1. Editorial

This UPDATE intends to inform the indigenous organizations and communities about the results of the Working Group on the Permanent Forum (WGPF) with regard to the discussion of agenda item 15 (“indigenous issues”) of the Commission on Human Rights which will take place on April 13.

That date is very important since the government of Denmark, following up on WGPF, wants to present a resolution asking for the establishment of the Permanent Forum at the upcoming session of the Commission. If that resolution is approved it will be the turn of ECOSOC to decide – next July. ECOSOC may adopt, amend, reject or report its decision. If the Commission adopts the resolution of Denmark by consensus, ECOSOC will probably accept the establishment of the PF as well.

From the procedural point of view there is still another possibility, namely that the Commission does not deliberate on the resolution, but transfers it directly to ECOSOC for decision.

The issue of the location of the PF in Geneva or in New York – which is, of course, of great interest to doCip – has for the time being not yet been agreed upon, neither among the States nor among the Indigenous Peoples. Normally, this issue should be treated and decided later, independent from the establishment of the PF itself. However, certain observers think that it could possibly be treated already at this session of the Commission and be adopted along with the establishment itself. Since it is placed at the end of the list, it has not yet been genuinely and objectively examined.

Therefore, an independent examination seems desirable so that States and Indigenous Peoples might judge based on thorough knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of either location. The decision about the location should, in fact, not be restricted to the cost issue. It also has to take into account the political and technical questions as well as those concerning synergies with other organizations (intergovernmental, trade unions, NGOs, etc.), accessibility, housing, working conditions, especially for the indigenous delegations, among other questions.

Thus, the discussion is open-ended. It might develop very rapidly though we cannot say in which direction. The next weeks will be decisive since the vote will take place on April 25. We therefore devote to this important issue a whole though rather small edition of UPDATE, where the readers will find the positions of the various actors in this process as expressed during the WGPF.

* * *
2. REPORT ON THE OPEN-ENDED AD HOC INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP ON A PERMANENT FORUM FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Geneva, 14 - 23 February 2000

2.1 Opening Statements

The meeting was opened by Mrs. Mary Robinson, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. In her statement Mrs. Robinson stated that the Forum should harmonize and coordinate activities on indigenous affairs, which her office strongly supported. The integration of indigenous concerns and solutions into the UN structure would assist the UN’s mission and create an active partnership between indigenous peoples and member states. There was still much work to be done.

Mr. Peter Wille of Norway was elected Chair by acclamation, and after a eulogy for Mr. Edwin Burnstick by Mr. Willie Littlechild, the agenda was adopted and the workplan laid out. The Chair decided to follow the lead of Mr. Richard Van Rijssen and have facilitators for each subitem of the agenda, and then opened the floor for general remarks. SC, TF, and IOIRD, as well as many other indigenous organizations, endorsed the recommendations of Indigenous Caucus (released as CRP1) for consideration by the Working Group. CUBA and CANADA declared their support for the Forum, and several governments, including CANADA, MEXICO, CUBA believed that CRP1 was a good basis or aid for the group’s work.

2.2 Mandate

Almost all governmental representatives (including NORWAY, SWEDEN, JAPAN, COSTA RICA, NEW ZEALAND, ECUADOR, CUBA) who spoke supported a “broad mandate.” This idea was, however, questioned by PERU. The UNITED KINGDOM agreed with a mandate that exceeded human rights and that encompassed issues such as environment, education, health, and development, as did GUATEMALA, DENMARK urged a broad, concise list of concerns, and a focus on functions: coordination, advice, dissemination of information, and recommendations; JAPAN, AUSTRALIA, and NEW ZEALAND agreed, minus the recommendations. A number of indigenous delegates agreed with governments on a wider range of issues for the Forum (COPMAGUA, AD). AITPN cautioned against imprecise use of terms.

CHILE stated that the Forum should take the place of other UN agencies and organs dealing with indigenous issues, and act as a bridge. IITC stated that the mandate promotes peace and prosperity under Articles 62 and 63 of the UN Charter. The Forum must make policy recommendations and standards, conduct studies and respond to urgent matters (CAPAJ, AFN, CTT). SPAIN stated that the Forum should formulate policy recommendations and development strategies to properly focus policies and programs at all levels. The Forum should also monitor the implementation of Decade activities. Several states were against the Forum having any dispute-resolution capacities, although AITPN felt this was a misplaced concern since the Forum was not a treaty body. SWEDEN stressed that the Forum must respect the mandates of other parts of the UN system, and that it should mainstream indigenous issues into the system. CISA felt that states were misunderstanding the possible role of the Forum in dealing with conflicts, while NKIKLH felt that states were reflecting their own fears rather than responding to actual intentions.

2.3 Membership and Participation

The recommendation of the Indigenous Caucus was for at least 30 members, and this was endorsed by JD. Some governments gave a wider range of 20-30 members (UNITED KINGDOM, NEW ZEALAND). A number of governments approved of the core group/assembly model (UNITED KINGDOM, NEW ZEALAND). DENMARK believed that a ‘special terminology’ of core group and open assembly was not needed, and advocated 18 members serving in their personal capacity, appointed by the parent body upon consultation with governments and indigenous organizations. NORWAY agreed. SPAIN advocated an ILO-style membership structure, with some support from Ibero-American countries (ARGENTINA, PERU). Indigenous delegates rejected this model (TF, TSNTC, CISA, COICA, NKIKLH, GCC, CTT, AN) and asserted that indigenous peoples should appoint delegates without state approval because of ongoing conflicts with states and the spread of indigenous peoples across state borders. AITPN pointed out that there were alternatives to SPAIN’s proposal within the UN system, despite the government’s assertion that state accreditation was necessary.

On the question of personal capacity, SWEDEN felt that state representatives did not need to serve in their personal capacity. Most states, however, agreed on personal capacity or “expert” status for Forum members. Some indigenous delegates expressed concerns with this formulation, wanting Forum members to have more connection to their communities and peoples (AN, THOA). Many state representatives (VENEZUELA, INDIA) pressed the indigenous delegates for an explicit system of appointment, and suggested that the process of creating the Forum could not continue until this was worked out. Indigenous delegates refuted this
Indigenous delegates (including indigenous organizations (MEXICO, NEW ZEALAND, FINLAND, ANCAP, AIPNSFE, JD, IMTA). She stated that in the absence of a non-‘arbitrary’ definition of ‘indigenous peoples’, the legitimacy of the Forum would be in question. DENMARK and AUSTRALIA stated that the Forum should work on the basis of consensus. Several Latin American indigenous delegates stated that there was a need for as open and diverse membership as possible (ANIPA, COJPITA) and other delegates (TKM, ANCAP) advocated a reformation of the UN’s geographical distribution to allow indigenous peoples to escape the arbitrary political coalitions of that system. NEW ZEALAND and SWITZERLAND agreed.

Towards the end of the meeting a new geographical distribution was proposed by the Indigenous Caucus, which would create a 34 member Forum. The geographical breakdown was as follows: North America : 2; South America : 2; Central America : 2; North Africa : 1; Western/Central Africa : 1; Eastern and Southern Africa : 1; Western Europe : 1; Russia/CIS : 2; Pacific : 2; South Asia : 1; Southeast Asia : 1; East Asia : 1; Total : 17.

2.4 Financial and Secretariat Implications

The governments of CANADA, NORWAY, MEXICO, FINLAND, SWEDEN, PARAGUAY, GUATEMALA and indigenous organizations AIPP, ANCAP, CISA, TKM, and IMTA all stated that the finances of the Forum should come from the regular UN budget. Many speakers also voiced support for some sort of voluntary fund; MEXICO advocated the merging of the Decade’s fund into the Forum. JAPAN stated that any activity of the Forum, including financial expenditures, must be approved by ECOSOC.

On location, SWITZERLAND and FRANCE supported Geneva, and MEXICO supported New York. Indigenous representatives were divided on the question; TSNTC, OSILIGI, ANCAP, AIPNSFE, IMTA, supported Geneva, while JD, AITPN, IITC, LMFP, and TF supported the Indigenous Caucus’ recommendation for New York. NIKIKLH advocated a “floating secretariat” between the two locations, which ICC and TKM found intriguing. SWEDEN, CANADA, AUSTRALIA, and AFN were flexible on location. ARGENTINA, JAPAN, and the NETHERLANDS were flexible but preferred Geneva.

2.5 Name and Placement of the Forum

The most contentious issue in regards to the name was the use of the term ‘indigenous peoples’ in the name. CANADA and GUATEMALA stated that they could accept the use of the term. SWITZERLAND, NORWAY, SWEDEN, AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, were flexible but felt that it should be avoided because other states had problems with it. They supported an informal Danish proposal to call the Forum ‘Permanent Forum for Indigenous People’s Affairs’ as a compromise. The UNITED KINGDOM and the UNITED STATES asserted that insisting on the term “peoples” would impede the Forum’s progress. MEXICO supported naming the caucus either ‘The Permanent Forum on Indigenous Affairs’ or ‘Issues,’ as detailed in their CRP; JAPAN agreed. ARGENTINA had no problem with the use of “peoples” in the document, as other international organizations used the term without legal implications. The NETHERLANDS opposed the use of “peoples” and supported the Danish proposal. Indigenous delegates (including ICC, RAIPON, ANCAP, IITC, NIKIKLH, OSILIGI, TKM, IOIRD, JOHAR, CAPAJ, CTT) overwhelmingly supported the use of “indigenous peoples” in the name of the Forum.

Most participants agreed that the Forum should be attached to ECOSOC in some manner, although there was some divergence of opinion on how this linkage should be formalized. MEXICO advocated a Commission-style linkage in its own proposal.

2.6 Other Issues

DENMARK made several proposals, the first was for a “review clause” to assess and, if needed, adjust the mandate and working methods of the Forum after five years. The delegate also advocated that the Forum should decide substantive issues by consensus, and technical issues by majority vote. The Forum may also wish, he suggested, to put a provision into its Rules of Procedure for deliberations behind closed doors, away from the open assembly of observers. While some indigenous delegates (including IOIRD) agreed with the inclusion of a review clause, others questioned the necessity of a “behind closed doors” provision in the Rules of Procedure later in the debate.

2.7 Highlights of Debate on Facilitators’ Reports and Chair’s ‘Perception Paper’

On the mandate, the facilitators were MEXICO, IOIRD, and IITC. On membership, the facilitators were NEW ZEALAND and TF. On financial and secretariat implications the facilitators were SWEDEN and NIKIKLH. On placement within the UN system, the facilitators were ARGENTINA and AN. On the remainder of issues, JAPAN was the government facilitator, with TF, IOIRD, and an African delegation as the indigenous facilitators.
On Monday 21 February the Chair presented his “perception paper” on the formal debate, to summarize positions and highlight the ‘many points of convergence’ and possible points of consensus. The work for the remainder of the meeting was focused on responding to this paper and its revisions. Several delegates (FRANCE, GCC, GUATEMALA) reiterated that the work of the Working Group was to condense ideas, and the Chair agreed, although other delegates demanded that their proposals be added (MEXICO, SPAIN, IMTA). Debate began in the late afternoon after a short speech by the President of the Panamanian Parliament, who is the first indigenous leader of that body. A number of governments reiterated their past positions and asked for inclusion of their ideas in the paper. DENMARK tried to clear up some terminological confusion: the delegate pointed out that the Forum had been called an advisory body, a subsidiary body and an expert body, and stated that really it was a subsidiary body under ECOSOC with advisory functions and that its expert aspect was reflected in its members serving in their individual capacity. Delegates called for a number of changes on the name, mandate, and the subsidiary body under ECOSOC with advisory functions and that its expert aspect was reflected in its members.

The Secretariat expert, Mr. Comba stated that, based on a two-week meeting of the Forum in Geneva with 18 members, the cost of holding the Forum would be about US$470,000. Some governments pointed out that this was nearly the same figure as the previous year, and Mr. Comba explained that differences in exchange rates and reassessed travel costs made the figure quite close to that quoted last year. In response to a question from ARGENTINA, Mr. Comba stated that each expert would cost about US$6,500. The figure also did not account for a separate secretariat for the Forum. For New York, conference services would cost roughly the same, about US$250,000, but extra costs for experts would run about US$30,000. In response to a question from the UNITED KINGDOM, he stated that a one-week session would cost US$370,000. Regarding a separate secretariat, he cautioned that there seemed to be no legal basis for this, but that with high-level staffing such a secretariat would cost about US$1.5 million per year. AIITPN pointed out that there were non-treaty-based groups in the UN with their own secretariat, such as the Commission on Human Settlements.

The Chair also opened discussion on Item 5 (the role and function of the WGIP) and 6 (Follow-up) of the agenda, and while he cautioned participants that it was not in the mandate of the Working Group to discuss the future of the WGIP, many governments made statements on this issue. The UNITED KINGDOM assumed that once the Forum came into being that the WGIP would cease to exist. NEW ZEALAND stated that it was “logical” for the Forum to replace the WGIP as it will be more effective as an advisory body, and JAPAN, UNITED STATES, AUSTRALIA, RUSSIA, and INDIA all agreed that the Forum should replace the WGIP. GUATEMALA stated that this discussion should be held after the Forum is created (COLOMBIA substantially agreed with this position), while FRANCE felt that the WGIP’s fate had to be decided before the Forum started, although the WGIP could function for a year or so after the Forum began. Many states cited budgetary constraints as the main reason for eliminating the WGIP, but PERU refuted this as sufficient reason for the WGIP’s elimination and asserted that this Working Group did not have the competence to discuss this matter (CHILE, MEXICO, and TF agreed). SWEDEN suggested that the WGIP be suspended until the first review of the Forum to determine the impact of its demise substantively and financially. IOIRD stated that both groups could and should co-exist, at least until the five-year review of the Forum took place. ANCAP, ITC, TF, NKIKHL, GCC, CISA, JOHAR, COPMAGUA, all urged that the WGIP be kept after the Forum was created.

In debate on the final day, a number of delegates made pertinent points. Several government delegates (GUATEMALA, NORWAY, VENEZUELA) expressed disappointment that the Chair’s paper was not a consensus document, and a number of indigenous delegates pointed out that there were a number of elements of unanimity in the paper (AN). TF listed four points of unanimity: (1) that the Forum would be established; (2) that it would be a subsidiary body of ECOSOC; (3) that there would be an equal number of indigenous and governmental representatives; and (4) that these representatives would be selected by each group’s own criteria and processes. Many government delegates (ARGENTINA, NEPAL, ECUADOR, INDIA, VENEZUELA) continued to express concern about the guidelines for appointing indigenous representatives, despite the inclusion of draft criteria in the final draft of the Chair’s paper. MEXICO refuted this concern, saying that it trusted indigenous peoples to create a transparent, democratic process of selection, and several indigenous delegates assured the meeting that these concerns would be dealt with.

Some indigenous delegates urged that provisions for the Forum to address urgent matters or engage in dispute resolution be maintained in the mandate (CAPAJ, AFN, COPMAGUA, NKIKHL). Some governments requested the references to Articles 62 and 63 of the UN Charter be removed from the Chair’s paper (UNITED KINGDOM, UNITED STATES, INDIA, MALAYSIA) while other delegates (including ICC, CTT, and SWEDEN) felt that these references should be kept. Governments continued to resist the inclusion of “peoples” in the Forum’s title (including BRAZIL), but ITC pointed out that all indigenous delegates and many governmental delegates accepted or could accept the term. The UNITED KINGDOM declared that it would push for a one-week session of the Forum at the CHR; JAPAN supported this idea.
The final session was devoted to the report of the Working Group, and for the most part passed without controversy. The only point of contention was over the use of “peoples” in the report. In the end it was decided not to include a footnote qualifying the term, since it had been used without prejudice in debate and because the Chair agreed to make changes so that the meaning was “less precise.” His paper, as well as several of the proposals, would be included in the final report.

2.8 List of abbreviations

AFN: Assembly of First Nations
AIPNSFE: Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, of Siberia and of the Far East
AN: Asociación Napguana
ANCAP: Association nouvelle de la culture et les arts populaires
ANIPA: Asamblea Nacional Indigena por la Autonomía
CAPAJ: Legal Committee for the Self-Development of Peoples of Andean Origin
CISA: Indian Council of South America
COPMAGUA: Coordinación de Organizaciones del Pueblo Maya de Guatemala
CTT: Consejo de Todas las Tierras
GCC: Grand Council of the Crees
ICC: Inuit Circumpolar Conference
IITC: International Indian Treaty Council
IMTA: Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”
IOIRD: International Organization of Indigenous Resource Development
JOHAR: Jharkandis Organization for Human Rights
LMPF: Lumad Mindanaw Peoples Federation
NKIKLH: Na Koa Ikaika o Ka Lahui Hawai‘i
OSILIGI: Organization for Survival of the Ilaikipiak Indigenous Maasai Group
RAIPON: Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North
SC: Saami Council
TF: Tebtebba Foundation
THOA: Taller de Historia Oral Andina
TKM: Te Kawau Maro
TSNTC: Teton Sioux Nation Treaty Council

* * *

3. SEMINAR ON THE DRAFT PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE HERITAGE OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Geneva, 28 February to 1 March 2000

By its resolution 1993/44 of 26 August 1993, the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities endorsed the study of the protection of the cultural and intellectual property of indigenous peoples prepared by the Special Rapporteur Mrs Erica-Irene Daes (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1993/28), and requested that she expand her study with a view to elaborating draft principles and guidelines for the protection of indigenous peoples’ heritage.

In conformity with resolution 1993/44, the Special Rapporteur Mrs Daes provided a final report containing draft principles and guidelines for the protection of the heritage of indigenous people to the Sub-Commission at its 47th Session (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1995/26).

After a number of unsuccessful attempts (due to lack of funds), a seminar on the draft principles and guidelines for the protection of the heritage of indigenous peoples was held at the Palais des Nations in Geneva from 28 February to 1 March 2000. The seminar was attended by about 50 individuals during the course of the two and a half days. Of these, approximately half were indigenous. Others were invited experts, officials from Permanent Missions and UN Agencies and academics with an interest in the subject.

Mrs Daes was elected unanimously as Chairperson for the seminar. She explained that the purpose of the seminar was to consider the draft principles and guidelines and redraft as appropriate. Ms Daes advised that she would use the results of the seminar to report to the next session of the Sub-Commission recommending that the revised draft principles and guidelines be adopted and sent to the Commission on Human Rights. From there it is hoped that they will be referred through the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly for adoption as a declaration or a body of principles.
During the two and a half days, seminar participants considered the draft principles and guidelines and made proposals for amendment. While it could not be suggested that the seminar represented a formal drafting group, its recommendations will be considered by Mrs Daes in the preparation of her report to the Sub-Commission.

Mrs Daes’ report will be available before the 18th session of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP) in July 2000. It would be highly desirable for WGIP participants to have an opportunity to debate the report so that Mrs Daes has the benefit of the views - and hopefully, the endorsement - of Indigenous peoples of her report.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS:**

**I. EXPERTS INVITED BY THE OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIA INDIGENOUS PEOPLES PACT, Thailand</td>
<td>Mr. Luingam Luithui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOCIACION NAPGUANA, Panama</td>
<td>Mr. Nelson De Leon Kantule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIPON, Russia</td>
<td>Mr. Nikita Kaplin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COICA, Brazil</td>
<td>Mr. Paulo Oliveira Pankararu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN AND NORTHERN EDUCATION PROGRAM (INEP), UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN</td>
<td>Ms. Marie Battiste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPACC, South Africa</td>
<td>Mr. Roger Chennells South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS</td>
<td>Mrs. Erica-Irene Daes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. PERMANENT MISSIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANADA:</td>
<td>Ms. Deborah Chatsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Sylvia Batt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT:</td>
<td>Mr. Mohammed Mounir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREECE:</td>
<td>Mr. Elefterios Douvos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Emmanuel Manoussakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUATEMALA:</td>
<td>Ms. Stephanie Hochstetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO:</td>
<td>Ms. Alicia Perez Duarte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tonatiu Romero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:</td>
<td>Ms. Baccam Veomayoury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III. UN AGENCIES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE (ILO)</td>
<td>Ms. Chandra Roy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>Mr. Edouard Planche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION, (WIPO)</td>
<td>Mr. Henri-Philippe Sambuc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Wend Wendland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. OTHER ORGANIZATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATSIC, Australia</td>
<td>Mr. Shane Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCIA INTERNACIONAL DE PRENSA INDIA (AIPIN), Mexico</td>
<td>Ms. Patricia Pena Haaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Genaro Bautista Gabriel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Claudia Castro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA INDIGENOUS PEOPLES PACT, Thailand</td>
<td>Ms. Piqueras Ramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCAP, Morocco</td>
<td>Ms. Latifa El Moussaoui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
doCip
Ms. Pierrette Biriaux-Ziegler
Ms. Barbara Bucher

FAIRA, Australia
Mr. Robert Lacey
Mr. Lyndon Ormond-Parker

INSTITUTO NACIONAL INDIGENISTA (INI), Mexico
Mr. Carlos Zolla

INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ICC
Mr. Tim Roberts

INTERNATIONAL INDIAN TREATY COUNCIL, (IITC)
Mr. Mario Ibarra

INTERNATIONAL SERVICE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
Ms. Monica Kunkel

NAILSS, Australia
Mr. Frank E. Guivarra

RAPA NUI
Mr. Fernando Atap
Ms. Eugenia Pakarati

SHIMIN GAIKOU CENTRE,
ASSOCIATION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES
OF RYUKYU, Japan
Ms. Chika Onaka

TIN HINAN, Burkina Faso
Ms. Khadidiatou Diop

V. ACADEMIC AND OTHERS:

Ms. Anida Yupari Aguado
University of Geneva, Switzerland

Ms. Monica Castelo
International Law and Policy, Uruguay

Ms. Sara Gustafsson
University of Lund, Sweden

Ms. Helga Lomosits
Indigena, France

Ms. Anne-Elisabeth Ravetto
University of Paris X, France

Ms. Mylène Valenzuela Reyes
Lawyer, Chile

Ms. Felicia Sandler
University Researcher, USA

Professor Siegfried Wiessner
St. Thomas University School of Law- Florida, USA

*
*
*

5. UPCOMING EVENTS AND NEWS

World Conference on Racism,
Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance
to be held in South Africa in 2001

Preparatory Committee, Geneva, 1 to 5 May 2000

The preparatory process:
In 1998, the General Assembly designated the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (HCHR), Mary Robinson, as Secretary-General of the Conference. The Assembly invited States and regional organizations to set up coordination structures responsible for promoting preparations for the Conference and for sensitizing public opinion. Governments, international and regional organizations, and non-governmental organizations are requested to participate in the preparations of the Conference by undertaking reviews and studies and submitting recommendations, among other activities, to the Preparatory Committee through the HCHR. The Commission on Human Rights will act as the Preparatory Committee for the Conference.

Non-governmental organizations have been encouraged to hold a forum both before and during the Conference, and to actively participate in the preparations for the Conference. They have also been requested to support the HCHR and the UN Department of Public Information in their efforts to undertake a world information campaign to mobilize and support the Conference and its objectives.

Setting the stage for the new millennium:
The Conference should not only promote greater awareness concerning the scourge of racism but also lead to decisive action at the national, regional and international levels.
Overall aims:
• To review progress made against racial discrimination, to re-appraise obstacles to further progress and to devise ways to overcome them;
• To consider how to ensure the better application of existing standards to combat racial discrimination;
• To increase awareness about racism and its consequences;
• To make recommendations on how the activities and mechanisms of the United Nations can be more effective in fighting racism;
• To review the political, historical, economic, social, cultural and other factors which have contributed to racism;
• To make recommendations with regard to new national, regional and international measures that could be adopted to fight racism; and
To make recommendations concerning how to ensure that the UN has sufficient resources to be able to carry out an effective programme to combat racism and racial discrimination.

Preparation:
Two preparatory meetings will be held, one in May 2000 and the second in 2001, both in Geneva

Participation:
The World Conference, as well as the session of its Preparatory Committee, are open to participation by: representatives of organizations which have received a standing invitation from the General Assembly to participate as observers; interested NGOs to be represented by observers, in accordance with UN ECOSOC resolution 1996/31; and other interested governmental organizations, to be represented as observers.

The International Year:
The General Assembly decided to proclaim the International Year of Mobilization against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance in 2001

For further information, please consult:
The Website of the Office of the HCHR, www.unhchr.ch or go directly to the Conference Website: www.unhchr.ch/html/racism/racism/htm

For specific inquiries, please contact:
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
World Conference Secretariat
United Nations
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917-9290
Fax: +41 22 917-9022
E-mail: husbands@un.org
Department of Public Information
Development and Human Rights Section
United Nations, Room S-1040
New York, NY 10017, U.S.A.
Tel.: 212 963-3771
Fax: 212 963-1186
E-mail: vasic@un.org

* * *

The United Nations General Assembly Special Session (UNGASS)
Geneva, 26-30 June 2000

World Summit for Social Development and beyond: achieving social development for all in a globalizing world

Social development: taking the next step at Geneva 2000
The United Nations General Assembly will meet in Special Session (UNGASS) to review progress since Copenhagen (1995) and to explore new initiatives that might move the social development agenda forward.

For more information on accreditation for the UNGASS please contact:
Division for Policy and Development
Department of Economic and Social Affairs
United Nations, Room DC2-1360
New York NY 10017
Tel : (1) 212-963-3175, Fax: (1) 212-963-3062
E-mail: esa@un.org ; website : www.un.org/esa/socdev

Contact for information on the Geneva Forum 2000:
Geneva 2000 c/o MCI Congress
75, rue de Lyon
1211 Geneva 13, Switzerland
Tel: +41-22-339 9584; Fax: +41-22-339 9 621
E-mail: Geneva2000@mci-group.com

For further information on these events, visit www.un.org/esa/socdev/geneva2000
TEBTEBBA FOUNDATION, INC.
(Indigenous Peoples’ International Centre for Policy Research and Education)

CALL FOR PAPERS
FOR THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION
PHILIPPINES, 21 – 23 SEPTEMBER 2000

THE WORKSHOP GENERALLY AIMS TO ANALYZE THE PROCESSES AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES INVOLVED IN RESOLVING CONFLICTS BETWEEN INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND NATION-STATES.

PAPERS SHOULD MEET THE FOLLOWING SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:

- Review, synthesize and draw lessons from previous and current studies on conflict resolution involving a specific ethnic group/minority group/indigenous peoples and nation-States;
- Identify the dynamics and processes of peace-building in indigenous territories in each specific site;
- Describe and analyze the actual conduct of the peace accords;
- Evaluate the implementation of the peace agreement, and
- Recommend measures or mechanisms for the attainment of a just and lasting peace in indigenous peoples’ lands.

Deadline for submission of abstracts: 15 June 2000
Deadline for submission of full paper: 15 August 2000

Please submit papers to: Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz
Executive Director
Tebtebba Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 1993
Baguio 2600 - Philippines
Telefax: (+63) 74 – 443 – 9459
e-mail: tebtebba@skyinet.net

* * *

Cultures and Biodiversity Congress 2000
21 – 31 July 2000, Kunming, PR China

Contact:
Therese Grinter: xuje97@public.km.vn.cn
Xu Jianchu: cbik@public.km.vn.cn
http://www.cbik.org

* * *

Consultation workshop on Cultural Survival
Working with Indigenous People in SW-China and SE-Asia:
concept for a strategy to enhance intercultural dialogue and cultural identity

Bad Boll (Germany), 30 September to 3 October 2000

Contact addresses
Dr. Klaus Hirsch/Helga Steck
E-mail: helga.steck@ev-akademie-boll.de
klaus.hirsch@ev-akademie-boll.de
Dr. M.A.Salas/Dr. H.J.Tillmann
E-mail: 101452.2370@compuserve.com
Timmi.Tillmann@gmx.de

Prof. Xu Jianchu
Center for Biodiversity and Indigenous Knowledge
E-mail: cbik@public.km.vn.cn
United Nations Indigenous Fellowship Programme 2000

For this year's Programme four fellowships were awarded to indigenous persons:

- Mr Ben Mugarura (Batwa, Rwanda)
- Ms Sirjana Subba (Limbu, Nepal)
- Mr Sixto Castro Jumpiri Acarapi (Aymara, Bolivia)
- Ms Brenda Odjick (Algonquin, Canada)

Members of the UN Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations

The members of the Board of Trustees who have been appointed by the Secretary-General for the period 2000-2002 are themselves indigenous persons:

- Mr. Michael Dodson (Australia)
- Ms. Naomi N. Kipuri (Kenya)
- Mr. José Carlos Morales Morales (Costa Rica)
- Ms. Tove S. Petersen (Greenland/Denmark)
- Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz (Philippines): Chairperson

UPDATE by e-mail

Please contact us to communicate your e-mail address, inform us about any address change, and ask for back issues. The electronic version of UPDATE is available since number 27 at:

docip@iprolink.ch

It is also available on our website: www.docip.org
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