

Minutes of the inaugural meeting of the Indigenous Global Coordinating Group (GCG), New York 22 – 23 March 2012

Present: Joseph Ole Simel (African member), Saoudata Aboubacrine (African member), Hjalmar Dahl (Arctic member), Joan Carling (Asian member and member of the drafting group), Kenneth Deer (North American member), Randy Kapashesit (North American member), Tracey Castro Whare (Pacific member and Secretariat), Rodion Sulyandziga (Russian member), Pavel Sulyandziga (RAIPON), Tarcila Rivera (Women's caucus), Jocelyn Hung Chien (Youth caucus), Kai Landow (on behalf of Leon Siu), John Henriksen (Sami Parliament of Norway representative and Indigenous facilitator), Kent Lebsock (on behalf of Owe Aku International Justice Project and member of the drafting group), Lola Garcia-Alix (IWGIA), Inger Johanne Mudenia (Sami Parliament of Norway representative and member of the drafting group), Patricia Borraz (IWGIA) and Mirian Masaquiza (staff member of the Secretariat of the PFII).

Chairs: Joseph and Kenneth

Rapporteur: Tracey with support of the drafting team being Kent, Inger and Joan

Apologies: Gilberto Solano (Latin American member)

Meeting opened with an incantation from Kent.

Summary of decisions taken by the GCG

1. The Report from the Copenhagen Meeting is adopted. The Concept Paper is a separate document.
2. The GCG met with Mexico, Bolivia and Denmark on 23 March.
3. The GCG established a Permanent Secretariat being Tracey with the drafting group of Inger, Joan and Kent.
4. A website is to be created.
5. Each region and the two caucuses will have 2 permanent representatives and 1 alternate. Decisions will be based on consensus with each region/caucus to have one vote if voting is required.
6. Terms of reference for the GCG drafted and adopted.
7. John was re-endorsed as the Indigenous co-facilitator.
8. List of contact details for the GCG will be created and distributed.
9. John to draft a modality resolution. GCG to provide input and John to present the draft resolution to States.
10. Each GCG region to prepare a budget to hold an Indigenous prep-com and to table such budget at the next GCG meeting.
11. The GCG established a fundraising committee whose members are John, Kai, Saoudata, Jocelyn, Kenneth, Joan and Randy.
12. The GCG will hold a side event at the PF on Wednesday 9 May, 1500 – 1615.
13. The next meeting of the GCG will be: Sunday 6 May, 1400 - 1800, American Indian Community House, 134 W. 29th St. between 6th and 7th Aves, 4th Floor and Monday 7 May, 1400 - 1800, UN DC 2, room 1282.

Agenda

Draft agenda adopted with some changes being, item 1 to include the Rapporteur's report of the Copenhagen meeting and agenda item 3 to include jurisdiction.

Agreement that the discussions of the GCG are public and that the minutes of the meeting will be widely distributed. UN staff who attend the GCG do so as observers.

Agenda item 1

Developments in relation to the resolution adopted by the open-ended Indigenous Peoples' Brainstorming Meeting on the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples 2014, held in Copenhagen, Denmark, 13 -14 January 2012 (Copenhagen meeting) and the Rapporteur's report of the Copenhagen meeting.

Rapporteur's report of the Copenhagen meeting

Rapporteur's report tabled and adopted.

There are currently two documents that have been produced as a result of Indigenous efforts in relation to the WCIP 2014, the report and resolution of the Copenhagen meeting and the Concept Paper. The later is an ongoing document that will evolve in response to new developments. Its purpose is to assist Indigenous peoples in their preparations for the WCIP 2014.

Developments since the Copenhagen meeting

John reported on the meeting in NY the week after the Copenhagen meeting. Participants included States, the President of the General Assembly (PGA) and Indigenous peoples (Kent Lebsack, Kenneth Deer, Wilton Littlechild, Ed John, Mirna Cunningham, Andrea Carmen and John Henriksen). There were no substantive discussions but the resolution of the Copenhagen meeting was presented.

The GCG will meet with Ambassador De Alba tomorrow. There may also be representatives from Bolivia and Denmark who will attend.

John explained that the PGA will appoint a facilitator to conduct consultations on the modalities of the WCIP 2014. Ambassador De Alba of Mexico is happy to be the facilitator if asked. Mexico is trying to get a meeting with the PGA on 29 March to discuss the appointment of an Indigenous co-facilitator. Mexico will propose to the PGA that Ambassador De Alba will only accept the role of facilitator if there is an Indigenous co-facilitator.

Mexico has been working on a paper to present to the PGA about this matter that was circulated amongst the GCG last week. Comments on the paper were made by John, Tracey and Kenneth and forwarded to Mexico. The idea of the Mexican paper is that it is given to the PGA, he then adopts the paper as his own, puts it on his letterhead and distributes it to States. John read out the Mexican paper which was sent to the GCG for input. John has not seen a revised version of the paper.

If there is agreement on appointing two co-facilitators, work on the modalities resolution will start in April – June. During the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (PFII) there should be a draft of this resolution so that States can have a dialogue with Indigenous peoples about it during the PFII. If an Indigenous co-facilitator is not accepted by the PGA, things will take a different course.

There was general discussion about the importance of ensuring that the WCIP 2014 is not a regular High Level Plenary Meeting of the GA because of the status of Indigenous peoples as peoples. There are precedents within the UN of equal participation of Indigenous peoples and States for example, the working group on the draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The question was raised as to whether Indigenous peoples can participate in the meeting between States and the PGA on 29 March. Strategically it might make it more difficult for the PGA to agree to two co-facilitators if he is faced with Indigenous peoples at the meeting. It was agreed to raise this with Ambassador De Alba. It was noted that the current PGA doesn't have much knowledge about Indigenous peoples and that his term ends in September 2012. In June we will know who the new PGA will be.

Agenda item 2

Updates from regions and women and youth caucuses.

Africa

Africa will have a meeting 18 – 19 April to discuss a number of issues including the WCIP 2014. Africa is trying to obtain more funding from Denmark and Switzerland to include more participants in this meeting as it is only focussing on forests and the World Bank. There may need to be two meetings later in the year, one for English and one for French speakers in order to have greater participation and to be more strategic. Given the costs involved in travelling between African countries, the meeting(s) might be held in Geneva. It was proposed that Africa would like to have one English speaking and one French speaking person on the GCG.

Arctic

The alternate for the GCG from the Sami has been chosen, her name is Sara Larsson. There was a meeting in Finland where information was shared about the GCG and the WCIP 2014. The meeting in Finland endorsed the Copenhagen meeting resolution. A working group called the human rights group has been established in Greenland with 5 – 6 members. Given the vast geographical area of the Arctic, face to face consultation is difficult. However, the Arctic plans to use meetings that are currently in place like the Arctic Council to raise awareness about Indigenous participation and modalities of the WCIP 2014 amongst States. The Arctic also plans to hold a regional meeting, location to be advised before the Alta meeting.

The Sami Parliaments have discussed working together on the WCIP 2014 including the Alta meeting. There will be a Pan Sami meeting which includes the Indigenous peoples of Russia and the Scandinavian Sami in June this year. In February the Barents Indigenous Peoples Conference held in Norway endorsed the Copenhagen meeting resolution.

Asia

There was a regional meeting in February; notes of that meeting have been previously disseminated to the GCG. The Asian region has established a reference group for regional planning. The prep-com meeting will be in November back to back with an IFAD meeting. Additional support is required to bring other Indigenous peoples who are not eligible for IFAD funding to the meeting. Asia plans to have as many people as possible attend this meeting. Given the costs and linguistic challenges Asia faces, there may be less people attending the Alta meeting next year but the prep-com will have broader support and participation. The alternate for the GCG is from Nepal, his name is Ang Kaji Sherpa and he is new to international processes. All information and consultations will involve the alternate. The Asian youth network has also been working with the Asian region.

Latin America

Gilberto Solano, the Latin American representative was not present at the meeting. No written report was tabled.

North America

North America held a caucus meeting in March. This is an annual meeting that focuses mainly on preparations for the PFII. It is the only meeting of North American Indigenous peoples where international issues are

discussed. The Copenhagen meeting resolution was discussed, there was no consensus on endorsement of it and there was also no consensus on having an Indigenous co-facilitator. However, the meeting decided to appoint two representatives and one alternate to the GCG. The alternate is Jessica Danforth Yee, a Mohawk, who is active in the youth caucus. It was also noted that a meeting of the Black Hills Sioux Nation Treaty Council endorsed John as Indigenous co-facilitator as well as the Copenhagen meeting resolution. In relation to the prep-com for North America, North America will try to organize a regional meeting next April.

Pacific

The Pacific is still in discussion as to who besides Tracey will be the other member of the GCG. However, the Pacific has agreed to establish a larger group of Pacific peoples to organize the regional meeting. Regarding the Pacific prep-com both NZAid and AusAid will be approached, looking to have a meeting next year before Alta. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people may take the lead on organizing the Pacific prep-com. Kai advised the GCG that he has no information about the Pacific processes and that he has a proposal to hold the meeting in the Fall.

Russia

Rodion made a request that all documents be translated into Russian as well as English and Spanish. In November last year RAIPON held a meeting and discussed the WCIP 2014. There is a meeting in St Petersburg on 7 April where the Copenhagen meeting report and resolution will be tabled as well as the outcomes of this meeting. Given the Russian government's reluctance in supporting Indigenous peoples, RAIPON are proactively approaching officials to inform them about the WCIP 2014 and to request their support. On March 14 there was a meeting with a Minister and Indigenous peoples requesting support from the Russian government. The outcome of that meeting was that the Russian government will arrange internal meetings to discuss the WCIP 2014 as it was the first time they were aware of it. Pavel is going to have a meeting with a Russian official today in NY to discuss in more detail the WCIP 2014. The Russian President has established a new Committee for Indigenous peoples' issues, and through this committee, lobbying can be done in the future.

The Senior Arctic Conference in Stockholm (SAO) will discuss the WCIP 2014. RAIPON will forward a submission to this Conference. Russia also plans to use the Arctic Council where there are 8 nation member States to lobby those States to support Indigenous peoples' initiatives for the WCIP 2014.

Pavel advised the GCG that he is a member of a new UN working group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises. This new working group can also be used for furthering the WCIP 2014.

Women

Tarcila spoke on behalf of Latin America and the women's caucus. They had a prep meeting for Rio +20, where information about the WCIP 2014 was shared. Latin America supports the resolution of the Copenhagen meeting in particular the preparatory process and having John as the Indigenous co-facilitator.

Latin America requires support for regional meetings and is planning to have a regional meeting in Apr/May 2013 at the same time as the Latin America PFII prep meeting due to a lack of funds. Tarcila's organization is promoting Indigenous young women and is working to secure the inclusion of Indigenous young women. It was suggested that this group could be an alternate for the youth representative for the GCG. Tarcila suggested that everyone should include youth in their delegations as it is difficult to obtain separate funding for them.

A proposal was tabled. That women have two members on the GCG – one for English and one for Spanish speaking women. Tarcila confirmed this was not a problem of representation; but a problem of communication, coordination and the dissemination of information.

Youth

The youth caucus will hold a training session just before the next PFII; this will be an opportunity to discuss the WCIP 2014 also. In the meantime Alancaay Morales and Jocelyn will serve as the alternate and member. Jocelyn reiterated that it is difficult to get resources for youth. She also noted that the Asian-Pacific youth were included in the Asian meeting. She emphasized that all regions should include youth in their work, they should train youth and give them resources to secure their participation in the WCIP 2014 and other meetings.

Lola for IWGIA

Lola advised the GCG that the GCG meeting was financially supported by the Greenland Government, IWGIA and the Sami Parliament. They were only able to raise funds for 9 GCG members to attend meetings. This meeting is the last meeting that funding is available but they are looking for additional funding for future meetings.

Agenda item 3

Global Coordinating Group (GCG): Composition and alternates, role, tasks and functions of the GCG.

There was general discussion about the nature and purpose of the GCG and the need to be inclusive of all Indigenous peoples who wish to participate. There was agreement to continue working on the basis of consensus and the need to respect the process that has been created by ensuring that each region and the two caucuses through their chosen representatives have the right to speak.

It was noted that as Indigenous peoples were not involved in the original GA resolution we need to be clear about our participation from here on in. We also need to be clear who has standing in the process.

There was discussion and agreement that regardless of whether States agree to have John as the Indigenous co-facilitator, we as Indigenous peoples should maintain the position that we took in Copenhagen and, that the global Indigenous co-facilitator in this process continues to be John.

Joseph proposed and it was agreed that the GCG has a permanent Secretariat until the WCIP 2014. He suggested Tracey should continue in this role. She could relinquish her position as the Pacific representative and hold a place on the GCG as the permanent Secretariat. He advised the GCG that a similar precedent had occurred with climate change and it had worked well. Tracey accepted the position on the condition that the drafting group remain in place as a critical support mechanism. She also noted that the position of Secretariat requires funding separate to the members of the GCG. John responded by stating that the Secretariat position has been considered in the budget for the GCG and that the Sami Parliament of Norway was considering ways to financially support this position.

There was discussion on forms of communication. Joseph noted that communication by email was not always possible in Africa. There was agreement that a webpage be created and it was suggested that Skype could be used. Kai stated that independent information would assist so that we are not reliant on email dissemination.

Saoudata noted that we need a plan of action for Africa and raised the question of how communication between the French and English speaking African Indigenous peoples could be carried out.

Kai reiterated Leon Siu's proposal that the GCG be made up of members based on subject/issue and not the 7 regions and two caucuses. Kai advised the GCG that he didn't completely agree with Leon's proposal. He noted there was distrust of the GCG but that could easily be solved with information dissemination. He also suggested that access and feedback protocol would address the cynicism that existed in Hawaii. He found it difficult to continue with the dialogue about choosing representatives, because he hadn't been involved before.

In response Kent noted that many documents have been sent out since the Copenhagen meeting to all the participants of the Copenhagen meeting and those people in turn have sent out information through their networks. If there are issues of communication then each region is responsible for sorting out their systems of communication.

Joan proposed that for each region and the Indigenous women and youth caucuses there could be two members and an alternate. However due to budget limitations only one person will be funded to attend GCG meetings therefore each region or caucus will have to decide who to send to the GCG meetings.

There was agreement with Joan's proposal and acknowledgement that the funders have been very generous. If regions or caucuses feel they need more reps, they should work that out themselves in the knowledge that funding is only available for 9 members that is, the 7 regions and the 2 caucuses. Hjalmar noted the Arctic region preferred to keep their representation on the GCG to one representative and one alternate.

John explained the current funding situation. IWGIA, the Government of Greenland and the Sami Parliament have already allocated funds for supporting the GCG meetings. If the GCG membership is expanded to 2 permanent representatives, the second member would have to fund themselves.

There was agreement that whilst the GCG meeting itself should be transparent and inclusive, it must maintain a balance by defining who the members are and who the observers are. There must be respect for the person who is the spokesperson for each region or caucus in order to have equity and balance.

In response Kai stated that participants cannot talk on behalf of those they don't represent.

Hjalmar responded stating that a practical approach was required as people were waiting on the outcome of the GCG meeting. He also noted that we are all working for our communities, regions and the entire Indigenous world.

Randy questioned whether we have a common understanding of what is consultation, and whether this was useful for international discussions. He also posed the question as to what are best practices, what is our definition/criteria for evaluation. In answering these questions he noted we should uphold principles and values that we accept as Indigenous.

John and Hjalmar both responded by noting that we are in the UN and we work within the UN because we want to. Whilst it does not meet all our criteria it exists. John also noted that we need to move beyond consultation and insist on free prior and informed consent as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (the Declaration). In terms of strategy we must focus on participation before substantive issues. If we cannot secure our full and effective participation first then the substantive issues are unlikely to be addressed in ways we want them to be.

There were calls for the GCG to have a work plan.

Tracey noted the need to make the most effective use of our time and that the GCG members should use their speaking time in the most effective manner. She also advised the GCG that the drafting group is creating a contact list of everyone at the meeting and that everyone needs to check their details are correct.

The Chair summarized the discussions as follows:

1. There will be two representatives per region/caucus and one alternate regardless of funding.
2. The proposal of representatives on the GCG by subject and not by region did not garnish any support.
3. Tracey accepts the role of permanent Secretariat for the GCG with the support of the drafting group being Inger, Joan and Kent.
4. The Co Chairs will rotate amongst the GCG.
5. Extra representatives require more funding so these proposals are subject to that criteria.

Terms of reference for the GCG

A draft document was tabled and discussed. A number of amendments were made and agreed to. Tracey will collate all changes and create a revised version.

In relation to other information Kenneth has a PPT presentation on the WCIP 2014 that can be shared. Kent agreed to redistribute the information that Sonia Smallacombe provided at the Copenhagen meeting about previous High Level Plenary Meetings and World Conferences.

Agenda 4a)

Key strategies: Co-facilitator

John explained his understanding of the role of the Indigenous co-facilitator was to engage States and promote the resolution of the Copenhagen meeting. The relationship between the co-facilitator and the GCG is that the co-facilitator has no mandate to do anything that has not been agreed to by Indigenous peoples. As the co-facilitator, John will work closely with the GCG and be as transparent as possible.

Hjalmar noted that the Copenhagen meeting resolution establishing the position of co-facilitator was a good strategic decision. He noted that John had already established good contacts with member States. Hjalmar expressed his gratitude to John for his work and was confident with his role as co-facilitator. He also noted that it was advantageous that John lives in New York.

Randy suggested that there should be terms of reference for the role of co-facilitator to which John agreed.

Joan asked if John needed help. John replied yes but noted the practical limitations that existed as many meetings with States were held in NY with only a few days notice.

Kenneth raised the question of what our response will be if the proposal for a co-facilitator is rejected by the PGA. It was agreed that if this occurs, we will deal with it at the time, perhaps by conference call.

Joseph summarised that the GCG wants John to continue in the role of co-facilitator. His mandate could be expanded to work on further issues like funding and that terms of reference should be drafted for the position.

Agenda 4b)

Key strategies: Modalities resolution

John explained that negotiations on the modality resolution will be based on previous modality resolutions regarding High Level Plenary Meetings. John provided 4 previous examples¹, one on MDG, one on rights of persons with disabilities, one on youth and one on diseases. These previous resolutions on High Level Plenary Meetings and World Conferences will be the basis that States will rely upon when they start to discuss the drafting of a resolution for the WCIP 2014.

John noted the importance of emphasizing that an Indigenous peoples High Level Plenary Meeting is very different than those previously held, it has to capture specific elements that are relevant to Indigenous peoples, for example we have the Declaration that includes the right to self determination, this is very relevant to the resolution as it will be the basis of ensuring our participation as non state actors. John also noted that Indigenous peoples must emphasize that the Declaration recognizes Indigenous peoples as peoples and that the Declaration is a result of broad consensus, and needs to be taken into account. As such, the WCIP 2014 cannot replicate earlier practices, Indigenous peoples' circumstances call for a different resolution.

John also noted the need to highlight the Copenhagen meeting resolution which formulates the minimum requirements for Indigenous peoples for example Indigenous peoples' participation. The modality will need to address accreditation procedures as well as what kinds of meetings will be held in connection to or during the WCIP 2014, such as public hearings.

John also noted that we need to find ways to ensure we are able to influence the outcome document of the WCIP 2014. This must be addressed through the resolution. Questions we need to consider are what kind of outcome do we anticipate? People seem to be interested in an action orientated outcome document in support of the realization of Indigenous peoples' rights therefore the focus should not be on the development of new standards but reviewing existing standards.

The drafting of the modality resolution will take place as soon as the appointment of an Indigenous co-facilitator is resolved. By the start of the PFII session, there is likely to be an advanced draft which can be used as a dialogue with Indigenous peoples. States will likely want to complete negotiations on the text by June. Our leverage as Indigenous peoples is that States will not want to adopt a resolution without Indigenous peoples support.

John explained that what will probably happen is that a draft will be circulated for our consideration. John will pass it on as soon as he obtains it. The main sponsors are likely to be Bolivia, Peru and Mexico. Regardless of whether a co-facilitator is appointed by the PGA, Indigenous peoples are still likely to have input into the resolution.

Joseph asked if we could draft a resolution for adoption by States. John replied yes and volunteered to do this. Kent, Tracey and Kenneth also agreed to assist. John agreed to provide the first draft within a week and that the regions and caucuses would have two weeks to have input. It would then be given to States for their consideration.

¹ A/RES/64/184 Millennium Development Goals, 5 Feb 2010, A/C.3/66/L.10/Rev.1 Disabilities, 17 Nov 2011, A/65/L.63 Youth, 11 March 2011 and A/RES/65/238 Non-communicable Diseases, 7 April 2011.

Kai considered it important to have a wider dialogue and asked whether there were liaison people in each region.

Agenda 4c)

Key strategies: Recognition of prep-coms

There was agreement that Indigenous prep-coms must be recognized as part of the official lead up to the WCIP 2014. In order for this to occur Indigenous prep-coms must be included in the modality resolution. Another strategy that was agreed to was that we should insist on using the phrase “World Conference” as opposed to “High Level Plenary Meeting”.

Each region and caucus summarized their preparations for the prep-coms as outlined in agenda item 2 above.

Agenda 4d)

Outcome document

It was agreed to discuss this item at a later date.

Agenda 4e)

Lobbying, plenaries with governments

John reported under agenda item 1. Refer agenda item 7 for Russian developments.

Agenda 4f)

Key strategies: Funding of regional meetings, GCG meetings, the global prep conference in Alta 2013 and the side event at the PFII.

Alta meeting

John tabled a draft budget for the Alta meeting based on different numbers of attendees. He requested feedback from the GCG on what the minimum number of people from each region for the Alta meeting should be. Once the amount of funded participants is agreed, funders can be approached.

It was agreed that the Alta meeting should cater for 300 – 400 funded participants (42 – 57 from each region). On the basis of the prepared budget funding of \$1.5 – 2 million USD is required to host the Alta meeting. Those who self fund may increase the number to 700 people.

Joan noted that such numbers would show solidarity, political will and the collectiveness of Indigenous peoples. She suggested that at the regional level numbers should be greater than this so that there is a broader process at the regional level. She also emphasized that there should be equitable representation of each region at the Alta meeting.

Inger noted that with those numbers Alta can accommodate everyone though some people may need to share rooms as Alta can cater for up to 950 people. John also noted that if cruise ships are used as additional accommodation facilities, Alta can cater for approximately 1,600 people. At this stage there is no need for cruise ships.

Joseph asked whether the Sami Parliament has a Secretariat for the Alta meeting. John replied no, a Secretariat has yet been to be created but the Sami Parliament has identified people as focal points for the Alta meeting and Inger is one of them.

Funding

There was discussion that each region find their own funding for regional prep-coms and that some regions may be able to work together. There was also discussion that the GCG try to get funds globally and then divide them amongst the regions.

John suggested that the GCG explore opportunities for regional prep-coms from donor Foundations. As some of the Foundations attend the PFII, the GCG could approach them at that time. Whilst some Foundations are reluctant to fund global events, they may be prepared to fund regional meetings. John proposed and it was agreed that each region prepare a budget for a regional prep-com in their region and bring it to the PFII so that it can be presented to the Foundations.

John noted there are two foundations that need to be approached.

- The Ford Foundation – the Chair of the PFII has promised to organize a meeting with the GCG and the Ford Foundation at the PFII. They might be prepared to fund regional activities.
- The Christiansen Fund – representatives will be in NY during the PFII session.

Also, in the modalities resolution a recommendation can be made to expand the mandate of the Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations or the UN Trust Fund. The George Soros Foundation was also mentioned.

Kent noted that the Ford Foundation likes to fund big visible projects and it might be more strategic to keep the North Americans out of it.

Kai suggested corporate sponsorship and agreed to approach Apple and IBM.

Kenneth noted that the GCG needs funding for meetings 2- 3 times per year, a Secretariat and communications. Funding is also required for regional prep-coms, the Alta meeting, prep-coms after Alta, the WCIP 2014 itself and potential prep meetings for Indigenous women and youth.

It was agreed to establish a fundraising committee, the members being Joan, Jocelyn, John, Kai, Kenneth, Randy and Saoudata.

Side event for the PFII

Mirian advised the GCG that if they wanted to hold a side event during the PFII, they needed to be aware that Rio+ 20 has booked almost all available rooms. The GCG agreed to hold a side event and asked Mirian to help them secure a room.

It was agreed that the official host of the side event is the GCG. Kenneth will contact DOCIP re interpretation. John will submit the application for a meeting room for the side-event at the UN, and the Sami Parliament will pay the fee of \$350 for the room.

The side event will held be on Wednesday 9 May, 1500 – 1615.

Agenda item 5

Review of the timeline, including follow-up meetings of the GCG

Kent presented a timeline that he had created. He noted it was a document in progress and that it should include all Indigenous meetings and relevant documents.

There was discussion about how information should be disseminated. Kent suggested that information could be shared by using his organization's website initially whilst the GCG set up a new website. Kenneth noted that the Indigenous portal may be useful and he agreed to look into that. Kenneth, Kent and Tracey will work on the creation of a website. It was noted that funding for communication will be required.

Follow-up meetings of the GCG

It was agreed that the GCG meet 2 -3 times per year. If further discussions were necessary conference calls could be held. It was also agreed to hold GCG meetings during existing UN meetings such as the PFII the EMRIP and one other.

The next meeting of the GCG will be Sunday 6 May, 1400 - 1800, American Indian Community House, 134 W. 29th St. between 6th and 7th Aves, 4th Floor and Monday 7 May, 1400 - 1800, UN DC 2, 44th Street between 1st and 2nd Avenues, room 1282.

Agenda 6

Review of key documents to be considered in relation to the WCIP 2014

Inger presented a database she had created of key documents. She has collated 19 documents which are yet to be distributed but will eventually be placed on the yet to be created website. Inger sent an email out to everyone requesting information on which documents should be included. Documents will be available in four languages, English, French, Russian and Spanish. She requested that relevant documents continue to be sent to the drafting group.

Joan suggested the database be divided into two types of documents, those related specifically to the WCIP 2014 process and other documents which are more for background and serve as reference materials.

Agenda item 7

Meeting(s) with governments in New York

Pavel reported to the GCG about his meeting with Russian officials in NY. He said that the meeting was very good and that the Russian office in NY had instructions from Moscow to provide assistance with the WCIP 2014. The focal point for Russia will be Mr Vokianzia, Senior Counsellor. Mr Vokianzia is looking forward to meeting with John. John will contact the permanent mission of Russia next week. Pavel will follow up in Moscow with how Russia can provide funding.

Agenda item 8

Other matters

Appointment of members for the GCG

Joan noted that decisions on the permanent GCG membership need to be made by each region and caucuses. Details for the alternates need to be provided to Kent and Tracey.

Name of the group

The name of the group is the Indigenous Global Coordinating Group (GCG).

Minutes

Tracey will produce two documents, a transcript of what was said and then a shorter document being the minutes. These will be completed within a month. There was a request that anything that anyone had asked to be noted specifically in the records be recorded as such.

Future work

Terms of reference for the Indigenous co-facilitator will be considered at the next meeting.

The need for an alternative World Conference if people are unhappy with the current process will be discussed at the next meeting.

Meeting between GCG and Mexico, Bolivia and Denmark 23 March 2012, New York

Present: Members of the GCG, Ambassador De Alba of Mexico (Permanent Representative to the UN) with Mexican officials, Ambassador Rafael Archondo from Bolivia (Deputy Permanent Representative to the UN) with a Bolivian official and Eva Raabyemagle from Denmark (Counsellor).

Apologies: Ambassador Laursen of Denmark.

Ambassador De Alba of Mexico referred to the draft document to be presented to the PGA. He noted they had put a few ideas on paper for the PGA explaining how they see the process. He noted Indigenous participation and prep meetings needed to be considered. He agreed to be facilitator on the condition that John Henriksen is accepted by the PGA as a co-facilitator. He said the proposal may not be accepted because it includes a non state actor. He reiterated that Mexico will not do anything that is not supported by Indigenous peoples.

Ambassador Rafael Archondo from Bolivia noted that Indigenous peoples have chosen their Indigenous co-facilitator and he thought that Ambassador De Alba was the best person for the job as the State facilitator. He stated that Bolivia supports the WCIP 2014 process and that it is a priority for them. Under the leadership of Ambassador De Alba, Bolivia will continue pushing the process. In terms of strategy, Ambassador Archondo noted that the PGA will see that States and Indigenous peoples are a united group and that we have the same goal. The next step therefore is to have a meeting with the PGA. Ambassador Archondo agreed that two facilitators would be better and that he wants governments and civil society and, governments and the Indigenous peoples' movement to work together.

Kenneth expressed his appreciation to Ambassador De Alba for his courageous approach to the co-facilitator process and noted that he looked forward to working with him. Kenneth explained the role of the GCG and noted the Copenhagen meeting resolution. He also emphasized that Indigenous peoples are peoples and that the UN has to respect that in the WCIP 2014 process.

John thanked the three missions for attending the meeting, and for their support. John stated he was pleased that Ambassador De Alba was ready to be a co-facilitator. He also emphasized that Indigenous peoples must participate in all stages of the WCIP 2014 and that this is crucial for the legitimacy of the WCIP 2014.

Joseph stated that Bolivia was brave to have taken the resolution on the WCIP 2014 to the GA. He stated that he believed it would add value to the rights of Indigenous peoples. He referred to the leadership role that Mexico has demonstrated before and noted that it is required again. He emphasized that Indigenous prep-coms need to be included in the modality resolution and asked what Ambassador De Alba saw as the final outcome of the WCIP 2014.

Eva Raabyemagle from Denmark (Counsellor) noted that Denmark was pleased to support the meeting in Copenhagen and that Denmark was happy that Ambassador De Alba was taking the role of co-facilitator. She noted that Denmark would support Ambassador De Alba as co-facilitator and that the vision of the outcome document was important.

Ambassador De Alba noted that co-facilitation was critical but that it is not the only challenge re the modalities. Equally, there is the participation of Indigenous peoples to act within the room. He noted that it is not that easy, as NY doesn't have the same practices as Geneva. He noted the need to identify delegates and officials that support Indigenous peoples' participation in order to change the modus operandi in NY and that supportive States are required not just for the process itself but also logistical arrangements particularly regional meetings. He asked the question where we can get financial support for regional meetings.

He suggested we have a calendar of events to see where there are opportunities to meet and where parallel events could be held. Firstly however, he noted that the PGA needs to send a letter to all States stating that the PGA has appointed a facilitator(s). Regarding regional events, he noted that these may not necessarily be reflected in the first GA modalities resolution.

Ambassador De Alba also referred to the outcome document of the WCIP 2014 and noted that they had a few ideas. He stated that it has to be a relatively short document that is action orientated, for example to take the principles of the Declaration and review how they have been implemented at all levels. He also noted the need to include the 2nd International Decade of the World's Indigenous People in these discussions.

Ambassador De Alba emphasized the need to establish the modalities first and reinforce the group of friendly states which included Nicaragua, New Zealand, Guatemala and Spain. In this way, if understandings were reached before the PFII, substantive issues and not the modalities could then be discussed.

Kenneth noted the importance of States supporting Indigenous initiatives in regard to the WCIP 2014. He also emphasized that it was important to remember Indigenous peoples' rights go beyond the Declaration and that whilst the resolution states "High Level Plenary Meeting", that Indigenous peoples consider this to be a World Conference. He also noted that the outcome document was very important.

Joan asked Ambassador De Alba what was his perception of other States views re the co-facilitator, what was the backup plan should the proposal not be accepted and what preparations were required from Indigenous peoples. She noted that the full and effective participation of Indigenous peoples will be a key determinant regarding the outcome document. She also noted that Indigenous peoples need not only a co-facilitator but also participation in all preparatory processes. This will give Indigenous peoples comfort on what the outcome will be. She noted that the WCIP 2014 is a long term process where Indigenous peoples and States can jointly develop benchmarks as to how we are progressing.

Hjalmar was grateful to have Mexico, Bolivia and Denmark at the meeting as well as their commitment to the process. He noted his appreciation that Denmark in particular had attended the meeting and referred to the opening session of the Copenhagen meeting where the Foreign Ministry of Denmark. Mr Villy Søvndahl,

together with the Premier of Greenland, Mr Kuupik Kleist had opened the meeting. He also asked the question of whether the Danish Mission had started on network building.

Joseph stated that everyone was trying to build a good practice with the appointment of a co-facilitator and that there should not be too much focus on the PFII because there needed to be greater participation of Indigenous peoples than just the PFII. He proposed that there be a meeting of States and Indigenous to discuss the outcome document.

Rodion thanked the States for their commitment. He noted that RAIPON and ICC will inform the Arctic Council about the WCIP 2014. He also noted that a High Level Plenary Meeting in NY will have a lot of limitations and another option is that there is an alternative World Conference hosted by some friendly countries instead. He asked the States what they thought would be the final outcome and whether they thought the PGA would support the proposal of a co-facilitator.

Randy commended Mexico and Bolivia for their leadership on this issue and noted that everyone is hoping to achieve tangible results. He stated that best practices were a positive way to collect evidence worldwide in order to show what has been done to implement Indigenous peoples' collective rights. He emphasized that the role of a co-facilitator is critical and is supported by Indigenous peoples. He encouraged everyone to err on the side of advancing the collective rights of Indigenous peoples and to see best practices as inclusive of that. He hoped that the bar could be raised for all in order to achieve success. He raised the question of what can we do to ensure these kinds of outcomes.

Saoudata recommended that during the next PFII session, States discuss these issues with Algeria and Indigenous peoples to create a positive dialogue. She noted that dialogue with Indigenous Peoples of Africa will most likely focus on the right of self determination, the resolution of conflicts and refugee issues.

Ambassador De Alba agreed that we should not only focus on the Declaration but noted that it is a major point of reference. He reiterated the need to be aware of the differences between this process and Geneva. He noted that the PGA will decide the issue of an Indigenous co-facilitator, not States and that the process is informal. There are advantages and disadvantages to this, he noted there is flexibility to organise consultations and we are not subject to UN rules of procedures. In Geneva we have formal working groups with rules of procedures, here we have a procedure which is open, and the only point of reference are the words of the resolution.

Ambassador De Alba also noted that if the PGA does not accept the Mexico proposal, a decision will need to be made. He stated that first, he would not accept to facilitate and noted that they would evaluate the risk at the time. He also emphasized that scenarios of full participation must include the issue of accreditation, as Indigenous peoples must have access to the building. He noted that without ECOSOC status it could be difficult, and that this needed to be included in the modalities resolution.

In relation to the PFII, Ambassador De Alba noted that it was important for the PFII to look at its own recommendations and create a dialogue with States. He noted that States should respond to ideas of the PFII and not just provide information on their positions.

He noted that a global meeting instead of a regional meeting may also be considered. However timing is critical because Mexico has an election next year so he could not commit to organizing such a meeting.

In relation to the kind of meeting the WCIP 2014 is, Ambassador De Alba noted that the resolution is what it is, we wanted a full World Conference but we didn't get that, instead we have a High Level Plenary meeting, this

is a one day discussion with no obligation to have an outcome. However he noted that it would depend on the collective attitude and that something in between the two would be best. He noted that the WCIP 2014 was a good opportunity because the political balance is much better now than when the Declaration was negotiated.

Ambassador Archondo noted that if the PGA doesn't accept two facilitators, one possibility is that Mexico will not be willing to accept the facilitator role. This could leave the decision for the new PGA to decide in September. Alternatively he noted we could have an informal process of our own where we could have two facilitators.

Randy noted that we must also speak for ourselves and not just allow States to speak for us.

Kai questioned whether there was room for others back home to disagree.