

**Human Rights Council**  
**Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples**

Third session, 12-16 July 2010

Agenda Item 5: Proposals to be submitted to the Human Rights Council for its consideration and approval

**Statement by the Arctic Caucus**

Thank you Mr. Chairperson,

The Arctic Caucus is concerned about the conclusions of this important body being stuck in EMRIP, and not acted upon by the Human Rights Council and beyond. Consequently, we agree with the government of Finland and other delegations that it is crucial that due attention is given to the follow-up on the study on indigenous peoples' right to participation, once the study is completed by the EMRIP and submitted to the Human Rights Council in 2011.

The Arctic Caucus recalls that the EMRIP - in its report to the Council last year - Document A/HRC/12/32, proposal 3, para. 1, proposed that the Human Rights Council during future sessions organizes panel events devoted to the rights of indigenous peoples. Specifically, it was proposed that such panel events focus on follow-up of the thematic studies prepared by EMRIP. The Arctic Caucus deeply regrets that this paragraph was not included in the Human Rights Council resolution on EMRIP and hence not acted upon by the Council.

Mr. Chairperson,

The Arctic Caucus notes that it has become standard practice that the Human Rights Council devotes half-day discussions during its sessions to the follow-up on thematic studies submitted to the Council. We refer here e.g. to Human Rights Council Resolution 12/18, paras. 5-7, Resolution 11/8, para. 7 and Resolution 9/1, paras. 9-11.

We fail to see why expert studies on indigenous peoples' rights should not be subject to the same kind of follow-up mechanisms as other expert studies commissioned by the Human Rights Council.

The Arctic Caucus therefore *recommends* that the EMRIP include in its report a draft Human Rights Council decision similar to the one submitted last year. The draft decision should hence provide for a half-day panel-discussion to be organized at the relevant Human Rights Council session sometime in 2013, focusing on the follow-up of the study on indigenous peoples' rights to participation. We think it is pertinent to allow two years to pass between the submission of the study and the follow-up, since, in our opinion, the panel discussion should focus on what states have done to implement the conclusions EMRIP has drawn in the study. Should it be revealed that the recommendations have not been sufficiently acted upon by states, it is pertinent to have an additional follow-up session in another two years time.

The Arctic Caucus further *calls on* the Human Rights Council to act on this recommendation by the EMRIP.

Finally Mr. Chairperson,

The Arctic Caucus in addition notes that it's customary that a concept note be prepared to introduce the panel discussions in the Human Rights Council. We think it is natural that EMRIP is responsible for crafting the concept note for the follow-up discussions on its own studies. This also allows EMRIP to ensure that the panel has the right focus, e.g. the follow-up by states of EMRIP's conclusions and recommendations. *On a final note*

*+ Rec. on Dec.*  
We thank you, Mr. Chairperson.