



Promoting inclusive parliaments: The representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament



Report on the first meeting of the Advisory Group

Geneva, 16–17 September 2008

Session 1- Overview of the project

Objectives

The meeting opened with a discussion of the context in which the project has emerged, its objectives, and the activities carried out to date. The project is based on the assumption that democracy requires a strong parliament, and that parliament should reflect the social diversity of the population in terms of gender, language, religion, ethnicity, or other politically significant characteristics. A parliament which is unrepresentative in this sense will leave some social groups and communities feeling disadvantaged in the political process or even excluded altogether, with consequences for the quality of public life or the stability of the political system and society in general.

The objectives are described in the project document as:

- Increase knowledge on the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples
- Provide tools for parliaments and other stakeholders on promoting inclusive parliaments
- Build capacity to advocate for more inclusive parliaments

Participants agreed that these objectives were appropriate and that they came in a logical sequence.

A discussion followed on the best ways to achieve the objectives. It was underlined that parliament alone is not in a position to bring about greater representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament. Political parties, which control access to candidacy, play a determining role in who gets elected to parliament. Policy-makers may be found in parliament but also in many other spheres, including government, political parties and NGOs. Other groups include election commissions, regional parliamentary associations and advocacy groups in general. Improving democratic behaviour requires going beyond parliament.

The question of exactly who the project would address its results to was raised. It was suggested that all of the above-mentioned groups should be made aware of the results. Results could be packaged differently according to the needs of the different groups of users. Members of the Advisory Group could help to disseminate results among their constituencies.

Participants insisted on the importance of including regional perspectives throughout the project. They also noted that there can be a wide gap between descriptive and substantive representation (referred to as 'physical' and 'mental' representation). It was acknowledged that the project intends to address both of these aspects.

Participants also insisted on the need to focus on results, in terms of implementation of reforms

Scope

Participants discussed the possibility of extending the scope of the project beyond national parliaments. There are many other structures in which minorities and indigenous peoples may in fact have a greater level of representation than in national parliaments. These include: cross-national parliaments (ex: Saami parliament, Indigenous Parliament of America); the institutions of autonomous regions; provinces in federal states with a large minority or indigenous population; institutions of local government; national institutions specifically designed for minorities and indigenous peoples (ex: the Assembly of Peoples in Kazakhstan).

In the light of IPU's mandate, it was agreed that data gathering activities would initially focus on national parliaments, while leaving open the possibility of extending to other types of structure at a later stage.

It was underlined that ethnic parties should come within the scope of the project. Ethnic parties are forbidden in many countries, whereas OSCE promotes the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in both ethnic and mainstream parties and the CoE instruments (ECHR and FCNM) do not allow for the prohibition of ethnic parties.

There was a discussion about whether it was appropriate to include both minorities and indigenous peoples within the scope of the project. It was noted that the protection of indigenous peoples is generally stronger in international law than that of minorities. Minority groups and indigenous peoples often prefer to define themselves differently. Indigenous peoples sometimes do not like to be considered as a minority.

Although indigenous peoples sometimes do not like to be considered as a minority, they have been using international instruments and mechanisms available for the protection of minorities in addition to those for the protection of indigenous peoples.

Both minorities and indigenous peoples often have a similar experience of exclusion from power. It was agreed that it is useful to address both groups within the project, while keeping in mind the distinctions between them.

Definitions

A lot of attention was given to finding an appropriate way to frame the definition of minorities and indigenous peoples that would be used throughout the project. It was widely agreed that the approach to definition of minorities used by the United Nations should serve as the basis of the project's definition. The project should not in any way be apologetic about any perceived lack of a precise definition of what constitutes a minority.

It was agreed that an additional paragraph on definitions in the introduction to the questionnaire would provide useful guidance to people involved in the project. A paragraph was drafted, and can be found as an Annex to this report. It clarifies that recognition of minority status should be based on objective and subjective criteria:

- the notion of being in numerical inferiority and/or a non-dominant position
- possessing distinct ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic characteristics
- self-identification

There was some discussion of the notion of 'old' and 'new' minorities (for example second or third generation immigrants). It was considered that the approach to the definition did not prevent parliament from including 'new' minorities should it wish to do so.

Summary of outcomes

The Advisory Group:

- confirmed the objectives of the project
- confirmed the scope of the project, with the possibility to extend beyond parliament at a later stage should the need become apparent.
- confirmed that the project should address both minorities and indigenous peoples, and should make clear the distinction between these groups.

- confirmed the use of the UN approach to definitions of minorities and indigenous peoples, and agreed on a text that provides further clarification of the definition.

Updates on other projects

The group was informed about recent initiatives within the OSCE and the Council of Europe. It was also briefed on the European Union Roma Summit (September 16, 2008 – Brussels)

Session 2- Questionnaire

Structure and content

Participants considered that the questionnaire would be a useful means of gathering information and that this information would be necessary to inform later activities in the project.

The importance of providing clear guidance for respondents and a well-formulated definition was underlined. The definition will be the one drafted by the Advisory Group.

Some significant changes were made to the structure of the questionnaire and numerous revisions were proposed to the questions. It was agreed that different parts of the questionnaire should be addressed to different respondents. The main changes were as follows:

Section 1 (introductory questions) should be moved to an Annex or answered in a different manner. Parliament is probably not the best source of information for these questions, which may be demotivating if placed at the beginning of the questionnaire. One option would be to hire a researcher to gather this data. This decision was left to the project managers.

Sections 2-8 should be answered by parliaments, that would receive the questionnaire through the regular IPU channels. In almost all cases, the IPU group in parliament is presided by the Speaker of parliament, which gives authority to the responses. Insofar as possible, the questionnaire should also collect data about historical trends in the representation of minorities and indigenous groups in parliament.

Questions relating to political parties should be extracted from the draft questionnaire and placed in a separate section. IPU should ask parliaments to forward this section to each parliamentary party group.

Section 9 (questions for individual members of parliament) provoked a lot of discussion. It was widely felt that it was important to gather the views of individual parliamentarians. Indeed, this section should be expanded to include more opinion-based questions. The methodology for distributing this section of the questionnaire needs to be refined. Respondents should receive a strong guarantee about the anonymity of their responses and how the data will be used. This is potentially a very sensitive issue for parliamentarians. The questions should not be addressed only to parliamentarians from minorities and indigenous groups, or parliamentarians who hold reserved seats, but to all parliamentarians. Getting views on minorities and indigenous issues from parliamentarians who were not elected through specific voting arrangements for minorities and/or indigenous peoples was seen as being important.

Interviews with selected parliamentarians should be carried out as an indispensable complement to the questionnaire. An interview protocol should be rigorously developed in order to ensure the authority of the sample and the data collected.

Uses

The data collected from parliaments and parliamentary groups would be entered into a publicly accessible online database, that could be used by whoever wishes to do so. It would form the basis for an analysis of the state of representation of minorities and indigenous groups in parliament, that would be updated annually. Many of the subsequent project activities would be shaped by the information collected at this stage.

The data collected from individual parliamentarians would be used differently. Steps would be taken to anonymize the data during the processing phase. Data would only be presented as aggregate figures. Data would not be made publicly available in any way that would enable the identification of individual parliamentarians without their specific written consent.

Strategy

Participants flagged a number of problems that may be faced during the data gathering exercise:

- The length and complexity of the questionnaire
- Low response rate

These issues would be addressed by raising awareness about this project among parliaments; by providing comprehensive guidance to respondents; by testing the questionnaire with some parliaments before general distribution

- 'Nil responses': Parliament says that there are no minorities and indigenous groups in their country
- Responses contain data that appears to be incomplete and/or inaccurate

These are rather more complex issues to address. It was agreed that it would be important to validate the data received from parliament by cross-checking with other sources. This additional research could be done in parallel or more likely as a second stage. In the case of nil responses and discrepancies in the data, IPU would raise the issue with the parliament concerned and seek to come to an agreed solution. A solution that could be envisaged would be to include in the database data from both the parliament and other sources, which should be clearly indicated. We will learn from experience to what extent this will be a problem. IPU-organised events would be good opportunities for testing the questionnaire and obtaining and crosschecking data. As indicated above, other sources of data should be consulted.

- Comparability of data

By inviting parliaments to provide data on what they consider to be minorities and indigenous groups in their country, it will not be possible to obtain data that is strictly comparable for all countries. This is in the nature of the exercise, and should be publicly acknowledged.

Timeline

The timeline proposed in the project document was felt to be too short. It should be revised to allow parliaments, parliamentary groups and individual parliamentarians sufficient time to respond. An initial deadline will be set as a milestone, at which point a decision will be taken on the need for follow-up with parliaments or supplementary research to complete gaps in responses.

A decision on the timing of the distribution of the questionnaire for individual parliamentarians was left to the project managers.

Summary of outcomes

- The questionnaire was restructured, and many questions were refined. Separate sections of the questionnaire will be answered by parliamentary authorities, parliamentary party groups and individual parliamentarians
- The questions for individual parliamentarians need further work, both on the content, methodology and how the data collected will be used. In addition, interviews with individual parliamentarians will be carried out to provide a more substantive perspective.
- A revised questionnaire will be circulated to members of the Advisory Group, and tested with some parliaments before finalization and distribution

- Regional parliamentary organisations should be engaged at an early stage to maximise the return rate for the questionnaire

Session 3 - Future project activities

Objectives

The Advisory group discussed the future knowledge activities and future advocacy activities listed in the project proposal and provided additional guidance for the future activities.

Scope

1) Knowledge activities:

The set of activities related to the questionnaire will increase the knowledge and gaps on the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples. It will be important to develop good arguments about why minority and indigenous representation is important. The Advisory Group discussed the target groups for an awareness raising campaign, the need for good practices (toolkit) and the risks related to such activities (question of legitimacy).

Knowledge gaps: Little research has been dedicated to this subject so far and little comparative data is available. The questionnaire will need to be a strong basis for comparative study, and statistics are a good starting point (as illustrated by the IPU programmes on gender and the normative aspect of its statistics on women's representation¹). The questionnaire and related activities will provide a first picture of what is happening in parliament in terms of numbers and effects of electoral mechanisms. Nevertheless, it will also be crucial to capture information about how minority groups gain access to the parliaments and how political parties are engaged on such issues.

The participants stressed the importance of combining the questionnaire with a more substantive research component such as dedicated case studies on the question of access to power together with examples of good practice by parliaments to include minorities. Additionally, national and regional perspectives and political systems will need to be taken into account.

It was recommended to set-up a model for case studies and to identify representative cases of inclusive and not inclusive parliaments.

The advisory group indicated that **additional research** could:

- Review the work and the role of NGOs on minority representation and success stories on boosting the public opinion.
- Illustrate regional experiences
- Include case studies
- Include individual interviews, face-to-face meetings in order to identify and map good practices and personal experiences

Women's representation and the IPU gender programme:

Discussion on women's representation was initiated in the 1980s in Nordic countries and led to strong campaigns for greater political participation. Since the first UN Assembly of Women, the legitimacy of women's representation has been clearly stated together with a commitment of the United Nations and the parliaments to continue the process. However

¹ The latest IPU Survey "Equality in Politics" comprised 300 responses and 30 face-to-face interviews to identify best practices. The survey confirmed the challenges of women's representation and included some more substantive reflection on how do women change policies. The next step will be to develop indicators for gender sensitive parliaments that could be integrated into specific benchmarks.

the question of minority representation is more recent and does not have almost thirty years of advocacy to build on. Although minority and women's representation is not symmetrical, the experience of the IPU gender programme could be replicated in the minority project by using its results and related substantive research to develop benchmarks and indicators for minority sensitive parliaments.

Minority representation is a sensitive and political subject. Therefore, it is recommended to promote the project to a broad audience to raise awareness on the subject and to legitimatise the different components of an inclusive parliament.

Need to engage with regional forums: the Advisory Group stressed again the importance of engaging regional parliaments and forums in the discussion (both at the additional research stage and during awareness raising activities). The additional research should further explore the role and synergies of the Parlamento Indigena (<http://www.parlamentoindigena.org/>), the Asian Parliamentary Forum and other relevant actors.

Awareness raising campaign:

The participants indicated that the awareness raising campaign needs to elaborate on why inclusiveness in parliament is so important. One aspect of the campaign should focus on educational work on democratic principles, human rights commitments (both soft-law and hard-law). The campaign should also summarize why the project is being conducted and why inclusiveness is legitimate, beyond numbers.

The participants noted the importance of engaging other UN agencies in the outreach strategy (for example through the UN Inter-Agency Group on Minorities).

The IPU meetings (Geneva October 2008, Ethiopia in April 2009) should be a good moment to engage parliaments in the process, to identify good practices and to further raise awareness on the objectives of the programmes to get a broad sense of ownership from parliaments on these issues. One on one interviews would go a long way in reassuring participants about the objectives of the project. Meetings of secretaries of delegations to IPU Assemblies could be another important forum for raising awareness. IPU technical assistance missions should serve not only to collect data for the project but also to promote advocacy. The participants recognized the IPU Secretariat's coordination role during these events. Parliamentary ownership and engagement will be important to get a good return rate for the questionnaire and to engage parliaments on a long-term and sustainable basis. Furthermore, the project should stimulate parliaments to develop good practices in an environment of weak legal obligations on minority representation.

The creation of a **dedicated website** was seen as a positive initiative by the participants in terms of visibility and dissemination of good practices. Before the dedicated website goes live, a special section should be included in the IPU website to inform parliaments of the project.

The main characteristics of the toolkit:

Participants discussed the future characteristics of the toolkit and highlighted its role in promoting the exchange of experiences and detailing the benefits of including minorities. Post-conflict situations are often demonstrated as good practice in terms of the attention paid to minority representation (Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, and Nepal). Consequently, the toolkit could address different needs and realities through dedicated chapters. Why do you need minority representation in old democracies, in new democracies...? The electoral

system, the role of political parties and the establishment of pools of candidates should also be addressed in the toolkit. The material should address the different needs and realities. The toolkit should reflect regional realities and the benefits of regional approaches (for example, the case of regional forums). The advisory board also reflected on the need to include a section on the benefits for government to support minority representation (as part of the rule of law, integration policies and conflict prevention mechanisms). Engaging other UN agencies who have been working on indigenous and minority issues would also be helpful for the dissemination of the toolkit. Treaty based bodies need to be reviewed in the toolkit, together with an analysis of electoral systems. Good practices from changes in the electoral laws should be further reviewed and discussed in the toolkit.

Risks:

- Length of the process to get a good return rate to the questionnaire. The participants indicated that it would be important to complement this exercise with additional research that would help fill the knowledge gaps;
- Developing a toolkit that would be too prescriptive or too simplistic: mechanisms and recommendations are not always applicable, consequently, the toolkit should identify parameters and measures of applicability. The project should aim to identify good practice and leave it to parliaments and other target groups to decide on the appropriate course of action.
- The cost of facilitating use of minority languages in parliament might be prohibitive in many parliaments. The participants noted the importance of the awareness raising campaign to decrease tensions by demonstrating the added value of minority representation in a more global picture.

Summary of outcomes (knowledge activities):

The Advisory Group:

- Confirmed the objectives of the toolkit and discussed its characteristics;
- Recommended using multiple channels to distribute and collect information for the questionnaire and to carry out additional research;
- Recommended engaging with regional forums and parliamentary organizations;
- Confirmed the need for a dedicated website and for a strong awareness raising campaign (engaging also regional forums)

2) Future advocacy activities:

The participants reviewed the main characteristics of an international conference on the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament together with the establishment of additional advocacy activities.

International conference on the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament:

The international conference should be the occasion to present the results of research activities and to launch the toolkit. The timing of the conference should therefore be put back, to come towards the end of the project. It might be difficult to plan its exact date at the current stage. The Advisory Group stressed that the conference should be the peak of the project; it should be a key push for changes and advocacy. The conference should only take place when clear outcomes of the research are available and demonstrate added-value. It should be broadened to a larger audience than just parliaments (including for example political parties, NGOs). Panel events could focus on parliamentarians only. The participants suggested to organize regional events ahead of the international

conference in the format of regional workshops to identify case studies that will help tackle some of the sensitive aspects of the project. This methodology would be similar to UNDP work on the dissemination of benchmarks for democratic legislatures and the organization of regional workshops to further disseminate the benchmarks. The regional events will pave the way for establishing long-term and sustainable structures at the regional levels that will continue the work through annual networking and can report back to the IPU. These regional workshops should focus on engaging with MPs committees and sub-committees working on minority issues. It was noted that the development of regional follow-up structures could be envisaged if additional budget resources are available at the end of the project.

In terms of timing, the activities should promote:

- regional events,
- international conference
- Additional follow-up at regional level if funds are available.

Importance of targeting UN treaty bodies:

Treaty bodies are good avenues to work on sustainable way of advocating for minority representation. Aside from the analysis of trends on minority representation, the knowledge that will be developed through the questionnaire and additional research will need to be incorporated in and transmitted to the different monitoring and reporting mechanisms to encourage states to report under these mechanisms. The Advisory Board discussed the following relevant UN treaty-based bodies on the issue of minority representation: the Human Rights Committee (<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrc/index.htm>), the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD - <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/index.htm>) and the Committee on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW - <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/index.htm>). Representation of minorities is monitored by the Human Rights Committee under Articles 25 and 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and political Rights (ICCPR) and by CERD.

The participants also highlighted the need to pay particular attention to article 27 of ICCPR and related concluding observations. CERD and CEDAW reporting exercises have increasingly been containing more information on the minority representation issues, but there is still room for improvement. The participants recommended supporting CERD to have a general day of discussion on the topic of minority representation. It was also suggested to connect with the Forum on Minority Issues² (in 2008, the focus of the forum is on education, but the topics are open for the coming years, and it would be interesting to suggest minority representation in parliaments, that could then lead to the possible adoption of recommendations). Another recommendation discussed by the participants was to advocate for developing a general comment of a treaty-based body on the question of the minority representation (ex: through the Forum on Minority Issues). Once the draft is produced, it could be adopted by CERD or another body. Should the issue of minority representation not be taken up by the Forum on Minority Issues, the OHCHR is prepared to address it through expert seminars developing guidelines and recommendations.

At the European level, the Council of Europe with the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages³ and Framework Convention for the protection of National Minorities⁴ represent additional opportunities to work on state reporting mechanisms.

² <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/minority/forum.htm>

³ http://www.coe.int/T/E/Legal_Affairs/Local_and_regional_Democracy/Regional_or_Minority_languages/

The participants also encouraged to inform and disseminate the created knowledge at various regional frameworks, such as the OSCE.

Other advocacy tools:

The project will need to promote powerful messages that will multiply the effect of the conference. The Advisory Group stressed the importance of capacity development activities and awareness raising for members of parliament. It is important to mainstream minority representation in training programmes not only for specialized parliamentary committees dealing with minority issues but also, as a matter of routine, for all MPs. The Advisory Group noted the need to develop dedicated activities for members of parliaments representing minorities together with the importance of identifying MPs (champions) for future networking and regional meetings. Organizing fact-finding missions to parliaments was also identified as another interesting advocacy tool. Finally, regional events (Asian Parliamentary Forum will be organized in Vietnam in 2009) were identified as positive multiplier effect events (awareness raising on the project, involving and creating networks of champions ...).

The project's advocacy work should build on the tools and documents of other organizations working in this area, such as OSCE and the Council of Europe, to avoid the risk of differences that could be used by states to exploit any divergence.

The added value of this project may lie in its ability to initiate debate and apply peer pressure. Progressive change is often based on peer observation. Suggestions should be practical, non-threatening and constructive.

Risks:

- The message of the project might be subject to misinterpretation. Therefore, the project team should strongly advocate that the project focuses on the principles of diversity and advocating for inclusive parliaments (human-rights based approach to minority representation); that the project explores both minority representation and minority participation in the activities of parliaments, and that the project is not about self-determination
- Caution should be exercised so that the project is not seen as being about the politization of minority representation issues. Project should focus on national parliament.
- Avoid naming and shaming approaches. This approach should be reflected in the questionnaire which should also allow parliaments to elaborate on their practices. .
- One size fits all approaches should be avoided (principle to be integrated in the toolkit)

Summary of outcomes:

The Advisory Group:

- Agreed upon the importance of targeting external influencing bodies and special bodies / mechanisms for their expertise
- stressed that it would be crucial for the project to connect with regional forums on minority issues

⁴ http://www.coe.int/t/e/human_rights/minorities/

- Agreed on the importance of the website and visibility activities to reduce possible tensions and misinterpretations
- recommended that the project develop an effective communication campaign with strong messages
- Stressed that the conference should be the peak event and should address a large and diverse audience.
- Stressed the importance of strong interconnections between the regional and the global events.
- Noted the importance of identifying champions and building alliances

Session 4 - the role of the advisory board:

The objective of this session was to allow the members of the Advisory Group to have a shared understanding of the role that they will play in the project; to review the working mechanisms and the composition of the group.

Timing and composition of the next Advisory Group meeting:

The role of the Advisory Group is to provide expert advice. Adding new members to the Advisory Group should reflect particular needs and ensure geographical and thematic expertise. On additional partners, the participants suggested the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, regional parliamentary organizations and forums; and ODIHR. As the project budget has limited funds, it was suggested to, at minimum and when possible, inform them about the initiative and keep them updated of the latest developments.

The participants suggested having the next meeting of the Advisory Group once the questionnaire has been circulated and initial responses received; as well as when there is a draft of the toolkit.. The timeline of activities will be reviewed accordingly.

Participants also recommended collecting information before the international conference (need to take stock on amount collected + research) and to start work on the toolkit by the end of 2008 (chapters' related to international legal obligations, publications etc). The advisory group noted that the project should make the best use of organizations through the members of the advisory group in terms of information already available and creating synergies (Central Asia information is available on numerical representation; material on Montenegro on reserved seats for minority).

The IPU presents useful opportunities for networking which should be leveraged. Its website should be used to promote the project. For instance, it was agreed that the IPU website should have a reference to the project; together with available documents so far (FAQ, promotional material with key messages). The ASGP Meeting and IPU e-Bulletin were also mentioned as good entry points to further disseminate the objective of the project in order to engage national parliaments as soon as possible. This preparatory work will contribute to a higher return rate for the questionnaire. The IPU mentioned that preliminary talks are ongoing with the Speaker of the Ethiopian Parliament to include the management of diversity and minority representation in the agenda of the next annual IPU meeting that will take place in April 2009. Some members of the Advisory Group could be invited to participate in the debate

Participants indicated that they will forward conclusions and papers on the 10th anniversary of the Lund Recommendations (May 2009) and recommended to consult International census databases.

Summary of outcomes:

The Advisory Group:

- Agreed to provide feedback and comments by e-mail when possible and identify alternate methods to collect the information if the return rate of the questionnaire is not up to expected standards;
- recognized the importance of creating new synergies (Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum) and to designate champions to maximize the impact of the project;
- recommended to meet once material is available for review and inputs (for example the draft toolkit or to prepare the international conference agenda)
- Welcomed the idea of organizing fact-finding missions together with an Advisory Board meeting.

Annex: Further clarification on the definition of the term “minority”:

The term minority as used in the United Nations human rights system refers to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities, as laid out in the United Nations Declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities (General Assembly resolution 47/135 of 18 December 1992) and in Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.. This Declaration also applies to indigenous peoples, in addition to the United Nations Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples (General Assembly resolution A/61/L.67 of 13 September 2007) which articulates its provisions around specific characteristics that indigenous peoples share around the world: a special relationship to lands and the environment; distinct political and social institutions, including customary legal systems and laws, cultural traditions and customs, health practices; own understanding/perspective of development priorities, and traditional management of resources and other knowledge.

Neither of the Declarations defines who minorities or indigenous peoples are as no single definition could encapsulate the realities of all the diverse groups and communities concerned. Instead the United Nations takes into account the principle of self-identification when working with indigenous peoples and minorities. It is now commonly accepted that recognition of minority status should be based on objective criteria (such as non-dominance in terms of numbers and/or political power and possessing distinct ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic characteristics) as well as on subjective criteria of self-definition (i.e. a will on the part of the members of the group in question to preserve these distinct characteristics). It is suggested that the same principle should be used for the purposes of this questionnaire.

Annotated agenda

Tuesday 16 September	
09:00~09:30	Welcome and Introduction
Session 1 (09:30~13:00)	Overview of the project and activities carried out so far Open discussion on the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament
Chair	Anders B. Johnsson, IPU
Speakers	All members of the Advisory Group will be invited to contribute
Expected outcomes: Members of the Advisory Group will be familiar with the project and each other. All participants will have provided their perspective on the major issues concerning the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament.	
Discussion points	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ What do IPU and UNDP expect from the Advisory Group, at this meeting and in the future?○ Are the objectives of the project clear?○ What are the specific obstacles to, and benefits of, parliamentary representation for minorities and indigenous peoples?○ Updates on recent projects / initiatives on minority representation○ How can this project make the most useful contribution to advancing the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament?○ What challenges does the project face, and how to address them?	
Session 2 (14:30~17:30)	Review of draft questionnaire for parliaments
Facilitator	Mark Lattimer
Speakers	Andy Reynolds
Expected outcomes: At the end of the session, the draft questionnaire will have been reviewed, revised and approved by the Advisory Group. If further revision is considered necessary, clear guidance will have been provided on the steps to finalization of the questionnaire.	
Discussion points	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Is the purpose and scope of the questionnaire clear?○ Does the draft questionnaire cover all the relevant areas? If not, what is missing?○ What ethical issues does the questionnaire raise, and how can they be addressed?○ What additions, deletions and modifications should be made to the questions?○ What problems can be anticipated in gathering the data, and how can they be addressed?○ In what ways will the data be used, and by whom?	

Wednesday 17 September	
Session 3 (09:00~13:00)	Future project activities The members of the Advisory Group will break out into two parallel working groups, before coming together to share and refine their conclusions in a joint session
Session (09:30~11:00)	3A Future knowledge activities Expected outcomes: A description of the main characteristics of a toolkit for parliaments. A set of proposals for future knowledge activities, including the possibility of a website/knowledge hub, and guidance on how to carry them out. Discussion points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the main knowledge gaps concerning the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament, and what can/should the project do to address them? ○ What should be the main characteristics of a toolkit for parliaments (purpose; target audience; content; format etc)? ○ How can/should the project investigate questions such as the legitimacy minority members of parliament are as representatives of minority communities, and whether they have power and influence beyond their (often) small presence and numbers. ○ What are the main risks of the future knowledge activities, and how can they be addressed?
Session (09:30~11:00)	3B Future advocacy activities Expected outcomes: A description of the main characteristics of an international conference on the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament. A set of proposals for future advocacy activities is established, as well as guidance on how to carry them out. Discussion points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How can the project advocate most effectively for enhanced representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament? How can the data collected be put to most effective use? ○ What could be the main advocacy strategies and messages, and who should they be aimed at? ○ What should be the main characteristics of an international conference on the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament (objectives; participants; partners; themes; outcomes etc) ○ What are the main risks of the future advocacy activities, and how can they be addressed?
Joint Session (11:30~13:00)	
Session 4 (14:30~17:30)	Future role of the Advisory Group Speakers All members of the Advisory Group will be invited to contribute Expected outcomes: Members of the Advisory Group have a shared understanding of the role that they will play in the project. The date and location of the next meeting of the Advisory Group are agreed. Discussion points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the main conclusions that have emerged from the meeting? ○ What will the members of the Advisory Group contribute to the next stages of the project (advice; promotion; networking etc)? How the members of the Advisory Board can become agents of change and champions of minority representation? ○ Objectives, date and location of future Advisory Group meetings ○ What partnerships should the project seek to build with other organizations? Which ones, and how to establish these linkages? ○ How can IPU-UNDP maintain contact with the members of the Advisory Group in between meetings, and at what frequency?

Participants

Ms. Jean Augustine

Former Member of the House of Commons, Canada
Former Minister of State for Multiculturalism and Status of Women

Mr. Alain Chablais

Head a.i. of the Secretariat of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Council of Europe

Mr. Kuma Madesha Dema

Member of the House of Representatives, Ethiopia
Member of the Infrastructure Affairs Standing Committee

Mr. Krzysztof Drzewicki

Senior Legal Adviser to the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities

Mr. Ngo Anh Dzung

Member of the National Assembly, Viet Nam. Vice-Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee.
Member of the IPU Executive Committee

Ms. Georgeta Ionescu

Secretary of State for Defense, Romania
Former Secretary General of the Chamber of Deputies

Ms. Ilona Klímová-Alexander

Associate Human Rights Officer, Indigenous Peoples and Minorities Unit
Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights

Mr. Martin Kovats

Lecturer in politics, University of London

Mr. Mark Lattimer

Executive Director, Minority Rights Group International

Mr. Andy Reynolds

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA

Ms. Catalina Soberanis

Former high functionary in the Central American Program for the Strengthening of Democratic Dialogue (Organization of the American States)
Political Advisor, UNDP, Guatemala

Members unable to attend the meeting

Mr. Julian Burger

Coordinator, Indigenous Peoples and Minorities Unit, Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights

Ms. Syada Greiss

Member of the People's National Assembly, Egypt

Ms. Gay McDougall

United Nations Independent Expert on minority issues