with a one-size-fits-all approach for the entire world, which will NEVER work.
 - New Zealand must NOT sign up to this proposed treaty! This decision should go to the people of NZ via a referendum and NO decision should be made by the government alone.

Regards
s9(2)(a)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Tuesday, 16 May 2023 12:30 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Pandemic Instrument Feedback

Pandemic Instrument Coordinator
Legal Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Private Bag 18-901
Wellington

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing regarding the World Health Organisation (WHO) Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and Response Accord. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback beyond the initial submission round, of which I was unaware.

Better international collaboration would have been beneficial in the Covid pandemic. An international accord could result in better sharing of information regarding a new microorganism, genetic variations, symptoms, severity, ways to treat it and improved speed of introduction of public health measures, as well as more equality to treatment accessibility.

However, any global, legally-binding governance could reduce the freedoms of individual countries in a detrimental way if it is not suitable for that country or its citizens. For example, what if the WHO initially presented a microorganism as not dangerous enough to warrant lockdowns, preventing New Zealand from initiating another successful isolation strategy until it was too late? Or what if a majority of the world employed the directed public health measures at huge economic cost to themselves, but enough less-altruistic nations (who were not members of the accord or who did not mind the repercussions if they were members) refused to do so, resulting in a pandemic regardless of the global directorates? Furthermore, the WHO handling of the Covid-19 pandemic was not without reproach. How could it be guaranteed that the next one be handled better?

I am concerned with the amount of power a single, unelected organisation could have on a global scale, especially with the possibility of incorrect or biased information at its fingertips and failure to consult adequate experts in the field. There is so much information available now (even among scientific studies) that there is a danger of echo-chambers even at the top level if intentional steps are not taken to avoid this. I also wonder at the proposed 7 year term for the Director-General. This is a very long time. If the individual was competent then this would be a blessing, but if not, 7 years is long enough to do significant damage. Perhaps a shorter term would be more appropriate.

Priorities I see are:

- 1.) Creating an international agreement that results in better collaboration, while enabling countries to retain their sovereignty.
- 2.) Creating a system where the decision makers are highly competent experts in the field, who also seek adequate consultation outside the immediate WHO panel regularly.
- 3.) Insisting on transparency of all decisions, particularly when they affect nations on a global scale.
- 4.) Developing an accountability process to ensure integrity of members and reduce likelihood of corruption.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

I would like to request that New Zealand keep these things in mind over the course of the next year as the terms of the treaty are negotiated and that if any sovereign rights are to be affected that the public be consulted prior to any agreements being signed. I note the statement that "because of the shorter time frame for international treaty examinations than legislations, a call for submissions happens exceptionally, rather than routinely." This sounds like a useful excuse that could be employed to push something through too quickly for fear of public backlash. For something of this significance every effort should, and I hope will, be made to enable public consultation.

Yours Faithfully,
s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Wednesday, 24 May 2023 6:14 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Do not enter into a pandemic treaty with the frauds they are the World Health Organisation.

They, and every other United Nations offshoot, are evil.

We should also desist from all dealings with the World Economic Forum and all other globalist entities.

They represent a massive risk to our wellbeing.

We must retain our own sovereignty.

If we submit to this there will be blood on your hands.

Don't do it.

s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Saturday, 27 May 2023 7:39 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: WHO Pandemic Treaty - my say.

To whom it may concern,

I have been closely monitoring the developments and discussions surrounding the WHO pandemic treaty. I would like to express the reasons why, after careful consideration, I have decided we as a nation should not sign up for the WHO Global Pandemic Treaty.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Firstly, in my opinion, the WHO's performance during this pandemic has been less than satisfactory. There have been instances of mixed messages, uncertainty, and poor decision-making, with no accountability in sight. Additionally, the non-democratic selection process of the WHO raises concerns about distant individuals making decisions regarding my health, which could potentially involve another experimental vaccine. The false information propagated by our governments regarding the effectiveness of certain measures, such as stopping transmission and the absence of side effects, only adds to my skepticism. I have no desire to be governed by a group of unelected individuals who lack an understanding of our context, culture, beliefs, and rights.

Establishing a decision-making body like the WHO diminishes the power and freedom of New Zealand citizens. We need only look at the historical injustices resulting from treaties, such as the Treaty of Waitangi, which we are still addressing for our tangata whenua, to realize the potential harm. As an informed citizen of Aotearoa, I am certain that few Māori would willingly surrender their rights and decision-making authority to unelected individuals abroad. Such a move would undoubtedly have detrimental effects on our country's sovereignty and democracy. Personally, I refuse to be dictated to again, as we were during the mandates and lockdowns. Furthermore, the Cochrane Review published this year, in 2023, the gold standard in research, highlights the ineffectiveness of masks in preventing viral spread. Despite previous evidence of their inefficacy, masks were imposed on children and others, representing a combination of misinformation and excessive control. Moreover, the adverse effects on our breathing, thinking, and learning make the situation even more concerning.

Secondly, the WHO's funding and influence from pharmaceutical companies and China raise questions about vested interests that prioritize financial gain over the well-being of people. For instance, China's two-year-long lockdown failed to prevent the spread of the disease, resulting in the loss of two years of quality of life for over a billion people. Furthermore, vaccinating children with a vaccine that lacks long-term data, despite their extremely low risk of falling ill from this disease, is both wasteful and risky.

Adopting a one-size-fits-all approach is narrow-minded, careless, and unscientific. It disregards the opportunity for on-the-ground research and fails to tap into the abundance of medical expertise within our global communities. As an educator, I firmly believe that a personalized approach, which allows for flexibility and tailored care, is the most effective. The stifling of creativity within the medical profession during this pandemic has been disheartening resulting in lost opportunities, robust discussion, and the saving of many more lives.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

I sincerely hope that the New Zealand Government recognizes the risks associated with agreeing to a global pandemic treaty led by a relatively small group influenced by pharmaceutical companies and lacking accountability. I have no trust in this system and firmly believe that it is in our best interest to preserve our sovereignty and make our own decisions.

Simply put, as a citizen of New Zealand, I strongly advocate for a national vote on this matter. This is a significant decision that should not be made by politicians without a referendum at the very least. I, for one, will not conform to or support the treaty and will not comply with a decision made by unelected individuals I did not vote for, which would entail surrendering my sovereignty, rights, and choices. Never again.

Sincerely, s9(2)(a) Concerned citizen of Aotearoa

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Monday, 29 May 2023 6:26 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Kia Ora,

We need a referendum with any unelected, outside organization, especially the WHO. They cannot be fully trusted.

WHO are heavily influenced by China, Bill Gates and pharmaceutical companies, which profit off the people.

Bill Gates had relations with Jeffrey Epstein.

China wants to dominate the world.

Our sovereignty is on the line!

WHO can declare a pandemic or anything they desire, under their science only, without any debate.

Forced experimental nanotechnology vaccines, vaccine passports and lockdowns.

This isn't in New Zealanders best interests whatsoever.

WHO's only interest is money and power.

We have seen the effects with this over three years. WHO got it all wrong.

WHO's prime example for the pandemic was China, which WHO fully supported people's rights being totally stripped away.

Human rights were trampled on, people locked in their apartments by padlocks and chains by the Government.

People were treated just like cattle, rounded up, fenced in, drafted, drenched and eartagged.

WHO supports this, it's absolutely criminal.

Why trust an unelected organization like this?

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

We don't want this to ever happen in New Zealand.
Our ancestors fought for our freedoms, don't let this ever slip away.

Do not sign the treaty.

Kia kaha
Ngā Mihi

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 31 May 2023 12:17 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: IHR submission

I agree with Winston Peters ,, and am making a submission that the IHR regulations will give too much power to one person ie director general WHO.
NZ is one of the best countries in the world, I am not natural born kiwi, but I love this country .
For my kiwi children's best future please do not succumb to the clever changes of the international treaty . Retain state sovereignty.
In fact the corruption of power and money , demonstrated in recent years, causes me to say consider leaving the WHO
(Or should I say leave Bill Gates as they are almost one and the same).
Hear our voices.
God defend NewZealand .

Sent from Proton Mail for iOS

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 31 May 2023 4:00 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

DO NOT sign up please opt out option of this treaty.
New Zealanders have their own way of dealing with this or any pandemic. There was far too much dictating from WHO in the covid era.
The WHO was set up after WW2 as an advisory group only they have gone far beyond their status in the recent years.

We have Rongoa and other therapies that work far better than vaccines that never worked properly and protected folk.
Regards s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 31 May 2023 9:06 pm

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Good evening,

I'm making a submission on this treaty. Considering the dogs breakfast made of the covid response, many businesses are left broke, the mental stress taken on folk being locked up in their homes and then for most to get a dose of covid and be OK, the fear properganda used on the public was like a military grade psychological warfare resulting in broken families/friendships/lost jobs .

The experimental vaccine that has left many with health issues including myocarditis, immunity disorders, blood clots, sudden deaths and a list of other side effects. Not to mention when this mandate was tested in court NZ govt v NZ police it was found to be unlawful & a breach of our human rights. Why would we want anyone that has had anything to do with this covid fail making decisions for the health and well being of humanity. NZ needs to put as much distance as possible between the WHO and the good folk of NZ, the only outfit the WHO has any interest in is big pharma & getting them bigger.

As the "covid virus" came from a Wuhan lab it is not a virus but a bio weapon that has been released on the public. Those who have had anything to do with it should get a rope and these labs anywhere in the world need to be shut down immediately. This is the equivalent of the medical experiments done on the Jewish people ie (the gas chambers using hydrogen cyanide) , have we learnt nothing from DDT, thalidomide, chemotherapy (hydrogen cyanide). The WHO and big pharma do not have the good health and well being of humanity at the forefront of their agenda but more the big dollars.

The lot of them should be dealt with by a military tribunal. Nuremberg 2.0

Regards

s9(2)(a)

-----Original Message-----

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Wednesday, 31 May 2023 10:15 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I totally oppose any further powers being transferred to the WHO. There are several reasons:

The WHO can now ignore human rights - this part is supposed to be omitted from the existing plan - according to a suggestion from India.

The WHO can declare a pandemic according to the watered down definition of a pandemic.

The WHO can declare a pandemic when animals are at risk or when the weather is bad - based on the idea of a pending climate catastrophe.

The WHO can decide to use untested treatments and vaccinations e.g. mRNA vaccines.

The side effects of the covid vaccines have not been examined properly and nothing has yet been learned from mistakes that were made.

The WHO can declare an infodemic and basically remove the freedom of speech.

The WHO is not a democratically elected body. The WHO is a bunch of business people who decide what is best for their business but not for humanity.

I suggest to immediately cut any ties with the WHO, cancel existing contracts with the WHO and do not sign any other contract with the WHO.

Kind regards

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Thursday, 1 June 2023 7:05 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

Say no to the health treaty, we don't need an unelected group running our country in a pandemic... you took your response from them the first time and what happened to two weeks to flatten the curve. You the government have a responsibility to the people, our taxes pay your wages, you threw good people under the bus during covid, split the country for a vaccine that didn't even stop transmission, you promised us that it was 90% effective at stopping it, you just said what these people told you to say, then blamed your people for misinformation when they spoke out, you also didn't meet with people that we vaccine injured, instead seemed to blame them from what happened... you should also not be running the country, when you turn on people who had questions, you should have questioned everything as well, sorry to say but your government is a bitter disappointment. I was always someone who listened to my government, you lead us to a ruined New Zealand, if you think the treaty is a good idea then it's not....

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Thursday, 1 June 2023 8:31 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I strongly urge you to remove New Zealand out of any interactions with this organization..it has proved itself to be untrustworthy&the tool of major pharmaceutical namely Pfizer and its major backer Bill Gates whose investment and association with the most evil men in the world Claus Swchab&his enlisted world leaders through his demonic society of the WEF and their foul agendas dictating our fate&control over all nations and citizens rights to choose their own destinys are masked with deceit, naming environmental concerns&the greater good for our own safety... that even the highest religious leaders in the catholic church have openly named as servants of the one world government&outspoken comments with conviction state they are performing the will of the anti christ.I have monitored world conditions&sincerely will fight any government party voted in for N.Z if they accept the WHO manipulated agendas or the introduction of the world digital currency,especially after recent weather events(look what happened to the isolated communities relying on digital transactions when systems went down.they were lost..we need cash especially with the possibility major solar ejections threaten our networks the next few years)New Zealanders are not fools,we can manage our own affairs make our own decisions ,independently&stay well away from any tyranny dictating what and when&how we run our country health system,our own bodies,genetics&economy.If we so much as accept one dictate from any of these corrupt&malevolent individuals or organizations,we will literally be trapped &controlled&lose all personal freedoms..Gates finances the WHO almost totally&they are servants to he&Schwabs dictates..they will extend their powers in increments..Pfizer made money out us all&needs to be put in prison ..they,the WHO and Gates lied to us all about the efficacy of the vaccine&its safety,they manipulated the whole world with fear&lockdowns to achieve the first stage of their 2030 agenda..to take away

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

our economy&put us all in financial hardship&destroy economies ready for stage 2 of their world control..I was all against conspiracy theories&vaccine deniers&was towing the line for NZ&Jacinda(major fan) but we all got sucked in.I had 3 vaccines...never again..not Gates not Pfizer.. they have weakened everyone's health permanently to keep us suckling on their poisons..they created the pandemic to do so&they had meetings&planning sessions on how ,when&what they would do..then began planning the next pandemic before it even has been announced..they are systematically buying all arable land to produce their genetically modified crops..they are monopolizing our food sources,our well being,our health&treatments,our money&political systems,stealing our jobs&industries&self sufficiency,they are enabling themselves to edit our speech our thoughts, our land under the guise they know better&we are stupid hearded cattle to be dictated to about every aspect of our freedom,masking their agendas with woke equality concepts for the common good..its the deception of the devil..I knew this moment would come since childhood everything we were warned to be aware of by prophecies,revelations ..is NOW! I am not a nutter ,conspiracy theorist or terrorist.But what is happening I swear with everything I hold dear is a matter of life&death&FREEDOM,a fight for the souls of all humanity.You will be their puppets&we will be their slaves..I implore you,keep strong;N.Z can be happily independent&do not be bullied or threatened ,let them try to break us,..to their will..at least we will keep our freewill&the country that is ours to work&thrive for..just because the rest of the world has turned to shit&under Satan's thumb..we can survive,create our own plans&diversify our production of all food&goods without any controls..Everyone I know&so many others,have seen through the shroud of deception thrown over us&have had enough..it needs to stop here&now,to set an example or to take the lead..just as we did when David Lange put his finger in the face of those who forced their nukes on us..Any Party that wants to govern our country will govern if they take this stance,I guarantee.. do not let them soft talk you into believing its all harmless..its an illusion..with sincerest intentions,the most devoted New Zealanders...Jonathan Bell-Booth(please forward to the P.M and all at the top..I implore you)

-----Original Message-----

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Friday, 2 June 2023 9:41 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

WHO has finally admitted the covid vaccine can cause auto immune disorders, SEE their own web page.

They didnt ask Pfizer to see transmission data (there was none)

DONT ACCEPT THESE INCOMPETENTS DECISIONS EVER AGAIN.

You (the govt)didnt check either, so the blood of many suicides, vax injuries . (Finally being acknowledged) (17% higher death rates than expected, in most vaxed countries,) are on your and WHO's hands .

Their incompetence has severely damaged NZ economy as well.

WE NEED an independant, two sided, NZ investigation into ANY new outbreaks .

Yours faithfully

s9(2)(a)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Sent from my iPad

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Saturday, 3 June 2023 11:27 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I know the last involvement with the WHO was a disaster border line criminal .we fist where told if you get the vaccine you would not get covid then when that was a lie we where told if you have the vaccine an got covid it wouldn't be severe but the truth was always kept in the dark people who were fully vaccinated were still dieing anyway 78 billion dollars for in my opinion was day light robbery I would like to see an enquiry into the hole mess 1.8 billion for the vaccine an 78 billion for the roll out alot of people were laughing all the way to the bank .you just have to look how the leaders in alot of countries have brought us the people to ruins. so please forgive me if I'm not so keen to jump into what will be a xxxxxxxxx

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Thursday, 1 June 2023 12:39 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

How dear you place my own health into the hands of others!!!! This is a human right to decide what to do with my own body under any kind of circumstances, I am the only one in charge of my own health decisions, and I will not keep quiet and rally for this dangerous pandemic prevention W.H.O treaty. Last time I looked this government did nothing for the individual rights of new zealanders under a health fear and terror campaign. There should never be a legal agreement to any party outside of this country and if so you are treasonous to New Zealand.

s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Sunday, 11 June 2023 2:53 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Have your say: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I oppose signing NZ up to any agreement of WHO.
Let WHO provide advice and receive information.

As an unaccountable body there is no redress when they act in the interests of those who fund them. As a large source of funding is pharmaceuticals companies, their interests are primarily in selling their products, not the health of our nation.

Regards
s9(2)(a)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Monday, 12 June 2023 11:32 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I am so upset that my government just excepted an untested vaccine. I had my vac but have since found out what the vac does and doesn't do.

I feel so upset and betrayed by who and my government that was lead down the garden path. Why did nz government except like a bunch of sheep this untested vaccine. The more we find out the more I distrust WHO how dare they try and run the world.

They are an unelected elite group that should not be able to try and tell countries how to govern.

What will my prognosis be now having had 3 vac, sudden death (mine) MS as now this is being brought out from research papers, heart issues, and should I go on and one.

Please do not let this group get away with ruling us and taking our personal freedom.

I have always done what I thought was good for my country but now my trust has gone bug time. I do not want this treaty for New Zealand

Yours s9(2)(a)

-----Original Message-----

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Tuesday, 11 July 2023 10:31 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I am most concerned that WHO will have powers over all member states including NZ that the general public have never been advised off. There's been NO media attention.

If we do not object WHO will decide on lockdowns mandated vaccines etc, out of the Govt hands.

Next year they plan to re introduce a global travel health certificate.

I'm not saying we don't want it, but WHY is there no media coverage in it. You should be shouting it from the rooftops.

Sent from my iPhone

[The feedback transcribed below was originally received via hard copy on 13 June 2023]

Pandemic Instrument Coordinator

Legal Division

Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade

Private Bag 18-901

Wellington

To Whom it May Concern

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

My view is that New Zealand needs to [EXIT](#) the World Health Organization.

I do not agree to unelected, self-appointed, so-called "officials" making ANY decisions for New Zealand.

Under their dictatorship over the past 3½ years, we have had undemocratic policies forced on us, some of which were definitely criminal, causing chaos and division of our nation.
Say Goodbye to the WHO !!

[signature]
s9(2)(a)
(New Zealand Citizen)

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, 14 July 2023 6:18 pm
To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>
Subject: No To Pandemic Treaty

Good Day,

In response to the question above, I will begin the answer in the blinding fascination that this is even an ethical question for such consideration in the first place.

Let me quantify that further.

In a strange, staged 'interview' that was conducted with the then-president of the WHO Marget Chan in 2015, a 'reporter' asked her about the organisation's perceived 'weakness' with regards to being nearly completely dependent on donations alone. Her response was telling and truthful (the video [here](#), beginning at the 1:50 mark).

Whilst 30% of their operating budget they are able to muster on their own and control, Ms.Chan explains clearly that the other 70% they "(have) to take a hat and go around the world and beg for money. And when they give us money. they (the donating entities) are highly linked to their preferences".

In a 2021 data sheet provided on the WHO's [website](#), (you will need to scroll down the chart breakdown for ease of dissemination) which list the donating countries and individual organisations by amount. You will note the largest donor the WHO is the United States and The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (Including [GAVI](#), their official website [here](#)) totaling nearly \$1.87 billion dollars. This does not include the World Bank which was created by the US government in support of the Marshall Plan in 1944, aiding in rebuilding Asia and Europe post- World War II, based in Washington DC - (an American -created banking institution which donated \$132 million), and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) also based in New York City, US which donated \$103 million dollars of its own.

The WHO is not an elected body, is not above letting the donor class utilise its global position to extoll greater authoritarian 'emergency powers' over nation states under of the guise of pandemic response and 'public safety', and has already proven deeply incompetent as a coordinating agency, evidenced by the nearly [7 million deaths](#) globally from Covid 19.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Their being so heavily compromised by the donor class and its own internal conflict of interest, prevented them from enacting any meaningful input as to how to approach the pandemic meaningfully, with verified fact, unfettered research and coordination efforts to help those who were economically disadvantaged, as well to rise above competing propagandistic narratives which lent itself to disinformation, discrimination, authoritarian practices implemented globally under cover of a global emergency. They did nothing of notable substance to ensure that all human rights were honoured under their feeble suggestions, late responses and echo-chamber dialects as directed by their corporate masters.

They proved Ms. Chang right: They move at the behest of their donors first, the people second.

Now, in a self-congratulatory gesture and a power-grab for the elites that sponsor them, they solicit the world's parliament and governments to step aside and allow them full control during the next pandemic response. An un-elected, fully compromised coordinating agency who completely failed to perform as such during the previous global emergency event, as well as its spineless body, wholly committed to the whims of its donor class and clients, willfully ignorant of the nature of science, which is to question and then research.. then question the research until absolute fact can be attained, claiming 'they own the science now'.

Terrifying.

They want to impart a binding Treaty, which cannot be overturned nor retracted. They are soliciting for the full capacity to come into Aotearoa, tell the Beehive here in Wellington to stand aside during the next global health crisis. Even when New Zealand did fairly well on its own without the WHO's interdiction. We were one of the few countries that still had meaningful economic activity and free movement of people within our borders in the first two years of Covid, whilst other countries and nation-states remained on draconian lockdowns for extended periods of time, damaging their GDPs extensively, and causing mental anguish within their populations. Our elected officials did their jobs to the best of their ability, and as they were elected to do...by the people

The response wasn't perfect, but it was one of the better outcomes.

New Zealand is still in the process of reviewing its own decisions on how it responded during that time. Procedural questions have already been raised and are currently being vetted by both legal professionals, the government and the people. To allow the WEF members and its paid-for public health advisors, the WHO, to have unfettered control under the cloak of public safety is definitely the completion of Aldous Huxley's dystopian dreamscape. It is undemocratic, authoritarian and violates the public trust through simple administrative handover without representation of the people, without foreseeable end is that brave new world where no challenge nor critical review or protest will be tolerated.

No redress of grievances.

No guarantee of a return to autonomous sovereignty....

What the WHO proffers is the essential making and permission of totalitarianism by the donor class. A historic attempt at global hegemony

I not only say no..but. with all due respect ...HELL no

PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON PANDEMIC TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

s9(2)(a)

-----Original Message-----

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Tuesday, 18 July 2023 2:41 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Have your say - and I say NO

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to provide feedback regarding the upcoming WHOIHR amendments due May 2024 currently in discussion.

I object to the WHO taking sovereignty of New Zealand and wish to express my concern about the future of our country if this amendment is signed.

I would like to make an official statement and petition a national referendum on this topic.

I believe all New Zealanders do not want to see our country in the hands of this organisation and we would all deny the WHO taking complete control and sovereignty over New Zealand.

Please advise how I can take this further and the steps you have in process so I can officially decline as a citizen of New Zealand, this amendment being signed by our government.

Thank you kindly.

Regards,

s9(2)(a)

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Friday, 18 August 2023 12:52 pm

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

We do not want WHO involved in our country no matter what supposed trumped up misguided flu/cold comes around. They want supreme rule over every country. DON'T LET THEM IN. They didn't handle the past pandemic well either. They will invent disease to inject again it & take all the money including the tax funded research money. NO. NO NO!

Sent from my Galaxy

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Saturday, 2 September 2023 10:48 am

To: PandemicInstrument <PandemicInstrument@mfat.govt.nz>

Subject: Improving pandemic prevention, preparedness and response with a legal instrument

I wish to have it recorded that as a New Zealand citizen I am vehemently opposed to New Zealand being subject to any authority from outside parties and organisations such as the WHO and the UN. I see absolutely no need for an international plan for anything. I see it as a breach of our rights as citizens for leaders of our country to agree to be subject to globally agreed regulations.