

Te Kawau Maro

PO Box 4522
Shortland Street
Auckland
Aotearoa/New Zealand
email: moanas@ihug.co.nz
Ph/fax 0064 9 620-5280

Commission on Human Rights
Fifty-fifth session
Open-ended inter-sessional ad hoc
working group on a permanent forum
for Indigenous Peoples.
Geneva, 15 - 19 February 1999

Mr Chairman - on the question of membership we thank Indigenous Peoples (IP) and Governments (Gs) for their constructive input.

Mr Chairman - the representative for New Zealand made a statement yesterday that membership of IP to the PF reflect a proportional and geographical balance. This comment is appreciated because it furthers the debate on the present 5 geopolitical regions from which membership should be sought. Essentially the 5 geopolitical regions is a good starting point and it is possible that was the intention.

The argument to be made is that a sixth region needs to be created out of Asia and the Pacific. Now New Zealand and I might add Australia belong to the Western Europe and other states region. So strictly applying this means we Maori people from the South Pacific would make up part of the Northern Hemisphere representation and membership. To cause a little more confusion Maori people are at times also and more commonly included in another bloc, that of Asia and the Pacific.

These five regions are the creation of the UN and there may be very good reason to maintain them, however there needs to be some structural adjustment due in particular to the political representative nature of the PF, and an argument needs to support the inclusion of the sixth region.

Asia and the Pacific are two very large distinct regions. There has always been an exchange and natural collaboration between the many peoples of the two regions for mutual benefit, yet this has not blurred the fact that there exists among us two distinct regions, culturally politically and economically. I give two small examples to support the perception of this.

At the recent regional conference in 1998 on the PF it was titled "First Asian Peoples Workshop on a PF..." there is no mention of the Pacific and rightly so... the second example is the Workshop hosted by Fiji in 1996, the title was the "Pacific Indigenous Peoples Workshop on the DDIPRs, there was no mention of Asia, and rightly so. Furthermore, when the issue of effective and reflective representation arises, the need to have appropriate regions becomes distinctly important. The request is for Asia to be one region and the Pacific another thus creating six regions, we can all collaborate together at a later date to work out the details. I will by-pass the Northern Hemisphere as its relevance in the PF context is not important.

The proposal that IP and Gs make up the PF in equal numbers is supported. The use of experts should serve to provide technical, legal and associated tasks, with no political involvement apart from an advisory role.

Two members from each region both IP and Gs is sufficient to begin the PF institution, the

only issue we make out for Asia and the Pacific is that a sixth region be created.

The term of representation should be 3 years with no right of renewal unless an exceptional case can be made to the contrary. The object is to include many participants, therefore a system of rotation in the regions may be a possibility.

Finally all other persons should have access to the forum perhaps following the procedure of WGIP, however voting procedures wherever necessary may and perhaps should be restricted to the representatives..

I would like to mention sanctions and accountability procedures on the representatives performance is also as an issue which should be discussed also at a later time, thank-you all Mr Chairman.

Anthony Tauni Sinclair.