

E/C.19/2011/CRP.2
4 April 2011
Language: English

Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
Tenth Session
New York, 16 - 27 May 2011

Report of the international expert meeting on the theme
"Keeping track – indicators, mechanisms and data for
assessing the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights"

Organized by the International Labour Organization, the
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human
Rights and the secretariat of the Permanent Forum on
Indigenous Issues

Geneva 20-21 September 2010

Table of contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
1 - INTRODUCTION	
2. KEY ISSUES AND CONCLUSIONS	6
3. OPENING REMARKS	9
3.1. Ms. Cleopatra Doumbia-Henry, Director, International Labour Standards Department, ILO	9
3.2. Mr. Antti Korkeakivi, Chief, Indigenous People and Minorities, Section, OHCHR	9
3.3. Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Member of the UNPFII	9
4. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS	10
4.1. Indicators on indigenous peoples' well-being and the CBD, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz	10
4.2. ILO experience with indicators, Ms. Karen Curtis	12
4.3. The OHCHR conceptual and methodological framework on indicators for human rights assessment, Mr. Nicolas Fasel	13
4.4. Human rights indicators for indigenous peoples , Ms. Nicole Friederichs	14
4.5. The UNDRIP and ILO Convention No. 169 as articulations of universal human rights, Ms. Samia Slimane	14
4.6. Discussion of basic assumptions	15
5. INDICATORS	17
5.1. Adapting OHCHR indicators to the Mexican context, Ms. Marycarmen Color	17
5.2. Adapting OHCHR indicators to the Nepali context, Mr. Ram Gautam	18
5.3. Specific indigenous indicators in Australia, Mr. Lawrence McDonald	18
5.4. Using traditional occupations as an indicator, Mr. David Hunter	19
5.5. Indicators for better work, Ms. Anne Ziebarth	20
5.6. Discussion, indicators	20

6. WORKING GROUPS: KEY CRITERIA FOR HUMAN RIGHTS INDICATORS FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES	22
6.1. Working group questions	22
6.2. Reporting from Working Groups	23
7. DATA	25
7.1. Data generation in Latin America, Ana María Oyarce, ECLAC	25
7.2. Disaggregation of data in Nepal, Mr. Balkrishna Mabuang	26
7.3. Difficulties with data generation in Africa, Mr. Joseph Ole Simel	26
7.4. Data generation in Ecuador, Mr. Silverio Chusiguano	27
7.5. Data generation in Paraguay, Ms. Zulma Sosa de Servin	28
7.6. Using ethnography to determine and measure Indicators of indigenous peoples' human rights, Neil Keating	29
7.7. Maori statistics – the framework and the survey, Mr. Peter Potaka	29
7.8. Discussion on data	30
8. MECHANISMS	31
8.1. ILO supervisory bodies, Ms. Shauna Olney	31
8.2. CERD, Mr. Francisco Cali Tzai	32
8.3. CDESCR, Ms. Virginia Bras Gomes	33
8.4. Mr. James Anaya, UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples	33
8.5. Experiences with the UPR, Ms. Joan Carling	34
8.6. Discussion on mechanisms	35
8.7. Conclusions and closing of the technical meeting	36
ANNEX A: AGENDA	37
ANNEX B: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	39

List of abbreviations

ACHPR	African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights
CAT	Compliance Assessment Tool
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEACR	Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations
CERD	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
CESCR	Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
CIYA	Cambodian Indigenous Youth Association
CoP	Conference of the Parties
CRC	Committee on the Rights of the Child
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EMRIP	Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
FPIC	Free, prior informed consent
FPP	Forest Peoples Programme
IACHR	Inter-American Court of Human Rights
IASG	Inter-Agency Support Group
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ICM	Inter-Committee Meeting of treaty bodies
IIFB	International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity
ILC	International Labour Conference
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILS	International Labour Standards
IPRA	Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (Philippines)
ISCO	International Standard Classification of Occupations
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
MPIDO	Mainyoto Pastoralist Integrated Development
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
PRO169	Programme to Promote ILO Convention No. 169
SPFII	Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
STAR	Supply Chain Tracking of Assessments and Remediation (STAR)
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
UNPFII	United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
UPR	Universal Periodic Review

1. Introduction

Since the adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007, the efforts of Governments, indigenous peoples and the United Nations system have been oriented towards the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights and the pursuit of positive impacts on the lives of indigenous peoples. A key challenge in this regard is to assess progress in implementation, which could serve to identify gaps, needs and challenges and to inform policies and interventions. In developing a framework for such work, the elements to be taken into consideration include:

- (a) The basic assumptions informing the framework, including the compatibility of International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No. 169 and other human rights instruments with the Declaration;
- (b) The identification of adequate indicators;
- (c) The availability, generation and disaggregation of data;
- (d) The existence and establishment of mechanisms that could sustain such a framework.

At its eighth session, in 2009, the Permanent Forum issued a recommendation for the Inter-Agency Support Group on Indigenous Peoples' Issues to convene an international technical expert seminar on indicators of the well-being of indigenous peoples to discuss indicators that could be used in monitoring the situation of indigenous peoples and the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (see E/2009/43, para. 33).

In response to that recommendation, ILO, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues jointly organized the technical expert meeting on 20 and 21 September 2010 at ILO headquarters in Geneva.

The aim of the meeting was to take stock of the various efforts to develop indicators and generate data on the situation of indigenous peoples and to discuss the main features of an integrated assessment framework, so as to assist actors at the local, national and international levels in their efforts to assess progress in implementing the Declaration. A total of 48 participants attended the workshop, including:

- (a) Members of the Inter-Agency Support Group, including field staff and experts on data, statistics and human rights monitoring;
- (b) The Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples and members of the Permanent Forum and the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;
- (c) Members of United Nations treaty bodies;
- (d) Institutions, Governments and individual experts with particular experience or involvement in the monitoring of indigenous peoples' rights and well-being;
- (e) Regional indigenous networks.

By the end of the meeting, the participants had agreed on a short text reflecting the conclusions and recommendations. The full report of the meeting is available on the web page of the tenth session of the Permanent Forum.¹ Birgitte Feiring was the rapporteur of the meeting.

¹ See http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/session_tenth.html.

2. Conclusions and recommendations

At the meeting, the participants were informed about the many valuable initiatives taken by indigenous peoples, Governments and United Nations agencies on indicators and data collection for assessing the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights. Experiences generated through the monitoring of human rights and labour rights in general were shared, in order to inspire the specific work on indigenous peoples' rights. The participants acknowledged the importance of these experiences, which were discussed and analysed to draw lessons and inform the way forward. The key conclusions of the discussions are set out below.

2.1. General principles

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and ILO Convention No. 169 (ratified by 22 countries) are compatible and complementary, and provide the common normative framework of indigenous peoples' rights together with key human rights instruments, including the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

There is no single institutionalized mechanism for monitoring the implementation of the Declaration, but many existing mechanisms and processes undertaken by States, indigenous peoples and the United Nations system contribute to providing quantitative and qualitative information on its progressive application.

A common assessment framework should be outlined in order to enhance coordination, complementarity and synergies, and facilitate the assessment of implementation. The framework should not replace but rather strengthen the many existing efforts by outlining a comprehensive and coherent approach, with illustrative indicators, possible data sources and linkages to relevant institutionalized mechanisms.

The framework should reflect the full range of rights enshrined in the Declaration and ILO Convention No. 169, in addition to the "deficit-oriented" approach applied in many countries to document the social, political and economic gaps between the indigenous and non-indigenous sectors of society.

The framework should be developed in partnership with indigenous peoples, to reflect their visions and ensure their full participation in the operationalization and use of the framework, including in community-led assessment processes.

The framework should be developed with a view towards ensuring its operational feasibility, taking into account regional and national differences, the low capacity of many institutions, the need to scale up promising experiences and the cost implications of suggested approaches.

The suggested approach includes the involvement of multiple and diverse actors and institutions who, in most cases, will have little or limited capacity and knowledge of indigenous peoples' rights or the technicalities associated with indicators, statistics and data generation. Substantial capacity-building efforts are therefore needed to ensure that all parties can contribute, including indigenous peoples, Government institutions concerned with data generation and statistics, and United Nations and donor agencies.

2.2. Indicators

Conceptually, the framework should be inspired by the OHCHR methodology for identifying structural, process and outcome indicators, to enable an assessment of (a) international commitments, domestic legislation and administrative regulations and institutions; (b) efforts undertaken to make rights effective through institutional arrangements, budgetary allocations and projects and programmes; (c) the actual result of such efforts, for example, in terms of life expectancy, health and well-being.

15. The framework should provide a list of illustrative, flexible indicators that can be adapted to regional, country and local contexts and to the diversity of indigenous peoples, including the diversity within indigenous communities, in particular with respect to age and gender. In addition to defining specific indicators to capture the collective aspects of indigenous peoples' rights, the framework should include, to the extent possible, indicators that can be informed by common data sources and disaggregated to specify the situation of indigenous peoples.

2.3. Data collection

A common framework will allow all parties to progressively contribute data to be used in the overall assessment of the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights. It should thus enable the accommodation of both qualitative and quantitative data, as well as data generated through censuses, surveys and administrative registers together with case studies, and information generated in community-led processes.

In parallel to the collection of disaggregated data and data related to specific indigenous peoples-related indicators, existing data collections should be reviewed to assess whether they could be used in a creative way to inform the assessment of the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights.

2.4. Mechanisms

The framework should indicate bridges to the broader human rights framework as well as links to existing institutionalized supervisory mechanisms (United Nations treaty monitoring bodies, United Nations specialized mechanisms, the ILO supervisory system and other international instruments and processes relevant to indigenous peoples). The

contributions of these mechanisms to the monitoring of indigenous peoples' rights are absolutely crucial, as they will provide qualitative assessments and recommendations with direct implications for States.

For disaggregated demographic and socio-economic statistics, national statistics bureaux will need to be involved, with the engagement of the Statistics Division, in particular with regard to expansion into regions that have not previously included indigenous identifiers in national data-gathering processes.

Efforts should be made to encourage and enable indigenous peoples to undertake their own processes of assessing the implementation of their rights at the local, national, regional and international levels. Such processes will inform indigenous peoples' own decision-making and enable them to feed quality information into existing mechanisms, including United Nations treaty monitoring bodies, ILO supervisory mechanisms and such specialized United Nations mechanisms as the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the Permanent Forum, and into poverty reduction strategies, poverty reduction strategy papers, common country assessments and United Nations Development Assistance Framework processes and other national policies and strategies.

ILO, OHCHR and the secretariat of the Permanent Forum, in collaboration with the Inter-Agency Support Group, are requested to continue developing an integrated assessment framework for indigenous peoples' rights, based on the key conclusions of the technical expert meeting. Recognizing that further technical work and capacity-building for international and national agencies and indigenous peoples are vital for the development and adequate application of a coherent assessment framework, Governments and donors are encouraged to support these efforts by making resources available.

Lastly, ILO, OHCHR and the secretariat of the Permanent Forum are requested to present the report of the technical expert meeting and an update on the progress towards an integrated assessment framework at the tenth session of the Forum, in 2011.

3. Opening remarks

3.1. Ms. Cleopatra Doumbia-Henry, Director, International Labour Standards Department, ILO

Ms. Doumbia-Henry welcomed all participants to the ILO and emphasized that the issues of indicators, data generation and supervisory mechanisms correspond with the ILO's experience of supervising the implementation of labour standards, including ILO Convention No. 169 on the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples. Convention No. 169 has now been ratified by 22 countries, including the first African ratification by the Central African Republic. The ILO has seen the strength of its supervisory comments, as they become roadmaps to guide implementation efforts of a broad range of actors and become the basis for large-scale technical cooperation programmes to assist ratifying countries. The ILO wishes to make these experiences available to the IASG, to governments and indigenous peoples as they strive to develop a coherent approach which could eventually conclude with the design of an integrated assessment framework that integrates adequate indicators, feasible modalities for gathering data and which build on the existing institutionalized mechanisms for monitoring, including the ILO supervisory bodies and existing UN mechanisms.

3.2. Mr. Antti Korkeakivi, Chief, Indigenous People and Minorities Section, OHCHR

Mr. Antti Korkeakivi thanked all the participants for agreeing to contribute to this meeting which brought together an impressive range of key players in advancing the rights of indigenous peoples, including members of the UNPFII, the Chair of the EMRIP, members of human rights treaty bodies, key indigenous organizations and NGOs, the Special Rapporteur on the Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous Peoples as well as national statistics institutions and colleagues from OHCHR field presences. This meeting is another demonstration of how calls for enhanced cooperation and coordination between different UN indigenous mandates are being followed up. OHCHR is of the view that development of indicators related to the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights is indeed an important area for such cooperation. At the OHCHR, a conceptual and methodological framework for the identification and use of indicators has been developed upon the request of human rights treaty bodies, and while it is not indigenous-specific, this work is of direct relevance for seeking synergies between distinct initiatives. The question of data collection and mechanisms in place to examine and analyze such data are critical to effectively pursue progress, identify shortcomings and recognize progress in terms of the implementation of the UNRIP.

3.3. Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Member of the UNPFII

Ms. Tauli-Corpuz thanked the ILO, OHCHR and SPFII for responding to the recommendation of the UNPFII to organize the Technical Meeting. The UNPFII has been engaged in issues of indicators and disaggregation of data from the beginning, realizing how important these are for implementation of rights and to ensure that development efforts reflect indigenous peoples' own vision of development. This also became clear in the context of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), where the definition of indicators was a highly politicized issue. The UNPFII has facilitated a series of seminars and regional meetings to discuss the concepts of rights, well-being and development and the related identification of indicators from an indigenous peoples' perspective. This holistic perspective may to some extent be contradictory to governments' claim that indicators should be few in numbers and be easily measurable. In any case, the inclusion of an indigenous identifier in censuses and surveys is an important first steps for the disaggregation of data.

4. Basic assumptions

The first substantial session was oriented towards clarification and discussion of the underlying assumptions that would shape an integrated assessment framework for indigenous peoples' rights. The session was chaired by Mr. Lee Sweptson, former Human Rights Special Advisor of the ILO.

4.1. Indicators on indigenous peoples' well-being and the CBD, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz

Substantial efforts have been undertaken to identify indicators for articles 8(j) and 10(c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), concerning indigenous peoples' knowledge innovations and practices as well as customary use of biological resources.

One already adopted indicator for article 8(j) is *status and trends of linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages*. This indicator is being monitored by UNESCO and the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership. It is relevant as 4'000 out of 6'000 languages are spoken by indigenous peoples and are disappearing at a very fast rate.

Also under article 8(j), the ILO has introduced the concept of *traditional occupations*, a concept that focuses on the link between biological and cultural diversity. The concept is intimately linked to rights to land and resources and to identity, as many indigenous peoples are identified by their traditional livelihood (e.g. pastoralists, hunter-gatherers, shifting cultivators). Traditional occupations should be protected through ILO Convention No.111 on discrimination in employment and occupation but are frequently marginalized and discriminated against. The *status and trends in the practice of traditional occupations* has been put forward as an indicator for adoption by the Conference of the Parties (COP) 10, with recommendation for ILO support. Once adopted, a series of operational steps should be taken, comprising the inclusion of indigenous livelihood in official classifications of occupations and efforts to encourage

statistical offices to include indigenous identifiers in surveys and encode and disseminate data regarding traditional occupations. Field testing of methodology for data gathering on traditional occupations has already been undertaken in the Philippines:

A third indicator under article 8(j), on land-use patterns, has not yet been finalized.

One general hurdle regarding the generation of disaggregated data is the low awareness of national and international agencies and departments on the significance of the issue and the related hesitance to assume responsibility for the cost implications. One positive example is the Philippines, where the UN Country Team (UNCT) paid for the inclusion of an indigenous identifier in the forthcoming census, due to the existence of a strong national legal framework; the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act, IPRA.

The UNPFII has undertaken a series of regional workshops to identify indicators that reflect indigenous peoples' own view of well-being (for example the concept of *sumac causai*, in the Andean region). Such concepts should be taken into account, documented and be the basis for indicators. The governments of Guatemala and Nicaragua are going to partner with indigenous peoples to test some of the indicators that have been selected.

However, most of this work was undertaken before the adoption of the UNDRIP and the challenge is now to develop indicators to monitor progress of implementation of this instrument.

Ms. Tauli-Corpuz's presentation was followed by a brief discussion.

Ms. Joan Carling, Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP), mentioned that the Philippine census will include questions regarding ethnicity and mother tongue, along with education and health. It will thus allow for disaggregation of data. One of the challenges is the fluidity in indigenous identities; some are losing their mother tongues but still maintain a strong identity. A UNCT task force (including ILO and UNDP, among others) provided funds to include the indigenous identifier. This is a positive example of good practice.

Ms. Zulma Sosa de Servin, National Institution of Statistics, Paraguay underlined the importance of working with the classification of occupations. This is something that Paraguay would like to pursue, once the 2012 census (which include an indigenous identifier) is concluded.

Ms. Tauli-Corpuz concluded by reinforcing the importance of capturing the qualitative aspects of occupations, particularly in Paraguay, where some indigenous peoples are subject to forced labour practices. One important parameter is to assess, whether occupational practices respect human rights. Also, traditional occupations are not static but flexible, and need to be rethought in the current context of climate change and economic crisis. There is a need to rethink approaches to development, to develop more comprehensive frameworks that combine the ecosystem-based and the human rights-

based approach. The ILO and the IASG should contribute to further develop these concepts.

4.2. ILO experience with indicators, Ms. Karen Curtis

Ms. Karen Curtis, Deputy Director of the International Labour Standards Department, emphasized the need to overcome the sensitivities related to the development of indicators by measuring progress rather than pointing fingers.

The ILO has a strong normative framework, comprising International Labour Standards and the ILO Declarations on fundamental rights at work and social justice for a fair globalization. The ILO is thus familiar with the synergies between Conventions and Declarations, paralleling the synergies between the UNDRIP and the ILO Convention No. 169. While declarations are universally applicable, conventions are ratified through voluntary acts of states.

The ILO process of developing indicators was boosted by the adoption of the 2008 Declaration on fair globalization, which includes the “the establishment of appropriate indicators or statistics, if necessary with the assistance of the ILO, to monitor and evaluate the progress made”.

The ILO has elaborated a source book of qualitative indicators for ILS and initiated a process to help ILO constituents to assess progress towards decent work, for analysis and policy development. One of the lessons learned is that we need to look beyond statistical or easily quantified indicators and combine these with qualitative information, in the case of the ILO linked to the ILO supervisory system. Another element is the development of country profiles, which provide information on the existing legal framework and statistical information combined with qualitative text. The challenge is to measure compliance.

The ILO’s development of an assessment framework for decent work has comprised the following steps:

- a) Initial work, aimed at bench marking. Provide comparable, easily accessible and concise information as related to key bench marks;
- b) Measurement of the situation in a “base year” (related to a baseline, established in 2000) and subsequent measurement of progress in 2008). The measurement is done through the development of a “coding framework”, which contains 168 evaluation criteria.

The framework builds on a variety of information sources. It also encourages ILO constituents to provide additional information. In particular, cases where de facto violations of labour rights are not captured trigger constituents to provide additional

information. In this sense, the framework does not replace the ILO supervisory mechanisms of ratified conventions but draws on them and enrich them.

The next steps will be validation of the framework and feed-back from the ILO Governing Body. One of the main concerns is related to budget, as the operationalisation of the framework requires an incredible amount of work.

4.3. The OHCHR conceptual and methodological framework on indicators for human rights assessment, Mr. Nicolas Fasel.

Mr. Fasel, from the OHCHR Right to Development Section, reported on the work of the OHCHR to develop human rights indicators, which was initiated upon request from the Inter-Committee Meeting of treaty bodies (ICM) in 2004. The initial work resulted in a conclusion regarding the need to have a conceptual framework and following 2 years of consultations, the approach was endorsed by the treaty bodies in 2008.

The work on indicators is not new, but the more systematic approach is recent. Indicators make the contents of human rights more tangible and are seen as something “between laws and the fact”. The purpose is to bring transparency into the implementation of human rights. The framework should also allow national human rights institutions and others to make contributions.

The *OHCHR conceptual framework* provides a common approach for human rights indicators, comprising economic, social and cultural rights and civil and political rights. The framework translates the *normative contents* of human rights into *attributes*, which are subsequently configured into *structural, process and outcome indicators*. The purpose of structural indicators is to measure commitments; process indicators measure efforts, and; outcome indicators measure results. So far, only illustrative indicators as opposed to an exhaustive list have been developed.

The OHCHR framework calls for disaggregation of data by all prohibited grounds of discrimination, including ethnicity. It draw on a variety of data resources, including socio-economic/administrative statistics; events-based data on human rights violations. The framework combines both qualitative and quantitative indicators and there is an effort to keep the indicators simple and based on objective information. The use of household perceptions and opinion surveys, for example, is controversial.

The OHCHR is now testing the operationalisation at the country level, which implies a series of considerations, including a focus on the most vulnerable groups, ensuring ownership and avoiding the misuse of data, including in the data gathering process.

4.4. Human rights indicators for indigenous peoples, Ms. Nicole Friederichs

Ms. Friederichs has undertaken research for the ILO, to provide an outline of a possible assessment framework for indigenous peoples' rights. The framework is based on the OHCHR approach to human rights indicators. It builds on the fundamental fact that the UNDRIP and ILO Convention No. 169 are articulations of universal human rights as they apply to indigenous peoples. Therefore, the OHCHR approach is easily applicable to indigenous peoples' rights. Consequently, the treaty monitoring mechanisms will also be involved in the assessment of application of indigenous peoples' rights.

The methodology applied for developing the outline of the framework, follows the same steps as the OHCHR approach:

- a) Identify the fundamental human rights of UNDRIP and ILO 169;
- b) Develop the normative content of rights;
- c) Identify attributes to reflect the normative content;
- d) Identify structural, process and outcome indicators.

A starting point is to disaggregate general data on fundamental human rights (right to food, health, life, work, social security) as they relate to indigenous peoples. Subsequently, additional work is required to capture the specificity of indigenous peoples' aspirations, e.g. to bilingual education.

Other rights that are not captured by general data are the rights to self-determination, property/lands, natural resources, cultural integrity and participation.

With regards to these rights, Ms. Friederichs has undertaken initial work to determine the normative content of the right to self-determination, to identify attributes and to identify indicators, based on the previous work undertaken by indigenous peoples themselves. The end-product would be a table to define structural, process and outcome indicators for right to self-determination, land/resources (property), participation and cultural integrity.

There are two important concerns related to this work; the budgetary constraints as well as the need to ensure indigenous peoples' full participation in the process.

With regards to the latter concern, efforts should be aimed at developing an illustrative rather than an exhaustive list of indicators. That would allow indigenous peoples and others to continuously contribute and develop the framework.

4.5. The UNDRIP and ILO Convention No. 169 as articulations of universal human rights, Ms. Samia Slimane

Ms. Slimane from the OHCHR indigenous peoples and minority Section underlined that indigenous peoples' rights as enshrined in the UNDRIP and ILO Convention No. 169

constitute an articulation of universal human rights as applied to indigenous peoples. These rights are also widely recognized; the UNDRIP was adopted by 144 states and ILO Convention No. 169 has now been ratified by 22 states. Also other international instruments, such as the CBD contains specific provisions regarding indigenous peoples.

The key rights affirmed in the UNDRIP and Convention No. 169 are:

- a) Right to identity – self-identification;
- b) Non discrimination and equality;
- c) Right to self-determination/self-management;
- d) Collective rights;
- e) Right to free, prior and informed consent;
- f) Right to participation;
- g) Right to lands and natural resources;
- h) Recognition of customary laws;
- i) Special measures to be taken by States.

Although the UNDRIP is not legally binding as such, most of the substantive rights affirmed relate to already existing obligations under treaty law, as interpreted by the relevant monitoring bodies. This implies that existing bodies and mechanisms have an important role to play in the monitoring of these rights, including UN Treaty bodies, special procedures such as the UN Special Rapporteurs, the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) under the Human Rights Council and the ILO supervisory mechanisms. Also regional bodies such as the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) and the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights (ACHPR) have developed jurisprudence on indigenous peoples' rights.

A series of examples illustrates and confirm the validity of this approach, e.g. general and country-specific recommendations and comments issued by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) and the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC). The Special Rapporteur on the situation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people obviously is directly concerned with assessing the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights, but also other Special Rapporteurs (on housing, food, education etc) can contribute. Finally, the UPR is frequently raising issues concerning indigenous peoples, e.g. explicitly evoking the UNDRIP and the need to implement the recommendations of treaty bodies and the Special Rapporteurs.

4.6. Discussion of basic assumptions

Ms. Beatriz Duncan, human rights specialist of UNICEF, said that when looking at the implementation of the UNDRIP, there is a tendency to overlook the fact that indigenous peoples are not homogenous and that members of indigenous peoples have different rights (take into account the rights of the elderly, women, children,

etc.). There is a risk that the internal diversity is falling between the cracks and the meeting should come up with specific indicators to address these groups.

Mr. Joseph Ole Simel, Mainyoito Pastoralist Integrated Development (MPIDO), thanked the organisers for a strategic and timely discussion. He noted that some of the presentations were traditional in the sense that they did not capture the specificities and the spirit of the UNDRIP.

There are particular concerns in the African region, as there is generally a low capacity for data collection, very little political interest of African governments on indigenous issues and a big challenge in terms of politisation of data. In many countries, there is an avoidance to show the patterns of neglect and marginalization. Issues of conflict and replacement, poverty and the destruction of indigenous identities are thus not captured. Therefore, there is a need to review existing indicators and bring these into line with the UNDRIP. The UN must come up with one coherent framework that can be useful for indigenous peoples, including the elderly, women etc.

Mr. Ram Gautam, OHCHR Nepal, mentioned that in Nepal there are misunderstandings of the scope of indigenous peoples' rights, including some people claiming right to separate states.

Ms. Virginia Bras Gomez, member of the CESCR pointed out that it would be possible to use the illustrative list of human rights indicators developed by the OHCHR, and adapt it to different groups of stakeholders.

Ms. Karen Curtis, ILO, mentioned that the low capacity in many states called for the need to link up with independent expert bodies, such as the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations in case of the ILO.

Mr. Nicolas Faser, OHCHR, said that the OHCHR approach as it is does not adequately reflect indigenous peoples' rights. While some indicators may be relevant, others will need to be developed at the country-level, by indigenous peoples and others. However, the use of common terminology may help the various monitoring bodies. Also, indicators are important as a tool for the wider community, not only for lawyers and human rights specialists. Rightly used, indicators are tools to build bridges between governments, statisticians, human rights activists, indigenous peoples etc.

Ms. Nicole Friederichs said that the OHCHR approach can constructively be used to monitor human rights compliance for indigenous individuals, but it should be supplemented by four additional fundamental rights; to self-determination, property/lands, natural resources, cultural integrity and participation

Mr. Lee Swepston stated that there is a need to further develop the specific framework for indigenous peoples and include those who have the capacity and the right to define the normative contents of international instruments, including secretariat staff and members of expert bodies.

Mr. Maurizio Ferrari, Forest Peoples Programme (FPP), indicated that the rights-based approach is not really accepted by the Conference of the Parties of the CBD. There thus seems to be a big divide between the human rights and the environmental instruments. The challenge is how to build synergies among UN agencies; can other UN agencies contribute/participate in the CoPs under the CBD to ensure a stronger rights-based approach?

Ms. Joan Carling, AIPP, underlined the importance of understanding indigenous peoples' own interpretation of human rights. For example, the right to life is frequently understood as an individual right but for indigenous peoples the right to lands is also the right to life. The right to food is the right to food security and traditional livelihood, and the right to security is interpreted as out right to territorial integrity. We are thus stretching the interpretation of fundamental rights, going beyond the individual interpretation of individual rights and using UNDRIP as the overarching framework. These perspectives should be taken into account when developing indicators. In addition to the four additional components identified by Ms. Friederichs – and the particular concern for women, children etc – the issues of transmigration and conflict-resolution are also missing from the proposed framework

5. Indicators

The second substantial session was focused on the issue of indicators, comprising a series of presentations reflecting experiences from countries and institutions. The presentations were followed by a brief discussion in plenary, before the participations continued the discussions in smaller working groups. The Session was chaired by Ms Joan Carling, Secretary-General of the AIPP.

5.1. Adapting OHCHR indicators to the Mexican context, Ms. Marycarmen Color

Ms. Color, OHCHR México, presented the work undertaken by the OHCHR in Mexico, to strengthen the capacity of the State to monitor implementation of its international human rights commitments. The work was initiated in 2007 and aims at promoting the application of the OHCHR approach in partnership with government, National Bureau of Statistics, NGOs, academia and the National Human Rights Commission.

The task has been to develop nationally contextualized indicators from the general illustrative list of indicators in the OHCHR framework. So far, indicators on the right to health, education, gender and freedom of expression have been developed. The indicator for gender was developed through an inter-agency working group on gender.

The health-related indicators have been validation in a process, involving more than 60 institutions, including the Secretary for indigenous peoples' rights. However, other indicators were problematic, due to the lack of information. This, for example, was the case with freedom of expression.

In conclusion, some of the proposed indicators of the OHCHR framework could not be adapted to the Mexican reality. Others should be added as cross-cutting concerns, for example the concern for indigenous peoples' rights in the Mexican context.

5.2. Adapting OHCHR indicators to the Nepali context, Mr. Ram Gautam

Mr. Gautam, OHCHR, Nepal, explained that Nepal is in a transition period after a civil war, where inequality was the root cause of conflict. OHCHR Nepal has worked on indicators since 2008, aiming at building capacity of national stakeholders and contextualizing the illustrative list of indicators to Nepal context. Main challenges are related to the creation of common understanding of the issue, the non-availability of data and the fact that no coordination mechanisms are in place. The OHCHR has identified the following ways forward:

- a) Continued engagement in capacity building;
- b) Continued contextualization of the indicators;
- c) Establishment of benchmarks and goals;
- d) Disaggregation of data.

5.3. Specific indigenous indicators in Australia, Mr. Lawrence McDonald

Mr. McDonald, Assistant Commissioner of the Australian Productivity Commission, reported on the research work undertaken upon request of the Government of Australia. In Australia, indigenous peoples comprise aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders; it is thus a broad category that comprises many different groups.

In 1967, Australian indigenous peoples were fully recognized and only from then on counted in censuses. They now constitute one of the most researched groups on the Earth with a large number of reports available. However, it was perceived that the information had only limited policy impact. Indigenous peoples constitute only 2% of the Australian population but belong to 250 distinct language groups. Of these, 145 are spoken languages but only 8 are considered "strong". Only 12% speak an indigenous language at home. In general, Australia's population is highly urbanized but indigenous peoples experience significant disadvantage wherever they live.

To overcome this situation, in 2002, it was decided to initiate the *Overcome Indigenous Disadvantage* initiative, which is mandated to pursue change.

It is conceived as a strategic framework, it a number of priority outcomes within a number of strategic areas for actions. These include maternal health, teenage birth rate, birth weight, early childhood hospitalisations, injury and preventable disease, basic skills for life and learning and hearing impediments.

The framework focuses on the causal factors that ultimately lead to disadvantage and includes a number of strategic change indicators, assuming that improvements over time in the strategic change indicators will drive improvement in the targets and headline indicators, meaning that the priority outcomes will be achieved. Policy makers can design specific programs to improve strategic change indicators and thus eventually reach the desired outcomes.

The initiative had the explicit task to identify indicators of relevance to both governments and indigenous stakeholders. Strategic change indicators should be sensitive to policy action, relevant to priority outcomes and also meaningful to indigenous peoples. The focus is on outcome, not on structure and process. Also, it should be comprehensive, implying that it should not leave issues out just because they are difficult.

Seven years after its initiation, there are still 50% of the indicators that cannot be informed. Where data are available, they show some general improvements but the gaps between indigenous peoples and other sections of the population are not closing. Generally, the statistics on avoidable mortality, income and employment, child abuse and neglect, imprisonment rates etc. still show big gaps.

Indigenous peoples have asked for the on culture and well-being to be improved. However, this is a very difficult issue to deal with statistically and it is mainly informed by case studies.

There are still pending data issues in Australia, for example related to indigenous peoples to identify themselves and the surveyors' reluctance to ask identity-related questions. While the data availability is being improved, it must also be noted that improvements in outcomes may actually reflect data improvement or change in indigenous identifications rather than real improvement in terms of outcomes.

5.4. Using traditional occupations as an indicator, Mr. David Hunter

Mr. David Hunter is responsible for the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) within the ILO Department of statistics. ISCO is a register of occupations, about what peoples do and serve as a model for national systems of classification of occupations and for labour statistics. ISCO

Indigenous peoples are interested in exploring the notion of traditional occupations for possible use as an indicator under the CBD. In this regard, there are several options, depending on what is to be measured; a static rather restricted notion of traditional occupations; or a more dynamic notion which can capture situations where indigenous knowledge is being re-contextualized. The two key options are to measure:

- a) Occupations where indigenous knowledge is central to performance of tasks, for example subsistence farmers, pastoralists, etc.

- b) Occupations where indigenous knowledge may influence the way work is performed. This would include a broader range of occupations, including, for example, artists, writer etc.

Some consultancy work been undertaken by the IIFB, with the support of the ILO, but the ways forward would include the following steps:

- a) Agree on and promote a standard definition of traditional indigenous occupations as an indicator under the CBD;
- b) Operationalize this in terms of an agreed set of ISCO codes;
- c) Encourage statistical offices to code and disseminate occupation data at as detailed a level as possible;
- d) Encourage statistical offices and agencies with administrative registers to use a standard indigenous identifier as widely as possible.

5.5. Indicators for better work, Ms. Anne Ziebarth

Ms. Ziebarth is the legal specialist of the ILOs Better Work Programme, which measures enterprise compliance with core labour standards and national labour law and work with factories to improve compliance.

The programme is operating with two tools for measuring compliance:

- a) A Compliance Assessment Tool (CAT), which is a questionnaire to gather information on compliance with core labour standards and national labour law, and;
- b) A Supply Chain Tracking of Assessments and Remediation (STAR), which is an information management system that captures information on compliance and improvement efforts, and shares results with suppliers and their buyers.

The CAT comprises 38 compliance points, structured in 8 clusters, which are fixed by international law. These are informed through approximately 250 questions, which vary with national law. National experts adapt the global template to national law.

5.6. Discussion, indicators

Mr. Broddi Sigurdarson, SPFII, mentioned that the UNPFII has continuously emphasized the need for disaggregation of data and full participation of indigenous peoples in data gathering and monitoring processes. He requested the panelists to clarify how they were working with indigenous peoples.

Mr. Nicolas Faser, OHCHR, asked whether disaggregated statistics on hate crime is being collected in Australia and whether the cost of adding questions in surveys constitutes an obstacle to disaggregation.

Mr. Silverio Chisaguano, National Institution of Statistics, Ecuador, stated that it is often lack of political will that prevents statistical offices from producing disaggregated data. There are basically two complementary options; to produce data with conventional methods and then disaggregate or to undertake specific surveys regarding indigenous peoples, which is often more complicated. This implies initiating a process of building distinct indicators, with the participation of indigenous peoples. This is necessary as poverty is measured in ways that, for example, does not capture Amazonian perspectives.

Mr. Albert Barume, ILO, suggested that indicators would perhaps be better designed if they were aimed at overcoming challenges rather than taking a traditional approach in identifying “rights”. One case in point would be the effects of climate change, which are not included through the traditional approach to rights.

Mr. Joseph Ole Simel, MPIDO, asked whether the indicators tested in Mexico can capture indigenous peoples’ aspirations and systems with regards to education. The Mexican government has been a keen supporter of UNDRIP and it would be good to know if the indicators are used to monitor compliance.

Ms. Marycarmen Color, OHCHR, responded that there are many government institutions working on indigenous issues in Mexico, but this has still not led to a homogenous approach. For the OHCHR it is fundamental to address indigenous peoples as a crosscutting issue.

Mr. Ram Gautam, OHCHR, mentioned that there is no specific concern for indigenous peoples in the work being undertaken in Nepal; it is just a testing of the general approach and framework at the country level

Mr. Lawrence MacDonald, Australian Productivity Commission, explained that the Commission was privileged in having indigenous staff members. This is a privilege as this type of technical work, a bit distanced from policy-making, is often not prioritized. In Australia, there is no single representative indigenous peoples’ body to consult; therefore the consultative process is a bit complicated. However, all government institutions have established liaison mechanisms with indigenous peoples and quality assurance mechanisms to ensure that language etc. is adequate. With regards to hate crimes; there are not enough such crimes reported to become statistically significant.

Mr. David Hunter, ILO, clarified that there are two types of information required for tracking status and trends of indigenous peoples’ occupations; namely registration of the occupation in combination with an identification as indigenous. Occupation surveys are relatively costly as they require open-ended questions (as opposed to tick boxes) but most of these costs are already covered as occupations are included in most censuses. What remains is thus the additional need to have an indigenous identifier included. In Australia

and Latin America this is almost universally applied but not, for example in Africa. In some regions where indigenous peoples constitute a small minority that is geographically unevenly distributed, sampling is also very difficult.

Ms. Tonya Gonella Frischner, UNPFII, reiterated the need for a comprehensive approach to data collection, taking into account the need to reflect the collective aspects of indigenous peoples' rights and to generate separate data on indigenous women and children. Also, the growing number of indigenous peoples living in urban areas should be considered.

Ms. Joan Carling, chair of the session, summarized the discussion in a series of key points to be addressed:

- a) Identification of indigenous peoples and inclusion of indigenous identifiers in census and surveys to allow for disaggregation of data;
- b) Coordination and establishment of mechanisms for the participation of indigenous peoples in developing indicators and in monitoring processes;
- c) Need for allocation of resources for disaggregation of data and initiation of specific indigenous peoples surveys, including mechanisms to measure "intangibles" ;
- d) Design of a coherent framework which includes indicators to address the specificities of indigenous peoples; which is rights-based approach, and; which brings the experiences of different institutions together and make them feed into the framework.

6. Working groups: key criteria for human rights indicators for indigenous peoples

6.1. Working group questions

The participants broke into three groups to discuss the following questions: Which are the key criteria for human rights indicators for indigenous peoples?

Taking into account the various presentations and discussions of the day, which criteria should be used to develop a set of key indicators for assessing the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights. Aspects to be considered could include:

- a) Should proposed indicators be included in a **comprehensive framework**?
- b) To what extent is the **methodology** of the "OHCHR framework" (definition of structural, process and outcome indicators) useful for monitoring indigenous peoples' rights?

- c) Considering that indigenous peoples' rights are articulations of general human rights, to what extent can **general human rights indicators** be used to monitoring indigenous peoples' rights?
- d) How can indicators be adapted to the **low capacity and the potential politicization** of data collection and data use in many countries?
- e) How to ensure that indicators **reflect indigenous peoples' aspirations** and will be **appropriated by indigenous peoples** in their own monitoring efforts.

6.2. Reporting from Working Groups.

The groups highlighted the following issues:

Group 1:

- There are many valid experiences, e.g. much progress has been made in Latin America with regards to disaggregation of data. However, experiences and efforts are dispersed and many do not take into account the framework for indigenous peoples' collective rights (for example the MDG and CBD processes)
- Convention No. 169 and UNDRIP constitute a consistent common framework for deriving indicators. There is thus no need to reinvent but to make use of what is already there and coordinate efforts in a common conceptual framework.
- Elements of the OHCHR framework is useful but should not be understood in a linear way (that there is a clear causal relation between structure, process and outcome).
- The challenge is to coordinate and achieve synergies between diverse institutions, including indigenous peoples, governments, civil society and human rights organizations and donors.
- Coordination with donors should be done with a view to push for certain conditionality in data collection processes to make sure that indigenous issues are addressed.
- The participatory process is essential to improve the significance and coherence with indigenous peoples' own concepts.
- The participatory process requires a level playing field, implying that government, international, civil society and indigenous peoples' institutions must engage in a mutual learning process, including capacity-building of all stakeholders.

Group 2:

The discussion evolved around the word “comprehensive”, which could imply that a “comprehensive framework” would just be a big menu of issues drawn from global instruments. There is a need to balance between global and local concerns. Contextualization is the key issue; a flexible and loose framework is conducive for engaging civil society. However, if it is too loose, it negates the possibility for comparison over time and across countries. The aim should be a global framework with sufficient flexibility for accommodating local specificities.

The general low capacity for generating data can be powerful argument for mobilizing government action. The non-existence of information about indigenous peoples' human rights situation is in itself a finding and could trigger reaction by governments. The fact that some governments cannot respond to questions regarding implementation of given commitments already indicates that rights are probably being violated. Some statisticians state that if data are not available, the questions cannot be asked. On the contrary, the absence of data should be used to trigger action/focus by governments, UN, donors and civil society.

The proposed outline of a comprehensive framework, structured according to structural, process and outcome indicators resembles that of international supervisory mechanisms. These also take point of departure in an established right; assess whether these are recognized in law, then moves on to ask questions and verify practice to see if the desired outcomes have been reached. The proposed methodology of the framework is thus applicable for the purpose of monitoring indigenous peoples' rights.

The point of departure is in the recognized rights, which should then be reflected in a few core indicators. However, considering the way most people think in practice, there should not be a strong insistence on a too rigid logic, as it can be difficult to clearly distinguish between structure, process and outcome.

Group 3:

The weak capacity for data generation can be addressed through capacity-building, but the politization of data generation is very worrying and should be addressed. Potential ways of overcoming this obstacle is by guaranteeing confidentiality, building on self-identification of indigenous peoples, ensuring the independent status of bodies managing statistics and investing in quality data.

There is a clear inter-linkage between general human rights indicators and specific indigenous peoples indicators. The general framework is therefore useful and relevant but the UNDRIP and Convention No. 169 should be used to develop specific indigenous peoples indicators. The process of designing indicators is probably going to be difficult, considering that the UNDRIP took a long time to develop and was met with a lot of opposition. However, the links to general human rights law will make the framework more effective, as it takes point of departure in legally-binding commitments of states. Although the UNDRIP may not be considered formally it may reflect customary international law as it reflects more than 25 years of negotiations between indigenous peoples and states.

Other processes, such as the CBD, should also be considered to grow bridges. In this way, the issues can be addressed in a holistic way, creating linkages between human rights and ecosystem-based approaches.

The issue of specific data on indigenous peoples versus disaggregation of general data for indigenous peoples can be reconciled by including general indicators (for example

regarding child mortality, live expectancy etc) as outcome indicators of an indigenous-specific framework.

7. Data

The third substantial session comprised a series of presentations regarding the generation of data on indigenous peoples in different regions and countries of the world. The session was chaired by Mr. Broddi Sigurdarson of the SPFII.

7.1. Data generation in Latin America, Ana María Oyarce, ECLAC

Ms. Oyarce, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) explained that the purpose of ECLAC's work on indigenous peoples statistics is to follow the implementation of international commitments and goals. The basis for the work is the UNDRIP and Convention No. 169. The monitoring is based on data generated through censuses and household surveys, thus re-reading conventional data from a human rights-based approach. ECLAC works with statistical bureaus, indigenous organizations and civil society, with a focus on capacity-building. Capacity-building is a necessary step in the process of identifying indicators.

There are more than 670 indigenous peoples in the Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) region; they are political actors who are claiming rights. In this regard, information is essential for monitoring policies and has a value as public good. Basic socio-demographic information is essential, to know who and how many. Additionally, there is a need to make the situation of women and children visible. The majority of LAC countries now have indigenous identifiers in the census. These have changed over time to progressively include the criteria of self-identification. Currently, only Mexico and Peru maintain spoken language as an identifier.

ECLAC monitors indigenous peoples' general human rights situation as related to common indicators (e.g. access to common health services) as well as indigenous peoples specific rights (specific indigenous health services)

ECLAC operates a database on indigenous peoples and afro-descendants in the LAC region, comprising 5 information systems including socio-demographic data, information regarding internal migration, health, youth and inequality. All information is available at the ECLAC website. The statistical information is accompanied by technical notes, to contextualize and interpret data to the situation of indigenous peoples. The contextualization of conventional data is very important, e.g. child mortality is a violation of the right to life but also a violation of the right to cultural integrity as the health systems have not been able to provide adequate services for indigenous peoples.

ECLAC has identified the following challenges for the production of information on indigenous peoples:

- ✓ It is crucial to obtain census information on indigenous and Afro-descendants peoples for the design, implementation and evaluation of public policies, as population censuses are the only data source with universal coverage.
- ✓ All Latin American countries include the identification of indigenous peoples in the 2010 round of census, taking into account the self identification criteria. Also include at least one question on indigenous language.
- ✓ It is necessary to better develop the conceptual-methodological framework from which the information on ethnicity is generated in order to include the rights perspective.
- ✓ To guarantee the indigenous participation at all stages of the process: in the formulation of the questions, definitions and terms that are used; in the collection of information, and the analysis and interpretation of the data.
- ✓ To promote the use of socio-demographic information.
- ✓ To institutionalize the production and analysis of indigenous peoples statistics in national statistics systems.
- ✓ To incorporate ethnic approach in the whole statistic systems.

7.2. Disaggregation of data in Nepal, Mr. Balkrishna Mabuang

Mr. Mabuan from the Department of Population Studies of Tribhuvan University, explained that Nepal is in the midst of a profound state reform process, from a unitary to a federal state model. In this regard, data is important, to indicate horizontal and vertical differences and to portray poverty situations. In Nepal, data needs to be disaggregated by ethnicity, caste and gender.

The inclusion of caste and ethnic groups has caused big discussions in Nepal, both in the 2001 census and in the forthcoming 2011 censuses. The perspective of dominant groups on data disaggregation is that it is better not to disaggregate as the revelation of patterns of inequalities could lead to disintegration of the State. Indigenous peoples are in favour of disaggregation, to strengthen their identity and the nation.

Indigenous peoples constitute approximately 37 % of the population. Available data shows high levels of poverty and inequalities in terms of occupations, child mortality etc.

The issue of disaggregated data is important for the creation of a federal state as it reveals the complexities of the patterns of geographical settlement of ethnic, linguistic and caste groups in Nepal.

7.3. Difficulties with data generation in Africa, Mr. Joseph Ole Simel

Mr. Simel, MPIDO, spoke about the general challenges of data collection in Africa, as the issue is intimately linked to the issue of governance. The mandated institutions should have legitimacy and enjoy the trust of people. If there is no confidence, the data produced by such institutions will not be trusted. These should also have the required technical expertise and human resources.

In Africa, data are often politized and manipulated to suit a region or the party in power, as data is used as the argument for distribution of resources. The use of fraud data at the national level may lead to conflict as the data manipulation is linked to particular ethnic groups.

In Kenya, there has been an example where the release of data was cancelled as it did not suit the people in power. Likewise, many Kenyans reject the information stemming from the latest census. Moreover, many people do not understand the value of data, but see it as a requirement imposed by donors. Subsequently, politicians do not allocate resources for data generation.

The issue is further complicated with regards to indigenous peoples. The concept of indigenous peoples is not clear or broadly agreed upon in Africa; it remains an unresolved issue. Although the ACHPR has addressed the issue in research and studies, most governments have not taken into account these conclusions. However, most governments have focused on the marginalized groups as well as pastoralists and hunter-gatherers. With regards to pastoralists, governments claim it is difficult to produce data on these groups as they move around and cannot easily be found. They thus claim there is a need to settle pastoralists in order to register them.

Generally in Africa, neither governments nor UN agencies understand Convention No. 169 and the UNDRIP. Even at the level of UN agencies, there is very little understanding. Without the understanding of UN agencies, the work with governments is even more difficult as UN agencies carry a lot of influence, internationally and nationally. We need to tap the technical expertise of UN agencies while they in turn need to understand the rights and aspirations of indigenous peoples. We need to see the UN-system collaborating with the ACHPR, with indigenous peoples and governments on indigenous issues in Africa. Then we can make ends meet and start working on data generation.

7.4. Data generation in Ecuador, Mr. Silverio Chusiguano

Mr. Chusiguano from the National Institution of Statistics, Ecuador, informed that since 2001, statistics are based on self-identification of indigenous peoples, including in labour registers. A specific National Commission on Statistics for Indigenous peoples and Afro-descendants (CONEPIA) has been established to produce statistical information. Existing disaggregated data shows a severe picture of exclusion and marginalization of the indigenous population.

CONEPIA is currently involved in consultation processes related to the upcoming census and has built alliances with donors and others. The expectations for the census are that it can be used to fight exclusion and discrimination. Statistics with focus on ethnic affiliation is considered a right, which will contribute to the decolonization of the Ecuadorian society. The census will be accompanied by a national campaign for self-identification, through which materials and information will be disseminated, following a strategy developed with indigenous peoples' organizations.

It is an important recommendation to undertake supplementary surveys regarding indigenous peoples' occupations and to facilitate exchange of experiences. Linked to this is the need to facilitate training of indigenous peoples in rights, statistics and related areas.

7.5. Data generation in Paraguay, Ms. Zulma Sosa de Servin

Ms. Sosa de Servin is Director of the National Institute of Statistics in Paraguay. There are 20 indigenous peoples, belonging to 4 linguistic groups in Paraguay. They constitute 1.7% of the population, mainly living in the Chaco region. Previously, these peoples were excluded from censuses but a specific indigenous census was undertaken in 1981 (INDI) and in 1992 they were included in the general census. However, there are serious doubts about the validity of the information generated in 1992.

The 2002 census had the full participation of indigenous peoples. It was looking not only at quantity (number of indigenous individuals) but also at diversity (number of distinct cultures). The census questionnaire comprises a special module for indigenous peoples but still allows for comparison with other sectors of the population. The indigenous participation in the process led to the allocation of an inclusive budget, comprising activities beyond traditional censuses. Such activities included the establishment of multi-disciplinary teams and possibilities for indigenous peoples to appropriate the census in their own worldview, through meetings, events etc. A specific logo for the indigenous census was elaborated and the oral traditions of the various peoples were used for dissemination and capacity-building. The questionnaires were translated into 12 languages and the materials were presented in ceremonies, through traditional dances, community radios etc. Likewise, the results of the census were disseminated orally, through radio, and through video.

Subsequently, further surveys and reports have been elaborated, including an indicators-system of more than 80 indicators on the MDGs adapted to indigenous peoples. Also, an ethnic identifier has been included in health registers.

In terms of policy change, this has led to a national programme on indigenous peoples and to the first Paraguayan submission of a report to CERD on indigenous peoples.

7.6. Using ethnography to determine and measure Indicators of indigenous peoples' human rights, Neil Keating

Mr. Keating is Assistant Professor of Cultural Anthropology at the State University of New York and thus takes an academic point of departure. Informed by work with US first nations and participation in UNPFII, he has used ethnographic methodology to design and field test indicators in Cambodia, in collaboration with the Cambodian Indigenous Youth Association (CIYA).

The research goal was to determine key impediments for indigenous peoples' human rights, focusing on self-determination, free prior informed consent (FPIC) and other key provisions of UNDRIP.

The first step implied development of indicators that are locally significant and relevant was informed by the OHCHR framework and ethnographic methods. For example, local indicators on self-determination were developed, based on conversations with community members, taking into account gender and other factors. Thus, the methodology depends on good relationship with the communities, which require time, residence and participation in daily life.

In the second stage, a survey instrument was developed, based on the identified indicators. This instrument allows for both qualitative and quantitative analysis.

There are strong arguments for advocating for inclusion of ethnography in the existing approaches and it has potential for replication at global scale. It is thus recommended that international human rights agencies strengthen their rapport with academics and include ethnographic approaches to developing indicators.

7.7. Maori statistics – the framework and the survey, Mr. Peter Potaka

Mr. Potaka, senior Maori advisor with Statistics New Zealand informed about the Maori Statistics Framework. It has been framed within the Maori worldview and endorsed by a broad and diverse group of Maori. Consultation workshops have led to a high level of ownership; the framework is developed for Maori, by Maori and overseen by elders and statisticians, with an authority to veto.

Underlying principle is to treat Maori well-being as an outcome of Maori development, defined as a function of people being able to live the life they wished to live. It is based on the opportunities of choice, in an environment free of impediments and institutional barriers.

In order to operationalize the framework, it has been integrated with the national system of statistics. It has been a mutual process of learning but the processes within the national system are very slow; a planning process may take 6 years, which is too long for Maori to wait. Therefore, a specific Maori social survey was undertaken in 2008.

In general, the Maori are sick of being seen as problems. There is thus a need to balance “deficit” information with good news with the potential for empowering Maori, e.g. the percentage of Maori among professional rugby players.

The survey tries to measure well-being, by assessing how connected people are to their culture. It aims at capturing a range of views to inform a process of reconnection. Methodologically, this is done through questions like; “do you know your tribe, traditional greetings?” The survey is intended to inform Maori development over the next 10-15 years.

7.8. Discussion on data

Beatriz Duncan, UNICEF, asked why the UN Division of Statistics was not present at the meeting.

Ms. Virginia Bras Gomes, (CESCR) requested more information about the issue raised in Nepal regarding the link between ethnicity and disintegration of state. Also, she inquired how self-identification has changed statistics on indigenous peoples and what the difference is between an ethnographic and a human rights-based approach.

Mr. Balkrishna Mahbuang explained that Nepal has a 230-year history of very centralized government structure, dominated by the Hindu high-caste population, who now feel threatened by the decentralization of state. Therefore, they question the gathering of disaggregated data.

Ms. Anamaria Oyarce mentioned an example from Chile, where data put in evidence the huge gap in child mortality between the indigenous and non-indigenous population, which led to the development of specific health programs. In other Latin-American countries it is more difficult to see direct results of data collection.

Ms. Zulma Sosa de Servin explained that the UN Division of Statistics meets every year. It functions through working groups, normally with one country taking the lead of a group. However, indigenous issues are absent from the discussions although internal coordination would be very important. With regards to the effects of self-identification; in Paraguay, 80% of the indigenous people live in identified communities where they maintain their traditions, so the problem of denial does not exist. However, there is migration to urban areas so in order to capture these people, awareness-raising and information campaigns as well as confidence-building initiatives are undertaken.

Statisticians should know that the framework has changed; from the previous framework oriented towards economic development to the human rights-based approach. In this context, statistics are tools for exerting rights.

Mr. Silverio Chiguano mentioned that in Ecuador, the identification as indigenous was previously based on language, stipulating the indigenous population at 3%. In 1991, with the inclusion of self-identification it raised to 7%. Self-identification is considered a right.

Mr. Neil Keating explained that the main difference between an ethnographic and a human rights-based approach is that the latter tends to focus on human rights violations and may be flattening out details, while the ethnographic approach is interested in details and complexities. Another main difference in the ethnographic approach is the amount of time spent in the field.

Mr. David Hunter noted that a large number of UN agencies have statistical responsibilities, including the ILO, but also the involvement of the UN Statistics Division is very important.

8. Mechanisms

The last substantial session was focused on existing institutionalized mechanisms and processes, which have a role in the monitoring of indigenous peoples' rights. The session was chaired by Ms. Tonya Gonella Frischner of the UNPFII.

8.1. ILO supervisory bodies, Ms. Shauna Olney

Ms. Olney coordinates the team, which works with the supervisory bodies on the application of ILO Convention No. 169 and other equality conventions, within the International Labour Standards Department of the ILO. Also, within the team, is the Programme to Promote ILO Convention No. 169 (PRO169), thus combining supervision of the Convention with technical assistance to facilitate its implementation.

The Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) is the main body which assesses whether a given Convention is duly applied in law and in practice; whether legislation is in place, whether it is applied in practice, whether it is reaching the desired results and making a difference on the ground. Thus, the supervisory procedure fits very well with the OHCHR framework.

The CEACR is an independent body of jurists, which looks at Convention No. 169 in a 5 year cycle. The next regular reporting year is 2013. However, the ordinary supervisory cycle is broken when a comment is received from workers or employers to flag an implementation problem. Under Convention No. 169, virtually all countries have comments that break the cycle. Indigenous peoples are technically not constituents of the

ILO, but many indigenous peoples channel their comments to the ILO through workers' organizations. That is the channel for shadow reports, comments, etc.

One way to assess whether indicators are meaningful for indigenous peoples is to look at the comments sent by indigenous organizations to the ILO, which reveal a lot of similarity in the issues addressed. One of the main questions regards the identification of indigenous peoples and the recognition of the right to self-identification. Another main issue is the development of legislation and administrative framework, in consultation with indigenous peoples, reaching agreement and consent. Finally, the issue of ownership and use of land and natural resources is often raised. These are the recurrent issues brought to the attention of the supervisory bodies.

In addition to the CEACR, the ILO also has a "complaint" procedure for violations of ratified conventions. Whenever a complaint is received and admitted, a tripartite committee is established to examine the case and come up with conclusions and recommendations, which are then followed up by CEACR.

The full report of the CEACR is submitted for consideration by the annual International Labour Conference (ILC). Of the approximately 800 observations of the CEACR, 25 are being discussed by ILC. Of these, approximately half address the issue of freedom of association, while usually one per year is on Convention No. 169. The last two years, the ILC has discussed the application of Convention No. 169 by Peru.

Convention No. 169 has 22 ratifications but the ILO supervisory bodies are addressing indigenous issues under a number of other Conventions including Convention No. 111 on discrimination (which has been ratified by 169 countries) and Conventions on child labour and forced labour. These conventions are considered "fundamental labour rights" and have a regular supervisory cycle of two years.

The supervisory bodies determine progress and challenges in a specific vocabulary where "satisfaction" indicates progress, "interest" indicates efforts being undertaken towards progress, and "concern" expresses regret. Also failure by states to report or absence of information is noted with regrets. Potentially, indicators can be drawn from the vocabulary used.

8.2. CERD, Mr. Francisco Cali Tzai

Mr. Francisco Cali, member of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) stated that many countries are reluctant to collect and present statistical disaggregated data on the social, economic and cultural situation of indigenous peoples. The Committee members are insisting on information regarding the human rights situation of indigenous peoples when reviewing the States' reports. While there is a need to have statistics, the Committee's work is to attach an identity to the numbers in order to see the peoples beyond the statistics. Which are the groups being discriminated?

How do States define ethnicity? The Committee members are also asking how States are complying with ILO Convention No. 169 and the UNDRIP. Indicators are critical to combat racial discriminatory policies. Statistics and indicators are useful for the Committee members in order to recommend measures to be taken by States and in order to monitor the Convention itself as well as recommendations of the Committee. However, there is a need to make sure that indicators are used to benefit indigenous peoples – not the other way around.

8.3. CESCR, Ms. Virginia Bras Gomes

Ms. Virginia Bras Gomes, member of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) underlined that the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) contains critical rights that are relevant for indigenous peoples, including the right to self-determination, cultural rights etc. Under the Covenant, States have core obligations to provide, at the least, minimum essential levels of each of the rights and to progressively achieve the full realization of these rights. The entry points for the protection of vulnerable groups are:

- (1) Principles of non-discrimination and substantive equality. Those rights are to be read in conjunction with the economic, social and cultural rights (General comment No. 20 on non-discrimination). To comply with the core obligation and the progressive realization of rights, States should inform and provide clear data to allow for the assessment of progressive or full realization of rights. In order for statistical department to comply with the requests of the Committee, there are two prerequisites: collection and generation of data on multiple and systematic discrimination – and collection and generation of data on the prohibited grounds of discrimination. Further, the generation of gender disaggregated data for vulnerable groups is absolutely necessary.
- (2) Monitor State obligation through the lens of needs-based versus greed-based development. Development policies that are not applying a human rights approach are increasing inequalities and often induce displacements and loss of traditional livelihood. Committee members need appropriate indicators to look at the rights of indigenous peoples, especially the right to free, prior and informed consent. It is important to use common indicators to assess the impact of discriminatory practices against indigenous peoples and look at indigenous peoples as rights holders and not merely as vulnerable groups. CESCR has recently noted an increased awareness regarding disaggregation of data based on ethnicity.

8.4. Mr. James Anaya, UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples

Mr. James Anaya, UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, reiterated the importance of the two fundamental instruments, ILO Convention No. 169 and UNDRIP, which represent the current international consensus about the rights of

indigenous peoples and the obligations of States and other actors regarding protection and implementation of these rights. The UNDRIP builds upon the rights affirmed in ILO Convention No. 169 and confirms, incorporates and clarifies provisions contained in other universally recognized legally-binding instruments as they relate to indigenous peoples. The UNDRIP is a benchmark for assessing States' conducts and should be regarded – along with ILO Convention No. 169 and other human rights treaties- as the reference for measuring implementation. The Special Rapporteur recalled the four areas of his work: 1) promoting good practices, 2) receiving and addressing communications on alleged violation of the human rights of indigenous peoples, 3) elaboration of country reports, and 4) engaging in thematic studies. Indigenous peoples and NGOs submit information to the Special Rapporteur on specific cases of violations, covering the full range of situations; from killings and massacres to forced removals, establishment of national parks, and lack of consultations. The Special Rapporteur communicates directly with governments regarding these situations, eventually leading to remedial measures. With regards to country reports, the Special Rapporteur takes stock of the overall situation faced by indigenous peoples, looking at clusters of issues: land and resources, governance, consultation, socio-economic concerns. Concerning land and resources, one of the relevant indicators is whether laws are in place to recognise indigenous peoples' rights to lands and resources based on traditional occupancy. In many countries, there are no legislative or administrative measures to make these rights effective. Another indicator is the extent to which general laws and agencies incorporate the rights of indigenous peoples. Regarding the right to free, prior and informed consent, the Special Rapporteur looks at whether or not there is a defined practice included in legislations. There is a remarkable absence of administrative or legislative provisions and ineffective consultation procedures, even when defined practices exist. Gaps also exist in terms of indicators to provide data on economic conditions including education and health. It requires specific concerted actions to overcome the legacies of this entrenched discrimination.

8.5. Experiences with the UPR, Ms. Joan Carling

Ms. Joan Carling, Secretary General of the AIPP reported on the use of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) by the Asian indigenous peoples. The examination of countries under the UPR takes place every four years, based on the UN Charter and human rights instruments, which stipulate the obligations and commitments of states. The UPR regulations were adopted prior to the adoption of the UNDRIP and therefore do not specifically mention the UNDRIP. The underlying principle of the UPR is to promote the universality, interdependence and indivisibility of human rights, thus also including indigenous peoples' rights. The objectives are to improve the application of human rights on the ground, the fulfillment of States' obligations, the enhancement of capacity and promotion of good practices.

Indigenous peoples' objectives for engagement with the UPR is to include and mainstream indigenous peoples' rights and to have the UNDRIP included as basis for the reviews.

During the first session, all parties were nervous and it seemed that there was an agreement between states not to criticize each other. However, increasingly, the EU block has become more critical to developing countries and has made strong recommendations for inclusion of international standards into domestic law. There is no space for engagement for civil society during the UPR.

8.6. Discussion on mechanisms

Ms. Tove Søvndahl Pedersen, Greenland Government, stated that the presentations and discussions illustrate the importance and urgency of this meeting. The recommendations of the meeting need to be developed with urgency so we can move forward with testing of the approach. The role of taking the conceptual work further should be assumed by the ILO, the OHCHR and the SPFII. However, this will only happen if there are resources available. We therefore need to send a strong message to donors that this work is crucial for taking further the work on indigenous people's rights. We need to develop strong indicators with regards to consultation mechanisms. We should therefore send out a message to encourage that the agencies are vigilant of ensuring resources for indigenous peoples' issues within their own agencies, also to continue the work of PRO 169. Greenland Government was involved in Denmark's ratification of Convention No. 169 and therefore understands the crucial role of the ILO in promoting and supporting the implementation of Convention No.169.

Mr. Lee Swepston noted that all of the different monitoring and supervisory mechanisms, whether UN or ILO, use the same methodology. There is thus basis for ensuring consistency in indicators and approaches and with regards to the questions to be asked to States.

Mr. Maurizio Ferrari mentioned the need to broadening the approach to look at linkages between human rights and other instruments, e.g. the CBD. There seems to be even conflicting indicators being developed. For example of 20 indicators used under the CBD, 19 indicate negative trends for biodiversity. The only positive trend is registered under the indicator which measures an increase in protected area. However, many protected areas are established on indigenous lands, thus violating indigenous peoples' rights. This reflects the importance of having a holistic approach, to make sure that indicators do not conflict.

Mr. Francisco Cali Tzay, CERD, reiterated that this "positive" CBD indicator is affecting indigenous peoples everywhere, including in Latin America where protected areas are mainly established on indigenous lands. Moreover, States are allowing extraction of resources from these areas, thus privatizing indigenous lands and resources.

Virginia Bras Gomes, CESCR, mentioned that states are not obliged to follow the recommendations of the UPR – but obliged to follow the recommendations of the treaty

bodies. It is thus politically important that the UPR reiterates treaty body recommendations.

Ms. Carling, AIPP, reiterated the importance of identifying ways forward, including the necessary resources for continuation of the work.

Ms. Zulma Sosa de Servin explained that there are steps to be followed when developing indicators and there is a need to distinguish between indicators and sources of information, which should necessarily be related to a conceptual framework. Experiences from CEDAW show that if we exaggerate the importance of indicators, we might be losing focus. With regards to indigenous peoples' rights, the temptation is even bigger, as this is a very broad issue. We need to determine the steps to follow and coordinate among international institutions with complementary roles and mandates. There is a need for an inter-agency mechanism and also clarify what is the role of the national bureaus of statistics. There is a need for resources for capacity-building while other initiative, e.g. the inclusion of indigenous identifiers in administrative registers does not necessarily require additional resources; it would be enough to include another column in the questionnaires used.

Mr. José Carlos Morales, Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (EMRIP) expressed his endorsement of the work of the meeting, including the proposed conclusions and recommendations and welcomed the collaboration between the agencies, regional and national stakeholders and the UNPFII, EMRIP and the Special Rapporteur

8.7. Conclusions and closing of the technical meeting.

Following the last presentations, the participants went into working groups to identify the key issues and conclusions of the Technical Expert Meeting. These are presented in Section 1 of the current report, and will be submitted for consideration by the UNPFII.

Ms. Shauna Olney, Mr. Broddi Sigurdarson and Mr Antti Korkeakivi closed the Technical Expert Meeting on behalf of the organizers, thanking in particular Ms. Stefania Errico and Ms. Niskua Igualikinya for their hard work in organizing the event and the participants for the rich contributions and sharing of experiences.

Annex A: Agenda

Monday 20 September 2010	Tuesday 21 September 2010
09.30-10.15: Opening remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Ms. Cleopatra Doumbia-Henry</i> Director, International Labour Standards Department, ILO ○ <i>Mr. Antti Korkeakivi</i>, Chief, Indigenous Peoples and Minorities Section, OHCHR ○ <i>Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz</i>, Member of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues 	09.00-10.00 : Briefing from working groups
10.15-10.30: Coffee Break	10.00-10.30: Session 3: Data Facilitator: Broddi Sigurdarson <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data generation in Latin America, <i>Ana Maria Oyarce, ECLAC</i> (10) ○ Disaggregation of data in Nepal, <i>Balkrishna Mabuhang CEADS</i>, (10) ○ Difficulties with data generation in Africa, <i>Joseph Ole Simel MPIDO</i> (10)
10.30-12.30 : Session 1 : Basic assumptions Facilitator Lee Swepton <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the ILO Convention No. 169 as articulations of universal human rights, <i>Samia Slimane OHCHR</i> (15) ○ ILO experience on the process of developing indicators, <i>Karen Curtis ILO</i> (10) ○ Introduction to the OHCHR's conceptual and methodological framework on indicators for human rights assessment, <i>Nicolas Fasel OHCHR</i> (40) ○ Human rights indicators for indigenous peoples, <i>Nicole Friederichs</i> (20) ○ Questions and Answers (25) ○ Facilitator's sum-up (10) 	10.30-10.45: Coffee Break
	10.45-12.00: Session 3: Data - continued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Experiences from Ecuador, <i>Silverio Chisaguano INEC</i> (10) ○ Experiences from Paraguay, <i>Zulma Sosa de Servin DGEEC</i> (10) ○ Experiences from New Zealand, <i>Peter Potaka</i> ○ Community experiences, <i>Neil Keating, The College at Brockport</i> (10) ○ Discussion (30) ○ Facilitator's sum-up (15)
12.30-14.00: LUNCH	12.00-13.30: LUNCH

<p>14.00-15.45 : Session 2 : Indicators Facilitator : Joan Carling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Indicators on indigenous peoples well-being and CBD, <i>Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, UNPFII</i> (15) ○ Implementation of the HR indicators project in Mexico, <i>Marycarmen Color OHCHR</i> (10) ○ Experiences in Asia, <i>Ram Gautam, OHCHR</i> (10) ○ Specific indigenous indicators in Australia, <i>Lawrence McDonald, Productivity Commission, Government of Australia</i> (15) ○ Using traditional occupations as an indicator, <i>David Hunter, ILO</i> (10) ○ Indicators and Better Work, <i>ILO</i> (10) ○ Questions and Answers (25) ○ Facilitator Sum-up (10) 	<p>13.30-15.30 : Session 4 : Mechanisms Facilitator: Tonya Frichner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ILO supervisory bodies, <i>Shauna Olney, ILO</i> (15) ○ UN Treaty Bodies, <i>Francisco Cali Tzay (CERD)</i> and <i>Virginia Bras Gomez (CESCR)</i> (30) ○ Special Rapporteur, <i>James Anaya</i> (20) ○ AIPP and experiences with UPR, <i>Joan Carling AIPP</i> (15) ○ Discussion (30) ○ Facilitator sum-up (10)
<p>15.45-16.00: Coffee Break</p>	<p>15.30-15.45: Coffee Break</p>
<p>16.00-17.30: Working Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Which are the key criteria for human rights indicators for indigenous peoples 	<p>15.45-17.00: Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How can progress on indicators and data collection strengthen the work and complementarity of these mechanisms
	<p>17.00-18.00: Conclusions and recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Briefing from Working Groups ○ Rapporteur summing-up ○ Concluding remarks by participants

Working groups:

- 1 Spanish-speaker
- 2 English-speaker

Working group facilitators Birgitte Feiring (Spanish), Albert Barume and Samia Slimane

Annex B: List of participants

	Name of participants	Title, Email
1	Lee Swepston	ILO Consultant
2	Nicole Friederichs	ILO Consultant
3	Joan Carling	Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact - AIPP
4	Zulma Concepcion Sosa De Servin	Director, Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Paraguay
5	Peter Potaka	Senior Maori Adviser Statistic New Zealand
7	Joseph Ole Simel	Mainyoito Pastoralist Integrated Development Organization - MPIDO
9	Silverio Chisaguano	National Statistic Institution of Ecuador
10	Marycarmen Color	OHCHR Mexico Human Rights Officer
11	Ram Gautam	OHCHR Nepal Human Rights Officer
12	José Carlos Morales	Member of the UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
13	James Anaya	UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
14	Francisco Cali Tzai	Member of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD)
15	Maria Virginia Bras Gomes	Member of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR)
16	Broddi Sigurðarson	UN Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
17	Victoria Tauli-Corpuz	Member of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous

		Issues (PFII)
18	Tony Gonella Frichner.	Member of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (PFII)
19	Balkrishna Mahbuang	Chairperson Centre for Ethnic and Alternative Development Studies (CEADS) Nepal
20	Birgitte Feiring	Consultant
21	Karen Curtis	Deputy Director, ILO Standards department
22	Shauna Olney	Coordinator Equality, Migrant workers and Indigenous peoples ILO
23	Albert Barume	Senior Specialist on Indigenous and Tribal peoples' issues ILO
24	Stefania Errico	Technical Officer ILO
25	Niskua Igualikinya	Technical Officer ILO
26	David Hunter	ILO Department of Statistics
27	David Kucera	ILO Department of Integration
28	Dora Sari	ILO Department of Integration
29	Antti Korkeakivi	OHCHR - Chief of the Indigenous Peoples and Minorities Section
30	Samia Slimane	OHCHR – Indigenous Peoples and Minorities Section, Human Rights Officer
31	Nicolas Fasel	OHCHR – Right to Development Section, Human Rights Officer
33	Maia Campbell	Assistant of the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples – Arizona University

36	Neal Keating	University Anthropology NY
37	Ana Maria Oyarce	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)
38	Maurizio Farhan	Forest Peoples Programme
39	Lawrence McDonald	Review of Government Service Provision Australia
40	Turid Arnegard	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
41	Tove Søvndahl Pedersen	Sinniisoqarfimmi pisortaq/Repræsentationschef/Head of Representation Greenland
42	Benigno Delgado	Documentalist DoCip
43	Aissatou Oumarou	Indigenous Fellow, Chad
44	Zeina Walet Aly	Indigenous Fellow, Mali
45	Joseph Itongwa Muumo	Indigenous Fellow, Democratic Republic of Congo

Members of Inter-Agency Support Group on Indigenous Issues

1.	Navin Rai	World Bank Indigenous peoples advisor
2.	Trisha Riedy	UN Institute for Training and Research Manager and Senior Trainer Programme in Peacemaking and Conflict Prevention
3.	Beatrice Duncan	UNICEF Programme Specialist (Human Rights) Gender and Rights Unit Division of Policy and Practice

4	Dr Ritu Sadana	World Health Organization Coordinator Equity Analysis & Research Department of Ethics, Equity, Trade and Human Rights Information, Evidence and Research Cluster
---	----------------	---