

14.02.00

(37)

Miliiani Urash

Intervention of Na Koa Ikaika o Ka Lahui Hawaii
Agenda Item #4 (a)

Points

- #1 : Support for a " broad mandate " is insufficient to give clarity to the Permanent Forum's mandate, we need to avoid interpretive issues in the mandate by detailing what the mandate is. The Indigenous Caucus submittal provides this clarity.
- #2 : States are not addressing the mandate of the Permanent Forum – but their fears regarding the mandate. States repeatedly say that the Permanent Forum should not engage in standard setting activities, dispute settlement, conflict resolution or policy formulation. Our mandate is to conflict resolution or policy formulation. Our mandate is to define the mandate of the Indigenous Peoples' Forum – instead States want to list what the Permanent Forum is not – that violates this bodies mandate. If the States read the Indigenous Caucus statement you will see we are not seeking to engage in standard setting activities, dispute settlement or policy formulation.
- #3 : States have addressed the "trial " or "experimental " Permanent Forum. This violates the Vienna documents and the ECO-SOC Resolution. A Permanent Forum is not a " trial " or "experimental " effort but a mandate for a permanent forum.
- #4 : I direct States to review E/CN.4/1999/83 25 March 1999 paragraph 39 – Indigenous Peoples consider conflict prevention to be of importance. We have deleted this from the Caucus Statement in difference to the jurisdiction of the Security Council : out of respect for the mandate of other UN forums. We have heard States say that our role will be to " advise " and "recommend " - this means the right to recommend solutions to conflict, to recommend policy changes. States are not acting in good faith.
- #5 : If proper will be made we must follow our mandate and act in good faith. States should address our work, not their fears.