Mr. Moderator,

- It is a pleasure to speak in the beginning of the workshop, which is aimed at the strengthening of the mandate of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. I understand that as an acknowledgment of the efficient work of the current members of EMRIP.
- Expert-Members being in the very center of EMRIP's work and possessing an invaluable knowledge on mandate's strengths and limitations, have submitted their views in writing. The current membership is interested in exercising a mandate of the best posible efficiency. It has to fit the demand of indigenous peoples, to comply with international standards and UN rules, and to assist member-states to improve legislative and executive measures in the sphere of the indigenous people's rights.
- First of all, I would like to stress the unique status of EMRIP as a subsidiary body to the Human Rights Council. At the same time, EMRIP is not integrated into the family of special procedures, which limits our communication and experience exchange with other mandate holders. For instance, EMRIP's chair does not participate in annual meetings of all special procedures, which excludes us from the discussions with colleagues, who perform in related areas.
- Despite its affiliation with the Council, EMRIP doesn't have much opportunities to communicate directly with the President and Bureau of the Council, nor with the High Commissioner for Human Rights, in a regular basis. Such meetings could play a big role in identifying focuses in our joint work, and they could offer an additional space for the consultations on the possible themes of EMRIP studies.
- In principle, EMRIP's mandate is at the moment the least strong among indigenous specific UN mandates. That's why GA pointed namely EMRIP in the first place, while recommended its reviewing. In fact, the mandate is declared quite clearly. It is more likely, that the mandate is not secured with resources and necessary support.
- For example, the Expert Mechanism, organizing its annual session, determines its agenda independently. We come back every year under this agenda to our previous studies, to give the opportunities to discuss how successful EMRIP recommendations are being implemented. However, only a small number of States and indigenous organizations intervene and offer their analysis under this agenda item. I will say more – some states practiced such a non-constructive approach, when one year they are offering for inclusion in our study a good practice, and the next year it appears that this practice does not work anymore or such adjustments have been made, that weaken the legal status of indigenous peoples. I will not go into details, I leave them for our annual session. Let me just say that the Expert Mechanism should be able to monitor the implementation of its recommendations. We should have an understanding of how seriously the states perceive our research and our recommendations. Today, our hands are tied in this respect.
- It is important to keep a positive experience that EMRIP has elaborated when doing thematic studies. We have always had preliminary consultations on the theme of future studies with the main co-sponsors of the relevant resolution, however, I think that the potential of the consultations on studies' themes has not been exhausted. It is important to most effectively use the potential and

expertise of the particular individual members of EMRIP, which are endowed with a mandate at a particular moment. EMRIP could be even more independent in chosing themes for its studies.

- From their side, States could better collaborate with us in terms of providing EMRIP with best practices and challenges they encounter on the way of achieving the ends of the Declaration. So far, we have not received many answers from member states to our questionnaire, which is the basis for our annual survey we are conducting with our academic partners.
- EMRIP cooperates with other indigenous specific mandates as declared by the mandate. This cooperation includes several joint meetings a year, information exchange, joint letters. However, joint actions and joint statements are missing from this cooperation.
- EMRIP does not have resources to participate in discussions and UN meetings of a crucial importance for indigenous peoples, for instance Climate Change and Sustainable Development negotiations and follow-up events. This excludes experts from up-to-date knowledge and information.
- EMRIP has no resources to develop its inter-sessional activities, including inter-sessional meetings. Also, EMRIP has a lack of secretarial support, since our secretariat consists of only one person who works very effectively, but at full capacity. An expanded mandate should assume a stronger secretariat support for the members.
- We talk a lot about openness, but there are technical limitations: there are no resources for online translation of our sessions. And last year we did not even have a possibility to translate the draft study into the official languages of the UN prior to the session, in order to make participants from an indigenous origin acquainted with the documents in advance.